Original citation:

Permanent WRAP URL:
http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/86148

Copyright and reuse:
The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

A note on versions:
The version presented in WRAP is the published version or, version of record, and may be cited as it appears here.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk
Chapter 11

Isaac D’Israeli, Reader of Montaigne

Ingrid A. R. De Smet

[A] vital spirit in his page,
kindred with the souls of a Bayle and a Montaigne.
— Benjamin Disraeli about his father Isaac

The Bodleian Library at Oxford is home to a copy of the 1588 edition of Montaigne’s *Essais*. As its class-mark ‘Douce M.101’ indicates, the volume belonged to the private book collection that the nineteenth-century antiquarian Francis Douce bequeathed to the Bodleian. Although the book bears the hallmarks of a collector’s item, it clearly served as a working copy too. The text of the *Essais* itself shows slight annotations in a late sixteenth-century or early seventeenth-century hand, but the volume appears to have been thoroughly cleaned at the time of its restoration in the early nineteenth century. Douce, however, pencilled in some brief notes of his own in the course of his perusal of the text. The book also has copies of various portraits of Montaigne and a title-page of the 1641 Rouen edition glued into it. Above all, it contains on yet another piece of paper pasted inside some additional manuscript notes by Douce. The first of these, most notably, replicates Montaigne’s French signature, based on ‘Montaigne’s autograph in a copy of De Guise *Illustrations de la Gaule Belgique* in the possession of I. D’Israeli Esq re’c’. Douce, in other words, apparently observed this signature in a copy of the *Premier [-tiers] volume des illustrations de la Gaulle Belgique, antiquitez du pays de Haynau et de la grand cité de Belges*, published in Paris in 1531–32 by François Regnault and Galliot Dupré. This voluminous text, which until recently was not known to have belonged to Montaigne’s library, is the abbreviated French translation by Jean Wauquelin — but often erroneously attributed to Jean Lessabé (or de Leussach) — of the *Annales Hannoniae* by the fourteenth-century chronicler Jacques de Guyse.

The owner of this signed copy, then, was the writer Isaac D’Israeli (or Disraeli), a close friend of Douce’s and father to the famous British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli. So far our quest for this lost volume has not unearthed Montaigne’s copy — assuming it still exists — but it has thrown light on the fortunes of this chronicle by a contemporary of Jean Froissart, an author who was demonstrably present on Montaigne’s bookshelves. It has also highlighted the intrinsic interest of the reception of Montaigne in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, among writers and bibliophiles such as D’Israeli and Douce, who had links to
France, and of the influence of Montaigne, across languages and across periods, on the practice of essay writing. It is this particular, British aspect of Montaigne’s reception that this chapter intends to deepen, with specific reference to D’Israeli’s essay-craft. Two titles in D’Israeli’s œuvre will be of notable importance here, viz., the *Curiosities of Literature* and *Miscellanies; or, Literary Recreations*. Taking inspiration from the French fashion of the *ana*, the *Curiosities* first appeared, anonymously, in 1791. It purported to consist of ‘anecdotes, characters, sketches, and observations, literary, critical, and historical’. Somewhat like Montaigne’s *Essais*, the popular and variegated collection not only accrued several more volumes over time; its individual pieces also went through varying degrees of revision and re-ordering in the course of at least 14 subsequent editions (including a French translation in 1810), until the collection found its definitive form in Isaac D’Israeli’s *Complete Works*, posthumously published by his son Benjamin in 1849. Not dissimilarly, the slightly longer pieces of the *Miscellanies* of 1796 went through a second edition in 1801 and were revised again in 1840.

1. Montaigne, English Romantic book-collectors, and the taste for French writers

In some respects, both D’Israeli and his friend Douce’s attention to Montaigne relates to the so-called bibliomania that swept through England in the Romantic period between the mid-eighteenth and mid-nineteenth century. The fashion for book collecting signalled a thorough shift in literary taste and kindled a new appreciation of printed books and manuscripts as physical objects — which in turn triggered scornful observations in some parts that hoarding books is not equivalent to reading them. D’Israeli himself devoted a short chapter to the trend in his initial *Curiosities* of 1791. After considering the dangers (such as a vulnerability to hoaxes) that lurk within ‘this luxury of literature’, the author ends, from 1794 onwards, on a positive note that no doubt reflected the hope that he might pass on his own love of books and his actual library to his son: ‘This passion, when hereditary in illustrious families, ceases to be a mania; it then claims our admiration and our love.’ In the 1807 edition of *Curiosities of Literature*, however, ‘Libraries’ became the opening piece, giving D’Israeli cause to rewrite the ensuing article on ‘The Bibliomania’ in a much more negative light and to redefine the concept as ‘the collecting an enormous heap of Books, without intelligent curiosity’. Nonetheless, ‘Libraries’ likewise starts from the idea of a general ‘passion’ (the word is repeated four times in the essay) for books, a passion which can arguably lead to an ‘intemperance of studies’ and ‘curious collectors’ seeking out rare bindings such as de Thou’s or Grolier’s, but which may also be of inordinate national benefit when significant private collections become the nuclei of great national libraries such as the British Museum. It is entirely in keeping with this bibliophilic movement — to use a later and less loaded term — that D’Israeli should have owned a copy of Wauquelin’s *Illustrations de la Gaule belgique* with Montaigne’s autograph in it, or that in his essay ‘On Reading’, published in 1796, he should pick up on Montaigne’s habit, famously described in II.10, ‘Des livres’ [Of Books], of annotating the books he had read with a date and brief reminder of their merit.
Now, besides the 1588 edition of the *Essais* mentioned above, Douce owned a copy of the 1627 Rouen edition (Jean Berthelin), two editions of the translation of the *Essais* by John Florio (London 1603 and 1613), an edition of the translation by Charles Cotton (London 1776), and the first edition of the *Voyage en Italie* (Rome 1775).\(^\text{14}\) Isaac D’Israeli, for his part, owned at least one copy of Montaigne’s *Essais* in French, in the 1669 Paris edition (Laurent Rondet, Christophe Joumel, and Robert Chevillon).\(^\text{15}\) It is also possible that the English translation of the *Essais* by Charles Cotton (London 1711), preserved at Hughenden Manor with the *ex libris* of Benjamin Disraeli, came in fact from Isaac’s collection.\(^\text{16}\) Isaac was certainly familiar with Montaigne’s *Voyage en Italie*, for in a piece on ‘The Recovery of Manuscripts’, first published in *Curiosities of Literature* in 1794, he discusses at some length the discovery, some 20 years earlier, of the sole copy of the travel journal in ‘an old worm­eaten coffer, which had long held papers untouched by the incurious generations of Montaigne’ and its authentication by French scholars on palaeographical and stylistic grounds.\(^\text{17}\)

D’Israeli’s — or indeed Douce’s — ownership of copies of Montaigne in both languages seems to have been fairly characteristic of the discerning book collector and educated reader. An older contemporary of theirs, the Shakespeare editor George Steevens, whose library was particularly rich in Elizabethan literature, similarly owned a copy of the 1588 edition of the *Essais* as well as the 1613 edition of Florio’s translation. Douce and D’Israeli, incidentally, both bought books from Steevens’ collection when it was sold by auction after his death, but not the Montaigne editions.\(^\text{18}\) The 1813 catalogue of Lord Byron’s book collection, drawn up for a sale that did not take place, listed both a French edition of the *Essais* ([Paris]: Pierre and Firmin Didot, 1802) and an English version ([London]: C. Baldwin for W. Miller, White and Cochrane, and Lackington, Allen, and Co. 1811); both were sold at auction in 1816, before their owner set out on his travels abroad.\(^\text{19}\) Byron — who was also an admirer of D’Israeli’s pen — reacquainted himself with Montaigne in the summer of 1822, reading and marking the text in the copy of Cotton’s translation that (presumably) the poet and essayist Leigh Hunt had lent him.\(^\text{20}\) Later, Lady Marguerite Blessington and James Hamilton Browne too remarked on Byron’s fond reading of Montaigne.\(^\text{21}\)

D’Israeli’s interest in Montaigne, however, was not typical in every respect. Firstly, it pre­dates by several decades the boost that the essayist’s reputation in Britain received from Mary Shelley’s *Life of Montaigne* (1838) or William Hazlitt the younger’s 1842 edition of Montaigne’s *Complete Works*. Secondly, Montaigne forms part of a broad spectrum of French authors whom D’Israeli had come to appreciate, not in the least during his travels to France in about 1788–89.\(^\text{22}\) In these early years of his literary career, in fact, D’Israeli’s ‘partiality for French writers’ (including Racine, Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau) was at odds with the preference for English and classical literature that many of his fellow countrymen espoused, especially during the Anglo­French wars of 1793–1802. So in 1791 (but possibly a few years later), the Exeter physician Hugh Downman, D’Israeli’s friend and the future dedicatee of his *Miscellanies* (1796), berated the bookman in a satirical *Epistle* for being ‘more prodigal in [his] panegyric on the most eloquent French authors,
than his [i.e., Downman’s] taste, and more particularly his patriotism, approved’:

With polish’d manners you would join in vain
The smut of Rabelais, coarseness of Montaigne.
To sage Boileau what genuine strains belong?
From Horace, and Tassoni, flow’d his song.
Pope from their open fountain likewise drew:
What mighty thanks are to the Frenchman due!

[...]
In vain your much­loved Nation you advance;
She ever was, and ever will be, France.
Like Greece or Britain never can she shine;
Ours are the great Originals divine.

2. D’Israeli and ‘old Montaigne’

Well aware of the criticisms levelled against Montaigne by the likes of Downman or indeed by preceding generations, D’Israeli will revisit Montaigne and ‘the simplicity of this old and admirable favourite of Europe’ throughout the half­century span of his literary career, from the first edition of Curiosities of Literature to his last substantive work, the Amenities of Literature, consisting of sketches and characters of English literature of 1841.24 Montaigne is thus portrayed as ‘humorous’, ‘plain and unadorned’,25 and (with Dryden’s term) ‘honest’.26 D’Israeli concedes in 1841 (perhaps with an eye to Downman’s satirical epistle) that ‘in France Rabelais and Montaigne had contracted the rust and the rudeness of antiquity, as it seemed to the refinement of the following generation’.27 D’Israeli is certainly not always in agreement with Montaigne.28 He even accuses the sage of being inconsistent, when he refers to the manner of his death (as described by Estienne Pasquier) in the 1807 edition of Curiosities: ‘Montaigne and la Fontaine, who wrote very philosophically on death, did not die like philosophers. The first raised himself, when expiring, with fervent devotion to the host! And the other, after his death, had on a hair shirt!’29 In effect, in 1823 D’Israeli starts his own reflections on death by evoking Montaigne’s interest in the subject, though not without repeating his gentle rebuke: ‘for [Montaigne] did not die as he had promised himself, — expiring in the adoration of the mass; or, as his preceptor Buchanan would have called it, in “the act of rank idolatry”’.30 For the most part, however, we shall see that D’Israeli’s references to the essayist reveal a positive, or at the very least an indulgent, attitude towards ‘old Montaigne’.

To begin with, it seems that D’Israeli seeks out the more curious and light­hearted passages. In ‘The Amusements of Men of Letters’ (first published in 1793, and later retitled as ‘Amusements of the Learned’), for instance, D’Israeli remarks that ‘Montaigne found a very agreeable play­mate in his cat’, although he curtails the deeper philosophical dimension of the original statement in the ‘Apologie de Raimond Sebond’ (II.12), where Montaigne wonders: ‘Who knows if she [the cat] passes her time more with me than I do with her?’31 Two years later, in D’Israeli’s Essay on the Manners and Genius of the Literary Character (1795), the notion of an ailurophile Montaigne supports the affirmation that ‘men of genius’ just as easily
find a soothing distraction in ordinary pursuits, as they are capable of virtuosic reasoning:

When a man of letters seeks the consolations of society, he would rest a mind enfeebled with one continued pursuit; or exercise it by suffering it to take those infinite directions which the diversities of conversation offer. If it is wearied, the simplest actions please; it is a child that would sport with flowers and pebbles; if it issues in all it’s force [sic], it is an athlete that leaps in the arena, and calls for an adversary. *It is Montaigne sporting with his cat*, or Johnson maintaining a thesis amidst his marvelling friends.\(^{32}\)

By 1807, however, the *Curiosities* essay ‘Amusements of the Learned’ restores some of Montaigne’s seriousness, by referring back — albeit rather gauchely — to the Frenchman’s love of writing: ‘Montaigne boasts of having found a very agreeable playmate in his cat, *but his pen itself seems not less to have amused him than his cat*.’\(^{33}\)

It is not that D’Israeli is unable to fathom the complexities that may lie behind even passing remarks in Montaigne’s *Essais*; more that to enter into any detail either does not suit his purpose or runs counter to the prevailing literary taste of his time. The defensive phrasing at the opening of ‘Imaginations and Antipathies’, with its thinly veiled reference to Montaigne’s chapter I.21, ‘De la force de l’imagination’ [Of the Power of the Imagination], is telling of D’Israeli’s concern with pleasing his readership: ‘I have collected several uncommon instances of the force of the imagination, which are taken from good authorities; at the same time the reader will recollect, that I am only a reporter in the present article.’\(^{34}\) Indeed, later in the same essay this initial statement is followed by a deliberate yet tantalizing *praeteritio*:

-Montaigne has a copious essay on ‘The Force of Imagination.’ He adduces a variety of singular instances; but it will not be commendable to detail them here; for most of them are of a nature which are best recommended by his own agreeable and free manner. A modern writer is not permitted to

—- “Pour himself as plain,
“As downright Shippen or as old Montaigne.”

POPE.\(^{35}\)

In this extract as elsewhere, moreover, D’Israeli readily applies the Montaignian technique of using citations to advance his own point of view, in clear defiance (as D’Israeli argues in 1823) of the received opinion that ‘where there is no quotation, there will be found most originality’.\(^{36}\) After harking back to the Ancients, ‘who in these matters [the various uses of quotation] were not perhaps such blockheads as some may conceive’, and who ‘considered poetical quotation as one of the requisite ornaments of oratory’, D’Israeli notes: ‘Old Montaigne is so stuffed with [quotations], that he owns, if they were taken out of him little of himself would remain; and yet this never injured that original turn which the old Gascon has given to his thoughts.’\(^{37}\) It is true that D’Israeli mistakenly attributes a criticism of Montaigne that the anonymous ‘Vindication of Montaigne’s Essays’ (prefixing editions of Cotton’s translation from 1700 onwards) had cited and rebuffed, to Montaigne himself; but even an error such as this can be put on a par with the French essayist’s avowed nonchalance and forgetfulness towards his sources.\(^{38}\) Indeed, as D’Israeli
had already explained in his 1796 essay ‘On Novelty in Literature’, what fascinated
him in Montaigne was precisely the interplay of borrowed materials — be they
acknowledged or teasingly left to the reader to identify — and the author’s own,
newly created context:

Montaigne, with honest naïveté, compares his writings to a thread that binds
the flowers of others; and that by incessantly pouring the waters of a few good
old authors into his sieve, some drops fall upon his paper. The good old man
elsewhere acquaints us with a certain stratagem of his own invention, consisting
of his inserting whole sentences from the ancients, without acknowledgement,
that the critics might blunder, by giving Nazardes to Seneca and Plutarch,
while they imagined they tweaked his nose.39

Furthermore, just as in Montaigne’s own essays, D’Israeli’s allusions and quotations
are spyholes that invite us to look at the original and take in the broader implications
of the intertext, albeit with vastly differing results. Take for example the ostensibly
summary allusion to another passage from the ‘Apologie de Raimond Sebond’,
which occurs in the ‘Account of a Singular Atrabiliarian or Hypochondriac’, first
published in 1794 in the ‘Miscellanea’ section of the Curiosities:

Do we not every where see what excesses men are led into by their inconstancy,
their fantastic hope, their perishable ambition, in a word, their madness? Are
the learned exempt from this disorder? Montaigne has said, that between wisdom
and folly there is only the turn of a screw.40

At first glance, D’Israeli has only retained Montaigne’s metaphor ‘il n’y a qu’un
demy tour de cheville à passer de l’un à l’autre’, treating it as an aphorism. But the
reasoning that precedes the modified quotation is clearly inspired by the original
context both in terms of content and style:

Dequoy se fait la plus subtile folie, que de la plus subtile sagesse? Comme
des grandes amitiez naissent des grandes inimitiez; des santez vigoreuses, les
mortelles maladies: ainsi des rares et vifves agitations de nos ames, les plus
excellentes manies et plus deterraquez; il n’y a qu’un demy tour de cheville à passer
de l’un à l’autre. Aux actions des hommes insansez, nous voyons combien
proprement s’avient la folie avecq les plus vigoureuses operations de nostre
ame. Qui ne sçait combien est imperceptible le voisinage d’entre la folie avecq
les gaillardes elevations d’un esprit libre et les effects d’une vertu supreme et
extraordinaire?41

Nonetheless, it is especially D’Israeli’s early, perfunctory reference to Montaigne’s
(and François de La Mothe Le Vayer’s) opinion of Julian the Apostate that seems
to carry a world of meaning in the non-dit.42 Surely, the allusion to Montaigne’s
lengthy discussion in II.19, ‘De la liberté de conscience’ [Of Freedom of Conscience]
of Julian’s accomplishments and virtues as a ruler in the face of an overwhelmingly
negative reception based on his religious views must be read in light of D’Israeli’s
own Judaism (from which he later distanced himself)?43 Yet, once more we
are not on stable ground, for by D’Israeli’s own admission the article entitled
‘Religious Enmity’ was ‘drawn from Naudé’. It does indeed heavily depend on
the Naudaeana, according to which Gabriel Naudé himself had urged the reader:
‘Voyez ce que Montaigne dit à sa loüange dans ses Essais, et M. la Mothe-le-Vayer
Whether the brief essay was too derivative (not to say plagiaristic) or dealt with too sensitive a subject, ‘Religious Enmity’ (or, alternatively, ‘Religious Enmities’) would disappear from later, nineteenth-century editions of *Curiosities of Literature*. There is certainly no evidence here that D’Israeli felt an affinity with Montaigne over shared Jewish roots: French scholars only began to explore the vexed question of Montaigne’s *marrano* or new-Christian ancestry, through his mother Antoinette de Louppes, in the final quarter of the nineteenth century.45

On occasion, D’Israeli’s desire for an arresting statement or even a *bon mot* prevails over faithfulness to Montaigne’s source text. Thus, in the essay ‘Historical Characters are False Representations of Nature’ of 1796, D’Israeli blithely omits Montaigne’s own explicit reference to Plutarch in ‘De l’inegalité qui est entre nous’ [Of the Inequality that is Between Us], when he asserts: ‘It has been boldly said, by old Montaigne, that man differs more from man, than man from beast. But speculations on human nature must not be formed on such rare instances.’46 Similarly, in a chapter on ‘The Matrimonial State’ that first appeared in the enlarged edition of *The Literary Character* (1818), D’Israeli refers to Montaigne as an authority in his own take on the old chestnut of whether a man of letters should marry:

> Assuredly it would not be a question whether these literary characters should have married, had not Montaigne, when a widower, declared that ‘he would not marry a second time, though it were wisdom itself’ — but the airy Gascon has not disclosed how far Madame was concerned in this anathema.47

D’Israeli draws here, quite inaccurately, on Montaigne’s declaration ‘De mon dessein, j’eusse fui d’épouser la sagesse meme, si elle m’eût voulu’ in III.5, ‘Sur des vers de Virgile’ [On Some Lines from Virgil]. In this text, there is, furthermore, no mention of a second marriage: just of marriage (V, p. 852). The misrepresentation of the original may or may not be due to quotation from memory, but it is unquestionably profitable, as it allows for the addition of a good-natured quip about Montaigne’s spouse, Françoise de La Chassaigne.

3. *Modes of transmission: a French or English Montaigne?*

It will already be clear that D’Israeli is far from systematic in his choice of editions to refer to Montaigne. Certainly, he respects Cotton as ‘a translator who has not ill expressed the peculiarities of his author’.48 But D’Israeli does not shy away from offering his own rendition, as he does in his musings on ‘Gaming’, where he quotes in English from III.10, ‘De mesnager sa volonté’ [On Husbanding your Will],49 or on the ‘Influence of Names’, where — predictably — he takes inspiration from I.46, ‘Des noms’ [Of Names].50 He even quotes Montaigne in French, for a variety of reasons. For instance, when referring to the Preface to the *Essais* (which was omitted from Cotton’s translation), D’Israeli insists that ‘[a]n engaging tenderness prevails in these *naive* expressions, which shall not be injured by a version’.51 Similarly, when in 1841 D’Israeli cites, in an extensive footnote to ‘The Page, the Baron and the Minstrel’, Montaigne’s preposterous anecdote of the woman who, whilst drowning, still insulted her husband as ‘louse-ridden’ (*pouilleux*) by making delousing hand
gestures above her head (II.32, ‘Defense de Seneque et de Plutarque’), he asserts that ‘his language must not be disguised by a modern version’.  

In his article on ‘Singularities observed by various nations in their repasts’ published in the first edition of Curiosities, on the other hand, D’Israeli’s cites an extract from I.23, ‘De la coustume et de ne changer aisement une loy receue’ [Of Custom, and Not Easily Changing an Accepted Law] about savages wiping their fingers on their thighs, groin, or the soles of their feet. He does so in French, because ‘it is impossible to translate this passage without offending feminine delicacy’.  

It is unlikely, though, that D’Israeli’s quotation here is first-hand, since by the author’s own admission the greater part of the chapter is extracted from Jean-Nicolas Demeunier’s L’Esprit des usages et des coutumes des différens peuples, which incorporates this exact passage from Montaigne. In a touched-up version of the essay, from 1833 onwards, Demeunier himself (still unnamed) is referred to as ‘a philosophical compiler’; interestingly, the remark about feminine sensitivity has now disappeared, so that the quote from Montaigne leads straight onto D’Israeli’s witty comment: ‘We cannot forbear exulting in the polished convenience of napkins!’ D’Israeli’s article on ‘Modes of Salutation, and amicable ceremonies observed in various nations’ is of a similar ilk, but seems to combine direct knowledge of Montaigne’s II.17, ‘De la praesumption’ [Of Presumption] with an anecdote that is in turn borrowed from the chapter on greetings in Demeunier’s L’Esprit des usages.

4. Montaigne as a model for D’Israeli’s essay-craft

In the light of D’Israeli’s varying treatment of Montaigne, the question remains as to how much the Frenchman’s style of writing influenced D’Israeli’s own concept of the essay. Firstly, it is clear that D’Israeli easily moves from terms such as ‘sketches’, ‘articles’, ‘characters’, and ‘compilations’ to ‘essays’ featuring ‘instances’ and ‘anecdotes’. His early Dissertation on Anecdotes of 1793 admittedly makes no mention of Montaigne, but in referring to his enterprise as an ‘essay’, D’Israeli reveals his concept of it as a literary form. An essay, it transpires, should ‘not [be] destitute of connection’, even if that appears to be the case at first glance. And more than consisting of ‘a mere mass of loose anecdotes’, the work should also include some elucidation and reflection. Always closely linked to reading, the essay, for D’Israeli, can be as much about the writer himself as it is about other authors; yet its purpose is one of edification, in the first place that of the essayist himself:

If we regard anecdotes as they are connected with the republic of letters, I do not hesitate to declare, that they offer most exquisite gratification. In literary biography, a man of genius always finds something which relates to himself. In the history of his fellow students, a writer traces the effects of similar studies; he is warned by their failures, or animated by their progress.

Unsurprisingly then, D’Israeli considered Montaigne to be ‘the venerable father of modern Miscellanies’. The phrase occurs precisely in D’Israeli’s own essay ‘Of Miscellanies’, a programmatic and eponymous piece heading his Miscellanies; or, Literary Creations of 1796. Of all of D’Israeli’s chapters and articles, its 23 pages contain the most references to Montaigne, some of which we have already had
occasion to discuss. Here D’Israeli defends the French essayist — and no doubt by extension himself — against the savant who labelled Montaigne ‘a bold ignorant fellow’, that is, the Huguenot scholar Joseph Scaliger who had allegedly called Montaigne ‘un hardy ignorant’. It does not prevent D’Israeli from advocating a more restrained approach to quotations and references than the number of loci Montaigne himself includes in his Essais:

To thinking readers, this critical summary [Scaliger’s comment] will appear mysterious; for Montaigne had imbibed the spirit of all the moral writers of antiquity; and although he has made a capricious complaint of a defective memory, we cannot but wish the complaint had been more real; for we discover in his works nearly as much compilement, as reflection, and he is one of those authors who should quote rarely, but who deserves to be often quoted. Montaigne was censured by Scaliger, as Addison was censured by Warburton; because both, like Socrates, perceived and reprobated that mere erudition, which consists of knowing the thoughts of others and having no thoughts of our own.

Montaigne, D’Israeli admits, ‘has also been censured for an apparent vanity, in making himself the idol of his lucubrations’. Yet, unlike Montaigne’s critic Pierre-Daniel Huet to whom this comment seems to allude, D’Israeli shows himself touched precisely by this writing of the self — an aspect he also appreciates in Abraham Cowley’s essays — as well as by Montaigne’s friend-like appeal to his readers; even though he admits elsewhere that the essayist’s candid revelations might well be a pose, ‘a theatrical gesture, as much as the sensibility of Sterne’. And just as Byron reputedly saw some truth in Huet’s qualification of the Essais as ‘le bréviaire des honnêtes paresseux, et des ignorans studieux, qui veulent s’enfariner de quelque connoissance du monde, et de quelque teinture des Lettres’ but retorted ‘that Montaigne was the greatest plagiarist that ever existed, and certainly had turned his reading to the most account’, so D’Israeli too casts the miscellaneous nature of the Essais not as a flaw but as a virtue:

Montaigne’s works have been called by a Cardinal ‘the Breviary of Idlers’. It is therefore the book of Man; for all Men are Idlers; we have hours which we pass with lamentation, and which we know are always returning. At those moments Miscellanists are conformable to all our humours, and often are so congruous to our mental tone, that they illuminate in many a critical moment.

5. A refracted Montaigne

The impression, then, which D’Israeli gives of Montaigne is fragmented, shattered, piecemeal, and as diverse as the shards of the Essais that D’Israeli quotes or alludes to. Direct readings from Montaigne mingle with half- or misremembered quotes and indirect modes of reception. For, often, D’Israeli’s Montaigne appears filtered: not just through Cotton’s translation but also through the ana, particularly the Naudaeana and Huetiana (which incidentally construed Montaigne’s own Essais as Montaniana); through the French editorial remarks to the first edition of the Journal du voyage en Italie; or through Demeunier’s philosophical compilation L’Esprit des usages et des coutumes des différens peuples. One might equally refer to the lenses of Carlo Goldoni’s comments on the pantomimical actor Sacchi (‘in his impromptus
they often discovered the thoughts of Seneca, Cicero, or Montaigne’), Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s perusal of ‘Plutarch, Montaigne and Locke’, or — much more opaquely — Louis-Silvestre de Sacy’s ‘Essay[s] on Friendship’ and ‘on Glory’. In addition to these Continental refractions and percolations of the French thinker, D’Israeli readily notes ‘Montaigne-like’ traits in Pope or Dryden, but also in Hobbes, Antony Wood, as well as arguably in the ‘self-painter’ Cowley.

What D’Israeli himself found in Montaigne was, firstly, a treasure house of stories, musings, and a digest of ancient authors (such as Cicero, Plutarch and Seneca), which D’Israeli, with his rather poor Latin and Greek, would not necessarily have consulted in any depth himself. In this respect, D’Israeli’s reading and evaluation of Montaigne was not so different from Byron’s who (according to Lady Blessington) had said that ‘independently of the quaintness with which [Montaigne] made his observations, a perusal of his works was like a repetition at school, they rubbed up the reader’s classical knowledge’. Secondly, D’Israeli manifestly did consider Montaigne’s miscellaneous style as a model of essay writing (albeit one among others) — a model that he was not afraid to adapt to the taste of his own age and to his own purpose of writing, as a passionate man of letters addressing a common readership. Above all, D’Israeli’s Montaigne was anything but an unread author adorning a bibliomaniac’s bookshelf. Engaging much more intensely than his friend Douce with the essence of Montaigne, D’Israeli may not always have concurred with the French essayist, nor was his appreciation of him static or consistent throughout his own, ever-changing pieces of writing. But that does not take away D’Israeli’s broad and long-lasting affection for Montaigne or indeed a certain emulation on his part: such, after all, is the fertile relationship between ‘a writer of imagination’ and ‘a reader of judgment’.

Notes to Chapter 11

3. The copy is free from any autograph correction by Montaigne to the date of his address ‘To the Reader’ (as manifested in at least four other copies of this edition). See Marie-Luce Demonet and Alain Legros, ‘Montaigne à sa plume: quatre variantes autographes d’une correction de date dans l’avis “Au lecteur” des Essais de 1588’, Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance, 75.1 (2013), 113–18.
of Curiosities of Literature (2005–06, revised 2011) <http://www.spamula.net/col/> [accessed 21 October 2015] differentiates between the different instalments of articles in this work. For my own consultation of the consecutive editions of D’Israeli’s Curiosities and other texts, I have used Eighteenth Century Collections Online and Early American Imprints (both accessed through Warwick University Library), Gallica, The Hathi Trust, Google Books, and The Internet Archive.

12. Curiosities (1807), vol. 1, pp. 1–10 (p. 6): ‘Sir Robert Cotton, Sir Hans Sloane, Dr. Birch, Mr. Cracherode, and others of this race of lovers of books, have all contributed to form these literary treasures [public libraries], which our nation owe to the enthusiasm of individuals, who have found such pleasure in consecrating their fortunes and their days to this great public object; or, which in the result produces the same public good, the collections of such men have been frequently purchased on their deaths, by government, and thus have entered whole and entire into the great national collections.’ Note that the 1807 edition of Curiosities is dedicated to Francis Douce.
13. Isaac D’Israeli, ‘On Reading’, in Miscellanies; or, Literary Recreations (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1796), pp. 189–207 (p. 202): ‘Montaigne placed at the end of those books which he intended not to reperuse, the time he had read it, with a concise decision on it’s merits [sic]; that, says he, it may thus represent to me, the air and general idea I had conceived of the author, in reading the work. He has obliged his admirers with giving several of these annotations.’ Compare ‘Des livres’: ‘Pour subvenir un peu à la trahison de ma memoire et à son defaut, si extreme qu’il m’est advenu plus d’une fois de reprendre en main des livres comme recens et à moy inconnus, que j’avoy leu soigneusement quelques années au paravant et barbouillé de mes notes, j’ay pris en coustume, dépuis quelque temps, d’adjouter au bout de chasque livre (je dis de ceux desquels je ne me veux servir qu’une fois) le temps auquel j’ay achevé de le lire et le jugement que j’en ay retiré, afin que cela me represente au moins l’air et Idée generale que j’avois conceu de l’autheur en le lisant. Je veux icy transcrire aucunes de ces annotations’ [To compensate a little for the treachery and weakness of my memory, so extreme that it has happened to me more than once to pick up again, as recent and unknown to me, books which I had read carefully a few years before and scribbled over with my notes, I have adopted the habit for some time now of adding at the end of each book (I mean of those that I intend to use only once) the time I finished reading it and the judgment I have derived of it as a whole, so that this may represent to me at least the sense and general idea I had conceived of the author in reading it. I want to transcribe here some of these annotations] (V, p. 418; F, p. 370).
15. Catalogue of a considerable portion of the valuable library of Isaac D’Israeli... which will be sold by auction, by Messrs. S. Leigh Sotheby & co. ... on Friday, March 16th, 1849, and three following days ([London]: Compton & Richie, [1849]), p. 43, no. 653.
National Trust Inventory Number 3023392. The Copac catalogue provides the following description: ‘Armorial bookplate: The Right Honourable Benjamin Disraeli. Binding: Nineteenth-century polished calf; gilt fillets; spines gilt.’
17. D’Israeli, ‘The Recovery of Manuscripts’, in Curiosities (1794), vol. 1, pp. 12–18 (pp. 16–17). This is the only passage of D’Israeli’s that seems to have retained Charles Dédeyan’s attention; Montaigne chez ses amis Anglo-saxons, vol. 1, pp. 97–98.
26. D’Israeli, ‘On Prefaces’, Miscellanies (1796), pp. 77–94 (pp. 91–92): ‘Dryden has had the candour to acquaint us with his secret of prefatory composition; for in that one to his Tales, he says, “the nature of preface-writing is rambling; never wholly out of the way, nor in it. This I have learnt from the practice of honest Montaigne.” There is no great risk in establishing this observation as an axiom in literature; but, perhaps, there may be some danger in following it.’ [Isaac D’Israeli], ‘Miseries of Successful Authors’, in Calamities of Authors; including some inquiries respecting their moral and literary characters. By the author of ‘Curiosities of literature’ (London: for John Murray, 1812), vol. 2, pp. 268–93 (p. 278): ‘Dryden shall answer in his own words; with all the simplicity of Montaigne, he expresses himself with the dignity that would have become Milton or Gray.’
27. D’Israeli, ‘Origin of the Vernacular Languages of Europe’, in Amenities of literature, consisting of

28. D’Israeli, ‘Salutations and Ceremonies Observed in Various Nations’, in Curiosities (1807), vol. 2, pp. 314–20 (p. 318): ‘Surely we may differ here with the sentiment of Montaigne’; ‘On Erudition and Philosophy’, in Miscellanies (1796), pp. 129–47 (pp. 131–32): ‘and if, as it cannot be denied, the pursuits of letters have been often satirized, it has been owing to their laborious trifling, and impertinent information. Montaigne has declined against them, in various parts of his works:* and, I lament, has in this invective, involved the more amiable studies. (In footnote: *See particularly his Chapter on Pedantry.)’


35. D’Israeli, Curiosities (1794), vol. 2, pp. 478–79. The quotation from Pope will re-occur in D’Israeli’s Quarrels of Authors of 1814: ‘Political Criticism on Literary Compositions’, in Quarrels of Authors; or, Some memoirs for our literary history, including specimens of controversy to the reign of Elizabeth (London: printed for John Murray, 1814), vol. 3, Appendix, pp. 273–311 (p. 286). For more on ‘De la force de l'imagination’, see Kate Tunstall’s essay in the present volume.


38. Anon., ‘A Vindication of Montaigne’s Essays’, in Essays of Michael seigneur de Montaigne, trans. Charles Cotton (London: printed for Daniel Brown et al., 1711), vol. 1, pp. 1–13 (p. 3): ‘These angry Gentlemen [the enemies of Montaigne] do likewise pretend, that what is most admir’d in Montaigne is stoln from some ancient Authors, and that if those Quotations and the little Stories he tells us about his Temper and Inclinations were taken out of his Book, the rest would be very little or nothing at all.’ The ‘Vindication’ is in fact a translation of Charles Sorel’s ‘Des Essais de Michel de Montaigne’, in La Bibliothèque françoise (Paris: Compagnie des Libraires du Palais, 1667), pp. 80–91 (for our quotation, see p. 82). I owe thanks to Professor Warren Boutcher for drawing my attention to this point.

39. D’Israeli, ‘On Novelty in Literature’, in Miscellanies (1796), pp. 310–38 (p. 318). Compare III.12, ‘De la phisionimie’ [Of Physiognomy]: ‘Comme quelqu’un pourrait dire de moy que j’ay seulement faict icy un asmas de fleurs estrangeres, n’y ayant fourny du mien que le filet a les lier’ [Even so someone might say of me that I have only made a bunch of other people’s flowers, having furnished nothing of my own but the thread to tie them] [V, p. 1055; F, p. 984]. I.26, ‘De l’institution des enfans’ [On Educating Children]: ‘Je n’ay dressé commerce avec aucun livre solide, sinon Plutarque et Seneque, ou je puyse comme les Danaïdes, remplissant et versant sans cesse. J’en attache quelque chose à ce papier; à moy, si peu que rien’ [I have not had regular dealings with any solid book, except Plutarch and Seneca, from whom I draw like the Danaids, incessantly filling up and pouring out. Some of these sticks to this paper; to myself, little or nothing] [V, p. 146; F, p. 129]. ‘Des livres’: ‘Ez raisons et inventions que je transplante en mon solage et confons aux miennes, j’ay à escient ommis parfois d’en marquer l’autheur, pour tenir en brinde la temerity de ces sentences hastives qui se jettent sur toute sorte d’escrits, notamment jeunes escrits d’hommes encore vivants, et en vulgaire, qui reçoit tout le monde à en parler et qui semble convaincre la conception et le dessein, vulgaire de mesmes. Je veux qu’ils donnent une nazarde à Plutarque sur mon nez, et qu’ils s’eschaudent à injurier Seneque en moy’ [In the reasonings and inventions that I transplant into my soil and confound with my own, I have
sometimes deliberately not indicated the author, in order to hold in check the temerity of those
hasty condemnations that are tossed at all sorts of writings, notably recent writings of men still
living, and in the vulgar tongue, which invites everyone to talk about them and seems to convict
the conception and design of being likewise vulgar. I want them give Plutarch a fillip on my
nose and get burned insulting Seneca in me] (V, p. 408; F, pp. 359–60).
40. D’Israeli, ‘Account of a Singular Atrabilarian or Hypochondriac’, Curiosities (1794), vol. 2,
‘Miscellanea’, pp. 520–25 (p. 525); emphasis mine.
41. ‘Apologie de Raimond de Sebond’ [Of what is the sublimest madness made, but the subldest
wisdom? As great enmities are born of great friendships, and mortal maladies of vigorous health,
so are the greatest and wildest manias born of the rare and lively stirrings of our soul; it is only
a half turn of the peg to pass from the one to the other. In the actions of the insane we see how
neatly madness combines with the most vigorous operations of our soul. Who does not know
how imperceptibly near is madness to the lusty flights of a free mind and the effects of supreme
and extraordinary virtue?] (V, p. 492; F, pp. 440–41).
42. ‘The ancient Fathers have said every thing they could imagine to depreciate the character of
Julian the Apostate. Though they had not done this, had he not proved an apostate and a per­
secutor of the Christians; they do not in the slightest manner notice his many eminent qualities.
He was rigorously just, a man of strict morals, and a great politician. See what Montaigne and La
Mothe le Vayer observe of him; and particularly his character, elaborately delineated by Mr. Gibbon’;
D’Israeli, ‘Religious Enmity’, in Curiosities (1791), pp. 187–91 (p. 188); emphasis mine.
43. V, pp. 669–71. For a discussion of ‘De la liberté de conscience’, see Richard Scholar, Montaigne
and the Art of Free-Thinking (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2010), especially pp. 118–33. Montaigne also
makes reference to Julian in I.16, ‘De la punition de la couardise’ [Of the Punishment of
Cowardice] (V, p. 70) and I.42, ‘De l’inequalité qui est entre nous’ [Of the Inequality That Is
Between Us] (V, pp. 266–67). François de La Mothe Le Vayer discussed the example of Julian
the Apostate in his controversial De la vertu des païens of 1641/47: La Mothe Le Vayer, De la vertu
des païens (Paris: François Targa, 1642 [in fact 1641]), especially pp. 319–67, and in the second,
44. Gabriel Naudé, Naudæana et Patiniæa, ou Singularitez remarquables prises des conversations de Mess.
45. See Daniel Ménager, ‘Juifs — Judaïsme’, and Jean Balsamo, ‘Louppe, Antoinette de’, and
‘Louppe, famille’, in Dictionnaire Montaigne, ed. Desan, pp. 630–32, 699–700, and 700–01; and
Elisabeth Mendes da Costa, ‘Aspects of Tolerance of the Jew in Selected French Texts in the
46. D’Israeli, Miscellanies (1796), pp. 59–76 (p. 75). Compare ‘De l’inegalité qui est entre nous’:
‘Plutarque dit en quelque lieu qu’il ne trouve point si grande distance de beste à beste, comme
il trouve d’homme à homme. [...] Mais, à propos de l’estimation des hommes, c’est merveille
que, sauf nous, aucune chose ne s’estime que par ses propres qualitez’ [Plutarch says somewhere
that he does not find so much difference between one animal and another as he does between
one man and another. [...] But apropos of judging men, it is a wonder that, ourselves excepted,
nothing is evaluated, except by its own qualities] (V, pp. 258–59; F, p. 229).
47. [Isaac D’Israeli], ‘The Matrimonial State’, in The Literary Character, illustrated by the history of
men of genius, drawn from their own feelings and confessions. By the author of ‘Curiosities of literature’
(London: J. Murray, 1818), pp. 250–72 (p. 258). For more on Montaigne and marriage, see
Chimène Bateman’s essay in this volume.
48. D’Israeli, ‘Cicero’, in Curiosités (1794), vol. 1, pp. 85–87 (pp. 86–87). See also his ‘Anecdotes
of Fashion’, in Curiosités (1807), vol. 1, pp. 93–120 (pp. 387–88), quoting Montaigne’s ‘De
l’institution des enfans’ (V, p. 172) in Cotton’s translation: ‘I have never yet been apt to imitate
the negligent garb which is yet observable among the young men of our time; to wear my cloak
on one shoulder, my bonnet on one side, and one stocking in something more disorder than the other,
meant to express a manly disdain of such exotic ornaments, and a contempt of art’ (D’Israeli’s italics).
D’Israeli’s topic (fashion) leads to the excision of Montaigne’s qualifying statement: ‘but I find
that negligence of much better use in the form of speaking’.
D’Israeli, ‘Gaming’, in *Curiosities (1807)*, vol. 1, pp. 313–19 (p. 315): ‘[Eckeloo, author of De Alea, sive de curanda ludendi in pecuniam cupiditate, 1569] had not the good sense of old Montaigne, who gives us the reason why he gave over gaming. “I used (says he,) to like formerly games of chance with cards and dice; but of that folly I have long been cured; merely because I found that whatever good countenance I put on when I lost, I did not feel my vexation the less.” A man of letters to be a gambler is one of the most undubitable [sic] follies he can practise.’ Compare V, p. 1014: ‘J’aymois autresfois les jeux hazardeux des cartes et dets; je m’en suis deffaict, il y a long temps, pour cela seulement que, quelque bonne mine que je fisse en ma perte, je ne laissois pas d’en avoir au dedans de la piqueure.’ I have compared the wording with Florio’s and with Charles Cotton’s in the 1711 and 1776 editions.

D’Israeli, ‘Influence of Names’, in *Curiosities (1807)*, vol. 2, pp. 408–26 (pp. 415–16): ‘Some nations have long cherished a feeling that there is a certain elevation or abasement in proper names. Montaigne on this subject says, “A gentleman, one of my neighbours, in overvaluing the excellencies of old times, never omitted noticing the pride and magnificence of the names of the nobility of those days: Don Grumedan, Quadragan, Argesilan, when fully sounded, were evidently men of another stamp, than Peter, Giles, and Michel.”’ Again, I have compared D’Israeli’s English phrasing with Florio’s and with Charles Cotton’s in the 1711 and 1776 editions.


D’Israeli, ‘Modes of Salutation, and Amicable Ceremonies, Observed in Various Nations’, *Curiosities (1794)*, vol. 2, ‘Historical anecdotes’, pp. 388–95 (p. 393): ‘The Chinese are singularly affected in their personal civilities. [...] If two persons meet after a long separation, they both fall on their knees, and bend the face to the earth, and this ceremony they repeat two or three times. Surely we may differ here with the sentiment of Montaigne, and confess this ceremony to be ridiculous. It arises from their national affectation. They substitute artificial ceremonies for natural actions.’ Compare Demeunier, ‘Manieres de s’aborder, de saluer. Réverences. Compliments’, in *L’Esprit des usages*, vol. 3, ‘Usage domestiques’, pp. 20–48 (p. 39): ‘Si deux personnes se rejouissent après une longue separation, elles tombent toutes deux à genoux, et baissent la tête jusqu’à terre; et elles répetent deux ou trois fois la même cérémonie’; and II.17, ‘De la praesumption’ [Of Presumption], V, p. 633: ‘Il y en a d’autres, artificiels, dequoy je ne parle point, comme les salutations et reverences, par où on acquiert, le plus souvent à tort, l’honneur d’estre bien humble et courtos: on peut estre humble de gloire. Je suis assez prodigue de bonettades, notamment en esté, et n’en reçois jamais sans revanche, de quelque qualité d’honneur que ce soit, s’il n’est à mes gages. Je desirasse d’aucuns Princes que je connais, qu’ils en fussent plus espargnans et justes dispensateurs: car, ainsin indiscrettement espandues, elles ne portent plus de coup. Si elles sont sans esgard, elles sont sans effect’ (see F, pp. 582–83).

D’Israeli, *A Dissertation on Anecdotes* (London: Printed for C. and G. Kearsley and J. Murray, 1793), p. iv: ‘I am even desirous, that this Essay may not be considered as destitute of connection, because at the first glance it may thus appear. The work consists not of a mere mass of loose anecdotes; these are given as sketches of the manner in which various topics may be conducted; and elucidate those reflections on the nature of anecdotes, which if they shall be found to be pertinent, is all of which I am solicitous.’

D’Israeli, *A Dissertation on Anecdotes* (1793), p. 31. See also p. [I]: ‘A writer should correct others, or correct himself: I therefore hazard this essay.’

D’Israeli, ‘Of Miscellanies’, in *Miscellanies*, pp. 1–23 (p. 5). The expression long pre-dates the common epithet of ‘the father of the modern essay’, which seems to go back to the second half of the nineteenth century.


D’Israeli, ‘Of Miscellanies’, in *Miscellanies* (1796), pp. 1–23 (pp. 7–8): ‘Those authors who appear sometimes to forget they are writers, and remember they are men, will be our favourites. He who writes from the heart, will write to the heart; every one is enabled to decide on his merits, and they will not be referred to more learned heads, or a more distant period.’

D’Israeli, ‘Cowley. Of his Melancholy’, in *Calamities of Authors* (1812), vol. 1, pp. 81–100 (pp. 85–86): ‘All of Cowley’s tenderest and undisguised feelings have therefore not perished. These Essays now form a species of composition in our language, a mixture of prose and verse — the man with the poet — the self-painter has sat to himself, and, with the utmost simplicity, has copied out the image of his soul.’

D’Israeli, ‘Of Miscellanies’, in *Miscellanies* (1796), pp. 1–23 (p. 18): ‘The readers of Montaigne, had they met with him, would have […] found a friend complaining like themselves of his infirmities, and smiling with them, at the folly of his complaints.’


D’Israeli, ‘Hobbes and his Quarrels’, in *Quarrels of Authors; or, Some memoirs for our literary history, including specimens of controversy to the reign of Elizabeth* (London: J. Murray, 1814), vol. 3, pp. 3–85 (p. 70): ‘[Hobbes] disperses, in all his works, some Montaigne-like notices of himself’.

D’Israeli, ‘Laborious Authors’, *Calamities of Authors* (1812), vol. 1, pp. 231–73 (p. 247).

Isaac D’Israeli, ‘Hobbes and his Quarrels’, in *Quarrels of Authors; or, Some memoirs for our literary history, including specimens of controversy to the reign of Elizabeth* (London: J. Murray, 1814), vol. 3, pp. 3–85 (p. 70): ‘[Hobbes] disperses, in all his works, some Montaigne-like notices of himself’.

D’Israeli, ‘Laborious Authors’, *Calamities of Authors* (1812), vol. 1, pp. 231–73 (p. 247).
