



LOCKE STUDIES

Vol. 15

<https://doi.org/10.5206/ls.2015.675> | ISSN: 1476-0290

Originally published: 2015

Published online: 19 FEBRUARY 2018

© Locke Studies, 2015

Additions to De Beer's *Correspondence of John Locke*

FELIX WALDMANN (GONVILLE & CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE)

Recommended citation:

Waldmann, Felix. "Additions to De Beer's *Correspondence of John Locke*." *Locke Studies* 15 (2015): 31-52. <https://doi.org/10.5206/ls.2015.675>

For more information about this article:

<https://ojs.lib.uwo.ca/index.php/locke/article/view/675>

Locke Studies is published by [The John Locke Society](#).

This is an open access article published under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International](#) license, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and shared under the original license.

ADDITIONS TO DE BEER'S *Correspondence of John Locke*

FELIX WALDMANN

A number of 'new' letters and enclosures by or to John Locke have been discovered since the final volume of Esmond S. de Beer's *Correspondence of John Locke (CJL)* appeared in 1989.¹ The following article prints and describes three unpublished letters and enclosures of this type (§1), including seven other letters recently located or auctioned but otherwise transcribed by de Beer from derivative sources (§2). The article additionally describes three letters written by Locke in various official capacities (§3) and two unpublished, non-epistolary manuscripts (§4).

§1. Unpublished Letters

1. National Library of Australia, MS 329: Peter Mauvillain to Locke, 4 March 1696 (NS). This manuscript is a copy in the hand of Locke's amanuensis Sylvester Brounower (d. 1699) of an enclosure sent to Locke by the calico printer Peter Mauvillain (c.1668–1740).² Mauvillain's original enclosure has survived as

¹ Lee Davison and Tim Keirn, 'John Locke, Edward Clarke and the 1696 Guineas Legislation', *Parliamentary History* 7 (1988), 228–40; Mark Goldie, 'Addenda to *The correspondence of John Locke*: request for information', *Locke Newsletter* 30 (1999), 15–16; J. R. Milton, 'Some recent additions to Locke's correspondence', *Locke Studies* 1 (2001), 229–34; Jonathan Walmsley, 'Locke's agent Cornelius Lyde: a new letter in the Bodleian Library', *Locke Studies* 11 (2011), 107–22.

² Mauvillain had been part of the Huguenot refuge. He was naturalized in January 1690 (NS) (William A. Shaw, ed., *Letters of denization and acts of naturalization for aliens in England and Ireland, 1603–1700* (Lymington, 1911), 207, 218) and appears to have opened his calico works prior to 1696. Davison and Keirn's claim ('1696 Guineas Legislation', 240, n.78) that Mauvillain's naturalization 'failed' is incorrect; his naturalization is recorded in *Commons Journal*, X, p. 335. For Mauvillain's dates see F. Clayton, ed., *The registers of Morden and Surrey, 1634–1812* (London, 1901), p. lvii; The National Archives, Kew (TNA), PROB, 11/704, fos. 5^v–6^f. For his calico works see E. N. Montague, *A study of the textile bleaching and printing industry in Mitcham and Merton from 1590 until 1870* ([Morden], 1992), 12, 18, 24–25, 40–41; id., *Ravensbury*

Bodleian, MS Locke b. 3, fo. 102^r (endorsed by Locke on fo. 102^v as ‘Money / Mauvillain 95/6’). De Beer does not make reference to Brounower’s copy of Mauvillain’s enclosure and he does not reproduce MS Locke b. 3, fo. 102^{r-v} in *CJL*. This omission is unexplained and it is out-of-keeping with de Beer’s regular practice of transcribing enclosures addressed to Locke.³ Another ‘new’ Locke letter, dated 6 March 1696 (NS) and addressed to the MP for Taunton Edward Clarke (1649/51–1710), comments briefly and critically on Mauvillain’s intentions (the letter was first printed in 1988, after de Beer’s final volume went to press):

Pray if it comes in yr way to enquire send me the Character of one Movillain he writes his name Pr Manvillain [*sic*] a little yong French merchant he lives by Bow I think the place is called Bromley. His place to be found in town besides the Exchange is Jonathans Coffee house & ye Rainbow Coffee house over agt ye exchange. He has been with me here with a project concerning our money wch has a specious pretence, wch though it mention noe thing of raising our money, yet that I think it will bottom. I would gladly know him soe well as to be able to judg what person or party tis probable he may be moved by.⁴

([Morden], 2008), pp. 27, 63–5. In April of 1696 Mauvillain would put his name to a petition against the prohibition of calicos produced in England (*The manuscripts of the House of Lords* (London, 1903), ii, 243–44 (1051); Muriel Clayton and Alma Oakes, ‘Early calico printers around London’, *Burlington Magazine* 96 (1954): 135–39, at 139).

³ Compare *CJL* 2070 (MS Locke b. 3, fos. 104^r–5^r) with *CJL* 2488 (MS Locke b. 3, fo. 127^v) for de Beer’s transcriptional policy on similar enclosures and their copies. An interesting exception is MS Locke b. 3, fos. 124^r–25^r: an economic proposal from March 1696 (misdated ‘1697’ in Philip Long, *A summary catalogue of the Lovelace Collection of the papers of John Locke in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1959), 35), which was physically brought to Locke by its author (*CJL* 2021) and disqualified by de Beer as an item of correspondence. The canons of inclusion for any supplementary volume to *CJL* should arguably be expanded to such items, the largest of which are the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew exercises by Locke’s Christ Church students, often addressed to him in the vocative (‘Magistro Locke’) or its equivalent (‘לוק לְרַבִּי’) and now preserved in MS Locke b. 7 and Locke 13.19.

⁴ Somerset Record Office, DD/SF 4512/20 (Sanford Manuscripts) published in Davison and Keirn, ‘John Locke, Edward Clarke and the 1696 Guineas Legislation’, p. 236. The editors there incorrectly identify Mauvillain’s enclosure as ‘MS Locke b. 3, fo. 101, “A Modest Enquiry into the true causes of the falling of the Course of the

Mauvillain's 'project concerning our money' appears to have been sent with a letter to Locke of 4 March 1696 (NS) (*CJL* 2026). Before 23 March 1696 (NS) Locke wrote to Edward Clarke and the lawyer John Freke (1652–1717), and enclosed 'a copy of Mauvillain's paper about money' (*CJL* 2043). This copy is now National Library of Australia, MS 329, part of the Leon Kashnor Collection.⁵ The manuscript appears to have been sold by Sotheby's in 1913 as part of a larger consignment of papers formerly in the possession of Edward Clarke's descendant Colonel E. C. A. Sanford (1859–1923) of Chipley Park, Somerset. Sotheby's described the item as 'LOCKE (J.) A[utograph]. Notes, 1 p. 4to, on the subject of bi-metallism'.⁶ The National Library of Australia's catalogue also attributes the item to Locke, entitling it '[A] portion of essay on the value of the English pound in silver by John Locke'. These incorrect attributions have possibly arisen from the manuscript's provenance, the similarity of Locke's and Brounower's handwriting, or an undated inscription on the manuscript: 'By John Locke + in his autograph.' The enclosure reads as follows (National Library of Australia, MS 329 is the copy-text; substantive variants with MS Locke b. 3, fo. 102^{r-v} are recorded with superscript symbols (†, ^) and listed as endnotes; [square brackets] denote editorial expansion of Brounower's ligatures):

a Pound Sterling is y^c English Measure

Exchange between England and the Dutch". This paper commences on fo. 103^r, a page after Mauvillain's, and is endorsed by Locke on fo. 103^v, 'From M^r Wrights brother in Law Sunman from B[enjamin] F[urly] 95/6'.

⁵ For the Kashnor Collection see Chris Kohler, 'Making collections', in Giles Mandelbrote, ed., *Out of print and into profit. A history of the rare and secondhand book trade in Britain in the twentieth century* (London, 2006), 165–76, at 168.

⁶ *Catalogue of valuable autograph literary manuscripts and historical documents* (28 July 1913) in *Sotheby's catalogues* (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms, 1973–6), part III, reel 40, lot 200. Other items in the consignment included *CJL* 797 (lot 194), British Library (BL), Add. 38771 (lot 195), *CJL* 2016 (lot 196), *CJL* 2048 (lot 197), *CJL* 2078 (lot 198), *CJL* 2114 (lot 199), *CJL* 2658 (lot 201).

It is by Law four ounces of silver of such a fineness all Lands & com[m]odities whatsoever have been measurd accordingly

But Gold being Tollerated to pass as money & y^t variable hath made our measure of no use but in name only. So y^t for these nine months Last past we have Traded after y^e rate of three ounces to y^e pound Sterling w^{ch}: hath been y^e measure of all o[ur] com[m]erce since y^t time Therefor as we have continued our former standard y^e nation w^{ch}: hath Traded since y^e time above said will sustain an almost Insupportable Loss by paying y^e †forreigners† four ounces of Silver for w^{ch}: it hath received of him but three ounces besides all w^{ch}: this other advantage will accrue to him, as he before drained us of o[ur] com[m]oditys by sending us gold at y^e rate it was then valued amongst us so he'l drain us of o[ur] money by sending us goods w^{ch}: we shall take of him at first at y^e present advance w^{ch}: disproportion twice in one year will impoverish us almost beyond recovery.

For remedy 'tis humbly offerd y^t all contracts for these 9 months last past be paid wth: three ounces of silver w^{ch}: provision alone will prevent y^t ruine w^{ch}: threatens ^without^ for then y^e forreigner will be paid his full & no more & so of consequence all com[m]oditys will fall to their former rates for if y^e Trader can pay his debts wth: three ounces of silver he hath Encouragem[en]t & will certainly sell those com[m]odities for three ounces & his Creditor be no looser since wth: y^t three ounces he can pay such debts or buy y^e same quantity of goods he sold for y^e same money. This at first may seem impracticable but if duely weighd & considerd may be renderd practicable & easy for it does every man Justice & pay him in his own coin & bring every thing to a right circulation again.

† MS Locke b. 3, fo. 102^r: 'forreigner'

^ MS Locke b. 3, fo. 102^r: 'without it'

Any explanation of Mauvillain's enclosure requires some knowledge of the circumstantial and intellectual context of the months preceding Recoinage, only a brief summary of which is possible here. Those seeking a fuller explanation will find it in Patrick Hyde Kelly's magisterial introduction to *Locke on Money* (Oxford, 1991). For now, it should be noted that Mauvillain's profession as a merchant almost entirely explains his enclosure's intentions. As a merchant, Mauvillain would likely have contracted a number of international debts denominated in

pounds sterling, the money of account. In the later 1690s, the principal means of settling international debts were either drawing a bill of exchange or directly exporting bullion to a foreign creditor. Exportation of this kind was a practice usually tempered by the ‘specie-points mechanism’, in which the dangers and logistical costs of exporting bullion were evaluated against the prevailing exchange rate.⁷ For many contemporaries, this was a rate determined largely or entirely by a money of account’s purchasing power in bullion,⁸ allowing the denomination of a remittance to be construed as a specific of weight of bullion made equivalent in the money of account.⁹ This appears to have been Mauvillain’s conception of the exchange rate: a conception which fitted within the broader and widely-accepted stipulations of mercantilist bullionism. Many of these stipulations were contested even by their proponents, but they were typically reducible to an equation of national wealth with the possession of precious metals and an associated fear of trade imbalances,

⁷ For an overview of the specie-points mechanism see John Sperling, ‘The international payments mechanism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries’, *Economic History Review* 14 (1962): 446–68.

⁸ For an example of this belief see [E. H.], *Decus & tutamen* (London, 1696), 19: ‘the quantity of Silver in Exchange is considered, and not the nominal value the Government gives to Money’. For a rival conception of the exchange rate, based upon commodity purchasing power, see Nicholas Barbon, *A discourse concerning coining the new money lighter* (London, 1696), 23–24.

⁹ This construal was often supplemented by the argument that only bullion, and not bills of exchange, could defray trade imbalances. For examples of this claim see BL, Add. 18759: John Briscoe, ‘Proposals for preventing the clipping & diminishing the currant coyne of the Kingdome’, fo. 115^v: ‘if our Imports exceed our Exports, the ballance must be paid in Gold or Silver’; BL, Sloane 2902: Abraham Hill, ‘Reflections on the Coin now currant. 1695’, fo. 21^r: ‘w^{ch} way soever the ballance incline, it must be paid...& paid in money’; [John Locke], *Some considerations of the consequences of the lowering of interest, and raising the value of money in Locke on Money (LM)*, ed. Patrick Hyde Kelly (Oxford, 1991), 229: ‘Tis ridiculous to say, that Bills of Exchange shall pay our Debts abroad’. A defence of this position is offered in Charles Wilson, ‘Treasure and trade balances: the mercantilist problem’, *Economic History Review* 2 (1949): 152–61; id., ‘Treasure and trade balances: further evidence’, *Economic History Review* 4 (1951): 231–42.

understood as an excess of bullion outflows relative to repatriation.

As Mauvillain explains in the enclosure's second line, the statutory weight of one pound sterling was 'four ounces of silver': a rate more often expressed as 5s (a crown) to the ounce or at the 'mint rate' of 5s 2d to the ounce (four ounces to £1 8d, 3 $\frac{7}{8}$ ounces to £1)—the price at which the mint would purchase bullion for coinage.¹⁰ In the years prior to recoinage, criminal alteration of the silver coin had widely reduced the bullion content of the circulating medium, creating a disparity between its nominal value and its statutory bullion weight. Notwithstanding this denudation, criminally-altered coins were often accepted at nominal or near-nominal values: a situation which was conceivably sustainable domestically, as a token-currency in embryo, but which entrained a series of unwanted difficulties internationally. The most immediate of these difficulties were caused by three imbalances: a diminished exchange rate, a disjunction between the market and mint rates for full-weight silver coin, and an overvaluation of gold coin as a surer store of value. When combined, these imbalances constituted Mauvillain's first 'disproportion', in which the overvaluation of gold and the reduction of the money of account's silver purchasing power to 6s 8d an ounce (Mauvillain's 'three ounces to y^e pound Sterling') had allowed speculators to purchase English goods cheaply with both metals, while also enabling arbitrageurs to engross English silver with imported gold.¹¹

¹⁰ For a fuller definition of the mint rate see Kelly, 'General introduction', *LM*, 42.

¹¹ For a detailed account of this disproportion see BL, Lansdowne 801: Hopton Haynes, 'Brief memoirs relating to the silver and gold coins of England', fos. 48^v–49^v, 62^v. The importance of remittances to England's foreign allies in the Nine Years' War and their impact on the first 'disproportion' are described in D. W. Jones, *War and economy in the age of William III and Marlborough* (Oxford, 1988). For an explanation of arbitrageurs' methods see Stephen Quinn, 'Gold, silver, and the Glorious Revolution: arbitrage between bills of exchange and bullion', *Economic History Review* 49 (1996): 473–90.

Mauvillain's second 'disproportion' had yet to occur: 'as we have continued our former standard y^e nation w^{ch}: hath Traded since y^e time above said will sustain an almost Insupportable Loss by paying y^e †forreigners† four ounces of Silver for w^{ch}: it hath received of him but three ounces'. At this point, it is important to recall that the success of the campaign to recoin silver money at its statutory rate had partly turned on an inverse 'disproportion'. Those who had attempted to recoin silver money at its market rate (usually 6s 5d an ounce)—the 'devaluationists'—were routinely accused of prospectively defrauding creditors. This was a claim made intelligible by the denominative's theorisation as a measure of weight rather than purchasing power: assuming the synonymy of £1 (or £1 8d) with four ounces of silver generally had the effect of converting debts in the denominative into debts of bullion weight.¹² Although the exchange rate mechanism could sometimes demonstrate this synonymy for remittances—and arguments against devaluation were frequently accompanied by the tautology that foreigner creditors would not be 'fooled' by devalued coin¹³—it was practically false for domestic transactions, where creditors often accepted criminally-altered coins at face value.¹⁴ If a devaluation would supposedly defraud

¹² [Locke], *Some considerations*, LM, 310: 'by giving the denomination now to less quantities of Silver by One twentieth, you take from them [*sc.* creditors] 5 per Cent. of their due'; [William Paterson?], *Some considerations about the raising of coin* (London, 1696), 17; [Hugh Chamberlen], *A fund for supplying and preserving our coin* ([London], [1695]), 2.

¹³ [Samuel Pratt], *The regulating silver coin* (London, 1696), 50: 'Foreigners are not such Fools to be dealt with at that rate, as to pay you a Rex Dollar of 18 *d.* weight 18 grains in *Amsterdam*...for a piece of Money of 15 penny weight in *London*'; [William Paterson?], *A review of the universal remedy for all diseases incident to coin* (London, 1696), 15; [George Mackenzie], *Additional considerations...against raising the value of money* (Edinburgh, 1695), 3; BL, Add. 18759: [Anon.], 'May it please your Lordships', fo. 108^v; BL, Sloane 2902: Hill, 'Reflections', fo. 46^v; [Locke], *Some considerations*, LM, 319.

¹⁴ Some in favour of devaluation insisted that criminally-altered coins also passed current for foreign transactions, such as All Souls College, Oxford, MS 152b: 'Considerations touching the alteration of the English Coyne with reasons for and against it', fos. 1^v–2^f: 'To the objection that if we lower our money, the fforreigne

domestic creditors, returning to the standard of 5s (or 5s 2d) an ounce in early 1696 would notionally realign debts with statutory weights and give creditors their due. Under the same assumptions, debtors were no worse off, if they were no longer possessed of criminally-altered coins.

What Mauvillain's enclosure sought to explain was that debts concluded prior to recoinage were conditioned on a bullion ounce valued higher in terms of the money of account than the statutory rate: for silver, three ounces to the pound sterling instead of four. It was also of some importance that these debts were concluded at a time when criminally-altered coins passed current: an implication of Mauvillain's complaint, but something which he tactfully left unstated.¹⁵ A creditor who had lent 36 ounces of silver (£12) under the old regime was theoretically now owed 48 ounces (£12). For Mauvillain, the immediate effects of this were inflationary and adverse to the balance of trade: bullion outflows to service foreign debt would increase by one third. The restored coin's higher rate of exchange and the diminished expense of imports would also worsen the imbalance: 'so he'l drain us of o[ur] money by sending us goods w^{ch}: we shall take of him at first at y^e present advance'. In order to resolve these problems, Mauvillain proposed to fix the mint and exchange rates at three ounces to the pound sterling for all contracts concluded in the nine months prior to March 1696. A creditor who had lent 36 ounces of silver (£12) in June 1695 would receive 36 ounces (£9)

merchant...will either Exact so much more money for his Com[m]odity, according to the proport[i]on we have lessened it, or will afford less of his com[m]odity for our money...[W]hy should not the new coined money purchase any Com[m]odity as easily as our Clipt money now does, which is not...so much worth as that new coin'd money will be, and yet no one scruples to sell any Com[m]odity...for such Clipt money'. According to Locke, any acceptance of clipped money was implicitly conditioned on its passing current for purposes of taxation or at the mint for its nominal weight (*Some considerations*, *LM*, 319; 'Guineas', *LM*, 364).

¹⁵ For Locke, those in possession of criminally-altered coins were either defrauding the system or had themselves been defrauded ('A paper given to Sir William Trumbull which was written at his request September 1695', *LM*, 369). The latter were usually figured by Locke as indigent and rusticated (*ibid.*, 371), a portrayal in tension with the principle ascribed to him in n. 14 above.

in March 1696—‘his full & no more’—and deflation would follow *ex hypothesi*.

Judging by his final paragraph, Mauvillain believed that creditors would break-even under his proposal: they would be ‘no looser’. Yet to accept this prediction, we would have to make two problematic assumptions: first, a 25% rate of deflation between June 1695 and March 1696; and second, a creditor who had not lately contracted new-coin debts on the strength of his debtors’ obligations. Even before we make these two assumptions, we would also have to admit of the problem which Mauvillain’s proposal ostensibly resolved. This would require our adherence to a bullionist conception of wealth, our denial of the equilibrating effects of the price-specie flow mechanism, and our commitment to three incredible suppositions: 1. that all debts in the denominative were simply a measure of bullion weight, 2. that most merchants with debts in the denominative were possessed only of uncoined bullion, and 3. that the exchange-rate mechanism unexceptionably reflected bullion purchasing power.

Finally, and most questionably of all, Mauvillain’s proposal would require us to neglect the historical circumstance of criminally-altered money passing at the mint for its nominal weight prior to 4 May 1696. Until that date, an individual in possession of 5s of criminally-altered money (for example, half an ounce of silver) would be entitled to 5s of statutorily weighted money at the mint (one ounce of silver).¹⁶ It would make no difference to this individual if their debt of 5s to a domestic creditor was contracted in June 1695 or March 1696. Even if we assume that the exchange rate simply reflected bullion purchasing power, an individual’s equally-old debt of 5s to a foreign creditor could also be discharged without any additional pain. Only the equation of national wealth with bullion reserves could make this an alarming prospect; and even then, the extent of one’s alarm would necessarily be proportioned to the prevailing exchange rate.

¹⁶ Kelly, ‘General introduction’, *LM*, 32–33.

As any reader of Locke's monetary works would know, Mauvillain's were arguments which appealed to their addressee's sympathies. On most points, the two men were in agreement: Locke accepted the equation of bullion with national wealth,¹⁷ condemned trade imbalances,¹⁸ identified the exchange rate with bullion purchasing power,¹⁹ synonymised denominative debts with bullion weight,²⁰ overlooked the specie-point²¹ and price-specie flow mechanisms,²² and believed that foreign arbitrage²³ and gold's overvaluation²⁴ were partly responsible for Britain's currency crisis. The following passage from *Further considerations concerning raising the value of money*, published under Locke's name in December 1695, also shows that Locke was in close agreement with Mauvillain on the question of contract amendment and revaluation:

¹⁷ Locke, 'Some of the consequences that are like to follow upon lessening of interest to 4 per cent', *LM*, 169; [id.], *Some considerations*, *LM*, 221–23; id., 'Answer to my Lord Keepers queries', *LM*, 378.

¹⁸ Locke, 'Some of the consequences', *LM*, 169; [id.], *Some considerations*, *LM*, 221.

¹⁹ [Locke], *Some considerations*, *LM*, 269, 319.

²⁰ [Locke], *Some considerations*, *LM*, 336, 338; [id.], *Short observations on a printed paper intituled, For encouraging the coining silver money in England, and after for keeping it here*, *LM*, 352; id., 'Propositions sent to the Lords Justices', *LM*, 375.

²¹ [Locke], *Some considerations*, *LM*, 228–29, 321, 334–35. Locke was evidently acquainted with the mechanism and knowingly discussed its relationship with the exchange rate (*ibid.*, 268, 347–48; 'Propositions', *LM*, 377). Yet he refused to allow its contradiction of the trade imbalance-bullion exportation principle (n. 9 above).

²² Kelly, 'General introduction', *LM*, 79; *Further considerations concerning raising the value of money*, *LM*, 419.

²³ 'Guineas', *LM*, 363–64; *CJL* 2018.

²⁴ 'Guineas', *LM*, 363–64.

Men are absolved from the performance of their legal contracts, if the quantity of Silver, under settled and legal denominations be altered: As is evident, if borrowing 100 *l.* or 400 Ounces of Silver to repay the same quantity of Silver (for this is understood by the same sum, and so the Law warrants it) or taking a Lease of Land for years to come, at the like Rent of 100 *l.* they shall pay both the one and the other in Money Coin'd under the same denominations with One fifth less Silver in it, than at the time of the bargain. The Landlord here and Creditor are each defrauded of 20 *per Cent.* of what they contracted for, and is their due. And I ask, How much juster it would be thus to dissolve the Contracts they had made; than to make a Law, that...all Landlords and Creditors should be paid their past Debts...[in money] twenty *per Cent.* lighter than it should be?...The case would be the same, and legal Contracts be voided, if the Standard should be altered on the other side, and each species of our Coin be made One fifth heavier. For then he that had borrow'd or contracted for any Sum, could not be discharged by paying the quantity he agreed for, but be liable to be forced to pay 20 *per Cent.* more than he bargained for, that is, more than he ought....Whether the Creditor be forced to receive less, or the Debtor forced to pay more than his Contract, the damage and injury is the same whenever a Man is defrauded of his due. And whether this will not be a publick failure of Justice, thus arbitrarily to give one Man's Right and Possession to another...I shall leave to be considered.²⁵

The difficulty for Locke was Mauvillain's overarching supposition that merchants had formerly concluded contracts according to market, and not statutory, rates. One has only to read the passage above to realise that this was a conceit which Locke's monetary theory could not endure.²⁶ For if fluctuating market

²⁵ *Further considerations*, *LM*, 416. Locke had earlier defended contract violation as a response to revaluation in *Some considerations* (*LM*, 312–13), *Short observations* (*LM*, 352), and 'Propositions' (*LM*, 375). Others emphasised contract's inviolability as a decisive argument against revaluation, such as MS Locke b. 3: Philip Meadows, 'Reflections upon y^e Coyn or Money of England', fo. 87^v: 'in y^e Cases...of lands leased and moneys lent upon securitys they were all fixd by...contract & cannot move[.] what's done cannot be undone, w[ha]t's past cannot be recalled'. [A. Vickaris], *An essay for regulating of the coyn* (London, 1696), 29, noted that a recent Spanish attempt at devaluation had resulted in 'many Law Suits...about the Debts then owing'.

²⁶ For contemporaries' acknowledgement that contracts were regularly concluded according to market rather than statutory rates see [Paterson?], *Some considerations*, 23, which records that a condition had 'of late' been added to certain contracts in the

rates had determined the price of debt, it would make no sense to insist on the fraudulence of revaluation; much as it would make no sense to vaunt the ‘Justice’ of the standard’s restoration.²⁷ The fact that restoring the standard had effectively made ‘each species of...Coin...heavier’ was an irony which Locke could never admit, but which Mauvillain’s solution had adjured him to presuppose. This was Mauvillain’s ‘specious pretence’ and the basis for what was, in Locke’s judgement, an attenuated devaluationism.

2. Bodleian, Locke 9.137: Hendrik Wetstein to Locke, [1698]. This manuscript is an undated invoice in the hand of the bookseller Hendrik Wetstein (1649–1726), endorsed by Locke ‘Wetsteins bill 98’ and bound into his copy of *Library of John Locke*, eds. John Harrison and Peter Laslett (Oxford, 1971) (*LJL*), 2293. The invoice is similar to *CJL* 1831 but it was not printed by de Beer. The invoice covers purchases from July 1696–August 1698: several numbers of the *Acta eruditorum Lipsiensia* (*LJL* 8),²⁸ *LJL* 1160, and *LJL* 2293 itself. An enclosure (*CJL*, VI, pp. 227–9) with *CJL* 2330 discusses Wetstein’s transmission of the invoice’s first seven entries, and on 26 November 1697 Locke recorded his receipt of the four 1697 entries in his journal (MS Locke f. 10, p. 365).

form ‘Pay to — the Summ of — of Good and Lawful Money of England, of the Weight and Fineness of the Standard establish’d by Law’.

²⁷ For a remarkable discussion of this point see [Edmund Bohun], *The proposal for raising the silver coin of England* (London, 1696), 4: ‘all the Mony lent since the Revolution, is not of much more than half the Weight it ought to have had; and there is no reason that besides an exorbitant Usury, freedom from Taxes at this time, &c. these Men [*sc.* creditors] should receive at last two Ounces of Silver for every one they lent; for so it will be, if the Mony be kept upon the old Foot and up to the Standard, when it is paid in’. For a similar observation, but with an emphasis on foreign debt, see [Chamberlen], *A fund*, 7–8: ‘I could be glad the whole Cause [*sc.* of devaluation] were to be tried on this one Issue: For, did Forreigners lend to the Crown Money of four Ounces to a Pound Sterling? Or did they lend such as was Current; and such as they Lent, such let them have again’.

²⁸ It would appear from this new invoice that Locke possessed post-1694 numbers of the *Acta eruditorum Lipsiensia*, *pace* de Beer’s surmise in *CJL* 1831 n. 2.

Envoyé a Monsieur Lock par Henry Wetstein d'Amsterdam.

1696 / 7. Juillet par le M^{re} d'un navire Ary Huybertz²⁹ a l'adresse de Mess.^{rs} Churchill.

1. acta Lips 1694. Julius usq[ue] december f 1:10 –

1. d^o 1695. Compl. f 3: – –

1. Supplement V^m usq[ue] X^m f 1:10 –

f 6: – –

1697 / 10. Juillet par Mons. Mortier³⁰

1. acta Lipsiens 1696. Compl. f 3: – –

1. d^o 1697. Jan usq[ue] april f 1: – –

1. II Supplem. Sect XI. & XII. f 0:10 –

1. d^o III Supplem. Sect. I. f 0:05 –

f 4:15 –

1698 / augusti par mon frere³¹

1. d^o 1697 May usq[ue] Xbr f 2: – –

1. d^o III Supplem. Sect II & III f 0:10 –

f 2:10 –

f 13:05 –

1. Phaedrus Gudij & variorum. f 2:15 –

1. Fournier Geographia 8^o. f 1:10 –

f 17:10 –

²⁹ This spelling is conjectural.

³⁰ David Mortier (*CJL* 2330 n. 4).

³¹ Johan Lucas Wetstein (*CJL* 2330 n. 3).

3. Houghton Library, Harvard University, fMS Eng 1090 (4): Locke to Awnsham Churchill, [1701–2]. This manuscript is a letter or enclosure sent by Locke to his publisher Awnsham Churchill, pertaining to William Baxter’s 1701 edition of Horace’s *Opera*. I have reproduced this manuscript in a separate article.³²

§2. Located and Auctioned Letters

1. Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Bibliothek–Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, Noviss.52: Locke to William Charleton, 10 September 1677. De Beer transcribed most of this letter (*CJL* 353) from excerpts or images of its manuscript in three separate auction catalogues. A small portion of the letter, its entire address panel and its entire endorsement were not reproduced by any of the catalogues and were omitted by de Beer accordingly. These can now be reproduced on the basis of the letter’s located manuscript, and they appear below between superscript * asterisks* .

that may be serviceable [*de Beer’s note ‘d’*] * to him³³ he has not those thoughts either of y^u or me as he ought.* I know not yet how my motions will be orderd this winter it depending not wholly on my self.* But when I goe from hence to any place where I can imagin I may be serviceable to him I shall take care to give him notice of it to be capeable of his commands Y^r letter to M^r Diggs³⁴ I shall take care to convey to him by a way that is like to come to his hands. For the superscription of y^r letter though it be the same that in his last letter to me³⁵ he directs me to make use of, yet I doe not see how by the ordinary way of the post it can ever conduct a letter to him there being noe addresse to any person in London. & Chilham castle being noe post stage. I hope y^u are off y^r journey into

³² ‘Locke, Horace, and a *syllabus errorum*’, *Locke Studies* 15 (2015): 3–29.

³³ Jacques Selapris (*CJL* 332 n. 1).

³⁴ Probably Col. Edward Digges, a member of the Digges family of Chilham Castle near Canterbury (*CJL* 350 n. 2).

³⁵ Digges’s letter to Locke is not extant.

Spaine.³⁶ I have many reasons to wish it For I am very affectionately * / S^r / Y^r most humble & obedient servant / JLocke

[*address panel*] *Monsieur / Monsieur Charleton gentilhomme / Anglois / á Montpellier*

[*endorsement* (Charleton's hand)] *Paris – 1677 / M^r: Locke – 7ber y^e: 10th / Answrd – y^e 5th 8ber*³⁷

2. Christie's (London), *Sale 7725. Valuable printed books and manuscripts* (3 June 2009), lot 32: Locke to William Charleton, 5 November 1678. De Beer transcribed a large portion of this letter (*CJL* 415) from an excerpt of its manuscript in an auction catalogue. A paragraph of the letter and two additional fragments were not reproduced by the auction catalogue and were omitted by de Beer accordingly. These have been facsimiled in a more recent auction catalogue, and they appear below between superscript * asterisks* .

*Lyon 5 Nov. 78

Deare S^r

Were it not that I know it is y^r peculiar way to doe favours & to aske pardon for not haveing donne more I should very much wonder at the Apologie in the beginning of y^r letter of the 1st instant w^{ch} I received this afternoon here.³⁸ But S^r y^u doe soe much for y^r friends that y^u have the priviledg to say what y^u please to them without the suspition of complem^t: it being hard to finde words that equall the kindenesse y^u actually doe & really meane those who have the happynesse to know y^u. And yet I cannot but desire y^u to moderate a little these expressions when y^u doe me the favour to write to me, & I make y^u this request for a contrary reason then I should make it to almost any body else, for one is usually would have ~~spared~~ such kinde of expressions spared in letters because there is little pleasure in reading what one cannot beleive but knowing y^u as I doe, &

³⁶ Cf. *CJL* 350: '[I] conjure you for a while to lay aside the thoughts of your Spanish journey'.

³⁷ Charleton's response to *CJL* 353 is not extant.

³⁸ Charleton's letter to Locke is not extant.

that all that y^u professe to y^r freinds is truth, I beg y^u that I may not heare from y^u things that ought not to be said to me, nor accustome my self by this meanes to beleive things w^{ch} would not be true from any bodys mouth but y^{rs}, & twould be great vacuity in me to give care to comeing from any body but y^u.

We got hither according to our desire & I have by it only the regret of leaveing y^u soe soon.* My comeing away from Montpellier...

...last weeke coverd the tops of the hills *in Vivaray³⁹ with snow, w^{ch} was a sight that gave me noe satisfaction* as I came along.

3. American Philosophical Society, Misc. MS.1169: Locke to Nicolas Toinard, 20 August 1678. De Beer transcribed the entirety of this letter (*CJL* 399) from four previous publications, which had variously excerpted or facsimiled its original manuscript or a nineteenth-century copy (BL, Add. MS 28836, fos. 1^r–2^r). The original manuscript was purchased by the American Philosophical Society in September 1956.

4. Morgan Library and Museum, New York, MA 4500: Locke to Nicolas Toinard, 14 July 1698. De Beer transcribed the entirety of this letter (*CJL* 2473) from a nineteenth-century copy (BL, Add. MS 28836, fo. 13^{r-v}). The copy differs in minor respects from the original manuscript, a facsimile of which was also deposited in the Library of Congress (MMC, mm 79002851) after the manuscript's sale in 1958 (Parke-Bernet Galleries, *American, British, continental autographs and mss: collection of the late Dr. Frank L. Pleadwell, Honolulu, T.H.* (New York, 1958), lot 318).

5. Christie's (London), *Sale 7411. The Albin Schram collection of autograph letters* (3 July 2007), lot 524; J. A. Stargardt, *Katalog 612. Autographen* (29-30 November 1977), lot 531a: Locke to Nicolas Toinard, 1 November 1698. De Beer transcribed portions of this letter (*CJL* 2504) from excerpts of its manuscript in two auction catalogues. A large portion of the letter and its entire address panel were not reproduced by the auction catalogues and

³⁹ Sc. Vivarais.

were omitted by de Beer accordingly. These have been facsimiled and excerpted in two more recent auction catalogues, and they appear below between superscript * asterisks* .

[*first page*] *Le surcharge des affaires et le peu de santé que j’avois pendant j’etois à Londres m’empechait de vous ecrire de cette ville. A cette heur que ma retraite m’a donne du temps mon premier employ à la campagne est de vous remercier de la peïn que vous avez prise de me procurer les Remarques de Monsieur Daucour,⁴⁰ et des honetetes que vous fits à Monsieur le Major Masham⁴¹ et en meme temps de me plaindre de votre silence.⁴² Monsieur l’Abè du Bos par une lettre qu’il me fit lhonneur de m’ecrire de Bruxelles⁴³ me fit comprendre que vous aviez recue la mine ecrite de Londres en Aout.⁴⁴ Depuis ce temps la Je n’ay point recu de vos nouvelles dont je suis fort en peïn.* Votre mort me seroit un terrible pert, et si vous ne vous souvenez plus de moy ce n’est guere moins. Je vive en esperance de meilleurs nouvelles de jour à autre.* En attendant permettez moy de vous dire que je n’ai pas negligè vos commandem^{ts} pendant que j’etois en ville j’ay taché de m’informer de dulcorata aquâ salsâ⁴⁵ et j’ay trouvè* qu’on l’a negligè comme une chose tout à fait inutile,* quia aqua eo modo dulcorata non erat operae pretium;⁴⁶ et que* c’est aussi facile de porter en mer une suffisant quantité d’eau que de porter une suffisant quantité de bois ou des charbons necessaire pour distiller l’eau. La machine de à tirer les naviers dans la Tamise est negligèe par la même raison parcequ’elle est inutile dans des occasions ou on en a besoin. On a trouvé

⁴⁰ Probably Jean Barbier d’Aucour, *Remarques sur deux discours prononcés à l’Académie françoise sur le rétablissement de la santé du Roy, le 27 janvier 1687* (Paris, 1688) (LJL 919).

⁴¹ Major Henry Masham (CJL 1003 n. 2, 2458, 2465 n. 3).

⁴² Toinard’s letter to Locke is not extant.

⁴³ CJL 2489.

⁴⁴ CJL 2483.

⁴⁵ Toinard discusses dulcifying seawater in CJL 2373, 2393 (‘ce seroit une des plus importantes decouvertes de nos jours’), and 2454.

⁴⁶ ‘Since water dulcified in that way was not worth the effort’.

par experience si le vent souffle un peu fort cette machine ne serve de rien si bien qu'on ne s'en serve, même on n'en parle plus. * Avant que de partir de Londres je mis entre le mains de Monsieur Verniete secretaire del'Ambassadeur de France⁴⁷ une Charte de pensylvania, qu'il m'a promis de vous fair tenir [?]⁴⁸ par la premiere occasion.*

Quousq[ue] tandem silebit harmonia⁴⁹ le monde l'attend avec impatience. Entre autres de mes occupations a Londres l'une etoit de fair imprimer une reponse à un de nos Eveques^{50} sur une chicanerie qu'il m'a fit sur quelques passages dans mon Essay touchant l'entendement humain

[*second page*] * Je suis à cette heur empêché dans la revision de mon Essay pour la quatrieme edition qu'on en fera ausitot que je l'aurai achevée mais ma santé fort abatue ne me permette pas travailler à quoi que ce soit que fort lentement. Quant cette besogne sera hors de mes mains je pretend de lire les traités que vous m'avez envoieez sur le paque...⁵¹

J'avois oublié de vous marquer...que l'Eglise de S^t Pol etoit vitrée, (c'est à dire le Choeur qui est tout qui en est encore achevé et qui sera achevé de plusieurs années) avant que j'arivois à Londres et je ne vois pas qu'on s'en serve de vitraux colorés...Je vous ai beaucoup d'obligation du soin que vous avez pris de remarquer quelques defauts dans la version de mon traité de l'Education des Enfans,⁵² on y prendra garde dans une autre edition...Vous avez fait parler en votre journal de scavants⁵³ si avantageusement de ce petit ouvrage...*

⁴⁷ Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, the poet (*CJL* 2489 n. 2).

⁴⁸ Two words here are difficult to read in both facsimiles: 'à Paris' or 'à prises' are possibilities.

⁴⁹ 'For how much longer will the harmonia [*sc.* Toinard's posthumously published *Evangeliorum harmonia Graeco-Latina* (Paris, 1707) (*LJL* 2934)] remain unheard of?'

⁵⁰ Locke's *Reply to the right reverend the Lord Bishop of Worcester's Answer to his second letter* (London, 1699).

⁵¹ *Sc.* 'paquebot'. I cannot identify 'les traités'.

⁵² *CJL* 2470.

⁵³ *Journal des Scavans* (1698), 177–80. Cf. *CJL* 2480 n. 10.

[*third page*] * Je prie Monsieur de Bos de me faire la grace de m'envoyer les peices du Theatre que son ami Monsieur Verniete à publiés.⁵⁴ Il n'a que les adresser à Monsieur Pigault marchand à Calais pour faire tenir à S^r Thomas Franklin⁵⁵ master of the post office in London / For M^r Locke*

[*address panel*] * A Monsieur / Monsieur Toinard chez Monsieur des Noyers⁵⁶ devant l'Espèe royale dans la rüe Mazarin à Paris*

6. Deutsches Literaturarchiv Marbach, A. Wiedemann Sammlung, 96.146.132: Locke to Thomas Burnett of Kemnay, 2 May 1700. De Beer transcribed most of this letter (*CJL* 2724A) from an excerpt of its manuscript in an auction catalogue. A small portion of the letter, its entire address panel and its entire endorsement were not reproduced by the auction catalogue and were omitted by de Beer accordingly. These can now be reproduced on the basis of the letter's located manuscript, and they appear below between superscript *asterisks*. The letter's second paragraph has also been entirely re-transcribed, to correct errors in the auction catalogue's excerpt.

I here with returne y^u M^r Leibniz's papers w^{ch} y^u did me the favour to send me & w^{ch} by y^r letter * of 13th of April,⁵⁷ w^{ch} accompanied them*

[*second paragraph*] As to the business y^u mention to me * in y^{rs} of the 14th of April* I receivd not y^r letter (w^{ch} I perceived should have come by y^r Lady *y^u mention in it*) till above a weeke after her returne to town. Soe that the answer y^u had by her, before y^{rs} came to my hand, makes y^u, I suppose, expect noething farther in answer to that commission from you then to me, w^{ch} was over before I received it. The gentleman from whom y^u will receive this brought me yours. He will assure y^u how ready I shall be

⁵⁴ Cf. *LJL* 2504a, 3072–3.

⁵⁵ *CJL* 1366 n. 5.

⁵⁶ *CJL* 1071 n. 2.

⁵⁷ *CJL* 2709.

to serve you on all occasions * & how much I am / S^r / Y^r most obedient
humble servant / J Locke*

[*address panel*] *For his much honourd friend M^r Burnet / in London*

[*endorsement* (Burnett's hand)] *2 May 1700*

7. Musée Royal de Mariemont, Belgium, BE MRM Aut. 541/6:
Locke to Anthony Collins, 11 August 1704. De Beer transcribed
almost all of this letter (*CJL* 3608) from an auction catalogue's
facsimile of its manuscript. The facsimile omitted the letter's
address panel: *For Anthony Collins Esq / at his Chamber in Serle
Court / Lincolns Inne / London* .

§3. 'Official' Letters

1. In 1891 Sotheby's advertised the following letter from Locke
to John Evelyn (1620–1706):

LOCKE (John) celebrated Philosopher, L[etter]. s[igned]. 1 p. 4to, 17 Oct.
1673, to John Evelyn, and endorsed by Evelyn with 4 lines autograph
telling him that a meeting is to be held of the Committee of Tangier
Affairs, *very rare, portrait* (*Catalogue of several important collections of
autograph letters* (26 November 1891) in *Sotheby's catalogues*, part II, reel
119, lot 215).

This is the only extant evidence of correspondence between
Locke and Evelyn, although the two men were certainly
acquainted.⁵⁸ The letter is not replied to in Evelyn's transcriptions
of his outgoing mail from this period (BL, Add. MS 78298, fo.
191^{r-v}) nor is it mentioned in Evelyn's diary for this date (ed. de
Beer (6 vols., Oxford, 1955), iv, 25). Locke's appointment as

⁵⁸ Evelyn refers to Locke in October 1672 (*Diary*, iii, 628) as 'an excellent learned
Gent:' and would later witness his swearing as the Council's secretary in October 1673
(*ibid.*, iv, 25). In 1690 he would take particular interest in the *Essay concerning human
understanding* (Guy de la Bédoyère, ed., *Particular friends. The correspondence of
Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn* (Woodbridge, 2005), 213–15 (D2)), and in 1697 he
would be enjoined by Richard Bentley (1662–1742) to join Locke among others at the
King's Library (Houghton Library, Harvard University, MS Hyde 77 (9.276.4) printed
in Christopher Wordsworth, ed., *The correspondence of Richard Bentley* (2 vols.,
London, 1842), i, 152 (LXVIII)). Evelyn appears once in *CJL* (2655).

Secretary to the Council of Trade and Foreign Plantations in October 1673 necessitated a number of notes of the kind above, even for contiguous Councils like the ‘Tangier Committee’; his ‘4 lines’ probably resembled a note (BL, Add. MS 78393, fo. 55^r) sent earlier in the year to Evelyn by Benjamin Worsley (1617/18–77), the Council’s previous Secretary: ‘Tuesday night 6.th May. 1673. / S^r / It is the desire of My Lord Chancellor [*sc.* Anthony Ashley Cooper, first earl of Shaftesbury (1621–83)] that the Council for Trade and Plantations will please to meet tomorrow in the afternoone at Six of the Clock. / Ben: Worsley Secretary’.

2. In 1869 Sotheby’s advertised the following letter from Locke to [Sir Thomas Osborne, Lord Osborne (1620–1706)], later Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds:

Locke (John) eminent Philosopher. L[etter]. s[igned]. To the Lord High Treasurer. 25 Oct. 1673 / Giving notice of a meeting of the Council for Trade and Plantations (*Catalogue of an important collection of autograph letters & historical papers* (5 April 1869) in *Sotheby’s catalogues*, part II, reel 47, lot 610).

This is the only extant evidence of correspondence between Locke and Osborne. The letter is not docketed in Osborne’s office minute-book for the period (BL, Add. MS 28077, fo. 21^v) nor is it mentioned elsewhere by Locke or Osborne; its content likely resembled Locke’s letter to John Evelyn, discussed above.⁵⁹

3. Collections of the Maine Historical Society, Coll. 420 Fogg Autograph Collection: Locke and others to the Province of New Hampshire, 27 October 1697. This is a letter in an unidentified hand bearing the signatures of Locke and five other members of the Council of Trade and Plantations: John Egerton, third earl of Bridgewater (1646–1701), Sir Philip Meadows (c.1626–1718), John Pollexfen (1636–1715), Abraham Hill (c.1635–1722), and George Stepney (1663–1707). It encloses a copy of the Peace of

⁵⁹ Osborne appears only obliquely in *CJL* (561 n. 10, 1301 n. 2, 1351 n. 9).

Ryswick and orders the province's forces to cease hostilities with the French. The letter is abstracted in *Calendar of state papers, colonial series, 15 May 1696–31 October 1697* (London, 1904), 676 (1422); the Council's copy of the order from the Lords Justices to circulate the Peace—dated 18 October [ESTC, R41131]—is at TNA, CO 323/3, fo. 194^r (endorsed on fo. 194^v: 'Rec.^d 23th / Read 25th Octo.^r 1697'). The manuscript is an unusual example of a Council of Trade and Plantations document which bears Locke's autograph and is preserved outside of The National Archives and the Bodleian.

§4. Non-Epistolary Manuscripts

1. The website famous-celebrity-autographs.com/john-locke.html offers an image of the following cheque in Locke's hand:

Oates 17 July 1704 / Upon demand pray pay to Peter King of the Inner Temple Esq any sum or Sums of money not exceeding in the whole the sum of Eleven hundred pounds & put it to the account of / S^r / Y^r very humble servant / John Locke [Locke's paraph] / To M^r Awنشam Churchil / Bookseller in London / £1100.

The website does not list the cheque's provenance or its present location. The cheque is referred to in MS Locke f. 10, p. 593 ('Given my Cosin King a bill on M^r Churchil for any sum not exceeding £1100') and may also be docketed in MS Locke b. 1, fos. 278^r, 281^r and MS Locke c. 2, p. 95.

2. British Library, Zweig MS 168 is a single leaf attributed by the Library's catalogue to Locke and described as 'an epitaph of René Descartes (1596–1650)'. The transcription of the epitaph does not appear to be in Locke's hand, but the manuscript's provenance suggests a Locke connection. I have reproduced this manuscript in a separate article.⁶⁰

Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge

⁶⁰ 'John Locke and a René Descartes epitaph', *Notes & Queries* 62 (2015): 260–63.