

C-E

32044077727394



# HARVARD LIBRARY

**Borrower:** HLS

**Lending String:** HLS

**Patron:** Darnton, Robert

**Journal Title:** Cinq siècles d'imprimerie genevoise :actes du Colloque international sur l'histoire de l'imprimerie et du livre à Genève 27-30 avril 1978 / publiés par Jean-Daniel Candaux et Bernard Lescaze.

**Volume:** v.2 **Issue:**

**Month/Year:** 1981 **Pages:** 71-101

**Article Author:**

**Article Title:** A Bibliographical Imbroglio: Hidden Editions of the Encyclopédie

**Imprint:** Via Scan and Deliver Service

**Special Instructions:**

**ILL Number:** 4346525



**Call #:** WID WIDL C Z176.G2 C64x  
1978

**Location:** HLS

**ODYSSEY ENABLED**

**Charge**

**Maxcost:**

**Billing Category:** Exempt

**Borrowing Library:**

Harvard University - Widener Library

**Email:**

**Notes:**

Transaction Date:7/10/2014 2:15:41 PM

**S & D Processing Notes:**

- Not as cited
- Duplicate
- Multiple articles
- Exceeds 10% of work
- Not on shelf
- On Reserve
- Too fragile
- Checked out/on hold
- Exceeds 100 pages

Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

Scan & Deliver



ILLiad TN: 4346526

## A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL IMBROGLIO: HIDDEN EDITIONS OF THE «ENCYCLOPÉDIE»

by Robert DARNTON

In 1786 Thomas Jefferson went shopping for *Encyclopédies* in Paris. The supply was plentiful and the prices cheap, he reported to James Madison in Virginia. "I can get for you the original Paris edition in folio of the Encyclopédie for 620 livres 35 vols; a good edition in 39 vols 4to for 380 [livres] and a good one in 39 vols. 8vo for 280 [livres]." <sup>1</sup> Buying *Encyclopédies* had not been so easy in the midst of the American Revolution six years earlier. Jefferson had purchased a folio edition "for the use of the Public" in Virginia for fifteen hogsheads of tobacco; but he had had to take special measures to save it from Cornwallis' troops, and he never did get one for himself, owing to difficulties with transport and insurance. <sup>2</sup> How different it was to make the rounds of the bookstores in prerevolutionary Paris! Jefferson bought an octavo and a subscription to the new *Encyclopédie méthodique*, and he ordered *Encyclopédies* for several of his friends, including Franklin, Madison, and Monroe. <sup>3</sup> It is an attractive picture, the philosopher statesman as a shopper, procuring Enlightenment in the Old World for the benefit of the New. But if one looks at it closely, it seems somewhat odd. How could Jefferson find "the original Paris edition" for 620 livres? Booksellers had informed their customers nine years earlier that the first edition and the Geneva folio reprint would fetch 1200 to 1500 livres, if they could be found at all. <sup>4</sup> Two other folio reprints had been published in Lucca

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson to Madison, Feb. 8, 1786 in *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, Julian P. Boyd, ed. (Princeton, 1950), IX, p. 265.

<sup>2</sup> Jefferson to John Fitzgerald, Feb. 27, 1781; Amable and Alexandre Lory to Jefferson, Dec. 16, 1780; and Jefferson to James Hunter, May 28, 1781, *ibid.*, V, p. 15; IV, p. 211; and VI, p. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Jefferson to Madison, Nov. 11, 1784; Jefferson to Monroe, Nov. 11, 1784; Jefferson to Francis Hopkinson, Jan. 26, 1786; and Jefferson to William Short, April 27, 1790, *ibid.*, VII, p. 507; VII, p. 511; XVI, p. 388; IX, p. 224.

<sup>4</sup> For example, in 1777, the Société typographique de Neuchâtel became embroiled in a dispute with one of its customers, a bookseller from Salins called Considérant, who refused

and Leghorn; but they could not be confused with the Paris edition, and they, too, were expensive and rare. The only other editions – the quartos of Geneva and Neuchâtel and the octavos of Lausanne and Bern – had been snapped up by subscribers, who had found the folios too costly and hard to get. It seems puzzling, therefore, that Jefferson had his pick of all the editions and that he could pick them up for so little.

But the publishing history of the *Encyclopédie* abounds in puzzles.<sup>5</sup> Judging from title pages and journal notices, the various editions were produced everywhere and nowhere. The last ten volumes of text in the first folio edition bore the fake imprint Neuchâtel, while the first seven claimed to come from Paris. The first three volumes of the second folio edition were clapped up in the Bastille and then disappeared, while the whole book was issued from Geneva under the false imprint of Paris, although, to confuse things further, some volumes in the fake Paris edition carried the true place of publication. A first quarto edition came out with Geneva on its title page, and a third quarto edition appeared as a product of Neuchâtel; yet no one has ever been able to find a copy of the second quarto edition, and Voltaire, who knew his way around the book trade, identified the two known quartos as “l’*Encyclopédie* de Lyon.”<sup>6</sup> Similarly, there seems to be a missing second edition of the next version, which came out in the octavo format from Bern and

to pay for a copy of the second edition on the grounds that he had ordered the first. In fact, Considérant had not specified which edition he wanted, and therefore the Société typographique lectured him as follows in a letter of June 8, 1777: “Comment osez-vous nous avancer que vous avez entendu la première édition de Paris, puisque vous devriez savoir qu’elle se vend 1200 à 1500 livres et même au-delà? ... Vous saviez donc sans doute, Monsieur, que ce n’était pas la première édition de Paris, très rare aujourd’hui, puisque nous l’avons déjà dit, vous devriez savoir qu’elle vaut le double [i.e. twice the price of the second edition, which in this case came to 650 livres].” This quotation and subsequent ones, unless specified otherwise, come from the Bibliothèque de la Ville de Neuchâtel, papers of the Société typographique de Neuchâtel, abbreviated henceforth as STN.

<sup>5</sup> For background on the complex history of the *Encyclopédie* after the first edition, see George B. WATTS “Forgotten Folio Editions of the *Encyclopédie*”, *French Review*, XXVII (1953-54), p. 22-29 and 243-44; “The Swiss Editions of the *Encyclopédie*”, *Harvard Library Bulletin*, IX (1955), p. 213-35; and “The Genevan Folio Reprinting of the *Encyclopédie*”, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, CV (1961), p. 361-67; and John LOUGH, *Essays on the Encyclopédie of Diderot and d’Alembert* (London, 1968) and “Luncheon de Boisjerman V. the Publishers of the *Encyclopédie*”, *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, XXIII (1963), p. 115-173. The present essay develops themes that were first sketched in Robert DARNTON, “The *Encyclopédie* Wars of Prerevolutionary France”, *The American Historical Review*, LXXVIII (1973), p. 1331-1352 and that could not be treated fully in my book, *The Business of Enlightenment: A Publishing History of the Encyclopédie 1775-1800*, Cambridge, Mass, 1979.

<sup>6</sup> Voltaire to Cramer, Jan. 5, 1777, *Voltaire’s Correspondence*, Theodore Besterman, ed. (Geneva, 1953-66), XCVI, p. 11-12.

Lausanne. At the same time, a Genevan publisher announced a fourth quarto edition, which has also disappeared. And some modern bibliographers have turned up "editions" which were unheard of in the eighteenth century, notably a "Riverside edition" in the University of California. Disentangling these editions involves something more than bibliographical puzzle-solving; for the puzzles lead directly into the workshops of the printers and the councils of the publishers. Although it is not possible to trace the editions from those departure points to the bookstores where Jefferson and other shoppers found them, enough of their route can be uncovered to dissipate some of the obscurity surrounding the general problem of the diffusion of Enlightenment. And there could be no better place to begin than Geneva, a favorite city of Enlightenment publishers.

Just how much Geneva went into the various *Encyclopédies* cannot be told from the title pages, which were notoriously mendacious in the eighteenth century. Samuel Fauche of Neuchâtel received 834 livres for lending his name to the last ten volumes of the first edition, which were printed in Paris just like the first seven.<sup>7</sup> The Geneva folio really was Genevan, even though most of its title pages bore the names of the original Parisian publishers; for Gabriel Cramer and Samuel de Tournefort printed the text in Geneva and owned a third of the speculation on it. But the next version of the *Encyclopédie* – aside from the two Italian editions – illustrates the opposite fraud: it was not genuinely Genevan, although it claimed to be published "A GENÈVE, / Chez PELLET, Imprimeur-Libraire, rue des Belles Filles." This edition, a quarto commonly known as the "*Encyclopédie de Pellet*" deserves to be studied in detail, because it shows how publishers manipulated editions in order to capitalize on the market for *Encyclopédies*.

From 1777 to 1780, Jean-Léonard Pellet, a Genevan printer who specialised in Protestant books,<sup>8</sup> served as a cover for an international consortium, which became the most important source of *Encyclopédies* in prerevolutionary Europe. For the use of his name, Pellet received 3,000 livres and a few printing commissions.<sup>9</sup> Judging from colophons,

<sup>7</sup> LOUGH, "Luneau de Boisjerman", p. 169.

<sup>8</sup> Pellet's specialization is clear from his letters to the STN, for example, his letter of March 2, 1775: "N'étant point libraire, je ne puis me charger des sortes que vous m'offrez. Je ne tiens absolument que des livres de religion."

<sup>9</sup> Pellet's fee for the use of this name appears in some notes, entitled "Dépenses", by Abraham Bosset de Luze, one of the STN's directors, in the STN papers, MS. 1220. The STN made Pellet's minimal role clear in several of its letters; thus STN to Ranson of La Rochelle, May 24, 1778: "Pellet, qui n'est qu'un simple imprimeur, est un prête-nom pour

he produced four of the thirty-six volumes of text in "his" edition. Other Genevan firms, notably Nouffer et Bassompierre and Bonnant, also printed some volumes. But most of the quartos came from about twenty shops, in Neuchâtel, Lyons, Trévoux, and Grenoble. The nucleus of the enterprise lay in Lyons, where a shrewd bookseller called Joseph Duplain collected the subscriptions, dispensed the printing, stored the sheets, dispatched the shipments, and managed the finances. Duplain owned half the shares in the consortium, although he sold portions of his interest to backers in Lyons. The other half was divided among Charles Joseph Panckoucke of Paris, the Société typographique de Neuchâtel, and Clément Plomteux of Liège (Marc Michel Rey of Amsterdam owned a twelfth for a while in 1776 but later sold it back to Panckoucke). The "Geneva" quarto was therefore an international enterprise; and if it can be identified with any location, it should be considered Lyonnais: thus Voltaire's remark about "l'*Encyclopédie* de Lyon", which has baffled the editors of his correspondence.<sup>10</sup>

But what about the more baffling problem of the missing second edition of the quarto? The third edition looks unambiguous enough: "TROISIÈME ÉDITION/. . . A GENÈVE,/ Chez Jean-Léonard Pellet, Imprimeur de la République./ A NEUFCHATEL,/ Chez la SOCIÉTÉ TYPOGRAPHIQUE," as its first volume proclaimed. An *Avertissement de la Société Typographique de Neufchatel* explained that the third edition was following on the heels of the second: "Le sieur PELLET, Imprimeur à Genève, craignant que les soins qu'aurait exigé de lui la troisième édition de l'*Encyclopédie* n'eussent retardé les livraisons des deux premières, nous a associés à ses engagements que nous rappellerons ici et que nous nous ferons un devoir de remplir. Nous imprimons sous nos yeux à Neuchâtel la troisième édition de l'*Encyclopédie* qu'il a annoncée." Advertisements and prospectuses repeated this theme, but

nous", and STN to Graffenried d'Avenches, "Celui-ci [Pellet] n'était que notre commissionnaire, chargé de notre part d'imprimer quelques volumes... Pellet avait commission aussi de collecter des souscriptions, et c'est à quoi tout son intérêt a été réduit."

<sup>10</sup> Not only did Voltaire correspond with Cramer about the "*Encyclopédie* de Lyon" as quoted above, he also intervened with his friends in Geneva to get his *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* included in it. See Voltaire to Henri Rieu, Jan. 13, 1777, in *Voltaire's Correspondence*, XCVI, p. 27: "Mon très cher corsaire, pourriez-vous demander à Pellet si son commettant ne trouverait pas fort bon qu'on imprimât les *Questions sur l'Encyclopédie* dans la nouvelle édition de l'*Encyclopédie* même? Cela composerait sept ou huit cents articles nouveaux avec ceux qu'on y ajouterait." If Pellet forwarded this proposal to the "commettant", Joseph Duplain, it never advanced any further.

<sup>11</sup> The *Avertissement* appears at the beginning of volume I. In this and other quotations, spelling and punctuation have been modernized.

it, too, was a lie. The Société typographique de Neuchâtel (STN) printed only one volume of "its" edition. Most of the others came out of Lyons; for Duplain had merely switched his typographical false front from Geneva to Neuchâtel, as he explained frankly in a letter to the STN:<sup>12</sup>

Nous nous sommes déterminés à réimprimer la troisième édition à 4 rames 15 mains [ie. 2,375 copies]. Elle est sous presse, et nous espérons délivrer deux à trois volumes en août. Comme nous voulons que cette édition (entre nous soit dit) soit supérieure à l'autre pour l'exécution, la correction etc. afin que s'il en reste quelques exemplaires ils ne nous soient pas à charge, nous avons pensé que pour qu'elle se distinguât, elle parût sous un autre nom. Nous vous prions en conséquence de nous permettre de nous servir du vôtre. Vous paraîtrez avoir acheté de Pellet etc. Envoyez-nous à cet égard votre consentement, s.v.p.

The first two "editions" had been thrown together so hastily and the customers supplied in so slipshod a manner that subscriptions for the third were flagging. Duplain hoped to revive them by presenting the "new" quarto as a Neuchâtel product. Actually, it was new enough, if not very Neuchâtelois, because Duplain had all the volumes recomposed and reprinted separately. But he changed the identity of the editions so casually that he confused his copy editor, a bumbling abbé called Jean-Antoine de Laserre, who instructed the STN to print "troisième édition à Genève" on the title page of volume XXXV of the first two "editions." That didn't make any sense at all, so Duplain had the pages redone in Lyons.<sup>13</sup> And having then reached the end of the first two of his three fake Swiss editions, he announced a fourth Genevan, once again. Writing as Pellet in the *Gazette de Leyde* and the *Journal encyclopédique*, Duplain explained that the first three editions had been oversubscribed. But he would satisfy those who had failed to get their down payments in on time by printing yet another quarto – provided that the subscribers agreed to pay 414 livres a set instead of 384, for he had to cope with an increase in his expenses. In a covering letter to the STN, which accompanied the text of this advertisement, Duplain revealed his real

<sup>12</sup> Duplain to STN, July 10, 1778.

<sup>13</sup> The STN recounted the confusion over the title page in a "Mémoire contre Duplain" in the STN papers, MS. 1220. It had proposed printing all three "editions" from the same type; but Duplain rejected this economical measure, because he feared it would produce complications and delays in the shipments, thereby halting the flow of badly-needed capital from the subscribers. When he first mentioned the possibility of a "third edition" in a letter to the STN of Sept. 30, 1777, he made it clear that the text would be recomposed and run off separately: "Nous pensons que nous aurons encore une édition à faire à 2,000, car les souscriptions se soutiennent. Mais il ne faudra point faire ajouter ce nombre aux feuilles que l'on tire, parce que cela retarderait trop nos livraisons."

purpose. He needed to pacify disgruntled customers by convincing them that they had got a bargain – that is, he was bluffing: he wanted to prevent lawsuits connected with his first three “editions”, not to produce a fourth.<sup>14</sup>

Would it be valid to conclude from all this false advertising that the second edition was as unsubstantial as the fourth? Not really, because it corresponded to an early phase in the production of the quarto, when an *Encyclopédie* boom had made Duplain’s assessment of the market look too modest. He had originally planned to produce about 4,000 sets; but while his printers began to run off the first few volumes, the subscriptions poured in at such a rate that he decided to expand to 6,000. He therefore ordered the printers to continue at a pressrun of 6,000 and to reset the sheets they had already printed for a supplementary run of 2,000. (Actually, as will be seen, the figures were not quite so round.) Thus the second “edition” can be considered an extension of the first, although it would be more accurate to abandon the term “edition” and to distinguish “states” in an overall printing of 6,000 sets.<sup>15</sup>

That distinction, however, did not exist in the eighteenth century, when analytical bibliography had not been invented. The printers of the Old Regime talked loosely about “editions”, without any concern for the headaches they would produce among bibliographers two hundred years later. But the *way* they talked is revealing. Here is how Duplain ordered the STN to increase its pressrun:<sup>16</sup>

Nous nous sommes déterminés à tirer trois rames dix mains de plus. Vous voudrez bien en conséquence, Messieurs, tirer sur chaque feuille que dorénavant vous mettrez sous presse en tout douze rames et six mains, et lorsque vous aurez fini votre volume, vous réimprimerez s.v.p. tout ce qui est fait et tirerez trois rames dix mains seulement.

Unlike their modern counterparts, eighteenth-century publishers thought primarily in terms of paper. They had to, because paper often took up more than half the production costs of a book. It came to three quarters of the STN’s expenses for printing volume XXIV in the first two “editions” of the quarto *Encyclopédie*.<sup>17</sup> So Duplain expressed

<sup>14</sup> Duplain to STN, March 31, 1779 and *Gazette de Leyde*, April 20, 1779.

<sup>15</sup> On “edition”, “state”, and related terms, see Philip GASKELL, *A New Introduction to Bibliography* (New York and Oxford, 1972), p. 313–316.

<sup>16</sup> Duplain to STN, Aug. 27, 1777.

<sup>17</sup> According to the account book called Brouillard B, entry for Nov. 6, 1778 in the STN papers, MS. 1034, the composition and presswork on volume XXIV came to 4,828 livres and the paper to 13,897 livres.

himself in reams and quires rather than round figures, when he discussed pressruns. Having begun to print each sheet at eight reams sixteen quires (4,400 copies), the STN was to increase to twelve reams six quires (6,150) and then to redo the earlier sheets at three reams ten quires (1,750). Duplain calculated costs in standard sheets or "feuilles d'édition." He allotted a fixed amount for composing and running off all the copies of one sheet; and he multiplied that amount by the number of sheets in a volume, when he wanted to determine the volume's total cost.<sup>18</sup> This way of calculating, which seems to have been typical of eighteenth-century publishers,<sup>19</sup> explains the terms of the contract for the "second edition," which Duplain and Panckoucke signed in Lyons on September 30, 1777:<sup>20</sup>

Je soussigné C. Panckoucke, libraire de Paris, en conséquence de la déclaration du sieur Joseph Duplain et Compagnie qu'ils ont placé quatre mille quatre cent sept souscriptions de l'*Encyclopédie* in-quarto sous le nom de Pellet et après m'en être assuré par moi-même d'après le registre des souscriptions, j'ai consenti comme en effet je consens qu'ils tirent encore un nombre de trois rames dix mains par feuille et qu'il leur sera tenu compte des prix suivants, savoir:

L'impression par feuille pour les volumes à recomposer et tirer au nombre de trois rames dix mains à trente-trois livres.

Pour l'augmentation de tirage sur chaque feuille qu'on ne recompose pas et sur lesquelles on tirera trois rames dix mains, après le nombre premier de huit rames seize mains, ladite augmentation à dix-sept livres dix sols.

The contract for the first edition had allotted 54 livres for the composition and presswork of each *feuille d'édition*, at a pressrun of 8 reams 16 quires (4,400). The new contract extended the run by 3 reams 10 quires (1,750), providing 33 livres for each sheet that had to be recomposed and reprinted. Those sheets really represented a new state rather than a second edition, although the publishers used the term "edition" in their correspondence and advertising. The subsequent sheets, run off at 12 reams 6 quires (6,150) would cost 71 livres 10 sous (54 livres

<sup>18</sup> This system of calculating costs is explained in S. BOULARD, *Le Manuel de l'imprimeur* (Paris, 1791), chap. VII (a slip for IX). Of course the printers also used round numbers, especially when they discussed payments for presswork, which were figured in milles (thousands) and marques (tokens).

<sup>19</sup> For another, particularly revealing example, see the journal of Emeric David of Aix, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, MS. 5947, f<sup>o</sup> 50.

<sup>20</sup> Papers of the STN, MS. 1189. Only the first part of the contract is quoted here. The rest of it fixed standard costs for Duplain's purchases of paper.



plus the 17 livres 10 sous for the increased run) per *feuille d'édition*. Thus the second "edition" was carefully prescribed by contract. Though not an edition in the full, modern sense of the term, it was no fiction either.

\* \* \*

Such were the formal arrangements for producing the quarto, but what actually happened in the printing shops? The transition from the first to the combined first and second "editions" can be followed precisely in the wage book of the STN's foreman;<sup>21</sup> and it is worth tracing, because it illustrates the complexities behind the hybrid editions of early modern books. The STN began volume VI of the first "edition" in the week of July 12-19, 1777. Twenty-two weeks later it finished the first two "editions" of the volume, having switched from 4,000 to 6,000 copies as soon as it received Duplain's order of August 27. The switch occurred in the first week of September. As the graph shows, the compositors had reached the end of the first alphabet that week; and the pressmen, working a few sheets behind them, had reached the end of sheet V. The compositors then proceeded as usual, setting sheets Z through 2D. But the pressmen ran off sheets T and V once again (there was no U nor W in the printer's 23-letter alphabet), this time at 2,000, and then continued with sheet X at the increased run of 6,000. They could not do R and S from the formes they had run off in the previous week, because the type had been distributed before the arrival of Duplain's letter. Thus one can isolate the precise moment when the first "edition" shaded off into the second. It stands out clearly in the foreman's notes on the sums he distributed on the payday of Saturday, September 6. For example:

Leduc Encycl.	tome VI. Augmentation de la feuille 1V . . . 26 [batz]	
	2Y. 1Aa	. . . 172
Roat Encyclopédie, tome VI. Augmentation de 2V		. . . 26
	1Y 2Aa	. . . 172

means that the pressman Leduc and his companion received 26 batz

<sup>21</sup> The wage books, known as "Banque des ouvriers", have been thoroughly studied by Jacques Rychner for the period 1769-1773 and will be an important ingredient of his forthcoming thesis. His generous help was crucial for the following interpretation of the printing of the *Encyclopédie*, which is based on the *Banques* for the years 1777-79.

(7 batz of Neuchâtel equaled 1 livre tournois) for printing the 2,000 additional copies from the first forme of sheet V; they received 172 batz for printing the second forme of Y and the first forme of 2A at 6,000; and Roat and his "second" received the same wages for printing the other formes of those sheets in the same manner.<sup>22</sup>

On the opposite page, the foreman, an exacting taskmaster from Liège called Barthélemy Spineux, noted the composition done that week:

Maltête Encyclopédie, tome VI. Z.Aa.Bb.Cc.Dd. . . . 295

No human being could have composed ten formes in small pica of a double-columned quarto in one week. In fact, as other entries indicate, Maltête directed a team of "paquetiers", usually three compositors who simply set pages or "paquets", leaving him to make up the pages and impose the formes in addition to the composition of his own paquets. The STN paid 59 batz for the composition of one sheet of the *Encyclopédie*: Maltête got 9 batz for the "mise en page", and each man received 6 batz 1 creuzer (or 25 creuzer, 4 creuzer being equal to 1 batz) for every paquet he had composed. The STN almost always paid a standard sum – 15 batz per thousand – for presswork. But it varied its payments for composition according to its assessment of the difficulty of the work. In the case of the quarto *Encyclopédie*, it experimented with different rates and finally adopted those being paid in Geneva; for the workers had attempted to exploit the *Encyclopédie* boom by playing one master printer off against another, and the masters responded by conspiring to freeze wages at the same level. The Genevans took the lead, as the following letter from Pellet to the STN demonstrates:<sup>23</sup>

Il est certainement très essentiel que nous nous conformions pour les prix de cet ouvrage, vu que les ouvriers nous mettent les pieds sur la gorge. Votre

<sup>22</sup> The STN almost always paid 15 batz for every 1,000 impressions. As it paid 60 batz for the printing of each forme of the first edition, its pressrun evidently came to 4,000. But this payment covered extra "mains de passe", in this case 25 sheets for every two reams of paper printed, to cover spoilage. Later the STN adjusted its wages slightly to bring them in line with those paid in Geneva – and probably also because the higher pressrun of the combined "editions" required proportionately less make ready. Thus the STN paid 86 instead of 90 batz for each forme run off at 6,000 (6,150 including the *mains de passe*). For the sheets it printed at 2,000 it paid only 26 batz, so that the presswork on them would come to the standard 86 batz, including the labor on their earlier printing. That the enlarged pressrun came to 6,000 (not including the extra 150 sheets) is confirmed by a margin note by the foreman about an error in the entry for Nov. 22, 1777: "4 feuilles de l'Encyclopédie à la presse à 6000 font 688 (batz) et non 860". It is not clear why the STN's initial pressruns did not conform to those in Duplain's instructions, i.e. 4,400 and then another 1,750. But the management of the enterprise was extremely confused during its first months, and by September 6, 1777 Duplain had all his printers working at 6,150.

<sup>23</sup> Pellet to STN, July 23, 1777.

prote ayant écrit que vous payez 15 batz le mil et une gratification à la fin, voici, Messieurs, ce que je paye, de même que dans les autres imprimeries, savoir 15 florins en paquet et corrige [sic] première et seconde; le prote corrige la troisième. Le prote met en page, ayant trouvé qu'il me revenait mieux à compte, vu que l'on demandait 4 florins de mise en page et même cinq florins. A la presse je paie 4 florins le mille soit 12 batz; et à chaque feuille finie je leur donne 6 cruches, de sorte que la feuille entière vaut 97 batz et demi, le florin toujours à 3 batz.

Thus one can read the documents in Neuchâtel – the only ones of their kind that exist for this period – as an indication of what was happening on a larger scale in Geneva. And behind the “missing” edition of the *Encyclopédie* one can see, in both sites, the perennial struggle between capital and labor.<sup>24</sup>

With the wages fixed and the pressrun adjusted, the work on the first-and-second edition of the quarto continued. As in all early-modern printing, it proceeded at an erratic pace. For example, in the week of October 25 the compositors set only 8 formes; and in the following week they set 17, even though the job assignments and the size of the work force remained constant. The output of the press crews fluctuated just as wildly; and as output determined income, so did wages. The pressmen as a whole printed twice as many sheets in the week of September 20 as in the week of September 13, not because they neglected other jobs in order to concentrate on the *Encyclopédie* but because they worked less. Leduc and his partner worked on nothing but the *Encyclopédie* during those two weeks: in the first week they produced 6,000 impressions and received 86 batz, and in the second they produced 18,000 impressions for 258 batz. Advancing slowly through the text in this irregular fashion, the shop finally completed the last sheet, 51, in the

<sup>24</sup> Like the TSN, Jean-Abram Nouffer of Geneva included make-up and imposition in his wages, which he described as follows in a letter to the STN of July 23, 1777: “Pour satisfaire à vos désirs par l’honneur de votre lettre du 21 courant et dans l’espoir que vous vous conformerez exactement à nos prix, nous vous les donnons ci-bas...”

Pour la composition d'une feuille en paquet . . . . .	f. 15
Pour la mise en page . . . . .	4
Pour le tirage à 4 R(ames) 14 mains . . . . .	32-6
Ensemble . . . . .	51-6”

The STN converted those figures into batz and then brought its wages into conformity with them, as indicated by the following margin note in its wage book, entry for July 26, 1777:

“Composition de Genève . . . . .	49-2
Mettage en page . . . . .	8-2
Ajouté au prix de Genève . . . . .	1
batz . . . . .	59”

week of December 13. At the same time, it redid sheets A through S, which had only been printed at 4,000. As he could work from the printed sheets of the first "editions," Spineux could cast off copy with great accuracy and did not have to follow the order of the text in the reprinting. He had one of the paquetiers, Erb, set sheet K in the week ending November 8. Then in the week of November 22, he put another paquetier, Guyaz, in charge of a second team, which composed L through the first form of O, while the first group of compositors, now working under Bertho (Maltête had quit in the second week of September), plugged away at the last of the original copy. The Guyaz group tacked back and forth in the text, followed at a certain distance by the pressmen. A compositor called Nicolas did the first forme of sheet F in the week of December 6. And in the very last week, Bertho's group took over the recomposition, ending at the beginning, at sheets A through E.

This analysis of the printing of one volume in the first two "editions" of the quarto, sheet by sheet and week by week, shows that printers did not simply superimpose one "edition" on another but blended them together in unpredictable ways.<sup>25</sup> It would be vain to draw inferences about the printing process from the examination of actual copies of the book, because the copies must vary endlessly. To cite a hypothetical example from the data of the wage book, one copy of volume VI might contain a sheet A, which was composed by Maltête and printed by Leduc (first forme) and Roat (second forme) during the week of July 19, and a sheet B composed by Bertho and his paquetiers and printed by George (first forme) and Gaillard (second forme) during the week of December 13. And another copy might contain a sheet A composed by the Bertho group and printed by Lhéritier (both formes) during the week of December 13 with a sheet B composed by Maltête (first forme in the week of July 19, second in the week of July 26) and run off in the week of July 26 by Guyaz (first forme) and Leduc (second forme). Considering the way the sheets could have been scrambled during the drying and gathering, it seems unlikely that any standard copies ever existed, or that it makes much sense to imagine an exemplary first, second, or

<sup>25</sup> There were also further complications. For example, sheet 2L was composed in the week of September 20, except for some passages requiring some special type, which the STN lacked. So 2L could not be run off until the type arrived, during the week of October 11. And in preparing the sheets for shipment, the STN evidently found some serious flaws in them, for it redid sheet 21 in the week of December 27, long after the volume had ostensibly been completed.

first-and-second edition. Moreover all these complexities pertain to only one of the 36 volumes of text in the set. While the STN redirected the flow of work in its shop, Pellet, Nouffer, and several other printers were doing the same thing in theirs. So to have some idea of the variations in the make-up of the sets, one should multiply all the permutations and combinations in the printing of volume VI by a factor of five or more.<sup>26</sup>

Finally, Duplain compounded the complexities by mixing up the sheets in his warehouses. Each printer gathered the stacks of sheets into volumes before shipping them to Lyons, where Duplain stored them, collated them, and sent them to the subscribers in groups of two or three volumes. This process involved a great deal of warehouse work and an ever-increasing capacity for confusion, because Duplain had two warehouses overflowing with loose sheets, which poured in from printing houses scattered all over eastern France and western Switzerland. His staff could not cope with the flood. The STN received dozens of complaints from customers who had received shipments with some sheets missing and others duplicated. Its traveling salesman reported from Marseilles that "quelques libraires que j'ai vus m'ont dit avoir reçu à bien des reprises des volumes pour des autres et avec cela quantité de feuilles très malpropres avec beaucoup de défectuosité. Il me paraît qu'il [Duplain] a trop peu de monde, car il n'a de commis que les deux frères Le Roy, un teneur de livres, et Le Roy l'aîné est presque toujours en voyage. En magasin il a deux assembleurs, trois femmes pour collationner et son domestique pour mettre de côté etc."<sup>27</sup> When the STN protested about mismanagement, Duplain replied testily,<sup>28</sup> "Nous vous dirons qu'il faut faire collationner avant d'envoyer, que notre monde achève les tomes 21, 22, 23, [of the first and second "editions"], vient de finir 3 et 4 [of the third edition], qui sont partis, va se mettre sur 24, 25,

<sup>26</sup> Duplain's letters suggest that the coefficient should be at least as high as seven, for on August 13, 1777 he informed the STN that volume VIII was under way in Lyons; and on August 27, when he instructed the STN to increase its printing, he said that 32 presses, aside from those in Neuchâtel, were at work on the book. Judging from references scattered throughout the STN's correspondence, it seems that about 100 presses in 20 different shops worked on the quarto *Encyclopédie* between 1777 and 1780.

<sup>27</sup> Jean-François Favarger to STN, Aug. 15, 1778.

<sup>28</sup> Duplain to STN, Dec. 20, 1778. The STN considered Duplain's management so faulty that it prepared to take him to court, and in a brief entitled "Griefs contre M. Duplain" (STN papers, MS. 1220), it stressed that "le désordre excessif qu'il a laissé régner dans ses expéditions aussi bien que dans les collationnements de l'ouvrage a occasionné des plaintes sans fin généralement de tous les souscripteurs". Although the printers probably did some collating in their own warehouses, Duplain specified that their duty was "assemblage" and his "collationnage": Duplain to STN, Sept. 2, 1778.

26 et après sur 5, 6, 7, 8. Vous rendez bien peu de justice à notre travail immense, et vous calculez bien peu son étendue. Ignorez-vous qu'il faut collationner près de 1800 rames sur chaque volume?" Everything indicates that this work, which is now treated as a treasure in rare book rooms, was thrown together in the sloppiest possible manner. It hardly seems surprising that modern bibliographers have failed to sort out the confusion surrounding it.

\* \* \*

The quarto *Encyclopédie* is the only one whose production and distribution can be studied in detail, but its history can help dissipate some of the obscurity clinging to the other editions. For example, the octavo *Encyclopédie* published by the sociétés typographiques of Lausanne and Bern between 1778 and 1782 has also produced a bibliographical puzzle. The publishers announced the existence of two editions in their advertising:<sup>29</sup>

L'*Encyclopédie* in-octavo qu'impriment les Sociétés Typographiques de Berne et de Lausanne ayant reçu l'accueil le plus favorable, elles ouvrent une nouvelle souscription, à raison de 5 livres de France le volume de discours (il y en aura 36) et de 15 livres chacun des 3 volumes de planches, comme on peut voir plus au long dans leurs Prospectus. Pour cette deuxième édition on délivrera les volumes de discours depuis 1 à 20 par 5 volumes à la fois, et depuis 21 à 36 par 2 volumes.

But bibliographers have failed to find any copies with "seconde édition" on the title page. Another case of a missing edition?<sup>30</sup> Not at all: a case of a second printing being grafted onto a first, exactly as in the "second edition" of the quarto. The publishers themselves indicated that they had adopted this tactic in an "Avertissement", which they published in the reprinted version (Lausanne and Bern, 1781, p. civ) of volume I (originally Lausanne, 1778):

Aussi notre édition a-t-elle reçu l'accueil le plus favorable; et parvenus au 20<sup>e</sup> volume de discours et au 1<sup>er</sup> volume de planches, nous avons senti par le petit nombre d'exemplaires qui nous restait l'insuffisance de celui auquel nous

<sup>29</sup> *Gazette de Berne*, April 8, 1780.

<sup>30</sup> For examples of speculation about the "missing" octavo, see Watts, "The Swiss Editions of the *Encyclopédie*", p. 230-232 and Lough, *Essays*, p. 40-43.

nous étions fixés pour fournir aux demandes qu'on nous en fait de toutes parts, et surtout en France... Nous avons donc pris de nouveaux arrangements pour faciliter la circulation de notre édition, d'augmenter le nombre des exemplaires pour les volumes que nous n'avons pas imprimé encore, de réimprimer ceux qui le sont, et d'ouvrir une nouvelle souscription.

A comparison of several sets of the octavo confirms that the publishers increased their printing at volume XX; for the places and dates of publication are irregular in volumes I-XIX, and the title pages and typography remain consistent in volumes XX-XXXVI.

But the full explanation of these changes must be sought in the correspondence of the quarto publishers. The low price of the octavo – 225 livres as opposed to 384 livres for the quarto – made it a formidable competitor in the French market, which Panckoucke and Duplain wanted to keep to themselves. At the end of 1777 a full-scale trade war broke out. By mobilizing his protectors in Versailles, Panckoucke finally turned back the invasion of octavos; and the Swiss publishers retreated to the market outside France. But they held on to their French subscription lists in the hope that they could negotiate a peace after the quarto group had finished its marketing. By October 1779 they thought that the time had come for *pourparlers* with the STN, which could be expected to listen to their proposals with sympathy; for the three Swiss houses had often banded together against the French in a joint pirating venture known as the “Confédération helvétique.” The proposals reveal a great deal about the octavo *Encyclopédie*. According to letters from Lausanne and Bern, its pressrun came to 3,000; all but 100 sets had been subscribed; and the printing had only reached volume XV. Allowing for a 25 per cent discount to booksellers and for free thirteenth copies, revenue was expected to total 450,000 livres; and expenses would come to 300,000 livres, leaving 150,000 livres in profit. Sales had gone so well that a second edition seemed certain to succeed, the Lausannois assured the STN: “Le public a bien accueilli la première édition, et l'on nous fait de toutes parts des instances en France pour cet ouvrage qui sont un bon garant de l'écoulement de la seconde.” So the STN should persuade its partners to open up the French market. “Leur moisson est faite: ils paraissent inclinés à nous permettre de glaner après eux.” And to bring them around, the octavo publishers could offer 20,000 livres. That sum could be produced from the savings to be made by increasing the pressrun. The last seventeen volumes of the

text could be printed at 6,000; so only the first nineteen would have to be recomposed.<sup>31</sup>

After some fierce bargaining, the quarto publishers finally accepted this proposal. But they squeezed 24,000 livres out of Lausanne and Bern, and the octavo group only increased its printing by 2,500 – or so it seems from a report by one of the STN's directors, who assessed the situation in June 1780:<sup>32</sup> "Je sais de science certaine que les gens de Lausanne et de Berne, qui ne la tiraient d'abord qu'à 3,000, la tirent présentement à 5,500, depuis l'entrée en France obtenue." In the end, therefore, the "second edition" of the octavo required only a reprinting of volumes I through XIX of the first, as its "Avertissement" indicated, and the French public received another cut-rate *Encyclopédie*.

\* \* \*

Prices also could be cut by producing other half-breed "editions", whose existence has gone unnoticed by bibliographers – with one exception. While working in the rare book collection of the University of California at Riverside, Richard Schwab turned up a folio *Encyclopédie* whose first seven volumes had no typographical affinity with those of the Paris and Geneva folios. After tracking the same mutation into other libraries, Schwab concluded that they must represent a previously undiscovered edition – the "Riverside counterfeit" – which probably had been put together by Panckoucke.<sup>33</sup> Panckoucke did own 2,000 extra copies of volumes I-III in the late 1770's, following a mishap in the production of what eventually became the Geneva folio.<sup>34</sup> He had begun printing his folio edition in Le Breton's shop in Paris and had reached the end of the third volume of the text by February 1770, when the police seized the sheets and walled them up in the Bastille. Panc-

<sup>31</sup> Société typographique de Lausanne to STN, Oct. 16, 1779. The Lausannois also offered to let the STN acquire a one-third interest in the enterprise and to do most of the reprinting. For further details on the *Encyclopédie* war, see DARNTON, *The Business of Enlightenment*, chap. 4.

<sup>32</sup> Frédéric-Samuel Ostervald of the STN to his partner, Abraham Bosset de Luze, June 4, 1780.

<sup>33</sup> Richard N. SCHWAB, «Inventory of Diderot's *Encyclopédie*», *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* LXXX (1971), p. 100-103. Schwab also argues that because all or part of volumes I-III in the first edition were reprinted on two separate occasions, the original version of the *Encyclopédie* should be considered not one but three editions. It seems preferable, however, to distinguish three states of a single edition, according to the criteria expounded by GASKELL, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 313-316.

<sup>34</sup> On this episode, see the articles by WATTS cited in footnote 5 and especially LOUGHI, "The Panckoucke-Cramer Edition", in *Essays*, p. 52-110.



koucke then moved the enterprise to the safer territory of Geneva. Cramer and de Tournes bought a one-third share in it and continued the printing at volume IV, while Panckoucke lobbied for the release of the first three volumes. But hard as he pulled at strings in Versailles, Panckoucke failed to overcome the opposition of the clergy and the tough Maupeou ministry. So, much to the consternation of his Genevan partners, the first three volumes had to be printed over again. Nevertheless, the "prisonniers", as Voltaire called them,<sup>35</sup> had great potential value, because they could be combined with leftover volumes from the first folio to make a scrap edition. That the original publishers had been stuck with a large supply of leftovers became clear in the course of their lawsuit against Luneau de Boisjermain, one of their disgruntled subscribers. In order to rebut Luneau's contention that they had taken excessive profits, they emphasized that they had 400-500 extra copies of volumes VIII-XVII on their hands. Although the claims and counter-claims in the Luneau case cannot be accepted at face value, the publishers' argument seems credible. The last ten volumes of the text came out simultaneously in 1765, yet most of the subscribers had signed up in the early 1750's. Many of them must have disappeared, died, or lost interest in the book by the time it was completed, leaving the publishers with a surplus of unclaimed volumes.<sup>36</sup> Multi-volume publications by subscription often suffered from this problem. In the case of the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, Panckoucke lost 2,000 subscribers between 1782 and 1792, and the build-up of surplus volumes nearly ruined the enterprise.<sup>37</sup> But for every stock of surplus there existed the possibility of patching together complete sets, reprinting missing sheets where necessary. Thus the contract between the original publishers of the *Encyclopédie* and the Panckoucke group envisaged the creation of a scrap edition while transferring the right to reproduce the text. The original publishers

<sup>35</sup> See for example Voltaire to Cramer, Feb. 19, 1770, *Voltaire's Correspondence*, LXXIV, p. 109.

<sup>36</sup> The eleventh and last volume of plates did not appear until 1772, when the publishers were already embroiled in their lawsuit with Luneau. They attempted to answer his charges about profit-gouging by stressing the casualty rate among the subscribers; see their defense quoted in Lough, "Luneau de Boisjermain", 127-28: "Il [Luneau] suppose que tous les exemplaires ont été retirés; cependant il est de fait qu'il reste encore 4 à 500 exemplaires des dix derniers volumes, et une bien plus grande quantité d'exemplaires de tous les volumes de planches. De ce grand nombre de souscripteurs, les uns sont morts, et les héritiers ne se sont point encore présentés; d'autres ont été hors d'état de fournir à une dépense si considérable; plusieurs ont entrepris des voyages de long cours, dont ils ne sont point encore revenus..."

<sup>37</sup> See Panckoucke's notice, "A Messieurs les souscripteurs", dated Feb. 13, 1792 in *Encyclopédie méthodique, Manufactures, arts et métiers* (Paris, 1790 [sic]) seconde partie, III, p. xlii.

noted that they still had “quelques centaines des dix derniers volumes de l'*Encyclopédie*” in stock, and they bound their successors to complete those sets with volumes from the reprint.<sup>38</sup> This project never came to anything; but while struggling with the reprint, Panckoucke and Cramer continued to toy with plans for a scrap edition. That seemed to be the best thing to do with the volumes in the Bastille, if they should ever be released, Cramer remarked:<sup>39</sup> “Monsieur Panckoucke observera, que les premiers éditeurs de Paris ont de reste, au moins, 600 tomes 8 à 17 de discours dont ils faisaient bon marché; de manière que, si M. Panckoucke obtient un jour la libération des tomes 1.2.3., il se procurera plus de 600 exemplaires complets, en imprimant les tomes 4 à 7.” Thus there is much to be said for Schwab’s hypothesis – and for opening up the question of scrap editions in general.

Although it is impossible to piece together the connecting links between the projects imagined by the *Encyclopédie* publishers and the set that materialized on the shelves of the University of California at Riverside, some key connections can be uncovered in the papers of the STN. On July 3, 1776, the Neuchâtel publishers succeeded Cramer, de Tournes, and Panckoucke’s other partners as his associates in the next speculation on the *Encyclopédie* – originally a plan for another folio reprint, then a project for a revised edition, and finally the three quarto “editions” launched from Geneva and Lyons by Duplain. The contract behind this complex series of enterprises gave the STN a half ownership of the 2,000 volumes I-III, which Panckoucke had by then extricated from the Bastille, thanks to his protectors and the more liberal atmosphere in Versailles following the accession of Louis XVI.<sup>40</sup> At first Panckoucke planned to incorporate those volumes in a new folio edition. But after

<sup>38</sup> See the text of the contract in LOUGH, *Essays*, p. 60-61.

<sup>39</sup> Cramer to Panckoucke, Aug. 21, 1772, quoted in Lough, *Essays*, p. 96.

<sup>40</sup> The contract of July 3, 1776, in the STN papers, MS. 1233, gave the STN a half share in Panckoucke’s general rights to the *Encyclopédie* and set the terms for a new folio edition, which was to incorporate the three volumes released from the Bastille. It specified that “le sieur Panckoucke déclare que les trois premiers volumes de cette nouvelle édition sont actuellement imprimés dans ses magasins, ainsi que le premier volume de planches composé de cent quarante-six cuivres, et que la dépense de ces deux objets est de soixante-dix mille huit cent livres dont le sieur Panckoucke a fait les avances...”. See also the comparable clauses in Panckoucke’s contract of June 26, 1770 with Cramer and de Tournes, in which the three volumes of text and the volume of plates were valued at 69,296 livres: LOUGH, *Essays*, p. 68 and 73. The additional 1,504 livres that Panckoucke charged the STN may have covered the expenses, including bribery, involved in getting the release of the books. In settling the accounts for the Geneva folio by an agreement of June 13, 1775, Cramer and de Tournes acknowledged that their one-third share in the confiscated volumes had reverted to Panckoucke: see the text in *ibid*, 103.

joining forces with Duplain in the speculation on the quarto in January 1777, he dropped that plan and picked up the old proposal for a scrap edition. It would be foolish to market another complete folio edition in the wake of the quarto, he explained to the STN. But it would be wise to patch the surplus volumes into sets instead of selling them for scrap paper ("à la rame").<sup>41</sup>

Les trois volumes mis à la rame pourraient produire environ douze mille livres; c'est une bien petite rentrée pour une aussi forte dépense [69,296 livres, according to Panckoucke]. Avant de prendre ce parti, dont nous serons toujours à temps, je crois devoir vous communiquer une idée qui m'est venue et qui pourrait nous faire tirer un grand parti de ces trois volumes. Il existe à Paris un fonds considérable de volumes séparés de l'ancienne édition depuis le tome 4 à 28. Mme. Briasson, qui possède ce fonds est très vieille. On le vendra sûrement à sa mort. Nous pourrions en faire l'acquisition et nous former 4 à 5 cent corps complets de l'édition de Paris, sans faire une grande dépense. Ces exemplaires édition [sic] de Paris sont très recherchés et auront toujours une grande valeur. Je crois donc qu'il est prudent d'attendre et de tirer le meilleur parti possible de ce fonds de volumes séparés.

A year later, however, Panckoucke let this project slip through his fingers. He had been juggling so many different speculations – the quarto *Encyclopédie*, the *Encyclopédie méthodique*, plots to buy up all the manuscripts of Voltaire and Rousseau, the purchase and merger of several journals, and a mammoth auction of his entire stock of books – that he dropped the plan for a scrap folio. In November 1778 he informed the STN,<sup>42</sup> "Ma vente à la chambre [the auction] aura lieu dans 15 jours. Je suis dans l'intention d'y mettre nos volumes in-folio de l'*Encyclopédie*. Nous pouvons en tirer meilleur parti qu'à la rame. Donnez-moi votre consentement, et j'irai en avant." On December 22 he reported that the surplus volumes had been sold: "Nos trois premiers volumes sont vendus. Ils ont produit deux mil quatre cent soixante et douze rames à raison de 4 livres 10 sous [ie. 11,124 livres], qui doivent être payés comptant à la fin de janvier. Je vous fournirai le bordereau de votre part la semaine prochaine, et vous pourrez tirer sur moi à cette époque. C'est Monsieur Saugrain le jeune, quai des Augustins, qui les a acquis. On travaille actuellement dans mes magasins à mettre les paquets à la rame." Pan-

<sup>41</sup> Panckoucke to STN, Dec. 22, 1777. Widow Briasson had inherited these surplus volumes from her husband, one of the publishers of the first edition. Presumably most of them came from the batch of unsold volumes VIII-XVII; so perhaps Panckoucke was speaking loosely when he talked of volumes IV-XXVIII (his remark included the eleven volumes of plates)

<sup>42</sup> Panckoucke to STN, Nov. 6, 1778.

ckoucke expected the volumes to go for scrap, not a scrap edition, and at an even lower price than he had estimated. But he was wrong. Within a year of the sale, the widow Briasson died; her volumes were sold; and the purchaser probably was Saugrain. Panckoucke did not mention Saugrain by name, but he reported that some sharp operator had snapped up the Briasson volumes in order to put together a scrap edition like the one Panhoucke had contemplated in 1772 and again in 1777. “Nous avons fait une grande sottise...,”<sup>43</sup> he confessed to the STN in January 1779. “On vient ici de réaliser le projet que j’avais toujours eu par l’achat du fonds de Mme. Briasson. Cependant comme ils n’ont pas les cuivres, ils ne pourront pas donner à leur spéculation toute l’étendue que nous aurions pu y donner nous-mêmes.”

Thus by 1779 the way had been cleared for a “Riverside edition.” Whether Saugrain or someone else executed it cannot be determined, because the documentation gives out at this point. But some kind of scrap *Encyclopédie* probably reached the market within the next few years, for in 1786 “the original Paris edition in folio” was being offered to Jefferson for 620 livres. Evidently Jefferson had crossed paths with Panckoucke’s “prisonniers.” Had he sent them to Virginia, he would have got less than he had bargained for; but Monticello would not have been the only library with a fake first edition. There must be hundreds of bastard sets in rare book rooms throughout Europe and America. Their fine bindings and imposing title pages conceal a shady past, which stretches back into the corridors of the Bastille and speculations on the death of widow Briasson.

\* \* \*

The proliferation of the scrap folio suggests that the publishers might have put together other scrap editions. Indeed, in October 1779 Duplain proposed one. Although his partners rejected the proposal, it deserves serious consideration by bibliographers, because it reveals the importance of a key element in the early-modern book trade: *défets* or surplus sheets, which remained in the warehouse after the largest possible number of complete copies of a book had been assembled by the printer. That number varied: if a great many sheets had been spoiled in the printing, the marketable copies, or net output, would be far less than

<sup>43</sup> Panckoucke to STN, Jan. 7, 1778 – a slip for 1779, as the context makes clear.

the original pressrun, or gross output. The *défets* represented the difference. In principle, they were intended to replace whatever spoiled sheets might turn up in the marketed copies. In practise, they often went into scrap copies. And in cases like the quarto, they could be patched into a scrap "edition", owing to the unusual gap between gross and net output. Duplain emphasized the importance of this gap in his proposal of October 1779. Although the contracts and codicils for the three "editions" had set pressruns totaling 8,525, he reported that he had only been able to assemble 8,011 complete sets. To ruin one of every seventeen *Encyclopédies* called for bungling on a grand scale, but Duplain glossed over that point by assuring his partners that at least 100 sets could be salvaged, with some reprinting here and there, from the *défets*.<sup>44</sup>

Je craignais bien que les *gachis* énormes qu'on a faits dans mes magasins, dans les envois, nécessité par la promptitude de l'opération, qui a obligé d'employer de toutes sortes de personnes, ne nous eussent privé de bien d'exemplaires et ne nous eussent pas mis dans le cas de faire une nouvelle récolte que voici. Comme le tome 36 va finir, je vais ranger les défets, et ce qui va vous surprendre, c'est que j'ai deux magasins remplis. Il est donc question de savoir si la compagnie veut suivre mon avis, qui est de refaire les feuilles qui compléteront les exemplaires; et je crois qu'avec une très modique dépense nous ferons 100, peut-être 130, peut-être plus encore d'exemplaires... Quant à moi, Messieurs, mon avis est qu'on travaille sur le champ aux défets, qu'on refasse les feuilles qui produiront avec un gros avantage des exemplaires complets, et qu'on vende 156 livres les exemplaires revenants net de l'opération, si M. Perrin, qui a acheté les autres, le veut.

The partners rejected this proposal, because they did not want to sink capital in new *Encyclopédies*, when, according to Duplain, they were having difficulty in selling the last of the old ones. Furthermore, they suspected that the customer for whom Duplain wanted to cut the price was nothing but a straw man. By emphasizing the decline in demand two months earlier, Duplain had persuaded them to accept a sale that he had arranged between the quarto association and Perrin, whom he identified vaguely as a businessman of Strasbourg and Lyons; and they had let Perrin buy up the rump of the third "edition", some 422 sets, for 156 livres apiece or 53 per cent of their wholesale price. But after accepting the sale, Panckoucke and the STN began to believe that Duplain had actually sold the 422 sets himself and was attempting to

<sup>44</sup> Duplain to STN, Oct. 11, 1779.

collect the full price for them while buying them at half price through a fake middle man. In fact, they had suspected foul play in Duplain's management of their affairs for more than a year; they had slipped a spy into his shop; and during a meeting in Lyons in February 1779, they had secretly made a copy of his subscription list. The list accounted for 7,373 subscriptions. But Duplain's report of October 1779 mentioned only 6,589; for his total of 8,011 included 1,000 sets that he and Panckoucke had split by a special agreement and the 422 sold to Perrin. Clearly Duplain was fiddling the accounts, and it would be foolish to give him room for further speculation by permitting him to produce a scrap edition.<sup>45</sup>

All this pent-up suspicion and intrigue finally exploded at the settling of the quarto's accounts in February 1780. Duplain's partners confronted him at a meeting in Lyons with overwhelming evidence of his swindles and then agreed to cover them up in exchange for 200,000 livres. Without going into all the Balzacian details of this episode, it is important to note three aspects of the quarto's liquidation, which bear on the general problem of unscrambling editions of the *Encyclopédie*. First, Duplain's attempt to hide his sales proves that the demand for the book had not dried up, as he had claimed; so a market for scrap editions continued to exist after the completion of the quarto. Secondly, the publishers attributed great value to the *défets* during their negotiations; so they recognized the feasibility of a scrap edition. And thirdly, they had only a vague idea of how many *Encyclopédies* they had manufactured; so analysis of book production ought to take account of an enormous grey area, bounded on one side by the output of the presses and on the other by the accumulation of complete copies.

To take the last point first, it would be a mistake to assume that eighteenth-century publishers calculated output with the precision of modern businessmen. They talked in approximations, without much concern for consistency. A remark about an edition of 2,000 generally meant 2,000 give or take 50-100, and it might contradict some previous statement or even a contract.<sup>46</sup> After receiving Duplain's sales report in October 1779, Panckoucke and the STN exchanged guesses as to

<sup>45</sup> For a detailed account of these intrigues, see DARNTON, *The Business of Enlightenment*, chap. 6.

<sup>46</sup> For example, in discussing his edition of Voltaire's works, Gabriel Cramer remarked, "On tirait cette édition à deux mille cent exemplaires, sur quoi il y en avait environ cinquante à retrancher pour les mauvaises feuilles, etc.": Cramer to Louis Necker de Germagny, May 25, 1777 in *Voltaire's Correspondence*, XCVI, p. 189.

how many quartos they had actually produced and sold. "J'ai reçu le calcul en gros des exemplaires envoyé par M. Duplain, montant à 8,011..."<sup>47</sup> Panckoucke wrote. "Les planches sont le thermomètre de la vente. On les tire à 8,600. En supposant exact le calcul que nous avons fait à Lyons de 8,309 et en y joignant 130 ou 150 provenant des défets, nous nous rapprocherions beaucoup du nombre exact, mais nous serions bien éloignés du calcul de M. D. Tout cela ne peut se vérifier que sur les lieux." In this case, the vagueness resulted primarily from the fact that Duplain's partners had to watch him from a distance, while he tried to obfuscate his operations in Lyons. But even the contracts and the correspondence of the printers abounded in inconsistencies. At one point the contract for the first edition mentioned 4,000 copies and at another 4,250.<sup>48</sup> The contract for the second "edition" said the first was being printed at 4,400 (8 reams 16 quires), yet the letters of the Genevan printers set its pressrun at 4,350.<sup>49</sup> And the wagebook of the STN's foreman indicates runs of 4,000 for the first edition, 2,000 for the sheets reprinted as the second, and 6,000 for the combined "editions." Some of this confusion can be attributed to the disorganization at the beginning of the enterprise, when Duplain had difficulty in coordinating his commissions and in imposing one "edition" on another. All the evidence agrees that the combined "editions" were printed at a gross run of 6,150 (12 reams 6 quires).<sup>50</sup> But the documentation concerning the third "edition" looks more ambiguous. Although the contract set the pressrun at 4 reams 16 quires (2,400 copies), Duplain directed the STN to print at 4 reams 15 quires (2,375) in a letter of July 10, 1778; and the STN described the "montant de l'édition" as 2,360 in a letter to Panckoucke of March 23, 1779. Here, however, the inconsistencies probably derive from overruns, which were intended to fill gaps in the earlier "editions." Thus on February 18, 1779 Duplain told the STN to print volume XIX of the third edition at 4 reams 17 quires (2,425),

<sup>47</sup> Panckoucke to STN, Oct. 25, 1779. Panckoucke was referring to estimates that he and the directors of the STN had made at the first meeting in Lyons of February 1779. Panckoucke himself had the plates printed in Paris; but they did not serve as an index to the real incidence of the sales, because Duplain distributed them from Lyons.

<sup>48</sup> See articles 4 and 8 of the contract of Jan. 14, 1777 in the STN papers, MS. 1189.

<sup>49</sup> Nouffer to STN, July 23, 1777 and Pellet to STN, July 23, 1777. The figure of 4,350 was also mentioned in a letter to the STN from its agent in Geneva, Louis Marcinhes, of July 11, 1777.

<sup>50</sup> See, for example, the contract for the second "edition", dated Sept. 30, 1777 and a preliminary agreement on the accounts signed by Duplain and Panckoucke on February 10, 1779 in the STN papers, MS. 1189.

“pour fournir aux imperfections des deux éditions premières.”<sup>51</sup> When they went over the accounts for the first time in February 1779, the partners certified that the gross pressrun was 4 reams 15 quires (2,375); and they kept to that figure, when they closed the accounts a year later.<sup>52</sup> Despite the bewildering variety in the publishers’ statements, therefore, it seems certain that the gross output of quartos came to 8,525 copies. But what was the net output?

Publishers did not set precise figures for the number of books they expected to market, because they could not know how much spoilage would occur in the printing and handling of the sheets. But they allowed for the difference between gross and net production by a crucial factor in their calculations: the *chaperon*. According to eighteenth-century printing manuals,<sup>53</sup> “le chaperon est du papier que l’on tire d’excédent du nombre indiqué; par exemple, une main par rame. Le chaperon sert à compléter les exemplaires défectueux, et à en faire de complets. Combien de maisons bâties avec des chaperons!” The STN also defined this term and stressed its importance during a dispute over printing costs with Duplain. Duplain had refused to reimburse their payments for *chaperon*, so the Neuchâtelois took their case to some arbitrators:<sup>54</sup>

Chacun sait que toutes les fois qu’on travaille dans une imprimerie, il se trouve toujours plusieurs feuilles de papier défectueuses ou que les ouvriers salissent, gâtent et déchirent, sans parler de celles qui servent pour les épreuves. C’est la raison pour laquelle celui qui fournit le papier en ajoute toujours un certain nombre en sus de ce qu’il faut, et ce surplus se nomme *chapelet* ou *chaperon*... Il n’y a de différence que dans le nombre de feuilles ainsi ajoutées pour chaperon. Quelques fois il va à une main par rame; le moins est une main pour deux rames.

<sup>51</sup> The STN began volume XIX, the only one it printed of the 36 volumes of text in “its” edition, on February 27, and it paid its press crews 36 batz 2 creuzers for every forme that they ran off. That rate corresponds quite closely to Duplain’s directive; for it would indicate a run of 2,433 at the standard wages of 15 batz per thousand, which the STN probably adjusted downward slightly, as it did in the previous edition.

<sup>52</sup> The preliminary accounting was expressed in the “règlement” signed in Lyons on February 10, 1779. The details of the liquidation of the enterprise can be followed from notes taken by the STN directors and Panckoucke at the final meeting in Lyons in February 1780, which are collected in a dossier of the STN papers, MS. 1233: see especially the notes entitled “Aperçu de l’*Encyclopédie* fait à Lyon par M. Panckoucke”, where the pressrun of the third edition is figured at 4 reams 15 quires.

<sup>53</sup> A.-F. MOMORO, *Traité élémentaire de l’imprimerie, ou le manuel de l’imprimeur* (Paris, 1793), p. 91-92. The printers also called this surplus paper “mains de passe”. See for example, S. BOULARD, *Le manuel de l’imprimeur* (Paris, 1791), p. 72: “On ajoute ordinairement une main par mil; c’est ce qu’on appelle les mains de passe.” See also the article “CHAPERON” in the *Encyclopédie*.

<sup>54</sup> «Mémoire contre Duplain» (Feb., 1780), STN papers, Ms. 1220.



The STN went on to explain that it had allowed one quire of *chaperon* for every two reams of paper it had purchased. Typographically, that constituted a margin of error of 2.5 per cent (25 for every 1,000 sheets).<sup>55</sup> Physically, it amounted to a formidable heap of paper: 111 reams or 55,500 heavy, hand-made sheets. And financially, it was worth 1,066 livres – the equivalent of about eighteen months' wages of a journeyman printer, merely for the surplus paper of five volumes.

It hardly seems surprising, therefore, that publishers took the *chaperon* into account when they put together speculations. As paper dominated their budgets, they generally thought in terms of reams and quires, rather than round numbers, in setting pressruns; and the quires in their calculations generally included the *chaperon*. Thus the pressrun of the first two quarto "editions", 12 reams 6 quires, contained 6 quires of *chaperon* – that is, 150 extra copies of each sheet printed at 6,000. The provision for *chaperon* remained implicit. Occasionally, however, the publishers set targets for net output and referred explicitly to the *chaperon*. The contract for the Geneva reprint specified,<sup>56</sup> "Monsieur Pankoucke a associé comme de fait il associe lesdits sieurs Gabriel Cramer et Samuel de Tourne pour un tiers dans une édition de deux mille exemplaires . . .," and a supplementary note added "non compris cent cinquante exemplaires de chaperon." This consideration may explain the inconsistencies in the evidence about the size of the first folio edition. The accounts indicate a pressrun of 4,225 (for volumes IV through XVII; the publishers began at a pressrun of 2,050 or 2,075 and twice reprinted portions of the first three volumes); yet in their suit against Luneau, the publishers claimed to have produced only 4,050 *Encyclopédies*. Evidently the first figure included the *chaperon*, and the difference of 175 copies can be attributed to the gap between gross and net production.<sup>57</sup>

Such gaps left enormous room for scrap editions, because most sheets of *chaperon* were not spoiled, even though the *chaperon* was intended to

<sup>55</sup> Of course each sheet was printed on two sides, so the margin of error could be considered smaller: the pressmen had only 25 sheets to compensate for errors in 2,000 impressions. Perhaps that is why some printers allowed one quire for every ream. The extra quire also covered faults in the paper itself; and the printer had to pay for his surplus paper, although he did not pay his pressmen for printing it.

<sup>56</sup> LOUGH, *Essays*, p. 67-68. In this case the provision for the *chaperon* was unusually high, higher than the quire per ream mentioned in some of the printers' manuals. *Chaperons* probably varied a good deal in size.

<sup>57</sup> On the conflicting evidence about the size of the edition, see LOUGH, "Luneau de Boisjerman", p. 124; and for a detailed account of the reprintings, see SCHWAB, "Inventory", p. 78-81.

cover spoilage. This apparent paradox can be explained by the way warehouse men gathered sheets into volumes.<sup>58</sup> After the newly-printed sheets had dried, they laid them out in piles according to the alphabetical order of the signatures. Each pile corresponded to a signature; but the size of them varied, for the pressmen would have spoiled more of some than of others. The STN printed 6,150 copies of all 101 sheets in the first two "editions" of volume VI of the quarto *Encyclopédie*. But it might have produced 6,098 unspoiled copies of sheet A, 6,127 of sheet B, and so on. The warehouse man would take the top sheet from the pile with the last signature (in this case 5I), the top sheet from the next pile (5H), and would proceed down the line until he had gathered one volume. He would then repeat this operation until one of the piles ran out. That meant that all the other sheets in all the other piles could not be used: they were surplus or "défets." In some respects, therefore, the term "défet" was positive, not negative. It pertained not to the spoiled sheets but rather to the unspoiled surplus remaining after the maximum number of complete volumes had been gathered.<sup>59</sup> When one or two piles were disproportionately shorter than the others, the number of volumes could be increased at little expense by recomposing and reprinting a few sheets. Duplain directed the STN to save a great many copies of volume XIX in precisely this way<sup>60</sup>:

Nous vous prions de mettre votre imprimerie sur: a ff eee iii kkk nnn ppp  
 qqq rrr sss ttt vvv xxx yyy dddd ffff gggg hhhh iiii kkkk llll iiii hhhhhh  
 nnnnnn qqqqqq rrrrrr ssssss tttttt vvvvvv  
 et sitôt que ces feuilles seront imprimées, nous vous prions de nous en envoyer  
 50 exemplaires de chacune par la carosse. Ces feuilles nous retiennent 50

<sup>58</sup> On techniques of gathering, see Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, p. 143-45; the article "ASSEMBLAGE" in the *Encyclopédie*; and the description in chap. 4 of a manuscript entitled "Anecdotes typographiques", dated 1762 and kindly supplied to the present writer in typescript by Giles Barber of the Taylolean Institute, Oxford. The quarto was so huge that the gathering of it probably proceeded in stages.

<sup>59</sup> See the article "DEFETS" in the *Encyclopédie*: "Ce sont les feuilles imprimées d'un livre qui restent après que les assemblages sont faits... Comme il est moralement impossible que toutes les feuilles d'un livre soient au même nombre immédiatement après l'impression, soit parce que les rames de papier qui doivent être de cinq cent feuilles ne sont pas toutes également bien comptées, soit parce que dans le cours de l'impression le nombre des différentes feuilles qui se gâtent ou qui se déchirent est inégal; il arrive qu'une ou plusieurs feuilles du livre manquent à la fin des assemblages lorsqu'il en reste encore des autres. Ces feuilles qui restent se nomment *défets*, du mot latin *defectus*, parce que réunies elles ne peuvent pas former des exemplaires complets. On a l'attention de les recueillir et de les conserver, pour servir à compléter dans la suite les exemplaires du même livre qui peuvent se trouver imparfaits ou défectueux."

<sup>60</sup> Duplain to STN, March 24, 1779.

souscriptions; et si nous ne les recevons pas dans douze jours, nous craignons bien de les avoir en perte.

But it was uneconomical to reproduce a great many sheets, and the amount of reproduction required would increase in proportion to the length of the copy. The attrition rate would be greatest in multi-volume works; for just as one missing sheet could spoil a volume, one missing volume could spoil a set. Still, every spoiled sheet created a potential surplus of unspoiled *défets*, and in a 36-volume work like the quarto *Encyclopédie* the leftovers could attain monumental proportions. Duplain's printers sent all of their *défets* to Lyons, and they eventually filled two of his warehouses.

Two warehouses of *Encyclopédie* sheets represented a gigantic asset. Many of the sheets were eventually used to complete faulty sets; for even after Duplain's staff gave the books a final collating in Lyons, many imperfections remained in the volumes that reached the customers. But the bulk of the *défets* probably found their way into a scrap edition like the one Duplain proposed in 1779. In fact, when Duplain's partners met to liquidate their association in February 1780, they suspected that he had already pieced together such an edition and had secretly sold it. In notes and memoranda, which they made during their meetings, they estimated that Duplain disposed of *défets* for 400 quartos in addition to the 8,011 for which he accounted in his sales report. Half of that surplus could be marketed as complete sets, they calculated. Indeed, Duplain probably had already marketed it. One of the STN's directors noted that the income from 8,011 sets could not possibly represent all the revenue of the enterprise, as Duplain had claimed, because, "...on peut encore ajouter le reste de la troisième édition, qui est sûrement vendu, c'est-à-dire la moitié des 400 que nous comptons être en magasin ou en défets, soit 200 exemplaires."<sup>61</sup> Duplain's partners could not produce evidence of this swindle, though they had proof of several others. So they argued that he had underrated the assets of the enterprise by failing to account for the full value of the *défets*. One of their memoranda denouncing his management began with the following assertion: <sup>62</sup> "M. Duplain porte la totalité des 3 éditions de l'*Encyclopédie*, non compris ceux à provenir des défets, à 8,011 exemplaires." The assumption was that a scrap edition would be produced, if it did not already exist.

<sup>61</sup> "Tableau de ce qui devrait nous revenir de l'entreprise", STN papers MS. 1220.

<sup>62</sup> "Premier mémoire de M. Plomteux", *ibid.*

Given that assumption, the earlier intrigues, and the continuation of the demand, it seems likely that someone put together a scrap quarto; but who did it? Duplain acquired all the remains of the editions, when he bought off his partners in the settling of accounts. But then he sold his business to one of his associates, Amable Le Roy; for he had made enough from the *Encyclopédie*, even after the settlement, to retire. For the next few years, Le Roy acted as “le gardien du magasin de défets,”<sup>63</sup> doling out sheets to subscribers with incomplete sets. This proved to be an ungrateful task, because he did not have an adequate supply, and the discontented customers took their complaints to Panckoucke and the STN, who believed that Le Roy was hoarding the *défets* for some ulterior purpose. By mid-1781, a “guerre de défets”<sup>64</sup> had developed. Each of the former partners suspected the others of secretly stockpiling sheets. Le Roy and Panckoucke prepared to sue Duplain, but somehow he slipped between them by embroiling them in suits against one another. In the course of this confrontation, they discovered that Duplain had falsified a clause about the *défets* in a contract with Le Roy. Le Roy then opened his warehouse to Panckoucke; Panckoucke verified that it did not contain any hidden treasure; and everyone felt confirmed in their former conviction that Duplain was the villain of the *Encyclopédie* speculations. It took two years, several lawyers, and hundreds of letters to unravel this imbroglio; and in the end one question still remained unanswered: if Le Roy had not been cheating on the 200-400 surplus sets, what had become of them?<sup>65</sup>

Evidently Duplain had stashed most of the *défets* in his *second* warehouse. Although that hypothesis cannot be proven, it is supported by a note that one of the STN's directors jotted down during the final meeting of the quarto associates in Lyons. He included the following item in a calculation of Duplain's revenue from the quarto: “Vente de défets à Jossinet... 20,000 (livres)”. Jossinet was a Lyonnais businessman,

<sup>63</sup> Le Roy to STN, Dec. 13, 1781. Le Roy added that in the last two months two of his workers had sorted through seven quintals of *défets*.

<sup>64</sup> The phrase was used by Le Roy in an undated letter to Panckoucke, which Panckoucke copied and sent to the STN on Aug. 31, 1781.

<sup>65</sup> The *guerre des défets* can be followed through several dossiers of the STN papers, especially those of Panckoucke, Amable Le Roy, and Jacques Revol, the STN's agent in Lyons. The most important letters are those from Panckoucke to the STN dated May 8, 12, and 31, 1781; July 18, 1781; Aug. 31, 1781; and Jan. 22, 1782.

<sup>66</sup> Bosset de Luze, “Produit net de l'entreprise tel qu'il doit être réellement”, STN papers, MS 1220. Bosset probably would have helped the STN to sort out the confusion surrounding the *défets*, but he died on August 6, 1781, before it had reached an advanced stage.

who had collaborated in Duplain's mismanagement of the *Encyclopédie* enterprise. Having bought up the *défets* that Duplain had intended to use for a scrap edition, he may have produced one himself – perhaps even with Duplain's collaboration, for in March 1781 the STN's agent in Lyons reported that Duplain had located some surplus sheets in Paris and was covertly attempting to buy them in order to patch together additional sets.<sup>67</sup> At this point the history of the quarto dissolves into uncertainties. It is not even possible to know how many copies of the book finally reached the market. But it is permissible to speculate that the intrigues of Duplain and Jossinet lay behind the quarto that Jefferson found in the Paris bookstores in 1786, just as those of Panckoucke and Saugrain led to the fake first folio that he recommended to Madison.

\* \* \*

If those intrigues remain too murky for one to advance firm conclusions, the murkiness itself is worth considering. The scramble for *défets* took place in an atmosphere heavy with industrial espionage, lawsuits, recriminations, profit-gouging, hatred, and greed – elements that were common enough among the pirates and speculators of early-modern publishing but that rose to the surface whenever there was money to be made. There was a great deal of money to be made from scrap editions in the eighteenth century, for a great many scrap sheets accumulated in the warehouses of eighteenth-century publishers. A scrap-and-remainder trade grew up, plied by specialists like Batilliot of Paris. Although he identified himself as a banker, Batilliot lived off secondary speculations in the book trade. At the end of 1776, for example, he bought up the rump of the Geneva folio *Encyclopédie*: 200 sets for 100,000 livres. A year later he had sold all but one, clearing almost 20,000 livres in profit. Similarly he sold odd volumes from the quarto edition: in November 1784 he informed his correspondents that his stock included two copies of volume III, one copy of volume IV, two copies of volume XII, and so on. And in 1782 Batilliot reported that a speculator of the same stripe, Barrois l'aîné of Paris, had acquired the last crumbs of the Geneva *Encyclopédie* – “tous les volumes et défets” – from Panckoucke's stock in Geneva.<sup>68</sup> Like the three volumes from the Bastille,

<sup>67</sup> Jacques Revol to STN, March 2, 1781.

<sup>68</sup> Batilliot to STN, Apr. 25, 1782. The other information on Batilliot comes from letters to the STN scattered throughout his dossier, especially his letters of Dec. 1, 1776; Feb. 6, 1777; March 13, 1778; and Nov. 20, 1784.

this material could have gone into a scrap edition, and there were still other sources of surplus sheets. The first publishers had kept not only the 500 or so leftover copies of volumes VIII-XVII, which Panckoucke had hoped to use for a scrap edition as far back as 1768, but they also held on to their own stock of *défets*: “environ cinq mille volumes séparés & imparfaits, estimés 60,000 livres.”<sup>69</sup> The publishers of the two Italian editions probably built up a comparable stock. It took thirteen years, from 1758 to 1771, for the text of the Lucca folio to be published; so a good many subscribers must have died or abandoned the enterprise, leaving the publishers with extra copies of the last volumes. The Leghorn folio (text, 1770-1775) probably did not produce so many surplus sheets, because it seems to have been a smaller and more efficient operation. But it brought the number of folio editions up to four – enough to make a supplementary “edition” from the *défets* alone.<sup>70</sup>

Enlightenment publishing included a rag-and-bone element, which contributed in its own to the diffusion of Enlightenment. By patching together scraps of old *Encyclopédies*, the discount dealers of the Old Regime produced hundreds of new ones – not the pure variety, which corresponds to the entries in bibliographies, but bastard sets, picked up at auctions, salvaged from warehouses, and dredged out of the Bastille. Parisian, Genevan, Neuchâtelois, and Lyonnais, both cosmopolitan and under-the-counter, these motley *Encyclopédies* were emblematic of the Enlightenment in general. They swelled the current of Encyclopedism everywhere in Europe, even though they did not emerge openly enough to be identified by bibliographers. Perhaps modern bibliography does not take sufficient account of eighteenth-century practises. The printers of the Old Regime changed course erratically in the midst of editions. The publishers announced editions that never existed and marketed editions that they never announced. In fact, there is something anachronistic about the notion of “edition” itself, for the men in the eighteenth-century book trade did not think in twentieth-century terms. Their habit of calculating pressruns in reams and quires, their allowance for

<sup>69</sup> This figure comes from material which the publishers produced to rebut Luneau de Boisjermain, quoted in Lough, “Luneau de Boisjermain”, p. 128.

<sup>70</sup> On the Italian editions, see Adriana LAY, *Un editore illuminista: Giuseppe Aubert nel carteggio con Beccaria e Verri* (Turin, 1973); Ettore LEVI-MALVANO, “Les éditions toscanes de l’*Encyclopédie*”, *Revue de littérature comparée*, III (1923), p. 213-56; and Salvatore BONGI, “L’*Enciclopedia* in Lucca”, *Archivio storico italiano*, 3rd series, XVIII (1873), p. 64-90. The Italian dossiers in the papers of the STN make it possible to form estimates of pressruns, as explained in DARTON, *The Business of Enlightenment*, chaps. 1 and 5.

## COMPOSITION

1777	July			Aug.				Sept.				
	19	26	2	9	16	23	30	6	13	20	27	
First Composition	A-D1	B2-D	E-H	I-L1	L2-O1	O2-S	T-Y	Z-2D	2E-2I	2K-2R	2S-2Y	
	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
1777	Oct.			Nov.				Déc.				
	4	11	18	25	1	8	15	22	29	6	13	
First Composition	2Z-3E	3F-3L	3M-3Q	3R-3V	3X-4F1	4F2-4M1	4M2-4T	4V-4Y	4Z-5B	5C-5I1		
	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
Second Composition					K		L-O1	O2-S+ H-I	F1	F2-G+ A-E		
					■		■	■	■	■	■	

## PRESSWORK

1777	July			Aug.				Sept.				
	18	26	2	9	16	23	30	6	13	20	27	
At 4,000	A	B-C	D-F	G-I1	I2-M	N-Q	R-V					
	■	■	■	■	■	■	■					
At 2,000								T-V				
								■				
At 6,000								X-2B	2C-2E	2F-2K + 2M	2N-2S	
								■	■	■	■	
1777	Oct.			Nov.				Déc.				
	4	11	18	25	1	8	15	22	29	6	13	
At 2,000					K		L-N1	N2-S+ I	H	A-G		
					■		■	■	■	■	■	
At 6,000	2T-3B1	3B2-3H + 2L	3I-3P1	3P2-3T	9V-4D1	4D2-4I	4K-4P	4Q-4V	4X-4Z	5A-5E1	5E2-5I	
	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	

*chaperons*, their technique of gathering, and their accumulation of *défets* all created a gap between the gross output of the presses and the net supply of marketable books. That gap opened up possibilities for what they called “combinaisons” – Riverside-type “editions”, which provided a vital element in the book trade long before Riverside existed. To recognise the importance of that element and to locate the “missing editions” of the *Encyclopédie* is to sense the disparity between the mathematical precision of bibliographical formulas and the messy reality of eighteenth-century publishing. It helps one appreciate how deceptive appearances could be in the book trade, not only for bibliographers but also for collectors like Thomas Jefferson.