

[Accueil](#)[Revenir à l'accueil](#)[Collection](#)[Les correspondances de François Guizot : 1806-1874](#)[Collection](#)[178\\_Lettres de John Croker : 1837-1857](#)[Item](#)[Bognon, the 8th June 1854, John Croker à François Guizot](#)

## **Bognon, the 8th June 1854, John Croker à François Guizot**

**Auteurs : Croker, John-Wilson (1780-1857)**

### **Les folios**

En passant la souris sur une vignette, le titre de l'image apparaît.

5 Fichier(s)

### **Les mots clés**

[France \(1852-1870, Second Empire\)](#), [Histoire \(Angleterre\)](#), [Lecture](#), [Réception \(Guizot\)](#), [Santé](#)

### **Relations entre les lettres**

Ce document n'a pas de relation indiquée avec un autre document du projet.□

### **Présentation**

Date1854-06-08

GenreCorrespondance

Editeur de la ficheMarie Dupond & Association François Guizot, projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle)

### **Information générales**

LangueAnglais

Cote76, AN : 163 MI 42 AP 178 Papiers Guizot Bobine Opérateur 28

Nature du documentLettre autographe

Supportcopie numérisée de microfilm

Etat général du documentBon

Localisation du documentArchives Nationales (Paris)

### **Citer cette page**

Croker, John-Wilson (1780-1857), Bognon, the 8th June 1854, John Croker à François Guizot, 1854-06-08.

Marie Dupond & Association François Guizot, projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-

Sorbonne nouvelle).

Consulté le 22/12/2024 sur la plate-forme EMAN :

<https://eman-archives.org/Guizot-Lieven/items/show/7508>

## Informations éditoriales

Destinataire Guizot, François (1787-1874)

Lieu de destination Val-Richer (France)

Droits Marie Dupond & Association François Guizot, projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle). Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Partage à l'Identique 3.0.

Lieu de rédaction Alverbank Gosport (Angleterre)

Notice créée par [Marie Dupond](#) Notice créée le 01/10/2024 Dernière modification le 14/12/2024

---

26

Mon cher Ami

Bogner 8<sup>th</sup> June 1854  
en route pour "Bloer-  
bank, Gosport", on le  
compte arriver, D. T.  
après demain.

Je viens de passer, à votre ins-  
su, deux jours très agréables avec  
vous. Voici comment. J'eus les  
deux volumes que vous me  
sendez plusieurs semaines ago, but  
about the same time I had a kind of  
relapse of my disease which disentan-  
gled me from any more of either read-  
ing or writing than could be avoided;  
and so I was obliged to forbear even  
opening the volumes. But finding my  
self better last week, my Doctors have  
advised to me to go to the seaside, &  
I accordingly set out on Monday, bring-  
ing your "Revolution" with me, & as I  
make a halt of three days here, I en-  
joyed yesterday & the day before in  
reading your excellent work. There can  
be, of course, nothing new for me in  
points of fact - but the clearness & vigour  
of the style - the justice & impartiality of

of your own reflections, the dramatic skill  
with which you conduct the story while  
it seems to tell itself & the views of  
Cromwell's designs which you develop  
undeniably from the obscurities of  
his language & conduct, all these gave  
the old story such an air of novelty &  
fresh interest, that I assure you that  
I read the volumes as eagerly, indeed  
more eagerly than, for many years, I  
have done a new novel. I should  
like to see a good English translation  
of it, in one volume & without the  
"Documents Historiques," it would not  
be too big a one, & in fact I do not  
think the "Documents" afford any abridge-  
ment proportioned to the space they oc-  
cupy. I think your text tells sufficiently  
well all that the "Documents" contain, &  
to say the truth I was a little disap-  
pointed that your archives at Paris &  
those of Simancas have not produced  
more details of the state of England dur-  
ing

ring that strange  
heartfully do the  
coincide, not only  
but even in their  
pick out of your  
intelligible & un-  
bound paper at the  
on the two sides is  
deal more or less  
wants to see a  
which my first  
colours, for I am  
Europe - I see the  
gathering - I see  
first explosion  
even my grand  
end of the unjus-  
wild pretensions,  
& general disor-  
der. Society of  
prejudice.  
There is, I think  
your note & what  
think, no doubt  
written after the  
of Protector (Dea)  
it is not possible

to be written... while  
in course of  
an elaborate  
series of  
these gave  
of variety &  
in that  
by, indeed  
you - of  
I should  
translation  
the  
not  
and any children  
to have they  
tells sufficiently  
and contained  
a little disape  
Paris &  
not produced  
of England dur  
ing

ring that strange period. But how would  
deeply do the two great revolutionaries  
coincide, not only in <sup>the</sup> general <sup>range</sup> principles,  
but even in their minutest details. I could  
pick out of your work & see as into an  
intelligible narrative, what I don't say  
would pass at Paris be thought a libel  
on the two revolutionaries. I could say a good  
deal more on this point, but I don't  
want to wear myself from politics, of  
which my prospects are of the darkest  
colour, for France, for England, for  
Europe - I see the storm gathering -  
I may live to see the  
first explosion - but I doubt whether  
even my grand children will see the  
end of the unjustifiable premises,  
wild pretensions, unnatural alliances,  
& general disorganisation of Euro-  
pean Society with which this war is  
pregnant.

There is, I think, an incense in  
your note 7. vol. 1. p. 256. There can be, I  
think, no doubt that Diderot's letter was  
written after the <sup>public</sup> assumption of the title  
of Protector (Dec. 1653) not only because  
it is not possible that a letter so one had  
ever

over than 10 of could have been anti-  
 cipated, <sup>by your two bygone</sup> but sicence in Feb. 1652.  
 Cromwell was not in a position to  
make any such propositions. The ~~fact~~  
 confusion is, <sup>I think the</sup> another consequence of  
 the difference of style which you  
 mention elsewhere - February 1652, in  
 England, Holland & all Protestant  
 Germany was ~~used~~ in the rest of  
 Europe ~~was~~ February 1653 - so that  
 if D. Littré adopted the reckoning of  
 England his letter would have borne  
 date 1653 ~~old style~~ <sup>that is in the</sup> new style 1654.  
 which must have been the real date.  
 I have had a good deal to do with  
 papers between 1640 & 1752. & I have  
 found the greatest difficulty in deter-  
 mining the 3 first months of each  
 year, which makes a much more  
 various discrepancy than that of  
 the 10 monthly days which often pass  
 without observation, as, for instance,  
 your text places Cromwell's death  
 3<sup>d</sup> Sept. Your documents give it 13 Sept,  
 both right in the respective styles, all  
 your D. Littré's dates sum to me. embrouillée

Conbrouilliers, D. 1. p. 231, the Prince of Orange is stated to have written a letter 2<sup>d</sup> Sept 1652 & next page that he had died 8 Nov. 1654. I have no books here to look at, but I am satisfied that there is some great mistake about D'Es-trades - probably that of his first editor. Ever sincerely  
Yours  
W. G.

27



Mr. Walker  
Paris  
17 JUN 1818