As we approach the 250th anniversary of the battles of Lexington and Concord, the Revolutionary story continues to capture the national imagination. On any given weekend, sites associated with the Revolution—from Boston to Valley Forge to Jefferson’s Monticello—are flooded with visitors seeking their slice of Revolutionary history. Meanwhile, the flood of scholarship continues unabated: just for instance, two recent entrants are Joseph Ellis’s *The Cause: The American Revolution and Its Discontents* and Rick Atkinson’s *The British Are Coming*, the first in his planned three-volume history of the Revolution (I highly recommend both). More germane to the business at hand, Revolutionary Americana continues to be one of the most sought-after categories in the antiquarian market. At the high end, a rare printing of the Declaration of Independence recently sold at Heritage Auctions for nearly $3 million. Sadly, I was not the consignor.

So, why this enduring fascination? Well, the Revolution is a great underdog story... and we Americans love an underdog. And it undeniably achieved American independence, with immense implications for the history of North America and indeed the world. And it was a revolution, at least in political affairs if not socio-economic arrangements. And if all that’s not enough to float your boat, the Revolution was marked by moments of the highest drama: the shot heard ‘round the world’ at Lexington Green on the morning of April 19, 1775, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the American victory at Yorktown (where surrendering British musicians may, or may not, have played “The World Turned Upside Down”), and so many others. We’re fortunate that by the 1770s both Great Britain and its American Colonies had developed a vibrant print culture. This enabled these thrilling events to be described and depicted by a flood of books, pamphlets, cartoons, portraits, maps and battle plans, a fine sampling of which are presented in this catalog. The material is wonderfully varied, from snarky political cartoons, to exciting on-the-moment manuscripts, to complex maps and plans of campaigns and battles. Almost without exception the material is very rare, in generally excellent condition, and deeply significant for the Revolutionary story.

I love everything in this catalog. But if I had to pick a few highlights, they would include Jonathan Mulliken’s rendering of “The Bloody Massacre”, vastly rarer than Paul Revere’s version; an extraordinarily rare printed textile of the New York campaign; an all-but-unknown map of the disastrous 1779 Penobscot Expedition, a wonderful equestrian portrait engraving of George Washington; and an unrecorded, gem-like map of the United States issued just weeks after the signing of the provisional Treaty of Peace. Enjoy!

MICHAEL BUEHLER
April 2024
The official printing of Parliament's repeal of the Stamp Act in February 1766.

Of the many events that precipitated the American Revolution, few were more significant than the passage of the Stamp Act on March 22, 1765. This was a direct tax imposed by the British Parliament specifically on the American colonies, designed to help defray the staggering costs of the French and Indian War and the ongoing maintenance of British forces in America. The financial situation was indeed dire: Great Britain's national debt had nearly doubled during the war, and interest payments alone consumed half the national budget.

The Act required American colonists to use specially embossed or stamped paper produced in England on practically all printed articles, everything from playing cards to newspapers. The stamps were to be sold by designated agents in major cities, including among them Andrew Oliver in Boston and James McEvers in New York. The whole plan seemed reasonable. Even the politically astute Benjamin Franklin, then serving in London as agent for the Pennsylvania Assembly, saw no problem with it and recommended that John Hughes be appointed the stamp agent for that province.

In the Colonies, however, the Act provoked widespread opposition on the grounds of economic hardship, coming as it did at a time of post-war recession and in the midst of a shortage of hard currency. More radical voices objected to “taxation without representation” in Parliament, a constitutional objection which was to gather momentum in the coming years.

In October 1765 the Stamp Act Congress in New York was attended by representatives from nine colonies and submitted a petition for repeal. Many colonists, among them merchants in the major cities, organized non-importation agreements in the belief that these would encourage British merchants to back repeal. Demonstrations erupted, some of them turning violent, such as the August 1766 attacks in Boston on the homes of Andrew Oliver and Governor Thomas Hutchinson. Eventually the violence, or the threat of violence, forced most stamp agents to resign, and the Act became unenforceable.

As a matter of expediency, Parliament repealed the act in February 1766, with the King's assent coming on March 18. The repeal legislation stated that the original act "would be attended with many inconveniences, and may be productive of consequences greatly detrimental to the commercial interests of these kingdoms". ESTC N56896.

The official printing of Parliament's repeal of the Stamp Act, reflecting the hardening of Parliament's position vis-à-vis its American Colonies.

As the language of the Act repealing the Stamp Act expressed, repeal was in Parliament's view a matter of economic expediency rather than constitutional principle. To make this point exquisitely clear, the Act of Repeal was accompanied by the so-called Declaratory Act, which asserted that King and Parliament "had, hath, and of Right ought to have, full Power and Authority to make Laws and Statutes of sufficient Force and Validity to bind the Colonies and People of America, Subjects of the Crown of Great Britain, in all Cases whatsoever.” Among other things, the Declaratory Act was by implication an unambiguous rejection of the "taxation without representation" argument deployed by the Stamp Act Congress. Nevertheless, the reaction in the Colonies was relatively muted, as its implications were little-noticed in the celebration over repeal of the Stamp Act.

In any event, Parliament would never again levy a direct tax on the American colonies, though in 1767 the Townshend Act did levy import duties, payable at American ports, on imports of glass, lead, paint, paper and tea. ESTC N56897.
A terrific political cartoon taking aim at the Stamp Act and its supporters and celebrating its repeal. A wonderful example of the seemingly limitless inventiveness of 18th-century British satirists.

The scene is set on an unnamed Thames dockyard, with three columns of explanatory letterpress below. In the foreground a funeral procession approaches a burial vault housing “unwise” Acts of Parliament (listed on the stone over the doorway). The vault is adorned with two skulls of Jacobite “Monsters”, an allusion to the Jacobite Rebellions of 1715, 1719 and 1745-6.

The funeral features a procession of prominent politicians and clergymen, including for example George Grenville (“Mr Stamper”), the architect of the Stamp Tax, carrying the coffin in which the Act is contained; the Earl of Bute, in tartan; the Duke of Bedford; Lords Temple, Halifax and Sandwich; and a brace of bishops bringing up the rear. Behind them are two bales, including one of black mourning cloth, sent from America, speaking to the commercial harm done by the Stamp Act. The two banners carried in the procession bear Jacobite emblems and the numbers “71” and “122”, the numbers of votes against repeal cast in the Houses of Lords and Commons respectively.

In the background, across the Thames from this “unhappy Gang”, is a “joyous scene”: Three ships, each named for a prominent member of the opposition to the Stamp Act and now liberated by the lifting of the American boycott on trade with the mother country, load goods for the Colonies. Among these are a statue of Sir William Pitt, honored for his leadership of the opposition to the Act.

The original version of this satire was drawn by Benjamin Wilson (1721-1788), a portrait painter, satirist, etcher, Fellow of the Royal Society, and successor to William Hogarth as Sergeant-Painter to the King. According to Dolmetsch, Wilson “boasted that it was available for sale within ten minutes of the official repeal. An instant success, it became one of the most copied satires of the period.” Stephens and George describe ours as the fourth of six versions, an anonymous treatment with descriptive letterpress text added in the lower margin.

Stephens & George, IV.4140 (4th of 6 versions described).
British Museum, 1868,0808.4376. See also Dolmetsch, pp. 38-39 (illustrating the original Wilson version) and Cresswell, 623-624 (illustrating other variants).
Jonathan Mulliken's dramatic engraving of the Boston Massacre, based on that by Revere but vastly rarer. A brilliant piece of Patriot propaganda, and the single most unforgettable image of the Revolutionary era.

On the evening of Monday, March 5, 1770, Boston was on edge: Since 1768 the town had been occupied by thousands of British Regulars, and relations with the civilian population were fraught. Indeed just days earlier, on March 2, a brutal melee had broken out between some “Redcoats” and civilian workers at Gray’s ropewalk near Milk Street. As darkness fell on the 5th, gangs of soldiers and Boston toughs roamed the streets looking for trouble.

Private Hugh White of the 29th Regiment was standing guard outside the Customs House, when he got into an argument with a young apprentice named Edward Garrick. Things escalated, and White struck Garrick on the side of his head with his musket. A crowd formed and began pelting White with snowballs, chunks of ice and whatever else came to hand. To his rescue came Captain Thomas Preston of the 29th along with a corporal and six grenadiers. They lined up in an arc, their backs to the Customs House, muskets loaded and pointed at the crowd. To this day no one knows precisely why, but one of the grenadiers fired, prompting a full volley from the squad of Redcoats. Three Bostonians died instantly, and two others were mortally wounded.

The event was probably a tragic accident but was immediately rebranded by Patriots as a “massacre”, and it was seized upon as a worthy subject for depiction in print. Paul Revere’s “Bloody Massacre” engraving, pirated from a drawing by artist Henry Pelham, was advertised in the Boston press as soon as March 26, while Pelham’s own version appeared just a week or so thereafter. Both were rushed and rather crude in execution. But they made for exciting viewing and effective propaganda, transforming the outnumbered, terrified Redcoats into leering executioners and the mob of rioting Bostonians into martyrs to the cause of liberty.

Soon thereafter Revere’s piracy was itself pirated by Jonathan Mulliken (1746-1782), a clock- and watchmaker in Newburyport, Mass. Mulliken “was probably a self-taught engraver, producing some of his own metal clock faces...” (Fielding), but the “Bloody Massacre” is the only print known to have been engraved by him. Mulliken’s work follows closely that of Revere with one significant difference: On Revere’s version Crispus Attucks is rendered as African-American, while on Mulliken’s he is rendered as Caucasian.

Of the Pelham, Revere and Mulliken editions, Pelham’s is the rarest, Revere’s is almost common, and Mulliken’s falls somewhere in the middle. Rare Book Hub records only a handful of examples having appeared on the market, and as of this writing I am aware of institutional holdings only at the American Antiquarian Society, Harvard University, Massachusetts Historical Society, and Winterthur. This impression was acquired at Christie’s “Important Americana” sale of Jan. 20-21, 2022, to which it had been consigned by Ambassador J. William Middendorf II.

A brutally vivid cartoon attacking the 1774 Boston Port Bill of 1774. Soon after the Boston Tea Party of December 1773, Parliament retaliated by passing the five so-called “Intolerable Acts”. Among these were the Boston Port Bill, which closed Boston’s port until reparations were paid for the destroyed tea. The Acts are the target of the ribald cartoon offered here, which portrays America as a native American woman being violated by British leaders.

(Prime Minister) North, with the Boston Port Bill in his pocket, is shown forcing a pot of tea down the throat of America, depicted as the Indian Princess, while she attempts to spit the tea violently back into his face. [Chief Justice] Lord Mansfield holds her arms while the womanizing John Montagu, Fourth Earl of Sandwich [and First Lord of the Admiralty] peers up America’s skirt. Lord Bute represents military law on the far right, while on the left, figures of France and Spain conspire with each other as Britannia turns away in disgust.”

(Hewes & Wolverton, p. 49)

In the far background is a tiny vignette of a fleet bombarding a town, labeled “Boston cannonaded” — effective propaganda, but entirely fictitious. “The Able Doctor” first appeared in The London Magazine for April 1774, accompanying an account of the Parliamentary debate on the Boston Port Bill. Within a couple of months Paul Revere — who as we have seen wasn’t squeamish about intellectual property rights — engraved this pirated version for the June 1774 number of the Royal American Magazine. We know from Revere’s records that he printed 1000 impressions of the engraving, reflecting the Royal American Magazine’s substantial circulation. Nevertheless, the print is today very rare on the market.

PAUL REVERE

Popular culture has reduced Paul Revere (1734-1818) to a cartoon, remembered only for the “Midnight Ride” immortalized by Longfellow’s poem. But Revere is better understood not just as a patriot, but as an accomplished silversmith whose work is among the treasures of Boston’s Museum of Fine Arts, a print engraver whose images are eagerly sought by collectors and libraries, and an early American industrialist, who founded a firm capable of producing enough copper to sheathe the bottom of the USS Constitution.

As an engraver during the Revolutionary era, Revere produced a number of iconic cartoons and other images, of which “The Able Doctor” is one of the better known. The most famous of these is his 1770 “Bloody Massacre” (see the previous item), a brilliant propaganda piece positioning the occupying Redcoats as the villains of the Boston Massacre. He also engraved at least three maps, one a world map illustrating John Hawkesworth’s, A new voyage, round the world … by, Captain James Cook (Hartford, 1774), the others being Bernard Romans’ monumental pair of maps of the Gulf Coast and of the Florida Peninsula (1774).

The quality of his engraving varied markedly, from a crude rendering of King Philip illustrating Benjamin Church’s History of King Philip’s War (1772) to the ambitious work on Romans’ map of Florida. It is however undeniable that he had a gift for being at the center of the action and for creating lasting images that reflected the fevered mood of the Revolutionary era.

PART TWO

REVOLT
In fact lay north and west of Breed's and was only lightly occupied. Hill (Bunker Hill, which gave the ensuing battle its name, now Charlestown). On the morning of June 17 the British awoke to find Americans moored in the river. The attack involved a direct assault on Americans, with artillery support from naval vessels stationed beyond the right flank of the American lines. The British Commander in Chief Thomas Gage ordered several regiments to cross the Charles and dislodge the Americans emplaced behind a breastwork atop Breed's Hill, with their right flank protected by additional troops and artillery. Just behind them is a mounted General Israel Putnam, who served with distinction at the battle. The British are shown both advancing up the hill in line abreast and in retreat, leaving behind many casualties. One curious feature, entirely unexplained, is the “Broken Officer” shown at lower left.

Romans chose to depict the battle as seen from a vantage point beyond the right flank of the American lines. The Americans are emplaced behind a breastwork atop Breed’s Hill, with their right flank protected by additional troops and artillery. Just behind them is a mounted General Israel Putnam, who served with distinction at the battle. The British are shown both advancing up the hill in line abreast and in retreat, leaving behind many casualties. One curious feature, entirely unexplained, is the “Broken Officer” shown at lower left.

Romans also published a map of the events around Boston, an advert for which describes him as “on the spot at the engagements of Lexington and Bunker’s Hill” (Pennsylvania Ledger, August 19, 1775). This is almost surely incorrect. Romans was a top drawer surveyor and mapmaker—more on which below—and if he had been present at the battle the view would presumably have been more accurate. Among other errors, his view depicts the battle taking place northwest of Charlestown, whereas Breed’s Hill is to the northeast, the flanking line of Americans—at the famous “rail fence” under Captain Thomas Knowlton—was on the American left, not its right; and the British redoubt was a hasty earthwork, not the stone fortification shown here.

None of this detracts from the view’s power as a piece of American propaganda. It effectively compresses and elides the complex events of the day, highlighting the Americans’ steadiness under fire, while omitting entirely the fact that the British ultimately carried the redoubt. The image would have been shocking to most viewers, who reasonably enough would have thought it impossible for American militia to hold a position against thousands of British Regulars.

Romans first published the view in Philadelphia, with prints available for sale around November 1, 1775. In June 1776 London publishers Wallis & Stonehouse published the folio version offered here, identical in all essentials to the Philadelphia edition but with more refined engraving. Examples of this London edition are known only at Colonial Williamsburg, the Winterthur Museum, and in a private American collection. The Philadelphia edition is only somewhat less rare, with impressions located at the Massachusetts Historical Society, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York Public Library (Stokes Collection), and the Yale University Art Gallery.

Bernard Romans was born in Delft, the Netherlands and baptized there on July 6, 1751. He learned mapmaking and surveying in England, then emigrated to America in 1775. He worked as a surveyor in Georgia and was promoted to Deputy Surveyor General in 1776. He eventually moved on to Florida, where in 1777 he was appointed Deputy Surveyor General for the Southern District under William Gerad de Brahm, though the two men soon came to hate one another. In 1778 he published his A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida, one of the most important colonial works on Florida, and also produced monumental maps of East and West Florida.

Romans was in Boston when war broke out in 1775, keeping tabs on Paul Revere as the latter engraved his maps of Florida. He enlisted in the American cause, was appointed a Captain and served with Benedict Arnold and Nathaniel Greene at the capture of Fort Ticonderoga. He went on to oversee construction of fortifications at Constitution Island on the Hudson River across from West Point, then in April 1776 took command of a Pennsylvania company on service in Canada.

Controversy followed Romans everywhere: he feuded with the commissioners over seeing the Constitution Island works, and in Spring 1776 he was court-martialed for the licentious behavior of the troops under his command in Canada, though he was soon acquitted. There is then a nearly two-year gap in our knowledge of his activities, but in July 1778 he resigned his military command and moved to Wertherfield, Connecticut.

From early 1779 until his death, Romans’ last years are “shrouded in uncertainty.” The two dominant narratives have him being captured by the British and imprisoned for several years, either in Montego Bay, Jamaica or in England itself. Both accounts have him dying at sea on his return to America in 1784, possibly murdered for his money. In addition to this view Romans produced a striking number of important cartographic publications during the Revolution. During the 1775-76 siege of Boston he published a map of the area around the town, entitled “The Seat of Civil War in America.” He also made a map of the American dominion in America.”

A dramatic and extremely rare depiction of the Battle of Bunker Hill by polymatic surveyor, mapmaker, military engineer, and natural historian Bernard Romans.

BACKGROUND

After the April 19, 1775 battles at Lexington and Concord, American militia formed a ring of encampments and fortifications surrounding Boston. But they lacked the training or equipment to attack the town head-on, particularly as the British retained unimpeded command of the sea.

On the morning of June 17 the British awoke to find that overnight the Americans had attempted a game changer: A force of some 1200 militia had occupied the Charlestown peninsula and built a redoubt atop Breed’s Hill (Bunker Hill, which gave the ensuing battle its name, in fact lay north and west of Breed’s and was only lightly fortified.) If the Americans were permitted to emplace artillery there, and could find sufficient gunpowder to fire it, they would have gained command of the Charles River and been able to bombard Boston itself.

British Commander in Chief Thomas Gage ordered several regiments to cross the Charles and dislodge the Americans with artillery support from naval vessels moored in the river. The attack involved a direct assault on the redoubt and a simultaneous move on the Americans’ left flank, aimed directly at a force of Connecticut militia positioned behind a rail fence. It was led by General William Howe, who in October of 1775 would succeed Gage as Commander in Chief in North America.

The British expected a walkover. They had something like 3000 well armed regular troops supported by naval vessels in the river, facing just over 2000 poorly-supplied and largely untested American militia. The expectation was that the Americans would turn and run when they saw the Regulars marching toward them, bayonets fixed. But the Americans didn’t run, and the battle was a nightmare for the British. Their first two assaults were thrown back with terrible losses, and only on the third attempt did they capture the redoubt and send the surviving Americans fleeing across Charlestown Neck. By battle’s end the British Army had suffered over 1000 casualties; indeed, British General Henry Clinton—another future Commander in Chief—wrote in his diary that “a few more such victories would have shortly put an end to British dominion in America.”

“AN EXACT VIEW OF THE LATE BATTLE AT CHARLESTOWN”

Romans chose to depict the battle as seen from a vantage point beyond the right flank of the American lines. The Americans are emplaced behind a breastwork atop Breed’s Hill, with their right flank protected by additional troops and artillery. Just behind them is a mounted General Israel Putnam, who served with distinction at the battle. Charles town is shown in flames, and British vessels on the Charles River fire on the Americans, while Boston lies in the distance at far right. Giving the view a time-lapse quality, the British are shown both advancing up the hill in line abreast and in retreat, leaving behind many casualties. One curious feature, entirely unexplained, is the “Broken Officer” shown at lower left.

Romans also published a map of the events around Boston, an advert for which describes him as “on the spot at the engagements of Lexington and Bunker’s Hill” (Pennsylvania Ledger, August 19, 1775). This is almost surely incorrect. Romans was a top drawer surveyor and mapmaker—more on which below—and if he had been present at the battle the view would presumably have been more accurate. Among other errors, his view depicts the battle taking place northwest of Charlestown, whereas Breed’s Hill is to the northeast, the flanking line of Americans—at the famous “rail fence” under Captain Thomas Knowlton—was on the American left, not its right; and the British redoubt was a hasty earthwork, not the stone fortification shown here.

None of this detracts from the view’s power as a piece of American propaganda. It effectively compresses and elides the complex events of the day, highlighting the Americans’ steadiness under fire, while omitting entirely the fact that the British ultimately carried the redoubt. The image would have been shocking to most viewers, who reasonably enough would have thought it impossible for American militia to hold a position against thousands of British Regulars.

Romans first published the view in Philadelphia, with prints available for sale around November 1, 1775. In June 1776 London publishers Wallis & Stonehouse published the folio version offered here, identical in all essentials to the Philadelphia edition but with more refined engraving. Examples of this London edition are known only at Colonial Williamsburg, the Winterthur Museum, and in a private American collection. The Philadelphia edition is only somewhat less rare, with impressions located at the Massachusetts Historical Society, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York Public Library (Stokes Collection), and the Yale University Art Gallery.

BERNARD ROMANS (CA. 1735-1784)

Romans was born in Delft, the Netherlands and baptized there on July 6, 1751. He learned mapmaking and surveying in England, then emigrated to America in 1775. He worked as a surveyor in Georgia and was promoted to Deputy Surveyor General in 1776. He eventually moved on to Florida, where in 1777 he was appointed Deputy Surveyor General for the Southern District under William Gerad de Brahm, though the two men soon came to hate one another. In 1778 he published his A Concise Natural History of East and West Florida, one of the most important colonial works on Florida, and also produced monumental maps of East and West Florida.

Romans was in Boston when war broke out in 1775, keeping tabs on Paul Revere as the latter engraved his maps of Florida. He enlisted in the American cause, was appointed a Captain and served with Benedict Arnold and Nathaniel Greene at the capture of Fort Ticonderoga. He went on to oversee construction of fortifications at Constitution Island on the Hudson River across from West Point, then in April 1776 took command of a Pennsylvania company on service in Canada.

Controversy followed Romans everywhere: he feuded with the commissioners overseeing the Constitution Island works, and in Spring 1776 he was court-martialed for the licentious behavior of the troops under his command in Canada, though he was soon acquitted. There is then a nearly two-year gap in our knowledge of his activities, but in July 1778 he resigned his military command and moved to Wertherfield, Connecticut.

From early 1779 until his death, Romans’ last years are “shrouded in uncertainty.” The two dominant narratives have him being captured by the British and imprisoned for several years, either in Montego Bay, Jamaica or in England itself. Both accounts have him dying at sea on his return to America in 1784, possibly murdered for his money. In addition to this view Romans produced a striking number of important cartographic publications during the Revolution. During the 1775-76 siege of Boston he published a map of the area around the town, entitled “The Seat of Civil War in America.” He also made a map of the American dominion in America.”
Rare broadside plan of the Battle of Bunker Hill issued during the first year of the Revolution, with a revealing letterpress account by General John Burgoyne.

The large and attractive plan depicts the entire Charlestown peninsula, Boston proper, and parts of Cambridge and Somervill. The American redoubt on Breed's Hill—here mislabeled “Bunkers Hill”—and the famous “rail fence” extending downhill to the Mystic River are detailed, along with the British landing points, direction of advance, and vessels at the mouth of the Charles River providing artillery support. The plan shows well the difficulty the Americans faced in moving reinforcements to the battle, as relieving troops had to cross Charlestown Neck and traverse hundreds of yards of highly-exposed terrain. What the plan does not reveal is that prior to the successful storming of the American redoubt, the first two British advances were thrown back with terrible losses.

Another interesting element of the plan is the small note just west of Charlestown Neck reading “Hither the Ships ought to have come.” This reflects General George Clinton’s recommendation for a landing at Charlestown Neck, which would have flanked and trapped the American troops on the peninsula. An over-confident General Howe overruled Clinton, opting instead for a frontal assault.

Below the map is a June 25 letter from General Burgoyne, who witnessed the battle from the safety of Copp’s Hill in Boston. The provides an important and vivid account of the battle, though “Burgoyne, always with a flair for dramatics, describes the action at Bunker Hill as if he were observing a grand tournament.” (Nebenzahl, Atlas, p. 43) The letter provides insight into the thinking of British officers prior to the battle, stating that it was “absolutely necessary we should make ourselves masters of these heights [around Boston] and we proposed to begin with Dorchester” on June 18, a plan which was of course upended by the American occupation of Breed’s Hill on the night of June 16-17. In the end the British failure ever to fortify Dorchester Heights provided the opening for George Washington and the Continental Army to do so in March 1776, compelling the British to evacuate the town.

Later in the letter Burgoyne relates that Howe, whose force was being “burt by musquetry from Charles-Town”, “desired us to set fire to the town, which was immediately done,” reducing it to “rubbish.” It is clear from Burgoyne’s letter that he had gained at least some measure of respect for the Americans: the battle was “a picture and a complication of horror and importance beyond anything that ever came my lot to be witness to”, and “a fight for a young soldier that the longest service may not furnish again.”

The combination of the informative plan and Burgoyne’s vivid letter render this one of the most desirable plans of the battle.


**R[obert] Sayer & J[ohn] Bennett, A PLAN of the BATTLE, on BUNKERS HILL. Fought on the 17th of June 1775. BY an Officer on the Spot. London, Nov. 27, 1775. Broadside on laid paper (fleur-de-lis watermark) comprising an engraved map surmounting three columns of letterpress. The map 13 ¼"h x 13 ¾"w at neat line, sheet size 23 ¼"h x 19"w. Outline and spot color to map. Cleaned, with mends to minor edge wear, tips of two corners reinstated, and original color retouched. Now better than very good condition. » $45,000**
A superb map of the 1775-76 siege of Boston, drawn by top-flight British military engineers. After the Battle of Bunker Hill, the siege of Boston settled down to months of stalemate and low-intensity conflict. The Americans lacked confidence to attack Boston directly and feared destroying the town in the course of liberating it. The British for their part were kept in check by General Howe, who had been appalled by the slaughter at Bunker Hill and held out hope for a reconciliation with the Americans.

This map of Boston under siege takes in the Shawmut Peninsula and large parts of the immediately surrounding towns. Great attention is given to both the natural and human geography of the region. The most valuable information is the careful depiction of the dozens of fortifications erected both in and around the town.

The position of the siege quickly becomes clear: Without command of the Charles River and/or Boston Harbor, the Americans could not possibly hope to effect a landing in the town or take it by storming the ramparts on Boston Neck. Conversely, while their command of the Harbor enabled the British to keep the town supplied, any effort to break out into the countryside would have exposed them to flanking attack and left the town itself terribly exposed.

Most interesting perhaps are the “new works” shown on Dorchester Heights. Put in place overnight on March 4-5, 1776, these gave the Americans artillery command of the sea approaches to Boston and completed the isolation of the town. On March 17 the British and their American sympathizers evacuated to Halifax, Nova Scotia.

This is the second state of the map, with the date in the imprint advanced to 1778. It includes significant additions, with the original right hand border cut away and a new half sheet added, extending the geographical coverage of the harbor well to the east. This example is printed on very heavy laid paper, bears two vertical centerfolds, and has an inked plate number “5” on the verso, all consistent with its having been issued in William Faden’s North American Atlas.

LIEUT. (THOMAS) PAGE AND CAPT. (JOHN) MONTRESOR

This map is attributed in part to Lieutenant Thomas Hyde Page (1746-1821), a British military engineer who transferred with the Corps of Engineers to the American theatre, serving briefly in Boston. He was severely wounded at Bunker Hill and invalided back to England, but gave his name to three very important maps of Boston and the Battle of Bunker Hill. The map is also credited to John Montresor (1736-1799), a fellow engineer and the author of a series of highly important printed maps of the maritime Canada, New England and New York regions, as well as innumerable manuscripts.

The respective contributions of the two men are hard to judge. Montresor was later to note “Page served Eleven days and was then wounded [at Bunker Hill] and return’d home and had ten shillings per day settled for life.” (Journals, p. 146). This should be taken with a grain of salt: Montresor was an irascible and not universally popular figure, prone to exaggerating his contributions and minimizing those of others. Indeed, during the French and Indian War Montresor had been caught trying to erase the name of a fellow surveyor (Samuel Holland, much more on whom later) from a major map of the province of Quebec (Cumming, pp. 34-35).

In all, a scarce and superb map overviewing the primary theatre of war in the first year of the American Revolution.
The Theses and Quaestiones broadsides display propositions and questions respectively, used in the Commencement tradition of public student disputation which began at Harvard College in 1639. The Latin theses were academic statements created by the graduating students to reflect the scope of their undergraduate study. The Theses fit within a curriculum that emphasized public discourse and syllogistic debate and ranged between approximately 50 and 250 propositions in most years. Printed at the expense of the graduating class, the Theses were posted in advance, and graduates were expected to be able to defend them upon request on Commencement Day (Harvard University Archives).

Likewise, in 1783 the political theses include the following, rendered in large type: "Civil societies, in which men are united and bound by equal laws, promote human happiness."

All these features are in keeping with what we know of the political leanings of Harvard faculty and students. Patriot alumni outnumbered Loyalists seven to one, eight alumni signed the Declaration of Independence, and during the siege of Boston faculty and students despaired so much for the loss of Lexington and Concord. When Harvard had renewed classes in October of that year, it was in a sort of voluntary exile in Concord, some 14 miles to the west.

Neither the 1776 nor 1778 broadside mentions the fact that Harvard canceled every public commencement during the siege of Boston in October 1775, when the town was under siege by the Continental Army. That for 1778 includes a dedication once again, but the dedicatee is now John Hancock, the first Governor of the new state of Massachusetts under the republican constitution of 1780. Further, the imprint at bottom of each bears the usual date form "Anno Salutis MDCCCLXVI [or MDCCCLXXVIII, or MDCCCLXXXII]", but in 1776 and 1778 is followed by "Annique Reipublicae Americanae Primo" (or "Tertio").

"The right or authority of the chief civil magistrate always arises from the people. Therefore, the supreme civil magistrate does not have the right to exercise any authority which is not given to him by the people."
The finest contemporary plan of the disastrous American assault on Quebec in December 1775.

In the Fall of 1775 the Americans invaded Canada with a small force under Richard Montgomery. The province was viewed by American leaders as a potential 14th Colony, and they believed it would take little to detach its mostly Francophone inhabitants from their allegiance to the British Empire.

After capturing St. Johns and then Montreal in November, Montgomery advanced toward Quebec City. There in early December he linked up with a force under Benedict Arnold, who had somehow marched his men through hundreds of miles of Maine wilderness. Already depleted by the previous campaigning the combined “army,” if one could call it that, numbered only around 1000 men, as against some 1800 defenders in the city commanded by General Guy Carleton. The Americans positioned their troops on the Plains of Abraham and placed the city under siege, though they had little artillery and could not dig trenches in the frozen ground.

The term of enlistment of Arnold’s men was due to expire at the end of the year, so early in the morning of December 31 the Americans used the cover of a blizzard to launch an all-out attack on the city. Columns under Montgomery and Arnold attacked the Lower City at two different points, with disastrous results: Montgomery was killed early on and his column stopped in its tracks, while Arnold’s column penetrated further into the city but was eventually surrounded and forced to surrender (Arnold was not captured, having been badly wounded in the leg and carried from the battle.) After the battle Arnold assumed command and maintained the pretense of a siege through the long winter, but in May the St. Lawrence thawed, British reinforcements arrived, and the Americans were forced to retreat back to Lake Champlain. It would be more than 35 years before the United States made another attempt to wrest Canada from the British Empire.

This excellent map was published in September 1776, just four months after the raising of the siege. It depicts the city and its surroundings in great detail, emphasizing its spectacular setting on cliffs overlooking the St. Lawrence. The street layout; major landmarks such as the citadel, cathedral and Jesuit seminary; the fortifications; and even the inhabitants’ gardens are all clearly visible. The letters “L” and “M” indicate the points of attack by Montgomery and Arnold on December 31. Arnold’s position on the Plains of Abraham during the long winter siege is shown, as are two American batteries erected in April 1776 across the St. Lawrence. The topography and road network of the surrounding countryside are also shown in some detail, making clear the farcical nature of Arnold’s attempt to maintain a siege with the few hundred men at his disposal.

In all, an excellent map depicting the circumstances of the first major defeat suffered by the Continental Army.

A fine plan, quite scarce, of the shambolic British attack on Charleston, South Carolina in June 1776.

Blessed by a fine harbor and proximity to the Lowcountry indigo and rice plantations, Charleston had the largest urban population south of Philadelphia and was the wealthiest city in the Colonies. During the Revolution it was much coveted by the British, who worked under the false assumption that the South had a high percentage of Loyalists, needing only some encouragement to rise up and help put down the rebellion.

Charleston was thus the target of not one but two major British campaigns, in 1776 and again in 1780. This plan depicts the first, which ended quickly and ignominiously at the June 1776 Battle of Sullivan’s Island, where South Carolina militia withstood a British attack on the fortifications protecting the seaward approaches to the city. The British plan suffered from imperfect intelligence about both the strength of the American fort at Sullivan’s Island and the hydrography of the surrounding waters. The attacking fleet suffered heavy casualties and serious damage to many of its vessels, and subsequently limped north to join Howe’s New York campaign.

This rare and important British chart depicts Charleston Harbor and its immediate surroundings, with a detailed treatment of the battle. The chart was based on surveys conducted by the Royal Navy during the campaign and was first published on August 31, 1776, little more than two months after the battle. The example offered here is a slightly-later issue bearing a date of 1791, with very substantial re-engraving of the waters around Charleston. It seems plausible that this new information was obtained from surveys conducted during and after the British capture of the city in 1780.

The Charleston campaign of 1780 was a different matter altogether: In May of that year a British army under Lord Cornwallis captured the city after a siege and took thousands of American prisoners, marking one of the worst Continental Army defeats of the war.

In all, a most interesting plan, depicting an important American victory early in the Revolution.

A landmark map of New York City, based on surveys made during the Stamp Act Crisis by John Montresor, arguably Great Britain's longest-serving and most accomplished military engineer in America.

Montresor (1736–99) had a long, varied and almost unbelievably accomplished career in the American Colonies, beginning with service during the French and Indian War and not concluding until 1778, by which time he was Chief Engineer in North America. In the mid-1760s he was based in New York City as a senior engineer reporting to General Gage, then Commander in Chief of British forces in North America. In December 1765, during the upheavals following passage of the Stamp Act, Gage ordered him to “Sketch him a Plan of this Place on a large Scale with its environs and adjacent country.” (Montresor, Journals, p. 342)

Montresor promptly complied, though in the toxic environment he was compelled to work “Sub Rosa as observations might endanger one house and effects if not one’s life” (p. 343). Despite the difficulties, he was able to present a fair copy to Gage in February 1766. He later returned to England for several months leave, during which time he oversaw the engraving of this and other maps by Peter Andrews at the firm of Mary-Ann Rocque. The “Plan of the City of New York” was published separately, advertised for sale by Rocque in December 1768, and copies were also included in Thomas Jefferys’ General Topography of North America.

Offered here is an example of the second edition of the map, which appeared in 1775 and differs only minimally from the first edition. The imprint of publisher Andrew Dury is added, and Dury has slyly altered the date of survey in the title cartouche from 1766 to 1775, thus disguising the map had been drawn a decade earlier.

This map is the first large-scale map to depict Manhattan as far north as Greenwich Village and the first to convey a sense of the island’s rolling, even hilly topography prior to later development. To achieve this Montresor used a variety of styles of shading and hachuring to differentiate built-up areas, areas of elevation, wetlands, woodlands, fields &c. A table of References at the bottom identifies particular points of interest, including Fort George, the Battery and other military facilities at the southern tip of the island, 14 religious establishments representing more than 10 denominations, among others “the Jews Synagogue” near Broad Street (with their “burying ground” well north at the apex of Bowery and Love Lanes), and King’s “College” (now Columbia).

North of town several new blocks are laid out in the Bowery; field boundaries are indicated, and much attention is given to the fine country manors of the De Lancey, Rutgers and other leading families, with their geometrically-arranged formal gardens clearly visible. At lower left a long note summarizes the history and geographical position of the city, along with more extensive observations about the layout and inadequacies of Fort George and the Battery, the latter of which “is in a ruinous situation, & seems to have been intended for Profit & Form then [sic] Defence.” At upper left an inset chart shows New York Bay and Harbor from Manhattan to Sandy Hook.

For all the map’s merits, Augustyn and Cohen rightly point out significant flaws, including imprecision in the street plan, lack of detail in the settled areas, and the omission of docks on the East River. These were likely the result of the very difficult circumstances under which Montresor was working rather than any inattention to duty on his part.

Montresor was a deeply flawed character, and his arrogance, xenophobia, entitlement and apparently limitless capacity for resentment leap from the pages of his journals. Nevertheless he deserves to be remembered and greatly admired for his immense talent, energy, and contributions to the British conquest and mapping of North America, among them this plan of New York.


Quotes from Montresor’s Journals are from G. D. Soull, ed., The Montresor Journals in Collections of the New-York Historical Society for the Year 1887.
The map was issued both separately and in some examples of The Atlantic Neptune, an atlas of superb charts of North American waters first published in 1775 and used by British navigators throughout the Revolution. As the war went on, publisher J.E.W. DesBarres began to augment the Neptune with maps and plans depicting important battles and battlefields, such as this map of the New York campaign.

The map is very scarce on the antiquarian market: Antique Map Price Record and Rare Book Hub had together list at most five trading in the past forty years.

S A M U E L  H O L L A N D  A N D  J O H N  K N I G H T

DesBarres does not identify his sources for the map. However, on another Atlantic Neptune map, titled “Plan of Fort Montgomery & Fort Clinton” and with coverage intersecting that of the present map (see page 40 of this catalog), DesBarres attributes the topography to Samuel Holland and the hydrography to John Knight. I can’t be certain, but I suspect that DesBarres also relied on their work for the map offered here. The information about troop positions and the many engagements of the campaign could have come from any of hundreds of British military engineers or other officers on the scene.

Major Samuel Holland (1728-1801), was one of the most important British surveyors active in colonial America. Born in the Netherlands, he enlisted in the British Army where he completed training before being posted to the Americas during the French and Indian War. He remained there throughout his career, and in 1764 was appointed Surveyor General of Quebec and Surveyor General of the Northern District of North America, reporting (if I understand the institutional arrangements correctly) to the Board of Trade and Plantations.

Holland left a remarkable legacy. Not only did he—and his several talented deputies—compile a remarkable number of superb surveys which survive in official archives, but his work also underpinned many of the great English printed maps of the period. His best-known contribution was as Surveyor General of the Northern District, in which capacity he oversaw a decade of hydrographic and terrestrial surveys that form one of the foundations of The Atlantic Neptune.

Scottish-born John Knight (1747-1831) first entered the Royal Navy in 1778. In 1779 he was promoted to Lieutenant and given command of the schooner Mary. In 1780, with the second rate Swiftsure he conducted an expedition into the Mediterranean.

In 1780, with the second rate Swiftsure he conducted an expedition into the Mediterranean.

In 1780, with the second rate Swiftsure he conducted an expedition into the Mediterranean.

In 1780, with the second rate Swiftsure he conducted an expedition into the Mediterranean.

John Knight was a captain in the East India Company’s navy by 1781 when he commanded the 12-gun Harlequin and then spent the next five years assisting DesBarres in his survey of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia. Knight and the Diligent were captured by rebels in Machias Harbor, Maine in July 1778, but he was exchanged by the end of the year and served in the Royal Navy throughout the American Revolution. He held a number of posts in North America and the Caribbean, along the way gaining a reputation as a superb hydrographic surveyor. Among other postings, he commanded the 12-gun Harlequin from February 1776 to July 1778, during which time he must have conducted his survey of the Hudson River.

In all, a very scarce, attractive and fascinating map of the largest and most complicated campaign of the American Revolution.

Haskell, 486-487; Nebenzahl, Bibliography. 98 Sellers and van Es, 1557; Sterner, 149.
Only the second known example of this striking cartographic textile celebrating the 1776 British invasion of New York.

This remarkable and very rare map of the greater New York area is printed on cotton in madder ink, extracted from the root of the perennial rose madder plant (rubia tinctorum). Roughly centered on “New Rochel”, the coverage includes what we today think of as the New York metropolitan area, thus encompassing the broad theatre of the 1776 New York Campaign.

The map includes a minimum of military information: an unnamed fort on the east bank of the Hudson just north of Phillipsburgh, Fort Montgomery (begun March 1776) just to the south, Fort Lee (begun July 1776) just across the Hudson from upper Manhattan, and “the great Magazine of the American Army” near the “Manor of Courtland” (probably a reference to the major Continental Army depot and assembly area at Peckskill). The naval vessels in Long Island Sound and New York Bay and on the Hudson are symbolic of Britain’s complete naval superiority, though they don’t appear to represent specific events. The absence of military detail for the 1776 campaign itself suggests that the map was issued before such information was readily available to the mapmaker.

The map is closely related to a very rare broadsheet map published by Rebecca Eynon, dated October, 3, 1776, that map attributed to “a Merchant who resided in America 15 years”. The obvious similarities include the geographical coverage and the basic format, with both featuring a cartouche and table of distances at upper and center left. However the map offered here is considerably more detailed, adding for example the label “The Woody Heights” for the Brooklyn Heights, “the great Magazine of the American Army”, the “Road to Boston and Rhode Island”, and other features.

Textile maps such as this were not intended for practical use, but were rather commemorative items or talking-pieces, that could be pulled out in a society setting to signal the user’s familiarity with contemporary events—or, in the present case, to signal support for the war effort. They were generally produced outside the mainstream map trade, possibly in London, presumably for sale by general retailers of knick-knacks or gentlemen’s clothing. There is however no attribution on the map, and I have found no record of it in the contemporary press. It is even possible that it was produced by Rebecca Eynon herself, for sale at her shop close to the Royal Exchange in the heart of the City of London.

The map is of the greatest rarity, with the only other recorded example held in the textile collection at the Winterthur Museum.

Burgoyne, by then already stationed in British Canada, between the northern and southern colonists. General would divide British forces in order to drive a wedge the Colonies, and General Howe, settled on a plan that

Ultimately, Lord George Germain, Secretary of State for the British campaign plans for 1777 evolved over the armi in New York as of June 8, 1777, just before its departure leaving a detachment under General Clinton to defend Manhattan and eventually meet up with Burgoyne’s men advancing southward. Howe would focus his own energies on the American capital at Philadelphia. The campaign’s results for Britain—in particular the loss of Burgoyne’s entire army at Saratoga—have engendered centuries of second-guessing from contemporary and military historians alike.

In early June 1777, though, Burgoyne’s troops remained along the Richelieu River south of Montreal, and Howe’s army was still almost entirely in New York except for some small detachments already stationed in New Jersey. Thus, this order of battle from June 8 depicts Howe’s army before it embarked on its campaign for the year.

THE ORDER OF BATTLE

It appears that the concept of an “order of battle,” as a document listing the units available for or engaged in fighting, was in transition at the time of the American Revolution. In medieval or early modern usage, the order of battle was intended at least in part as a visual representation of how military units would line up on an open field of battle. Later, as here, it took on a more figurative meaning, reflecting the hierarchy of units and their relationship to the commanding officer. In this way, the “order of battle” would apply more broadly throughout the campaign, as that hierarchy would remain mostly unchanged.

The order of battle offered here lists the senior officers of the British Army in North America, under Commander in Chief Howe. First, it denotes Howe’s chief aides, Adjutant General Lieutenant Colonel James Paterson and Quartermaster General Brigadier Sir William Erskine. As Adjutant General, Paterson had been dispatched on multiple occasions by Howe to confer with George Washington or other American officers. Erskine, meanwhile, had validated his recent promotion to Brigadier General as second-in-command on an April expedition of about 2000 British troops from New York to Connecticut. There, they destroyed Patriot supplies at Danbury and faced an American force in the Battle of Ridgefield, at which Erskine led a bayonet charge to break the American lines. Below these top aides, the document divides the forces under Howe into “Foreign” ones, hired from Hesse and other German states, occupying the left half of the sheet, juxtaposed against the “British” on the right half. The foreign troops were led by Lieutenant General Leopold Philip de Heister, who had landed in command of the first Hessian troops aiding the British on Long Island in August 1776, and his second-in-command, Lieutenant General Wilhelm Von Knyphausen. Howe and de Heister had clashed almost immediately, and as a result de Heister was recalled to Europe on June 23, 1777, just two weeks after the date on this document. Von Knyphausen took de Heister’s place, and later that year in the Philadelphia campaign he led one wing of the two divisions of the British forces there. Under these commanders, the Order of Battle lists five officers leading three or four “Battalions [of] Grenadiers” each.

On the British side, the order of battle lists Lieutenant Generals Earl Charles Cornwallis and Henry Clinton as the highest-ranking officers. Having returned to England after the 1776 campaign, Clinton did not arrive in New York until late July and was dismayed by Howe’s plans to split his forces (He also disliked “a damned starved defensive” role in New York.) Cornwallis, meanwhile, would go on to lead the other main division of the upcoming assault on Philadelphia, opposite Von Knyphausen, and of course to famously lead the British army through the southern United States in 1780 and 1781, culminating in his surrender at Yorktown. Serving under these officers were Brigadier General Samuel Cleveland, who commanded the Royal Artillery and Engineers, and four further officers, each commanding their own brigade.

A Rare Order of Battle for William Howe’s Army in New York

The British campaign plans for 1777 evolved over the preceding winter with no small amount of disagreement. Ultimately, Lord George Germain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, and General Howe, settled on a plan that would divide British forces in order to drive a wedge between the northern and southern colonists. General Burgoyne, by then already stationed in British Canada,
An extremely detailed chart and map of the Delaware River below Philadelphia, depicting the heavy American fortifications and their capture by the British in the late Fall of 1777.

BACKGROUND

As both the largest city and the capital of the young United States, it was natural that Philadelphia would have been heavily defended. Most of the effort went into fortifying the Delaware River below the city, as this was seen as the most natural point of attack. The Americans thus constructed three major forts—Fort Billingsport and Fort Mercer along the New Jersey shore, and Fort Mifflin on Mud Island—as well as blocking the main channel with lines of sunken obstacles (chevaux de frise) between Billings Island and Billingsport and between Mud Island and Fort Mercer.

“Word of these [fortifications] had undoubtedly influenced the circuitous course taken by the British fleet, when they embarked from New York on the Philadelphia campaign. Instead of heading up the Delaware, the fleet sailed south around Cape Charles, Virginia, then northward up the entire Chesapeake Bay to a point near Elkton, Maryland, where Admiral Richard Howe landed the army of his brother, General William Howe.” (Nebenzahl, Atlas)

Thus, after occupying Philadelphia on September 26, 1777, the Howes were still faced with the need to reduce the Delaware River fortifications held by the Continental Army. This they accomplished in a costly six-week campaign, capturing Fort Billingsport on October 2, Fort Mifflin on November 16, and Fort Mercer on November 18. The battle for Fort Mifflin was particularly vicious, with the British suffering hundreds of casualties and the loss of the 64-gun HMS Augusta.

Thereafter the British settled into a relatively comfortable occupation of Philadelphia over the Winter of 1777-78. For its part, the Continental Army retreated 25 miles northwest to Valley Forge, where it suffered months of starvation, disease and desertion. Much good any of this did the British: After the French joined the war in early 1778, General Howe felt forced to evacuate Philadelphia and march overland to New York in anticipation of a joint Franco-American attack on that city.

THE MAP

This extremely detailed map depicts the Delaware from Philadelphia downriver to Chester. Soundings indicate the main and secondary ship channels; and American forts, batteries and lines of chevaux de frise—the latter referred to as “stackadoes”—are all delineated. Superimposed on this are the movements of the British land and naval forces, the former advancing along the New Jersey shoreline and rolling up the American fortifications; the latter making their painful way upriver, culminating in the violent assault on Fort Mifflin at Mud Island.

The map has a number of other interesting features. At lower right are plan and profile views of the chevaux de frise, along with a table listing the American fleet on the Delaware, most of which was destroyed during the campaign. At upper left is a large “Plan of Fort Mifflin on Mud Island”, which shows in great detail the island’s strong fortifications and their bombardment by British naval vessels and batteries on the far shore. I recall reading somewhere that at one point the fort was being struck by 1000 cannonballs per hour.

The map was first issued in 1778 and reissued with significant changes in 1779 and again in 1785. Offered here is the third version, which was most likely bound into a copy of Faden’s Atlas of Battles of the American Revolution.

The only contemporary map providing a detailed overview of the New York campaign of 1776 and the Philadelphia campaign of 1777, with fascinating omissions and elisions suggesting the mapmaker’s pro-British slant.

The main map, covering the 1776 campaign, depicts the area bounded in the north by Fort Montgomery on the Hudson River south to Burlington on the Delaware River, and from the Delaware River east to Jamaica, on Long Island. Most detail is found in the immediate environs of Manhattan, western Long Island, and Westchester County. Letters A through R, explained in a table at lower right, locate key events, including the initial landing of the British Army on Long Island, the advance to the Battle of Long Island, the crossing to Manhattan, and the progress of the campaign culminating in the capture of Forts Washington and Lee.

The 1776 map is also interesting for what it omits, namely General Cornwallis’s failed attempt to bring the Continental Army to bay in New Jersey after the capture of Fort Lee in November 1776, and the Continental Army’s stunning victory at Trenton on the morning of December 26. Elsewhere the map is willfully misleading: For example, according to item F, at a September 10th “skirmish on Vanderwater’s Height” the Americans were “oblig’d to retire within their Works with loss”. This “skirmish”, known today as the Battle of Harlem Heights, was in fact a draw, and while the Americans did “retire”, they did so in good order after holding their ground and even forcing the British back two miles.

The 1777 Philadelphia campaign is treated in an inset at upper left, depicting the region between the Delaware River and the upper reaches of Chesapeake Bay. It shows the principal events from the British landing on the Elk River on August 15, 1777 to the Battle of Germantown on October 4th of that year. The British lines of march are shown, as are the principal encounters, including the Battles of Germantown, Trudruffin and “Brandewine”.

The map was issued in The History of the Civil War in America. Vol. I. Comprehending the Campaigns of 1775, 1776, and 1777. By an Officer of the Army (1780). I have seen that work attributed to “Captain John Hall”, “Hall, John, Captain in the 46th regiment of foot”, “Major William C. Hall”, “Major William Cornwallis Hall”, and “Captain William Hall of the 28th Foot”. Both the 28th and 46th were with Howe in the 1776 and 1777 campaigns, so your guess is as good as mine. Whoever precisely the author was, Sabin describes the work as “rather a vindication of the measures of the mother country, and consequently a condemnation of the Americans, than an impartial history. Although this Vol. 1 reached a so-called second edition, it was never completed.”

The History is well represented in institutional collections but rare on the market, and I find no record of the map having been offered separately.
A scarce and interesting pair of maps on one sheet, epitomizing much of the British war effort during the American Revolution: often tactically effective or even brilliant, but strategically futile.

**BACKGROUND**

Forts Montgomery and Clinton were constructed in 1776 and 1777, part of a network of American fortifications designed to maintain control of the vital Hudson River corridor. Were the British able to break through from New York City and gain control of the river up to Albany, they would have been able to cut off the flow of men, materiel and communication between New England and the mid-Atlantic colonies.

In the Summer of 1777 the British tried just that, sending General John Burgoyne with an army down Lakes Champlain and George and into the Hudson Valley. The plan depended on General Howe advancing north from New York City to meet Burgoyne. But Howe inexplicably led his army south to capture Philadelphia, leaving General Henry Clinton in New York with a small army and vague instructions.

It was only in late September that Clinton moved north up the Hudson, his first objective a diversionary attack on Forts Montgomery and Clinton to draw off some of the American forces facing Burgoyne at Saratoga. Clinton was a superb tactician, and the attack on the forts went off brilliantly. He first landed troops on October 5 at Verplanck’s Point, on the east shore a few miles below the forts. This had the effect of distracting and diverting American forces stationed nearby. Then, early on October 6, he had a thousand troops ferried across the river and executed simultaneous surprise attacks on Montgomery and Clinton.

**THE BRITISH CAPTURE FORTS MONTGOMERY & CLINTON ON THE HUDSON**

Major [Samuel] Holland and Lieut[enant] John Knight, A PLAN of FORT MONTGOMERY & FORT CLINTON... [on sheet with:] PART of HUDSONS RIVER, Shewing the position of Fort Montgomery and Fort Clinton... London: J.F.W. DesBarres, Jan. 1, 1779. Engraving and etching on heavy laid paper (“J. BATES” watermark), 20 ½” h x 30 ¼” w at neat line plus margins, wash and spot color. Some offset, small closed split in lower margin, pencil annotation in lower margin by previous owner, but about excellent. $20,000

This plan with its inset chart of “Part of Hudsons River” was issued in 1779 by J.F.W. DesBarres, who sold it both separately and bound into his *Atlantic Neptune*. He first issued that superb atlas of North American waters in 1775 for use by British navigators throughout the Revolution. As the war went on, DesBarres, augmented the atlas with maps and plans depicting important battles and battlefields, such as this plan, issued in 1779.

The main plan depicts Fort Montgomery and the still-incomplete Fort Clinton, lying to the south across a deep ravine, with shading indicating their strong position on bluffs overlooking the Hudson. An alphabetical legend identifies the locations of powder magazines, barracks &c; the huge chain and cable stretched from Fort Montgomery across the river to Anthony’s Nose, thus blocking British vessels sailing north from New York; and American naval vessels sheltering upriver of the chain and cable. The roads used by the British to attack the two forts are clearly shown, one running west and south from Fort Montgomery and the other running almost directly south from Fort Clinton.

The inset chart at left depicts a 20-mile stretch of the Hudson River, done at a smaller scale and extending from Newberry (now Newburgh) downriver to just below Anthony’s Nose. The forts, Anthony’s Nose, the towns of New Windsor and Newberry, and other landmarks are shown (Oddly, the important American fort at West Point is not identified, though it is located on the west bank at the sharp bend in the middle of the chart.) In the river itself several dozen soundings indicate the main channel, while a note at Polipus Island indicates the presence of “Chevaux-de-Frieze,” sunken obstacles designed to tear the bottoms out of ships.

The main map is credited to Major Samuel Holland (1728-1801), one of the most important British surveyors active in colonial America. The inset chart is attributed to the Scottish-born John Knight (1747-1831), who had a distinguished career as a hydrographer and naval commander (For short biographies of both men, see p. 30.)

The capture of the two forts accomplished little: Clinton eventually sent a force north toward Saratoga, but it was too late to relieve Burgoyne, who surrendered there on October 17, changing the course of the war.

Nebenzahl, Bibliography, 54. Sellers and van Ee, 1190. Stevens, 156.
THE STATE OF THE BRITISH ARMY AFTER BURGOYNE’S SURRENDER AT SARATOGA

A fascinating manuscript compiling the numbers of men available to the British Army in the Winter of 1777-1778, likely drawn up just weeks after Burgoyne’s surrender at Saratoga. The document is particularly dramatic in its treatment of Burgoyne’s army, the entirety of which is listed as "prisoners" or "sick & wounded", but whose condition is only guessed at.

The document provides a wonderfully-detailed snapshot of British military readiness at a transitional moment in its military approach to the American rebellion. The data is presumably from "returns," the official submissions of military numbers from the commanders on the ground. These charts would include statistics on the number of men at each rank in each unit, how many were fit for duty as opposed to ill or wounded, and so on. From these, officials would compile the statistics for the full army.

DESCRIPTION

The document consists of tables listing British troops in the Colonies, down to the regimental level. For each unit, it reports the numbers of men "Present [and] fit for Duty," "On Command Absent &c," (i.e., detached for other duties), "Prisoners," "Sick and Wounded", and the "Total Effectives", including men temporarily missing or indisposed. In the final columns, the list gives the numbers needed to return the unit to its full "Establishment", meaning the full complement as defined at the unit’s inception (In a few cases, the page shows "supernumeraries" meaning a surplus of men enlisted over that establishment number.) The establishment figure would have determined the need for reinforcement, budgeting for the unit, the amount of supplies it needed, and so on. So officials looked to make big-picture decisions for the army from London would have relied on such figures as a baseline.

The first two pages of the report are both rendered in two different hands, one a fine copperplate hand, the other rougher. These pages address General William Howe’s army, situated "on the Coast of the Atlantic." The first page describes Howe’s "Division at Philadelphia," helpfully differentiating between light dragoons, light infantry, grenadiers, foot guards (i.e., infantry), artillery, and the Queen’s American Rangers, the last a regiment of American Loyalists. The second page adds the large contingents at New York and Rhode Island to the count. In sum, the total army on the East Coast numbered 31,214 "effectives", of which 19,328 were British and the rest German.

The third page of the folio, rendered in the rougher hand, recounts the "General State of the Canada Army." The notetaker conceives that "the state of that Division ... under Lt. General Burgoyne is only guessed at from the Newspaper accounts," though he gives more detailed information on General Guy Carleton’s division, which had remained in Canada while Burgoyne marched south in the summer of 1777. Of particular note, after their October surrender at Saratoga, the British and German units under Burgoyne all list zero "Present [and] fit for Duty" and "On Command Absent &c". Instead, those units contained "guessed at" totals of 3,150 prisoners and 1,700 sick or wounded. The large numbers of "Rank & File wanting to complete", some 1,659, presumably reflects deaths and desertions in the course of the campaign.

CONTEXT AND SIGNIFICANCE

The document appears to have been compiled in the middle of a tumultuous period in British politics. Parliament was debating the next step in a war that had been frustrating to Britain in 1775 and 1776, then humiliating in 1777. Britain had poured ever more resources into the military response to the rebelling colonists that year, with mixed results: the capture of Philadelphia, of dubious strategic value, more than balanced by the loss of Burgoyne’s entire army at Saratoga and the growing prospects of a Franco-American alliance.

Some Whig politicians, including Charles James Fox and the Duke of Richmond, seized on these failures to call into question the military misadventures of Lord North’s ministry and to oppose any additional spending or allocation of troops to North America. Fox and Richmond had opposed the war from the beginning, now they argued in part that the high volume of troops sent to North America would sap Great Britain of its own troops for defense, or at least of its potential to raise a domestic army if needed. Richmond in particular pushed the idea that the more prudent course would be to concede America’s nominal "independence" while agreeing to treaties that would keep the thirteen colonies in a "friendly league" with Great Britain, ensuring the continuation of profitable ties.

There seems to be no way to determine the identity of the authors, other than that the underlying source is the returns submitted by senior military officers. All that can be said with some confidence is that the breadth of information and the degree of detail indicate that it was compiled by persons relatively senior in the British military establishment, or by their aides. Whether they were located in North America or England, I cannot say.

The source material for these documents would likely be in British archives, particularly the files of the War Office and the Secretaries of State at the National Archives, Kew. One avenue to gain clarity into the exact timing of the document’s creation and perhaps generalization as to its authorship, would be to find a version of this data, perhaps in Kew’s WO 57 files, that matched the numbers in this document precisely. A researcher might then be able to determine where the writers obtained their information and work backwards from there.

In all, a fascinating record of the enormous British investment in putting down the revolt of its American colonies, which by the end of 1777 had produced little by way of return.

Thanks to David Flaherty of Charlottesville, Virginia for compiling an earlier draft of this document, the great majority of which has been retained in this version.
Charles Blaskowitz / William Faden (engraver). A Topographical Chart of the Bay of Narragansett in the Province of New England, with all the Isles contained therein, among which Rhode Island and Connickunt have been particularly Surveyed. London: William Faden, July 22, 1777. Engraving and etching on laid paper, 37 1/4 x 25 1/4 at neat line plus margins, uncolored. Segmented and mounted on linen at an early date. Recently washed and rebacked with the original linen, now with only minor toning. Early ownership inscription in ink on verso, along with unfortunate later scribbles in magic marker. ₩ $22,500

THE FINEST 18TH-CENTURY CHART OF NARRAGANSETT BAY, WITH STELLAR PROVENANCE

The single most important 18th-century printed chart of Narragansett Bay, very scarce on the market. This example owned at an early date by Claude Joseph Sauthier, one of the leading British military engineers and surveyors active in North America. Boasting substantial port towns and the superb harbor at Newport, Narragansett Bay played a prominent role in the American Revolution. In May 1776 Rhode Island became the first American colony to declare its independence, but that December Newport was seized by Admiral Parker as a base for the British fleet. In the Summer of 1778, the British repelled a combined land and sea attack led by American General John Sullivan and French Admiral d’Estaing. Finally, in July 1780, after the British evacuated the town to consolidate their forces at New York, it became the base for the French expeditionary force under the Comte de Rochambeau. It was from there that Rochambeau marched his army in the Fall of 1781 to join the Continental Army at the decisive battle at Yorktown.

Published in mid-1777, during the British occupation, this chart of the bay would thus have been received eagerly by officers of the Royal Navy and their civilian and military leaders. It is somewhat unusual for a navigation chart, in that the hydrographic data for the bay is complemented by a detailed depiction of the adjacent landmasses, in particular Aquidneck Island. Numerous shore batteries and other fortifications are indicated, most located around Newport and at strategic choke points in the bay, and a table at upper right details the numbers and types of cannons fielded by each.

CHARLES BLASKOWITZ

A native of Prussia, Blaskowitz (ca. 1743-1823) entered the British Army at a young age, served in the Royal American Regiment during the French and Indian War, and assisted Samuel Holland in a major survey of the St. Lawrence River after the capture of Quebec. In 1764 Holland detailed him to survey Narragansett Bay, in order to assess Newport’s suitability as a naval base. Upon his return to Quebec he rejoined Holland, who in the interim had been appointed Surveyor General of the Northern District of North America. Blaskowitz served as one of Holland’s deputies until the outbreak of the American Revolution, and, given his previous experience, was the natural choice to lead the team surveying Narragansett Bay in 1774.

Blaskowitz’ surveys formed the basis for two charts issued in London, one published by J.F.W. DesBarres in The Atlantic Neptune in 1776. Offered here is the second, engraved and published by William Faden in July 1777. It is a much more accomplished production, on a larger sheet and more elaborately engraved—and according to Mary Pedley, cost two and a half times as much as the DesBarres edition (Pedley, p. 142).

PROVENANCE

This example of the chart was segmented and mounted on linen at an early date for durability and portability. The reverse side bears the early inscription “C.J.S. Rhode Island”. These are the initials of military engineer Claude Joseph Sauthier (1736-1802), and the inscription matches known examples of his handwriting. Sauthier came to the Colonies in 1762, where he was first employed by Governor Tryon of North Carolina. When in 1771 Tryon assumed the governorship of New York, Sauthier accompanied him and soon went to work on a survey of the eastern part of the province, which at the time included all of present-day Vermont. He was also involved in running the boundary line between New York and Quebec at the 45th parallel.

During the American Revolution Sauthier served on the staff of Hugh Percy and Duke of Northumberland and was with him during the New York campaign. Percy returned to England in mid-1777 after disagreements with Commander-in-Chief William Howe, accompanied by Sauthier. Since this chart of Narragansett Bay was published in July 1777, Sauthier must have acquired it after his arrival in England.) Sauthier served Percy as secretary until around 1790, then returned to his hometown of Strasbourg, France, where he died in 1802.

Uncommon map detailing the British capture of St. Lucia from the French in 1779.

Although a less well-known theatre of the Revolution, the West Indies saw much conflict as Britain and France sought to dislodge one another from their island possessions, valued primarily for their hugely-profitable sugar plantations.

In December 1778 a British force under Admiral Samuel Barrington and General James Grant sailed from Barbados and launched a surprise invasion of French-held St. Lucia. At the time the island had a population of some 19,000, of whom more than 80 percent were enslaved persons working more than 40 sugar plantations. The unfolding events are clearly illustrated on this map depicting the northwest coast of St. Lucia from Grand Cul De Sac Bay to Castries, with some coverage into the hinterland.

The map captures the phases of both the naval and ground campaigns. The tables below provide much important information, including the composition of the French fleet and British ground forces, the locations of French batteries, and the owners of plantations shown on the map. This example is notable in having letterpress text below, reproducing the official dispatch sent by Grant to Lord George Germain, the Secretary of State for the American Department.

THE INVASION

On December 13 and 14 the British landed a large force at the deep harbor on St. Lucia’s northwest coast known as Grand Cul de Sac. From there they advanced against French resistance and captured the fort at Moune-Fortune, a tall hill where the French kept their military stores. They then went on to capture the Carenage (the capital, known today as Castries) at the head of the eponymous bay as well as La Vigie, a series of hills controlling the bay’s entrance.

Close behind the British was a French fleet with 12 ships of the line, commanded by Admiral Jean Baptiste Charles Henri Hector, Comte d’Estaing. The fleet had sailed from Sandy Hook in early November and picked up thousands of troops along the way, with an eye toward capturing Britain’s West India islands. On the 15th d’Estaing arrived at St. Lucia and attacked Barrington’s fleet at the mouth of Le Grand Cul de Sac. This attack was repulsed, after which d’Estaing sailed up the coast and on the 16th landed a large force at Gros Islet Bay. This force attacked the British position on La Vigie, but the British held the field and inflicted heavy casualties: Grant writes in his dispatch: “Their two first attacks were made with the impetuosity of Frenchmen, and they were repulsed by the determined bravery of Britains!”

Having twice failed to dislodge the British, d’Estaing re-embarked his troops and sailed away on the 28th, leaving the French defenders to their fate. Without hope of reinforcement, they surrendered St. Lucia on the 29th. The British held the island for the remainder of the war, but it was restored to France in the 1783 Peace of Paris.

THE MAPMAKER

The printed map offers no attribution to a mapmaker, but this example bears a notation in a tidy early hand: “Made and Drawn by Lt. G.V. Hart 46th. Regt. Assistant Engineer whilst in North America”. George Vaughan Hart (1752-1832) was a British army officer, born at Kilderry, near Muff, in County Donegal. He joined the 46th Regiment as an Assistant Engineer and made Lieutenant in 1777. During the Revolution his regiment was posted to America, where it saw much action. Hart himself was present at the Battles of Long Island and Germantown, and served as Aide-de-Camp to General James Grant at St. Lucia.

In all, a superbly-detailed map of a dramatic British victory in the Caribbean, an important but relatively little-known theatre of war.
One of the finest charts of the southern coastline available to the Royal Navy during the Revolution, issued in time for the Southern Campaign.

The 25 miles of coast along the Georgia-South Carolina border was of considerable strategic import, encompassing as it did the superb anchorage at Port Royal Sound and the approaches to the city of Savannah. Until the opening of the American Revolution, however, there were no adequate charts available to the British Navy.

British map publishers filled the gap by dusting off an ancient chart by naval officer and hydrographer Captain John Gascoigne (ca. 1697-1753). In 1728 Gascoigne had received orders to assume command of the HMS Alborough and survey Port Royal Harbor and the coast as far north as Charleston. He arrived in South Carolina in the Summer of that year and remained until 1734, during which time he fulfilled his mission while becoming a significant landowner in the region. He returned to England in 1734, bearing as passengers Georgia founder James Oglethorpe and a delegation of Creek Indians.

Gascoigne's original chart has been lost to history, but around 1729 one Francis Swaine made a copy, preserved today at the UK National Archives. Then, some time between 1773 and 1776, Thomas Jefferys, Jr. and William Faden issued a chart based on Swaine's work. Offered here is another version, published in August 1777 by J.F.W. DesBarres in *The Atlantic Neptune*.

The chart depicts the coast from Pritchard's Island (here labeled “Hunting Islands”) south to Daufuskie Island, with coverage nearly 20 miles into the interior including all of Port Royal, Parry's (now Parris), Trench's (now Hilton Head), St. Helena and Lady's Islands. The town of Beaufort is shown as well as Fort Lyttleton slightly downriver, symbols differentiate marshes and swamps from somewhat more elevated areas, and the locations of several plantations are marked. The inland detail may be rather sparse, but the chart provides extremely detailed hydrographic data, with hundreds (thousands?) of soundings as well as shoals, tides and other information of use to pilots. The soundings differ substantially from those on the Faden version of the chart. It may be that hydrographic surveys of the area were made during the June 1776 campaign that culminated in the Battle of Sullivan's Island, and that DesBarres had access to these.

When DesBarres published this chart in the summer of 1777 the Revolutionary conflict was still concentrated far to the north, with Burgoyne descending the Champlain-Hudson Valley and Howe moving against Philadelphia. But in late December 1778 the British initiated a southern strategy, beginning with the capture of Savannah by an army under Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell. A month later a small British force of 200 infantry attempted to capture Port Royal Island and Beaufort, but after landing encountered a slightly larger force under South Carolina Brigadier William Moultrie and was forced to retreat. The area remained in American possession for the remainder of the war.

Cumming, British Maps of Colonial America, p. 47 (fig. 20); Phillips, p. 721; Sellers et Viz Ex, 1554; Streeter, 1968. Also mentioned in Cumming, The Southeast in Early Maps, 284.
Thus, in 1779, Massachusetts impetuously launched an expedition to capture the strong point that the British were even aware of the arrangements. With Dudley Saltonstall commanding the fleet and its 2,000 men and General Solomon Lovell leading 900 militia, including Paul Revere as chief of artillery, a direct attack most likely would have succeeded. Instead, delay and excessive caution allowed time for a Royal Navy squadron, led by Sir George Collier, to arrive and the British force abandoned the island, with the American fleet on August 14.

Calef’s work consists primarily of a daily journal of the siege, beginning on July 18, 1779 when “intelligence was received that a fleet and army were preparing at Boston to besiege Penobscot.” The account ends on August 14, when, after the appearance of a British relief force in the Penobscot Bay, the Massachusetts force abandoned the siege and fled up the Penobscot, where most of its vessels were burned. This is followed by a “List of the Enemy’s Ships, &c. taken and destroyed in the Penobscot River”, reprints of proclamations and letters by the opposing commanders, and a short account of the country around the Penobscot, in which Calef argues that its rich resources and Loyalist population make it ripe for chartering a new colony, separate from Massachusetts.

According to Sabin, Calef’s account is “recorded with apparent precision, but with a strong English bias.” Indeed, Calef generally attributes the British victory to “the harmony and good understanding that subsisted amongst the Forces by sea and by land”, which “enabled them to effect almost prodigies” (p. 23). That said, Calef’s journal, and the accompanying “General Lovell’s Letter to Commodore Saltonstall”, make clear that more than anything Saltonstall’s timidity was to blame. Indeed Saltonstall was later court-martialed and dismissed from the service.

**THE MAPS**

Calef’s work is illustrated with two maps on a single large sheet. The first is a large-scale treatment of the island of “Majabigwaduce” (now Castine) and compresses the events of the nearly month-long siege into a single image. Fort George dominates the island, with the American ground force occupying the heights to the west and the harbor contested by the large American fleet and the small British squadron. Above this a smaller map depicts the lower reaches of the Penobscot River and the flight of the American fleet on August 14.

Nebenzahl correctly notes of the main map that “there are considerable differences in the configuration of the shoreline between this and the inset”. Likely the two are based on different sources: The main map is unattributed, though it appears closely related to an unsigned manuscript map in the Faden Collection at the Map Division of the Library of Congress. The map not in Phillips or Sellers and Van Ee: Background on Calef’s finding aid to “John Calef Memorials and Petitions, 1776-1782” at the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan.

The work is well represented in institutional collections but extremely rare in trade: Per Rare Book Hub, the last to appear on the market was offered by Goodspeed’s in 1966 for the very substantial sum of $1750.


A rare account of the disastrous 1779 Penobscot Expedition, organized by Massachusetts to capture Fort George, a British fortification on the future site of Castine, Maine. With a very fine though little-known map of the campaign, missed by major bibliographers.

During the Revolution the individual colonies remained largely independent of one another, retaining among other things wide latitude in military affairs. Thus, in 1779, "Inadequate planning and poor execution doomed the project. Neither Congress nor General Washington were even aware of the arrangements. With Dudley Saltonstall commanding the fleet and its 2,000 men and General Solomon Lovell leading 900 militia, including Paul Revere as chief of artillery, a direct attack most likely would have succeeded. Instead, delay and excessive caution allowed time for a Royal Navy squadron, led by Sir George Collier, to arrive from Sandy Hook. Collier drove the American fleet up the Penobscot River, forcing the Yankees to burn every ship not taken by the British. All survivors, mariner and militia alike, had to make it back to the Boston area on foot." (Nebenzahl, Atlas, p. 177)
UTILITY OF THE ATLANTIC NEPTUNE.

A spectacular and very rare broadside issued by J.F.W. DesBarres to promote the merits of The Atlantic Neptune.

The broadside consists of several paragraphs of letterpress, set above an aquatint depiction of a Royal Navy ship of the line dismasted and foundering in high seas, as its crew is rescued by another vessel. The text touts the Neptune's great benefit to Britain: "In the safety, abduction, confidence, and frequency of Voyages, the nation has saved millions, and the naval and military service has been proportionally benefitted." It goes on to cite specific examples from the years of the American Revolution, such as:

"[Earl [Richard] Howe, on various critical occasions, greatly availed himself of the advantages given by this Work, and particularly during the manœuvres of the French fleet under Count d'Estaing off Rhode Island, and the dangerous shoals of Nantucket, which not even the American pilots had it in their power to supply."}

The letterpress is signed by printer Thomas Bensley and includes a description of the broadside's contents, which in its most complete form ran to four volumes containing hundreds of navigation charts, maps, and coastal recognition profiles, topographical views and even Revolutionary War battle plans, some of which have been featured in this catalog.

DesBarres spent years seeking a whopping £43,000 in compensation from the government for his work on the survey of Nova Scotia and The Atlantic Neptune. When it was decided in 1784 to separate Cape Breton from Nova Scotia and establish it as a refuge for American Loyalists, this claim may have helped him obtain the Lieutenant-Governorship of the new colony. Unfortunately, DesBarres’ tenure there was brief and unhappy, in part due to his controlling and belligerent personality, and he was recalled in 1787.

At war’s end, DesBarres was appointed by the Admiralty to survey the coast of Nova Scotia, an enormous undertaking that required the better part of ten years. He returned to England in 1774 and, with the support of the Admiralty, organized the publication and sale of his charts and those of others, most notably those supplied by Samuel Holland, Surveyor General of Quebec and of the Northern District of North America (For a short biography of Holland, see p. 30). DesBarres ultimately compiled these into The Atlantic Neptune, which in its most complete form ran to four volumes containing hundreds of navigation charts, maps, and coastal recognition profiles, topographical views and even Revolutionary War battle plans, some of which have been featured in this catalog.

DesBarres spent years seeking a whopping £43,000 in compensation from the government for his work on the survey of Nova Scotia and The Atlantic Neptune. When it was decided in 1784 to separate Cape Breton from Nova Scotia and establish it as a refuge for American Loyalists, this claim may have helped him obtain the Lieutenant-Governorship of the new colony. Unfortunately, DesBarres’ tenure there was brief and unhappy, in part due to his controlling and belligerent personality, and he was recalled in 1787.

DesBarres spent the next 17 years in England, putting much energy into gaining satisfaction for his long-standing claims for compensation and vindicating his performance at Cape Breton. In 1804 he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Prince Edward Island, where he served until 1812. Thereafter he moved to Amherst, Nova Scotia and then in 1817 to Halifax, where he died in 1824 at the age of 102, his long life perhaps fueled by an abundance of beer.

In all, a striking and all-but-unknown broadside touting the merits of one of the finest atlases ever compiled.

PART THREE

VICTORY
A rare 1781 cartoon celebrating American independence, in an almost uncanny anticipation of the impending British surrender at Yorktown.

The cartoon depicts an outsized America “with the Flag of the United States displayed over her head; holding in one hand the Olive branch, inviting the ships of all nations to partake of her commerce; and in the other hand supporting the Cap of Liberty”. She gazes confidently over a vista of “French, Spanish, Dutch, &c shipping in the harbours of America”, while across from her sits Britannia, her spear broken at her feet, “weeping at the loss of the trade of America, attended with an evil genius”. Behind America is “New York wherein is exhibited the Traitor [sic] Benedict Arnold, taken with remorse for selling his country and Judas like hanging himself” (One must look very carefully to make out the miniscule figure of the hanged Arnold, just below the number “6”).

Most extant examples are found in copies of Weatherwise’s Town and Country Almanack, for the Year of Our Lord, 1782 (Boston: Coverly and Hodge, 1781), but our impression appears to have been separately issued. The artist and engraver are not known, though its publication in Boston suggests that the print was drawn and engraved there, perhaps by John Norman. The Almanack was first advertised in the Boston-based Continental Journal for September 27, 1781, “Embellished with a large and beautiful Copper-Plate frontispiece representing America Triumphant and Britannia in distress.” The timing was fortuitous, almost as if the publisher anticipated the outpouring of patriotic fervor that was to follow the British surrender at Yorktown less than a month later.


A scarce and entertaining Gillray satire on Britain’s loss of her American colonies, the loss compensated somewhat by the lifting in February 1783 of the Franco-Spanish siege of Gibraltar.

At the time of the print’s publication in April 1783, the American Revolution was essentially over: On January 20 the United States, Great Britain, France and Spain had signed a provisional treaty of peace, ending hostilities and recognizing American independence. The recent lifting of the French and Spanish siege of Gibraltar should have been some consolation to patriotic Britons, but this satire presents John Bull in despair.

“With the Treaty of Paris, Great Britain acknowledged American independence, here represented by the map [labeled “America”] carried off by a farting devil. John Bull, representing England, holds up his arms in surrender and perhaps because he has just let go of the map. He is teased first by a French man, who offers him snuff…. The Spaniard gestures toward Gibraltar, where a naval battle rages. The Dutch, represented by the ill dressed man on the right [sic], continued their negotiations into 1784.” (Library of Congress)

Of course, America was not “irrevocably lost” to Great Britain, which retained huge possessions in Canada, the staggering wealth of its sugar-producing colonies in the Caribbean, and, for many years, its status as the United States’ largest trading partner.

Cresswell, 835. Stevens & George, V:6210. OCLC 58871681.
at revolution’s end, guy carleton prepares
the british army to evacuate new york city

Manuscript orders preparing for the evacuation of British forces from New York City, disseminated by Commander-in-Chief Guy Carleton in August 1783. Little more than three months later, on November 25, 1783, the British would depart the city, the Continental Army would march in, and the Revolutionary War would be at an end.

By the Summer of 1783 the British had held New York City since its capture by the Brothers Howe seven years earlier. For most of that time—with a brief interregnum during the occupation of Philadelphia in 1777-1778—New York had served as the hub of British administrative, military and political activity in the Colonies. Now however, the writing was on the wall: After the American victory at Yorktown in October 1781, the two sides had met in Paris and hammered out a provisional treaty of peace, signed on November 30, 1782. Article 1 of the Treaty of Paris provided that “the British Monarch and his heirs and successors will hold himself in readiness to embark for Europe.” All military and political activity in the Colonies. Now however, the writing was on the wall: After the American victory at Yorktown in October 1781, the two sides had met in Paris and hammered out a provisional treaty of peace, signed on November 30, 1782. Article 1 of the Treaty of Paris provided that “the British Monarch and his heirs and successors will hold himself in readiness to embark for Europe.”

The first part of the document pertains to six infantry regiments, which are ordered “to embark for Nova Scotia where they are to remain till further orders.” Indeed, subsequent orders confirmed that these units would be stationed in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland as Britain sought to fortify those colonies following the close of hostilities. The document goes on to list 12 additional regiments (one cavalry and eleven infantry), who are “to hold themselves in readiness to embark for Europe”. All except the Dragoons are to be “reduced” immediately to 400 privates, and six of the regiments are to be “disembodied” (i.e., disbanded) upon arrival in Great Britain.
An appealing, mysterious, and extremely rare 18th-century American equestrian portrait of George Washington, a puzzle to scholars of Washington iconography for over a century. The image is an explicitly patriotic representation of Washington as Commander in Chief of the Continental Army. His Excellency is shown full figure in uniform, mounted on a rearing horse—fitting, as he was a superb horseman—his right arm extended and wielding a sword. Tents representing a military encampment can be seen in the left background, as can two groups of men with shouldered arms, as if on the parade ground. The scene is encircled by a title styling Washington as “The Protector of his Country, The Supporter of Liberty, And the Benefactor of Mankind.” The whole is surrounded by a circle of what appear to be laurel leaves. The engraving retains some of its old color, most notably to the saddle blanket, whose stripes are surely meant to recall those on the American flag. The engraving is neither signed nor dated. However, the style of engraving, language of the title, and the use of laid paper together point to an American engraver and printer active during or immediately following the years of the American Revolution. Below I’ll take a stab at the knotty issues of dating and attribution.

I have inspected images of nine other 18th-century impressions of the print and identified at least three variants. Two of the variants, including that offered here, are from the same engraved plate—curiously, cut down so as to leave a circular plate mark—while the third exhibits myriad differences suggesting that it was printed from an entirely different plate. Complicating matters, early-20th-century writers identified at least two counterfeit versions, though one of is readily identifiable by the absence of ¼” of the laurel border at the top. All variants of the engraving are extremely rare. I am aware of institutional holdings only at Mount Vernon, the New Haven Colony Historical Society, and the New York Public Library. Several were auctioned from private collections early in the 20th century, and a small number have been in circulation in recent years, and the location of these is not known.

**DATING THE PORTRAIT**

As mentioned above, the engraving indicates neither artist, engraver nor date. For starters, the reference to the Stars and Stripes on his saddle blanket indicates it was produced after the Continental Congress approved the design of the flag on June 14, 1777. On the other hand, the title of the engraving provides strong evidence for a date no later than early 1789. It describes Washington as “Commander in chief of the American Armies”—a rank he only held from his commissioning on June 19, 1775 through his resignation on December 23, 1783—and makes no mention of his role as President, a role he assumed on his inauguration on April 30, 1789. Though not conclusive, this suggests that print should be dated to no later than early that year.

**AMOS DOOLITTLE?**

Stylistically, the engraving practically screams “American, 1780s”, as its bold and relatively primitive execution surely predates the far more refined works that came to predominate in the 1790s. Assuming I’m right about this, it could have been the work of any number of engravers active in the years 1777-1789. Among others, Amos Doolittle, Peter Rushton Maverick, John Norman, Paul Revere, or even a young Cornelius Tiebout come to mind. A colleague has recently made a plausible argument for an attribution to Doolittle (He also made a case for Revere, but to my mind it’s too weak to merit discussion here.) The case for Doolittle rests in part on the similarities of title between the present portrait and Doolittle’s well-known engraving, “A Display of the United States of America” (ca. 1790). The present portrait reads:


The similarities of language are hardly conclusive, but they’re at least suggestive. There’s also circumstantial evidence supporting a Doolittle attribution. To begin with, the rather naive engraving makes sense in the trajectory of Doolittle’s career. As one biographer observed,

> “By the summer of 1780 Doolittle had a shop on a corner of the Yale College yard and was calling himself a jeweler... it appears that engraving was still an ancillary occupation and that he was attempting only small orders. He may have been still in the learning stage, experimenting with different intaglio processes, before he later settled on line engraving.” (Donald O’Brien, *Amos Doolittle: Engraver of the New Republic* (New Castle: Oak Knoll Press and the American Historical Print Collectors Society, 2008, p. 9)

Furthermore, as discussed above the present engraving was subject to many reworkings. The same is true of Doolittle’s “Display”, which is known in several recorded variants. It is also worth noting that unsigned Doolittle works are known (See, for instance, “The Looking Glass for 1785”.) Last but perhaps not least, The New Haven Colony Museum holds an impression of the print; given its extreme rarity, it is suggestive that one of the very few known impressions resides in the city where Doolittle lived and worked.

Unrecorded proof state of this striking map issued in London in early 1783, just after the signing of the Provisional Treaty of Paris. Only the third known example of any state or edition.

The Provisional Treaty, signed on January 20, 1783, recognized American independence, set the boundaries of the new nation, and marked a formal end to the Revolutionary War. There was naturally enormous interest in the Treaty in Britain, and publishers rushed to produce maps of the United States to meet the demand. The first to market simply dusted off and slightly reworked existing plates to produce their maps, with Carington Bowles winning the race and publishing one on February 4, closely followed on February 9 by Robert Sayer and John Bennett.

Unlike those retreads, this finely-engraved image by John Wallis is an original work, almost certainly designed and engraved after word of the Treaty reached London. It incorporates a simple oval map of the new nation, flanked by full-length portraits of General Washington and master diplomat Benjamin Franklin, the two most significant figures in the struggle for independence. Washington is accompanied by an allegorical figure of Liberty and Franklin by those of Justice and Wisdom. At the head, an angel bearing a laurel wreath blows a trumpet fanfare.

It’s hard to argue with the choice of Washington and Franklin, but it does bring to mind a wonderful line in a 1790 letter by the ever-irritable John Adams: “The history of our Revolution will be one continued Lye from one end to the other. The essence of the whole will be that Dr Franklin’s electrical rod, smote the earth and out spring General Washington. That Franklin electrified him with his rod—and thence forward these two conducted all the policy negotiations, legislation and war.” (Adams to Benjamin Rush, April 4, 1790)

The publication in London of a map celebrating American independence might seem puzzling, but for decades there had been a strong strand of Whiggish sentiment running through the British governing class and commentariat. In issuing this map, Wallis no doubt expected to find a ready market.

The map can be dated to early 1783, because there exists a second state dated March 18, 1783 and bearing the imprint of Wallis and of engravers Thomas Jones Woodman and Henry Mutlow. The only known impression of that variant is held by the British Museum. The map was also re-engraved by an unknown engraver, with the Stars and Stripes added above the map and the Wallis, Woodman and Mutlow imprints replaced by several lines of verse. Per McGuirk this too is known only a single example, in the New York Public Library’s McAlpine Collection, though I have not traced it in the Library’s online catalog. Yet another variant of the map is often encountered on transferware jugs produced in England.


[John Wallis, Untitled Map of the United States. London: John Wallis, February or March 1783.] Engraving on wove paper, 5 7/8” h x 7” w at neat line plus generous margins, some early color. Minor soiling and staining, color rather faded. Very good. $20,000
First edition of one of the great accounts of the American Revolution in the South, the only one published by an American in the years immediately after the war, and the first book granted a copyright by Congress. Compiled and edited by a significant participant who was both a gifted historian and skilled storyteller.

Ramsay’s History

David Ramsay, THE HISTORY OF THE REVOLUTION OF SOUTH-CAROLINA, FROM A BRITISH PROVINCE TO AN INDEPENDENT STATE, BY DAVID RAMSAY, M.D. MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN CONGRESS. IN TWO VOLUMES. Trenton: Isaac Collins, [for David Ramsay], 1785. 2 vols. xx, 453 pp., folding engraved map; xx, 574 pp. 4 folding engraved maps. Full calf with spine labels in gilt and arms of William Stuart in gilt on front and rear boards. Ownership inscription of Foster Alexander Sondley (1857-1931) on front free endpapers, bookplate of Sondley Reference Library (Asheville, NC) on front pastedowns. Text generally clean, with minor offsetting, very occasional minor foxing, occasional pencil markings, and some staining to pp. 196-197. Bindings somewhat worn, with cracks at spines and some loss to endcaps. Still, a very nice set. > $15,000

AN IMPORTANT HISTORY OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE SOUTH, BY AN EYEWITNESS

First of its kind, Ramsay began compiling the History, largely based on the Annual Register, which had been published in London since 1758 and remains so today. On this framework, Ramsay superimposed materials from his own personal experience and those of his colleagues and friends. Despite the title, the book contains not only a full account “of the operations of the late war in South-Carolina, but in a great measure those of the states of Virginia, North-Carolina and Georgia” (London New-York Packet, no. 558 (Jan. 12, 1786), p. 3). Ramsay also appended to each volume a long “Notes” section, in which he reproduced complete texts of many documents, including items of general interest such as the Declaration of Independence and Articles of Confederation but also proclamations, surrender terms, casualty lists and other material germane to the Revolution in the South.

The importance and value of the History is greatly enhanced by a suite of five maps relating to the southern theatre of the Revolution. These include a map of the June 1776 Battle of Sullivan’s Island before Charleston; a map of South Carolina and adjacent areas, showing the routes of the American and British armies; two maps relating to the British siege and capture of Charleston in 1780; and a plan of the Battle of Yorktown. The maps are particularly significant as near-contemporary depictions of events, and all the more interesting for having been engraved in Charleston by Thomas Abernethie. Both volumes of this set bear the gilt arms of William Stuart (1798-1874) of Tempford Hall in Bedfordshire and Aldenham Abbey in Hertfordshire. He served several terms in Parliament and was a grandson of the much-maligned third Earl of Bute, a favourite of George III who served as Prime Minister in 1762-1765.

Ramsay’s Later Life and Death

After the war, Ramsay served from 1782 to 1786 as a South Carolina delegate to the Continental Congress, with a brief stint as Acting President in the absence of John Hancock. Thereafter he served three terms in the South Carolina Senate and was for a time its President. He continued with his historical writing, publishing a two-volume History of the American Revolution (1789), a biography of George Washington (1807), and a three-volume History of the United States (published posthumously in 1816-1817).

Ramsay has a further, unfortunate claim to fame. In 1815, after Ramsay gave evidence against him in court, one William Linnen, a tailor, was found to be deranged and consequently confined. After his release, Linnen encountered Ramsay on Broad Street in Charleston and shot him twice in the back. Ramsay died of his wounds two days later.

In all, a very nice copy of an important history of the American Revolution in the South, by a significant and well-connected eyewitness to events and with interesting provenance.


Full tree calf, boards and spines stamped in gilt, spines with red and black morocco lettering pieces. Without the list of subscribers usually found in volume 1. “Frederic van Heller 1839” inscribed in ink on ffep of each volume. Very minor scattered foxing, some misfolding and offset to maps, and minor insect damage and a few repairs to boards.

$10,000

EARLY HISTORY OF THE REVOLUTION, IN LOVELY PERIOD BINDINGS

“A lovely copy of one of the earliest comprehensive histories of the American Revolution, much enhanced by an interesting suite of maps.”

According to the Preface, author William Gordon resolved in early 1776 to compile a history of the conflict and to that end “gathered from every source of intelligence in his power”, “whether oral, written, or printed” (1.6,7). He avidly consumed the contemporary press and other printed sources, was granted access to the records of both the Continental Congress and the State of Massachusetts, and communicated with Generals Washinton, Gates, Greene and others, even being allowed “a liberal examination of their papers, both of a public and more private nature.” The result is a mammoth work of over 2000 pages, presented as a series of letters from Gordon to an unnamed friend.

The first volume features short histories of each colony, the French and Indian War, and the controversies leading up to the Revolution. The succeeding volumes follow the Revolution chronologically, with some attention to related events elsewhere in England, Europe and the Caribbean. Though Gordon was deeply sympathetic to the American cause, the work strikes me as surprisingly evenhanded: To give but one example, his account of the

William Gordon, [1737/8-1807]

Gordon was a native of Hertfordshire, studied for the (dissenting) ministry in London, and between 1752 and 1770 held a series of ministerial positions in his home county. One biographer describes him as a man of “ready wit and active mind, strong in his opinions”, but one viewed by others as “forth-putting”, “officious”, “arrogant” and “rude”. In 1770, perhaps having burned bridges at home but also impelled by “a growing sympathy for the American cause”, Gordon emigrated to Massachusetts. By 1771 or 1772 he was pastor of the Third Congregational Church in Roxbury, a position he held until his return to England in 1786. Whatever his defects of personality, he was held in sufficient esteem to receive honorary degrees from the College of New Jersey (now Princeton), Harvard and Yale. At some point he was appointed chaplain to both houses of the Massachusetts legislature, though he was eventually “removed… for including pointed personal remarks in his prayers.” (Pilcher, pp. 449, 450).

Gordon had a gift for making enemies, among other things accusing John Hancock of misusing funds in his position as Treasurer of Harvard College, and charging Alexander Hamilton with seeking to overthrow the
Continental Congress and establish General Washington as head of a new government (Pilcher, 452). This leads me to wonder at the extraordinary degree of access he claims to have been given while writing the History. Perhaps he was lying about this. Or maybe he was not as obnoxious as Pilcher indicates, or perhaps he was, but this was outweighed by other, stellar qualities.

In any event, Gordon’s penchant for conflict caught up with him. In 1786, after losing his position at the Roxbury church and being attacked in the press, he pulled up stakes and returned to England. Two years later, after revising his manuscript—originally judged by many in England to be “too favorable to the American cause” (Pilcher, 453)—he published the History in 1788. From 1789 to 1802 Gordon held a pastorate in Huntingdonshire. After resigning that position he returned to Ipswich—where he’d begun his ministry in 1752—and declined into senility and poverty, supported by his friends. He died there in 1807. After his death the reputation of his History seems to have gone up and down, but Sabin praised him as “one of the most impartial and reliable of the numerous historians of the American Revolution”, while Pilcher asserts that he “strikes a modern and sophisticated note while still preserving the timeliness of the 1780s.” (Pilcher, p. 464)

In all, a lovely set of a fine history of the American Revolution, by a complicated man.


Two frontis portraits, full-page view, and 8 engraved, folding maps and plans. Contemporary tree calf, rebacked to style with original gilt morocco spine label laid on. Minor-to-moderate foxing and offset to text and maps. Saratoga map with a silver excised at upper center, reinstated in facsimile. Yorktown map with small closure at mount point. Early ink ownership inscription to front free endpaper. $25,000

A very rare American military periodical, issued in parts in 1796-1797, including a history of the Revolutionary War illustrated by a suite of maps, plans, portraits, and a view. Not normally recognized as such, but unquestionably the first military atlas published in the United States. An April 16, 1796 advert in the Aurora General Advertiser tells the story:

“This Work will treat occasionally of every thing belonging to the Military Science that can be useful or interesting. It will give Instructions for Officers, Subalterns, and others; Treatises on Tactics, Artillery, Gunnery, Fortifications, &c. Military Anecdotes. Biographies of distinguished Military Men. Descriptions of the great Battles and Sieges renowned in History, as well ancient as modern, the Interesting Parts of Histories, so far as they relate to Military Achievements — such as Revolutions of Empires, the Overthrow of States, &c. with Plans, Maps, Historic Plates, &c. Of the principal Battles and Actions fought during the American Revolutions, Descriptions in a Military Point of View will be given, accompanied with engraved Military Plans.”

In the preliminaries to Volume I, compiler Charles Smith (1768-1808) admits that the Repository was to be largely derivative of other works, though he also refers to “some rare and valuable manuscripts with which he has been favoured, [which] will furnish him with a copious supply of original matter.” Sabin states that the Revolutionary War content was “said to have been supplied by Baron Steuben and General Gates”, though he does not specify whether the supplied material was in manuscript or print.

A very rare American military periodical, issued in parts in 1796-1797, including a history of the Revolutionary War illustrated by a suite of maps, plans, portraits, and a view. Not normally recognized as such, but unquestionably the first military atlas published in the United States. An April 16, 1796 advert in the Aurora General Advertiser tells the story:

“This Work will treat occasionally of every thing belonging to the Military Science that can be useful or interesting. It will give Instructions for Officers, Subalterns, and others; Treatises on Tactics, Artillery, Gunnery, Fortifications, &c. Military Anecdotes. Biographies of distinguished Military Men. Descriptions of the great Battles and Sieges renowned in History, as well ancient as modern, the Interesting Parts of Histories, so far as they relate to Military Achievements — such as Revolutions of Empires, the Overthrow of States, &c. with Plans, Maps, Historic Plates, &c. Of the principal Battles and Actions fought during the American Revolutions, Descriptions in a Military Point of View will be given, accompanied with engraved Military Plans.”

In the preliminaries to Volume I, compiler Charles Smith (1768-1808) admits that the Repository was to be largely derivative of other works, though he also refers to “some rare and valuable manuscripts with which he has been favoured, [which] will furnish him with a copious supply of original matter.” Sabin states that the Revolutionary War content was “said to have been supplied by Baron Steuben and General Gates”, though he does not specify whether the supplied material was in manuscript or print.
Of particular note are the eight maps and battle plans, including the United States, Bunker Hill, Quebec, White Plains, Yorktown, Savannah, Charleston, and Saratoga, though for some reason several are bound out of chronological order. The most impressive of these is the quite large (16 ¾" x 15½") plan of the Battle of Yorktown, a derivative of the highly-important and very rare plan published by Sebastian Bauman in Philadelphia in 1782. Presumably because it was issued in parts, surviving copies of the *Monthly Military Repository* vary considerably with respect to the engravings. This copy has the full complement of seven battle plans, plus a map of the United States only rarely found. It also has three of the five plates—the view of Quebec and portraits of George Washington and Anthony Wayne—but lacks the portrait of Nathaniel Greene and the plate titled “Scale of 15 Toises”.

The *Repository* is very rare on the market. *Rare Book Hub* records only three more-or-less complete sets having appeared since 1970. In 1797 Smith gathered together the Revolutionary War content, had the type “mostly reset” (or so says Sabin), and re-published the material as *The American War, from 1775 to 1783 with Plans*. That too is very rare, with *Rare Book Hub* recording only two copies on the market since 1960, one imperfect.

In all, an early, interesting, and quite rare American military history of the Revolutionary War, and the first military atlas published in the United States.

Cole, Church Catalogue of Americana (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1907); 1275; ESTC P4574; Evans, 30807 (vol. I) and 32492 (vol. II). Howes, S581 (listing *The American War*). Sabin, 82379. OCLC is a mess for this title, so I’m not even going to go there. The individual maps and plans are variously listed in Jolly. Maps of America in Periodicals before 1800 and Wheat & Brun.
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