CARDIFF CORVEY

READING THE ROMANTIC TEXT

Issue 12

(Summer 2004)

Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research
Cardiff University

Cardiff Corvey is available on the web @ *www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey*

ISSN 1471-5988

Published by the Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, Cardiff University.
Typeset in Adobe Garamond Pro 11 / 12.5, using Adobe InDesign CS; images and illustrations prepared using Adobe Illustrator CS and Adobe PhotoShop CS; final output rendered with Adobe Acrobat 6 Professional.

Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text is a fully peer-reviewed academic journal (as of Issue 5, November 2000), appearing online in Summer and Winter of each year. Based in Cardiff University's Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, *Cardiff Corvey* provides a variety of information, including articles, bibliographical material, conference details, and sample texts.

Submissions

This periodical is only as substantial as the material it contains: therefore, we more than welcome any contributions that members of the academic community might wish to make. Articles we would be most interested in publishing include those addressing Romantic literary studies with an especial slant on book history, textual and bibliographical studies, the literary marketplace and the publishing world, and so forth. Papers of 5–8,000 words should be submitted by the beginning of April or October in order to make the next issue, if accepted. Any of the usual electronic formats (e.g. RTF, Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, HTML) are acceptable, either by post or e-mail. Submissions should be sent to Dr Anthony Mandal, Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, ENCAP, Cardiff University, PO Box 94, Cardiff CF10 3XB, Wales (UK), *mandal@cardiff.ac.uk*.

CONTENTS

A Note on the Retirment of Professor Peter Garside

This issue of *Cardiff Corvey* sees the retirement of Professor Peter Garside, following thirty-seven years as a member of the English faculty at Cardiff University and seven years as Chair of the Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research (CEIR). Over the course of his career, Professor Garside has gained an international reputation for his invaluable contribution to bibliographical and textual scholarship. Over the last thirty years, he has written numerous articles and edited a number of anthologies that focus specifically on contextualising the print culture of the Romantic period.

A more recent achievement—the culmination of over ten years' research by Professor Garside into the Romantic period and his involvement with the Corvey Library—was the publication of the groundbreaking bibliography of fiction, *The English Novel 1770–1829*, co-edited with James Raven and Rainer Schöwerling (OUP, 2000). This record was later extended, in a British Academy-funded project spanning the years 1830–36, which had been available via the *Cardiff Corvey* website since June 2003. Taken as a whole, these surveys provide for the first time an accurate and comprehensive account of fiction published during an era that witnessed the birth of the modern novel-publishing industry.

The breadth of Professor Garside's bibliographical expertise is complemented by his editorial work, which demonstrates a mind as attentive to close detail as it is to the broader context. Although this facet of his academic career has focused in the main on the Scottish Romantic novelists Walter Scott and James Hogg, other editions he has prepared have made lesser-known writers such as Amelia Opie and Mary Robinson accessible to a wider audience.

As founding Chair of CEIR, Professor Garside has established a research centre where traditional scholarly rigour has been combined with cutting-edge developments in Information Technology, giving a distinctively modern slant to the field of book history. Two large-scale digital projects based in CEIR have translated his expertise and experience into a broader framework: *British Fiction, 1800–1829: A Database of Production, Circulation & Reception* and *The English Novel, 1830–36*. On a more personal level, Professor Garside has also supervised a number of successful doctoral projects that have been housed within CEIR.

Although he will be retiring from the front lines of CEIR in October 2004, Peter will continue to be involved in a number of key research projects over the next three years, including the preparation of new editions of Hogg's

The Forest Minstrel and Scott's *Waverley*, and co-editing *The Oxford Encyclopaedia of British Fiction, 1789–1836*. We at *Cardiff Corvey* would like to take this opportunity to thank Peter for his wisdom, leadership, and encouragement over the years. We wish him well as he steps down as Chair of CEIR and assumes a gentler pace of life (!!) in the coming years.

'Shadows of Beauty, Shadows of Power'

Heroism, Deformity, and Classical Allusion in Joshua Pickersgill's *The Three Brothers* and Byron's *The Deformed Transformed*

Imke Heuer

In the preface to his dramatic fragment *The Deformed Transformed* (1822), Byron acknowledges it to be partly based on *The Three Brothers* (1803), a Gothic romance by Joshua Pickersgill.[1] Most studies on *The Deformed Transformed* have stated that Pickersgill's impact on Byron's drama was only superficial, and that the novel was not interesting for its own sake.[2] However, *The Three Brothers* is an original and complex novel which is more important to Byron's *oeuvre* than is usually acknowledged. In the first part of my essay, I introduce Pickersgill's novel and briefly show how his main character foreshadows the Byronic Hero. The remaining part of the essay discusses Byron's creative adaptation of Pickersgill's use of classical characters to reinforce his play with a complex set of intertextual classical allusions both in order to elaborate on the question of the extent to which personal identity and freedom are dependent on outward appearance, and to question the concept of heroism and war as a 'heroic' endeavour.

I

Written in 1803, Pickersgill's romance shares elements both with the Gothic novel and historical fiction. Pickersgill remained an almost unknown writer during his lifetime; when *The Three Brothers* was reviewed in *The Gentleman's Magazine* in 1804, the reviewer knew him 'only by name'.[3] According to a personal comment on his authorship in the last chapter of his novel, he was a very young author—he commenced the novel at the age of nineteen and worked on it for two-and-a-half years (iv, 459f.). Although the book shows him as a promising novelist, he apparently wrote nothing else.[4] The name might even have been a pseudonym—one of the reviewers of *The Deformed Transformed* who mentioned *The Three Brothers* as Byron's source, attributed it to Matthew Gregory Lewis ('for though published under another name, it is his').[5]

Like many Gothic romances, *The Three Brothers* has a complex structure with several stories-within-the-story. In its entirety, the time dimension of the story spans about twenty years (i, 147) and is set in France and Italy during the

first half of the sixteenth century. Like many historical novelists, Pickersgill focuses upon a 'transitional time in history', a period of wars and changes.[6] The Renaissance setting is used largely as a colourful background, although the particular violence of the period is emphasised. Still, the writer is aware he is writing about an epoch which in beliefs and customs is different from his own. Occasionally, he includes footnotes with background information, and informs his 'historical reader' (III, 332) about liberties taken with dates (II, 177; III, 332). *The Three Brothers* has comparatively few supernatural elements—it belongs to a sub-genre of the Gothic novel which could be termed 'historical fantasy'.[7]

As the title suggests, this is a story about family relationships, with sins and secrets of the past returning to haunt the present. The reader does not know at first that the three main characters Henri, Claudio, and Julian are in fact brothers. Their relationship and true identities are only revealed in Julian's long confession towards the end of the fourth volume (IV, 228–368), which is the most interesting and dense part of the novel, and the part I will focus on in this paper.

In his first-person narrative, the severely wounded Julian reveals his origins and background. He was born as Arnaud, the illegitimate eldest son of the Marquis de Souvricourt and his lover, a nun who has left her order. Arnaud is initially witty and charming (II, 68f.), a child 'extraordinary in Beauty and Intellect' (IV, 229).[8] As a boy, he is unaware of his illegitimacy, and is spoilt by both his parents and everyone around him. The narrator describes his education as unsystematic and superficial (IV, 229–33). His arrogance and his reliance on charm are blamed on his aristocratic upbringing, which fosters manners and wit, rather than inner values such as the capacity for deep feelings (IV, 237).

At the age of eight, however, Arnaud is robbed by a group of banditti, who injure his shoulder and his spine (IV, 240–44), leaving him crippled, or as his father puts it, a 'mass of Deformity' (IV, 246). With his beauty, he also loses the affection of his parents and his cherished position in the polite circles of his family (II, 68f.). His deformity makes him look sublime rather than beautiful, and consequently the change in his looks also causes him to lose the 'effeminate' quality with which 'beauty' was associated in the eighteenth century, as well as the capacity to be loved. Pickersgill was probably informed by Edmund Burke's influential essay on the Sublime and the Beautiful of 1757.[9] In Burke's conceptual model, the effects of the Sublime and the Beautiful are opposed and not reconcilable (Burke, II, 1, 2; III, 13). Interestingly Arnaud's confessor later tells him that '[t]here is oftentimes a sublimity in deformity' (*Three Brothers*, IV, 372), and that deformity can therefore be associated with greatness.

Thus, as Arnaud ceases to look sweet and effeminate, he is no longer treated as a brilliant and exceptional child, and his parents start to favour his younger brother Lewis over him (IV, 251f.).[10] He becomes embittered and jealous, and his wit is transformed into sarcasm. His extreme feeling of insufficiency makes him project his hate onto his younger brother, who resembles his own former self, as Arnaud himself recognises. When the family is eventually transferred

to Italy because of the Marquis's involvement in the wars, Arnaud attempts to kill his brother out of envy (IV, 257).

When he is older, he develops an intense self-hatred but nevertheless retains the arrogance and feeling of superiority from his childhood, as well as his high ambitions (IV, 261–74). He is further humiliated when he learns of his illegitimacy and of his legitimate younger half-brother Henri, who is heir to the Marquis (IV, 286–90). In the circles in which Arnaud has grown up, illegitimacy is at least as great a social 'disability' as actual physical deformity, so in a sense, he is now doubly deformed.[11] Arnaud and his mother are sent into exile to a small village where he is insulted and avoided by the superstitious peasants. His banishment from aristocratic society and domesticity to the obscurity of a remote village, a wild, 'unformed' place, corresponds with Arnaud's bodily change from beauty to sublimity.[12]

Following the death of his wife, the Marquis returns to Arnaud's mother, but when Arnaud forces him to propose marriage to her, his father has him arrested as an impostor (IV, 318–23). Arnaud manages to escape and finds shelter in the house of a young woman he has fallen in love with, only to find out that she is his father's mistress (IV, 327–33). In horror and desperation, he flees into the woods where (in contrast to Byron's Arnold) he deliberately seeks the aid of the Devil to obtain a new body (IV, 344–48). Pickersgill's Satan shows him the images of several heroes from classical Greek history; Arnaud opts for the form of Demetrius Poliorcetes (IV, 347).[13] Like the diabolical Stranger in Byron's fragment, the Devil does not make any conditions (IV, 364), probably convinced that Arnaud's own disposition will lead him into damnation. However, it is implied that he forfeits his soul (and indeed, his life) through the transformation: in order to assume the new body, he has to kill himself (IV, 359), and thus commits the deadly sin of suicide. Thus, the transformation implies Arnaud's death, and his future career, is that of a ghost in a body not his own. He adopts the name of Julian (IV, 348); through marriage, he manages to obtain a noble title (I, 112–31; IV, 355), turns a bandit captain (II, 196–200; IV, 359), and takes revenge on his family.[14] Yet despite his beauty and power, he is incapable of love and happiness (IV, 355), and suffers from the knowledge of his guilt (IV, 362).[15] After he is persecuted for his deeds, he seeks a second transformation, for which the Devil demands a human sacrifice (IV, 364f.). Arnaud comes close to killing his enemy Claudio, but hesitates when he recognises him as his lost brother Lewis (IV, 198–200, 204). He even saves Lewis from his persecutor Henri, whom he gives a deadly fatal wound, but is himself wounded (IV, 219f.). He is handed over to the secular authorities, and sentenced to death (IV, 386). However, before the execution, he is freed from his false body, which in a haunting scene is executed as a mobile, but empty and soulless form (IV, 394–97).

Although the novel can be aptly called uneven in quality, its particular strength lies in the description of its protagonist and the way he is employed

for Pickersgill's criticism of aristocratic rule and lifestyle.[16] His reviewer in *The Gentleman's Magazine* was fascinated by the character of Julian, and the reviewer of *The Deformed Transformed* in the *New European Magazine* calls Pickersgill's main character 'a bold-faced, interesting villain; one that […] is at once mysterious, as well as ardent'.[17] Julian may well have been a direct influence on the Byronic Hero, whom he prefigures in several aspects:

> Hastily turning round, they beheld a Cavalier of a thrice noble and stately mien: his figure grand and august seemed fashioned in the vast capacity of an Herculean mould; and as they surveyed his supple limbs of peerless symmetry, they secretly acknowledged 'twas wrong to fancy humanity could not reach perfection. He looked attentively to the Chevalier, slightly inclining a head nature wisely might make her boast. His full dark eyes humbled the gaze of beholders, and his proud lip, thickened with disdain, projected conscious superiority to men, and self independence of aught earthly. His high forehead was crowned with hair black as jet, which in waving curls wantoned about his temples, and crescent eyebrows of a fellow hue, strikingly contrasted with the polished whiteness of an unblemished skin. His attire was becomingly simple, for a king's parade could not have added grace to what was altogether majesty […] They might have judged him even as young as themselves, but the significance of his eye-beam, the expressiveness of his motion, proved him far ripened beyond the greenness of immaturity; and with superstitious fancy they even doubted if that aspect could ever have known the vacant smile of babyhood. The heedlessness of his bow Henri in another would have treated resentfully, but before him his spirits sunk for an interval awestruck […] (I, 49–51)

It has long been recognised that the Gothic villain was one of the many influences on the Byronic Hero, with whom he shares his mysterious, guilty past, giving him tormenting memories, a dark, arrogant look, and a sense of superiority. Indeed, the descriptions of Radcliffe's villains resemble those of Byron as much as the description of Arnaud does.[18] However, the complex character of Arnaud, particularly those elements that Byron used for his conception of *The Deformed Transformed*, not only resembles several of Byron's protagonists, there are also specific parallels in the summary of their characterisation:

> his was a stupendous soul in a diminutive body. He was so Proud of Himself, that disdain was his usual feeling towards others […] He esteemed himself born to confer, not to receive favours. In him pride was downcast and solitary: because it could not look up to superiority, it restrained him aloof from other men: it was truly satanic, and would have lost him divinity in the idea, That better it be to reign in hell, than to serve in heaven. Yet it was a pride

> not dis-natured to magnanimity, being generous and courageous. But as with a detestation of what is knavish and abject, it joined a contempt for that which is meek and humble, it was entirely unchristian; though, nevertheless, it was grand. (IV, 261–64)

Arnaud's pride is a typical character-trait of Gothic villains, but it is also shared by several of Byron's heroes, most prominently Manfred and the protagonists of the Oriental tales, where its anti-Christian aspect is equally stressed. It puts them at odds with the social order and makes them vulnerable to satanic temptations because they are not able to accept an ordinary position in life.[19]

> In him were of all the germs that is heroically good [*sic*], all that is heroically wicked, but none of what is ignoble or knavish. No virtue but of which he bore some vestige; no vice of which he had not some taint; but passion was his bane; passion mingled with virtues and vices beyond the discrimination of an ordinary analysis. (IV, 274)

Arnaud's change from extraordinary beauty to deformity and ugliness (and later vice versa) equally emphasises that, no matter what he looks like, he is an exceptional character, his appearance always extraordinary and larger than life. According to Burke, the opposite of beauty is not deformity, but 'the common form'. As Burke puts it, 'the beautiful strikes as much by its novelty as the deformed itself' (III, 6). Even after his injury, Arnaud shows an extremity that is an expression of his superiority. The description of Arnaud's portrait as an adolescent, before his career as Julian, strongly resembles Byron's presentation of the contradictory, but grand character of the protagonist, particularly in *Lara*:

> In him inexplicably mix'd appeared
> Much to be loved and hated, sought and feared; […]
> There was in him a vital scorn of all:
> As if the worst had fall'n which would befall,
> He stood a stranger in this breathing world,
> An erring spirit from another hurl'd; […]
> Too high for common selfishness, he could
> At times resign his own for others' good,
> But not in pity, not because he ought,
> But in some strange perversity of thought,
> That swayed him onward with a secret pride
> To do what few or none would do beside;
> And this same impulse would in tempting time
> Mislead his spirit equally to crime;
> So much he soared beyond, or sunk beneath
> The men with whom he felt condemned to breathe,
> And longed for good or ill to separate
> Himself from all who shared his mortal state […]

(*Lara*, ll. 289–348)

In fact, Byron's own protagonist Arnold in *The Deformed Transformed* seems to be much less 'Byronic' than Pickersgill's Arnaud. In contrast to aristocratic Arnaud, Arnold is born deformed and of obscure origin. His mother addresses him with words like 'hedgehog' (I. 1. 20) or 'incubus' (I. 1. 2), which put him on a sub-human level.

From Arnold's point of view, the tragedy of his situation is not so much his deformity itself, but the fact that he is convinced he is unable to be loved. Arnold sees his status as an outcast as a direct result of his multiple disabilities. When he sees his mirror-image in a spring, he 'starts back' (stage direction after I. 1. 46) and admits that 'They are right' (I. 1. 46) to despise him. He does not question a society which excludes him from any community with other people because he accepts the notion of being 'Other' and therefore necessarily excluded. In connection to Burke's concept of the Beautiful and the Sublime, it is interesting to see that Arnold, in his own body, is convinced he could be admired and feared, but not loved. Thus, people would react to him as to a sublime presence, and the qualities that make a person lovable are outside him.[20]

II

The Three Brothers inspired Byron's complex use of allusions from classical history and mythology which are such an important element in *The Deformed Transformed*. When Arnaud in *The Three Brothers* calls for the Devil to give him another body, the Devil gives him the choice of the shapes of several heroes from classical antiquity:

> The satanic gaze turned on the side of the cavern heat so powerful, that the clay in the interstices was absumed to an ash, and the flinty rock vitrified into glass pervious to the sight of Arnaud, who saw thereon visions admirable and amazing. There past in liveliest portraiture the various men distinguished for that beauty and grace, which Arnaud so much desired, that he was ambitious to purchase them with his soul. He felt that it was his part to chuse whom he would resemble, yet he remained unresolved, though the spectator of an hundred shades of renown, among which glided by Achilles and Alexander, Alcebiades and Hephestian: at length appeared the supernatural effigy of a man, whose perfections human artist never could depict or insculp—Demetrius the son of Antigonus. Arnaud's heart heaved quick with preference […] (IV, 347f.)

The choice of the Greek heroes at Arnaud's disposal is significant—although they otherwise differ in their image and career, all of them were famous for their extraordinary beauty (see, for instance, Plutarch, *Demetrius*, II; *Alexander*, IV; *Alcibiades*, I). Pickersgill's immediate source for this list was probably Plutarch's *Lives*,[21] whose biographies of famous Greeks and Romans were very popular in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[22]

Arnaud's eventual choice of the body of 'Demetrius the son of Antigonus' is also an evident allusion. In Plutarch's biography of Demetrius, the Macedonian king and conqueror (336–283 BC), who spent his last years as a prisoner, is described as 'flawed', somebody to be viewed as a negative example rather than a positive one (*Demetrius,* I). Like Pickersgill's Arnaud/Julian, he is a 'mixed' character whose nature 'exhibit[s] great vices also, as well as great virtues' (*Demetrius*, I). This is echoed in Pickersgill's characterisation of Arnaud as one both 'heroically great' and 'heroically wicked' (IV, 274). In addition, Demetrius' epithet *poliorcetes* ('besieger of cities'; *Demetrius*, XLII) suggests a destructive quality, which is also a characteristic of Arnaud in his later career as a bandit. The name Julian, which he adopts after his transformation, is also an example of Pickersgill's use of classical allusions, for it suggests Julian the Apostate (AD 331–363, Emperor AD 361–363), the Roman Emperor in late Antiquity who renounced the Christian faith (*Apoštata* means 'the renegade'), and attempted to restore the traditional polytheistic Romano–Greek religion.[23]

Byron takes up Pickersgill's use of classical characters, but he develops it into a complex set of intertextual allusions. In *The Deformed Transformed*, the Stranger gives Arnold a choice similar to Arnaud's: he conjures up the shades of Julius Caesar, Alcibiades, Socrates, Mark Anthony, Demetrius Poliorcetes, and Achilles. But while Pickersgill simply gives the reader a list of the bodies his protagonist is to choose from, the Stranger elaborates on the various characters he shows Arnold, who himself comments on their looks. The Stranger introduces them, in most cases not calling them by their names, but describing their character and destiny so that they are easily recognisable for a classically educated reader.[24] Thus, he says of Caesar that 'Rome became / His, and all their's who heired his very name' (I. 1. 189f.), and Anthony is described as 'the man who lost / The ancient world for love' (I. 1. 236f.). For most characters, except for Socrates (whose description is probably taken from Plato's *Symposium*)[25] and Achilles, Byron's main source was evidently Plutarch, from whom he took several details such as Anthony's likeness both to Hercules and Bacchus (*Antonius*, IV, LX).

The choice of shapes shown to Arnold differs from the one given in *The Three Brothers* in a significant way. Not only does Byron add Roman characters to Pickersgill's Greek ones, but, although the Stranger invokes the shapes as 'shadows of beauty' and 'shadows of 'power' (I. 1. 157f.), not all of them are marked by extraordinary bodily perfection, and in fact most are actually flawed. Caesar's baldness (I. 1. 190) and Socrates' ugliness (I. 1. 217–20) are commented on in the play. Alcibiades spoke with a lisp (Plutarch, *Alcibiades*, I), and, according to legend, Achilles had, of course, his eponymous weak heel, his only vulnerable part, which became the cause of his death. Antonius and Demetrius did not have a bodily ailment, but are both said to have been addicted to alcohol (Plutarch, *Antonius*, IV; *Demetrius*, I).[26] The Stranger uses the shapes to show Arnold that 'greatness' does not depend on bodily perfection, that freedom and achievement are a matter of strength and independence of

mind. Arnold himself is aware that the outward appearance does not necessarily correspond to the inner values. In his famous monologue on deformity, Arnold himself recognises the masculine, 'overtaking' effect a deformed body may have. In his view, a bodily disadvantage may even be a spur for major achievements (I. i. 317f.):

> I ask not
> For Valour, since Deformity is daring.
> It is its essence to overtake mankind
> By heart and soul, and make itself the equal—
> Aye, the superior to the rest. There is
> A spur in its halt movements, to become
> All that the others cannot, in such things
> As still are free to both, to compensate
> For stepdame Nature's avarice at first.
> They woo with fearless deeds the smiles of fortune,
> And oft, like Timour the lame Tartar, win them.
>
> (I. i. 312–22)

Apart from the psychological effect a deformity might have as a spur, his remark suggests that, in contrast to beauty, deformity has an awe-inspiring effect on the viewer. Bodily 'otherness' must not necessarily mean weakness, but can be associated with strength, masculinity (in contrast to 'feminine' beauty), and heroism.[27] This connection is already suggested in the description of Arnaud in *The Three Brothers*, which is probably why Byron as a teenager was attracted to the story.[28] In 1805, as a pupil in Harrow, he made a list of famous men, marking all those who had a disability.[29] Byron was evidently fascinated by the combination of bodily deformity, beauty, and fame. Attractive yet flawed bodies like those of Alcibiades or Achilles seem to suggest that beauty and sublimity do not necessarily exclude each other, but can appear in one individual. Consequently, considering the gendered connotations these qualities both have to feminine and masculine traits, the contrast between each adds to their quality of being larger than life. As the Stranger comments, 'The greatest / Deformity should only barter with / The extremest beauty, if the proverb's true / Of mortals, that extremes meet' (I. i. 284–87). The fragment's concept of heroism is thus a combination of the sublime and the beautiful, of masculinity and effeminacy, transcending gender boundaries, and a product of hybridity. However, in the Stranger's 'shadows', the contrast between their opposed qualities makes these attributes even more prominent. Byron contests the Burkean notion that the blending of beautiful and sublime qualities in one object or individual weakens the power of both (see Burke, III, 13 and 27). While many of Byron's characters transcend gendered categories, in the experimental, over-the-top fragment the idea of the 'hybrid' hero is taken to grotesque extremes, when the Stranger describes Arnold's deformities as misplaced animal features:

> Were I to taunt a buffalo with this
> Cloven foot of thine, or the swift dromedary
> With thy sublime of humps, the animals
> Would revel in the compliment. […]
> Thy form is natural: 'twas only
> Nature's mistaken largess to bestow
> The gifts which are of others upon man. (I. 1. 103–112)

The Stranger rejects the concept of the superiority of Man over Animal, and of the beautiful over the deformed body, claiming instead that 'unto spirit / All clay is of equal merit' (I. 1. 456f). Despite its obvious absurdity, the statement, rejects the derogatory concept of 'deformity' as 'unnatural' and reflects Byron's fascination for the idiosyncratic body and his defiance of the notion of purity.[30]

The Stranger's comments about the characters he conjures up subvert a tradition which glorifies war as an heroic enterprise and conquerors as heroes and role models. His emphasis is instead on their destructive quality. Thus, in his incantation he summons 'the shape of each Victor / From Macedon's boy / To each high Roman's picture, / *Who breathed to destroy*' (I. 1. 177–80; my italics). He stresses that military glory is only achieved through destruction: when Arnold wonders that the disappearing shadow of Julius Caesar, 'the man who shook the earth', 'is gone / And left no footstep' (I. 1. 203f.), the Stranger also describes Caesar as a destroyer: 'His substance / Left graves enough, and woes enough, and fame / More than enough to track his memory' (I. 1. 204–06). In this, the play rejects an idealised image of classical heroism and warfare. In the context of the play's preoccupation with war and violence, it is also significant that all characters shown to Arnold had a violent death of unnatural causes, except for Demetrius who, however, died a prisoner in a foreign country (Plutarch, *Demetrius*, LII, LIII). Pickersgill's Alexander and Hephaistion, who, although young, both died of natural causes are notably absent in *The Deformed Transformed* (see Plutarch, *Alexander*, LXXII, LXXVI). Thus, the choice illustrates the point the play makes about the violence inherent in Western culture, and also gives a hint that the Stranger's offer will ultimately bring Arnold to a violent end.

In *The Three Brothers*, Joshua Pickersgill presents a society of cruelty and violence on different levels. The book opens with the description of a village emptied of its young men because of a current military expedition (I, 4–6). The story is filled with military campaigns that give the reader the impression that this is a world permanently and senselessly at war. It is a similar world of chaos and violence that Byron's Arnold enters after his transformation. As his main wish is to experience life in its fullness, he tells Caesar that he wants to go 'Where the world / Is thickest, that I may behold it in / Its workings' (I. 1. 493–95). Caesar's answer shows that Byron adapts Pickersgill's dark concept of human culture:

> That's to say, where there is War
> And Woman in activity. Let's see!
> Spain—Italy—the new Atlantic world—
> Afric with all its Moors. In very truth,
> There is small choice: the whole race are just now
> Tugging as usual at each other's hearts. (I. 1. 495–500)

Thus, when Arnold chooses to go to Rome, it is not surprising he finds it at a moment when it is under siege. At this point, relatively late, the story which started out in a remote forest moves into a concrete historical situation: the *Sacco di Roma*, the conquest and plundering of Rome, which took place on 5 May 1527.[31] Even though Demetrius, 'Taker of cities' (I. 1. 259), would have been an equally appropriate choice in the context of the *Sacco di Roma,* Byron's hero opts instead for Achilles. So fixed is Arnold on physical beauty as the only means to happiness that he can only be content with the ideal, superhuman beauty of a mythological rather than historical character.

Unlike Pickersgill's hero, Arnold claims not to have any grand, overreaching aspirations or a lust for power. Although he knows that even in his own body he could 'be feared, admired, respected, loved' (I. 1. 359), he is convinced he could not be loved by 'those next to me, of whom I / Would be beloved'.[32] As he says, he wishes primarily to be loved by those close to him (I. 1. 358–61), to be part of the community and belong with and be accepted by the others. However, his later choice to assume the form of the mythological war hero Achilles (which Byron's character opts for instead of the body of Demetrius), suggests that he also desires superiority and greatness.[33] His true desire is to be free from the limits of his existence; in this aspiration, Arnold resembles other Byronic overreachers such as Manfred, Cain or Lucifer, from whom he otherwise seems to be different in his wish for private, domestic happiness. Appropriately, like Byron's Manfred (II. 2. 150–62) and Cain (I. 1. 301–18) and unlike Pickersgill's character, who deliberately calls for Satan, he refuses a Faustian pact with a supernatural being. He agrees to the Stranger's unconditional offer of a bodily exchange only when he is assured that he 'shall have no bond / But [his] own will' (I. 1. 150f.). Thus, he does not realise that with a change of body he essentially gives up his individuality and agency.

Despite his bodily transformation, Pickersgill's Arnaud is not able to free himself from his past and the memories of his rejection, or even from his original body. It does not decompose (IV, 195f.), and when he later seeks a second change of shape, the Devil tells him that he cannot seal a new pact, as the blood in his veins is not his own (IV, 365), so that his new shape is ultimately an illusion. In Arnold's case, the impossibility of escaping the material reality of the body is even more poignant. As he finds out, he cannot leave his old body behind.[34] The Stranger, assuming the name of Caesar, assumes Arnold's rejected original form and follows him 'as his shadow', thereby showing that

his process of transformation and self-reinvention cannot be complete and leads to a split identity.

Stranger: In a few moments
I will be as you were, and you shall see
Yourself forever by you, as your shadow.
Arnold: I would be spared this.
Stranger: But it cannot be. (I. 1. 446–49)

After his metamorphosis, Arnold exists as a fragmented being, alienated from his past.[35] There are hints that he no longer remembers his former life, having forgotten 'all things in the new joy / Of this immortal change' (I. 1. 445f.). Thus, despite of his refusal of a conventional pact, he has lost his individual identity and implicitly his 'soul' at the very moment of his transformation.

Unlike Pickersgill's protagonist, who changes his name to Julian, Byron's character decides to stay 'plain Arnold still' (I. 1. 543), convinced that he can essentially remain the same person. However, he has to discover that he cannot completely maintain his original self. Quite early on in his career as 'a conqueror [and] chosen knight' (I. 2. 4) Arnold longs to be 'in peace—at peace' (I. 2. 21); he has no desire to be a war-hero, but as a new Achilles, he is trapped in that role. The Achilles reference is also of particular importance, in that it underlines the fragility of the life of the hero-figure. The presence of an immortal stresses the vulnerability of human life, and Caesar expressively reminds Arnold of his mortality:

Caesar: [...] though I gave the form of Thetis' son,
I dipt thee not in Styx; and 'gainst a foe
I would not warrant thy chivalric heart
More than Pelides' heel; why then, be cautious,
And know thyself a mortal still. (II. 2. 19–23)

There is a certain irony in this passage, for Achilles' famous invulnerability which he has in various versions of the legend (although not in the *Iliad*) is always invariably connected with his equally famous heel, his one weakness that causes his early death. One of his key characteristics in the *Iliad*, as well as in later versions of the story, is that he is 'short-lived', doomed to a violent death at an early age (for example, I, 352; I, 416; XVIII, 95). The *Iliad* repeatedly emphasises both Achilles' many gifts which make him superior to others and the awareness of his near death, thereby illustrating the destructive force of war and the sadness of the loss of young life. According to legend, Achilles had to choose between a short and glorious life and a long one spent in obscurity (*Iliad*, IX, 412–16). Both in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* the Achilles-figure is employed to question the heroic ideal and the view that glory is worthy and desirable reward for an early death. His imminent end is repeatedly mentioned, but the epic closes before his death, which is narrated in the *Odyssey*, where the shadow of dead Achilles would 'rather slave on earth for another man— / Some dirt poor tenant farmer who scrapes to keep alive— / Than rule down here over all the

breathless dead', thereby implicitly correcting the choice he made in life.[36] In addition, the *Iliad* questions the glorification of war in another way: Achilles, as its main character and greatest warrior, is not an entirely positive character. The best fighter and the most beautiful and gifted of all Greeks, he can also be a cruel and brutal killer, an over-emotional and vindictive character who does not always act according to the epic's concept of honour.[37] In *The Deformed Transformed*, the Achilles connection is thus a hint at Arnold's probable early and violent death, and also supports the play's subversive comment on the heroic ideal and the illustration of its brutality.[38]

Byron's reviewer in *The New European Magazine* noticed that Caesar's role as cynical commentator also recalls Thersites, a minor character in the *Iliad*, and a more prominent figure in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*.[39] The lame and deformed Thersites, in the *Iliad* 'the ugliest man who came beneath Ilion' (II, 216) questions the sense of the campaign, and after several lost battles suggests that the Greeks give up the siege (II, 25–242). His protest is effectively suppressed by Odysseus, who beats him down (II, 265–69), but although Homer has the crowd cheer and agree with Odysseus (II, 270–77), his arguments are not contradicted, and (at least for the modern reader) they leave an uneasy feeling. In *Troilus and Cressida*, Thersites' role is of greater importance.[40] Like *The Deformed Transformed*, Shakespeare's play presents a very unheroic, brutal war: its Achilles is a very negative character who kills the Trojan prince Hector not in a fight, but while he is taking off his armor (V. 8. 1–22). Thersites mocks and ridicules the Greek warlords very much as Byron's Caesar mocks Bourbon (e.g. II. 1; II. 3; III. 3; V. 1). At one point, he makes his exit calling the Greek commanders 'the faction of fools' (II. 1. 118). Like *The Deformed Transformed*, *Troilus and Cressida* is concerned with a criticism and subversion of the heroic ideal and a presentation of the dirt and violence of war.

As one of the main heroes fighting on the Greek side, Achilles is invariably connected with the Trojan War. In transporting Arnold to a Rome under siege, Caesar therefore to a certain degree makes him re-enact the role of the original Achilles in a rewriting of the *Iliad*. Arnold has to discover that he cannot completely maintain his original personality and self in a new body. Quite early on in his career, he longs to be 'in peace—at peace' (I. 2. 21); he has no desire to be a war-hero, but apparently, in the body of Achilles, he cannot escape from this role. In this context, it is also significant that the city under siege is Rome. According to Roman legend (told, most famously, in Virgil's *Aeneid*), Rome was founded by the descendants of Aeneas, the only survivor among the great Trojan heroes.[41] The Romans saw their city as a second Troy, which makes Arnold's position as Achilles even more poignant.

While Arnold as an Achilles-figure is the enemy of Rome as a second Troy, Caesar's name links him to the city. Not only has he chosen the name of the famous dictator, and the title of Roman emperors. Julius Caesar's family, the Patrician Julii Caesares, claimed direct descent from the Trojan hero Aeneas

via his son Julus (*Aeneid*, I, 321–48). Thus, the Stranger's decision to call himself Caesar already alludes to a future enmity between him and Arnold. In this context, Caesar's name even gives a subtle hint that he is in fact the Devil. Aeneas was the son of the goddess Venus (*Aeneid*, I, 315): the planet Venus, both 'morning' and 'evening star', is traditionally also identified with Lucifer, the 'bringer of Light', or 'Son of the Morning', as Arnold addresses him (III. I. 21).[42] Arnold's own suggestion that the Stranger, when he announces his intent to change his own shape, might adopt 'that of Paris' (I. I. 367), who killed Achilles, or that of 'The Poet's God' Apollo (I. I. 368), the most powerful god to fight on the Trojan side, also prepares for their future rivalry. In addition, the allusion to Apollo as the god of poetry also refers to the Stranger as an artist, a product and defender of civilisation in contrast to Achilles as a destructive war hero, and of course, as a 'creator' like the poet himself. Throughout the drama, the Stranger/Caesar is linked both to the Devil and the artist. Thus, his claim to 'ape' (I. I. 367) the actions of the 'Being who made' (I. I. 86) the original Achilles alludes to the traditional image of the Devil as 'God's ape', but also to the artist 'aping' the author of the original *Iliad*. Implicitly, the play both rejects and mocks the Romantic idea of the artist as a godlike original creator and instead hints at the iconoclastic, or even derivative nature of all art.

Unlike Arnaud, who after his transformation finds himself incapable of affection and love, Arnold falls in love with the Roman girl Olimpia, whom he had rescued from a rape attempt. Despite his deed, as well as status, valour, and physical beauty, however, Olimpia remains indifferent to him (III. I. 46–54). When he complains about this in the fragment of Part III, Caesar implies that once Arnold has chosen to reject his own body, he has also lost the capacity to be loved for himself:

> *Caesar:* […] you would be *loved*—what you call loved—
> *Self-loved*—loved for *yourself*—for neither health
> Nor wealth—nor youth—nor power—nor rank nor beauty–
> For these you may be stript of—but *beloved*
> As an Abstraction—for—you know not what—[…]
>
> (III. I. 61–65)

Though his greatest wish had been to be loved, he has to find out that, in a body other than his own, it is impossible to inspire true affection. Instead of liberating him, his transformation has lead to alienation and loss of self. In the 'sublime' shape of Achilles, much like in his original body, he can find admiration, but not the affection he claims to desire. Byron may also be alluding to Burke's remark that 'Achilles, in spite of the many qualities of beauty which Homer has bestowed on his outward form, and the many great virtues with which he has adorned his mind, can never make us love him' (IV, 24), as he is too far removed from ordinary human beings. Thus his beauty and qualities make him sublime and 'Other' in the same way as a disabled character (such

as Pickersgill's Arnaud), whereas a loveable character is familiar and small.[43] Burke also argues that the reader is meant to sympathise with the domestic Trojans rather than the Greeks:

> With regard to the Trojans, the passion he chooses to raise is pity; pity is a passion founded on love; and these *lesser,* and if I may say domestic virtues, are certainly the most amiable. […] Admiration is the passion which Homer would excite in favour of the Greeks, and he has done it by bestowing on them the virtues which have little to do with love. (IV, 24)

It has been argued that Byron meant to have Arnold turn against Caesar after he had won the love of Olimpia. Caesar's mention of Lucifer and Venus (the goddess of love) when describing Olimpia might be a hint at this outcome, and the allusions to the *Iliad* and the Trojan War would support it. The *leitmotif* of the *Iliad*, the 'anger of Peleus' son Achilleus' (*Iliad*, I, 1; the epic opens with these words), is initiated by his quarrel with Agamemnon, about his 'prize of honour', the captive woman Briseis (*Iliad*, I, 106–344).[44] Byron left an interesting memorandum he wrote on the fragment of the unfinished third part, according to which Arnold was to become jealous of Caesar as 'of himself under his former figure, owing to the Power of Intellect'.[45] Together with his note 'Olimpia *at first* not liking Caesar' (my italics), this makes it probable that he planned to let Caesar win the love of Olimpia despite his deformity because of his wit and charisma. Their *doppelgänger* relationship would have developed into an enmity which could well have ended with a murder, which at the same time would have been a suicide.[46] By provoking Arnold's jealousy, Caesar would probably have shown him that self-fulfilment and love are not dependent on strength and beauty.

The character of Olimpia herself is also linked to other women from classical mythology. Her readiness to kill herself instead of being raped associates her with the Roman heroine Lucretia, who killed herself after having been raped by Sextus Tarquinius, son of king Tarquinius Superbus (Livius, *Ab Urbe Condita*, I, 58). In ancient Rome, she was seen as the epitome of female heroism and virtue; according to legend, her fate gave the impulse for the expulsion of the Tarquin kings, and the foundation of the Roman Republic (Livius, *Ab Urbe Condita*, I, 59–60).[47] Caesar explicitly compares Arnold's love for her with Achilles' love for Penthesilea (II. 3. 144–46), queen of the Amazons, who—according to one tradition (although she does not appear in the *Iliad*)—is first killed by Achilles and then raped by him.[48] When the Stranger first describes Achilles, he mentions his betrothal to the Trojan princess Polyxena, how 'With sanctioned and with softened love' he stood 'before / The altar, gazing on his Trojan bride' (I. 1. 274f.). Like his mention of Penthesilea, however, the invocation of Achilles' love for Polyxena points to a tragic, violent ending, for, according to some versions of the legend, Polyxena was sacrificed to the shadow of dead Achilles after the Greeks had conquered Troy. Olimpia's attempt to kill

herself at the altar in St Peter's may also be an allusion to Polyxena.[49] All these women resemble Olimpia in that they are traditionally represented as being very courageous, but all of them share a tragic fate and are either abducted, raped, or killed. Thus these allusions hint at a tragic outcome of the love story between Olimpia and Arnold, which may have to do with his rivalry with Caesar. At the same time, they also point at a major consequence of war and pillage: violence towards women.

In Byron's representation of a chaotic world, the choice of Rome and of the particular event of the *Sacco di Roma* is highly significant. The political centre of the ancient world and medieval capital of Western Christianity, Rome is in more than one sense the centre of the Western World and European culture. Interestingly, in Caesar's view the city as a place is re-gendered and changes gender as it develops from political to spiritual capital: it 'hath been Earth's lord / Under its Emperors, and—changing sex, / Not sceptre, an hermaphrodite of empire— / *Lady* of the Old World' (I. 2. 8–10).

In the early sixteenth century, when the story takes place, Rome had long lost its political power and its spiritual leadership of Christianity was threatened and questioned by the Protestant Reformation (which features in *The Deformed Transformed* in the person of the Lutheran soldiers who call the Pope the 'Anti-Christ'; II. 3. 5), so that the city in *The Deformed Transformed* symbolises both power and its fragility. Several times, the play emphasises that Rome itself had been the aggressor, an expansive empire similar to the Holy Roman Empire by which it is now attacked. Although, as Arnold points out, the present Romans cannot be held responsible for the deeds of their ancestors, the Holy Roman Empire, once itself conquered and subdued by Rome, now sees itself as Rome's heir. Both are located in a world and a culture in which violence breeds violence. In this context, the intertextual reference to the Trojan War is equally important: the ancient Romans saw themselves as the descendants of the Trojans. The allusion to Troy supports the notion that a victim will in time become an aggressor. It shows present conflicts as rooted in a distant, mythological past. In addition, in the *Iliad*'s version, the story of the Trojan War was the oldest literary text in Western culture known in Byron's time. Although legendary, in ancient Greece and Rome it was largely seen as historical. By alluding to the first great war in European cultural memory in a play which subverts the heroic ideal, Byron implicitly criticises and challenges a literary and historiographic tradition which glorifies and idealises classical heroism and which celebrates the wars of the past and the present.

* * * * *

In its unfinished state, *The Deformed Transformed* is a genuinely sceptical work. Clearly, in the play love and freedom are not achieved by the rejection of one's own physical reality and individuality, but Byron does not argue either that 'mental beauty' has precedence over or transcends the physical state (which

might have been the case if Olimpia had indeed fallen in love with Caesar in Arnold's body). In fact, in a finished version the play might have easily lost some of its complexity. As it is, the fragment explores the relationship between body and soul without giving any definitive answers. Keeping Caesar's identity ambiguous, it also maintains an interesting tension between the presentation of a chaotic, amoral universe and a world conforming to Christian theology. It is therefore an interesting and tempting thought that the fragmentary state of *The Deformed Transformed* may have been deliberate. Although in a short preface he wrote that 'the rest may appear, perhaps, hereafter',[50] he wrote to his publisher John Hunt 'I doubt I will go on with it'.[51] Byron's decision to publish this 'odd sort of drama' as a fragment suggests that he might have intended it as an experiment, a dramatic counterpart to *Don Juan*, which was composed at the same time and shares its digressive structure. Contemporary reviewers already pointed out the similarities and supposed that his eventual decision whether to continue it or not depended on the audience's reaction that it elicited.[52]

Byron, who claimed to 'deny nothing, but doubt everything', had a lifelong suspicion of truths represented as definitive and orthodox.[53] The fragmentary state of *The Deformed Transformed* gives him the opportunity to use a Devil-figure and make a point about human cruelty in a chaotic world, without assuming any clear-cut theological position. His scepticism and awareness of the impossibility of any absolute truths is also connected to an awareness of the fragmentary character of every state and statement. From the beginning of his literary career, he experimented with fragmentary writing, and he commented in one of his journals that his own 'mind [was] a fragment'.[54] The play also reflects the situation of the protagonist. It recalls the structure of the *Iliad* itself, which concludes before the imminent death of its main character Achilles. On a deeper level, Arnold himself is a fragmented being, who, through the transformation and the bond with the Stranger, gives up his body and his real self. Henceforth, he is divided in parts, his body severed from his soul and mind, and all of them disconnected from his past, so that he exists only in the present, split from his history.

As the Stranger and Byron's play argue, love and a fulfilling existence are not achieved through a narcissistic pursuit of perfection and a rejection of the imperfect. Rather, a reinvention of the self should acknowledge and integrate individual idiosyncrasies. As I have argued in this paper, *The Three Brothers* is relevant for Byron's use of intertextual classical allusions in *The Deformed Transformed,* for his concept of heroism and the genesis of the Byronic Hero, as well as for his defiance of the Burkean concept of an opposition between the Sublime and the Beautiful. It is this combination of contrasts, this fluidity and paradox that constitute the fascination of the Byronic Hero and the Byronic idea of a complex, fulfilling life. In its present state, *The Deformed Transformed* is a highly sophisticated work, with a complex use of intertextuality. The classical allusions function on different levels, to characterise Arnold and Caesar and

their relationship, to put in question the possibility of individual freedom and the nature of heroism, and to subvert the 'classical' Western heroic ideal and heroic historiography. *The Deformed Transformed* deserves to be recognised as one of Byron's important investigations of the human condition.

Notes

1. All of Byron's works quoted in this paper are taken from *Lord Byron: The Complete Poetical Works*, 7 vols, edd. Jerome J. McGann, et al. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980–91), hereafter referred to as *BCPW*. Joshua Pickersgill, Jr, *The Three Brothers. A Romance*, 4 vols (London: John Stockdale, 1803); subsequent references are from this edn, and will be given in the text.
2. Charles E. Robinson's source study 'The Devil as Doppelgänger in *The Deformed Transformed*: The Sources and Meaning of Byron's Unfinished Drama', *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 74 (1970), 177–202, emphasises the pride of Pickersgill's protagonist and quotes from the novel's transformation scene (p. 180f.), but does not further explore Pickersgill's impact on Byron's fragment drama. Anne Barton's essay '*Don Juan* Transformed', *Byron: Augustan and Romantic*, ed. Andrew Rutherford (London: Macmillan Press, 1990), pp. 199–220, acknowledges Pickersgill's influence on Byron in a footnote (p. 219), however without discussing it. The commentary on the play in *BCPW*, VI, gives a brief summary of Arnaud's confessional narrative (p. 728f.), emphasising the transformation scene, but does not mention Arnaud's relation to the Byronic Hero.
3. *Gentleman's Magazine* 74 (1804), 1047 (hereafter referred to as *GM*).
4. A collection of verse tales entitled *Tales of the Harem*, by someone called 'Pickersgill' was published more than twenty years later by Longmans in 1826, but there is no indication that it is by the same person.
5. Review in *New European Magazine* 4 (March 1824), 255–60 (p. 256); quoted in *The Romantics Reviewed. Contemporary Reviews of British Romantic Writers. Part B: Byron and Regency Society Poets*, 5 vols, ed. Donald H. Reiman (London and New York: Garland Publishing, 1972), V, 1879–84, hereafter referred to as *RR*. In 1826, a biographer of Byron also suspected, probably mistakenly, that Pickersgill was 'the late M. G. Lewis'. The reason for their identification was probably that Lewis adapted the main motif of *The Three Brothers* for his play *One o'Clock, or the Knight and the Wood Daemon*, and acknowledges his debt to Pickersgill in the preface—Matthew Gregory Lewis, *One o'Clock, or The Knight and the Wood Daemon. A Grand Musical Romance in Three Acts* (London: Lowndes and Hobbes, 1811), p. 1.
6. Elissa Lynn Stuchlik, 'The Origins of the Historical Romance' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Rochester, NY, 1994; rptd Michigan: UMI Ann Arbor, 1994), p. 63. Throughout the novel, Pickersgill occasionally mentions historical events such as Charles the Fifth's invasion of the south of France (IV, 308); at one point, he specifies the date as 1541 (III, 332).
7. See Mary Waldron, 'Historico–Gothic', in *The Handbook to Gothic Literature*, ed. Marie Mulvey-Roberts (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1998), p. 274; Devendra P. Varma, *The Gothic Flame* (1957; New York: Russell & Russell, 1966), pp. 74–84; Stuchlik, pp. 28–107.
8. According to the standards of the time, that would make him effeminate, for 'beauty' was gendered as female. For the connection between beauty and femi-

ninity and sublimity and masculinity, see e.g. the third part Immanuel Kant's essay on the Sublime and the Beautiful (1764): *Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen* (Frankfurt am Main: Anton Hain, 1993), pp. 37–57. See also Chloe Chard, 'Effeminacy, Pleasure and the Classical Body', in *Femininity and Masculinity in Eighteenth-Century Art and Culture*, edd. Gill Perry and Michael Rossington (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), pp. 142–61; Robert Miles, *Gothic Writing 1750–1820. A Genealogy* (London and New York: Routledge, 1993), p. 71f.

9. Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Sublime and the Beautiful* (1757). References are to Part (roman) and Section (arabic).
10. Arnaud's progress from initial beauty in childhood to later deformity mirrors the fate of the girl Eugenia in Fanny Burney's contemporaneous novel *Camilla* (1796). See Fanny Burney, *Camilla, or a Picture of Youth*, edd. Edward A. Bloom and Lilian D. Bloom (1972; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), pp. 11 and 28f.
11. As is the case in many Gothic novels, part of the plot in *The Three Brothers* is a threat to the aristocratic principle of primogeniture—see Miles, p. 27. In criticising this practice, which puts all sons but the eldest legitimate one at a disadvantage, Pickersgill is in the tradition of Thomas Paine's influential essay on the *Rights of Man* (1794). See also Chris Baldick, *In Frankenstein's Shadow. Myth, Monstrosity and Nineteenth-Century Writing* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), pp. 19–21.
12. Burke, II, 7, 8.
13. Demetrius Poliorcetes (336–283 BC) was king of Macedonia (294–287 BC) and a famous conqueror and warrior. His life is narrated in Plutarch's *Lives*. In his parallel biographies, the Greek historian Plutarch (*c.* AD 50–120) compares famous Greeks and Romans. All references to Plutarch are taken from *Plutarch's Lives*, edd. E. H. Warmington, et al., trans. Bernadotte Perrin, in *The Loeb Classical Library*, 11 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, and London: William Heinemann, 1914–26), hereafter referred to under the name of the respective biographical subject.
14. He tells his father the truth about himself (I, 149), and uses his power and influence to terrorise him and make him live in constant fear (II, 200–03). He keeps his half-brother Henri prisoner, and then leads him into moral corruption (see esp. III, 1–106), giving him his own wife as a lover (III, 104) and persuading him to join his banditti (III, 105f.).
15. For the characteristic unhappiness of the Gothic villain see also Ingeborg Weber, ' "Gothic Villain" und "Byronic Hero" ', in *English Romanticism. The Paderborn Symposium*, edd. Rolf Breuer, Werner Huber, and Rainer Schöwerling (Essen: Die Blaue Eule, 1985), pp. 153–79 (pp. 154–56); Peter L. Thorslev, *The Byronic Hero. Types and Prototypes* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1962), pp. 57–61.
16. Pickersgill's reviewer in *GM* complained about the stylistic weaknesses in an otherwise fascinating story—*GM* 74 (1804), 1047.
17. Ibid.; *New European Magazine* 4 (Mar 1824), 257 (*RR*, v, 1881).
18. For instance, compare the description of Schedoni in Ann Radcliffe, *The Italian, or the Confessional of the Black Penitents. A Romance*, ed. Frederick Garber (1797; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 34f., or that of Montoni in Ann Radcliffe, *The Mysteries of Udolpho. A Romance*, ed. Bonamy Dobrée (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 122.

19. See Paul A. Cantor, 'Mary Shelley and the Taming of the Byronic Hero: "Transformation" and *The Deformed Transformed*', in *The Other Mary Shelley. Beyond Frankenstein*, edd. Audrey A. Fisch, Anne K. Mellor, and Esther H. Schor (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 89–106 (p. 93). Cantor suggests that the fear of a conventional existence is one of the main traits of the Byronic Hero, and the origin of most of the conflicts he is involved in.
20. See Burke, II, I, 2; III, 13. In his own essay on the Sublime and the Beautiful, Kant also stated that the Sublime would inspire admiration, whereas the Beautiful would inspire love (Kant, p. 14).
21. The statement that it was impossible to 'depict or insculp' the beautiful Demetrius is taken directly from Plutarch (*Demetrius*, II).
22. In Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), Plutarch's *Lives* are among the books from which the creature gets his essential education about Western civilisation. They were one of the most popular sources of classical history. Of the characters mentioned only Achilles and Hephestian (probably Hephaistion, the closest friend and lover of Alexander the Great) are not portrayed in Plutarch, but the latter is mentioned frequently in his *Life of Alexander* (e.g. XXVIII, XXIX, XLII, LXXII), whereas Achilles is of course famously described as the most beautiful Greek in Homer's *Iliad.* See Homer, *Iliad*, trans. Richmond Lattimore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951, repr. 1961), e.g. II, 673f., XXI, 108.
23. For Julian's life and career see Glen W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997). Pickersgill's reviewer in *GM* talks of Julian's 'apostate career', no doubt in allusion to the historical Julian—*GM* 74 (1804), 1047. After his transformation, Julian is referred to as 'the Apostate' (IV, 351) and he talks of his own 'apostacy' (IV, 364).
24. The only exception is 'Demetrius the Macedonian' (I. 1. 258). The names are added only in the stage directions when the respective shapes Arnold has rejected disappear, so that readers have the opportunity to look whether their own guess had been correct.
25. See Plato, *The Symposium*, trans. Walter Hamilton (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1999), 215a–215d.
26. Thus, Arnold remarks at the sight of the first shape, Julius Caesar, that 'the Phantom's bald; my quest is beauty' (I. 1. 190), wishing he could 'Inherit but his fame with his defects' (I. 1. 191). The Stranger, however, emphasises that he could but 'promise [Arnold] his form; his fame / Must be long sought and fought for' (I. 1. 194f.), thereby implying that form and character do not necessarily correspond. Later, he mocks Arnold's 'quest for beauty' by proposing the form of the 'low, swarthy, short-nosed, round-eyed' (I. 1. 217) Socrates as 'the earth's perfection of all mental beauty' (I. 1. 221).
27. Christine Kenyon-Jones argues that Byron here comments and reclaims Francis Bacon's critical account of the supposed effects of physical disability in his essay 'Of Deformity' (1612)—see her *Kindred Brutes. Animals in Romantic Period Writing* (Aldershot, Burlington, Singapore, Sydney: Ashgate, 2001), p. 195f (n. 59) and 'Deformity Transformed: Byron and his Biographers on the Subject of his Lameness' (Paper given to the Byron and Disability panel at the MLA conference, Chicago, Dec 1999), p. 5f.
28. See e.g. the description of the teenage Arnaud: 'Disdainful haughtiness and ferocious cruelty had seat upon the brow, which, by its lowering frowns, pursed the flesh above into wrinkles misbecoming youthfulness: manly care was dis-

tinguishable on boyish features; for the jaundness of melancholy and unsettled mood had supplanted freshness from the cheeks, […] Still was visible a gleam of nature, though faint, which warranted that hers was not the blame of his early baseness: in her vindication was hung about clear proof of the mighty faculty she had gifted him wherewith; and so he was marked as the more wilfully guilty in a vicious subjugation, as heaven, in it bounty, had bestowed on him sense to distinguish good from evil.' (II, 68–72)

29. See *Lord Byron: The Complete Miscellaneous Prose*, ed. Andrew Nicholson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), p. 197f.
30. In addition, for Byron's use of animal features in *The Deformed Transformed* see Kenyon-Jones, *Kindred Brutes*, p. 197; Kenyon-Jones, "Deformity Transformed", p. 14f.
31. It was the culmination of what was to be known as the War of the League of Cognac against the Holy Roman Empire. In May 1527, Rome was under siege from the imperial troops under the command of Charles, duc de Bourbon (1490–1527). On 5 May 1527, his army of Spanish, German, and Italian mercenary soldiers entered Rome (Bourbon himself died in the attack) and sacked and plundered the city for several months. The occupation only ended in December, because the army was then dispersed by the plague. See James H. McGregor's introduction to Luigi Guicciardini, *The Sack of Rome* (New York: Italica Press, 1993), pp. xv–xxxix.
32. Like Pickersgill, Byron uses Burke's notion that the Sublime can inspire fear and admiration, whereas the Beautiful inspires love, which Arnold in his 'sublime' deformed body cannot have (see Burke, II, I, 2; III, 13).
33. When the Stranger suggests that Arnold should style himself 'Count Arnold' (I. I. 544), which will 'look well upon a billet-doux' (I. I. 545), Arnold's reply 'Or in an order for a battle-field' (I. I. 546) shows his wish for military heroism.
34. 'What shall become of your abandoned garment, / Yon hump, and lump, and clod of ugliness, / Which late you wore, or were?' (I. I. 421–24), the Stranger asks him. The word-play in the last question already hints at the fact that the bond between body and spirit cannot be as easily dissolved as Arnold had thought.
35. Comparing Arnold's limbs to those of animals, the Stranger describes his deformity as a fragmentation of the human body, so Arnold used to be a fragmented being even before his transformation. His *doppelgänger* relationship with the Stranger shows the impossibility of escaping fragmentation by a reinvention of the self.
36. Homer, *Odyssey*, trans. Robert Fagles (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997), XI, 556–58.
37. After having killed Hector, the killer of his close friend Patroclos, he ties his corpse to his chariot and drags it, instead of returning him and allowing the Trojans time for decent burial (*Iliad,* XXII, 395–404).
38. In the siege of Ismael in *Don Juan* (Canto VIII), the protagonist also becomes a sort of Achilles-figure, and there are allusions to the Trojan War which equally function to question the heroic ideal.
39. *New European Magazine* 4 (Mar 1824), 257. The reviewer describes Caesar as 'a mere prating jester, the Thersites of the camp as well as of the Council', alluding to the *Iliad* in which a man is measured by his excellence in battle and council (e.g. II, 201f.), and Odysseus taunts the mocking Thersites, who is unimportant in both, saying there is 'no worse man' than him (II, 249).

40. Quotations from William Shakespeare, *Troilus and Cressida*, ed. D. Bevington (Walton-on-Thames: The Arden Shakespeare, 1998).
41. See Livius, *Ab Urbe Condita Liber*, I, 1–7; Virgil, *Aeneid* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934, rptd 1998), I, 313–41.
42. Caesar himself makes the connection: when Arnold waits for the unconscious Olimpia to open her eyes, he tells him they will look 'Like stars, no doubt; for that's a metaphor/ For *Lucifer and Venus'* (II. 3. 189f; my italics). In *Cain*, Lucifer also identifies with the star 'welcoming the morn' (I. 1. 496) and asks Cain's wife Adah why she does not 'adore' it (I. 1. 498).
43. Burke, III, 13; IV, 24. In *The Deformed Transformed*, the Stranger persuades Arnold to accept a body smaller than Achilles' original one, for, 'by being / A little less removed from present men / In figure, thou canst sway them more' (I. 1. 301–03).
44. The Trojan War itself was of course also caused by the quarrel over a woman, the Spartan queen Helen, who had been abducted by the Trojan prince Paris.
45. Memorandum for the draft of Part III; quoted from *BCPW*, VI, 574.
46. Apparently Byron was already preparing for a rivalry between Arnold and Caesar over the love of Olimpia:

    Caesar: […] The beautiful half-clay, and nearly spirit!
    I am almost enamoured of her, as
    Of old the Angels of her earliest sex.

    Arnold: Thou!

    Caesar: I. But fear not. I'll not be your rival.

    Arnold: Rival!

    Caesar: I could be one right formidable; […] (II. 2. 174–80)
47. See Ian Donaldson, *The Rapes of Lucretia. A Myth and its Transformations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), *passim*. For the representation of Lucretia as a hero during the late eighteenth century, see Duncan Macmillan, 'Woman as Hero: Gavin Hamilton's Radical Alternative', in *Femininity and Masculinity*, pp. 78–98.
48. See Katherine Callen King, *Achilles. Paradigms of the War Hero from Homer to the Middle Ages* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1987), pp. 124–33.
49. According to Ovid's account in the *Metamorphoses*, Achilles' spirit demanded the sacrifice, and Polyxena went to it willingly. See Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. David R. Slavitt (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1994), XIII, 441–500. See also Callen King, pp. 188–94.
50. *BCPW*, VI, 517.
51. Letter to John Hunt on 21 May 1823; see *Byron's Letters and Journals*, 12 vols, ed. Leslie A. Marchand (London: John Murray, 1973–82), X, 182.
52. A negative review in the *Scots Magazine* commented that 'we are informed by Lord Byron, that, *should the public show any anxiety for their appearance*, a few more *Cantos* are forthcoming' (my italics), and suspected from the present reception that they would 'be postponed to the Greek Kalends' (*Edinburgh Scots Magazine* (Mar 1824), p. 356 (*RR*, V, 2221). The review in the *Literary Chronicle*, one of the few favourable ones, ended with the remark that 'we shall be glad to follow the hero and his companion through a few more adventures, which we doubt not will soon be supplied; for the drama, like *Don Juan*, need not be confined to any length'—*Literary Chronicle* (28 Feb 1824), 131 (*RR*, III, 1354).

53. Letter to Francis Hodgson, 4 Dec 1811, *Byron's Letters and Journals*, II, 136.
54. Journal entry, 17 Nov 1813, *Byron's Letters and Journals*, III, 237.

Referring to this Article

I. Heuer. ' "Shadows of Beauty, Shadows of Power": Heroism, Deformity, and Classical Allusion in Joshua Pickersgill's *The Three Brothers* and Byron's *The Deformed Transformed*', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 12 (Summer 2004). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc12_n01.pdf*>.

Contributor Details

Imke Heuer studied English and History at the Universities of Hamburg, Perugia, and York. The present article derives from research originally done for her MA thesis in Romantic Literature at the University of York, where she is currently working on a PhD on 'English Theatre, German History and the Politics of Adaptation'. Her research interests include English interest in German theatre and culture in the Romantic Epoch; Romantic drama (particularly Byron); the representation of history in Romantic writing; the reception of classical history and mythology in English Literature.

'Satire is Bad Trade'
Dr John Wolcot and his Publishers and Printers in Eighteenth-Century England

Donald Kerr

'Wolcot left behind many boxes of unpublished manuscripts of his own writings for which, it was said, the booksellers offered a thousand pounds, but for which the executor demanded double and which when he, too, died, disappeared.'[1]

'They will probably be disposed of as waste-paper' said [John] Taylor ruefully, 'though perhaps, if properly selected they might prove a valuable addition to the poetical treasures of the country.'[2]

Catalogue of a valuable collection of Autograph Letters […] of the published and unpublished literary remains of Dr John Wolcot (Peter Pindar) […] lots 267–312, which will be sold by Auction by Messrs Puttick and Simpson […] on Thursday, May 17th, 1877.[3]

* * * * *

On 7 April 1888, Governor Sir George Grey (1812–98) bought from John Davies Enys (1837–1912) six volumes of unpublished material by and about Dr John Wolcot, the Regency satirist.[4] Grey paid £30 for the manuscripts, once part of a much larger Wolcot Collection that was sold off by Puttick and Simpson in London on 17 May 1887 and somehow acquired by Enys, who, born in Penryn, Cornwall, lived in New Zealand from 1861 to 1891.[5] Five volumes contain hundreds of unpublished verse on small pieces of paper in the poet's hand.[6] The sixth volume (GMS 5) contains 288 leaves of letters and ledger documents concerning Wolcot's affairs with his publishers, printers and booksellers between 1785 and 1810. The accounts, the book lists, the promissory notes, and letters are not in Wolcot's hand, rather, in the hand of those with whom he had dealings. There are, however, numerous annotations by Wolcot on these documents that give small but no less significant information. While much of the material is new in relation to Wolcot's literary activities, they do shed light on book trade practices (and its vagaries) in eighteenth-century England, in particular the cost of printing advertisements (a most necessary expense), the cost of fundamentals

such as stitching and collation, and more specifically, Wolcot's somewhat testy relationship with publishers William West (and Thomas Hughes) and John Walker, printers Thomas, Charles, and William Spilsbury, and Thomas Brice and bookseller Margaret Sweetman of Exeter. In addition, embedded in many of them are clearer indicators of when the titles were printed. Such information assists greatly the researcher who wants to establish those bibliographical certainties concerning Wolcot's total literary output. However, before documenting the archive material pertinent to the book trade, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of Dr John Wolcot's life.

John Wolcot was born on 6 May 1738 at Dodbrooke near Kingsbridge in Devonshire and, according to records, was baptised a few days later on 9 May.[7] The schools he attended included the Free School of Kingsbridge, Liskeard Grammar, under the Revd Mr Hayden, and then the Revd Dr Fisher's Academy at Bodmin.[8] In 1751, after the death of his father, he was sent to Fowey, Cornwall, and placed in the care of his uncle John, a surgeon–apothecary. His uncle's sisters also lived there and it was they who 'kept [him] under rigid control [and who] cowed his spirit'.[9] His apprenticeship with his uncle was grudgingly done. He preferred the Muses. A favourite haunt during his teens was the old defence towers at Fowey where he would write poetry, away from the watchful eyes of his domineering paternal aunts, 'who, although women of solid intellects, and literary acquirements, could not overcome the common prejudice, that poetry is a very dangerous interruption to business.'[10] His first appearance in print was a poem to Miss B[etsy] C[ranch] in *Martin's Magazine* for 1756, followed by another in the same periodical in 1757 called *On the Recovery of Mr Pitt from an Attack of Gout*.[11]

In 1761, Wolcot was sent to France to learn the language. This reward for completing his apprenticeship backfired. Although he gained a good command of the language, he developed a strong dislike of the French, something that was borne out in his later verse. His return to England saw a couple of years' work in hospitals in London, where he also developed contacts in the literary and art world. In 1764, he returned to Fowey to assist his uncle and on 8 September 1767 he was granted an MD Diploma from Aberdeen without attending the University. His competence was satisfied by a Dr Huxham of Plymouth who gave him 'a strict examination'.[12]

Wolcot's desire to make a break from life at Fowey and gain personal and financial independence was strong. The Trelawney family (of Trelawne, Fowey) came under the care of the Wolcots and their practice. When Sir William Trelawney was appointed the Governor of Jamaica, Wolcot applied for the position of physician. Here was his opportunity: 'Ah! Benjy it is not the idea of grandeur but of independence that seduces me from Great Britain, or should I say from old England; the hope of placing myself, by the labour of a few years beyond the caprice of a mob.'[13] He was successful and, by October 1768, Wolcot was living in Jamaica as attendant physician to Sir William. Encouraged by Trel-

awney to take orders with the likelihood of a preferment in Jamaica, Wolcot returned to England in June 1769. On 24 June 1769, he was made deacon by Richard Terrick, the Bishop of London, and the following day 'by the assistance of Almighty God a Special Ordination', a priest.[14] He returned to Jamaica in March 1770 to hear that the living dangled before him was no more. Grudgingly an inferior clerical appointment was taken: Vere, at £800 per year, along with the rather official-sounding but hardly onerous 'Physician–General to all the Horse and Foot Militia raised or to be raised throughout the island'.[15] Wolcot's foothold on island life ended abruptly when Trelawney died in December 1772. Stranded with unlikely employment from the new governor, he left for England about March 1773 as escort to his late patron's widow, Lady Trelawney. He may have planned a more lasting relationship with her, but disappointment again followed. She died suddenly on 28 May 1775.

Island life obviously afforded Wolcot ample time to versify. Sometime in the first three months of 1773, he developed a desire to see more of his verse in print. Just before he left Jamaica, he paid Joseph Thompson, a Kingston-based printer, an unknown sum to print *Persian Love Elegies* (1773). The work was dedicated to Lady Trelawney, and contained the 'Nymph of Tauris', an elegy on Anne, Sir William's sister, who had also unexpectedly died in Jamaica.[16]

Between 1773 and 1779, Wolcot lived in Truro, Falmouth, and Helston, where he practised as a doctor. As an amateur artist himself (he had been schooled by Richard Wilson, the Welsh painter, who was proclaimed by Wolcot as the 'English Claude'),[17] he continued to cement friendships with the London art and literary crowd. In 1774, he wrote to James Northcote, the English (Plymouth-born) painter: 'I have sent you a Compliment on your Picture at the Royal Academy [No. 195. "a Lady in the character of St Catherine"].'[18] In the same year, he wrote again to Northcote asking for a portrait: 'Dear Northcote—Come out of that d—mn'd p— Hole or by G— you'll die,—much obliged t'ye for your compliments on my poetical talent […] I long for a head'.[19] With such familiarity, it is no wonder the relationship between Northcote and Wolcot cooled. To Ozias Humphry, the English portrait painter, he offered a welcome return 'from Italy to old England, loaded (I make no doubt) with all the Excellencies of the Painters of His Holinesses Dominions' and again asked for a portrait: 'As I am myself a *Dabbler* I want a Head in water colors & in oil finished in your highest manner, not only for my Instruction but for the Vanity of being possessed of the finest paintings in the world. Will you please tell me in your next [letter the] Price?'[20]

In 1778, Wolcot gained small notice in the London literary world with the publication of *A Poetical, Supplicating, Modest and Affecting Epistle to those Literary Colossuses, the Reviewers*. Supposedly written 'on behalf of a poetical Friend',[21] this satire gave him the first opportunity to attack his critics, albeit provincial ones such as Henry Rosewarne, the MP for Truro. This modest sampling was printed in Truro and paid for by Wolcot. With his London contacts,

he arranged for Robert Baldwin, the London bookseller in Paternoster Row (who, according to Benjamin Collins of Salisbury, was 'a happy Collation of Industry, Integrity, and Method' to sell it).[22] Baldwin's involvement continued briefly when he teamed up with Thomas Egerton (of Chancery Lane) and John Debrett (178 Piccadilly) to sell Wolcot's *Lyric Odes to the Royal Academicians* (1782). These fifteen 'odes' demolished some members of the Royal Academy. Benjamin West was viciously attacked, George Stubbs was told to stick to painting horses, and Dominic Serres and John Zoffany, the first being about sixty and the last about forty-nine years of age, were told rather cuttingly that 'you'll improve as you grow older'.[23] There was praise: Sir Joshua Reynolds (a Devonshire man himself) was called an eagle among wrens and Thomas Gainsborough 'has great merit too'.[24] It also contains some of Wolcot's common sense sentiments towards painting and painters. This is but one:

> Carry your eyes with you, where'er you go;
> For not to trust to them, is t'abuse 'em:
> As Nature gave them t'ye, you ought to know
> The wise old Lady meant that you should use 'em;
> And yet, what thousands, to our vast surprise,
> Of Pictures judge by other people's eyes.[25]

The work bore the by-line 'Peter Pindar, a Distant Relation to the Poet of Thebes' and it marked the beginning of the Pindar industry, so aptly described by P. M. Zall: 'From 1782 until his death in 1819 Wolcot managed to survive the strains of the *beau monde*, political and legal tangles, and physical and emotional crises, mainly with the income from the labours of Peter Pindar.'[26]

In 1780, Wolcot (at forty-three) moved to London and introduced into London society John Opie, an ex-mine-carpenter's apprentice, whose artistic talents had attracted his attention while living in Truro. Wolcot had instructed the 'Cornish Wonder' in art and manners—'I want to polish him, he is an unlicked cub yet'[27]—and, in anticipation of their individual successes in the city, it was mutually agreed to 'share the joint profits in equal division'.[28] After setting themselves up at Orange Court, they began to attract attention. A green feather in Opie's hat was but one device. The high point for Opie was obtaining the patronage of Sir Joshua Reynolds, then the president of the Royal Academy, and receiving an introduction to George III and Queen Charlotte, who bought a painting, *A Beggar and his Dog*. The partnership between Wolcot and Opie dissolved the following year by pressure bought about from Opie's in-laws (his first wife was Mary Bunn; his second Amelia Alderson) who no doubt saw Wolcot as a hindrance to their son-in-law's future success (in 1786, Opie was elected a member of the Royal Academy). Wolcot and Opie remained on amicable terms, with the latter recognising the debt he owed to mentor: 'I promise to paint for Doctor Wolcot any picture or pictures he may demand as long as I live; otherwise I desire the world will consider me a damned ungrateful son of a bitch.'[29]

Under the pseudonym of Peter Pindar, Wolcot wrote more than sixty satires of varying length from 1782 to 1817, five miscellanies of serious and humourous verse, two edited works, one play, and a large number of unpublished manuscript pieces.[30] His attacks on the follies and foibles of George III, and others such as William Pitt, Sir Joseph Banks, and James Boswell, and on particular events, were all fair game. It suited his prime purpose of gaining money and provided the public with good reading copy. Indeed, he inspired tributes, attacks, imitators, and followers who traded radical satire under the same or similar pseudonyms ('Peter Pindar, Esq.', aka C. F. Lawler; 'Peter Pindar, Junior', aka John Agg, who also wrote under the name of 'Humphrey Hedgehog') and piracy (rewards of ten and twenty guineas were posted in many of Wolcot's works).[31] Although a relatively late-starter, Wolcot was certainly popular and, at the height of his reputation, 'twenty to thirty thousand of his works went off in a day'.[32] This is a large number, and if Cyrus Redding's account is true, it says much about the reading public's awareness and their reception of the various topics dealt with by Wolcot during this period.[33] Indeed, such was his success that it has been claimed that he was 'the only man who really made money by poetry in the last decades of the eighteenth century'.[34]

In his last years, Wolcot was blind and although he continued to write (often through an amanuensis), the body of this work remained unpublished. He was still socially active, accepting visitors such as Mary Shelley, William Godwin, William Hazlitt, and Henry Crabb Robinson for dinner. Of such an evening, the latter stated:

> The man whom we [Robinson, Thelwall, etc.] went to see, and, if it we could, admire, was Dr Wolcott [*sic*], better known as Peter Pindar. He talked about artists, said that West could paint neither ideal beauty nor from nature, called Opie the Michael Angelo of our age, [...] spoke contemptuously of Walter Scott, whom, he said, owed his popularity to hard names [...] He recollected on [his own writings] with no pleasure, [adding], 'Satire is a bad trade.'[35]

His main comforter was music, composing light airs for amusement. According to the entry in the *DNB*, Wolcot was

> 'a thick squat man with a large dark and flat face, and no speculation in his eye.' He possessed considerable accomplishments, being a fair artist and, as mentioned, a good musician. Despite the character of his compositions, his friends described him as of a 'kind and hearty disposition.' He was probably influenced in his writings by no real animosity toward royalty and himself confessed that 'the king had been a good subject to him, and he a bad one to the king.' His writings, despite their ephemeral interest, still furnish stock quotations.[36]

He died on 14 January 1819 and was buried in St Paul's Church, Covent Garden. His funeral was attended by William Francis and John Taylor, Wolcot's execu-

tors, and 'eleven of his most particular friends agreeable to his wishes.'[37] As requested in his will, he was laid next to the remains of Samuel Butler, satirist and author of *Hudibras*.[38] According to his good friend John Taylor, his final words were: 'Bring back my youth.'[39] Wolcot was one of the most important satirists of the eighteenth century and, as one commentator has stated, constituted a link between the satiric work of Charles Churchill and Lord Byron.[40]

Publishers

John Taylor, editor of *The Morning Post*, met Wolcot and formed a friendship that lasted until the latter's death in 1819. Taylor included many of Wolcot's poems in his paper and it was this exposure that resulted in an approach by George Kearsley, the Fleet Street publisher. Kearsley was certainly known to Wolcot. He had published John Wilkes's *North Briton* and had been arrested (with fifty others), but later discharged, for issuing the seditious No. 45 (23 April 1763). Kearsley (and sometimes 'W. Foster' or 'Forster') was Wolcot's publisher between 1785 and 1790, and published twenty titles and some eighty-five reissues and new editions. The first was *More Lyrical Odes to the Royal Academicians* in 1786 and the last *A Rowland for an Oliver* (1790). About 1791, Kearsley's involvement with Wolcot as publisher ended. This was about the time that Catharine, Kearsley's wife, joined her husband on the imprint.[41] Although Wolcot did suffer financial losses (he supposedly lost £40 with *More Lyrical Odes*), he was, by 1790, very successful in his verse-writing. Why did the association end? Perhaps Mrs Kearsley did not like Wolcot and saw him as a risk, a contentious versifier who not only made barbed attacks on the monarch but also on celebrities such as Boswell and Banks. Such a man could easily cause her husband to be sent back to jail.

In 1791, James Evans, a bookseller of Paternoster Row, took over the role of publisher. Although Evans's involvement only lasted two years, he published eight titles, many of them significant in the Wolcot canon. The first was *A Commiserating Epistle to James Lowther* (1791), Wolcot's vitriolic and libellous response to Lowther, the 'bad earl' of Lonsdale, and his actions in not only closing down a mine in Whitehaven but also withholding compensation to the local community. Evans also published the third Canto of *The Lousiad*, part of Wolcot's most important and longest work. The last title was *More Money, or Odes of Instruction to Mr Pitt* (1792), a satire on the request through Parliament for additional money that because of the King's frugality was not really required. Despite its title, the work actually focused more on George III than the Prime Minister. Evans also reprinted some of Wolcot's works, including *Lyric Odes for the Year 1785* (1791) and *Peter's Pension* (1792). Although Wolcot must have been seen as a steady earner, the financial gain from his publications was not enough. Evans was bankrupt by July 1795 and, after leaving his family, he went to America. According to John Nichols, he returned and died in absolute distress.[42]

Wolcot then attached himself to Henry Delahay Symonds, a bookseller in Paternoster Row. Symonds also had his problems with the authorities. He had been fined £100 for publishing *The Jockey Club*, a satirical work attributed to Charles Pigott, and was imprisoned in Newgate for a year for publishing Thomas Paine's *The Rights of Man* before its two-year expiry term.[43] He received a further year and a fine of £100 for publishing Paine's *Address*. In 1792, Symonds published ten titles by Wolcot, three of which were reprints: *The Remonstrance*, *A Complimentary Epistle to James Bruce*, and *A Poetical, Supplicating, Modest and Affecting Epistle to those Literary Colossuses, the Reviewers*. The last was one of Wolcot's first productions and it had been republished in 1787 and 1789. With assistance from James Robertson and Walter Berry of Edinburgh, Symonds obviously felt another reprint was worth it.[44]

The Conger

After Symonds, Wolcot settled on George Goulding, a music seller and publisher; John Walker, a one-time auctioneer and bookseller in Paternoster Row; and the Robinsons, John and George, the latter who, 'greatly respected meritorious authors, and acted with singular liberality in his pecuniary dealings with them' and was a successful purchaser of copyrights.[45] Sometime between 1793 and 1795, the four men—with John Walker as delegated spokesman—agreed to give Wolcot an annuity of £250 for life for copyright permission to publish his collected works.[46] This contract was not without discord:

> A year or two later they attempted to establish that this agreement was to include his *unwritten works*, as and when they became available; a suggestion which Peter stoutly resisted with some justice. [Wolcot] maintained that 'with respect to my annuity from the Robinsons, it is £250 per annum. It was *not* a part of the agreement, that they were to have my *future* works included for the annuity: these they were to purchase, provided I chose to *sell* them. Such is the agreement. But possibly they wish to dragoon me into a sale.'[47]

Even though Wolcot won his suit at Chancery with costs, there were still misunderstandings. The question was still what constituted copyright properties, and even though in 1802 it was agreed that 'all animosities shall be laid aside' there was still dissent.[48] In fact, Wolcot left Walker, his prime publisher at this time, and had his *The Horrors of Bribery* published under Thomas Dean's imprint. A court case brought against Walker and summarily dismissed in his favour by Justice Lord Eldon did not help relations. According to one of Wolcot's obituarists, 'much skirmishing constantly took place on these occasions; and […] many angry words passed so that Peter was at last obliged to employ the good offices of a third person to transact the business. On these occasions he was particularly bitter'.[49]

Yet despite all the legal rancour, Wolcot and Walker's relationship continued. Walker, undoubtedly aware of Wolcot's popularity and saleability, reprinted many of his past works (often supported by others), and published new titles and those contentious collected works. He was known as the 'Trade Auctioneer' and, according to John Nichols (1745–1826), was greatly respected in the trade.[50] However, there was obviously a niggle present because Nichols himself was disparaging about Walker and his 'trade sale' activities of selling copies—modern day remainders—of recently published works at a less than usual price.[51] Even bookish competition can be cut-throat.

Problems were further exacerbated by the deaths of most of the signatories of the annuity to Wolcot: Robinson in 1800; Goulding about 1800, and Walker sometime after 1816. The litigious squabbling passed to their families and others. Sarah Goulding was left to pay George Goulding's share and in 1815 there was reluctance by the Robinsons to pay their full share.[52] This was complicated by the involvement of a Mr Potter and a Mr Wilkie, the last being 'the greatest defaulter' and who, like Potter, did not sign the bond.[53] Walker himself was miffed by the pressure he received from Wolcot's 'third person': 'Sir, I am rather surprised that Mr Pollen should have stated he has called several times upon me for the annuity as I never objected but on the contrary always paid him immediately.'[54] Indeed, Walker's intentions had already been made clear to Wolcot by William Francis, the satirist's lawyer: '[Walker] *has no wish on his part but to pay the Doctor honestly and punctually his annuity.*'[55] The 'heat' continued after Walker's death, and the obvious frustration over the lack of information on publication details was directed at William Wood, his executor.

> Sir
>
> From the terms of your letters we are led to suppose that your clients have left you quite uninstructed in this matter. In your last you state that it is quite evident we must let the Executors have an account what works and editions our client [Wolcot] has any claim upon, & in what way. Your clients bought the copyright of all Dr Woolcot's [*sic*] writings commonly called 'Peter Pindar's Works' for an annuity to be paid to the Doctor for life and with an agreement to pay him a certain sum for every subsequent edition. They have been going on ever since publishing edition after edition: and what we now ask is how many editions they have published. It is impossible we can tell what has been doing in their workshops. Will you favour us with a call?
>
> We are Sir,
> Your Obed't Serv't
> Amory & Coles
> 52 Lothbury.[56]

John Walker

One publication that highlights Wolcot's popularity was his *Pindariana, or Peter's Portfolio*, a work that contains a number of serious and satirical poems on various subjects (Sir Joseph Banks, the French, author-reviewer relationships).[57] It occupied 242 pages in quarto and was printed in 1794 by Thomas Spilsbury for Walker and James Bell, J. Ladley, and Mr Jeffrey. According to the records, a staggering 42,500 copies were printed. at a cost of £189 18s, with an additional £9 2s 1½d to cover Stamp Duty and copies to the Stationers' Hall. This number reflects Wolcot's immense popularity and says much about the publisher's confidence in making sales. However, not everything went smoothly. The sum of £238 4s 6d stands out as representing returned copies of this work, some 13,235 copies. Despite advertising strategies, this must have hurt Walker. Indeed, leaves 25–26 of the same volume contain further details of Wolcot's accounts with Walker, spanning the years 1794 to 1796. Running account balances are present as well as cash and book advances (of £105 6s 9d), and the cost of paper, for example 18 reams of paper at £22 2s for the third edition of *Hair Powder: A Plaintive Epistle to Pitt*, and 30 reams of Demy at £31 10s for the second edition of *The Royal Tour and Weymouth Amusements*. The sum total is £318 2s 1½d. Various entries on the contra side reduce this amount. They include £8 11s 6d from 'W. Gutherie by W. Walker on Wolcot's account', £6 6s 'paid by Dr Wolcot for his engraving of his head for the work of 1796 which ought to have been charged to Mr Walker', the amount of £32 for the sale of *Picturesque Views with Poetical Allusions* (1797), four guineas charged to Wolcot but returned to Walker, £11 9s profit from the sale of *Celebration, or the Academic Procession to St James's: An Ode* (1794), twelve guineas allowed from 'Batch's [Bache] bill', £4 11s to Thomas Spilsbury for a reprint of Canto Two of *The Lousiad*, £2 'for stitching 4000 of the *Pindariana* which were not done', six guineas in favour of Dr Wolcot for *Liberty's Last Squeak* (1795), £17 10s 3d as balance of account for *The Convention Bill: An Ode* (1795), and £4 13s 11d for advertisement overcharging. This crawl back totalled £115 12 s 8d, which when subtracted from the above total of £318 2s 1½d resulted in a balance of £202 18s 5½d. A note is scrawled beside it: 'Balance due to J. Walker.' Payment was often slow, indeed glacial. Walker's own note reflects this: 'This is the account allowed by me this 20th December 1801.'

There were also new ventures initiated by Walker. One was a new edition of *Pilkington's Dictionary of Painters* (1799), edited by Wolcot, who was certainly capable of such a role. As a memo reveals, it was to be a shared venture.[58] The second venture was a monthly publication tentatively titled 'Miscallanious [*sic*] Collection of poetry', comprising poems selected from British and other poets, with criticisms and remarks by Wolcot (15 February 1804; GMS 5, ll. 12–13). This publication was probably *The Beauties of English Poetry. Selected from the Most Esteemed Authors. By Dr Wolcot. Containing Several Original Pieces, Never before Published* (London: Walker, 1804), undoubtedly following in the path of Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765) and Johnson's *Lives of*

the English Poets (1779–81), and the myriad of other anthologies of the day. It is of interest on two levels. Firstly, it involved the quartet of Walker, Goulding, and the Robinsons, each willing to back Wolcot on such an ambitious project. Confidence was high, because they were prepared to pay him 'twenty-five guineas per volume *whether the works sells or not*' and an additional 'ten guineas' for every 500 copies sold after the first 1,500.[59] Secondly, the publishers had definite views on what the publication would look like. Wolcot's 'Miscellany' was to be 'brought out in volumes the size of Hayley's *The Triumphs of Temper* or smaller as the Publishers think proper consisting on 164 pages or theirabouts [*sic*] monthly.' William Hayley's poem was published in 1781 and it was his most popular work. That it stood out as a model is testimony to its physical makeup, to John Dodsley who published it, and its overall effect amongst other publications. Importantly, it provides a benchmark for what Wolcot would have produced.[60]

West & Hughes

William West and Thomas Hughes took over the publishing role between late 1799 and late 1801. They were based at Paternoster Row, London. West had experience in the trade. He had been apprenticed to Robert Colley and was later turned over to Thomas Evans. West was manager to Evans and on the latter's retirement, assisted the already mentioned James Evans.[61] On the latter's departure to America, West was left on his own. Little is known of Hughes, the partner. It is in this capacity that these two men had dealings with Wolcot who, again, must have seemed a lucrative catch, a sure means to bolster their business. In a little over two years, they published five works and from the records available, actively promoted them.

The first work they published was *Nil Admirari*, printed by William and Charles Spilsbury in an edition of 1,000 *c.* 21 October 1799.[62] This work was a satire on Hannah More and Beilby Porteus (1731–1808), Lord Bishop of London, and centred on the folly of flattery occasioned by Porteus's generous praise of More's *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (1799).

> A sorry Critic thou in prose and Metre,
> Or thou hadst judged her power a scanty Rill;
> Which, if thou wilt believe the word of Peter,
> *Crawls* at the *bottom* of th' Aonian hill.
>
> *Twice* can't I read her labours, for my blood;
> So *simply* mawkish, so *sublimely* sad:
> I own Miss Hannah's Life is *very good*;
> But then, her Verse and prose are *very bad*.
>
> (*Nil Admirari*, *Works*, IV, 261)

While in London, the Polish General Tadeusz Kosciuszko had expressed interest in seeing only one person: Peter Pindar. He wanted to present the good Doctor with some Falernian wine in acknowledgement of the pleasure he derived from reading his works while in prison. *The Expostulation to Miss Hannah More*, which accompanies the above work, carries Wolcot's record of their meeting.

> Me Kosciusko deems a Bard divine;
> My Works illumed his dungeon of affright*
> 'Twas here the Hero read my Lyric Line;
> Yea, read my Lucubrations with delight.
>
> To me the Hero rich Falernian sent,
> To sooth the horrors of our gloomy weather:
> To him in Leicester-fields with joy I went;
> For Bards and Heroes *pair* like Doves together.
>
> *When a prisoner in Russia. [Wolcot's footnote.]
>
> (*Nil Admirari*, *Works*, IV, 281)

The satire also included a prose *Postscript* in which Wolcot provided model reviews of his own satire for magazines. It represents one of his strongest statements on the work of critics and reviewers:

> Instead of coming forwards as the fair and candid interpreters of the Muses, they [the critics] are too many of them the partial trumpeters of their own pigmy pretensions: or despicable pimps, hired to debauch the public taste, and mislead the judgment; to displace the statues of Genius, to make room for those of Arrogance and Folly. (Postscript, *Nil Admirari*, *Works*, IV, 297)

In business together for the first time, West and Hughes obviously wanted to capitalise on this new work by promoting it as much as possible. Wolcot's West Country contacts and his immense popularity induced them to extend their advertising beyond the London newspapers, those traditional outlets that would normally have catered to most new book sales and promotion. They made sensible use of the established networks for distribution in the provincial areas. Indeed, over the two-year period, twenty-four towns were integrated into the firm's distribution network. The coverage is reasonably extensive, given that sixty-nine provincial towns (and their various newspapers) are listed in the *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*.[63]

Advertisements promoting *Nil Admirari* were printed between 5 and 7 October 1799, at a cost of 5s (GMS 5, l. 237), while simultaneously, charges for placing the advertisements in various newspapers and periodicals were recorded (GMS 5, l. 164). Five London newspapers are listed: the *Sun*, the *Star,* the *Morning Chronicle*, at a combined cost of £1 7s, the 'Times & Mail' at 18s, and the

Oracle at a lower rate of 9s.[64] Further advertisement charges were recorded for towns rather than specific newspapers: Portsmouth, Bristol (twice & postage), Bath (twice & postage), and Canterbury (twice & postage).[65] Charges were £1 each except for the second despatch to Bath at £1 3s 6d. Thus began a concentrated effort by both West and Hughes to promote *Nil Admirari*. Indeed, just over a week later, there was a flurry of repeats. On 16 October, advertisements were recorded for the *Sun*, the *Star*, the *Morning Chronicle*, and the *Oracle*, with additional advertisements for 'Whitehall', the *Herald*, the *Volunteer*, and John Taylor's London-based *True Briton*.[66] The cost for these was £6 17s.

A month later, accounts for various towns were again recorded with a mention of some specific newspapers and journals. On 25 November 1799, Robert Raikes's *Glouceſter Journal* (8s) and one in 'Newcastle' (9s 8d)[67] were recorded, while on 27 November, the *Hereford Journal & Poſt*, an unknown paper in 'Edinboro', and the *Chelmsford Chronicle* were recipients, with their respective charges: 8s 1d, 8s 8d, and 9s 6d. The following day advertisements were recorded for Worcester (9s 7d), Hull (9s 6d), and Brighton (8s), while on 29 November, Dorchester (10s 6d) and Norwich (11s 1d) were added.[68] The final run on 30 November included Northampton (10s), Maidstone, probably the *Maidſtone Journal* (9s), Oxford (9s), Bury [St Edmunds], probably the *Bury and Norfolk Advertiser* (10s), Exeter (10s 8d), and Norwich again—twice (£1 2s).[69]

During this period, 9 copies were sent to the Stationers' Hall, 1 to the Stamp Office, and 6 to reviewers unknown.[70] By late October 1799, Wolcot was working on his next production, *Lord Auckland's Triumph*. Although sales of *Nil Admirari* had no doubt lessened, this did not stop West and Hughes registering advertisements in a 'Gloucester paper', no doubt Raikes's newspaper again (9s), the *Aberdeen Journal* (9s 6d) and the *Sheffield Gazette* (9s) on 26 May 1800, and later, in a 'Doncaster paper' (9s 6d) and a 'Winchester paper' for 15 August and 5 November 1800 respectively. They certainly received encouragement. William Meyler, a bookseller in Bath and agent for the *Gazetteer*, commented to West: 'You will give my best Respects to [Wolcot]. I have had volumes of Lampoons on him for his *Admirari* sent for publication. I have not inserted any, and yet the work sells here with great avidity!' (16 December 1799; GMS 5, l. 44)

A relatively small number of returns of Nil Admirari are recorded: 34 copies, amounting to £3 6s, with the commission on 1,300 [*sic*] copies at '9/12/ per 100 5%' equalling £6 5s. Two eager readers are also recorded as ordering copies; each verifying the sale price of 2s: 'Oct 23—3 [copies] Wilson Stewart Dutton—6s' and 'Jan 13 1800—2 copies to order Mr Vizer [or Viger]—4s.' The account sub-total of £43 7s 10d was added to a brought forward sum of £1 9s 6d for a grand total of £127 6s.

Such was the pattern and strategies that West and Hughes put in place. From the appearance of Lord Auckland's *Triumph or the Death of Crim. Con*, published in June 1800 in an edition of 1,000 copies (GMS 5, l. 237),[71] *Out at Laſt*, printed about 14 March 1801 in an edition of 1,000 copies (GMS 5, l.

238), and *Odes to Ins & Outs*, to *A Poetical Epistle to Benjamin Count Rumford*, Wolcot's 'Knight of the Dishclout' published in mid-July 1801 in an edition of 1,500 copies (GMS 5, l. 32) and Dr Wolcot's *Tales of the Hoy*, in which William Richardson and William Clarke were also involved,[72] the same newspapers and journals featured, with a marked degree of consistency. The *Sun*, the *Morning Chronicle*, the *Post*, the *Star*, the *Oracle* (6s) and the *Courier* (and others) appear regularly as recipients, with advertising charges recorded as remarkably consistent, hovering around the 5s to 8s 6d per advertisement. Other consistencies include the 9 copies despatched to the Stationers' Hall, and a copy to the Stamp Office, although charges reveal that there may have been more than 1 copy.

Returns—bugbears to any publisher—were also present. Thirty-five copies of Wolcot's *Lord Auckland* copies were returned at a cost of £3 8s, 240 copies of Out at Last, 191 copies of Odes to Ins and Out at a cost of £18 8s, 650 copies of *A Poetical Epistle to Benjamin Count Rumford*, Wolcot's satire on the American Benjamin Thompson, Count von Rumford (1753–1814), and 67 copies of *Tales of the Hoy*—supposedly. Underneath the above figure for the *Hoy* there is in Wolcot's hand a note: 'The above 65 [*sic*] copies *not* returned according to Bennett's account' and beside the entry, in faded pencil, is the succinct: 'not returned'.[73] As will be seen, this would not be the first time Wolcot would question his publisher's dealings.

Wolcot's growing dissatisfaction with West and Hughes is further evidenced in two leaves that contain notes by him on what was to be discussed next time they met. Headed 'Agenda', he begins: 'To meet West & his books and desire the different receipts for cash & and [sic] orders for Pamphlets &c. To see some of the newspapers—the Post, Oracle, Times, Chronicle—and search the file. To make Mr West produce proofs of the insertions of advertisements & the names of the Papers (Country) and Publishers.' (GMS 5, l. 69) In short, Wolcot did not trust publishers. Other notes by him bear this out. In reference to an announcement in a newspaper of 'the Horrors' (a work written about July 1800 and not appearing in Wolcot's *Collected Works*), he asked 'What papers', and in relation to *Out at Last*, he noted 'balance of acc't false by 100 copies.' He repeated the details of the 65 missing copies of the *Tales of the Hoy* and recorded overcharges: '38 shillings for ream charged for Lord Auckland—I think an overcharge' and 'Sundries charged without specification'. And, with reference to William Richardson: 'Mr West rec'd £15 from Richardson. Unmentioned in his acc't. Upon questioning him about it he answered he had rec'd nothing from him—the £15—was for £25 Tales of the Hoy. Richardson showed me his books.' He continued: 'Advertisements not inserted—the particular paper scarcely mentioned—a Brighton paper charged that never existed.' He is more specific on West: 'I think W charges me with more sets of my works, printed by the Robinson's, than I ever received. Memo: to investigate, also orders of the smaller publications as I never gave a verbal one but a written [*sic*] by our mutual agreem't.' Throughout these agenda notes, Wolcot also itemises money owed or drawn upon, as for example, 'Drawn by West £29', 'My note to Spilsbury

accp. but not paid (£50)', and 'Promissory note—May 30 1801 in my possession (£30)'. Another account headed 'Pindar's Picturesque Views', giving the sum of £9 12s owed, has Wolcot's note: 'N.B. Mr West received from my house July 13 '99. 6 Picturesque Views delivered by me to his boy. Mr West has forgotten to make me creditor, for those he rec'd from Richardson, also the money from Richardson.' (GMS 5, l. 88)

Wolcot was dependent on verse-making for a living and his concern over money issues is understandable.[74] A letter from West and Hughes not only highlights their promotional efforts in selling his works—most certainly at this time *A Poetical Epistle to Benjamin Count Rumford*—but also their efforts in placating the satirist. Of particular importance is the list of booksellers, their presence reiterating the wide range of provincial and city locales that formed part of the publisher's distribution network. They represent the real depth in the book trade of the late eighteenth century.

No. 40 Paternoster Row
10th August 1801

Sir,

On the 20th July we sent your last adv't accompanied with Copies of the work, through the medium of their own & other Booksellers Parcels (to save yr expence of carriage &c) to the following places—Collins—Salisbury; Goadby—Sherborne; Burbage—Nottingham; Wolmer [*sic*]—Exeter; Swinney—Birmingham; Wood—Shrewsbury; Flower—Cambridge; Bacon—Norwich; Merrit—Liverpool; Meyler—Bath; Bulgin—Bristol; Raikes—Gloucester. These with once in the Times—Post—Courier—Oracle—Star & Morning Chronicle we conceived was a good beginning, but as you wished it to appear more public in Town we are much vexed that it has from several perplexing circumstances been delay'd, but more particularly so at your taking the trouble upon yourself—as you must no doubt be much offended with us in taking that step. The advertisement has appeared in the Birmingham & Bristol papers & no doubt several others by this time. I have now sent again for the Paper for the Canto. What they sent me was too white. Spilsbury will no doubt have it today. Mr Dwyer has apartments a little beyond Walworth Terrace, but I do not know the name of the Person. I observe your 12 Views are charged 15/– each, 9£ in our invoice. He has promised to call & pay his Bill of 90£ in a few days, and if you think proper to *trust us with ye Rect of it* the money it shall be sent to you *immediately* we receive it. We have been in hopes of his calling and that we might have the pleasure of his & your company in a friendly way.

We also hope you will not continue to be offended, as no such delays shall occur in future.

We remain Sir
Your most obd't Serv't
West & Hughes. (GMS 5, ll. 186–87)

A year later, West sent another letter to Wolcot. In this he is apologetic about his services, making references to the dissolving and the 'difficulties' of the firm which had occurred the previous year. Indeed, the firm of West and Hughes had been declared bankrupt on 3 October 1801 and both men were now operating separately. Scribbled on a corner is a note by Wolcot, 'West Nov. 1802 acknowledging error in acc't, particularly Richardsons.' The letter is given in full below:

No. 8 Queen's Row
Newington, Nov. 11 1802.

Sir,

I duly received your letter this morning, and beg leave to inform you that nothing has been more distant from my thoughts than that of treating your letters with disrespect, or wishing you to experience an unnecessary loss in addition to the real one which our affairs have created. At the same time if you could have form'd an idea of the necessities & state of mind I have experienced in keeping myself & family together, you would not I am sure altogether condemn my conduct. Indeed former difficulties must in some measure palliate those little irregularities which you have complained of, but which I am willing to rectify to the best of my ability. Our books are in course copies of the accounts delivered, but as I have sent them to Mr Hughes, No. 1 Queens Head Passage as you requested, and am willing to meet or wait upon you. I trust you will not judge so harshly upon explanation. With respect to Richardson's account, I do not find that you are credited for what he paid, altho' I remember settling an account with him at the early part of our concerns. I do not recollect the sum, but that and other circumstances shall be clear'd up.

With respect to Mr Dwyer's business, the evil could not be forseen as his acc't was included in a note at 20 months & was paid before our misfortune so that I could have no view to your suffering on that account. If you judge otherwise, I have no objection to liquidate it as I can spare it if I should succeed.

Mrs Colbert has made some large returns of your works—which shall be delivered up to you, as some indemnification from the loss.

> I am not surprized you should be angry at my apparent neglect, but if you were aware of the struggles I have had, I am convinced you would not wish to add to them. Be that as it may I await your appointments hoping all difficulties will be adjusted in an amicable manner.
>
> I am Sir
> With due respect,
> You very obed't serv't,
> William West. (GMS 5, ll. 188–89)

Wolcot was by no means blameless. An unsigned undated letter conveys something of the intricacies of eighteenth century record keeping and hints at the Doctor's reputation.

> Dear Sir
>
> Incl'd last week a Letter from Dr Wolcot informing me that he had given you a Bill on me for ten guineas. I have been so much confined by indisposition, and my mind so much employed that I really neglected to investigate the matter. I have now ascertained the acc't and find the Dr. erroneous. I had 6 from Walker—6 from the Dr. & two coloured ones. He says *12* but does not mention the *two* in colours. I have drawn out an exact statement of the Account & enclose you the Balance which I hope Dr Wolcott [*sic*] will find right. Your submission [*sic*] is to him and explaining the matter will oblige me for the Doctor is too powerful in and attentive to *Numbers* to stoop to the drudgery & minutia of *Figures*, I presume.
> (GMS 5, l. 51)

Printers

Printers also came and went. The already mentioned Thomas Egerton, before joining his brother John as a publisher, printed *More Lyrical Odes* (1783). John Jarvis (283 Strand) printed the very successful first Canto of *The Lousiad* (1785) and *Lyric Odes for the Year 1785* (1785), while Joseph Cooper printed *Peter's Prophecy* (1788), a successful attack on William Pitt, Sir William Chambers and Sir Joseph Banks.[75] This work contains one of Wolcot's finest (and last) renderings of the manners and speech of King George III:

> What's new, Sir JOSEPH? what, what's new found out?
> What's the society, what, what about?
> Any more monsters, lizard, monkey, rat,
> Egg, weed, mouse, butterfly, pig, what, what, what?
>
> Toad, Spider, grasshopper, Sir JOSEPH BANKS?
> Any more thanks, more thanks, more thanks, more thanks?

> You still eat raw flesh, beetle, viper, bat,
> Toad, tadpole, frog, Sir Joseph, what, what, what?
> (*Peter's Prophecy*, *Works*, II, 63)

Thomas Brice

In 1790, Wolcot was living in the West Country. His versifying continued. For convenience, he employed Thomas Brice, the Exeter based printer and newspaper proprietor, to prepare copy.[76] Brice printed 1,500 copies of *A Complimentary Epistle to James Bruce*, costing out the typesetting of one copy at '6 sheets, at 15/6' for a total of £4 13s (possibly the first edition; GMS 5, l. 56). Although priced 19 years later, this is much less than the £1 6s per sheet that Benjamin Collins charged for 1,500 copies of Smollett's *Humphrey Clinker*.[77] The account—dated 17 September 1790—also priced corrections to the copy at 4s. And as expected, paper was the most expensive commodity. Eight and a half bundles of 'fine demy' cost £14 17s 6d, at £1 15s per bundle. The cost of 'folding, collating and stitching' the said number was 2s per 100, which at 1,500 copies came to £1 10s. However, Brice underestimated the amount of paper required for the job and he was forced to obtain an additional 17 quires, at the cost of 17s 6d. Cartage, from London by water (not an unusual practice) and from Topeham, was included. In addition, advertising in an unknown paper cost 5s 6d.

The following month, on 7 October 1790, Brice completed the printing of a 'new edition' of 500 copies of Wolcot's *Instructions to a Celebrated Laureat*, the first of which appeared in 1787 (GMS 5, l. 57). The typesetting for this work was £2 7s 6d, involving 4½ sheets at 11s per sheet; 4½ reams of 'demy paper' at 13s was used, costing £2 18s 6d, and the seemingly constant 2s per 100 for folding, collating, etc. The total sum on the invoice was £5 18s 6d.

A draft payment of 5 guineas was made by Wolcot on this title in 1791. The remaining balance was added to another printing job, completed by Brice some time after 1 January 1791. This was another reprint, a reissue of *Lyric Odes to the Royal Academicians* in 1,000 copies, which first appeared in 1782.[78] Once again the account is broken down to the cost of setting copy: '6½ sheets at 12s per sheet'; folding only at 10s; '8 bundles of demy paper at 35s per bundle' (£14); 'To Land Carriage of Paper' at £1 12s; and package at 3s. The total was £21 14s 10d. Because of Brice's own efforts to upgrade his stock, a letter of 4 January 1791 accompanying the account was sent to Wolcot, who was by now back in London. Directed care of Kearsley in Fleet Street, it read:

> Sir,
>
> Your books were sent by waggon for Spilsbury on Saturday last—and I take the liberty to send the bill on the other side. I have ordered new letter for my news-paper [*Old Exeter Journal*] of Mr Jackson, letter-founder, Salisbury Court, and it is necessary for me to discharge a *demand* he has already on me. To do this I have ventured to draw on you for *Ten Pounds* at Twenty Days,

> and you will greatly add to your former favours by accepting this draft. I wish you care and health amidst the fogs of London, and am respectfully,
>
> Yours at Command
> Thomas Brice (GMS 5, l. 58)

Thomas Spilsbury & Sons

The 'Spilsbury' mentioned in the above letter was Thomas Spilsbury, a printer who operated at Snowhill, London. Between 1790 and 1808, the Spilsbury family—including Charles and William—were employed in printing Wolcot's verse and promotional material. According to John Nichols, himself a printer, an author (*Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*), and a publisher of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, Thomas Spilsbury was a man of the strictest integrity. He was said to be the first in London, if not England, to print French accurately.[79] He printed the works of the Revd William Herbert (1778–1847?), the translator of Danish and Icelandic sagas and poetry, and printed *Lloyd's Evening Post* from 1791 to 1796. Spilsbury traded alone from 1781 to 1795, and then later with his son William as 'Spilsbury and Son'. Wolcot himself states the beginning of their business relationship: 'Spilsb: & I came together March 11 1790' (GMS 5, l. 87). When Spilsbury Senior died in December 1795, his sons Charles and William carried on a joint business between 1796 and 1803. After 1803, they dissolved the partnership: William operating solely up to 1808 and Charles operating solely up to 1810.

Although there is only one document at Auckland that relates specifically to Thomas Spilsbury, it is important because it contains details on his activity as a printer of advertisements for 16 works written by Wolcot between 1790 and 1794 (GMS 5, l. 223). The number of advertisements printed not only indicates the extent the publisher was prepared to promote each title, with telling hints on the realities of the marketplace, but also reveals the day-to-day work and production costs of an eighteenth century English printer.

In 1790, Thomas Spilsbury's 'Wolcotian' efforts were but small beer. On 10 April, 96 '8vo page foolscap' advertisements for *A Rowland for an Oliver* (1790) were registered (GMS 5, l. 223): the cost of printing them was 3s. Two months later, on 30 June, 40 '8vo page' advertisements were invoiced for Wolcot's *Advice to the Future Laureat* (1790), his instructions to Thomas Warton's unknown successor: these cost 2s.[80] In 1791, the production rate increased. Five new Wolcot titles were promoted: the third Canto of *The Lousiad*, the *Rights of Kings*, *Odes to Mr Paine*, the *Remonstrance*, and *A Commiseration Epistle to James Lowther* (GMS 5, l. 223). The largest number of 60 advertisements was registered to *Odes to Mr Paine*, while the lowest of 24 was recorded for *Epistle to James Lowther* and the *Remonstrance*. A supplementary sheet covering 1791 through to 1795 records the days on which the advertisements were printed, their associated costs, but no actual numbers issued (GMS 5, l. 226). For example,

advertisements were printed for *Odes to Mr Paine* on 8, 13, 15 and 18 July 1791, and cost £1. Two batches for the *Remonstrance*, Wolcot's defence against the charge that he joined the King's party because of his attack on Thomas Paine, were printed on 23 and 26 September 1791: these cost 12s. *Liberty's Last Squeak* and *The Royal Visit to Exeter*, both written in 1795, had advertisements printed on 4 and 7 December respectively. The total cost for 16 titles was £8 6s 6d.

As Wolcot continued to write his odes and elegies, his publisher continued to job them out to Spilsbury. And here the pattern was the same, from *More Money* (1792) through to the advertisements and proposals for Pindar's *Works* and *Pindariana, or Peter's Portfolio* (1794–[1795]). All the advertisements were printed on octavo or half-sheet pages in much the same quantity and cost, approximating to 1d per page.

Although Thomas Spilsbury printed many of Wolcot's works, there was only one title that registered his actual involvement: the above-mentioned *Pindariana*. Perhaps Spilsbury's more tangible involvement was a catalyst to greater promotion. On 23 August 1794, '1000' proposals were printed at a cost of 13s, which included the cost of alterations to the text. Noticeably, these octavo pages were printed on 'fine wove paper'.

Spilsbury also printed a backlist of available titles by Wolcot. On 4 June 1791, 200 '8vo page, on half-sheet foolscap' were invoiced at a cost of 7s. Four months later, on 25 September, Spilsbury printed another 154, including 30 that were 'recomposed' in 'brevier' for the newspapers. The latter process was relatively expensive and cost 3s. The other 124 advertisements cost 6s total. Given Wolcot's popularity with the reading public, a further 4,000 'Copies of a List of P. Pindar's Works' were printed (and invoiced) on 27 October 1792 for 16s. Seemingly, this was an insufficient number because twenty days later, on 17 November, another 75 were produced on octavo foolscap, costing 3s.

The stitching of printed gatherings—especially smaller verse publications—was an integral part of book production. An account detailing the cost of stitching 27 titles from March 1790 to 10 August 1793 reveals costs of this important process and offers valuable evidence on issue numbers and anticipated demand.[81] Thirteen titles were reprints or later editions, ranging from Wolcot's *An Epistle to the Reviewers*, *Ode upon Ode*, and *A Poetical Epistle to a Falling Minister* to *Peter's Pension*, the *Remonstrance*, and *A Complimentary Epistle to James Bruce*. The numbers of copies of these 6 titles stitched give a good indication of commitment by the publisher: 286, 750, 409, 500, 1,750, and 750 respectively. They are priced accordingly: 1s 6d, 3s, 2s 6d, 3s, 2s 6d, and 2s 6d. Indeed, John Nichols criticised the relatively high cost of Wolcot's productions. 'They were […] very dear to the purchaser, being printed in thin quarto pamphlets at 2s 6d each, and containing only a very small portion of letter-press.'[82] The 14 other titles were more recent publications; for example: on 30 June 1790, 950 copies of the first edition of *Advice to the Future Laureat* were stitched at a cost of 1s 6d per hundred, while on 19 March 1791, 1,500

copies of the first edition of Canto Three of *The Lousiad* were stitched at 2s 6d per hundred. Two days later, 1,500 copies of the first edition of the *Rights of Kings* were stitched at 3s per hundred, while on 25 August 1793, 1,150 copies of another printing of *A Pair of Lyric Epistles to Lord Macartney* were stitched at 1s 6d per hundred. A month later, on 29 September, 2,000 copies of another edition (perhaps a third) of *Odes to Kien Long* were stitched at 3s per hundred.[83] The tempo had increased with these titles. For example, from March to 16 November 1791, 9,250 copies of 7 titles were stitched. Given that they were stitched just after printing, the numbers indicate a fair demand for Wolcot's works. The bill for the entire number stitched amounted to £31 1s 5½d.

The normal period of credit was two months.[84] Wolcot disregarded this convention totally; his payments for printing were infrequent and were never in full. A 'Memoranda' note reveals the complexities of Wolcot's finances and a decided lack of any systematic records. It is as follows:

> On June 29 1790 Mr Sp[ilsbury] received a draft of 23 from Kearsley on my acct. Mr Sp. in his account makes it in the year 1791 without specifying the month. It is probable that I should [*sic*] have made no payment between June 1790 and January 17th 1793? But grant that Mr Sp. is right & that it was 1791, that I made him a payment, there [*sic*] will be two years. But there *was* money received by Mr Sp. from Evans by Mr Spilsbury's own man. Dawson [?] [illegible word] 21 taken from Evan's book. (GMS 5, l. 87)

Wolcot's infrequent payments to Spilsbury are further documented on a small piece of paper headed 'Paid Spilsbury' (GMS 5, l. 92). Wolcot's calculations are as follows: '1792 July 31 draft on Symonds £30; December 17 £20; 1793 May 26 £20; June 24 £20; April 1792 £21; June 1790 from Kearsley's acc't £23.' In his hand, there is a further note: 'Jan 17 1793 gave Mr Sp. a £20 note on Beddingsed [?] […] see my long green book.' Crossed out and still readable is the note, 'I certainly paid Sp. for ever [?] before July 31 1792. What were terms?'

Charles & William Spilsbury

As already mentioned, William and Charles Spilsbury joined forces after their father's death, and statements of account, spanning May 1797 to December 1802, reveal their involvement with Wolcot and detail the job-to-job activities in their printing house. The information includes numbers printed, composition, format details, and costs, and confirm many of the details registered in the other accounts. One details costs of Wolcot's *Picturesque Views with Poetical Allusions*, one of his few non-satiric works, and as such, it is worth quoting in full.

> Dr Wolcot
> To W & C Spilsbury 1797 May 28

To printing Descriptive Verses to Six Picturesque Views, elegantly, with superfine ink, Super-Royal Folio, 1000 Copies—			
3 Sheets (2 pages on each sheet) @ 36/–	5	8	0
Title to ditto (twice composed) 500 copies	1	0	0
To 1000 Wrappers to ditto	0	18	0
Hot-pressing the work, 7 R[ea]ms	2	14	0
Ditto Wrappers, 2 R[ea]ms			
2 Rms of Double Crown Blue Paper	1	16	0
1 Bundle of Tissue Paper	0	16	0
	£12	12	0
To balance on former Bill	1	0	7
	£13	12	7
To an Advertisement of *Picturesque Views* in *Lloyd's Evening Post*, July 15, 96, May 8, 17, & 26, 97 @ 5/–	1	0	0
Total:	£14	12	7

(GMS 5, l. 234)

Another ledger details charges for the printing of six titles (GMS 5, ll. 238–39), of which four are given here. There is a marked consistency in the price structure, with small variation because of the different numbers of sheets used and thus charged for. *Nil Admirari*, one of the few Wolcot titles that the Spilsburys assigned their name to, was printed in a 'demy 4to' edition of 1,000 utilising 8½ sheets at 19s per sheet: these cost £8 1s 6d. There were the alterations and the 'doing in slips' which came to £2 12s 6d. Stitching at the relatively higher price of 3s 6d per hundred was recorded as well as 17 reams of paper at 25s each. This last —the most expensive commodity faced by printers—amounted to £21 5s. The total cost (excluding advertising) for producing this work of 68 pages was £33 13s 6d.

The printing of Wolcot's *Tears and Smiles*, a miscellaneous collection of poems, including 'Elegies for Julia' and 'Orson and Ellen', occurred at the end of May 1800, even though the imprint—under publishers West and Hughes—is dated 1801. Once again, 1,000 copies were printed utilising 11 sheets at £2 each. An additional note highlights some consideration for workmanship and the need for footnotes: 'To printing elegantly in Foolscap 8vo Tears & Smiles long primer with Brevier Notes.' The alterations for this 167-paged work cost £1 2s, the total £23 2s. Interestingly, this work formed the benchmark for another title, planned and quoted for on 21 May 1806. George Hayden, of 4 Bridges Street, Covent Garden, supplied the first quote for 'composing and printing a work in the manner of "Tears and Smiles" same size page and type, *per sheet.*' His figures were: '500 copies at £1 11s 6d, 1000 copies at £2 2s, 1500 copies at £2 14s, and 2000 copies at £3 6s (GMS 5, l. 27). As expected, the more one

wanted printed, the less proportionately was the final unit cost. An adjustment, however, was made when Wolcot supplied a 'sheet of 4to' that was presumably more in line with his liking—and purse. Hayden's second quote (on the same sheet) was a little cheaper: '500 copies at £1 3s, 1000 copies at £1 10s, 1500 copies at £1 18s, and 2000 copies at £2 6s. This work may have been Wolcot's *Tristia*, published in 1806 and in which from the ledger accounts extant, Hayden had some dealings: 'To bill delivered for printing, boarding, and advertising Tristia, to 7 Oct. 1806—£38 11s.' (20 August 1807; GMS 5, l. 6)

The third title was *Out at Last*, a work that offers real indication on the popularity of Wolcot's verse. The first edition was printed in 1000 copies about 14 March 1801. Two months later, two further separate editions were printed, each at 1500 copies. And again it was produced in a 'demy quarto' with a noticeable increase of 4s per sheet (4½ sheets at £1 3s per sheet). Alterations and 'doing in slips' cost £1 18s 6d, while stitching was charged out at 2s 6d per hundred. Nine reams of paper were charged for at the higher price of 30s per ream. On the 12 March 1801, 48 advertisements were printed on '8vo Foolscap' for 5s, while 12 days later, another 48 were produced, but because 'in half sheets' they were charged out at a shilling extra (total 6s). The cost of this edition was £21 17s. Again, paper proved to be the most expensive commodity.

The last title, *Odes to Ins and Outs*, was squeezed in between this hectic activity of reprinting. In this case, 1,500 copies were printed. Perhaps this increase was the result of the flurry of producing *Out at Last*; perhaps because *Odes to Ins and Outs* was seen as a companion piece to the former. At more than double the sheets and well over 21 reams used, and the increased number of issues stitched, its cost was a rather large £48 13s 6d. Such was the publisher's commitment to Wolcot.

Wolcot's *The Horrors of Bribery* was printed on 18 December 1802. While this was not the last title the Spilsbury brothers printed together, fractures were developing. By 1803, they had split and were operating independently. The reviews for *The Horrors of Bribery* and another, *Island of Innocence*, were bad: 'Peter is generally speaking a merry fellow and often a witty one, but we cannot say we have once smiled during this perusal [...] we are afraid you have almost exhausted your budget.'[85] A lagging interest in Wolcot's works would not have helped sales. Nor would a slowness in paying money owed. Indeed, the total balance registered on the last account sheet was £244 12s 6d, a rather large amount that needed paying. Although written in the early part of 1796, the letter below reflects the cash-flow situation (presumably not an uncommon occurrence) that the brothers faced, especially with their involvement over the years with the slow-paying Doctor. The pirated copies mentioned would not have assisted sales either.

> Dear Sir,
>
> It is with regret we trouble you in your retirement from this scene of bustle and perplexity with any thing that may put you in

> mind of it sooner than you would wish. But, having before stated to you the necessity we should be under of applying to you soon for money, and as you expressed your readiness to help us out, we have made out, and now enclose your account to this day, the balance of which (as stated) appears to be £106 13s—and, as we have some very heavy payments to make in a few days, we hope you will be so good as to favour us with a draught for the amount of it, or, if it should not be quite convenient to settle the whole directly, for so much of it as you can. Be assured Sir, that as soon as we hear anything respecting Mr E's [Evans's?] concerns, we will acquaint you. In respect to the spurious Editions of your Works, we do not pretend to advise you, as you no doubt have better counsellors at hand; but we think it a duty to remark to you, that they are daily advertised in a most barefaced manner; that your property seems to be suffering an irretrievable loss; and that if some step is not immediately taken, your own sale will be entirely stopped. We hope your health is good; and remain,
>
> Sir,
>
> Yr obliged & obed. Humb. Serv't
>
> W & C Spilsbury.
>
> P.S. Mrs S. & the rest of the Family write in respectful compliments. (GMS 5, l. 227)

Although their partnership was dissolved in 1803, both brothers figured later in printing for Wolcot. In June 1805 William Spilsbury details work done on two titles for Wolcot (GMS 5, l. 249). He charged £1 18s for the 'Composition for Odes of Horror in Great Primer Quarto, with Alterations', 12s 6d for the 'pulling in slips', and 14s for corrections 'composed on half sheet in Pica'. There is no mention of the cost of paper. Two items, however, are of interest, because they are not present in any of the other accounts. Spilsbury itemises a separate 'title & preface' page charge of 10s 6d, and a charge for 'Sunday work', incorporated into the amount of 12s 6d for slips. Comparisons with charges made by other printers may reveal interesting statistics, especially concerning 'weekend' work. The total for this title was £3 15s.

Spilbury's printing of *The Saints*, in 'Long Primer and Brevier Foolscap Octavo 1000. No. 5 sheets @ 2. 0. 0.', cost £10. He lists an additional charge of £1 12s 6d for 'Various corrections, pulling in slips and matter erased', while 'sections H and I with alterations' cost a rather high £3 4s. The total for this work was £16 12s 6d. While both titles amounted to £20 7s 6d, William Spilsbury made an adjustment: 'As sheets H and I though composed were not worked off, the amount must be reduced from the sum total.' The final total for these publications—works that do not appear to be by Wolcot—was £17 3s 6d.

In June 1808, Charles Spilsbury printed 'Odes to Academicians', either a reprint of either *Lyric Odes* (first printed in 1782) or *More Lyric Odes*, first printed

in 1783 (GMS 5, l. 250). This work consisted of 5½ sheets at 25s each (£6 17s 6d) and 8¼ reams 'Demy' at 38s per ream. There is no indication of how many copies were printed, yet paper, as expected, was the most expensive item: £15 13s 6d. Corrections and 'pulling Proofs on Slips' amounted to £1 8s while printing a cancel leaf (of possible interest to textual bibliographers) cost 7s. Twenty advertisements printed on slips cost 2s 6d. Below the total of £23 0s 6d, there is a note signed by Spilsbury: 'Mem. Added by Bill @ 6 months. Due Feb 15th 1809.' Such were the realities of dealing with the slow paying Doctor.

Distribution: Sweetland & Brice

Margaret Sweetland took over her late husband's book selling business in September 1787, where she also traded in patent medicines and bound 'books neatly done'.[86] According to a 'Memo' by Wolcot, he began his dealings with her in 1790 (GMS 5, l. 228). Although the documentation is sparse, Sweetland seemed to play a pivotal role in disseminating Wolcot's works from her shop in Exeter, passing the books to her Exeter colleagues such as Robert Trewman, bookseller, printer, and proprietor of the *Exeter Flying Post*; Shirley Woolmer, one of the first to organise a circulating library in Exeter; and John (Glanville) Manning or John Manning, both booksellers in High Street, as well as Gilbert Dyer, the 'distinguished veteran of the book trade' and owner of a circulating library, and James Manning.[87]

Between 11 September and 12 November 1790, 24 titles by Wolcot were recorded for Sweetland (GMS 5, ll. 54–55). In almost all instances, 20 copies of each title were despatched, ranging from Wolcot's earliest work, *A Modest and Affecting Epistles to the Reviewers* (perhaps the 1789 reprint) to his *Epistle to John Nichols* (1790). They were registered on 26 October 1790 at a total cost of £93 3s 4d. The exceptions were 75 copies of *A Complimentary Epistle to James Bruce* (1790) and 450 copies of *Whitbread Brewhouse*, Wolcot's celebrated account of the King's visit to Samuel Whitbread's brewery, found in *Instructions to a Celebrated Laureat*. These cost £7 10s and £45 respectively. The fact that these 2 titles were printed locally by Thomas Brice may have explained the relatively high number ordered. It certainly indicates a keen level of local support by Sweetland.

Revealing a buoyant optimism for items 'hot off the press', an increased number were ordered and sent.[88] On 21 October 1790, Kearlsey despatched '20 complete sets', incorporating Wolcot's *A Modest and Affecting Epistle to the Reviewers* and *Rowland for an Oliver*, and 20 engraved portraits of Wolcot. Five months later on 31 March 1791, 50 copies of Canto Three of *The Lousiad* were sent, followed two months later, with 30 copies of the *Rights of Kings*. On 31 October 1791, 50 copies of the *Remonstrance* were sent, and then on 7 December, 50 copies of *A Commiserating Epistle to James Lowther* and a further 20 copies of Canto Three were despatched. Finally, on 23 February 1792, 50 copies of *More Money* (1792) were sent. As an established bookseller, Sweetland would

have done her best to sell them. Indeed, a note headed 'Dr Woollcott [*sic*] to Marg Sweetland' overlaps this period (GMS 5, l. 56). It records brief details of Sweetland's distributional transactions with her book-selling colleagues in Exeter. On 11 September 1790, she despatched a dozen copies of *Epistle to Bruce* to Trewman, 6 to Woolmer, 4 to Manning and 2 to Dyer. Copies were charged out at 2s each. On 18 October, 2 more copies of *Epistle to Bruce* and *Whitbread Brewhouse* were ordered (at 2s each), while 8 days later, 1 copy only of the *Epistle* was sent to Woolmer along with 6 'sets' of Wolcot's works. These last were registered at £2 15s 6d each, a total of £12 14s. They were part of the consignment that had arrived directly from Kearsley in London; the charge for the parcel was 8s 2d.

On 25 September 1791, Sweetland wrote to Wolcot about binding services provided by Woolmer. Among the plea for more works, one wonders what the books were that Wolcot himself requested.

> Sir,
>
> I delay'd to answer your last to this time, in hope to remit the whole balance. Woolmer hath not cared to pay me more than 2£ for that says he you [*sic*] owe him for binding your Works, notwithstanding I hope soon to induce him to. Inclosed to Cr. Of Acct. is a five Guinea Bill to Bearer on Demand. On the other side is the list of all your works in Exon. I cannot find those you request. Be pleased to send me of your new Work without delay and of all others which you may publish.
>
> I am Sir,
> Your most obedient
> Margaret Sweetland. (GMS 5, l. 45)

And true to her word, overleaf there are the numbers of 27 titles that she had in stock. They ranged from *A Poetical Epistles to the Reviewers* (2 copies), Canto One of *The Lousiad* (2 copies), *Advice to a Future Laureat* (4 copies) and *Whitbread Brewhouse* (80 copies) to *Epistle to Bruce* (69 copies), the *Rights of Kings* (5), and *Odes to Mr Paine* (57 copies). The last had just been printed. In an effort to monitor the traffic of his publications, Wolcot added a note on the sheet: 'Memo—To enquire of Spilsbury what he has sent to Mrs Sw. of my books.' (GMS 5, l. 46)

Another longer account headed 'John Wolcot Esqr. Dr. to the late Mrs Marg't Sweetland' covers the period 18 October 1790 to 28 June 1793 (GMS 5, l. 48).[89] Aside from a draft of £20 on Balthius[?] entered on 24 June 1793 and 'Returns made to Goulding of all that remained in hand' amounting to £36 18s 7d, the charges recorded are divided into two main areas: carriage and portage fees and the cost of actual titles. And carriage costs certainly mounted up. Sixteen instances are given, some matching deliveries registered in the other accounts. The highest charge of 8s 2d for the delivery of Wolcot's works from Kearsley

is again registered while 1s for 4 letters delivered to unknown destinations is recorded as the least.

The charges for individual titles despatched also vary. A buyer called Lucraft received 7 titles at 2s each. They included the third Canto of *The Lousiad* (on 7 March 1791), the *Rights of Kings* (on 7 June), the *Remonſtrance* (on 20 October), *More Money* (on 27 February 1792), *The Tears of St Margaret* (on 28 June), Canto Four of *The Lousiad* (on 1 December), and *A Poetical, Serious and Possibly Impertinent Epiſtle to the Pope* (on 24 June 1793). The others he received included *Odes to Mr Paine* at 9d on 6 December, *Odes of Importance* at 2s 6d on 19 May, *A Pair of Lyric Epiſtles to Lord Macartney* at 1s 3d on 4 September, and *Odes to Kien Long* at 2s 6d on 16 October. Over the same two-year period, a similar number of titles were despatched to a Mrs White, while 3 (*Rights of Kings*, *Odes to Mr Paine* and *Remonſtrance*) were sent to Mr Polwhele, presumably Wolcot's friend, the Revd Richard Polwhele (1760–1838), the Cornish historian and poet, for 5s 3d.[90]

A further glimpse of the distribution of Wolcot's works out West is highlighted in a scrappy notebook 'Mr Brice's Book' (GMS 5, ll. 52–53). On 9 September 1790 the Exeter-based printer and bookseller Thomas Brice despatched 200 copies of *A Complimentary Epiſtle to James Bruce* by coach to George Kearsley in London. The following two days another 600 copies were sent. There was also local distribution. On the 11 September, 50 copies were sent to Benjamin Haydon, a printer and bookseller in Plymouth, 12 to Sweetland, 12 to Trewman, via Mrs Sweetland, an unknown number to Woolmer at Fore Street, Dyer, and James Manning.[91] On the 13 September, 5 more copies were sent to Mrs Sweetland and 52 to Edward Hoxland, another bookseller and printer in Exeter. On the 14 September, 12 copies went to James Penny, another Exeter-based bookseller and binder, while on 16 September, 24 more were despatched to Sweetland and a further 448 to Kearsley.[92] Wolcot was given or sold 12 copies and Brice sold 3. Thus in matter of 8 days, 1,430 copies of a run of 1,500 were distributed, and, as expected, most were destined to London for sale.

* * * * *

Although Wolcot's reputation suffered much in his last years, there were those such as John Taylor, who remained a true and loyal friend. Acknowledging his stormy relationships with the reading public, Wolcot still expressed some fondness towards them. It would be appropriate to completed this study of Wolcot by allowing him the last word in full. In an apparently unpublished account, intended as a preface and written some time after 1800, Wolcot addresses the 'Public' much like an old friend. Beginning with warm salutations, it closes on a note of separation and departure. It is worth giving in full.

> My Old Friend,
>
> Many a year have I written for thee and my own amusement, as well as emolument, and I really have vanity enough to fancy that I have not been unpleasant to thee. The numerous editions

through which my celebrations[?] have passed in more than ones language form a neat little pedestal for my statue to exhibit itself, and which to the disgrace of your likes[?] where be it said my envious enemies, the proprietors of the Reviews & their journeymen have been most unsuccessfully endeavouring to pull down. Thou sawest their cruel dilapidating spirit and did'st with thy friendly hand did'st sustain it to their unspeakable mortification as well as disappointment, for which I here make thee my best bow. The Reviewers thou knowest, or oughtest to know and all authors & authorlings hired at an easy expence [*sic*] to puff off the wares of their employers and decry shit of others like those fellows thou frequently observest in this great City, called Barkers, inviting and rollicking the passing crowd to enter a dirty auctioneer's shop to be *taken in* by the purchase of most excellent & cheap articles, not worth one farthing. Indeed I have been treated in a most barbarous manner and great, let me own has been my danger. With propriety I may quote an old Ballad and apply it to myself: For Death he was so near / He took away one ear / But yet thank God I'm here.

In my ramble I have called at the lodgings of some of those mine enemies, with whose characters thou will be somewhat acquainted. Although I have christened this my youngest child a sentimental brat, thou must not find much on its wisdom. Should it fall into the hands of a Frenchman he may possibly exclaim: Ah! Mon Dieu, que ce Monsieur Pindare est plein de genie, de fel, d'agremens et meme d'urbanite. How antipodically opposite to the language of my countryman, coarse inquisitors, the Reviewers. Let me not ostentatiously assert that I have never been irritated by those wasps. Not long ago in a splenetic humour I caught up the Pen, and began an imitation of Juvenal's first satire in the following manner:

> Heavens! Shall the patient Muse restrain her rage,
> While vice and folly stain th' abandon'd age.
> Condemn'd to silence say must I peruse
> The stuff that issues from our vile Reviews,
> The nonsense of each literary shrimp
> Two booksellers, three parsons & a pimp.
> The canting hypocrites of Paul's churchyard
> All busy lab'ring for God's Glory hand
> One eye with tears to heav'n uplifted floating,
> The other down upon their Mammon glowing
> One hand imploring Grace with the hearts sob
> The other proding a blind Nation's Job.
> Quick let my vengeance on their heads be hurl'd
> Quick on th' impostors be my vengeance hurl'd,
> And let me whip the rascals through the world.

> Such was the poetical foam of my fury but on reflection I threw the verses aside consoling my wounded vanity with an old reflection: a fly may sting a horse, yet a fly is still a fly, and a horse, a horse. And now my Friend I take my leave and let me thy sweet smile receive. I care not for the scowl of dull Reviewers, such stuff as forms for their flimsy mind. In every ragshop I can find, nay find it floating in a common sewer. (GMS 5, ll. 7–10)

Notes

1. Tom Girtin, *Doctor with Two Aunts: A Biography of Peter Pindar* (London: Hutchinson, 1959), p. 253.
2. Ibid.
3. Grzegorz Sinko, *John Wolcot and his School: A Chapter from the History of English Satire* (Wroclaw: Prace Wroclawskiego Towarzystwa Naukowego Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wroclaw, 1962), Appendix: p. 155.
4. Wolcot Papers, Grey Manuscripts (GMS) 1–6, Special Collections, Auckland Central City Library (APL); Grey also purchased from Enys a portion of the journal of Sir Joseph Banks. See J. D. Enys to Grey, 7 Apr 1888 (Grey Letters GL: NZE5(1), APL). See June Starke's 'John Davies Enys', *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books; Department of Internal Affairs, 1993), II (1870–1900), 133–34.
5. Cited in Sinko, Appendix: pp. 154–56.
6. '[Wolcot's] method was to tear a piece of paper into quarters, on each of which he wrote a stanza of four or six lines, according to the nature of the poem'. Cited in Kenneth Hopkins, *Portraits in Satire* (London: Barrie Books, 1958), p. 265.
7. See William Carr's entry on Wolcot in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, LXII, 290–93; also, Sinko, p. 28.
8. Hayden's post at Liskeard is mentioned in a memorandum by John Taylor, 11 Sep 1822 (A. H. Reed Autograph Collection, No. 829, Dunedin Public Library).
9. Wolcot, cited in Robert L. Vales's *Peter Pindar (John Wolcot)* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1973), p. 13.
10. 'Memoirs of the Author' in *The Works of Peter Pindar, Esq.*, 5 vols (London: Printed for J. Walker; J. Robinson; Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown; and G. Robinson, Paternoster Row; and G. Goulding & Co., Soho Square, 1812), I, vi. All of Wolcot's verses quoted in this essay are from the 1812 edn.
11. Cited in Girtin, p. 25; Sinko, p. 18.
12. 'Memoirs', p. vi. Hopkins gives the examiner's name as 'Hexham of Exeter', see his *Portraits in Satire*, p. 218.
13. Wolcot to Benjamin Nankivell, 3 Dec 1767; cited in Vales, p. 14.
14. Girtin, p. 47. Of Terrick, Horace Walpole said 'that his only episcopal qualifications were "a sonorous delivery, and an assiduity of backstairs address." '—cited in Ada Earland, *John Opie and his Circle* (London: Hutchinson, 1911), p. 10.
15. Girtin, p. 48.
16. The poem also appeared in the *Annual Register* (1773), 240.
17. Ode VI, *Lyric Odes to the Royal Academicans*, *Works*, I, 27.
18. John Wolcot, Truro, to James Northcote, Leceister Fields, London, 22 May 1774. The compliment was:

The Human Face whilst others humbly paint
Northcotes bold art attempts the form divine;
So with each Grace celestial blooms the Saint,
and like her Beauties shows th'immortal Line
Pictor.'

—*Verse on Mr Northcotes Picture of a St Catherine at the Exhibition of the Royal Academy.*

(AND/2/120 and AND/2/121, Royal Academy of Arts Archive, London)

19. Cited in Girtin, pp. 63–64.
20. John Wolcot, Truro, to Ozias Humphry, 'at Mrs Sledges, Print-Seller, Covent Garden, London', 3 Aug 1777 (Hu/2/57, Royal Academy of Arts Archive, London).
21. Cited in Hopkins, p. 225.
22. Letter from B. C. Collins to John Nichols in 1793, cited in John Feather, *The Provincial Book Trade in Eighteenth Century England* (Cambridge: CUP, 1985), p. 111.
23. Ode X, *Lyric Odes*, *Works*, I, 36.
24. Ode IV, *Lyric Odes*, *Works*, I, 22.
25. Ode XI, *Lyric Odes*, *Works*, I, 38.
26. P. M. Zall, 'Peter Pindar "Redivivus" ', *Notes and Queries* 197 (19 July 1952), 319–22 (p. 319); cited in Sinko, p. 32.
27. Wolcot, cited in Cyrus Redding, *Fifty Years' Recollections, Literary and Personal with Observations on Men and Things*, 3 vols (London: Charles J. Skeet, 1858), I, 271.
28. Cited in Hopkins, p. 224.
29. Opie, cited in Girtin, p. 94.
30. *New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), II, 695–97; hereafter cited as *NCBEL*. Sinko gives a further list of titles in his bibliography section on Wolcot, pp. 18–21.
31. For example, *Brother Peter to Brother Tom* (1788) and *Peter's Prophecy* (1788). See also Walter Berry, the Edinburgh bookseller, and his concerns on piracy in letters to Wolcot on 21 Sep 1793 and 25 Aug 1794 (GMS 5, ll. 139 and 141), APL. Bridget Ikin deals briefly with this issue in her 'Peter Pindar and the Pirates', *Factotum* 9 (Aug 1980), 27–31.
32. Redding, II, 273.
33. As early as 1726, César de Saussure, the Swiss traveller, wrote: 'All Englishmen are great newsmongers. Workmen habitually begin the day by going to coffee-rooms to read the latest news […] Nothing is more entertaining than hearing men of this class discussing politics and news about royalty.'—cited in John Wardroper, *Kings, Lords and Wicked Libellers: Satire and Protest 1760–1837* (London: John Murray, 1973), p. 2. Cf. Roy Porter's 'the English [are] extraordinarily politically well informed and attentive' and Joseph Addison's 'nation of statesmen', cited in Roy Porter, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Allen Lane, 1982), pp. 118–19.
34. A. S. Collins, cited in Vales, p. 19. Zall (p. 320) comments that 'Wolcot was craftsman enough to become the most popular writer of a decade' (that is, 1785 to 1795).

35. *Diary, Reminiscences and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson*, 3rd edn, 2 vols (London: Macmillan, 1872), I, 171. See Thomas Sadler's 1869 edited work for another version of this quotation.
36. *DNB*, LXII, 292. See also Mary Robinson [Perdita], *Memoirs of the Late Mrs Robinson, Written by Herself*, 4 vols (London: Richard Phillips, 1801), IV, *passim*.
37. William Francis to Miss Wolcot, 25 Jan 1819 (Wolcot Papers, GMS 5, ll. 138–40).
38. 'Funeral costs for Dr John Wolcot', Jan 1819 (GMS 5, ll. 268–70); Wolcot, cited in Redding, II, 267.
39. Cited in Vales, p. 23.
40. Sinko, p. 105.
41. See the entry for Kearsley in Ian Maxted's Exeter Working Papers in British Book Trade History, hosted by Devon Library and Information Services. See <*http://www.devon.gov.uk/library/locstudy/bookhist/*>. Kearsley continued to publish.
42. See entry for Evans in Maxted's Exeter website; see also Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 9 vols (London: For the Author, 1812–15), V, 712.
43. See entry for Symonds in Maxted's Exeter website. *The Jockey Club, or a Sketch of the Manners of the Age* and the *Female Jockey Club* established Pigott as one of the first radical writers to make political capital out of the 'boudoir politics' of the aristocracy: see Nicholas Rogers, 'Pigott's Private Eye: Radicalism and Sexual Scandal in Eighteenth-Century England', *Canadian Historical Association Journal* n.s. 4 (1993), 247–63.
44. This was in the same year that Robertson, along with Walter Berry, were indicted for publishing a seditious pamphlet. For further details, see the Scottish Book Trade Index in the National Library of Scotland website: <*http://www.nls.uk/catalogues/resources/sbti/*>.
45. John Nichols, *The Rise and Progress of the Gentleman's Magazine* (New York: Garland, 1974), p. 38. William West called George Robinson 'the King of Booksellers'. See the entry for George Robinson in Maxted's Exeter website.
46. There is conflicting opinions on when the annuity was offered to Wolcot. The *DNB* gives 1793; Girtin gives 1793–94; Hopkins 1795.
47. Hopkins, p. 252.
48. Cited in a copy of memorandum of agreement between Messrs Goulding, Robinsons and Walker and Dr Wolcot, 31 May 1802 (GMS 5, ll. 19–20).
49. Cited in Girtin, p. 187.
50. Nichols, *Rise and Progress*, p. 64.
51. Ibid., pp. 64–65.
52. 'Statement for Doctor John Wolcot' by William Francis, 1 Nov 1815 (GMS 5, ll. 163–66).
53. Ibid.
54. John Walker to John Wolcot, 18 Apr 1816 (GMS 5, l. 159).
55. 'Statement for Doctor John Wolcot' by William Francis, 1 Nov 1815 (GMS 5, ll. 163–66); Francis's emphasis.
56. Amory & Coles to William Wood, 22 Sep 1817 (GMS 5, l. 153).
57. 'Dr Wolcot Account with Pindariana', 1794 (GMS 5, ll. 229–30).
58. 'Memorandum of an Agreement between Dr W[olcot] & Mr Walker for Publishing Pilkington's Dictionary' (GMS 5, l. 235): 'A & B hereby agree to print, conjointly, a New edition of Pilkington's Dictionary; and to take an equal share in the expenses of Printing, Paper, Publishing, advertising, &c. And whatever

Profit may arise from the said publication, is to be divided equally between A & B—but if any loss should take place, then each part to take his share of such loss.'

59. Ibid. My italics.
60. Another work by Hayley, *The Triumphs of Music*, appeared in 1804.
61. See entry on West in Maxted's Exeter website.
62. 'Dr Wolcot To W & C Spilsbury' (GMS 5, l. 237). A 2nd figure of 1,300 is found in 'West's Account of *Nil Admirari* & advertising', Oct 1799 (GMS 5, l. 64). Throughout these accounts there are issue number discrepancies.
63. *NCBEL*, II, 1353–69, with a list of towns with newspapers.
64. The second of these was more than likely the *Star and Evening Advertiser*, and the fourth *The Times*; the *Mail* remains unidentified. Cf. 'The average front-page price for advertisements in 1790 was 6s for 18 lines; in other parts of the paper (*London Adviser and Guide*) 4s; and about 1d a line afterwards. The evening papers charges 5s a time and the four Sunday papers a somewhat higher price.'—Dr Trusler, in Arthur Aspinal, *Politics and the Press c. 1780–1850* (London: Home & Van Thal, 1949), p. 6, n. 3.
65. Probably the *Portsmouth Gazette and Weekly Advertiser*; for Bristol, one of the various newspapers listed in *NCBEL*, II, 1354; for Bath, one of the many newspapers listed in *NCBEL*, II, 1353; and either the *Kentish Chronicle*, or the *Kentish Herald and Universal Register.*
66. Probably the *Whitehall Evening Post*, or others listed in *NCBEL*, V, 524; either the *Morning Herald* or the *London Herald and Evening Post*; probably the *Volunteer*, a London based periodical, or the Irish *Volunteer Evening Post.*
67. Any of those listed in *NCBEL*, II, 1362.
68. Either *Berrow's Worcester Journal* or the *Worcester Herald*; either the *Hull Packet* or the *Hull Advertiser;* and any of the newspapers in Norwich listed in *NCBEL*, II, 1363. The Brighton and Dorchester papers have not been identified.
69. The Northampton paper remains unknown; it was either *Jackson's Oxford Journal* or the *Oxford Mercury*; and for Exeter any of the newspaper listings in *NCBEL*, II, 1357–58.
70. An unfavourable review appeared in the Nov 1799 issue of the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, edited by John Richard Green. Perhaps Green was one of the six recipients. Cited in Sinko, p. 34.
71. Another issue discrepancy of '949' copies occurs in the account headed 'Lord Auckland's Triumph' (GMS 5, l. 79).
72. William Richardson was nephew to Samuel Richardson, novelist and printer; Clarke may have been related to the Quaker printer S. Clarke.
73. 'Pindar's Tales of Hoy' (GMS 5, l. 62). Of interest, Wolcot Papers, GMS 6 contains the printed version of the *Tales of the Hoy* and the entire manuscript of 'Tales of the Hoy, Part II'. This unpublished work will form the basis of another article on Wolcot.
74. There is evidence that Wolcot also received money from stocks and shares. At his death, stock values were realised at £1,108 5s 2d. Cited in a document titled 'Mr Francis, Executor to the late Dr John Wolcot. Bank Acct. of Stock. 1819' (GMS 5, l. 258).
75. John Jarvis was the printer of *English Chronicle* 1783–87, of *Westminster Herald* 1791. Joseph Cooper printed the *General Evening Post* 1771, and the *London Courant* 1779–81. He was sentenced to twelve months in prison, one hour in

the pillory, and £100 fine for libel on Russian ambassador 5 July 1781. He went bankrupt 25 Jan 1800. For further details see entries in Maxted's Exeter website. Thomas Egerton is found in the 'Index to Insurance Policies'; John Egerton is not mentioned at all.

76. See entry for Thomas Brice II in Maxted's Exeter website.
77. Feather, p. 104.
78. Although there was certainly continued contact, this 'new edition' represented Wolcot's last connection with George Kearsley as a publisher.
79. See entries for the Spilsbury family in Maxted's Exeter website. See also Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes,* III, 442.
80. Thomas Warton died on 20 May 1790; the post of laureate was eventually given to the 'dull, inept and feeble' Henry James Pye (1745–1813) in July 1790. See Vales, p. 47.
81. 'Messrs Goulding, Robinsons & Walker to T. Spilsbury and Son, GMS 5, l. 225.
82. Nichols, *Rise and Progress*, p. 66.
83. The first 2 edns were printed by Symonds, and Robertson and Berry of Edinburgh.
84. Feather, p. 55.
85. Cited in Girtin, p. 218.
86. See entry for Sweetland in Maxted's Exeter website.
87. Thomas Frognall Dibdin, cited in Ian Maxted's 'Some Scholars in the Book Trades' (no. 57), of *A History of the Book in Devon:* Exeter Working Papers in British Book Trade History 12. Online: Internet (Aug 2004): <*http://www.devon.gov.uk/library/locstudy/bookhist/west57.html*>.
88. 'Books sent to Mrs Sweetland for Dr Wolcot' (GMS 5, l. 47).
89. This must have either been a slip of the pen or a bill presented retrospectively by Sweetland's creditors, as she had died of a lingering illness in 1796. See entry for Sweetland in Maxted's Exeter website.
90. See Richard Polwhele's *Traditions and Recollections*, 2 vols (London: J. Nichols and Son, 1826), I, *passim*, and *Biographical Sketches in Cornwall*, 3 vols (London: J. B. Nichols, 1831), II, *passim*, for references to Wolcot.
91. Dibdin, cited in Maxted (see n. 87 above).
92. See entries for these booksellers in Maxted's Exeter website.

Referring to this Article

D. Kerr. ' "Satire is Bad Trade": Dr John Wolcot and his Publishers and Printers in Eighteenth-Century England', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 12 (Summer 2004). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc12_n02.pdf*>.

Contributor Details

Donald Kerr is currently the Special Collections Librarian at the University of Otago, Dunedin. In 1992, he completed an MA on Frank Wild Reed (1874-1953) as a collector of works of Alexandre Dumas *père*, and in 2002 completed a PhD thesis on Governor Sir George Grey (1812–98) as a book collector. Other publications in the field of the history of libraries and book collecting include work on Henry Shaw (1850–1928), another Auckland book collector, and the Auckland City Library's holdings of Malagasy manuscripts and books. He is currently working on a history of duelling in New Zealand.

Anne and John Ker
New Soundings

John Gladstone Steele

I
Biography with Reference to 'A Ker-ish Trick' and *The Heiress di Montalde*

As a descendant of Anne Ker, I have researched her family history including her novel *The Heiress di Montalde* (1799) and her husband John Ker's poem 'A Ker-ish Trick'. These, along with other memorabilia that included Anne's sampler, were handed down by her descendants, who emigrated to Australia in 1825–46.[1]

Rachel Howard has contributed to this journal a comprehensive article on Anne Ker and her novels.[2] The article reproduces 'A Ker-ish Trick', prefatory material in Anne Ker's novel *Edric, the Forester* (1817, but expected in December 1804). The interpretation of this poem requires, firstly, an understanding of John Ker's relationship to the Dukes of Roxburgh, who bore the family name Ker until the Fourth Duke died in 1805. The Fifth Duke, whose surname was Innes rather than Ker, was confirmed in the title in 1812 and he adopted the name Innes–Ker. The title page of *Edric, the Forester* makes the claim that John Ker was 'of His Grace the Duke of Roxburgh's family', and in his poem prefacing that book John wrote

> Fleurs—I envy not that pretty place,
> Although I am one of the race;

John considered the family seat of Floors (or Fleurs) near Kelso in Roxburghshire as part of his heritage. He knew it well, and identified himself as one of the Kers, who saw it as their home, but he never aspired to own it. He felt its beauty, as did Sir Walter Scott who referred to Floors as 'altogether a kingdom for Oberon or Titania to dwell in'.[3]

Furthermore, the interpretation of 'A Ker-ish Trick' requires a knowledge of the very public dramas concerning the succession of the Fifth Duke of Roxburgh in 1812 and the subsequent administration of the estate of the Third Duke. From the evidence presented here, it will emerge that John Ker was probably a son of the unmarried John Ker, Third Duke of Roxburgh (1740–1804), the famous book collector and close friend and contemporary of George III. It will be shown that on his deathbed the Duke provided a secret annuity for a person residing in London whose name was revealed only to a lawyer. In his

poem, John alluded to his dependence on income from the Duke's estate. The administration of the estate was delayed by protracted litigation. John lamented that he failed to obtain charity from the Fifth Duke. The pertinent biographical details are presented here below in chronological sequence. Personal names are spelt as they appear in source documents.

In 1755, the Third Duke acceded to his title. In 1761, at the age of twenty-one, he travelled on the Continent and courted Christiana, eldest daughter of the Duke of Mecklenburgh–Strelitz, then aged twenty-seven. Soon after, Christiana's sister Charlotte became engaged to George III, and at the royal marriage on 8 September 1761 Duke John's two sisters, Lady Essex and Lady Mary Ker, were bridesmaids.[4] Duke John and Christiana broke off their engagement, as etiquette did not allow the elder sister to live in the realm as subject to the younger. It was said that the lovers thenceforth devoted themselves to celibacy.[5] Given the probability that John was a son of Duke John, he may have been conceived during the engagement of John and Christiana. Many children of royalty and the nobility were conceived or born out of wedlock. In an era when marriages were 'arranged' by parents or dictated by politics, premarital and extramarital adventures occurred, and were the stuff of many plots and subplots in Anne Ker's novels. George IV as Prince of Wales is said to have fathered six illegitimate children by different mothers.

Anne Ker's sampler records her birth thus: 'Anne Phillips Born Nov^{r}. 17. 1766 in the Parish of St Luke Chelsea'; the sampler has as its central motif the chained lion rampant from the arms of the Phillips family of London.[6] She was baptised as Ann Phillips at St Luke's Chelsea on 7 December 1766.[7] Her parents John and Ann Phillips lived at Cheyne Walk, Chelsea.[8]

On 1 November 1788, John Kerr, widower, and Anne Phillips were married in the parish of St Pancras, London.[9] At the time of her marriage Anne added to her sampler the date 1788, the initials 'A. K.', as well as a royal crown and a ducal coronet considered to be symbols of her husband's ancestry. In proximity to these symbols are two chevrons, each 'charged with three stars or mollets', from the arms of the Border Kers.[10] The pair was recorded as having been residents of the Parish of St Pancras, which was included in the district of Holborn. John and Anne were to live at Holborn for much of their life together.[11] The marriage ceremony took place at the Kentish Town chapel of ease, by banns rather than licence, and the Curate officiated. The witnesses who signed the marriage register were Benjamin Mence (Vicar) and a Mary Morgan; these functioned as witnesses at many other weddings recorded in the register. Since no members of the Ker or Phillips families signed as witnesses, the marriage was a low-key affair, perhaps even a clandestine one. Secret marriages were not uncommon amongst royalty and the nobility; HRH the Duke of Gloucester married the Dowager Duchess Maria Waldegrave (née Walpole), a subscriber to Anne's novels, secretly in 1766, and the Prince of Wales married the widow Maria Fitzherbert secretly in 1785. Clandestine marriages feature in Anne's

novels, with the marriage of Sebastian and Adelaide in *The Heiress di Montalde* (1799) and that of Henry and Elinor in *Adeline St Julian* (1800).

In 1799, Anne dedicated *The Heiress di Montalde* to HRH the Princess Augusta Sophia (the king's daughter, born 1768), and subscribers included the Duke of Roxburgh, his sister Lady Mary Ker and HRH the Duchess of Gloucester (the king's sister-in-law). Given the probability that John Ker was the son of Duke John and Christiana, this list includes his cousin, father, and aunt, and a kinswoman by marriage, respectively. Subscribers to *The Mysterious Count* (1803) included Lady Mary Ker, and HRH the Princess of Wales (Caroline, the 'official' wife of the future George IV). HRH the Duchess of Gloucester and her daughters HRH the Princess Sophia (surnamed Hanover) of Gloucester and the Duchess of Grafton (Charlotte Maria Fitzroy, née Waldegrave)—kinsfolk to the king and presumably to John Ker—were also subscribers. (Charlotte's cousin and brother-in-law Earl Waldegrave had been a subscriber to John Phillips's *Treatise on Inland Navigation* [London, 1785]).

Duke John died in 1804. On his deathbed at his house at St James's Square, London on 18 March, he gave instructions to Mr James Dundas, an Edinburgh lawyer appointed to be a trustee for the Duke's estate. He told Dundas where he would find a sealed parcel, and desired Dundas to bring it to him. The Duke explained that the reason for wishing to have the sealed parcel was in order to see whether it contained a bond of annuity in favour of a particular person in London for whom he intended to provide. The parcel contained a sealed letter addressed to Dundas, in which was enclosed a bond of annuity in favour of the person named by the Duke.[12] Dundas gave this testimony on 17 February 1812 at an appeal by Lady Essex and Lady Mary Ker against the validity of the deathbed deposition that formed part of the will, and the appeal was dismissed. The secrecy surrounding this bond and the name of the beneficiary suggests that the beneficiary was an illegitimate child. The deathbed deposition dated 19 March 1804 was recognised as part of a much longer will, and probate was granted on 23 March 1811. The will stipulated that the trustees were to pay annuities granted during the Duke's life or by his will. Annuities to factors and servants mentioned specifically in the deposition ranged from £40 to £300. In order to give evidence, Dundas renounced his role as executor prior to probate, thereby giving up a legacy of £1,000.[13]

Louisa Peterson, widowed daughter of John and Anne Ker, was married by banns at St James's Church, Piccadilly on 1 January 1811, near the former home of the late Duke John. John and Anne signed the register as witnesses to the marriage. It seems that they lived comfortably at this time, perhaps enjoying the annuity provided by the late Third Duke and paid out of his deceased estate. Anne may have had access to the Duke's library which was still at the house in St James's Square.[14]

The Fourth Duke had also died in 1805 and the succession to the title of Fifth Duke of Roxburgh was finally decided by the Committee of Privileges of

the House of Lords on 9 May 1812.[15] The title and the property entailed with it went to the seventy-six-year-old Sir James Innes (later Innes–Ker, 1736–1823) rather than to Major-General Walter Ker of Littledean. Litigation over the succession bankrupted Walter Ker; Littledean was sold and the Fifth Duke graciously maintained him.[16] The administration of the estate of the deceased Third Duke was assigned to John Wauchope, the remaining executor after the withdrawal of James Dundas. The famous library was auctioned for £24,341 at the house in St James's Square in May–July 1812. The Duke's will had authorised his trustees to sell his house and contents to meet his obligations. The proceeds of the sale are thought to have been applied to legal costs.[17] Litigation over the Duke's will persisted; it was perhaps during this period that the payment of the annuity to John Ker came under threat.

A Ker-ish Trick

From internal evidence, the poem was written after the failure of Major-General Ker's claim to the title and the Floors estate, rather than in 1804 when the publication of *Edric, the Forester* was mooted. The poem was written between 1812 and 1817, and reveals that John Ker visited 'Floors' and obtained a verbal promise of financial support.

> There is a man on Scottish ground,
> Caus'd me to lose two hundred pound;
> Surely, how could such things be?
> Why, in promising to provide for me!

The man who made this promise appears from internal evidence to have been the Fifth Duke, then aged between seventy-six and eighty-one. The 'two hundred pounds' may represent the secret annuity provided by the Third Duke; if so, it should have been paid from the deceased estate of the Third Duke and it is unlikely that the Fifth Duke had a direct interest in it, or even knowledge of it. John would have seen the promise as an attractive alternative to the trouble and expense of pursuing his own claim in the courts. The elderly Duke, preoccupied with his new properties, his new wife of 1807, and his son and heir born in 1816, might easily have forgotten the promise.

> And though in me there was no pride,
> In fine grand coach I once did ride;
> And for my fare for four miles round,
> It cost me just two hundred pound;

The description of the coach is consistent with the idea that John's host was the Fifth Duke rather than the Duke's factor or solicitor, or the executor of the Third Duke's estate. Roads and drives with a circumference of four miles encircled the Floors estate.

> Now could I find HIS *number* out,
> Although my wife has got the gout,

She says, on crutches she would stride,
And travel o'er the country wide,

The mention of Anne's gout accords with her letters to the Royal Literary Fund in 1820–21, and confirms that the illness handicapped her as early as 1817.[18] Anne was more inclined to litigation than her husband:

To summons for such imposition,
Or try by way of a *petition.*
But lawyers say we were not right—
It should have been in black and white,

John and Anne consulted lawyers who lamented the lack of a written promise from the Fifth Duke. They may not have been aware of the existence of the 'bond of annuity' signed by the Third Duke.

So Ker was left by side the Tweed,
And Sawny drove away with speed.

The gate to the Floors estate on the edge of Kelso was at the East Lodge, beside the Tweed.[19] 'Sawny' was a nickname for a Scotsman. The Fifth Duke was born and lived in Scotland. Although John is believed to have stayed frequently at Floors, he was apparently not invited to remain on this occasion.

Fleurs—I envy not that pretty place,
Although I am one of the race;
But from my heart I wish I'd seen
A man live there from *Little Dean*
And why so wish? Because, some say,
He'd not have sent me empty away.

John Ker felt sure that he would have received some immediate support from Major-General Ker of Littledean, if the latter had succeeded to the title of Fifth Duke of Roxburgh and lived at Floors. The inference is that the 'man on Scottish ground', 'Sawny', who promised but failed to help, was the successful claimant to the title.

Now if there's left a Ker of Linton
Who at these lines should take a hint on,

The village of Linton is six miles south-east of Floors and three miles east of the ruins of Cessford Caste, the principal seat of the Kers of Cessford until 1650. On 11 December 1811, the Court of Sessions in Scotland affirmed that Major-General Walter Ker was the undoubted heir-male of the ancient family of Ker of Cessford.[20] The Dukes of Roxburgh retain the title Marquess of Bowmont and Cessford and the unicorn's head crest granted *c.* 1500 to the Cessford Kers by James IV of Scotland. The phrase 'a Ker of Linton' was chosen to facilitate rhyming, but it was probably intended to mean a Cessford Ker as distinct from a Ker of the Ferniehirst line whose ancient seat Ferniehirst Castle was near Jedburgh.[21]

Or noble Scot that's fat on taper,
May cure J. Ker with HASE's *paper*.

The poem ends with an appeal for donations in the form of 'HASE's *paper*'. Henry Hase was Chief Cashier of the Bank of England in 1807–29. During those years, his name appeared for legal reasons in the promissory clause on the Bank's notes. 'Fat on taper' suggests a plentiful supply of the wax candles used by nobles to seal documents. John is believed to have possessed a signet ring with the Cessford crest and Roxburgh motto, but was thin on resources.[22] He clung to his hope that the Fifth Duke would take the hint. The flippant tone suggests that the writer was mocking himself, and that (unlike his wife, who was livid) he bore no grudge against anyone. The fact that Anne Ker published *Edric, the Forester* in 1817 at her own expense shows that she was not yet entirely destitute. Perhaps she had received a legacy from the estate of her father who died in 1813 (RLF).

In 1818, Lady Essex Ker, after persistent litigation, obtained the residue of her brother's estate, then amounting to about £200,000 pounds. This would have involved the overturning of the clause in the Duke's deathbed deposition requiring his sisters to receive only the income from the residue of his estate during their lifetime, after which the residue itself was to be paid to three other specified beneficiaries.[23] Lady Essex Ker had expended £35,000 in legal fees, and John Ker could hardly have contested the will in such an environment. The only winners were the lawyers, and the Mostyn family who inherited the estate of Lady Essex Ker in 1819.[24]

The Heiress di Montalde (1799)

Anne Ker's autobiographical references in *The Heiress di Montalde* are of uneven credibility, but the incorrect data are nonetheless revealing, and may shed light on her marriage and the birth of her child Louisa.

On the one hand, she reveals herself as 'Miss P——', the narrator of the story.[25] In a footnote (I, 2), she identifies her father as the canal writer John Phillips, the author of *A General History of Inland Navigation* (1792). She claims that she went with her father to France in the spring 1787 (I, 9), when he was studying canals including the Canal of Languedoc (the Canal du Midi). At one stage in the novel, Miss P—— is in a library; asked if she likes to read she replies 'I am exceedingly fond of that amusement, my Lord' (I, 217). Miss P—— is addressed as 'My dear Anne' (I, 219). This much is credible. On the other hand, she falsifies her age, the date of her return from the Continent, and possibly the reason for her going there. She gives her age as eighteen in the spring of 1787, but she was actually twenty then (I, 14). She claims to have spent two-and-a-half years on the Continent, not returning to England until about October 1789 (II, 189), but she was actually married near London on 1 November 1788. She states that she had been to the Continent partly for the recovery of her health (I, 1), but the main reason may have been to obscure the

relationship between the birthdate of her child Louisa (presently unproven) and the date of her marriage.

A Louisa, daughter of John and Ann Carr, was born on 6 December 1786 and baptised in the parish of St Pancras on 4 March 1787.[26] This was the same venue as the apparently secret marriage of John Kerr and Anne Phillips on 1 November 1788, when John was described as a widower. 'John Carr' and 'John Kerr' may have been different people, but it is plausible that they were one and the same person, and that Louisa Carr was a child of John's first marriage to another Ann. Another scenario might be that John was in a relationship with Anne Phillips when Louisa was born. Anne may have gone to the Continent with her father soon after Louisa was baptised, and returned to London prior to her marriage in November 1788, by which time she was aged almost twenty-two and could marry without her father's consent. (Her father may have remained abroad.) It may be coincidence, but in *The Heiress di Montalde* Anne receives a note addressed to 'Miss Anne Elinor P——' (I, 222), while in *Adeline St Julian* a heroine named Elinor has a clandestine marriage. This Louisa is considered to be the daughter who married at St James's, Piccadilly in 1811. John and Anne were in attendance and signed their names in the same handwriting as at their own marriage but spelt their surname as 'Ker' instead of 'Kerr'.

Postscript to Part I

Anne and John were in reduced circumstances when Anne applied for help from the Royal Literary Fund in 1820–21, saying that she was 'destitute of friends'. At that time, their daughter Louisa was living on the Continent; Louisa's son Cornelius William Uhr was born in Bremen in May 1819 and baptised in London in September 1821.[27] Anne died at Southwark leaving an estate of under £200; administration was granted to her husband John Ker on 5 December 1823.[28] Louisa's married daughter Mary Louisa Jones emigrated to Australia in December 1824, taking with her a copy of *The Heiress di Montalde*. This copy contains Anne Ker's signature as well as a printed portrait of Anne, presumably the frontispiece cut and pasted from a copy of *Modern Faults* (1804). An album that belonged to Mary Louisa Jones contains a portrait that could be a likeness of Anne Ker, and a lithograph of 'Lord Waldegrave's in Rockingham', Northamptonshire. A manuscript copy of 'A Ker-ish Trick' handed down since early days in Australia may indicate that a copy of *Edric, the Forester* found its way to Australia. Seven children of Louisa's two marriages migrated to Australia, taking with them heirlooms associated with Anne and John Ker, including Anne's sampler and a signet ring engraved with a unicorn's head and the motto of the Dukes of Roxburgh.

II

J. Ker: Publisher and Bookseller of the Gothic

J. Ker of 4 Greek Street, Soho Square, has been mentioned as a well-known publisher of bluebooks—slim inexpensive books of Gothic fiction with blue paper covers that proliferated in the early 1800s.[29] This was the period when Anne Ker flourished as a Gothic novelist. Her fifth novel *Modern Faults* (1804) was published by 'J. Ker, 34 Great Surrey Street, Black Friars Road'. It is tempting to float the hypothesis that J. Ker, the publisher, should be identified with John Ker, the husband of Anne Ker, the novelist.

John Ker intriguingly referred to himself as 'J. Ker' in the text of his poem 'A Ker-ish Trick', and in his signature at the end of the poem. This was published in the prefatory material of Anne Ker's novel *Edric the Forester* (1817).[30] The title page declared the Kers' family relationship to the aristocracy, a connection that may have been kept hidden from the book trade. It seems that John and Anne Ker were ready to unveil the fact that the publisher J. Ker was none other than the son of a deceased duke—a revelation like the *denouement* of a Gothic mystery. In *Edric the Forester,* Edric and his army attempt to take St Egbert's Castle. The story ends with the revelation that Edric, separated at birth from his family, is actually the heir to Castle St Egbert. For those who read between the lines, Edric was John Ker, and Castle St Egbert was Floors Castle in Roxburghshire.

Apart from his poem and his novelist wife, John Ker had other associations with books and the book trade, and these tend to support the hypothesis. His probable father, John Ker, Third Duke of Roxburgh (1740–1804) was a noted collector of rare books and kept an extensive library in London. His father-in-law, John Phillips, was an author of non-fiction, including the best-selling *A General History of Inland Navigation* (1792) which ran to five editions; the fifth, in 1805, was published by B. Crosby & Co., of Stationers' Court, Paternoster Row (next to Stationers' Hall between Ludgate Street and Amen Corner), London. Phillips was editor of an annual publication, *Crosby's Builder's New Price Book,* until his death in 1813. Crosby and Co. were also the sole sellers of Anne Ker's self-published novel *The Mysterious Count* (1803).

The hypothesis can now be regarded as proven thanks to Angela Koch's research concerning the bluebooks published by J. Ker, *c.*1800–04. Koch has opened an extensive window on the bluebooks in her checklist published previously in *Cardiff Corvey.*[31] Details in the checklist reveal additional links between J. Ker and Anne Ker, in respect of business and private addresses, choice of printers, and the publishing by J. Ker of bluebooks that were probably written by Anne Ker. It emerges that the identification of J. Ker—publisher and bookseller—with John Ker, husband of Anne Ker, is now irresistible. As a result, the biography of John and Anne Ker is more fully known.

Of the 217 bluebook titles catalogued by Koch, 14 were associated with J. Ker as publisher and/or seller. The 14 titles are listed in the appendix to this

paper; each title is headed by its number in the Koch checklist and followed by data abridged from the checklist. Ten of these bluebooks were published with J. Ker as the principal publisher, at one or other of his various addresses in the suburbs of London. Five distinct addresses are specified, ranging from Soho and Holborn north of the Thames to Blackfriars Road and the Elephant & Castle on the south side. In Table 1 (overleaf), these ten bluebooks are grouped by their locations without implying any chronological sequence, and Anne Ker's novel *Modern Faults* is also included.

Since the known or inferred dates of publication fall between 1800 and 1806, it is likely that most of the five addresses were occupied concurrently. Other publishers, printers or sellers of bluebooks had only one address, or rarely, two concurrent ones, throughout the period. With outlets in four suburbs concurrently J. Ker had what might now be described as a chain of bookstores. His address at 90 High Holborn was on the north side of that important thoroughfare about midway between the present Procter Street and Red Lion Street. Directly opposite his shop was Red Lion Yard at 254 High Holborn. A little to the south were Lincoln's Inn Fields.[32] Publishers and booksellers in this area profited from the sale of law books and stationery, and J. Ker at this address was described as 'publisher and stationer' (Koch, Item 63). John and Anne Ker lived at Holborn from the time of their marriage in 1788 until they took up residence near the Elephant & Castle during the 1810s.[33]

J. Ker's address at 4 Greek Street, Soho Square, was on the east side of Greek Street, four doors from the square (Horwood). Nearby at 7 Berwick Street was the printery of D. N. Shury who printed for J. Ker the bluebook *The Three Ghosts of the Forest* (1803) and for Anne Ker the novels *The Mysterious Count* (1803) and *Edric the Forester* (1817) (Horwood). Later discussion will suggest that Anne Ker was the author of *The Three Ghosts of the Forest*.

South of the Thames, 40 London Road was a few doors from the Elephant & Castle, and on the north side of the road. Around 1800, this area was semi-rural, with ribbon development along main roads, and open fields at the back of the development (Horwood). Subdivision of rural land near Newington Road would create the plot of land where John and Anne resided by 1820.

2 Green Walk, Bear Lane, Christ-Church was in the Parish of Christ-Church, the parish church of which was on Blackfriars Road. This section of Blackfriars Road was then known as Great Surrey Street. Bear Lane is one block east of the church, and Green Walk (now Hopton Street) was at the end of Bear Lane north of the Church Street (now Burrell Street) intersection. 34 Great Surrey Street, Blackfriars Road, was on the east side of Blackfriars Road twelve doors south of Church Street. J. Ker's two addresses near Christ Church are associated with six of his publications including Anne Ker's *Modern Faults* (1804), printed at 15 Church Street by John MacGovern. Another printer of significance to J. Ker was Ann Kemmish, 17 King Street (now Newcomen Street), off High Street, Borough (Horwood). Kemmish printed five bluebooks for J. Ker, sold

J. Ker's address	Koch #	Title & Earliest Known/ Inferred date	Printer	Booksellers
4 Greek Street, Soho Square	37	*The Caſtle of St Gerald, or the Fatal Vow*		Most booksellers
90 High Holborn	43	*Clairville Caſtle, or the Hiſtory of Albert and Emma [...]*	Kemmish, 17 King-Street [now Newcomen Street], Borough	Kemmish, Wilmott & Hill, Perks, Elliot, Barfoot, Dixon, Evans, Howard & Evans, Neil, Champante & Whitrow.
90 High Holborn	63	*Duncan, or the Shade of Gertrude [...].*	Neil, Chalton-Street, Sommers Town	Neil, Hughes, Muggeridge, Wilmot & Hill, Perks, Elliot, Barfoot, Dixon, Evans, Howard & Evans.
40 London Road, near the Elephant & Castle, Southwark	47	*Cronſtadt Caſtle, or the Myſterious Visitor* [1803]	Kemmish	Kemmish, Hughes, Muggeridge, Perks, Elliot, Barfoot, Dixon, Wilmot & Hill, Hodgson, Evans.
40 London Road, near the Elephant & Castle, Southwark	140	*The Prophetic Warning, or the Caſtle of Lindendorff [...]* by a young gentleman of note. 1800	Kemmish	Kemmish, Hughes, Wilmot & Hill, Barfoot, Perks, Dixon, Hodgson, Evans.
2 Green-Walk, Bear-Lane, Christ-Church, Surrey	196	*Lilly of Navarre, or Banditti of the Foreſt* By Sarah Wilkinson [1804]	Cranwell, Long-Lane [now named West Smithfield], West Smithfield	Hughes, Muggeridge, Elliot
2 Green-Walk, Bear-Lane, Christ-Church, Surrey	167	*The Three Ghoſts of the Foreſt [...]* 1803	Shury, Berwick-Street, Soho	Hughes, Muggeridge, Elliot
20 Green-Walk, Bear-Lane, Christ-Church, Surrey	7	*Alphonso & Elinor, or the Myſterious Discovery* (1802)	Tibson, Bridge-Road, Lambeth	Tibson, Elliott
34 Great Surrey Street, [portion of] Black Friars Road	112	*The Midnight Bell, or the Abbey of St Francis [...]* by the authoress of *Alphonso and Elinor, Three Ghoſts of the Foreſt*, etc. [1802]	Kemmish	Kemmish, Hughes, Muggeridge, Elliot, Wilmot & Hill, Dixon, Barfoot,
34 Great Surrey Street, [portion of] Black Friars Road		*Modern Faults, a Novel, Founded upon Facts*. By Mrs Ker. 1804	M'Gowen, Church Street [now Burrell St], Blackfriars Road	Badcock
34 Great Surrey Street, [portion of] Black Friars Road	207	*The Spectre, or the Ruins of Belfont Priory* By Sarah Wilkinson [1806][34]	Kemmish	Kemmish, Hughes, Muggeridge, Elliot

Table 1: Ten Bluebooks and a Novel, Published by J. Ker

them at her premises, and republished one of them, *Clairville Castle,* herself (Koch, Item 43).

Among the sellers of J. Ker's bluebooks the most frequently-named were S. Elliott of High Street, Shadwell (300 metres from St George's in the East); T. Hughes of 1 Stationers' Court, Ludgate Street and 15 Paternoster Row (opposite Canon Alley); and N. & J. Muggeridge of Borough. These were strategically located in the City, and in suburbs where J. Ker seems not to have had a shop of his own. By 1809, John and Anne Ker's daughter Louisa Peterson and her family lived in Cannon Street adjacent to the church of St George in the East, then patronised by wealthy merchants, near Shadwell.[35]

Just as the topographical details lend support to the identification of J. Ker with Anne's husband John Ker, the internal evidence of the publications gives further support. Before examining this evidence, it is well to be aware of certain aspects of the literary phenomenon known as the Gothic, particularly in the bluebook form:

(a) In nearly all bluebooks the author was anonymous.

(b) Some authors of bluebooks condensed their own longer works, but some plagiarised the works of others.

(c) Attempts to prove connexions between titles, *dramatis personae*, and topics are hazardous. The literary critics of the day found this difficult to grasp. A modern commentator writes 'Gothic thrives so much on convention that to cite direct sources is often impossible when so many works share the same stock episodes, characters, and even phrases'.[36]

(d) With this caveat, the trend of Gothic was strongly influenced by Matthew Lewis's novel *The Monk* (1796) and Francis Lathom's *The Midnight Bell* (1798). In 1799–1804, when J. Ker and Anne Ker flourished, these models had an influence both on their writings and on the titles they chose for their works.

(e) For both novels and bluebooks, the title was a key element in the marketing strategy; even if a work was original, the title was chosen to attract readers aroused by the horror, mystery, and salacious doings found in the works of Lewis and Lathom.

Bearing in mind these cautions, I would propose that Anne Ker is the 'authoress' of three of J. Ker's bluebooks: *The Midnight Bell, or the Abbey of St Francis* (1802) claimed on its title page to be 'by the authoress of *Alphonso and Elinor, The Three Ghosts of the Forest, etc.*'. Was Anne Ker the real authoress? The following facts establish that this might very likely be the case:

(a) All three titles were published by J. Ker about 1802–03, although the exact chronological sequence is uncertain.

(b) *The Three Ghosts of the Forest* was printed at the same printery and in the same year as Anne Ker's *The Mysterious Count* (1803).

(c) While forests were a stock subject in bluebooks, it may be relevant to note that a spirit in the Forest of Amans featured in Anne Ker's *Adeline St Julian,* that the Forest of Amiens featured in both *Emmeline; or, the Happy Discovery* (1801) and *Modern Faults,* and that the hero of *Edric, the Forester* was raised in a forest.

(d) The title *Alphonso and Elinor* reflects the names of two *personae* in Anne Ker's *Adeline St Julian* (1800).

(e) The name Elinor is not widely used in Gothic literature (but compare the use of 'Ellinor' in *Arthur and Ellinor*—Koch, Item 183), yet it occurs in Anne Ker's part-autobiographical novel *The Heiress di Montalde* (1799), where the narrator is revealed as Anne Elinor Phillips.

(f) J. Ker might well have encouraged Anne Ker to turn an episode from *Adeline St Julian* into a bluebook. He was unlikely to publish a plagiarised version of her novel, for fear of the potentially acid rebuke of which she was capable.

(g) *The Midnight Bell, or the Abbey of St Francis* is suggestive of Anne's title *Adeline St Julian, or the Midnight Hour.*

With respect to (d), it is admitted here that the choice of the name Alphonso was characteristic of the Gothic. The name was known also from Lewis's popular drama *Alfonso, King of Castile*, first performed at Covent Garden on 15 January 1802. Points (d) and (e) should be taken together. With regard to (g), this observation is not without interest. Lathom's *Midnight Bell* is indicative of the Gothic motif of bells ringing at midnight, while Lewis used similar phrases such as 'the Castle-Bell announced the hour of midnight' in *The Monk*. Montague Summers is no doubt correct in asserting that the bluebook *The Midnight Bell* was derived from Lathom's work of the same name.[37] But it is possible that only the title was derived from Lathom (and the notorious Lewis) as a deliberate marketing ploy, and that the text of the bluebook was derived from one of Anne Ker's own works. All in all, the idea that Anne Ker was the 'authoress' of these three bluebooks is attractive.

Another bluebook title of interest is *The Prophetic Warning, or the Castle of Lindendorff* (1800) with the extension 'An Original Romance. By a Young Gentleman of Note'. The title suggests an affinity with Lewis's *The Monk*, which features a Castle of Lindenberg. Indeed a bluebook entitled *The Castle of Lindenberg* (1799), printed and sold by Simon Fisher, consists of the Raymond and Agnes episode from *The Monk*, and later editions attributed the original authorship to 'the late G. M. [*sic*] Lewis, Esq.' (Koch 184; Lewis died in 1818). The most notable young gentleman and Gothic author in the year 1800 certainly was Matthew Lewis, then aged twenty-five. Whoever the real author of *The Prophetic Warning* might have been, J. Ker certainly used clever marketing on its title page.

Among the 150 or so bluebooks in Koch's checklist that can be dated, only 11 were initially published before 1801; *The Prophetic Warning* stands among

the earliest seven per cent of the bluebooks of known date. During 1799–1801 only 18 bluebooks of known date were issued, the majority published by Ann Lemoine of White Rose Court, Coleman Street, and S. Fisher, printer of 10 St John's Lane, Clerkenwell. Did not Ann Lemoine, of Huguenot descent, have the peculiar advantage of a surname that evoked the French-language title of *The Monk* (*Le Moine*)? J. Ker needed inspired salesmanship for the next heady phase of his career, and the spectre of Anne Ker was arguably prompting him in the wings.

Interestingly, the bluebook *Edmund and Albina* (1801—Koch, Item 65) was published by both J. Ker and Ann Lemoine in the same year. In 1799, Lemoine had published *Kilverstone Castle* (Koch, Item 91) with a three-page teaser at the end entitled 'Edmund and Albina. A Fragment', presumably a preview of the bluebook.

What else may we surmise concerning J. Ker? We may speculate that the 'young gentleman' was J. Ker himself, a man not lacking in literary ability. If he cheekily described himself as a 'young gentleman of note' (he was then aged about 38) the phrase would have been recognizable to his close friends; the same self-mocking humour is evident in his later poem 'A Ker-ish Trick'.

Conclusion to Part II

Although the identification of J. Ker with John Ker, husband of Anne Ker, has not been proved absolutely, there is abundant evidence supportive of such a contention—through shared family connections and interests, publishing history, and the proximity of business and residential addresses. Many are likely to agree that the identification has been proved beyond reasonable doubt. Moreover, further light has been shed on the dark and misty world of the Gothic and the obfuscations of its authors and publishers.

Appendix

14 Bluebooks with J. Ker as Publisher and/or Seller, Abridged from the Koch Checklist

Koch 7
ALPHONSO AND ELINOR, OR THE MYSTERIOUS DISCOVERY.
London: Printed [by Tibson, Lambeth] for & Sold by J. Ker, No. 20, Green-Walk, Bear-Lane, Christ Church, Surry; and to Be Had of S. Tibson, at the Surry Printing-Office, Bridge-Road, Lambeth; and S. Elliott, No. 9, High Street, Shadwell, n.d.
42p. 12mo. Frontispiece bears legend: 'Is it possible that thou art Alphonso exclaimed a voice which seemed familiar to his ears'. 6d.

Koch 37
THE CASTLE OF ST. GERALD, OR THE FATAL VOW.
London: Published and Sold by J. Ker, No. 4, Greek-Street, Soho Square; and to Be Had of most Booksellers in Town and Country, n.d.
34p; pp. 33–34: 'The Value of Time'. 12mo. Frontispiece. 6d.

Koch 43
CLAIRVILLE CASTLE; OR, THE HISTORY OF ALBERT & EMMA. WITH THE DEATH OF THE USURPER MORENZI.
London: Printed [by A. Kemmish, King-Street, Borough] for, and Sold by J. Ker, No. 90, High Holborn. Sold also by Wilmott and Hill, 50, Borough; Perks, Stationer, 21, St. Martin's Lane; T. Elliot, High-Street, Shadwell; Barfoot, Norton-Falgate; Dixon, Rochester; T. Evans, 79, Long-Lane; Howard and Evans, 42, Long-Lane, West-Smithfield; Kemmish, 17, King-Street, Borough; Neil, 448, Strand; and Champante and Whitrow, Jury Street, Aldgate, n.d.
38p; pp. [34]–38: 'Ogus & Cara Khan, or the Force of Love. 8vo. Frontispiece bears legend: 'Bernard and Emma taking farewell of their Cottage to escape the snares of Morenzi. 6d.
*Further edn: London: A. Kemmish, n.d.

Koch 47
CRONSTADT CASTLE; OR, THE MYSTERIOUS VISITOR. AN ORIGINAL ROMANCE.
Surry: Printed by A. Kemmish, 17, King-Street, Borough—for and Published by J. Ker, 40, London Road, near the Elephant and Castle, Southwark—Sold also by Hughes, Stationer's Court—N. and J. Muggeridge, Borough; Wilmott and Hill, 50, Borough; A. Kemmish, King-Street, Borough; Perks, Stationer, 12. St. Martin's Lane; Elliott, High-Street, Shadwell; Barfoot, Norton-Falgate; Dixon, Rochester; Hodgson, 20, Strand; T. Evans, 79, Long-Lane, West-Smithfield, &c., [1803].
38p; pp. [34]–38: The Unfortunate Victim. 12mo. 6d.

Koch 60
DOMESTIC MISERY, OR THE VICTIM OF SEDUCTION, A PATHETIC TALE; ADDRESSED TO THE UNPRINCIPLED LIBERTINE.
London: Printed [by T. Plummer, Seething-Lane, Tower-Street] for Tegg and Castleman, No. 122, St. John's-Street, West Smithfield; T. Hurst, Paternoster-Row; T. Brown, Edinburgh; and B. Dugdale, Dublin. And Sold by Champante & Whitrow, Aldgate; Wilmot and Hill, Borough; T. Hughes, Queen's-Head-Passage, London; J. Belcher, Birmingham; T. Troughton, Liverpool; I. Mitchell, Newcastle upon Tyne; B. Sellick, Bristol; E. Peck, York; M. Swindells, Clarke, and Co., Manchester; T. Binns, Leeds; J. Dingle, Bury St. Edmund's, and All Other Booksellers in the United Kingdom, [1803].
36p. 12mo. Frontispiece. Quotation from Virgil. 36p. 12mo. [1s].
*Bound to this without title page: *Highland Heroism; or the Castles of Glencoe and Balloch. A Scottish Legend of the Sixteenth Century* (London: Tegg & Castleman, 1803]). 36p. 12mo.
Further edns: London: Dean & Munday, n.d.; London: J. Ker, n.d.; On single edition of *Highland Heroism*, see Item 62 of the main Koch checklist.

Koch 63
DUNCAN; OR, THE SHADE OF GERTRUDE. A CALEDONIAN TALE.
London: Printed [by Neil, Chalton-Street, Sommers Town, and No. 448, Strand] for and Sold by J. Ker, Publisher and Stationer, No. 90, High Holborn; Sold also by A. Neil, 448, Strand; T. Hughes, Stationers'-Court; M. &. J. Muggeridge, and Wilmott & Hill, Borough; Perks, 21, St. Martin's Lane; S. Elliott, High-Street, Shadwell; Barfoot, Norton Falgate; Dixon, Rochester; T. Evans, 79, and Howard & Evans, Long-Lane, West Smithfield, n.d.
40p. 12mo. Frontispiece bears legend: 'Lord Pevensey sacrificing the Thane of Fife in his jealous rage'. 6d.

Koch 65
EDMUND AND ALBINA; OR, GOTHIC TIMES. A ROMANCE.
London: Printed by T. Maiden, Sherbourne-Lane, for Ann Lemoine, White-Rose Court, Coleman-Street, and Sold by T. Hurst, Paternoster-Row, 1801.
48p. 12mo. Frontispiece bears legend: 'Albina rescued from the Ruffians'. Quotation from Shakespeare. 9d.
*Further edn: London: J. Ker, 1801.

Koch 112
THE MIDNIGHT BELL, OR THE ABBEY OF ST. FRANCIS. AN ORIGINAL ROMANCE. BY THE AUTHORESS OF ALPHONSO AND ELINOR; THREE GHOSTS OF THE FOREST, &C.
London: Printed [by A. Kemmish, King-Street, Borough] for, & Sold by J. Ker, 34, Great Surrey-Street, Blackfriars Road; Hughes, Stationer's Court; N. & J. Muggeridge, Borough; S. Elliot, Shadwell; Willmot and Hill, Borough; Dixon, Bookseller and Stationer, Rochester; J. Barfoot, 27, Norton-Falgate; and A. Kemmish, Printer, 17, King-Street, Borough, [1802].
40p. 12mo. Coloured frontispiece bears legend: 'Just as she approached the Tomb, the same mysterious form issued form thence and slowly glided by her'. 6d.

Koch 140
THE PROPHETIC WARNING; OR, THE CASTLE OF LINDENDORFF. AN ORIGINAL ROMANCE. BY A YOUNG GENTLEMAN OF NOTE.
Southwark: Printed by Ann Kemmish, 17, King-Street, Borough, for and Sold by J. Ker, 40, London-Road, near the Elephant and Castle, Southwark. Sold also by T. Hughes, Stationers' Court; Wilmott and Hill, Borough; Kemmish, King-Street Borough; Barfoot, Norton-Falgate; Perks, 12, St. Matin's Lane; Dixon, Rochester; Hodgson, 20, Strand; T. Evans, Long-Lane, Smithfield, &c., &c., n.d.
38p; pp. 35–38: 'Rinaldo and Adeline; or the Ghost of St. Cyril'. 12mo. Frontispiece bears legend: 'The spirit of the Marchioness warning Edwin, and Mathilda of her Brother Alfreds [*sic*] treachery. 6d.
*Further edn: London: J. Ker, 1800.

Koch 159
SIR MALCOLM THE BRAVE, OR, ISABELLA'S GHOST. A SCOTTISH LEGEND.
London: Printed, by C. and W. Galabin, Ingram-Court, for M. Tuck, Circulating Library, near the Adam and Eve, Peckham; and Sold by Champante and Whitrow, Aldgate; J. Cleverly, No. 6, Barbican; Kerr, No. 36, Blackfriers [*sic*]-Road; T. Evans,

Long-Lane, Smithfield; and All Other Booksellers in Town and Country, n.d.
44p. 12mo. Frontispiece. 6d.

Koch 163
A TALE OF MYSTERY; OR THE CASTLE OF SOLITUDE. CONTAINING THE DREADFUL IMPRISONMENT OF COUNT L. AND THE COUNTESS HARMINA, HIS LADY.
London: Printed [by T. Plummer, Seething-Lane, Tower-Street] for Thomas Tegg and Co. No. 122, St. John's-Street, West Smithfield; T. Hurst, Paternoster-Row; T. Brown, Edinburgh; and B. Dugdale, Dublin. And Sold by Champante & Whitrow, Aldgate; Wilmot and Hill, Borough; T. Hughes, Queen's-Head-Passage, London; J. Dingle, Bury; T. Gibbons, Bath; T. Lamb, T. Matthews, and Messrs Cowley and Richardson; Bristol; Messrs. Clarke & Co. M. Swindale, and J. Reddish, Manchester; N. Rollaston, Coventry; T. Richards and W. Gray, Plymouth; Harrod and Turner, Nottingham; T. Binns, Leeds; T. Newling and M. Wood, Shrewsbury; W. Troughton and W. Jones, Liverpool; J. Legg, Gosport; T. Crooks, Rotherham; J. Belsher, Birmingham; and Every Other Bookseller in England, Scotland and Ireland, [1803].
72p. 12mo. Frontispiece. Quotation from *Hamlet*. [1s].
*Further edns: London: J. Ker, n.d.; London: Tegg & Co., 1802.

Koch 167
THE THREE GHOSTS OF THE FOREST, A TALE OF HORROR. AN ORIGINAL ROMANCE.
London: Printed by D. N. Shury, Berwick Street, Soho; for, and Sold by J. Ker, No. 2, Green Walk, Bear Lane, Christ Church, Surry; also Sold by T. Hughes, Paternoster Row; N. and J. Muggeridge, Borough; and S. Elliot, High Street, Shadwell, 1803.
36p; pp. 34–36: 'The Miraculous Preservation of Androcles'. 12mo. Frontispiece.

Koch 196
WILKINSON, Sarah [Scudgell].
THE LILLY OF NAVARRE, OR, BANDITTI OF THE FOREST. AN ORIGINAL ROMANCE. BY SARAH WILKINSON AUTHORESS OF "THE CHATEAU DE MONTVILLE," "JOHN BULL," "GOTHIC CELL," "MONKCLIFFE ABBEY" &C.
London: Printed [by J. Cranwell, Long-Lane] for J. Ker, No. 2, Green-Walk, Bear-Lane, Christ-Church, Surry. Sold also by T. Hughes, Stationers [*sic*]-Court, Ludgate-Street; N. and J. Muggeridge, Borough; and S. Elliott, High-Street, Shadwell, [1804].
38p. 12mo. Frontispiece. 6d.

Koch 207
[WILKINSON, Sarah Scudgell].
THE SPECTRE; OR, THE RUINS OF BELFONT PRIORY.
London: Printed by A. Kemmish, 17, King-Street, Borough—for and Sold by J. Ker, 34, Great Surrey-Street, Blackfriars Road. Also Sold by T. Hughes, Stationer's Court; N. and J. Muggeridge, Borough; A. Kemmish, King-Street, Borough; and S. Elliot, High-Street, Shadwell, n.d.
40p; pp. 31–35: 'Eugenia; or, the Carnival of Venice'; pp. 36–40: 'The Treacherous

Lover; or, the Fatal Effects of Deception'. 8vo. Frontispiece. Quotation from Blaine. 6d.

Notes

1. John Gladstone Steele, *The Petersons and the Uhrs: An Australian Family since 1825* (Brisbane, 2003).
2. R. A. Howard, 'Anne Ker: A Biographical and Bibliographical Study', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 11 (Dec 2003). Online: Internet (June 2004): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc11_04.html*>
3. John Talbot White, *The Scottish Border and Northumberland* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973), p. 124.
4. Sidney Lee, 'John Ker', *DNB*; George Edward Cokayne (ed.), *The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain, and the United Kingdom*, 13 vols (1887–98; revised edn, Gloucester: A. Sutton, 1982), v, 225
5. *Gentleman's Magazine* 74 (1804), 383
6. Sampler, in private collection.
7. Register of Baptisms, St Luke's.
8. Rate Books, 1767–69; W. H. Godfrey, *Survey of London: The Parish of Chelsea*, edd. M. H. Cox and P. Norman (London: Batsford for the London City Council, 1909), II, 83.
9. Register of Marriages, St Pancras.
10. Walter Riddell Carre, *Border Memories*, ed. J. Tait (Edinburgh and London: J. Thin, 1876), p. 97.
11. Prerogative Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Letters of Administration, Public Record Office, London PROB 6/199, f. 137 (5 Dec 1823).
12. Thomas S. Paton, et al., *Reports of Cases Decided in the House of Lords upon Appeal from Scotland*, 6 vols (Edinburgh and London: T. & T. Clark, 1849–56), v, 553.
13. Will of John Duke of Roxburghe, PRO, PROB 11/1520, ff. 309–19; Carre, p. 110.
14. Register of Marriages, St James's Church; Arthur Irwin Dasent, *The History of St James's Square* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895), pp. 135–37, 255; *Complete Peerage*, v, 224
15. Sir James Balfour Paul (ed.), *The Scots Peerage Founded on Wood's Edition of Sir Robert Douglas's Peerage of Scotland*, 9 vols (Edinburgh: Douglas, 1904–14), VII, 353.
16. Carre, pp. 111–12.
17. Anon., *Floors Castle* (Derby: Pilgrim Press Ltd, 1979), p. 16.
18. Archives of the Royal Literary Fund, 1790–1918 (RLF), 145 reels (London: World Microfilms Publications, 1982), Reel 12 (Case 424). Original letters held at the British Museum Library, Department of Manuscripts.
19. Mathew Stobie, *Plan of Fleurs, the Seat of His Grace John Duke of Roxburgh* (1798).
20. *Scots Peerage*, VII, 354.
21. Carre, pp. 95 and 101.
22. A copy of the ring impression is held by the author.
23. Will of John Duke of Roxburghe, PRO, PROB 11/1520, ff. 309–19.
24. *Gentleman's Magazine* 89 (1819), 286.

25. See Anne Ker, *The Heiress di Montalde; or, the Castle of Bezanto*, 2 vols (London: For the Author, 1799), 1, 1. Subsequent references are from this edn, and are given in the text.
26. Register of Baptisms, St Pancras.
27. RLF; Baptism Register, St George's in the East
28. Prerogative Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Letters of Administration, PRO, PROB 6/199, f. 137.
29. Montague Summers, *The Gothic Quest. A history of the Gothic Novel* (1938; New York: Russell & Russell, 1964), p. 83.
30. See Howard, Section IV, Item 4.
31. Angela Koch, ' "The Absolute Horror of Horrors" Revised. A Bibliographical Checklist of Early-Nineteenth-Century Gothic Bluebooks', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 9 (Dec 2002). Online: Internet (July 2004): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc09_n03.html*>.
32. Details taken from Richard Horwood, *Map of London, Westminster & Southwark Shewing every House, 1792–9.* Subsequent references to this map will be given parenthetically in the text as Horwood.
33. Register of Marriages, Parish of St Pancras; Prerogative Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Letters of Administration, PRO, PROB6/199, f. 137 (5 Dec 1823); RLF, Reel 12 (Case 424).
34. The dating of this item is taken from Franz Potter, 'Writing for the Spectre of Poverty: Exhuming Sarah Wilkinson's Bluebooks and Novels', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 11 (Dec 2003). Online: Internet (July 2004): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc11_n02.html*>.
35. Land Tax Books for St George's in the East, Guildhall Library.
36. Howard Anderson, 'Introduction' to M. G. Lewis, *The Monk* (1796; Oxford: OUP, 1973, rptd 1998), p. xiii.
37. Summers, p. 84.

Copyright Information

John Steele thanks other Australian descendants of Anne Ker who collaborated in his research since 1980, especially Frank Uhr and the late Ruth Smith. The late Iris Bancroft and the late Rex King made heirlooms available. Rachel Howard kindly provided encouragement and made available a facsimile of 'A Ker-ish Trick'.

Referring to this Article

J. G. Steele. 'Anne and John Ker: New Soundings', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 12 (Summer 2004). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc12_n03.pdf*>.

Contributor Details

The Revd Canon John Gladstone Steele AM (BSc, PhD University of Queensland, ThL Australian College of Theology) is a retired Anglican priest and physicist who writes on Australian history and art.

The matter contained within this article provides bibliographical information based on independent personal research by the contributor, and as such has not been subject to the peer-review process.

'The English Novel, 1800–1829'
Update 4 (June 2003–August 2004)

Peter Garside,
with Jacqueline Belanger, Sharon Ragaz, and Anthony Mandal

This project report relates to *The English Novel, 1770–1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles,* general editors Peter Garside, James Raven, and Rainer Schöwerling, 2 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 2000). In particular it offers fresh commentary on the entries in the second volume [EN2], which was co-edited by Peter Garside and Rainer Schöwerling, with the assistance of Christopher Skelton-Foord and Karin Wünsche. The present report is the fourth (and last) Update in a series of annual Reports, each featuring information that has come to light in the preceding year as a result of activities in CEIR and through contributions sent by interested individuals outside Cardiff.

The entries below are organised in a way that matches the order of material in the *English Novel, 1770–1829*. While it makes reference to any relevant changes that may have occurred in Updates 1–3, the 'base' it normally refers to is the printed Bibliography and not the preceding reports. Sections A and B concern authorship, with the first of these proposing changes to the attribution as given in the printed Bibliography, and the second recording the discovery of new information of interest that has nevertheless not led presently to new attributions. Section C includes three additional titles which match the criteria for inclusion and should ideally have been incorporated in the printed Bibliography, while Section E involves information such as is usually found in the *Notes* field of entries, and those owning copies of the printed Bibliography might wish (as in the case of the earlier categories) to amend entries accordingly. An element of colour coding has been used to facilitate recognition of the nature of changes, with red denoting revisions and additions to existing entries in the Bibliography, and the additional titles discovered being picked out in blue. Reference numbers (e.g. 1806: 12) are the same as those in the *English Novel, 1770–1829*; when found as cross references these refer back to the original Bibliography, unless accompanied with 'above' or 'below', in which case a cross reference within the present report is intended. Abbreviations match those listed at the beginning volume 2 of the *English Novel,* though in a few cases these are spelled out more fully for the convenience of present readers.

This report (and its addenda) were prepared by Peter Garside, with significant inputs of information from Drs Jacqueline Belanger and Sharon Ragaz, on this occasion especially as a result of a survey of relevant entries in the Ledgers of the Longman Archives, and work with the Oliver & Boyd and Blackwood Papers in the National Library of Scotland. Information was also generously communicated by a number of individuals, including: Andrew Ashfield, Richard Beaton, Emma Clery, Isobel Grundy, David Skilton, John Strachan, and (once more) Professors Rolf Loeber and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber. As before, the Cardiff team has benefited from its association with Projekt Corvey at Paderborn University, most recently through the joint preparation of a *Bibliography of Fiction, 1830–1836* (available now within Cardiff Corvey, and abbreviated below as EN3). Thanks are also due to Michael Bott, of Reading University Library, for help received in locating materials in the Longman archives; to Miss Virginia Murray for support and guidance with the Murray archives; and to the trustees of the National Library of Scotland [NLS] for permission to quote from manuscripts in their care.

A: New And Changed Author Attributions

1802: 3
[PHILIPPS, Janetta].
DELAVAL. A NOVEL. IN TWO VOLUMES.
London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for William Lane, Leadenhall-Street, 1802.
I 266p, ill.; II 216p. 12mo. 8s boards (CR); 8s (ECB).
CR 2nd ser. 34: 476 (Apr 1802); WSW I: 32.
Corvey; CME 3-628-47405-1; ECB 158; xNSTC.
Notes. The authorship has been discovered through the appearance of 'Stanzas Inserted in the Novel of Delaval' in Janetta Philipps's privately printed *Poems* (Oxford, 1811), pp. 31–2, these matching the untitled 5-stanza poem interspersed in the novel above at I, 116. Further comparison has revealed that 5 other poetical pieces in the novel are reprinted in Philipps's *Poems*, constituting nearly a third of the items in that volume. Little else has been found about Janetta Philipps, other than that Shelley praised her poems and was active in collecting subscribers for the 1811 volume (see Jackson, p. 256). Thanks are due to Andrew Ashfield for drawing attention to 'Stanzas Inserted in the Novel of Delaval'.
Further edn: Newbern, NC, 1804 (NUC).

1806: 6
[?HURRY, Margaret].
DONALD. A NOVEL. IN THREE VOLUMES.
London: Printed by I. Gold, Shoe-Lane, for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, Paternoster-Row, 1806.

I 335p; II 324p; III 213p. 12mo. 13s 6d (ECB); 13s 6d boards (ER).
ER 9: 500 (Jan 1807); WSW I: 34.
Corvey; CME 3-628-47448-5; ECB 168; NSTC D1544 (BI BL, C).
Notes. Longman Divide Ledger (CD, p. 221) and Commission Ledger (IC, p. 21) show that 6 copies were sent to Mrs Ives at Yarmouth and that half profits were paid to a 'Mrs H.'. 'Mrs Ives Hurry' is given as the author on the title-page of *Artless Tales* (1808: 59), also published by Longmans. Mrs Hurry's maiden name was Margaret Mitchell. The subscription list to *Artless Tales* includes 6 Yarmouth subscribers, including a Mr James Hurry (among 11 of that surname). The same list also includes a Mrs T. Ives, who subscribes for 3 copies, as well as three Miss Mitchells. The ledger nomination of Mrs H. apparently as the author, similarity of publisher, and a coincidence of names and East Anglian connections, point strongly (though not decisively) towards authorship of the above title by Margaret Hurry.

1808: 13
[?MERIVALE, John Herman].
THE RING AND THE WELL; OR, THE GRECIAN PRINCESS. A ROMANCE. IN FOUR VOLUMES.
London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, Paternoster-Row, 1808.
I 271p; II 220p; III 249p; IV 300p. 12mo. 18s (ECB, ER).
ER 12: 524 (July 1808), 13: 507 (Jan 1809); WSW I: 104.
Corvey; CME 3-628-48607-6; ECB 494; NSTC G1895 (BI E).
Notes. Longman Divide Ledger (ID, p. 88) shows a number of copies, some in special bindings, being sent to 'Mr Merrivale' (or 'Mr M'). This raises the possibility that the author of this work was John Herman Merivale. Merivale's brother-in-law was Henry Joseph Thomas Drury (1778–1841), and it is noticeable that a copy of the novel was also sent to 'H. Drury Esq'. Merivale was a classical scholar, whose works included *Collections from the Greek Anthology and from the Pastoral, Elegiac, and Dramatic Poets of Greece* (London, 1813). He was also a contributor to *Blackwood's Magazine*.

1809: 10
[?PORTER, Sir Robert Ker].
TALES OF OTHER REALMS. COLLECTED DURING A LATE TOUR THROUGH EUROPE. BY A TRAVELLER. IN TWO VOLUMES.
London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, Paternoster-Row, 1809.
I viii, 199p; II 208p. 12mo. 8s (ECB, ER, QR).
ER 15: 242 (Oct 1809); QR 2: 466 (Nov 1809); WSW I: 118.
Corvey; CME 3-628-51155-0; ECB 575; NSTC T131 (BI O).
Notes. Preface dated London, May 1809. Longman Divide Ledger (ID, p. 50) shows 6 copies in boards being sent to 'Miss Porter'. This indicates a connection

with either Jane or Anna Maria Porter, and beyond that possible authorship by a member of the Porter family. Sir Robert Ker Porter (1772–1842), their elder brother, had travelled extensively in Russia, Germany, Finland and Sweden, since 1804, and more recently had accompanied Sir John Moore on his expedition to Spain. He was the acknowledged author of *Letters from Portugal and Spain, written during the march of the British Troops under Sir John Moore* (1809), published by Longman & Co, for whom he also wrote other travel books. In the Preface to the present work, the author refers to his having added notes to 'the Spanish story', but having desisted from doing the same in the case of 'the Sicilian, Swiss, or Portuguese stories' (vii–viii) Granting the present attribution to Sir Robert Ker Porter, and the almost certain authorship of *Sir Edward Seaward's Narrative of His Shipwreck* (EN3 1831: 57) by William Ogilvie Porter, this would place four of the Porter siblings as writers of fiction.

1812: 23
[BENGER, Elizabeth Ogilvy].
MARIAN, A NOVEL. IN THREE VOLUMES.
Edinburgh: Printed for Manners and Miller; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1812.
I 288p; II 271p; III 250p. 12mo. 15s (ECB, ER, QR).
ER 19: 511 (Feb 1812); QR 7: 471 (June 1812).
Corvey; CME 3-628-48156-2; ECB 368; NSTC M1135 (BI BL, E, O).
Notes. Benger is given as the author in FC and NUC; Mme[?] Barbara Pile is listed as the author by Bentley (p. 94) (also spelt Pilon—p. 72). The absence of any further evidence about the otherwise unknown Pile, and an increasing awareness of the provenance of this novel, both argue strongly for attributing this novel to Benger alone. One useful pointer is the recommendation of the work to its Edinburgh publishers as 'the very best novel she had ever read' by Elizabeth Hamilton, one of Benger's close friends: see Lady Charlotte Bury, *The Diary of a Lady-in-Waiting*, ed. by A. F. Steuart, 2 vols. (London: Lane, 1908), II, 262.
Further edn: Philadelphia 1812 (NUC).

1815: 17
BUONAPARTE, Louis; K{ENDALL}, E{dward} A{ugustus} (*trans.*).
MARIA; OR, THE HOLLANDERS: BY LOUIS BUONAPARTE. IN THREE VOLUMES.
London: Printed by J. Gillet, Crown-Court, Fleet-Street, for H. Colburn, Conduit-Street; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, 1815.
I xvi, 225p; II 189p; III 251p. 12mo. 16s 6d (ECB, ER); 16s (QR).
ER 25: 278 (June 1815); QR 13: 281 (Apr 1815); WSW I: 180.
BL N.1820; ECB 64; NSTC L2387 (BI C, Dt).

Notes. Trans. of *Marie, ou les Hollandoises* (Paris, 1814), which is the 2nd edn. of *Marie, ou les peines de l'amour* (Gratz, 1812). Preface to the Translation, signed E. A. K., 6 Feb 1815, reads: 'The first edition, under the title of *Marie, ou les peines de l'amour*, was printed at Gratz, in the year 1812. Of that edition, a reprint appeared in Paris, but, from whatever cause, not before the beginning of the year 1814. In the interim, the author had made several alterations in his work, changing some of the minor incidents of the story, and consequently suppressing some of his pages, and adding others; and, in the month of June, 1814, he conveyed, by a written paper, dated at Lausanne, in Switzerland, and signed "L. de St. Leu," to a particular bookseller in Paris, authority to print, from the original manuscript, with its alterations, a second edition of his book, under the new title of *Marie, ou les Hollandoises*. From this edition, the following translation has been made' (pp. [v]–vi). OCLC (Accession No. 5381478) identifies the translator as probably Edward Augustus Kendall (1776?–1842). This identification is substantiated by the Longman Divide Ledger entry (2D, p. 76), where 'Mr Kendall' receives payment of £31. 10. 0. as the 'Translator'.

1819: 18

[?EDWARDS, Mr].

ROBIN HOOD; A TALE OF THE OLDEN TIME. IN TWO VOLUMES.

Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, High Street; G. & W. B. Whittaker, Ave-Maria-Lane, London; and W. Turnbull, Glasgow, 1819.

I 246p; II 221p. 12mo. 12s (ER).

ER 32: 257 (July 1819).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48615-7; NSTC 2H28683 (BI BL).

Notes. Oliver & Boyd ledger entry itemizes £20 'Paid to Mr Edwards for the copyright' (NLS, MS Accession 5000/1, Copyright Ledger I, pp. 135–6). Normally in such cases in the Oliver & Boyd records this refers to the author, though there is still the possibility that an agent was involved in this particular case. 8 pp. of separately paged advs. at the end of vol. 2.

Further edn: 2nd edn. 1819 (NSTC).

1820: 10

[?DIBDIN, Thomas John].

TALES OF MY LANDLORD, NEW SERIES, CONTAINING PONTEFRACT CASTLE. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for William Fearman, New Bond Street, 1820.

I xlvi, 226p; II 290p; III 319p. 12mo.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48870-2; ECB 575; NSTC 2T1406 (BI BL, E; NA MH).

Notes. Vol. 1 includes a long 'Publisher's Preface' containing details of a dispute with John Ballantyne, Walter Scott's literary agent, concerning the copyright of the *Tales of My Landlord* series. See Update 3 under 1820: 10 for Robert Cadell's report to his partner Constable that 'Thomas Dibdin is the author'. Additional

support for an attribution to Thomas John Dibdin (1771–1841) has since been found in OCLC's attribution of the follow-up work in this spurious 'new series' to this Dibdin (see Notes to 1821: 17 below). On the other hand, mention by the Publisher (in a notice in the *Morning Chronicle* of 13 Nov 1819) of the MS of the present work 'coming from a great distance' would seem to militate against the London-centred Dibdin being the origin.
Further edns: French trans., 1821 [as *Le Château de Pontefract* (Pigoreau)]; German trans., 1824 [as *Das Schloss von Pontefract* (RS)].

1820: 12
[SANSAY, Leonora].
ZELICA, THE CREOLE; A NOVEL, BY AN AMERICAN. IN THREE VOLUMES.
London: Printed for William Fearman, Library, 170, New Bond Street, 1820.
I 243p; II 254p; III 309p. 12mo. 21s (ECB).
ER 35: 266 (Mar 1821); WSW II: 41.
Corvey; CME 3-628-47473-6; ECB 654; NSTC 2A10533 (BI BL).
Notes. ER gives 'Madame de Sansée' as the author. This is substantiated by the attribution of this title to Leonora Sansay (b. 1781) by OCLC (Accession No. 22421579). Sansay is also given in OCLC as the author of *Secret History, or the Horrors of St.* Domingo (1808), and of *Laura* (1809) 'by a lady of Philadelphia' (where that novel was published). Both these latter works are mentioned in the entry on Sansay in FC, though no mention is made there of the above work and its companion *The Scarlet Handkerchief* (see 1823: 12 below). Adv. opp. t.p. of vol. 1 for 'American Novels', announcing two titles 'In the Press, by the same Author', viz. 'The Scarlet Handkerchief, 3 vols.', and 'The Stranger in Mexico, 3 vols.', which with the present work 'form a Series of Novels that have been transmitted to the Publisher from America'. For the first of these titles, though from another publisher, see 1823: 12.

1820: 28(b)
GENLIS, [Stéphanie-Félicité, Comtesse] de; [STRUTT, Elizabeth; formerly BYRON (*trans.*)].
PETRARCH AND LAURA. BY MADAME DE GENLIS. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.
London: Printed for Henry Colburn & Co. Public Library, Conduit Street, Hanover Square, 1820.
I xii, 195p; II 213p. 12mo. 10s 6d (ECB).
BL 837.b.27; ECB 225; NSTC 2B54567 (BI Dt, O).
Notes. Trans. of *Pétrarque et Laure* (Paris, 1819). This translation is given as Strutt's in an MS list of her works found in the Oliver & Boyd Papers held in NLS (Accession 5000/91).

1820: 38
[BLAIR, Mrs Alexander].
DOMESTIC SCENES. A NOVEL. IN THREE VOLUMES. BY LADY HUMDRUM, AUTHOR OF MORE WORKS THAN BEAR HER NAME.
London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, 1820.
I 368p; II 359p; III 386p. 12mo. 21s (ECB, ER).
ER 33: 518 (May 1820); WSW I: 333.
Corvey; CME 3-628-47801-4; ECB 168; NSTC 2H36417 (BI BL, C, O).
Notes. Distinct from *Domestic Scenes* by Mrs Showes (see 1806: 61). Longman Divide Ledger (2D, p. 174) has 'Mrs B' written on upper right side of ledger entry, in a position where authors are normally shown; it also records '1 copy bds [sent to] Mrs Blair'. This is almost certainly Mrs Alexander Blair, the widow of a ruined industrialist and speculator, and very probably the same person who is described by Maria Edgeworth in a letter of 4 Mar 1819 as writing 'novels if not for bread for butter' (*Letters from England, 1813–1844*, ed. by Christina Colvin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 173). See also Update 1 (under 1813: 14) for a now disproved suggestion that a 'Miss Cox' might lie behind the pseudonym 'Lady Humdrum'; and Update 3 for further commentary on the Blairs, and their daughter, the novelist Mary Margaret Busk.

1821: 17
[?DIBDIN, Thomas John].
TALES OF MY LANDLORD, NEW SERIES, CONTAINING THE FAIR WITCH OF GLAS LLYN. IN THREE VOLUMES.
London: Printed for William Fearman, New Bond-Street, 1821.
I xcvi, 256p; II 360p; III 368p. 12mo. 24s (ER, QR).
ER 35: 525 (July 1821); QR 24: 571 (Jan 1821).
Corvey; ECB 575; NSTC 2T1407 (BI BL, E).
Notes. OCLC entry (Accession No. 13819230) ascribes to Thomas John Dibdin (1771–1841), apparently on basis of anonymous MS note on t.ps. of surviving copy attributing to Thomas Dibdin of Sadler's Wells. For other evidence in support of such an attribution, see Update 3 under 1820: 10 and Notes to 1820: 10 above.
Further edns: French trans., 1821 [as *La Belle Sorcière de Glas-Llyn* (Pigoreau)]; German trans., 1822 [as *Die Circe von Glas-Llyn* (RS)].

1821: 67
SOUZA[-BOTELHO], [Adélaide-Marie-Émilie Filleul, Marquise de Flahaut]; [?RYLANCE, Ralph (*trans.*)].
HELEN DE TOURNON: A NOVEL. BY MADAME DE SOUZA. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, 1821.
I 269p; II 263p. 12mo. 10s 6d (ECB); 10s 6d boards (ER, QR).
ER 35: 266 (Mar 1821); QR 24: 571 (Jan 1821).
BL N.368; ECB 552; NSTC 2F7815 (BI C).
Notes. Trans. of *Mademoiselle de Tournon* (vol. 6 of *Oeuvres Complètes*, Paris, 1821–2). Longman Impression Book entry (No. 7, fol. 109v) lists 'Payments to Rylance [for] translating'. This is likely to refer to Ralph Rylance, the author of several books and pamphlets in this period, including *A Sketch of the Causes and Consequences of the Late Emigration to the Brazils* (1808) for Longman & Co. Rylance also appears in the Longman ledgers as a house reader for the firm. He is on record as receiving payment, for example, for reading and/or correcting the MSS of Jane West's *The Loyalists* (1812: 64), *Alicia de Lacy* (1814: 60), and *Ringrove* (1827: 78), as well as Agnes Anne Barber's *Country Belles* (1824: 16).
Further edn: Boston 1822 (NUC).

1823: 12
[SANSAY Leonora].
THE SCARLET HANDKERCHIEF. A NOVEL. IN THREE VOLUMES. BY AN AMERICAN, AUTHOR OF ZELICA THE CREOLE, &C. &C.
London: Printed for A. K. Newman and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1823.
I 272p; II 264p; III 302p. 12mo. 18s (ECB).
Corvey; CME 3-628-48531-2; ECB 516; NSTC 2A10524 (BI BL).
Notes. Attribution to Sansay as a consequence of information relating to *Zelica, the Creole* (see Notes to 1820: 12 above). ECB dates Feb 1823

1823: 14
[BLAIR, Mrs Alexander].
SELF-DELUSION; OR, ADELAIDE D'HAUTEROCHE: A TALE. BY THE AUTHOR OF "DOMESTIC SCENES." IN TWO VOLUMES.
London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, 1823.
I 365p; II 353p. 12mo. 14s (ECB, QR); 14s boards (ER).
ER 39: 272 (Oct 1823); QR 29: 280 (Apr 1823); WSW II: 33.
Corvey; CME 3-628-48641-6; ECB 526; NSTC 2S12804 (BI BL, C).
Notes. *Domestic Scenes* was written under the pseudonym of Lady Humdrum (see 1820: 38). 'Mrs Blair' is written on top right of entry for the present title in Longman Divide Ledger (2D, p. 175). For the identification of Mrs Alexander Blair as the author underlying the pseudonymous 'Lady Humdrum', see extended Note to 1820: 38 above.

1824: 85
[?HOWARD, Francis].
TORRENWALD. A ROMANCE. IN FOUR VOLUMES. BY SCRIBLERUS SECUNDUS, SOMETIME INSTRUCTOR OF YOUTH, VULGO GRINDER.
London: Printed for A. K. Newman and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1824.
I 315p; II 291p; III 304p; IV 317p. 12mo. 26s (ECB).
WSW II: 38.
Corvey; CME 3-628-48762-5; ECB 594; NSTC 2S11201 (BI BL, C, O).
Notes. Francis Howard apparently claims this novel in a letter of 20 Dec 1824 to Oliver & Boyd, while approaching the firm over another novel of his: '[…] I never wrote a line till early in June 1823 when literally for want of amusement I began & wrote a Romance named Torrenwald' (NLS, Accession 5000/191). Other correspondence in the Oliver & Boyd papers indicates that he was also the author of *The Vacation, or Truth and Falsehood: A Tale for Youth* (1824). Apart from this, however, nothing has been discovered about Howard, and his new novel appears not to have been taken up by Oliver & Boyd. ECB dates May 1824.

1825: 30
FOUQUÉ, [Friedrich Heinrich Karl], Baron de la Motte; [GILLIES, Robert Pierce (*trans.*)].
THE MAGIC RING; A ROMANCE, FROM THE GERMAN OF FREDERICK, BARON DE LA MOTTE FOUQUÉ. IN THREE VOLUMES.
Edinburgh: Published by Oliver & Boyd, Tweeddale-Court; and Geo. B. Whittaker, London, 1825.
I xv, 319p; II 344p; III 332p. 12mo. 21s (ECB).
BL N.278; ECB 213; NSTC 2L2906 (BI C, Dt, E, O).
Notes. Trans. of *Der Zauberring* (Nürnberg, 1813). Dedication 'to Conrad Charles, Freyherr von Ämselnburg, in Berlin, translator of "The Lady of the Lake", "The Bridal of Triermain" and "The Antiquary" '. Correspondence between Gillies and George Boyd in the Oliver & Boyd Papers held in NLS (Accession 5000/191) makes it clear that Gillies was the translator. ECB dates Nov 1825.
Further edn: another trans. 1846 (NSTC).

1826: 8
[?HALE, Sarah Josepha Buell].
STRANGER OF THE VALLEY; OR, LOUISA AND ADELAIDE. AN AMERICAN TALE. IN THREE VOLUMES. BY A LADY.
New-York: Printed for Collins and Hannay. London: Reprinted for A. K. Newman and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1826.
I 273p; II 271p; III 262p. 12mo. 16s 6d (ECB).
Corvey; CME 3-628-47472-8; ECB 565; NSTC 2L1432 (BI BL, C).

Notes. OCLC (Accession No. 27635457) attributes New York edn. unquestioningly to Sarah Josepha Buell Hale (1788–1879). This work is not listed as Hale's, however in Blanck. ECB dates Aug 1825. Colophon in each vol. reads: 'J. Darling, Leadenhall-Street, London'. Originally published New York 1825 (OCLC).

1828: 9
[STRUTT, Elizabeth; formerly BYRON].
MARY HARLAND; OR, THE JOURNEY TO LONDON. A TALE OF HUMBLE LIFE.
Edinburgh: Published by Oliver & Boyd, Tweeddale Court; and Geo. B. Whittaker, London, 1828.
320p. 18mo. 4s (ECB).
BL 1210.c.18(2); ECB 371; NSTC 2H8444.
Notes. Correspondence of Elizabeth Strutt and others with George Boyd in the Oliver & Boyd Papers held in NLS (Accession 5000/192-3) makes it clear that Strutt was the author of this work. ECB dates Mar 1828.

1828: 17
[BANIM, Michael].
THE CROPPY; A TALE OF 1798. BY THE AUTHORS OF "THE O'HARA TALES," "THE NOWLANS," AND "THE BOYNE WATER." IN THREE VOLUMES.
London: Henry Colburn, New Burlington Street, 1828.
I 314p; II 299p; III 318p. 12mo. 31s 6d (ECB); 31s 6d boards (ER).
ER 47: 524 (May 1828).
Corvey; CME 3-628-47353-5; ECB 145; NSTC 2B6685 (BI BL, C, Dt, E; NA MH).
Notes. Letters from John to Michael Banim during the preparation of this work indicate that it was authored by Michael alone, and not as previously given by the brothers together (see Patrick Joseph Murray, *The Life of John Banim, the Irish Novelist* (London, 1857), pp. 180, 190–2). Dedication 'to Sheffield Grace, Esq, F.S.A. &c.', signed 'The O'Hara Family'.
Further edns: 1834 (NUC); Philadelphia 1839 (NUC); French trans., 1833.
Facs: IAN (1979).

1829: 6
[ALEXANDER, Gabriel].
MY GRANDFATHER'S FARM; OR, PICTURES OF RURAL LIFE.
Edinburgh: Published by Oliver & Boyd, Tweeddale-Court; and Geo. B. Whittaker, London, 1829.
335p. 12mo. 7s (ECB, QR).
QR 39: 525 (Apr 1829).
Corvey; CME 3-628-51100-3; ECB 403; NSTC 2G17267 (BI BL, C, Dt, E).

Notes. A letter of receipt in the Oliver & Boyd papers, 15 May 1828, shows Gabriel Alexander acknowledging payment of £20 sterling for the copyright of this title (Letter Book, Agreements, 1814–47; NLS, Accession 5000/140). In the index to the same Letter Book, the author is listed under 'Alexander, Gabriel, Advocate'. This is almost certainly the same Alexander Gabriel who was admitted to the Faculty of Advocates on 25 Jan 1817, and died in 1868. In a letter of 11 Apr 1834 to the Royal Literary Fund, to whom an appeal was made, Alexander describes his work as 'a seven shilling volume which I had published by Oliver & Boyd Edin. 1828' (RLF 25: 789, Item 1). James Rennie, writing on his behalf on 20 April 1834, also states that 'The only volume he has had published is 'My Grandfather's Farm' which I am told in P[aternoster] R[ow] sold very well' (Item 2). The RLF records show that Alexander was granted £20. ECB dates Nov 1828.

B: New Information Relating To Authorship, But Not Presently Leading To Further Attribution Changes

1803: 38 KARAM[Z]IN, Ni[k]olai [Mikhailovich]; ELRINGTON, John Battersby (*trans*.), RUSSIAN TALES. Examination of the 1804 reissue, titled *Tales from the Russian of Nicolai Karamsin* (BL 12590 f. 90), shows a completely different set of preliminaries, which themselves strongly argue for the attribution of the translation to Andreas Andersen Feldborg. These consist of a dedication 'to Mr A de Gyldenpalm, His Danish Majesty's Charge D'Affaires At the Court of Great Britain &c', in which 'The Translator' speaks 'As a native of Denmark'; and also a 'Translator's Preface' in which the same translator refers to having 'already the honour of introducing my author to the British Public, by the translation of his Travels'. This latter presumably relates to Karamzin's *Travels from Moscow, through Prussia, Germany, Switzerland, France, and England* (London: Printed for J. Badcock by G. Sidney, 1803)—see OCLC Accession No. 9213044, which states translated from the German, though no translator is given. Translation of both works by the same Dane is strongly implied in a letter of Isaac D'Israeli to John Murray II, probably belonging to 1803, in the Murray Archives. Here D'Israeli states: 'I heard last night that Karamsin's Travels is a very indifferent book. This does not augur well for Karamsin's Tales; the work in question of the Dane's. I give you this information *in time*, that you may not plunge headlong into any independent engagement respecting the work. If he has printed 900, it is a good many; parts of the work should not extend beyond the circle of a Circulating Library.' It is worth noting that Sidney, the printer of Karamzin's Travels, appears on the title-pages of both the 1803 and 1804 Karamzin *Tales*: alone in the first case (indicating a private publication), and with 'J. Johnson, St Paul's Church-Yard' in the second case. The main body of the work is both instances is made up from the same sheets,

suggesting possibly that Johnson had bought up remaindered stock for the second issue. (The 1804 reissue also lacks the two plates found in the 1803 issue, the second of which, facing p. 204, bears the legend 'Published Novemr 5th 1803'.) If however Feldborg is adjudged translator, this not only leaves the large problem of the 1803 edition's title-page attribution of the translation to John Battersby Elrington, but also the questions posed by a different set of preliminaries profiling Elrington as an entirely different kind of entity. The address 'To My Friends' there in particular refers to the translator as being 'a Gentleman in Prison, labouring for Bread'. One potential solution is that Elrington is a pseudonym of Feldborg's, though this seems a large conjectural step to take. For further commentary on the larger issues involved, see Addendum 1 to this Update concerning 'Charles Sedley'.

1804: 71 WIELAND, C[hristoph] M[artin]; ELRINGTON, John Battersby (*trans.*), CONFESSIONS IN ELYSIUM, OR THE ADVENTURES OF A PLATONIC PHILOSOPHER. The possibility that Elrington is a pseudonym, and/or of an involvement by Andreas Anderson Feldborg as translator, is opened up by the case of 1803: 38 above. The licentiousness of much of the present text, at least in its translated form, might seem to match the Elrington persona; translation of an extensive text 'from the German' would seem to accord more with Feldborg. One linking factor is the appearance of G. Sidney as printer again on the titles. For further commentary on the larger issues involved, see Addendum 1 to this Update concerning 'Charles Sedley'.

1805: 10 ANON**,** THE MYSTERIOUS PROTECTOR: A NOVEL. DEDICATED TO LADY CRESPIGNY. The 1821 Catalogue for J. Brown's Circulating Library, Standishgate, Wigan, attributes this novel to Mrs Crepigny, though most probably as a result of the incorporation of Lady Crespigny as the dedicatee within the main title. It is perhaps worth noting, nevertheless, that the same Mary Champion de Crespigny is the accepted author of *The Pavilion. A Novel* (EN1 1796: 35).

1805: 15 [ANDERSON, Andreas], *MENTAL RECREATIONS. FOUR DANISH AND GERMAN TALES. BY THE AUTHOR OF TOUR IN ZEALAND. Attributed to Andreas Anderson, following Andrew Block, though no actual copy has been located. *A Tour in Zealand, in the Year 1802* (London, 1805), as mentioned in the title above, however, is a work by Andreas Andersen Feldborg. It is probably significant too that the pseudonym of 'J. A. Anderson' was used for Feldborg's later work, *A Dane's Excursions in Britain* (1809), where again incidentally the titles refer to the writer as 'Author of a Tour in Zealand'. In this light it seems likely that: (a) the pseudonym Andreas Anderson was actually used in the case of *Mental Recreations*; and (b) the true author (or perhaps more accurately, translator) of the same was Andreas Andersen Feldborg.

1807: 19 DIOGENES [pseud.], THE ROYAL ECLIPSE; OR, DELICATE FACTS EXHIBITING THE SECRET MEMOIRS OF SQUIRE GEORGE AND HIS WIFE. WITH NOTES. According to the review of this work in *The Satirist, or, Monthly Meteor*, 1 (1 Oct 1807), it was 'written by the SAME AUTHOR' (p. 65) as *The Infidel Mother* (1807: 58), itself attributed on its title-page to (the almost certainly pseudonymous) Charles Sedley. Another review in the same issue of *The Satirist* of Sedley's *The Barouche Driver and His Wife* (1807: 57) also furthers the connection (p. 69), drawing in as well *The Royal Investigation; or, Authentic documents containing the official acquittal of H.R.H the P—ss of W—s* (1807), 'by a Serjeant at law'. The publisher of all four publications mentioned here was J. F. Hughes. For further commentary on the larger issues involved, see Addendum 1 to this Update concerning 'Charles Sedley'.

1808: 9 ANON, MEMOIRS OF FEMALE PHILOSOPHERS, IN TWO VOLUMES. BY A MODERN PHILOSOPHER OF THE OTHER SEX. Advertised in *The Morning Chronicle* of 19 and 25 Mar 1808 as translated from the German by the Author of Caroline of Lichtfield and Christina [i.e. Jeanne-Isabelle-Pauline Polier de Bottens, Baronne de Montolieu]. Investigations are in process as to whether this item represents a re-translation back, through the French, of Charles Lloyd's *Edmund Oliver* (EN1 1798: 42), itself translated into German as *Edmund Olliver, Seitenstück zu Rousseaus Heloise* (1799–1800).

1808: 91 RATCLIFFE, Eliza, THE MYSTERIOUS BARON, OR THE CASTLE IN THE FOREST, A GOTHIC STORY. For a possible interconnection with Mary Anne Radcliffe, the named (but likewise possibly pseudonymous) author of *Manfroné; or, the One-Handed Monk* (1809: 61), see Addendum 2 to this Update.

1809: 51 MORRINGTON, J., *THE COTTAGE OF MERLIN VALE. The 1814 Catalogue of Robert Kinnear's Circulating Library in Edinburgh gives the author's name as 'Isabella Morrington'; that of A. K. Newman's Minerva Library, London, also 1814, offers the fuller title of 'Fashion's Fool, or the Cottage of Merlin Vale'. Still, however, no actual copy has been located, to help reconcile the differing secondary evidence.

1810: 24 [?BAYLEY, Catharine], CALEDONIA; OR, THE STRANGER IN SCOTLAND: A NATIONAL TALE. See 1812: 20, below.

1810: 25 [?BAYLEY, Catharine], THE SPANISH LADY, AND THE NORMAN KNIGHT. A ROMANCE OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY. See 1812: 20, below.

1812: 10 ANON, MY OWN TIMES, A NOVEL. The Longmans Commission Ledger entry for this title (1C, p. 601) has 'Mr Cormack' at the top right corner of the entry (where author names often appear), and also registers payment to 'H Cormack' in the accounts. No likely Cormack writing at this time, however, has been discovered; and alternative possibilities are that this person was the author's agent or a member of the book trade.

1812: 20 [?BAYLEY, Catharine], A SET-DOWN AT COURT; INCLUDING A SERIES OF ANECDOTES IN HIGH LIFE, AND THE HISTORY OF MONTHEMAR. A NOVEL, FOUNDED ON FACT. The identification of 'Mrs Bayley' (given as the author on the 1816 titles of vols. 2 and 3 of the Bodleian copy used for this entry) as Catharine Bayley does not gain further credence from the record of the latter's appeals to the Royal Literary Fund. A letter of 27 Aug 1814 to the Fund (RLF 9: 317, Item 1) acknowledges only 'Vacation Evenings and the little Volume abbreviated from the Zadig of Voltaire, entitled by her, Zadig and Astarte, published by Longman & Co Paternoster Row 1809 1810' as individual publications. In the same letter, Bayley describes herself as 'the Widow of the late Major Henry Bayley of the Royal Marines', her lack of a widow's pension (her husband having died nine years ago on half-pay), and later refers to pieces published by her in periodicals, 'particularly the European Magazine'. No suggestion is made however of the three chain titles published by 'Kate Montalbion' and associable with Mrs Bayley (1810: 24, 25, and the above work). Another letter of appeal to the Fund, dated 12 Nov 1816, again mentions only 'the Vacation Evenings—*now* out of print—and my Zadig from Voltaire, which is nearly so'. The same letter goes on to describe how 'I have been ill many months, and am *now* so reduced that every garment, every necessary even my Wedding *Ring* are deposited for the present means of sustenance' (RLF 9: 317, Item 16). Of course it is quite possible that Bayley did not wish to acknowledge three novels published by two far less salubrious publishers than Longmans, viz. J. F. Hughes and Allen & Co. The apparent reissuing of *A Set-Down at Court* in 1816 also tallies interestingly with Catharine Bayleys's last desperate appeal to the Fund in that year.

1812: 47 [?MAXWELL, Caroline], MALCOLM DOUGLAS; OR, THE SIBYLLINE PROPHECY. A ROMANCE. The question mark qualifying the attribution, hitherto based on a title-page attribution, can now be removed in the light of Caroline Maxwell's appeal to the Royal Literary Fund. In a letter to the Fund dated 12 April 1815, 'Malcolm Douglas. In 3 Volumes. Printed for Hookhams 15 Old-Bond Street' is listed as one of seven published works by her (RLF 9: 324, Item 1). The same letter, written on Maxwell's behalf by another, and naming her at the start as 'Mrs Maxwell of No 9 Margaret Street Cavendish Square', describes her as a widow with five children (four of them daughters), one of whom one is now an officer in the Navy and another established as a

governess. The letter continues that the bankruptcy of both the person who looked after her funds and of 'a person by whom she was employed to compose & ornament books for children' has left her in a state of debt. This letter is docketed at its head '£10 given'. The presence of the above title in this letter also further contradicts the Bodleian catalogue dating of [1824?].

1813: 14 COXE, Eliza A., LIBERALITY AND PREJUDICE, A TALE. An association of the present author with the 'Miss Cox' written to by Longman & Co in 1821 as the author of several remainderable novels (see Update 1 under this title) now looks considerably less likely. Another contender, for example, could just as well be Frances Clarinda Adeline Cox, the identified author of *The Camisard; or, The Protestants of Languedoc* (1825: 21), also published by Longmans. The identification of Mrs Alexander Blair as the author of *Domestic Scenes* (1820: 38; see entry under this title, above) also cancels out any possibility of a connection with the pseudonymous 'Lady Humdrum'.

1814: 12 BATTERSBY, John. TELL-TALE SOPHAS, AN ECLECTIC FABLE, IN THREE VOLUMES. FOUNDED ON ANECDOTES, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC. The author name John Battersby interestingly echoes that of John Battersby Elrington (see items 1803: 38 and 1804: 71 above); while the salacious nature of the contents is reminiscent of the scandal novels supposedly by Charles Sedley. Characteristic of this latter quality is the conversation involving two fashionable ladies in the first item ('An Invisible Traveller, or Peep into Bond-Street'): ' "Why—the BOOK! Don't you know, that the P***** is the wickedest fellow that ever breathed; and the dear charming P******* the most virtuous and most injured creature in the whole world […]" ' (I, 11–12). The text also makes use of the long ellipses, supposedly veiling unmentionable matter, which are a familiar feature of the Sedley novels and associated titles. For further commentary on the larger issues involved, see Addendum 1 to this Update concerning 'Charles Sedley'.

1818: 50 [?PHILLIPS, John], LIONEL: OR, THE LAST OF THE PEVENSEYS. A NOVEL. The question mark qualifying the attribution, hitherto based on correspondence in the Longman Letter Books, can now be removed in the light of further evidence found in the entry for this title in the Longman Divide Ledger (2D, p. 86), where 'John Phillips' is written in the margin after the detailing of a payment to the author.

1819: 6 ANON, THE ENGLISHMAN IN PARIS; A SATIRICAL NOVEL. WITH SKETCHES OF THE MOST REMARKABLE CHARACTERS THAT HAVE RECENTLY VISITED THAT CELEBRATED CAPITAL. Jarndyce CLIV, Item 265, lists as by 'Brown, Thomas the Elder, pseud.?', evidently on the basis of half-title adverts there for two other satirical novels

attributable to the pseudonymous Brown. In terms of contemporary practice, the original publisher's apparent ploy to make an association between the titles in our own view does not constitute enough to make an attribution.

1819: 49 MOORE, Mrs Robert, EVELEEN MOUNTJOY; OR, VIEWS OF LIFE. A NOVEL. OCLC (Accession No. 47116197) gives author's name as Eleanor Moore, perhaps mistakenly. The Longman Divide Ledger (2D, p. 153) has 'Mrs A. A. Moore, Fletching, near Uckfield, Sussex' written at top right hand corner above entry for this title. Neither naming seems strong enough to warrant replacing Mrs Robert Moore as found on the title-page.

1820: 32 HEFFORD, John, CRESTYPHON, A THEBAN TALE: AND THE VANDAL ROBBERY, A CATHARGINIAN TALE. OCLC (Accession No. 13323716) attributes to both John Hefford and Mrs A. Yossy. The possibility of an involvement by Ann Yosy or Yossy also gains some support from a letter (signed A Yosy) of 1833 to the Royal Literary Fund: 'I have subjoined a list of the works which I have published being besides the Switzerland 2 Classic Tales and a novel in four Volumes entitled "Constance and Leopold" […]' (RLF 16: 534, Item 11). The last work mentioned must be *Constancy and Leopold* (1818: 62), which in the titles is given as by 'Madame Yossy, author of Switzerland'. The 'Switzerland' thus mentioned is evidently *Switzerland […] Interspersed with Historical Anecdotes* (2 vols., 1815), the poor returns for which is a subject of complaint in an earlier letter of Yossy's to RLF headed 24 May 1825 (16: 534, Item 4). As argued in the relevant entries of EN2, the confusion of Yossy's non-fictional *Switzerland* with *Tales from Switzerland* (1822: 12) best explains the almost certainly incorrect attribution of the latter title and its successors to her authorship. Unfortunately the list of titles mentioned in the letter of 1833 to RLF has apparently not survived. The name of John Hefford has not been found in association with any other title of this period, nor has anything positive been discovered about the 'Commercial College, Woodford' as given as his domain in the extended title of the present work. One wonders whether the '2 Classic Tales' claimed in 1833 represent this title, possibly written in association with Yossy at an educational establishment. The address given at the head of Yossy's letter of 24 May 1825, however, is 14 Pultney Terrace, Pentonville.

1820: 40 [JONES, George], SUPREME BON TON: AND BON TON BY PROFESSION. A NOVEL. George Jones is identified as the author of the chain of novels associated with the pseudonymous Leigh Cliffe (see also 1822: 49, 1823: 49, 1829: 49). This sequence of novels in nevertheless claimed by Christian Frederick Wieles in approaches to the Royal Literary Fund. The first letter of appeal, of 13 Nov 1821 and signed Christian F. Wieles, mentions his having 'published several works exclusive of criticisms and miscellaneous articles for the *London Magazine*', and refers to his forwarding of what could

be the present work: 'I presume to send three volumes of a light work which I have published with far more praise than profit' (RLF 12: 444, Item 1). In another letter of 10 June 1823 Wieles specifically mentions the two subsequent 'Leigh Cliffe' titles, both of which list *Supreme Bon Ton* as a work by the same author on their title-pages: 'My case is very hard, and I am placed in the most unpleasant circumstances through the conduct of my Publisher, who, for two works—"The Knights of Ritzburg" and "Temptation" has only given me two small Bills of Five pounds each, which have been months overdue and are not yet, even in part, paid' (12: 444, Item 3). All four novels in the chain are listed by title and date in a later appeal to RLF in 1842 (12: 444, Item 14): the same application also listing the poem *Parga* (1819). The London addresses given at the head the letters of 1821 and 1823 are, respectively, 32 Frederic Place, Hampstead Road, and 9 Tonbridge Street, Brunswick Square. The 1842 application involves a printed form, on which the applicant describes himself as 'Christian Frederic Wieles Leigh Cliffe', his address as 27 S[outh] Howland Street, Fitzroy Square, and his age as 43. On the surface of things this would seem to offer rock-hard evidence for attribution to Wieles rather than Jones. However caution is still needed, arguably, pending an explanation for the name George Jones.

1821: 6 ANON, HAPPINESS; A TALE, FOR THE GRAVE AND THE GAY. This title is advertised as 'by the author of *No Fiction*' [i.e. of 1819: 56, by Andrew Reed] in *The Edinburgh Evening Courant* on 1 Dec 1821 and 19 Jan 1822. This direct attribution has not however been found in the London newspapers viewed, though the two works are often compared or advertised together there. The most likely explanation is that the Edinburgh paper turned a general association into a more direct connection. Examination of the two works themselves has revealed no striking similarities, though both are in a didactic moral register and have the publisher Francis Westley on their imprints. Granted the success of *No Fiction* (6 edns. by 1822), it would only be natural for the publishers to try and connect this new work with its popularity.

1822: 49 [JONES, George], THE KNIGHTS OF RITZBERG. A ROMANCE. For evidence that the true author is Christian Frederic Wieles, see 1820: 40 above.

1823: 49 [JONES, George], TEMPTATION. A NOVEL. For evidence that the true author is Christian Frederic Wieles, see 1820: 40 above.

1823: 56 LEWIS, Miss M. G., GWENLLEAN. A TALE. The author's forenames can be expanded to Mary Gogo, as used in this author's appeal to the Royal Literary Fund (14: 507). The choice of the initials 'M. G.' for this title was possibly motivated by a desire, originating most likely from the publisher, to echo the familiar authorial name of M. G. ['Monk'] Lewis.

1824: 56 [JONES, Hannah Maria], THE GAMBLERS; OR, THE TREACHEROUS FRIEND: A MORAL TALE, FOUNDED ON RECENT FACTS. A letter from Thomas Byerley to the publisher George Boyd of 11 Aug 1824 contains the following postscript, which raises some questions about the attribution of the above to Hannah Maria Jones: 'Has Robertson sent you Haynes novel of the Gambler. I read one or two scenes which are admirable & his name stands well in London' (NLS, MS Accession 5000/191). The two authors called Haynes known to have written fiction at this time are D. F. Haynes, Esq, author of *Pierre and Adeline* (1814: 30), and Miss C. D. Haynes, author of a number of novels from 1818 on. It is of course possible that Byerley (editor of the *Literary Chronicle* and assistant editor of the *Star* newspaper) mistakes the authorship of the present novel. A play called *The Gamblers*, by H. M. Milner, was also published in 1824.

1824: 68 MOORE, Hannah W., ELLEN RAMSAY. The Longmans Divide Ledger entry (2D, p. 292) for this title shows a number of special copies being sent to 'Mr Lubé[?]. This might just possibly point to a different authorship of the novel, which if it were the case would mean that Hannah W. More is an eye-catching pseudonym. A Dennis George Lubé was the author of *An Analysis of the Principles of Equity Pleading* (1823), which by itself does not point to novel writing. It is also noteworthy that Longman & Co themselves were later to complain in a letter to Mr [William?] East of 14 Dec 1827 about defacement of the title-page—presumably of remaindered copies— to 'cause it to be supposed the said work was written by Mrs Hannah More' (Letter Books, Longman, 1, 202, no. 67A).

1825: 53 [LEWIS, Miss M. G.], AMBITION. The author's forenames can be expanded to Mary Gogo, as used in this author's appeal to the Royal Literary Fund (14: 507). See also 1823: 56 above.

1826: 11 APPENZELLER, [Johann Konrad], GERTRUDE DE WART; OR, FIDELITY UNTIL DEATH. The entry for this title in the Longman Commission Ledger (3C, p 143) has written in the top right corner: 'Revd. W. H. Vivians, 2 Hans Place'. This might signify that Vivians was the translator, and this work is listed under his name in the *Index to the Archives of the House of Longman*, compiled by Allison Ingram (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey Ltd, 1981). John Henry Vivian [*sic*] (1785–1855) was the author of *Extracts of Notes taken in the Course of a Tour […] of Europe […] 1814 and 1815*, published by Longman & Co, 1822.

1827: 10 ANON, STORIES OF CHIVALRY AND ROMANCE. Longman Commission Ledger entry for this title (3C, p. 217) has 'Mr Davis, 7 Throgmorton St' written at top right hand corner, perhaps providing a clue to the authorship. No suitable 'Davis' writing at this period has been discovered, however, and the name could feasibly be that of a literary agent or banker.

1827: 51 [?MAGINN, William], THE MILITARY SKETCH-BOOK. REMINISCENCES OF SEVENTEEN YEARS IN THE SERVICE ABROAD AND AT HOME. BY AN OFFICER OF THE LINE. Update 1 provides evidence of use of the pen name 'Officer of the Line' by a presumably Irish author other than William Maginn (1793–1842). A more recent report has suggested that the true author of *Tales of Military Life* (1829: 58), the follow-up to this title, is Daniel Wentworth Maginn, a military surgeon. Further investigations are being made.

1828: 1 ANON, DE BEAUVOIR; OR, SECOND LOVE. Update 3 has cited a letter of George Croly's identifying the author as a female acquaintance: 'A lady, the widow of an officer, & friend of mine, has just published a novel, *De Beauvoir. Or Second Love* […]' (to William Blackwood, 21 Jan 1828: NLS, MS 4021, fol. 126). A possible identification of that lady/widow can be now claimed on the basis of the entry for this title in the Longman Divide Ledger (2D, p. 46), where 'Mrs Foote 45 Sloane St' is written at the top right corner. This in turn might lead possibly to Maria Foote (1797?–1867), the celebrated actress; though, if this is the case, Croly's description of her as a widow was more decorous than accurate. OCLC (Accession No. 47870384) interestingly describes a pamphlet-sized *Amatory Proceedings of a Well-known Sporting Colonel with Miss Foote, and numerous ladies of all descriptions* (1830), possibly removed from *Amatory Biography, or Lives of the Seductive Characters of both Sexes of the Present Day.*

1828: 38 [?DEALE, … or ?LUTTRELL, Henry], LIFE IN THE WEST; OR, THE CURTAIN DRAWN. A NOVEL. The argument for Henry Luttrell's authorship, as found in Wolff, stems from *Craven Derby, or the Lordship by Tenure* (1832), which carries on its title-page 'by the author of Crockford's: or, Life in the West', and is ascribed to Henry Luttrell (as an alternative to '—— Deale') in H&L. It is worth considering, however, whether the ascription of *Craven Derby* is itself flawed, as a result of a confusion with *Crockford-house; a rhapsody in two cantos* (1827), which is more positively identifiable as by Henry Luttrell (1765?–1851). It may also be worth noting that OCLC (Accession 20312659) attributes *Life in the West* to 'Deale, Mr.'.

1828: 70 [?SCARGILL, William Pitt], PENELOPE: OR, LOVE'S LABOUR LOST. A NOVEL. Updates 1 and 3 discuss this title within the context of the problematical issue of Scargill's overall output. It is perhaps worth noting in addition that Henry Crabb Robinson evidently had no doubts about this particular title, as well as an impeccable source in the author himself: 'Read today the first volume of Scargill's *Penelope*—a dull but clever novel. Scargill says it has been praised by Lamb': *Henry Crabb Robinson on Books and their Writers*, ed. by Edith J. Morley (London: Dent, 1938), 1, 358.

1829: 49 [JONES, George], MARGARET CORYTON. For evidence that the true author is Christian Frederic Wieles, see 1820: 40 above.

1829: 58 [?MAGINN, William], TALES OF MILITARY LIFE. BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE MILITARY SKETCH BOOK." See 1827: 51, above, for a new suggestion that the true author of this work is actually Daniel Wentworth Maginn, a military surgeon.

C: New Titles For Potential Inclusion

1815
WOODHOUSE, Thomas Rhodes.
THE TWO BARONS; OR, ZINDORF CASTLE, A BOHEMIAN ROMANCE.
London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1815.
3 vols. 12mo.
CtY In.W8585.815T [not seen]; xNSTC.
Notes. An account, apparently for this title, is found in the Longman Commission Ledger (2C, p. 291), positioned after an account for Henrietta Rhodes' *Rosalie; or, the Castle of Montalabretti* (1811: 68). The present title bears a strong resemblance to *Vileroy; or, the Horrors of Zindorf Castle* (1842), though this is normally attributed to Elizabeth Caroline Grey.

1818
BOYD, Arabella.
THE FOUNDLING ORPHAN AND HEIRESS: A NOVEL. IN TWO VOLUMES.
Belfast: Printed by F. D. Finlay, 1818.
2 vols.
Linen Hall Library, Belfast BPB1818.15 [not seen]; xNSTC.
Notes. Might possibly be a juvenile work, though use of 'Novel' in title and 2-vol. size point to adult fiction.

1823
ANON.
THE LEGEND OF MOILENA; OR, THE PRIEST OF ASHINROE.
London: Geo. Corvie & Co.; Dublin, John Cumming, 1823.
1 vol. 8vo.
[not seen] ; xNSTC.
Notes. Information above courtesy of Rolf Loeber. Summers (p. 384) lists 'Legend of Moilera [*sic*], The. A Tale. Minerva-Press, Newman. [1812]'; but this title is not in Blakey.
Further edn: London, A. K. Newman, 1828: this recently featured in Jarndyce CLVI (Item 371). Jarndyce commentary speculates whether National Library of Ireland's catalogue description of a Newman '1823' edn. (Ir.82379.13) contains a misprint for 1828.

D: Titles Previously not Located for Which Holding Libraries Have Subsequently Been Discovered

Nothing new to report for this section.

E: New Information Relating to Existing Title Entries

1802: 8 ANON, *THE MYSTERIES OF ABRUZZO, BY THE AUTHOR OF THE CHILD OF DOUBT, &C. Title as conjectured derives from Corvey 2nd edn. 1802. Catalologue (1808) of Richards's Circulating Library nevertheless lists 'Parental Turpitude, or the Mysteries of Abruzzo'. This is matched by ECB 432, which has: 'Parental turpitude; or the Mysteries of Abruzzo. 12mo, 3s, Treppas, Aug. 1801.' This might then represent the 1st edn. and original title of present work, though it is worth noting that the ECB pricing points to a smaller production than 1802: 8.

1803: 11 ANON, NOTHING NEW, A NOVEL; IN WHICH IS DRAWN CHARACTERISTIC SKETCHES FROM MODERN AND FASHIONABLE LIFE. OCLC (Accession No. 52903117) describes the following: *Nothing New! or, Louisa, the Orphan of Lennox Abbey: a Novel* (London, J. Barfield, 3 vols., 1803). It should be noted that 1803: 11, with its different sub-title, bears the printer's mark of J. Barfield. There is a strong likelihood that this and the present title are variant issues of the same novel as published in 1803. This in turn reinforces the view that *Louisa; or, the Orphan of Lenox Abbey* (1807: 1) is a reissue, in which case ideally it should not have been given a separate entry.

1807: 1 ANON, *LOUISA; OR, THE ORPHAN OF LENOX ABBEY. See 1803: 11 above for further evidence that this represents a reissue.

1817: 3 ANON, HARDENBRASS AND HAVERILL; OR, THE SECRET OF THE CASTLE, A NOVEL. The presence of an entry for this title in the Longman Commission Ledger (2C, p. 23), accounting for 500 copies, would seem to point to at least a share by that firm in the publication. All secondary sources seen, however, reinforce the Sherwood, Neely, and Jones imprint described in the existing entry.

Appendix F: 4 DARLING, P[eter] M[iddleton], PATERNAL LOVE; OR, THE REWARD OF FRIENDSHIP. This title is listed in the *Monthly Review*, 76 (Jan 1815), p. 102. The format is given as 12mo (no pagination given), and the price at 6s sewed, the imprint being Gale & Co. 1814. The short notice reads: 'The heroine of this tale is a young lady of Norway, attired in a gypsey straw-bonnet, who refreshes herself after sultry days by taking evening walks along "the winding shores of the *Atlantic* ocean." No peculiarities of climate, language, or manners, are regarded, and the most common rules of grammar are repeatedly violated, in this defective performance.' This new evidence strengthens the claim for this work to be included in the main listings, though some uncertainty about its length and whether or not a juvenile audience is targeted remain.

F: Further Editions Previously not Noted

Information secured after Update 3, chiefly as a result of a full search through OCLC World-Cat, have been incorporated in our online website *British Fiction, 1800–1829: A Database of Production, Circulation & Reception* (forthcoming, October 2004).

Addendum 1: Charles Sedley

Jacqueline Belanger and Peter Garside

'Charles Sedley [pseud.?]' is credited with the authorship of six titles in volume 2 of the *English Novel, 1770–1829*. Four of these bore the name of Charles Sedley on the title-page: *The Barouche Driver and his Wife: A Tale for Haut Ton* (1807: 57); *The Infidel Mother; or, Three Winters in London* (1807: 58); *The Faro Table; or, the Gambling Mothers* (1808: 97); and *A Winter in Dublin: A Descriptive Tale* (1808: 98). A fifth title (evidently the last in the series), *Asmodeus; or, the Devil*

in London (1808: 96), effectively identifies Sedley through title-page attribution to 'the Author of "The Faro Table," "A Winter in Dublin", &c. &c. &c.'; while a sixth (and probably the first), *The Mask of Fashion; A Plain Tale* (1807: 59), though sometimes given to Thomas Skinner Surr, is mentioned as a work of Sedley's on the titles of *The Winter in Dublin* and *The Infidel Mother*.

All six titles were published by James Fletcher Hughes, then tilting his output away from lurid Lewisian Gothic 'horror' novels towards a peculiarly acerbic kind of topical 'scandal' fiction: see Peter Garside, 'J. F. Hughes and the Publication of Popular Fiction, 1803–1810, *The Library*, 6th ser. 9.3 (September 1987), 240–58. All six 'Sedley' titles featured a dated preface or dedication, indicative of a fashionably mobile person: *The Mask of Fashion*, London, November 1806; *The Infidel Mother*, London, March 1807; *The Barouche Driver and His Wife*, Brighton Cliffs, 19 July 1807; *A Winter in Dublin*, Ramsgate, 17 October, 1807; *Asmodeus*, London, April 1808. Two are dedicated to aristocratic figures: *The Mask of Fashion* to the Duchess of St Albans; and *The Barouche Driver* to the Earl and Countess of Jersey. As a whole, a strong sense of a palpable originating author is given in the preliminaries (the BL copy of the *Barouche Driver* actually has an inscription 'From the Author' on the half-title to vol. 1). When assailed on the score of slander in *A Winter in Dublin*, J. F. Hughes (according to a 'Postcript' [*sic*] by him in *The Faro Table*) denied the existence of any real author named Sedley: 'I informed him that Charles Sedley was a fictitious person' (II, 182). Hughes's own presence tends to be increasingly invasive in the later titles.

Who then might have been Sedley? Though the majority of modern catalogues list it without indicating pseudonymity, the name most probably derives from the Restoration rake, Sir Charles Sedley (1639–1701; and who, in OCLC, is listed as author of these novels!). Sedley was also commonly used as a name for licentitious characters in contemporary fiction. For instance, Frances Burney's Sir Sedley Clarendel in *Camilla* (1796), or Isaac D'Israeli's Sedley in *Vaurien* (1797), whose 'life was a system of refined Epicurism' (II, 58). Research carried out in CEIR during the last three years, especially by Jacqueline Belanger, has brought us tantalisingly close to identifying a true author, though in the final count the sheer complexities of the evidence discovered has made it necessary to withdraw from positive identification. The remainder of this report concentrates on three possible contenders for the dubious credit of authorship.

i) John Battersby Elrington

The name of John Battersby Elrington features on the title-pages of two works of fiction in the early 1800s, each time as translator. The first of these is Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin's *Russian Tales* (1803: 38), the second is Christoph Martin Wieland's *Confessions in Elysium* (1804: 71). On the surface of things, these two foreign works (both probably translated from German) look unlikely sources. Rather surprisingly, however, each contains prefatory material

reminiscent in some respects of the Sedley preliminaries. In *Russian Tales* an unpaginated address 'To My Friends', signed 'J. B. E. Borough Oct 10, 1803', figures the translator as 'but a Gentleman in Prison, labouring for Bread. It is a trifle […] without merit; […] a mere essay in Famine'. Another such statement, 'To the World', also contains just a hint (albeit metaphorically) of the voluptuary mode that was to become one of Sedley's trademarks: 'I have attempted to dress a Foreign Beauty in an English Costume; and, while the simplicity of Nature, and the sensibilities of the heart, are objects of admiration, I have every thing to hope—nothing to apprehend.'

Confessions in Elysium, for its part, includes a dedication 'to His Royal Highness Prince William Frederick of Glocester [*sic*]', signed 'I. B. Elrington, London, March 1st, 1804'. It also contains its own address 'To the World', where again one senses an inclination towards voluptuary language, as well as a penchant for extended ellipses, suggestive of either breathless wonder and/or unmentionable material; this last address is signed 'I. B. E., London, March 1st 1804'. In this instance, such intimations are fully realised, in a species of erotic description that may or may not derive from Wieland: 'She [an "amorous Priestess"] half reclined upon a sopha magnificently embroidered […] and richly spangled with pearls and variegated precious stones … There was an easy negligence in her dress' (II, 155). It is also worth noting the similarity between Elrington's full name and that of 'John Battersby', the named author of *Tell-Tale Sophas: an Eclectic Fable* (1814: 12), which is filled with similar descriptions along with the more domestic scandal materials associated with Sedley. Perhaps significantly the printer of *Tell-Tale Sophas* is D. N. Shury, J. F. Hughes's most commonly used printer (there is a possibility of a later issue of sheets which had fallen victim of Hughes's collapse in 1809/10).

A series of strong intimations that Elrington was the concealed author of the 'Sedley' titles have been discovered in *The Satirist, or, Monthly Meteor*, a periodical (founded in 1807) deeply involved in the scandals surrounding the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the Duke of York, *c.* 1807–9. In a series of review articles attacking Sedley with all-out vigour, this magazine all but spelled out what in completed form is surely meant to be Elrington. For instance, in its review of *The Infidel Mother*: '[…] the cloven foot of E———n stares the reader full in the face throughout this Infidel Mother: which, to conclude, is one of the most disgusting farragoes of absurdity ever put together' (vol. 1, 1 November 1807, p. 185). Likewise, aprops *Asmodeus*: 'When we contemplate the present piteous condition of the wretched Charles Sedley, *alias* E———n, we cannot repress that species of compassion which a humane judge would feel at the sight of a criminal, whom he had sentenced, expiring on the rack' (vol. 2, 1 June 1808, p. 438). In other articles, *The Satirist* uncovered what it took to be the same authorship of two works dealing more directly with the topical royal scandals (see under 1807: 19 in Update 4 above). Lastly, in alluding to a civil action for damages in which its publisher was the defendant, *The Satirist* at

the onset of a feature titled 'The Satirist and Pickpockets' spelled out the name in full: 'The SATIRIST having excited the wrath of Messrs. Finnerty, Hague, Ellrington, alias Charles Sedley, Esquire, Cobbett, and the whole fraternity of pickpockets […]' (vol. 4, 1 January 1809, p. 1).

This might all seem conclusive evidence, were it not for the fact that it has not so far been possible to verify the existence of a real John Battersby Elrington. Perhaps significant, too, is *The Satirist*'s apparent uncertainty at one point as to whether Elrington is itself a pseudonym.

ii) Andreas Andersen Feldborg (1782–1838)

This Danish writer would make the most unlikely of candidates, were it not for a bibliographical mystery surrounding the English translation of Karamzin's *Tales*. As described in Update 4 (see under 1803: 38), the 1804 reissue of this work lacks any mention of Elrington in the title or preliminaries, while the latter strongly suggest the very different persona of a Danish translator (while at the same time in procedure strangely paralleling the Elrington preliminaries). This time the dedication (dated 'London, 5th Nov. 1803' and signed 'The Translator') is to the Danish Ambassador. The 'Translator's Preface' then alludes to previous work on Karamzin's *Travels* (1803), for the accomplishment of which he expresses gratitude to 'her royal Highness the Duchess of York' (p. v). Correspondence in the Murray archives (see Update 4) also points to the translation of both Karamzin's *Tales* and *Travels* by the same Dane, who, even without this kind of support, seems a more likely translator of foreign literature than Elrington. One noticeable typographical feature of the main sheets, which are identical in both issues, is the use of a succession of a dots, in the form of extended ellipses, to indicate pauses etc.

According the *Dansk Biografisk Lexicon* (Copenhagen, 1887–1905), Feldborg (who is described as a 'literary vagabond') came to England in 1802, wrote on the English naval victory over the Danes, translated materials, and returned to Denmark in 1810. There is also evidence that he dabbled at least once more in fiction. For evidence indicating that *Mental Recreations. Four Danish and German Tales*, apparently written as by 'Andreas Anderson', was his work, see Update 4, under 1805: 15. Feldborg's departure from Britain near the end of the decade also matches with evidence within another of his productions, *A Dane's Excursions in Britain* (1809), written under the half-pseudonym of J. A. Andersen. In this the publisher explains the abrupt ending as follows, in an end statement dated 25 August 1809: 'Here end the "Excursions" of the Dane.—Mr. Andersen, the Author of a Tour in Zealand, the Translator of the Great and Good Danes, Norwegians, and Holsteinians, and the writer of the present volumes, has suspended his task, and made, as the Publisher must think, an excursion from Britain!' (II, 121) Though the samplings are small, one cannot help noticing an air of amazement in statements concerning Feldborg, as if a kind of rather outrageous person was involved.

One possibility from the above is that Elrington (and so Sedley) was yet another pseudonym of Feldborg's, though, if so, it hard to believe that a foreign incomer could have such a grasp of domestic scandal. Another is that Feldborg and Elrington were involved in some kind of strange collaboration, momentarily visible through the two issues of Karamzin's *Tales*. It would be useful to compare the hand written inscriptions that are to be found in the British Library copies of the 1803-issued Karamzin *Tales* (BL 12591.h.21) and *The Barouche Driver* (BL 12613.g.14), to see if there is any similarity in hand. (The inscription in the 1803 *Tales* reads: 'To Doctor William Tenant, This little volume, is, most respectfully, presented by the translator'.)

iii) Davenport Sedley

The activities of such an actual person, indexed there as 'blackmailer and extortionist', are described in Iain McCalman's *Radical Underworld: Prophets, Revolutionaries and Pornographers in London, 1795–1840* (Cambridge, 1988; Oxford: Clarendon Press edn., 1993). By McCalman's account: 'Sedley had a vulture's instinct for corruption, and the Regent's vendetta against Princess Caroline, as well as the Duke of York's indiscretions with Mary Anne Clarke, provided him with especially rich pickings. His technique was to furnish victims with a title page and extracts from a projected book containing what he typically described as "extreamly unpleasant matter". He would then offer to have the embarrassing material suppressed or expurgated for a price' (pp. 35–6). According to McCalman, there is evidence that Sedley had United Irish affiliations, and that 'he had been sent in May 1799 from Dublin gaol to England on a warrant for swindling and embezzlement' (p. 36). (It is worth noting here that the name Elrington itself has strong Irish connotations—there was, for example, an Irish Bishop Elrington, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin—and the surname might just possibly have been adopted by Davenport Sedley as a *nom de guerre*). Considering the gravitational pull of the main Sedley scandal novels, it is also interesting find that Davenport Sedley appears to have gained access to 'The Book', concerning the 'Delicate Investigation' of Princess Caroline, no doubt making hay from this out of the establishment's desire for its suppression (see p. 42). It is just feasible, then, that the Sedley part of Charles Sedley was a true name, and that J. F. Hughes's output was more fully involved in extortion than has been realised. If so, Hughes was clearly telling at least a half-lie when claiming Sedley was a fictitious person. Granted the large body of scandal included, furthermore, it would also seem that any attempts to gain payment for suppression of materials were by no means always successful!

Conclusion

The six Sedley novels reflect so much the surreptitious world of scandal-mongering at this period as well as the underhand activities of a still largely unregularised book trade that it is highly possible the mystery of Sedley's true identity will never be solved. Other possibilities exist as well as the options listed above. One is that, in spite of the projection of such a distinct author identity, these texts were put together from a variety of sources, representing in some respects a kind of pastiche. It has been discovered, for example, that a whole sequence in *The Faro Table* (see 3rd edn., I, 105–10), feeds on an account supposedly given by a '*Femme de Chambre*' in an early issue of *The Pic Nic* (vol. I, no. 6, Saturday, 12 February, 1803, pp. 203–8), a periodical run by a number of individuals active on the less respectable margins of London theatre life and published by J. F. Hughes. In the light of his increasing invasiveness in the later Sedley titles, it is also tempting to think that Hughes himself had a hand in creating and/or assembling materials. Certainly his own disappearance as a publisher, probably from inescapable bankruptcy, presently offers as good a reason as any for the disappearance of 'Charles Sedley'.

Addendum 2: Mary Anne Radcliffe / Louisa Bellenden Ker

Peter Garside,
with Sharon Ragaz, Jacqueline Belanger, and Anthony Mandal

Two items in the second volume of *The English Novel, 1770–1829* are attributed in the author-line to either ?RADCLIFFE, Mary Anne or ?KER, Louisa Theresa Bellenden. These are: *Manfroné; or, the One-Handed Monk* (1809: 61) and *Ida of Austria; or the Knights of the Holy Cross* (1812: 53). The attribution of *Manfroné* to Radcliffe stems directly from its title-page, which states 'by Mary Anne Radcliffe', and in the main is followed in modern catalogues and critical studies, this work still being well known, buoyed up by a combination of its arresting title and the continuing academic appetite for the Gothic. By comparison hardly anything is known about *Ida of Austria*, and it is not unlikely that the Corvey copy which provides the EN2 entry is unique. The connection with Radcliffe in this case comes indirectly as a result of the title-page, which states 'by the author of "Manfrone" '. The name of Louisa Bellenden Ker, in turn, comes into play only as a result of the record of her appeals to the Royal Literary Fund. Three appeals from Ker there (RLF, II: 400, Items 6, 10, 11), written between 1822 and 1824, list 'Manfroné or the One handed Monk' as one of several works by the applicant, this particular title coming first in the list on each occasion. No mention is made of *Ida of Austria* there, however, so the association of Ker with this second novel is arrived at through the most tenuous of links.

As reported in Update 1, the issue is further complicated by the title-page attribution of the 1819 second edition of *Manfroné*, as reprinted by A. K. New-

man, to 'Mary Anne Radcliffe, Author of The Mysterious Baron, &c. &c.' In actuality, *The Mysterious Baron, or the Castle in the Forest, a Gothic Story* (1808: 91), which was published by C. Chapple, is attributed on its own title-page to 'Eliza Ratcliffe', the dedication of this work ('to Miss Mary Ann Davies, of Fleet-Street') introducing it as 'the first essay of a female pen'. One possibility is that Newman later confused the two similar sounding names. Certainly on reading the texts there appears to be little similarity between the rather naïve-seeming Walpolian romance style of *The Mysterious Baron* and the more fraught high Gothic manner of *Manfroné*. Behind this, of course, lies the similarity of both names to Ann Radcliffe, the high priestess of Gothic romance, and the possibility that either or both were fabrications based on a desire to cash in on the latter's fame.

Despite a number of forays into the issue of attribution, it has not been possible to offer any fresh positive suggestions, and if anything the claims of both Mary Anne Radcliffe and Louisa Bellenden Ker have diminished, for reasons outlined below.

i) Mary Anne Radcliffe

There can hardly be any doubt as to the existence of a real-life Mary Anne Radcliffe writing at this time, nor that she is the author (as given on both titles-pages) of *The Female Advocate; or An Attempt to Recover the Rights of Woman from Male Usurpation* (London: Vernor and Hood, 1799) and of *The Memoirs of Mrs Mary Ann Radcliffe; in Familiar Letters to a Female Friend* (Edinburgh: Printed for the Author, and sold by Manners & Miller [etc.], 1810). According to the address 'To the Reader' in *The Female Advocate*, this Wollstonecraftian study was written seven years, prior to publication, but delayed through 'timidity' and 'other hinderances'. The later *Memoirs* also states that the original intention was to publish the *Female Advocate* anonymously: 'But the publisher (who at that time took a share in it) […] strongly recommended giving my name to it. Whether, with a view to extend the sale, from the same name at that period standing high amongst the novel readers—or from whatever other motive, is best known to himself' (p. 387). As this last comment indicates, there is a clear interconnection between these two non-fictional works, the second of which offers an account ('after a life of more than three-score years') of an insecure Scottish upbringing, complicated religious loyalties, early marriage to an older and unreliable husband, struggles to survive independently with her children in London during the 1790s, and a return to live in Edinbugh *c.* 1807, where charitable assistance was sought (part of the process involving the present work, which lists 99 'Subscribers Names', a number from the higher echelons of Scottish society).

The spectre of uncertainty, however, enters into the equation with the fictional works that have been ascribed (or are ascribable) to Mary Anne Radcliffe, which can be seen as forming three distinct phases. Foremost here are two 1790

novels published by William Lane at the Minerva Press, both of which are given under her name in the second volume of *The English Novel, 1770–1829*, though neither supplies an author on the title-page: *The Fate of Velina de Guidova* (EN1 1790: 62) and *Radzivil. A Romance* (1790: 63). Granted that the memoirist Mary Anne Radcliffe [henceforth MAR] was in London at this time, struggling to survive independently, it is not implausible that she should undertake work for Minerva as a means of supplementing income. It should be added though that neither work gives a strong sense of an underlying author identity; and *Radzivil* in particular, ostensibly (at least) 'from the Russ[ian] of the Celebrated M. Wocklow', has several marks of being a fairly routine translation possibly from the French. The second phase of writing associated with MAR, *Radcliffe's New Novelist's Pocket Magazine* (a compilation of chapbook stories) has not been seen, but is described by Donald K. Adams as bearing the legend 'The whole written, adjusted and compiled solely for this Work, By Mrs. Mary Anne Radclife, of Wimbledon in Surrey': 'The Second Mrs. Radcliffe', *The Mystery and Detection Annual* (1972), pp. 48–64 (p. 53). By Adams's account also, the first number was published in Edinburgh by Thomas Brown (though printed in London), both surviving issues are dated 1802, and amongst Gothic materials can be found in the second issue 'Monkish Mysteries; or, The Miraculous Escape'. The last 'phase' of involvement is then found with the eye-catching *Manfroné; or, the One-Handed Monk*, whose contents might seem to match the out-and-out Lewisian Gothic implied by the title 'Monkish Mysteries'. This last 'phase' is now extendable to *Ida of Austria*, though this historical romance set in the time of the Crusades has little of the Gothic in it, and in fact shows internal signs of possibly being a translation from a root German title.

The large resulting question as to whether it is possible to combine the MAR of the two non-fictional works with the fiction writer of all or some of phases 1–3 has never met with a fully positive answer. Even Donald K. Adams, who makes the fullest case for combination, qualifies his argument with hedging phrases at key points. Janet Todd's *A Dictionary of British and American Women Writers, 1660–1800* (1984) , noticeably provides two entries, one for the 'polemical writer and autobiographer' (1745?–1810?), the other for the 'novelist' (*fl.* 1790?–1809). Joanne Shattock in her *The Oxford Guide to British Women Writers* (1993) and *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English* (1990), ed. by Blain, Grundy, and Clements, both supply single entries, though with inbuilt qualifications regarding the novels involved. Isobel Grundy, author of the *Feminist Companion* entry (which also raises the possibility of Ker), has subsequently expressed the opinion to the present writer that any real connection of the novels with the memoirist is unlikely, and that the probable cause is a publishers' scam.

With this in view, it is worth reviewing the history of the attribution of the 'phase one' novels, especially as found in contemporary circulating library catalogues. In Part Two [1798] of *A Catalogue of the Minerva General Library*, held in the Bodleian Library (Don.e.218), 'Velina de Guidova (the Fate of)' is listed as 'by Mrs. Radcliffe', in a way exactly comparable to 'Sicilian Romance, a

Tale' on the preceding page. 'Radzivil, a Romance', however, is merely stated as being 'from the Russian of Mr. Wocklow'. In the 1814 C*atalogue* (Don.e.217) of the same library under A. K. Newman, on the other hand, we find 'Radzivil, a Romance, from the Russian of Wocklow, by Mrs. Ann Radcliffe', and 'Velina de Guidova, a Novel, by the Author of the Romance of the Forest'. In other words, *Radzivil* between 1798 and 1814 has been attributed to Ann Radcliffe, whereas *Velina de Guidova* has remained consistently as by her, though the means of signifying this has changed. Reinforcing the joint attribution is the appearance of both titles again in the 1814 Catalogue under the prefix 'Radcliffe's (Mrs.)', though it is also interesting to see placed there as well (along with the main Ann Radcliffe titles) both 'Manfrone, or the One-handed Monk' and 'Mysterious Baron, or the Castle in the Forest'. *Manfroné* also has its own separate entry there as 'Manfrone or the One-handed Monk, by Mrs. Radcliffe'. The now extremely rare *Ida of Austria* is likewise listed individually, but without any author being nominated. All in all no reference is made in either of these catalogues to Mary Anne Radcliffe as such. The assumption that *Radzivil* and *Velina de Guidova* are 'probably by Mrs. Mary Ann Radcliffe', made by Dorothy Blakey under the entries for those titles in her *The Minerva Press 1790–1820* (1939), pp. 150–1, and which evidently informed later attributions of these works to that author, appears to be based primarily on her own conjecture. In some fifty circulating library catalogues surveyed, no instance of an attribution to Mary Anne Radcliffe as such has been discovered in relation to this phase.

There are also strong circumstantial reasons rejecting the idea that the memoirist MAR had any connection *Manfroné* (1809), the most obvious explanation for the appearance of her name in the titles of that novel being that it is a pseudonym. Whereas (as already suggested) it would not be implausible for MAR when in London to earn money writing for Minerva, by 1809 she was quite obviously domiciled in Edinburgh, and the placing of this work with J. F. Hughes in London would have been hard to accomplish from such a base. Nor would one expect an author seeking social acceptance, and employing the eminently respectable Manners and Miller for her *Memoirs*, to have had dealings with a publisher operating at the lower end of the fiction market. Conversely, there are number of reasons why Hughes should have enticed or bullied one of his stable of authors into featuring as Mary Anne Radcliffe. It was Hughes who in the same imprint year brought out *Seraphina; or A Winter in Town* (1809: 14), 'by Caroline Burney', evidently hoping to cash in on the genuine trademark names of Frances Burney and her half-sister Sarah Harriet Burney (Hughes's lists for 1809–10 also contained titles by 'Mrs Edgeworth'). In the 'Advertisement' to Sarah Harriet Burney's *Traits of Nature* (1812: 24), Henry Colburn implicitly dissociated himself from Hughes's malpractice: 'The publisher of this Work thinks it proper to state that Miss Burney is *not* the Author of a Novel called "Seraphina," published in the year 1809, under the assumed name of Caroline Burney.'

The stamp of J. F. Hughes is also to be traced in titles as well as author names. According to the testimony of its author, T. J. Horsley Curties, it was probably Hughes who fabricated the actual title of *The Monk of Udolpho* (1807: 16), which managed to combine two of the most talismanic word in the Gothic canon. Whereas Hughes's main stock in trade had hitherto been in Monk-like Lewisian Gothic, in 1809, as Rictor Norton has reminded us, Ann Radcliffe's name was very much in the public eye, owing to reports of her madness and/or death: see *Mistress of Udolpho: The Life of Ann Radcliffe* (London and New York: Leicester University Press, 1999), pp. 212–18. Approached from the vantage point of Hughes's production of popular fiction, both the arresting title and association-filled author name of *Manfroné* have an air of predictability about them.

One useful pointer to how contemporary witnesses, and more particularly rival authors, might have felt has been found in *A Winter in Edinburgh* (1810: 74), published by J. Dick, and attributed on its title-page to Honoria Scott (which may or may not be a pseudonym for Susan Fraser). Matching a real-life incident in which Hughes had attempted to introduce a 'spoiler' *Winter at Bath* on the market (see notes to 1807: 7), one of the characters proposes bringing out a novel entitled 'A Winter in Wales', only to find the same title to be advertised by:

> Mr. Wigless [the sobriquet is based on Wigmore Steet, Hughes's address], a bookseller, certainly of celebrity; for, under his guidance, the literary bantlings of the Miss Muffins were ushered into the world as follows;
>
> 'The Horrors of the Church-Yard; by *Mrs Radcliff*.'
>
> 'Euphrosyne in Frocks, by *Miss Burney*.' (III, 196–7)

If indeed (as seems likely) the author name in *Manfroné* is an invention aimed at producing an association with Ann Radcliffe, then records of circulating library catalogues point to the overall success of the ploy, no less than five out of eleven catalogues recently surveyed attributing the work to 'Mrs. Radcliffe' rather than the specific name actually given. In fact, the pull of Ann Radcliffe's fame seems to represent the one single element unifying the three 'phases' outlined above. However, it is perhaps not inconceivable that the compiler of *Radcliffe's New Novelist's Pocket Magazine* and whoever wrote *Manfroné* are one and the same person. As for 'Eliza Ratcliffe' of *The Mysterious Baron*, on internal evidence she would appear more likely to have had a hand in *Ida of Austria* rather than *Manfroné*, though the reality might be that there is no true linkage between any of these three titles.

ii) Louisa Bellenden Ker

Normally in a case such as that of *Manfroné*, a claim of authorship in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund would provide a welcome solution, with the prospect of further fresh attributions following in suit. In the case of Ker (whose earlier letters to the Fund are signed variously Louisa Bellenden Ker, Louisa Theresa

Ker, and Louisa Ker) the end result is more obfuscation rather than clarification. In all Ker made eleven applications for assistance from 1819 to 1836, sending lists of her publications on at least three separate occasions.

In the first of these applications, dated 26 October 1819 (RLF II: 400, Item 1), it is noticeable that Ker makes no mention of *Manfroné*, in spite of its having been first published in 1809 and reprinted by Newman in 1819. Instead she refers only to 'a small volume of Tales from the French of Bernadin St Pierre', for which a publisher could not be found, and translations of two French plays, 'Bermicide or the Fatal Offspring' and 'the Brazen Bust', for which, though performed at Drury Lane and Covent Garden theatres respectively, she had not received due credit. The bulk of this letter is taken up in outlining her personal credentials, as 'the only surviving daughter of the late Dr Lewis Ker of the College of Physicians', dashed expectations of becoming 'the heiress of the noble family whose name I bear', and parlous situation after the death of her mother. The names of 'Mr Chapple, Circulating Library, Pall Mall' and 'Mr Woodfall, Printer to the College, Dean's Yard, Westminster' are given as suitable additional referees, and Ker's address in this letter is given as 3 Britannia Street, Westminster Road, Lambeth. In 1822 she made her second application, this time adding a list, having been informed that the first donation had been approved on the merits of her father. This list (Item 6) gives the following 'published novels and dramas':

> Manfroné or the One handed Monk
> Aurora of the Mysterious Beauty
> Koningsmark a tale
> Herman and Rosa small pamphlet
> Abdallah & Zaida melo drama from the French, from which the piece Bermicide performed successfully at Drury Lane Theatre was taken
> Brazen Bust performed at Covent Garden
> Lewis & Antoinette a local piece performed in Bath & Dublin
> The Swiss Emigrants a tale
> and several [other] dramatick pieces […]

This application is supported by P. Boulanger, who affirms his knowledge of 'the Brazen Bust and several other applauded dramatick pieces', but mentions nothing else. Further listings are supplied in relation to applications in April and November 1824. The first (Item 10) brings into play 'Dangerous Connections translation 3 vol.' and 'Indian Cottage d[itt]o from St Pierre', as well as three extra plays performed 'at Covent Garden and the Cobourg Theatres' (one of which is 'Ruins of Babylon'). The second (Item 11), a cut-down version, still features 'Manfroné', while adding 'Theodore or the Child of the Forest Romance in four volumes'. This last list is introduced by the qualification that 'most […] are now out of print, and others have never been published'. No mention is made at any point of *The Mysterious Baron*.

On the surface of things, it is quite feasible that Ker delayed claiming novels (with their less salubrious reputation) until forced to by the Committee's regulations. A major problem nevertheless exists with the titles eventually supplied, not least since several are attributable to other writers. *Aurora, or the Mysterious Beauty* (1803: 29), for instance, based on the *Aurora, ou l'amant mystérieuse* (1802) of J.-J.-M. Duperche, is described on its title-page as 'Taken from the French. By Camilla Dufour'. Dufour herself was a popular singer at Drury Lane, and married to J. H. Sarratt, who himself is the acknowledged translator of a chapbook version of *Koenigsmark*, from the German of Raspe, another title listed by Ker. *The Swiss Emigrants: A Tale* (1804: 52) was almost certainly by the Scottish author Hugh Murray: in fact, the Longman Divide Ledger entry for this title (CD, p. 178) itemises payment of £10 to 'Mr Murray'. Perhaps significantly, too, P. Boulanger when called into service again in 1826 could only vouch for 'the Brazen Bust, Ruins of Babylon and several other dramatick pieces' (Item 14). One also wonders why Ker never used her own name in any of the above claimed novels, especially in view of her sympathy-inducing situation and alleged aristocratic connections (a valuable point of comparison is provided by her namesake Anne Ker: see especially John Steele's 'Anne and John Ker: New Soundings', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 12 (Summer 2004). Online: Internet: <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/cc12_n03.html*>).

A further insight has been gained through the discovery by Sharon Ragaz of two reports evidently concerning Ker in *The Morning Chronicle*. The first, in the issue for 17 October 1823, concerns a trial for petty theft, the accused being Louisa Bellenden Kerr [*sic*] and another woman. Kerr or Ker described herself as distantly related to the Duke of Roxburgh (whose family name was Ker) and allied to other important figures. Her father she identified as a friend of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, and she made other claims about his status, saying he was librarian to the Royal College of Physicians. The court seemed to think there was enough evidence (or lack thereof) to consider these things unlikely and that she was a professional criminal. Although Kerr said that she had turned to other means of obtaining a livelihood because all attempts to support herself by honest means had failed, she appears to have made no mention to the court of being a dramatist or novelist; neither did she claim to have published any works. Kerr was remanded into custody pending a further court appearance and an investigation of her circumstances by the Mendicity Society.

The *Morning Chronicle* of 22 October 1823 carries a further notice on Kerr's second court appearance, at which an official from the Mendicity Society was in evidence. The official had viewed Kerr's apparently squalid place of abode, where a number of letters were found. It was determined that Kerr carried on an expert trade in writing 'begging letters', a trade at which her mother was said to be even more expert. By claiming relationship to various people, she had received payments of small sums (£5 or so) from them. The newspaper notes that her case excited considerable interest because of her supposed aristocratic

connections; however, the court determined that these had no basis in reality. Her claims about her father's profession are also stated to have been investigated and found to be untrue. She is described as a 'swindler'. Nevertheless, the grim circumstances of her living conditions were taken into account, and while the other woman was dismissed without further charge, Kerr was sent home to her parish (not identified) and urged to abandon the life she had adopted.

Of course, there remains the possibility that Ker was being unfairly maligned: one of the RLF letters of 1824 (Item 10) refers to her as being 'the victim of unjust and malicious accusations'. Moreover, even if direct authorship is highly unlikely, a valuable insight into the general atmosphere that helped create *Manfroné* might still be found in the theatrical world conveyed by these appeals, a world from which J. F. Hughes drew a number of his authors. On the fuller front, however, the case of Louisa Bellenden Ker probably takes us no further in identifying an actual novel-writing 'Mary Anne Radcliffe'. ▨

Referring to this Article

P. D. Garside, with J. E. Belanger, S. A. Ragaz, and A. A. Mandal. '*The English Novel, 1800–1829:* Update 4 (June 2003–August 2004)', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* 12 (Summer 2004). Online: Internet (date accessed): <*http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/corvey/articles/engnov4.pdf*>.

The matter contained within this article provides bibliographical information based on independent personal research by the contributor, and as such has not been subject to the peer-review process. For the sake of consistency with *The English Novel*, the formatting conventions used in this article differ from those of the usual *Cardiff Corvey* stylesheet.