

# ROMANTIC TEXTUALITIES

LITERATURE AND PRINT CULTURE, 1780–1840



ISSN 1748-0116

ISSUE 24

WINTER 2021



◆ SPECIAL ISSUE : ROMANTIC NOVELS 1817 AND 1818 ◆

[www.romtext.org.uk](http://www.romtext.org.uk)

◆ CARDIFF UNIVERSITY PRESS ◆

*Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021)

Available online at <[www.romtext.org.uk/](http://www.romtext.org.uk/)>; archive of record at <<https://publications.cardiffuniversitypress.org/index.php/RomText>>.

**Journal DOI:** 10.18573/ISSN.1748-0116 ♦ **Issue DOI:** 10.18573/romtext.i24

*Romantic Textualities* is an open access journal, which means that all content is available without charge to the user or his/her institution. You are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search or link to the full texts of the articles in this journal without asking prior permission from either the publisher or the author. Unless otherwise noted, the material contained in this journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 (CC BY-NC-ND) International License. See <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> for more information. Original copyright remains with the contributing author and a citation should be made when the article is quoted, used or referred to in another work.



*Romantic Textualities* is an imprint of Cardiff University Press, an innovative open-access publisher of academic research, where ‘open-access’ means free for both readers and writers. Find out more about the press at [cardiffuniversitypress.org](http://cardiffuniversitypress.org).



Cardiff University Press  
Gwasg Prifysgol Caerdydd

**Editors:** Anthony Mandal, *Cardiff University*

Maximiliaan van Woudenberg, *Sheridan Institute of Technology*

Susan Civale (Guest Editor), *Canterbury Christ Church University*

Claire Sheridan (Guest Editor)

**Reviews Editor:** Barbara Hughes Moore, *Cardiff University*

**Digital Editor:** Andrew McInnes, *Edge Hill University*

**Platform Development:** Andrew O’Sullivan, *Cardiff University*

**Cardiff University Press Administrator:** Alice Percival, *Cardiff University*

#### Advisory Board

Peter Garside (Chair), *University of Edinburgh*

Jane Aaron, *University of South Wales*

Stephen Behrendt, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Emma Clery, *Uppsala University*

Benjamin Colbert, *University of Wolverhampton*

Gillian Dow, *University of Southampton*

Edward Copeland, *Pomona College*

Gavin Edwards, *University of South Wales*

Penny Fielding, *University of Edinburgh*

Caroline Franklin, *Swansea University*

Isobel Grundy, *University of Alberta*

Ian Haywood, *University of Roehampton*

David Hewitt, *University of Aberdeen*

Gillian Hughes, *Independent Scholar*

Devoney Looser, *Arizona State University*

Robert Miles, *University of Victoria*

Christopher Skelton-Foord, *University of Durham*

Kathryn Sutherland, *University of Oxford*

Graham Tulloch, *Flinders University*

Nicola Watson, *Open University*

**Aims and Scope:** Formerly *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text* (1997–2005), *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840* is an online journal that is committed to foregrounding innovative Romantic-studies research into bibliography, book history, intertextuality and textual studies. To this end, we publish material in a number of formats: among them, peer-reviewed articles, reports on individual/group research projects, bibliographical checklists and biographical profiles of overlooked Romantic writers. *Romantic Textualities* also carries reviews of books that reflect the growing academic interest in the fields of book history, print culture, intertextuality and cultural materialism, as they relate to Romantic studies.

# CONTENTS

ISSUE 24

WINTER 2021



EDITORIAL	7
ARTICLES: ROMANTIC NOVELS 1817 AND 1818 Special issue edited by Susan Civale and Claire Sheridan	
Romantic Novels 1817 and 1818: Introduction <i>Susan Civale and Claire Sheridan</i>	11
The Romance of Commerce: <i>Rob Roy, 1817–1818</i> <i>Juliet Shields</i>	25
<i>Mandeville</i> , Mourning and National Myths: William Godwin's Civil War Novel and the Use of History <i>Richard Gough Thomas</i>	43
Reading <i>Frankenstein</i> in 1818: From Climate Change to Popular Sovereignty <i>James Grande</i>	61
Florence and the Machine: Female Authorship, Popular Culture and Technological Modernity in Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan's <i>Florence Macarthy</i> (1818) <i>Sonja Lawrenson</i>	76
'Start not, gentle reader!': Re-reading Alicia LeFanu's <i>Helen Monteagle</i> (1818) <i>Anna M. Fitzer</i>	94

## ARTICLES: GENERAL

- Shadow and Substance: Restoring the Literary Output of  
Robert Pearse Gillies (1789–1858) 117  
*Peter Garside*

- Fugitive Text: Robert Southey and S. T. Coleridge's *Ballad of the Devil* 149  
*Robert William Rix*

## BOOK REVIEWS

- Vincent Carretta (ed.), *The Writings of Phillis Wheatley* (2019) 172  
*Amy Wilcockson*

- Manu Samriti Chander, *Brown Romantics: Poetry and Nationalism in the Global Nineteenth Century* (2017) 174  
*Màire Ní Fhlathúin*

- Linda Colley, *The Gun, the Ship, and the Pen: Warfare, Constitutions, and the Making of the Modern World* (2021) 177  
*Katherine Voyles*

- Richard de Ritter, *Imagining Women Readers, 1789–1820: Well-Regulated Minds* (2015) 179  
*Katie Garner*

- Hrileena Ghosh, *John Keats's Medical Notebook: Text, Context, and Poems* (2020) 183  
*Octavia Cox*

- Daisy Hay, *The Making of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein* (2019) 187  
*Jingxuan Yi*

- Anna Mercer, *The Collaborative Literary Relationship of Percy Bysshe Shelley and Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley* (2019) 189  
*Stephen Pallas*

- Kathryn Sutherland (ed.), *Jane Austen: The Chawton Letters* (2017) 191  
*Christopher Vilmar*

- Angela Wright, *Mary Shelley* (2018) 194  
*Barbara Hughes-Moore*

CONTENTS	5
REPORTS	
<i>The English Novel, 1800–1829 &amp; 1830–1836: Update 8 (April 2000– June 2023)</i>	197
<i>Peter Garside, with Jacqueline Belanger, Anthony Mandal and Sharon Ragaz</i>	
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS	306
BOOKS RECEIVED	311
INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS	314



## EDITORIAL

*Anthony Mandal  
Maximiliaan van Woudenberg*



THIS PRESENT ISSUE OF *ROMANTIC TEXTUALITIES* continues from our last in delivering a very full slate of material. Our previous issue (23) was the largest in the journal's history, and no. 24 is just about equal in length. Originally slated for winter 2021, the present issue has encountered a number of delays, not least the continuation and aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, and its impact on academic life; the ongoing industrial action taking place within the UK's higher education sector; and the personal and professional obligations of the editorial team. We remain grateful to our contributors and readers for their patience while we have prepared the present issue.

As has been the case in previous years, despite the gaps in our publication schedule, the journal has been active in other areas, such as our blog and our Twitter platforms. We have recently resumed our 'Teaching Romanticism' series, edited by Daniel Cook, who is now joined by Sarah Burdett and Jonathan Hicks. The team continues to expand and we are delighted to announce the appointment of Andrew McInnes as our Digital Editor. Andrew most recently organised the tremendous *New Romanticisms* conference for the British Association for Romantic Studies and North American Society for the Study of Romanticism in summer 2022. In his role as Digital Editor, Andrew will oversee the development of our general blog and its various sub-series, as well as exploring additional digital platforms, such as podcasting, for the dissemination of new content. A fuller announcement regarding Andrew's appointment and his aims for the role will be published shortly on our blog. Alongside this, we will also be advertising for an Associate Editor, whose role will be to assist our editorial team in preparing our serial issues and digital content, as well as standardising our archive of back issues.

Over the past 25 years, *Romantic Textualities* content has appeared in both HTML and PDF formats. From this issue onwards, we will only display content in PDF format, on pages where users could previously see the HTML versions. Our reasoning was that the almost doubled workload that comes with preparing content in two formats did not reflect any clear and distinct benefit, especially given the static nature of HTML. Liberating ourselves from this publishing paradigm will expedite the preparation and delivery of future issues. We will also begin replacing previous HTML versions of our material with viewable PDFs, for a consistent visual appearance. As always, the PDFs will also be downloadable for personal use. Thanks are due to our Platform Developer, Andrew O'Sullivan, for implementing these changes.



Turning to the present, Issue 24 focuses on *Romantic Novels 1817 and 1818*, building on a successful series of seminars directed in 2017 and 2018 respectively by our guest editors, Susan Civale and Claire Sheridan. Examining various novels, both famous and lesser known, the authors of the five essays—and general introduction by Susan and Claire—demonstrate the range and complexity of the late Romantic literary marketplace. The research of the guest editors reflects more widely this interest in the intersections between the canonical and the popular. Susan has published widely on Romantic women's writing, adaptations and afterlives: her first monograph was *Romantic Women's Life Writing: Reputation and Afterlife* (Manchester University Press, 2019), and she is currently preparing a monograph on Mary Shelley to be published in 2024. Claire is the author of articles on William Hazlitt, Mary Shelley, William Godwin and Alan Moore, among others. Her research interests include the influence of Godwin's 'philosophical gothic' on later gothic writers, and the various communities associated with Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. For a fuller consideration of the Romantic Novels 1817 and 1818 project, and the five essays published in *Romantic Textualities* that have emerged from it, see Susan and Claire's introduction to the special issue.


In addition to these six essays, Issue 24 also includes two standalone articles. The starting point of Peter Garside's 'Shadow and Substance: Restoring the Literary Output of Robert Pearse Gillies (1789–1858)' lies in Gillies's deep regret over his eventual incapacity to piece together his own literary record owing to the loss of materials at significant points in his life. Garside's article attempts to ameliorate this situation by providing a fuller record than was then available to Gillies himself, through means such as the recovery of rare editions, identification of periodical contributions and information provided by the archives of the Royal Literary Fund. In 'Fugitive Text: Robert Southey and S. T. Coleridge's *Ballad of the Devil*', Robert William Rix examines the print history of Robert Southey and S. T. Coleridge's co-written, but anonymously published, 'The Devil's Thoughts' (1799), which was transcribed, reprinted and imitated over the next three decades. Rix's article examines the poem's genesis and reproduction, as well as unpacking its most significant satirical barbs in the context of contemporary print satire, alongside considering how book market entrepreneurs cashed in on the popularity of the 1830 illustrated version.

The second part of this issue consists of reviews of nine books on Romanticism, literary history and print culture, published between 2015 and 2021. Titles examined span a range of subjects, from Romanticism and race, to scholarly editions and biographies, as well as studies of the worlds of warfare and statecraft and of readers and the regulation of minds. Authors treated in the books reviewed include Jane Austen, John Keats, the Shelleys and Phyllis Wheatley.

The final section provides Update 8 to three linked bibliographical projects, all of which originated alongside *Romantic Textualities* at Cardiff University's Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, under the direction of Peter Garside: volume 2 of *The English Novel, 1770–1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in the British Isles* (2000); *The English Novel*,



*1830–1836: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction Published in Britain and Ireland* (2003); and *British Fiction, 1800–1829: A Database of Production, Circulation and Reception* (2004). For the first time, in addition to new information gathered between 2020 and 2023, Update 8 collects and updates all previously published Updates 1–7 to these bibliographical resources, stretching back to April 2000. Spanning over 100 pages, this report provides updated author attributions, new titles previously undiscovered or omitted from the bibliographies, fresh information on the location of surviving copies, as well as further details about existing entries. We hope to take Update 8 forward by revising, expanding and augmenting our *Database of British Fiction, 1800–1829*, so that it remains fit for purpose for another two decades.

Speaking of the future, despite the recent hiatus in serial publication, we have lined up a number of new issues for the coming years, which we cannot wait to share with you. Issue 25 will take the theme *Romanticism Goes to University*, guest edited by Andrew McInnes, and due for publication in autumn 2023. This will be followed by a special issue on *Romantic Boundaries*, edited by Yu-Hung Tien and Andrew Taylor, with the assistance of Cleo O’Callaghan-Yeoman. Due for publication in the first half of 2024, Issue 26 will include essays that draw on presentations given in the same-named Postgraduate and Early Career Research Conference hosted in June 2023 by the British Association for Romantic Studies. This will be followed in late 2024 by Issue 27, edited by Christopher Stampone and Joel Pace, entitled *In Other Wor(l)ds: Romanticism at the Crossroads*. At the time of writing, the Call for Papers will remain open until mid-August 2023, and can be found here. Alongside these scheduled issues, we are planning to publish a special or standalone issue based on our successful ‘Teaching Romanticism’ blog series. This issue would consolidate and update the blog posts (36 to date) into essay format, gathered into thematic sections. Beyond this planned activity, we continue to welcome submissions for standalone essays or future special issues: please read our Instructions for Authors (p. 314) for more information. 

#### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

A. A. MANDAL and M. F. P. VAN WOUDEMBERG. ‘Editorial’, *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.118>>.

#### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2023 The Editors and is the result of the independent labour of the scholars credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 16 June 2023.





# ROMANTIC NOVELS 1817 AND 1818

## Introduction

*Susan Civale and Claire Sheridan*



THIS SPECIAL ISSUE comes out of two ‘Romantic Novels’ seminar series, held in 2017 and 2018, inspired by the Romantic Bicentenary and hosted by the University of Greenwich, UK.<sup>1</sup> Each of the twelve seminars focused on a novel published in either 1817 or 1818, which was introduced by an expert and then discussed by the group at large. By including well-known writers such as Walter Scott and Mary Shelley, as well as their prolific and popular but now forgotten contemporaries, such as Ann Hatton, the series asked questions about why some books continue to be studied two hundred years after their initial publication, and others have all but disappeared. The seminars also allowed us to reposition ‘classic’ novels in the context of the varied literary marketplace in which they were originally printed, offering a window into how these novels differed from—but also resembled—their literary competitors.

The criteria for including a work in the series were that it should be a new work of fiction, first published in the year in question: either 1817 or 1818. We had good reasons for this approach. It allowed us to emphasise the year of publication as an important lens for (re)interpreting these texts, to ask how they might have worked at the moment of their first appearance. What might have struck contemporary readers about these novels? Can the experience of reading new novels in 1817 or 1818 be better reconstructed if we read a set of original fictions that are exact contemporaries, instead of focusing on the output of a single author or publisher?

Although the novels spanned a range of genres including historical romance, domestic fiction, gothic, didactic literature and the national tale, and an array of authors and publishers, the selection of texts was not truly random or representative. From a field of 117 novels published in Britain in these years, the sample of twelve chosen for study was influenced by considerations of accessibility, length, interest, and the expertise and availability of scholars sufficiently well versed in the texts.<sup>2</sup> Still, taken as a group, the sample of twelve books covered a range wide enough to respond to the calls of scholars to move beyond reading what we already know how to read, to address questions of aesthetic value, and to contribute to the long overdue ‘reassess[ment of] just what Romantic novels actually are’.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the fact that the Romantic period saw a transformative rise in both the production and readership of the novel, surveys of fictional literature often

ignore this period or regard it as problematic. Its so-called generic promiscuity has been regarded as a challenge and apart from a handful of well-known names (Austen, Shelley, Scott), it has often, at least until recently, been seen as an embarrassment or a failure.<sup>4</sup> According to Amanda Gilroy and Wil Verhoeven, the Romantic novel remains ‘one of the most underresearched—or unevenly researched—areas of English literature’.<sup>5</sup> Their 2001 special issue of *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* investigated the Romantic novel’s internationalism, politics and aesthetics. More recently, scholars such as Robert Miles have suggested that the success of Walter Scott and Jane Austen in particular ‘distorts a retrospective view’ of the Romantic-era novel, leading to a misunderstanding of its modalities and ideological perspectives.<sup>6</sup> Stephen Behrendt likewise argues that ‘the long-standing rejection of the many alternative forms of the Romantic novel’ relates to an ‘inability [...] to appreciate the social, political, and economic dimensions of these novels’.<sup>7</sup> The disparagement of the Romantic novel may therefore result from ‘asking the wrong questions [...] so that we see what we expect to see rather than looking around on our own and seeing what is actually there before us’.<sup>8</sup> In this issue of *Romantic Textualities*, we build on the work of these critics by examining a selection of five novels, both canonical and non, published in two consecutive years. The close reading of a varied group of texts which were issued within a narrow time frame opens up new possibilities for understanding their various ‘dimensions’—social, political, economic, literary and historical—and paves the way for fresh insights into the novel in the period.

The reading that was undertaken by attendees of the 1817 and 1818 series did suggest fresh insights. In his chapter on ‘The Historical Novel’ in the *Cambridge Companion to Fiction in the Romantic Period* (2008), Richard Maxwell alludes to the practice, once relatively widespread, of ‘working through Scott’s novels in sequence’: ‘Reading all the Waverley novels, often in order of composition (and even, in extreme cases, on an annual basis) was a known habit of pre-World War I enthusiasts [...]; this completist approach has its merits.’<sup>9</sup> Our reading group did not attempt this particular feat; nor can we claim that reading a total of twelve novels, six books each from two consecutive years, counts as ‘completist’. Yet, there is something comparable here. Maxwell suggests that reading the Waverley novels in this way—all of them, from first to last—‘suggests something of what it must have been like to have discovered them as they appeared on the scene, one by one, over some eighteen years’. It is here that the parallel lies.

There are, of course, limits and oddities created via this method. Gary Kelly points out the mismatch between modern scholarly prioritisations of new work and what we know about what was actually read in the early nineteenth century:

Literary histories usually restrict themselves to ‘original’ works produced in a particular period, but most fiction circulating during the Romantic period had been produced earlier, working-class readers enjoyed past and contemporary fiction equally, and most of the fiction they read had been first published before the Romantic period.<sup>10</sup>

It is important to acknowledge this, and to accept that the approach of our reading group and of this issue—to focus on new fiction published in single, discrete years—whilst it may be usefully and uniquely reconstructive in some ways (it is not, yet, usual practice to read ‘original’ Romantic fiction in batches per year of publication), is distorting in others. If we follow Kelly’s account, in the reading habits our schedule inculcated, we were certainly not behaving much like working-class readers would have done in 1817 and 1818. Perhaps we were (to a degree) emulating some segment of the 1817–18 reading population, however: namely, users of circulating libraries. Anthony Mandal has highlighted the importance of circulating libraries in the Romantic period:

the biggest market for fiction was not the individual purchaser, but circulating libraries, which were one of the main success stories of the Romantic literary marketplace [...] Circulating-library owners could make a significant income from the demand for the latest works, as attested to by the fortunes of the Noble brothers in the 1780s, William Lane’s Minerva Library in the 1790s and Henry Colburn’s English and Foreign Circulating Library in the 1800s.<sup>11</sup>

‘Demand for the latest works’ suggests that there was an appetite for newness in fiction, for what had just been published, and that the business model of circulating libraries was predicated on their provision of ‘the latest works’ in response to subscriber ‘demand’. The literary historical privileging of ‘original’ works is not anachronistic, from a reading experience point of view. There were readers reading new fiction for its newness, as well as readers who would have found it easier and cheaper to access older titles.

Mandal’s work on the relationship between gothic and circulating libraries makes examples of *Northanger Abbey*’s Isabella Thorpe and Catherine Morland, identifying these two characters, along with the author who created them, as ‘circulating-library patrons’.<sup>12</sup> *Northanger Abbey* was also the novel we used to inaugurate our reading group series. This was, in some ways, an obvious choice. It made perfect sense from today’s perspective for the first meeting of a seminar series concerning itself with Romantic novels to headline Jane Austen, the most famous representative we have of early nineteenth-century fiction. In other ways, though, Austen, and *Northanger*, were actually atypical of the series as a whole. Though it appeared in 1817, *Northanger Abbey* can more properly be regarded as a novel of the 1790s than of the 1810s, as Katie Halsey has explained:

Written in the late 1790s, finished in 1799, revised and accepted for publication in 1803, but not published until after Austen’s death in December 1817 (though the title page read 1818), *Northanger Abbey* reveals many of the assumptions and prejudices about reading the Gothic romance that are also articulated in the social and cultural criticism of the period.<sup>13</sup>

The delay between composition and publication in the case of *Northanger Abbey* makes it oddly unlikely as a novel of 1817. The historical circumstances to which it is responding are not the same as those to which Thomas Love Peacock

was responding in his 1817 work *Melincourt* (the second text we read for our 2017 series); its immediate contexts are different to those that informed Walter Scott's *Rob Roy* (the sixth and final novel we looked at in 2017, itself published on 30 December 1817). The gap mattered to Austen herself, who was aware of the changes in literary taste that had occurred over the course of nearly two decades, as well as the difference between her own early and late work. Halsey notes the tone of Austen's 1816 "Advertisement," in which Austen apologized for "those parts of the work which thirteen years have rendered obsolete". Halsey goes on to suggest that '*Northanger Abbey* must have felt to her like a rather risky endeavour in a marketplace that was just beginning to value the verisimilitude of her own later novels'.<sup>14</sup>

*Northanger Abbey* was not a typical novel of 1817, then, but it was published in 1817—never mind the title page—and therefore it could be included in the first year of the series. Besides, something we learned quite swiftly is that no single novel could be said to be typical of British novels *en masse*, sharing a year of publication and little else. We also discovered quickly that Austen's novelistic sensibilities were atypical for her time anyway, especially her interest in psychological realism. Despite what Deidre Shauna Lynch designates as Romantic gothic fiction's 'interest in morbid psychology' and 'the period's new psychological case histories', Austen's attention to internal thought processes and the texture of subjectivities is quite different to the more extreme 'mental anatomies' that we encountered frequently in the fiction of these years.<sup>15</sup> Characters that post-Freudian, postmodern readers would recognise as 'real' or 'realistic' were arguably confined to the Scott and Austen novels. Therefore, while no single novel was quite typical of other novels, Austen was even less typical than usual, and not just because her novel of 1817 was really a novel of 1799.

In fact, the 1790s aspect of *Northanger Abbey*, far from distancing it from other works published in 1817 and 1818 that were actually prepared shortly beforehand, proved to be a point it had in common with them. The seismic changes wrought by the French Revolution had not faded from novelists' views by the 1810s. History had not gone away. While the Napoleonic wars were certainly more recent and immediate contexts from the perspective of 1817 and 1818 than the fall of the Bastille or the Burke/Paine debate, those originary events (from which so much followed) were very evidently still in writers' minds over two decades later. *Frankenstein*, the novel with which we chose to launch the 1818 series, provided perhaps the clearest examples of the persistence of 1790s thought into the 1810s. As James Grande points out in his essay included here, that Mary Shelley's novel is steeped in the political and philosophical traditions of the revolutionary generation is apparent as soon as we encounter the dedication. This famously reads: 'To William Godwin, Author of *Political Justice*, *Caleb Williams*, &c, These Volumes are respectfully inscribed by The Author'. The anonymous publication of *Frankenstein* in 1818 meant that it would not have been apparent to most of its original readers that this dedication was not just from one author to another, but from a daughter to her father. Many readers,

however, would have been able to ascertain from a glance at the dedication, the likely political tendency of the book. Not only is Godwin, one of the most 1790s of writers, name checked, but he appears there along with the titles of his most 1790s of works—*Political Justice* (1793) and *Caleb Williams* (1794)—both of which are preoccupied with social and political tyrannies. Grande also highlights Susan Wolfson's recent research into the chronology of *Frankenstein*. This reads fictional events from the novel (its 'internal calendrics', in Wolfson's terms) as mapping on to dates from the 1790s that had either private or public significance to Mary Shelley. For instance, Wolfson dates the beginning of Victor's studies to 1789, a key year in revolutionary history, and Victor's death to 1797, the year Mary Wollstonecraft died as a result of complications following Mary Shelley's birth.<sup>16</sup>

Several of the Romantic authors discussed in our series used their novels to make explicit political protests that had their roots earlier in the Romantic period. Ann Hatton's four-volume Minerva Press potboiler, *Gonzalo de Baldivia* (1817), for example, incorporates a searing abolitionist critique which is heralded on its title page by a dedication to William Wilberforce. *Gonzalo* has an international scope that takes the reader from the capture of slaves in West Africa, via the brutal 'middle passage', to the slave-worked silver mines of Peru, a site of Spanish colonial magnificence and exploitation. The novel culminates in a spectacular insurrection (inspired by the 1804 slave revolt in Haiti) in which the melodramatic and political strands of the novel come together as the slave Ozembo, who functions as a 'noble savage' character, rips out the heart of the eponymous anti-hero, Baldivia. While the heroine Rosaviva argues passionately on several occasions that the slaves are in fact thinking and feeling beings, it is the male (English) hero who articulates in nationalistic terms the novel's full anti-slavery, anti-Catholic message:

'Yonder [...] lies the island of Great Britain, the land of liberty, the mart of commerce, the nursery of science, the emporium of arts, where, instructed by the wisest laws, and inspired by the purest religion, its legislators have abolished, and for ever, the inhuman traffic for slaves.'<sup>17</sup>

In the fourth volume the main characters relocate to England and the grand-scale violence and international trajectory of the slave narrative(s) give way to a domestic gothic/sentimental plotline lacking any overtly polemical content. For a modern audience, this abrupt shift signals the difficulties Hatton had in marrying the various subplots and subgenres in her novel, but these inconsistencies were likely far less troubling for contemporary readers, who would have been accustomed to such generic variegations.

Thomas Love Peacock's comic novel *Melincourt* (1817) also rails against the institution of slavery but the protest here takes the form of an 'anti-saccharine fete'. This sugar-free dinner is hosted by the heroine Anthelia Melincourt's love interest, Sylvan Forester, who aims to persuade his company to abstain from this West-Indian-produced luxury: 'What would become of slavery if there were no



consumers of its produce?’<sup>18</sup> In an impassioned after-dinner speech, Mr Forester, who was apparently modelled after Peacock’s friend Percy Bysshe Shelley, lectures his guests on the ‘morally atrocious’ and ‘politically abominable’ commodity of sugar, which he identifies as ‘the primary cause of the most complicated corporeal suffering and the most abject mental degradation that ever outraged the form and polluted the spirit of man.’<sup>19</sup> Though the novel’s polyvocality can make it difficult to pinpoint where Peacock’s beliefs truly lie, the fact that Forester manages to convince some of his guests to join his sugar boycott suggests the sincerity of the novel’s critique of slavery. Our speaker for the session on *Melincourt*, Freya Johnston, argued that the urgency of the political situation was being felt with particular force when Peacock was composing the novel, and pointed out that its publication in 1817 coincided with Parliament’s suspension of Habeas Corpus. Habeas Corpus had previously been suspended under Pitt, during 1794–95 and 1798–1801.<sup>20</sup>

Social and political messages of a different kind also surface in the depictions of contemporary Ireland that we encountered in many of the novels. For instance, according to Simon Avery’s introductory talk, Patrick Brontë’s *The Maid of Killarney* (1818), can be considered an Irish national tale that endorses a conservative idea of progress. The novel opens with the English hero, Albion, admiring the picturesque Killarney landscape, and soon sees him admiring the beautiful native Flora, whose name suggests her affinity with the Irish natural world and, by extension, its traditional culture. With frequent debates between characters on topics such as religion, poverty and the legal system, Brontë puts forward his ‘radical Tory’ ideas about gradual reform (as compared to violent revolution). The marriage of Albion and Flora at the novel’s close signifies Brontë’s endorsement of a peaceful union between England and Ireland.

The symbolic resonances of other Irish tales, such as Sydney Owenson’s intricately plotted and highly allusive *Florence Macarthy* (1818), are not as easy to parse. Owenson is clearly concerned with the history and contemporary politics of Ireland, and engages with themes of inheritance and dispossession throughout the novel. As in so many Irish tales, the final volume culminates in a wedding, here between the Anglo-Irish General Walter de Montenay Fitzwalter and the patriotic Florence Macarthy, Lady Clancare. The Dunore castle and lands are at long last rescued from ‘the oppression of petty, delegated authority, and [...] the neglect and absence of its natural protectors’, and the concluding maxim—‘IRELAND CAN BEST BE SERVED IN IRELAND’—is a clear enough statement of the need for Ireland to have its own, home-grown leadership.<sup>21</sup> Yet, the marriage of these cosmopolitan figures does not offer the stabilising symbolic union of *The Maid of Killarney* nor even of Owenson’s earlier *The Wild Irish Girl* (1806), and Owenson’s vision of a political future is uncertain.

Moreover, the literary and personal self-consciousness of Owenson’s posturing in *Florence Macarthy* adds layers of complexity to her portrait of Ireland. The heroine is, after all, an author of Irish fiction who enjoys an international celebrity, and she ultimately reveals that the novel we are reading is one of her

literary productions ('I shall take the liberty of *putting myself in my own book* [...] under the title of—*Florence Macarthy*').<sup>22</sup> This nod to Owenson's own literary reputation, and perhaps to her past performance of her role as the Wild Irish Girl, raises questions of authenticity. As Jenny McAuley has argued, the copious 'citations, parallels and intertexts highlight the extent to which Owenson regarded not only Ireland, but also women in her society, as having been constructed (and possibly distorted) by texts'.<sup>23</sup> Owenson's self-reflexivity in the novel implies her interest in interrogating such constructions. *Florence Macarthy* thus fits with Claire Connolly's argument about the inadequacy of the 'national tale' designation when it comes to the diversity of Irish fiction produced in the Romantic period.<sup>24</sup>

Although William Godwin's *Mandeville* is subtitled 'a Tale of the Seventeenth Century in England', it also, in large part, concerns itself with Ireland. The dedication gives us a clue to what these concerns are: Godwin inscribed *Mandeville* 'To the memory of the sincerest friend I ever had, the late John Philpot Curran, (who a few days since quitted this mortal stage)'. In introducing the novel at the seminar, Jenny McAuley highlighted the sort of statement Godwin was making by dedicating *Mandeville* to Curran. The editorial notes to the Godwin Diary Website explain that Curran was 'lead counsel for the leaders of the 1798 rebellion' in Ireland.<sup>25</sup> James Kelly's entry on Curran in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* concludes that his 'sympathies were with the United Irish leadership from the mid-1790s'.<sup>26</sup> Godwin is sometimes credited with indirectly helping exculpate John Horne Tooke, Thomas Hardy and John Thelwall from charges of high treason in 1794, via the arguments he made in his pamphlet, *Cursory Strictures on the Charge Delivered by Lord Chief Justice Eyre*. An apocryphal story has the recently exonerated Horne Tooke taking Godwin's hand and kissing it, pronouncing: "I can do no less for the hand that saved my life!"<sup>27</sup> Curran's intervention on behalf of the Irish rebels was much more direct, though less successful: 'Curran's eloquent defence was insufficient to prevent a capital verdict'.<sup>28</sup> But Curran's defence worked in other cases, and both before and after the 1798 treason trials in Ireland, Curran was a crucial figure in Irish radical politics.

*Mandeville*, like novels by Jane Porter and Charles Robert Maturin that we read as part of the scheme, is not only interested in historical legacies, but can be vehemently contemporary too. This double vision also applies to Peacock's *Melincourt*. Gary Dyer has commented that in *Melincourt*, 'Peacock emphasises immediacy':

By depicting or evoking rotten boroughs, sinecure-holding intelligentsia, West Indian slavery, and other ills, he brings politics to center stage, and the allusions to very recent writings like *The Statesman's Manual* (published three months earlier, in December 1816), make *Melincourt* seem as up to date as the latest number of *The Edinburgh Review*.<sup>29</sup>

Up-to-dateness is registered in different ways by different authors, but several texts were notable for their treatment of war. This was true of Jane Porter's *The Pastor's Fire-Side* (1817), as well *The Fast of St Magdalen* (1818), which was written by her sister, Anna Maria Porter. Both Porter experts who joined us to speak to these texts, Thomas McLean and Fiona Price, noted the Porter family's interest in battle scenes. Price commented on the precision with which Anna Maria Porter plotted battles, in *The Fast of St Magdalen* as well as her earlier and more famous work, *The Hungarian Brothers* (1807). *The Fast of St Magdalen* opens with a depiction of a town under siege:

At the close of the year 1508, a small Pisan town in the Appenines was stormed and taken by the Florentines.

The assault had been made at midnight; and the confusion of darkness was thus added to the customary horrors of war.

To the continued roar of artillery (reverberated by mountain echoes) succeeded the less deafening, but more dreadful sound of the rush of troops, the clamour of pursuit, and the cry of quarter!<sup>30</sup>

The Porter sisters were influenced in this practice by their brother, Robert Kerr Porter, 'an accomplished military painter' who, in 1799, 'became a great pioneer in the field of military panorama painting'.<sup>31</sup> Maxwell has written about the impact of Robert's work on Jane's novels in particular:

she was delighted with her brother's virtuoso performance [...] [her] ambitious war scenes [...] show a military eye for the topographic placement of soldiers, as well as considerable flair for describing the way that a battle develops and for the way that troops move about over a particularized terrain [...] Prose fiction is hardly the ideal medium for such kinetic representations, but Jane convincingly marries strategic movement to the forces of history.<sup>32</sup>

Maxwell goes on to explain that the combination of military precision and a propensity to be 'fascinated by the idea of national resistance movements', meant that the Porter sisters' novels were often read as 'stag[ing] tacit confrontations with [Napoleon] who, for his part, did Jane the honor of banning *The Scottish Chiefs*'. For Maxwell, Jane Porter can take credit for having 'helped turn historical fiction in a certain sort of strategic, landscape-oriented, and panoramic direction' and 'thus intimidating the greatest general of her day'.<sup>33</sup>

*The Scottish Chiefs* was published in 1810, in the middle of the Napoleonic wars. *The Pastor's Fire-Side* and Anna Maria's *Fast of St Magdalen* are post-Napoleonic novels. *Frankenstein*, too, has been read in this light. Kelly's seminal study *English Fiction of the Romantic Period* includes a Napoleonic reading of Mary Shelley's novel:

Out of [the French Revolution] arose a titan, a 'modern Prometheus', a heroic transgressor in the name of humanity, the self-proclaimed embodiment of the Revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte, whose career had only just been halted when Mary Shelley began her novel in 1816.<sup>34</sup>

This post-war mood, the sense of things 'only just' at a halt, is marked in many of these novels, but perhaps most distinctly in Charles Robert Maturin's *Women; or, Pour et Contre* (1818), 'set in Dublin at the time of Napoleon's first defeat'.<sup>35</sup>

In Volume Two of *Women*, several pages are devoted to how the news of this is received in Dublin:

Happy those who could read, and happy even those who could only get others to read to them, the great talismanic words of—'Entrance of the Allies into Paris—Overthrow of the Buonaparte Dynasty—Restoration of the Bourbons'—all *exclusive intelligence* that day received. Then the shops where the papers were sold. They could not have been more beset had the salvation of mankind depended upon the working of the press.<sup>36</sup>

This chapter of the novel, where we learn that, as the story hit the city, 'Nothing ever was like the tumult in Dublin that day, and many a following one', reads more like reportage documenting recently eye-witnessed history than fiction.<sup>37</sup> It also dates this section of the plot very precisely to April 1814. As the episode concludes, Maturin gestures toward a more conclusive era-ending event:

The general sentiment was certainly that of joy. The appalling, supernatural greatness of Buonaparte had terrified even those who wished him well, and men seemed relieved, as from the spell of an enchanter. His very well wishers were glad he was checked; *checked only*, as they hoped, not overthrown. The violet blossomed again in their imaginations; they did not foresee its final blast at Waterloo.<sup>38</sup>

Maturin's *Women*, like Shelley's *Frankenstein*, is a novel whose content and meaning are partly determined by the recentness of the cessation of hostilities in Europe from the point of view of 1818.

The public spectacle that ensues in response to news of Napoleon in Maturin's novel is one example of the book's broader fascination with theatre and personae. The performance of politics and the politics of performance are themes integral to *Women*. Interest in the relationship between dramatic lives and Dramatic Lives, particularly those of women, recurs throughout texts chosen for the 1817 and 1818 series. From the stage acting of Zaira Dalmatiani in *Women*, to the lute playing of Rosalia in *The Fast of St Magdalen*, to the poetry of the brilliant if mentally unstable Ellen in *Maid of Killarney*, women in so many of the novels we read unsettle the dichotomy of public and private realms through their performances. Paid stage work, of course, seems a particular source of unease, as is evident in the character of Maturin's Zaira, a literary descendant of Germaine de Staël's Corinne. The beautiful, expressive and experienced Zaira easily attracts the attention of the hero Charles De Courcey with her powerful stage presence, and he eventually breaks off his engagement with the devout Eva to follow this fascinating actress to France. Though Zaira is punished ultimately by losing De Courcey and learning that the woman she stole him from (Eva) is in fact her daughter, Zaira arguably proves a more sympathetic character than

either De Courcey or Eva. Female performance is everywhere a double-edged sword: powerful yet dangerous, captivating yet transgressive.

Though not a performer per se, one of the strongest female characters we encountered across the novels we read was Walter Scott's Diana Vernon, whose masculine education, independence and political savvy make her an advantageous educator for the hero Frank Osbaldistone in *Rob Roy*. With the tenacity of one 'who was accustomed to mind nobody's opinion but her own', and the quick wit necessary to get the better of Frank in conversation, Diana easily steers him throughout the novel, helping him to avert the snares of the cunning Rashleigh and to succeed on his quest to recover his father's credit.<sup>39</sup> When Diana chastises Frank for wasting time writing poetry when he could be more productively employed, he feels acutely 'the childishness of [his] own conduct, and the superior manliness of Miss Vernon's'.<sup>40</sup> As Judith Wilt remarks, '[i]t is their lack of resemblance to the conventional of their sex that attracts Diana and Frank to each other [...] Diana virtually orders Frank into male action'.<sup>41</sup> Of course, their eventual marriage sees the end of this gender role reversal. Still, the spirited dialogue between Frank and Diana and the degree of psychological realism that imbues her characterisation make for an interesting comparison with Austen's women, whose complex character development and agency have long been recognised.

Diana also has similarities with Peacock's eponymous Anthelia Melincourt, who articulates feminist ideas indebted to Mary Wollstonecraft. In a conversation with Mr Forester and Mr Fax about female education, she rails against the practice of treating women 'only as pretty dolls' and subjecting them to 'the fripperies of irrational education', arguing instead for equal treatment of the sexes:

In that universal system of superficial education which so studiously depresses the mind of women, a female who aspires to mental improvement will scarcely find in her own sex a congenial associate; and the other will regard her as an intruder on its prescriptive authority, its legitimate and divine right over the dominion of thought and reason.<sup>42</sup>

Forester's progressive ideas—and suitability as a love match for Anthelia—are proven by the support he lends her in this argument and in particular by his self-referential statement that there are men 'who can appreciate justly that most heavenly of earthly things, an enlightened female mind'.<sup>43</sup> Peacock does not develop character in the manner of Austen or Scott, of course, preferring stagey dialogue, stylised characters and caricatured set pieces to psychological realism. However, the examples of Diana Vernon and Anthelia Melincourt remind us that (proto)feminist characters exist beyond the pages of Austen's domestic narratives and appear in a variety of styles and modes.

Reading the twelve novels of 1817 and 1818, in 2017 and 2018, illuminated not only the range of fiction available in the late Romantic period, but also the dialogues that emerged between these texts. Since many were composed concurrently, this is not so much a matter of direct influence as an effect of

the zeitgeist. That *Melincourt* and *Gonzalo de Baldivia* share an interest in the abolition movement, for instance, does not imply that Hatton had read Peacock, or vice versa. Godwin's diary does record his reading of Scott's *Rob Roy* and Owenson's *Florence Macarthy* in 1818, but neither could have influenced 1817's *Mandeville* (though it is possible that *Mandeville* could have influenced Scott and Owenson).<sup>44</sup> The essays collected here represent some of what we came to see as the most pressing and persistent topics articulated across the fiction we read, and what was discussed at the seminars.

In the first article of our special issue, Juliet Shields tackles matters of genre, and reads *Rob Roy* in terms of gothic romance and 'the adventure story'. Shields argues that by weaving these together into a 'modern version of the chivalric quest' that nevertheless feels haunted by ancestral relics, Scott explores attitudes to commerce and landed property revealing of both his own financial circumstances and national economic anxieties at the time he was writing.

Richard Gough Thomas's consideration of *Mandeville* starts from the premise that the work is Godwin's 'most conspicuously gothic' novel. For Thomas, the anti-realist feeling of *Mandeville* has less to do with the structure of the work (which is part of what Shields argues gives *Rob Roy* its romance), and more to do with its oversaturation with personal and historical trauma. Thomas considers the possible impact of biographical factors on the tone of Godwin's 1817 publication, as well as the broader 'contemporary resonance' at that time of a work of fiction that tackles the aftermath of sectarian violence. The essay suggests possible links between the intensity of religious feeling explored in the book and Godwin's readings in Dissenting history and life writing.


James Grande's essay situates *Frankenstein* in terms of its reception by readers first encountering it in 1818. Grande looks across from Mary Shelley's novel to the contexts and debates that were topical when it appeared, and contemplates how these might have determined the way it was read then.

The remaining two articles address the role of the female author in the Romantic literary marketplace. Departing from scholarship that emphasises Sydney Owenson's *Florence Macarthy* as an Irish national tale, Sonja Lawrenson argues that this novel can also be read as a challenge to masculine modes of textual production. Like Shelley's *Frankenstein*, Lawrenson argues, *Florence Macarthy* privileges palimpsestic rewriting over solitary creative autonomy. Instead of the macabre scientific experiments of *Frankenstein*, the technological modernity of *Florence Macarthy* is epitomised by the kaleidoscope, an 1815 invention which soon became a widely available toy, and which serves as a fitting symbol of the novel's performative, eclectic and populist elements, as well as a metaphor for the author's 'prismatic' style of creative production.

Anna M. Fitzer also discusses Alicia LeFanu's *Helen Monteagle* (1818) as a meditation on the craft of Romantic prose fiction, and more specifically the female purveyors of it. Like Owenson, LeFanu implicitly responds to detractors in critiquing the tiresome standards of female character as well as the unjust assumptions about the quality and effect of novels on women readers. It is no



coincidence, Fitzer suggests, that *Helen Monteagle* resonates with the satirical texts produced by LeFanu's female contemporaries, many of whom were, in the late 1810s, implicitly responding to Lord Byron's outlandish attacks on literary women.

The articles contained in this special issue offer new insights into the five texts covered—*Rob Roy*, *Mandeville*, *Frankenstein*, *Florence Macarthy* and *Helen Monteagle*—by drawing attention to some of the commercial, environmental, historical, technological and literary contexts that informed their production and reception. In doing so, they not only help to paint a fuller and more nuanced picture of the literary marketplace of the post-Napoleonic Romantic period, but also to showcase a historical contextual framework that allows us to reconsider classic novels, as well as providing a 'way in' to the often bewildering generic and stylistic range of non-canonical fiction of the period. In this way this special issue responds to Stephen Behrendt's anxiety that we may be 'asking the wrong questions' of these texts. The work presented here suggests the kinds of questions we can ask of non-canonical novels in order to extend our understanding both of the literary field in the Romantic period, as well as the qualities of the texts that we now take for granted as canonical. Such questions avoid the pigeonholing tendencies that can inadvertently arise when studying both little-known works and their famous counterparts from the perspective of an imagined (and misleadingly teleological) consensus about which literary productions 'deserve' certain reputations, and why. 

## NOTES

1. These two series were generously co-funded by the University of Greenwich, Canterbury Christ Church University, Romantic Bicentennials and the British Association for Romantic Studies (BARS).
2. The twelve Romantic novels we covered across the two series, in order of study, were: Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey* (1817), Thomas Love Peacock's *Melincourt* (1817), William Godwin's *Mandeville* (1817), Jane Porter's *The Pastor's Fire-Side* (1817), Ann Hatton's *Gonzalo de Baldivia* (1817), Walter Scott's *Rob Roy* (1817), Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* (1818), Sydney Owenson's *Florence Macarthy* (1818), Patrick Brontë's *The Maid of Killarney* (1818), Susan Ferrier's *Marriage* (1818), Anna Maria Porter's *The Fast of St Magdalen* (1818) and Charles Maturin's *Women* (1818).
3. Stephen Behrendt, 'Questioning the Romantic Novel', *Studies in the Novel*, 26.1/2 (Summer 1994), 5–25 (p. 9).
4. Amanda Gilroy and Wil Verhoeven, 'The Romantic-Era Novel: A Special Issue', *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 34 (2001), 147–62 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/1346212>> (p. 147).
5. *Ibid.*, p. 156.
6. Robert Miles, *Romantic Misfits* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 135 <<https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230582279>>.
7. Behrendt, pp. 14–15.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 7.



9. Richard Maxwell, 'The Historical Novel', in *The Cambridge Companion to Fiction in the Romantic Period*, ed. by Richard Maxwell and Katie Trumpener (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 65–87 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521862523.005>> (p. 76).
10. Gary Kelly, 'Fiction and the Working Classes', in *Cambridge Companion to Fiction in the Romantic Period*, pp. 207–33 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521862523.013>> (p. 208).
11. Anthony Mandal, 'Gothic and the Publishing World, 1780–1920', in *The Gothic World*, ed. by Glennis Byron and Dale Townshend (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014), pp. 159–71 <<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203490013-14>> (p. 160).
12. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
13. Katie Halsey, 'Gothic and the History of Reading, 1764–1830', in *Gothic World*, pp. 172–84 <<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203490013-15>> (p. 174).
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 176–77.
15. Deidre Shauna Lynch, 'Gothic Fiction', in *Cambridge Companion to Fiction in the Romantic Period*, pp. 47–64 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521862523.004>> (p. 58). For the term 'mental anatomies', see William Dean Brewer, *The Mental Anatomies of William Godwin and Mary Shelley* (London: Associated University Presses, 2001).
16. Susan J. Wolfson, 'Timelines', in *The Annotated Frankenstein* (London: Belknap Press, 2012), pp. 353–60 (pp. 353, 358 and 359).
17. Ann Hatton, *Gonzalo de Baldivia*, 4 vols (London: Minerva Press, 1817), III, 298.
18. Thomas Love Peacock, *Melincourt* (London: Macmillan, 1896), p. 208.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 207.
20. Marc Baer, *The Rise and Fall of Radical Westminster* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), pp. 89–90 <<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137035295>>.
21. Sydney Owenson, *Florence Macarthy*, ed. by Jenny McAuley (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 366–67.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 264.
23. Jenny McAuley, 'Introduction', in *Florence Macarthy*, pp. vii–xx (p. xvi).
24. Claire Connolly, *A Cultural History of the Irish Novel, 1790–1829* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 4.
25. See *The Diary of William Godwin*, ed. by Victoria Myers, David O'Shaughnessy and Mark Philp (Oxford: Oxford Digital Library, 2010) <<http://godwindiary.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/people/CUR01.html#CUR01-notes>> [accessed 11 December 2019], editorial notes for 'Curran, John Philpot'.
26. James Kelly, 'Curran, John Philpot (1750–1817), politician and lawyer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6950>>.
27. William Hazlitt, *The Spirit of the Age: Or, Contemporary Portraits* (London: Colburn, 1825), p. 56.
28. Kelly, 'Curran, John Philpot'.
29. Gary Dyer, *British Satire and the Politics of Style, 1789–1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 117 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511585333>>.
30. Anna Maria Porter, *The Fast of St Magdalen*, 3 vols (London: Longman, 1818), I, 1.
31. Maxwell, p. 74.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 75.

34. Gary Kelly, *English Fiction of the Romantic Period 1789–1830* (Harlow: Longman, 1989), p. 191.
35. Ina Ferris, 'The Irish Novel 1800–1829', in *Cambridge Companion to Fiction of the Romantic Period*, pp. 235–49 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521862523.014>> (p. 245).
36. Charles Robert Maturin, *Women; or, Pour et Contre*, 3 vols (Edinburgh: Constable, 1818), III, 167.
37. *Ibid.*, III, 166.
38. *Ibid.*, III, 169.
39. Walter Scott, *Rob Roy*, ed. by Ian Duncan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 127 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199549887.001.0001>>.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 210.
41. Judith Wilt, *Secret Leaves: The Novels of Walter Scott* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 66.
42. Peacock, pp. 117–18.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
44. For records of the reading Godwin undertook in 1818, see *Diary of William Godwin*.

#### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

S. CIVALE and C. SHERIDAN. 'Romantic Novels 1817 and 1818: Introduction', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.100>>.

#### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Authors and is the result of the independent labour of the scholars credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

**Date of acceptance:** 6 September 2019.



# THE ROMANCE OF COMMERCE

*Rob Roy, 1817–18*

*Juliet Shields*



WALTER SCOTT'S *ROB ROY* was published on the last day of December 1817, only a few days after the posthumous publication of Jane Austen's *Northanger Abbey*. That both novels bore the date of 1818 on their title pages is not the only connection between these two seemingly disparate novels. Both are *bildungsromane* of sorts: one, the story of a young woman's visit to Bath, where after some misguided attempts to transform herself into a gothic heroine, she is more than content to make an ordinary marriage; and the other of a young man who, having been banished to the North of England on account of his disinclination for commerce, finds himself occupying the position of a gothic heroine until he is rescued by the combined efforts of a Highland chieftain and a lovely young woman who help him restore the credit of his father's firm. Austen's protagonist, Catherine Morland, is an avid reader of gothic fiction and imaginatively shapes her own experiences through gothic conventions until her suitor Henry Tilney calls into question her judgement. Although Tilney manages to convince her that gothic novels do not accurately represent metropolitan southern Britain, 'Catherine dared not doubt beyond her own country, and even of that, if hard pressed, would have yielded the northern and western extremities.'<sup>1</sup> Depending on whether Catherine considers England or Britain 'her own country', the 'northern extremities' could refer either to the Scottish Highlands or to Northumberland. While the former was a more conventional setting for gothic fiction in the early nineteenth century, it is in the latter that Scott's protagonist Frank Osbaldistone finds himself living in the most gothic of circumstances—an ancient hall with a mouldering library in which strange lights and shadows are seen at night, in the company of a young woman who is surrounded by vague mysteries and very real dangers.

But if *Northanger Abbey* invokes unstable oppositions between gothic romance and realism, and between the extravagance of fantasy and the ordinariness of reality, the latter terms of these oppositions are largely missing from *Rob Roy*. Instead, *Rob Roy* incorporates related but distinct varieties of romance: the gothic and the adventure story. In this, *Rob Roy* also differs from *Waverley* (1814), which literary scholars once saw as a superior prototype of which *Rob Roy* was the degraded imitation.<sup>2</sup> Both *Waverley* and *Rob Roy* describe a dreamy, impractical young Englishman's journey north, where he is accused of treason and finds himself mixed up in rebellion. However, *Waverley* is more similar

to *Northanger Abbey* than to *Rob Roy* in its opposition of romance and the real. Like Catherine Morland's, Edward Waverley's worldview is shaped by his reading, and he finds at Tully-Veolan and Glennaquoich the romance he has hitherto only read about. When Rose Bradwardine tells Waverley of the frequent Highland raids on Tully-Veolan, he 'could not help starting at a story which bore so much resemblance to one of his own day-dreams', and reminds himself delightedly, 'I am actually in the land of military and romantic adventures, and it only remains to be seen what will be my own share in them.'<sup>3</sup> Journeying further north through the sublime Highland landscape in the company of the fierce Donald Bean Lean, Waverley 'give[s] himself up to the romance of his situation' (p. 84). Later, he is introduced to Charles Edward, 'a Prince, whose form and manners, as well as the spirit he displayed in this singular enterprise, answered his idea of a hero of romance' (p. 206). And finally, after the defeat of the Jacobites at Culloden, Waverley 'felt himself entitled to say firmly, though perhaps with a sigh, that the romance of his life was ended, and that its real history had now commenced' (p. 301). Waverley's hasty conclusion is almost as affected as his earlier tendency to romanticise the Highlands as the land of his daydreams. Nonetheless, there is in *Waverley* a 'real history' that Waverley can embrace: an 'amiable' Rose Bradwardine (p. 70) instead of an 'exquisite' Flora (p. 114), the improvement of Tully-Veolan in place of a military career and an uninspired but reliable loyalty to the current government rather than a fervent but transient allegiance to an exiled king.

In *Rob Roy*, I will argue, there is no alternative to romance, and no opposition between romance and 'real history'; there are only different kinds of romance—the gothic romance, associated primarily with Northumberland, where Osbaldistone Hall is located, and the commercial adventure, the quest narrative generated by the network of speculation, credit and debt that extends from London into the Scottish Highlands and around the globe. Ian Duncan and Andrew Lincoln have argued persuasively that in its representation of the relations between metropolitan England and its peripheries, *Rob Roy* is more complex and less schematic than *Waverley*. It acknowledges Britain's imbrication in a system of global, imperial trade that renders the nation state, in Duncan's words, a 'network of uneven, heterogeneous times and spaces, lashed together by commerce and military force'.<sup>4</sup> Whereas Waverley's journey into the Highlands is figured as a journey from modernity into the primitive past, in *Rob Roy* 'savagery and commerce sustain rather than cancel out each other'.<sup>5</sup> Rob Roy's practices of freebooting coexist with his kinsman Bailie Jarvie's prosperous trade so that 'the primitive signifies an origin still structurally present within modernity—disavowed but persistent—rather than a superseded developmental form'.<sup>6</sup> The raids through which Rob Roy and his followers make a living are an uncanny version of the daring speculations made by the firm of Osbaldistone and Tresham. If, as Duncan suggests, *Rob Roy* challenges the Enlightenment theories of progress that would contrast the commercial prosperity and refinement of metropolitan southern Britain to the primitive feudalism of the Highlands, it

also refuses to neatly map literary genres onto Britain's topography. Rather than associating romance with the primitive Highlands and realism with civilised southern Britain, as *Waverley* does, *Rob Roy* undoes the opposition between realism and romance, leaving in its place only varieties of romance.

The genre of *Rob Roy* has been debated by scholars, with Lars Hartveit describing it as a picaresque; Anna Faktorovich as a 'popular rebellion novel', the invention of which she attributes to Walter Scott; and Fiona Robertson noting its incorporation of gothic conventions.<sup>7</sup> Significantly, all of these genres resolve into varieties of romance. And the predominance of romance perhaps owes something to the novel's form. *Rob Roy* is Scott's only novel to employ first-person retrospective narration, although others contain first-person narratives embedded within them. First-person narration is a common authenticating device in the early novel, and if 'real history' or mundane experience resides anywhere in *Rob Roy* we might expect to find it in Frank Osbaldistone's present, the time and place of the story's telling rather than the time and places of the story's action. But retrospection arguably accounts for Frank's tendency to romanticise his experiences. Jane Millgate has described Frank as an 'unreflecting narrator' whose story is 'absolutely resistant to the opportunities for commentary, analysis, and moralization implicit in the retrospective memoir form',<sup>8</sup> and whose inability to distance himself from his narrative renders causal connections murky. In *Waverley*, Scott's loquacious narrator comments on Waverley's romantic interpretation of his experiences, and other characters, such as Colonel Talbot, offer correctives to Waverley's perspective. This narrator informs us in no uncertain terms that Waverley is left wiser and sadder by his participation in the Jacobite rebellion. Frank has no comparable moment of realisation. Instead, the Frank who relates this story in the 1760s seems unchanged from the Frank who experienced it in 1715, leaving us to wonder what he learned from his adventures and why he continues to dwell on them. In Millgate's reading, Frank must retell the 'guilts and horrors of the past' because of his 'inability or refusal to confront them and their meaning'.<sup>9</sup> Frank is unable to confront the implications of his story, I argue, because in the course of his adventures he succumbs to the romance of commerce, which colours his retrospective narration.

While Frank might remain blind to his own imbrication in the commercial system that has rendered Rob Roy an outlaw and left many Highlanders impoverished and without work, Walter Scott was perhaps not similarly blind to his own position as a novelist commanding a commercialised literary marketplace, and who made his money by manufacturing a romanticised version of the Scottish Highlands. For, while Scott was writing *Rob Roy*, money was on his mind. Like his hero, Rob Roy, he was in debt. When he brought the idea for *Rob Roy* to Archibald Constable, Scott hoped that the sales of the novel would enable him to repay a loan from the Duke of Buccleugh that had helped him to survive the near failure in 1813 of John Ballantyne and Co., the publishing house in which Scott had held a half-share. The bewildering complexity of Scott's financial affairs at this time are well represented by a letter in which he tells James Ballantyne to

'renew Constables bill of the 12 to meet mine of the 6th and I will renew mine to take up his'.<sup>10</sup> Scott's literary endeavours entangled him in a system of credit and debt that he, perhaps wilfully, never entirely understood. The financial crash that brought him to the brink of bankruptcy for the second time would not occur until 1826, but much earlier than that Constable had begun to pay Scott for works that had yet to be written, or even envisioned.<sup>11</sup> While Scott may have considered the intricacies of business beneath him as a gentleman, he was also keenly aware that these advances helped to fund his improvements to Abbotsford, such as the purchase of the neighbouring estate of Kaeside in 1816 ('a sort of fairy land marching with Abbotsford'), and the first expansion of the original 'cottage' in which the family lived.<sup>12</sup> Scott evinced the preference for heritable property over mobile forms of wealth common to his time; and from Thomas Carlyle onwards, critics have noted with disapproval his desire to transform himself into a landed gentleman.<sup>13</sup> But *Rob Roy* reveals heritable property in the form of land to be no more stable than the bills of credit that Frank chases across Scotland.

Economic anxiety was by means no peculiar to Scott in 1817 but was widespread throughout Britain. Scott may have hoped that the publication of another novel set in his highly marketable version of the Highlands would resolve his personal financial difficulties, but *Rob Roy* also reflects the financial difficulties of the British nation both in 1817 and 1715. Although Scott, unlike some of his lesser-known contemporaries, never wrote a novel specifically about the Highland Clearances, *Rob Roy* contains his closest scrutiny of the economic patterns that in 1817, as in 1715, led to the eviction of Highlanders from their homes.<sup>14</sup> The Parliamentary Union of 1707 had opened up England's colonies to Scottish trade; and while this would eventually enrich the Lowlands, it did not reach the Highlands, which were economically depressed by laws which, in David Hewitt's words, 'enforce[d] the [...] mercantile ideology of the Hanoverian state'.<sup>15</sup> This economic depression is evident in *Rob Roy* when Baillie Jarvie explains of Highlanders that

there is neither wark, nor the very fashion or appearance of wark, for the tae half of thae puir creatures; that is to say, that the agriculture, the pasturage, the fisheries, and every species of honest industry about the country, canna employ the one moiety of the population.<sup>16</sup>

Britain in 1817 was experiencing a post-war recession that similarly left many small farmers and industrial workers out of work. John Sutherland suggests that, 'as a sheriff and a landowner', Scott would have witnessed 'much distress, particularly in the Scottish countryside', at this time.<sup>17</sup> And indeed, while working on *Rob Roy*, Scott wrote to Joanna Baillie that the 'distress' of 'the poor folks' near Abbotsford 'has been extreme and [...] they have borne severe privations with great patience'.<sup>18</sup> The Highlands were especially hard hit, and the plight of *Rob Roy*'s Highlanders in 1715, as described by Jarvie, resembles that of Highlanders in 1817.<sup>19</sup>



Malcolm Gray has described Britain's hard-won victory in the Napoleonic Wars as marking 'the end of an era' for the Highlands, as skyrocketing rents left the subsistence farmer, 'who had never possessed any surplus for personal use [...] now a serious debtor'.<sup>20</sup> These subsistence farmers saw none of the wealth that landowners, many of whom did not live on their estates for much of the year, acquired through the introduction of large-scale sheep farming. For, as Eric Richards explains, in the wake of the Napoleonic wars,

[t]he Highlands of Scotland were transformed as much as any colony in the Empire in that age, fully incorporated into the role of supplying the metropolitan economy [...]. The benefits which accrued from this great upheaval did not flow in the direction of the people who inhabited the region.<sup>21</sup>

*Rob Roy*, more than any of Scott's other novels, situates the Highlands in an economic network that connects them not only to metropolitan southern England, but also to the urban Lowlands, Europe and the Caribbean.<sup>22</sup> As Richards suggests, this network tended to extract wealth—in the form of manpower, land or natural resources—from the Highlands, in the process gradually undermining traditional ways of life so that by 1715, only the remnants of the feudal clan system continue to exist in the form of fierce loyalties. *Rob Roy*, through his 'trade o' theft-boot, black-mail, spreaghs, and gill-ravaging' (p. 185),<sup>23</sup> attempts with some success to intercept and redirect a small part of this flow of wealth out of the Highlands. His practices of blackmail, extortion and plunder are distorted versions of the commercial exchanges practiced by tradesmen like Jarvie or merchants like William Osbaldistone.

April of 1817 saw the publication of the most important work of political economy since Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776)—David Ricardo's *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation*, which examines the economic relationships between landowners and capitalists. There is no evidence that Scott read Ricardo, but given that he lived through the same moment of economic crisis, it is perhaps not coincidental that *Rob Roy* represents feudalism and commerce as coexisting and interconnected socio-economic states, one epitomised by the landowner and the other by the capitalist. The novel explores these socio-economic states through two genres of romance: the gothic and the adventure story. The late eighteenth-century gothic, as E. J. Clery has argued, explores anxieties surrounding the ongoing transition from feudal society, in which wealth took the form of heritable land, to bourgeois society, in which it took the form of moveable property.<sup>24</sup> The horrors, real or imagined, of late eighteenth-century gothic romance often emanate from contested property—the castle, abbey or hall within which the heroine is confined and to the patrilineal inheritance of which she is often key. The gothic was considered a feminised and debased genre even though some of the best-known gothic romances were written by men, such as Scott's friend Matthew Lewis.<sup>25</sup> The adventure story, by contrast, would become in the course of the nineteenth century a distinctively masculine genre. A modern version of the chivalric quest, the adventure



story often takes as its protagonist a young man on the cusp of adulthood, and dramatises his loyalties, rivalries and love affairs, as he undertakes a quest to prove his worth not necessarily to the woman he loves, but to older men who wield power over him.<sup>26</sup> *Rob Roy* embodies the proximity of these two genres, which together structure its complicated plot.

The primary locus of the gothic in *Rob Roy* is Osbaldistone Hall, the Northumberland estate that belongs to Frank's uncle Hildebrand only because Frank's father William was disinherited after a family quarrel. Osbaldistone Hall is replete with hidden rooms and secret passages: Diana Vernon, who is a captive inmate, describes the building as a 'fearful prison-house' (p. 110). During his evening walks in the garden, Frank sees 'lights which gleamed in the library at unusual hours' along with 'passing shadows' and 'footsteps which might be traced in the morning dew from the turret-door to the postern-gate of the garden' (p. 136). As in Ann Radcliffe's novels, the servants attribute these phenomena to all kinds of supernatural causes. Frank more rationally assumes them to be produced by the visits of Diana's confessor, Father Vaughan. In contrast to the Protestant South, the North of England remained a strongly Catholic region well into the eighteenth century, and Scott, like his contemporaries, exploited Catholicism's gothic associations, including the Church's supposed tyranny over the minds of Catholics, supported by the perpetuation of superstition. Catholics were politically and economically marginalised by the penal laws, which may have provoked the region's participation in the 1715 Jacobite uprising.<sup>27</sup>

*Rob Roy*'s incorporation of gothic elements highlights the barbarism of the North of England. Were Catherine Morland to have read *Rob Roy*, she might have felt her belief in the persistence of gothic customs in the 'extremities' of England to be vindicated. Osbaldistone Hall's locality is untouched by the refinements introduced by commerce or the niceties of metropolitan society, and its situation in a 'Druidical grove of huge oaks' (p. 36) associates the family with ancient Britishness, as if it were the relic of an earlier age. Sir Hildebrand's boorish sons are like 'rough, unhewn masses of upright stones in Stonehenge, or any other druidical temple [...] heavy, unadorned blocks' (p. 43). Rather than evoking the spirituality associated with Stonehenge, Scott emphasises the sheer mass and durability of the Osbaldistone men. In addition to the massive stone 'blocks' of Stonehenge, the family name perhaps alludes to Osbald, an eighth-century king of Northumbria known for his violence and greed.<sup>28</sup> Until its gradual disintegration in the ninth through eleventh centuries, Northumbria comprised the North of England and South-East Scotland, so that when Frank's childhood nurse told him stories of the 'northern wars' between the Scots and the English, she was describing conflicts between people that were for several centuries of the same kingdom. In Mabel Robson's stories, however, the 'warlike' Scots played 'the parts which ogres and giants with seven-leagued boots occupy in the ordinary nursery tales' (pp. 30–31). To Mabel, and thus to the young Frank, Scots are the enemy—cunning and violent. Yet, the latter-day inhabitants of both Northumberland and Scotland are not very different from

these ‘ogres and giants’ of old, again suggesting an underlying similarity or even kinship between these antagonistic peoples.

Indeed, Northumberland of the early eighteenth century turns out to be almost as lawless as it was in the time of Mabel Robson’s tales. As Scott represents it, Northumberland is beyond the reach of centralised government. The rule of law—safeguard against the violence Catherine Morland fears—is attenuated here. Andrew Fairservice, the gardener at Osbaldistone Hall, explains:

‘The priests and the Irish officers, and the papist cattle that hae been sodgering abroad, because they durst na bide at home, are a’ fleeing thick in Northumberland e’en now, and thae corbies dinna gather without they smell some carrion [...] there’s naething but gun and pistol, sword and dagger, amang them [...]’ (p. 152)

Frank benefits from the attenuation of rule by law when, much to his surprise, he is accused of stealing important state papers from Morris, his fellow-traveller on the northern road. Diana accompanies him to visit the justice of the peace, noting, “you have no one to stand by you—you are a stranger, and here, in the outskirts of the kingdom, country justices do odd things” (p. 59). The Justice, a reformed Jacobite who more than occasionally regrets his allegiance to the new regime, is willing to let Frank go—an escape that surprises Frank less when he realises that, thanks in part to its distance from the seat of monarchical power, Northumberland is a Jacobite stronghold, and Diana, according to Andrew, is ‘the bitterest jacobite in the haill shire’ (p. 52). Diana’s familiarity with the lawlessness of the region enables her to assist Frank repeatedly, but she is also a victim of this lawlessness—or rather of a feudal social order in which the patriarchal authority embodied in her father and uncle replaces the rule of law and leaves her unprotected when the ‘perfidious’ Rashleigh attempts to seduce her (p. 111).

At Osbaldistone Hall, Frank occupies a feminised position, relying on Diana’s greater knowledge and decisiveness for direction. While his blockish cousins spend their days hunting and drinking, Frank spends most of his time alone or in the library conversing with Diana, of whom he is soon enamored. He exerts a great deal of effort fuming about his ‘reputation’, which he considers to have been ‘publicly attacked’ when his name is mixed up in the robbery of state papers from Morris (p. 124) and further endangered by his ‘correspondence’ with the mysterious Mr Campbell (p. 197). But although he regards himself as the victim of ‘infamous calumnies’, he is slow to take action to prove his integrity, particularly if it might involve leaving Osbaldistone Hall. When Diana comes across the translation of *Orlando Furioso* that Frank has been working on, she asks him “whether you could not spend your time to better purpose?” (p. 131). Initially and delightedly assuming that she means to encourage him to write his own verse rather than waste his talents on translation, Frank is mortified at ‘the childishness of my own conduct, and the superior manliness of Miss Vernon’s’ (p. 132) when she informs him that the credit of his father’s firm is in danger. Diana possesses the ‘courage and activity’ that Frank lacks, and she

readily acknowledges to him, “I belong, in habits of thinking and acting, rather to your sex, with which I have always been brought up, than to my own” (p. 110).

Thanks to her perspicacity, Diana often plays the part of Frank’s rescuer. At the same time, however, her own agency is much more limited than his; and, like more conventional gothic heroines, she is involved in a ‘series of nets, and toils, and entanglements’ (p. 79). Frank employs the language of magic to describe Diana’s odd position in the household, wondering: ‘Of what nature could those mysteries be with which she was surrounded as with an enchanter’s spell, and which seemed continually to exert an active influence over her thoughts and actions, though their agents were never visible?’ (p. 135) While it may seem mysterious to Frank, the ‘enchanter’s spell’ is no more than a patriarchal system that reduces women to objects of exchange: Diana’s father, a Catholic and a Jacobite, has decreed that she must either marry one of the Osbaldistone men or join a convent. Diana too resorts to the language of magic to explain her knowledge of circumstances that elude Frank and enable her to mysteriously extricate him from difficulties. For instance, she equips him for his journey to Glasgow with ‘a spell contained in a letter’, a packet that he must not open ‘until other and ordinary means have failed’ (p. 143). She ultimately fulfils the aim of Frank’s foray into the Highlands when she delivers to him the papers that Rashleigh had taken from the house of Osbaldistone and Tresham, explaining that she would have brought him ‘these representatives of commercial wealth’ sooner, ‘but there were giants and dragons in the way’ (p. 285). Again, the supernatural becomes a metaphor for obstacles that she cannot describe directly: her giants and dragons are the government troops that Rashleigh’s treachery has unleashed on the Highlands and that she and her father must elude.

Diana’s dual roles as Frank’s courageous rescuer and powerless gothic heroine—pawn of her father, uncle and blockish male cousins—highlight Scott’s transformation and even inversion of gothic conventions in *Rob Roy*. Fiona Robertson and Michael Gamer have shown that over the course of his literary career, Scott made a practice of selectively borrowing gothic conventions while distancing himself rhetorically from the gimmicks of this genre in its most popular forms, such as the novels that the Minerva Press spewed forth.<sup>29</sup> This practice contributed to what Ina Ferris has described as Scott’s remasculinisation of the novel, a genre that by the late eighteenth century had come to be associated with women writers and readers, and above all with romance.<sup>30</sup> In *Rob Roy* Scott further distances his fiction from the Minerva variety by incorporating the conventions of the masculine adventure story or quest narrative along with the feminised gothic romance. While these genres of romance turn out to be more proximate and even overlapping than Scott might have liked to acknowledge, the Highland section of *Rob Roy* moves the reader rhetorically away from the gothic realm of Osbaldistone Hall and into the world of commercial adventure.

While Osbaldistone Hall and its feudal traditions belong to the gothic, with its language of magic, the commercial speculations of the house of Osbaldistone and Tresham belong to the genre of the adventure story. In 1714, when the ac-

tion of *Rob Roy* takes place, the word ‘adventure’ could refer to what we would now describe as a ‘venture’—a financial risk or commercial enterprise.<sup>31</sup> To speculate, in the economic sense, is to court dangers, albeit of a different kind than a questing knight might encounter. Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe* (1719) is thus for Martin Green an archetypal adventure story. When Crusoe sails to Guinea, he takes with him ‘a small Adventure’ consisting of ‘Toys and Trifles’ which he ‘increased very considerably’ by selling them, and his financial speculations result in the shipwreck and ensuing events that we would now think of as his adventures.<sup>32</sup> In *Rob Roy*, too, adventure in the economic sense leads to Frank’s perilous undertaking in the Highlands.

Frank describes his father William as an adventurer in his commercial speculations. The elder Osbaldistone is ‘impetuous in his schemes, as well as skillful and daring’ a man to whom it is as ‘necessary [...] as to an ambitious conqueror, to push on from achievement to achievement’ (p. 10). Commerce offers him scope for his ‘active energies, and acute powers of observation’; for, as Frank explains, ‘in the fluctuations of mercantile speculation, there is something captivating to the adventurer, even independent of the hope of gain’ (p. 7). William intends Frank to ‘extend and perpetuate the wealthy inheritance’ he can offer his son; but Frank himself seems insensible to ‘the animating hazards’ of commercial pursuits (p. 10). Far from an adventurer, Frank is a homebody, preferring to translate the exploits of *Orlando Furioso* than to participate in his father’s commercial quests.

It is to save the credit of Osbaldistone and Tresham that Frank journeys north to Glasgow and onwards into the Highlands, enduring dangers and discomforts in an adventure that was not of his seeking. For he knows that, to his father, ‘mercantile credit’ is a form of ‘honour’: ‘if declared insolvent, [he] would sink into the grave, oppressed by a sense of grief, remorse, and despair, like that of a soldier convicted of cowardice, or a man of honour who has lost his rank and character in society’ (p. 142). Credit is to the modern commercial adventurer what honour once was to the questing knight, and Frank thinks more in terms of the latter than the former. When Frank speaks of restoring his father’s honour, Jarvie warns him:

‘I maun hear naething about honour—we ken naething here but about credit. Honour is a homicide and a bloodspiller, that gangs about making frays in the street, but Credit is a decent, honest man, that sits at hame and makes the pat play.’ (p. 207)

Honour belongs to the gothic and Jacobite world of aristocratic chivalry, and credit to the Whiggish world of commerce. Jarvie’s personification of credit as a staid man of regular habits might seem antithetical to the elder Osbaldistone’s adventurous spirit, but Jarvie’s willingness to join Frank on his journey into the Highlands suggests his awareness that adventures are as necessary to create and protect credit as they are to establish honour.

On the eve of the Jacobite rebellion, the Highlands are full of activity compared to the stasis of Osbaldistone Hall, even though the remnants of a

stagnant feudal social order are still visible there. The secretive furore of activity reminds us that, as Eric Richards has emphasised, the Highlands ‘were not simply the passive victim and receptor’ of economic developments initiated by southern metropolitan England; instead ‘they were a vital contributor’ to the eventual emergence of industrial capitalism.<sup>33</sup> Frank is initially surprised that ‘the mercantile transactions of London citizens should become involved with revolutions and rebellions’ in the far north of the country (p. 216) and finds it hard to believe that Rashleigh has made away with bills from his father’s house ‘merely to accelerate a rising in the Highlands, by distressing the gentlemen to whom these bills were originally granted’ (p. 215). His surprise indicates his ignorance of how far the power of credit extends. Jarvie must explain to him that Osbaldistone and Tresham has bought forested land from ‘some o’ the Highland lairds and chiefs’, to whom they ‘granted large bills in payment’ (p. 214). If Osbaldistone and Tresham fails, and the bills are not honoured by merchants in Glasgow, Jarvie informs Frank, “the stopping of your father’s house will hasten the outbreak that’s been sae lang baling us” (p. 215). According to Jarvie, Rob Roy himself lost ‘his living and land’ to creditors because he ‘was venturesome’ in his business dealings (p. 211). Like William Osbaldistone, albeit less successful, Rob Roy is a daring speculator—an adventurer.

Frank’s difficulty in unravelling the specifics of the commercial entanglement of Highland lairds with London merchants has been shared by generations of readers. The restoration of Osbaldistone and Tresham’s credit depends upon the recovery of a valise of papers the exact nature of which is never specified. Nassau Senior wrote in an 1821 review of the novel, ‘the whole business of the assets—what they were—the objects for which they were taken—the manner in which they are recovered, is one mass of confusion and improbability.’<sup>34</sup> We know only that they are important to Britain’s economic stability and political security. But their mystification encapsulates the way commerce is represented in the novel—as a powerful and inscrutable system that exceeds the individual’s control and understanding. It would seem, then, that commerce, as a kind of supernatural force, should belong in *Rob Roy* to the genre of the gothic, as it does in Jamison Kantor’s reading of *The Castle of Otranto*. In Walpole’s gothic, according to Kantor, ‘finance capital finds itself refigured as a new, unavoidable, supernatural apparatus from which characters attempt to flee, but to which they are hopelessly bound.’<sup>35</sup> The impossibility of locating in any one place or person the dominion of commerce contributes to the sense of foreboding that animates much of *Rob Roy*; however, the ‘finance capital’ represented in the mysterious bills or assets also belongs to the adventure narrative, driving Frank’s quest in the Highlands.

The proximity of the gothic and the adventure story as forms of romance is implied by the two characters who move most easily between them, and between the feudal and commercial modes of society with which these genres are respectively allied. Rashleigh Osbaldistone and Rob Roy belong equally to the novel’s gothic and adventure plots, and this, along with their outward deformati-

ties, and their shared capacity for disguise, signifies their status as doubles.<sup>36</sup> Rashleigh, with his designs on Diana's chastity, is in some ways a conventional gothic villain who wears his moral deformity in his person. He is 'bull-necked and cross-made,' with an 'imperfection in his gait' (p. 44). His expressions seem to change 'almost instantaneously from the expression of one passion to that of the contrary', like 'the sudden shifting of scene in the theatre, where, at the whistle of the prompter, a cavern disappears and a grove arises' (p. 102). Rashleigh's transition from the gothic world of Osbaldistone Hall into his position with Osbaldistone and Tresham is as sudden and as seamless as his changes of mood. Frank comes to regard Rashleigh as 'the great author of all ill' (p. 199) because he seems as much at ease in undertaking the 'education of a deserted orphan of noble birth [...] with the [...] purpose of ultimately seducing her' (p. 111) as he is in making Osbaldistone and Tresham's 'revenues and property the means of putting in motion his own ambitious and extensive schemes' (p. 133). In both situations, his aims are entirely 'selfish and unconscientious', making Frank's passivity seem positively benign by contrast.

Rob Roy is also adept at moving between feudal and commercial modes of life, and between the registers of gothic romance and adventure story. Like Rashleigh, Rob is 'for his ain hand' and will 'tak the side that suits him best' (p. 217). His Jacobitism stems from the belief that a Stuart restoration will further his own interests rather than from deep loyalty to a wronged monarch. Rob's appearance is as malleable as his principles. Frank first encounters Rob at an inn on the North Road, where he appears as Mr Campbell, a 'Scotch gentleman' and a 'dealer in cattle' (p. 29). When Frank sees Rob in his Highland dress, he can 'scarce recognize him to be the same person' as Campbell (p. 275). In his Highland garb, Rob Roy belongs to the gothic. His 'wild, irregular, and, as it were, unearthly' appearance reminds Frank

of the tales which Mabel used to tell of the old Piets who ravaged Northumberland in ancient times, who, according to her traditions, were a sort of half goblin half human beings, distinguished, like this man, for courage, cunning, ferocity, the lengths of their arms, and the squareness of their shoulders. (p. 187)

It is difficult enough for Frank to accept that the unknown and apparently undistinguished Mr Campbell might be able to help him resolve his father's difficulties, almost impossible for him to believe that Rob Roy—a quasi-supernatural being from 'ancient times'—can, as Rob himself puts it, 'stead your father in his extremity' (p. 188).

While Rob Roy and Rashleigh pass easily between feudal and commercial social orders, they belong fully to neither. To the extent that the novel reconciles these social modes and their literary corollaries, the gothic and the adventure story, it is through Frank. Rob Roy lives out his days in a liminal state, practising his distorted parodies of commercial exchange, and eventually acquiring 'to a certain degree, the connivance of government to his self-erected office of Protector of the Lennox, in virtue of which he levied black-mail with as much



regularity as the proprietors did their ordinary rents' (p. 342). By contrast, Rashleigh's death—fittingly at Rob Roy's hands—signifies his expulsion from both social systems. Having failed to bring down Osbaldistone and Tresham and instead betrayed his Jacobite allies to the government, Rashleigh attempts to recover what he regards as his rightful inheritance—Osbaldistone Hall and Diana Vernon's hand in marriage. When his plot is foiled, Rashleigh's dying words to Frank are a curse:

'in love, in ambition, in the paths of interest, you have crossed and blighted me at every turn. I was born to be the honour of my father's house—I have been its disgrace—and all along of you. My very patrimony has become your's [*sic*]—Take it [...] and may the curse of a dying man cleave to it.' (p. 341)

The speech is almost parodic in its villainous intensity, and yet, Rashleigh's curse seems to have some efficacy. For although Frank acquires Osbaldistone Hall, his father's rightful inheritance, he apparently has no children to inherit it or to listen to his story.

If, as Alexander Welsh has argued, the rightful inheritance of landed property signifies the perpetuation of tradition and the restoration of national stability in the Waverley novels, then the ending of *Rob Roy* would seem to depict the triumph of a feudal hierarchy that values honour over a commercial society that privileges credit. However, in fact Frank's inheritance reveals that the vagaries of commerce underlie all semblance of order in the modern nation state.<sup>37</sup> With its good standing restored, Osbaldistone and Tresham, along with other London 'bankers and eminent merchants [...] agreed to support the credit of the government and to meet that run upon the Funds, on which the conspirators had greatly founded their hope of furthering their undertaking, by rendering the government, as it were, bankrupt' (p. 317). The stability of George the First's government turns out to rest not on any kind of inherited authority, or even, as David Hume would have it, on custom. Rather it rests on 'credit', and it is thus as susceptible to sudden changes of fortune as any other house of business. Frank's father uses 'a great share of the large profits which accrued from the rapid rise of the funds upon the suppression of the rebellion' to pay off the 'large mortgages affecting Osbaldistone Hall', of which Frank, following the sudden death of Sir Hildebrand and his several sons, takes ownership. While Frank's father may be inspired by 'the experience he had so lately of the perils of commerce [...] to realize, in this manner, a considerable part of his property', his investment in Osbaldistone Hall suggests that commercial endeavour is necessary to sustain landed property. Frank is sent back to Northumberland to take possession of Osbaldistone Hall 'as its heir and representative of the family', but we learn that he also joins 'with heart and hand in his [father's] commercial labours' (p. 342), uniting the two social orders that he initially regarded as antithetical.

At the outset of his narrative, the young Frank expresses 'insuperable objections' to adopting his father's profession (p. 8), declaring himself uninterested in learning about 'emptions, orders, payments, receipts, acceptances, draughts,



commissions and advices' (p. 15). He prefers the army 'to any other active line of life' (p. 18), choosing a profession founded in honour to one grounded in credit. Yet he evinces the highest respect for 'the commercial character', which 'connects nation with nation, relieves the wants, and contributes to the wealth of all' (p. 14). But Frank's adventures seem to bring under thrall to the system of credit that underwrites his position as Lord of Osbaldistone Manor. By the end of his adventures, Frank has succumbed to the romance of commerce despite having witnessed that it does not in fact relieve the wants or contribute to the prosperity of all, but rather creates dramatic disparities in wealth across Britain. Hewitt attributes Frank's evident 'melancholia' at the time of writing his narrative to 'his perception of the cultural costs of the expansion of trade'; yet while readers may perceive these costs, it is unclear that Frank does.<sup>38</sup> Despite the 'checkered and varied feeling of pleasure and pain' that writing down the story of his adventures evokes in Frank (p. 3), he seems to have no sense of his privileged position in a global commercial system that renders some men wealthy landowners and others dispossessed outlaws, and no sense of how others' misfortune, debt or even dishonour might be the inadvertent by-product of Osbaldistone and Tresham's investments and speculations. Frank's self-absorption, Andrew Lincoln has shown, reveals a 'split between the benevolent ideology of commerce and the actual consequences of commercial activities' of which Frank remains unaware.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps, though, it is a mistake to expect such psychological development in a hero that, as Hewitt argues, is 'only a means by which we look at the condition of Britain'.<sup>40</sup> Frank's purpose is not to draw moral conclusions for readers, but rather to allow them to draw their own.

Patrick Brantlinger has described how the realist novel was a creature of 'credit' in at least two senses. First, it was a commodity, produced to be transformed into money in the increasingly capitalized and bourgeois literary marketplace. Second, it begged to be 'credited' or taken at face value as true.<sup>41</sup>

Although, as I have shown, *Rob Roy* incorporates varieties of romance, it nonetheless exemplifies Brantlinger's claims, suggesting that they may not be specific to realist fiction. Scott undoubtedly understood the novel's value as a commodity, and its first-person retrospective form invites readers to take Frank's story as true. As Nassau Senior remarked of *Rob Roy* a few years after its publication:

Nothing but the novel's being in the first person, so that the author appears bound to relate the events which his hero saw and heard, without detailing the steps by which they are brought about, could have enabled him to make it hang together, even with the small portion of plausibility which it now possesses.<sup>42</sup>

Yet, much as the seeming security of landed property is shown to rest upon volatile commercial investments, so the novel's truth claim rests in a stock convention of gothic romance: the found manuscript. 'Throw, then these sheets into some secret drawer of your escritoire', Frank instructs Will Tresham at


the beginning of his story, 'till we are separated from each other's society by an event which may happen at any moment' (pp. 5–6). By encouraging Will to lay aside the story in a 'secret drawer' until after its writer's death, Frank creates the conditions for a found manuscript that recalls Scott's story of coming across the incomplete manuscript of *Waverley* in his own drawer. This gothic convention underwrites *Rob Roy's* publication, as we are informed in the 'Advertisement' that the Author of *Waverley* 'received a parcel of Papers, containing the Outlines of this narrative' from 'his respectable Publishers' (p. 3).

It was through the sales of this thinly veiled fiction that Scott funded the enlargement of his own estate. In October of 1817, while nearing the end of his work on *Rob Roy*, Scott purchased another piece of land, writing to John Balantyne: 'I have closed with Usher for his beautiful patrimony, which makes me a great laird. I am afraid the people will take me up for coining. Indeed, these novels, while their attractions last, are something like it.'<sup>43</sup> Coining literally means to stamp metal into a coin, but figuratively it can mean making money rapidly and easily, or to fabricate, invent or counterfeit.<sup>44</sup> Scott's cryptic note implicitly compares his novels to coins—means of purchasing the land that he covets—but also suggests that they are counterfeit, and that his status as 'great laird' is also a fiction.

In representing his novels not just as a way to make money, but as money itself, Scott implies that they bear a certain resemblance to each other, just as coins must carry certain markings in order to pass as currency. This sameness was troubling to Scott insofar as it threatened to render him a writer of formula fiction, akin to the authors who published their works with the Minerva Press. While working on *Rob Roy*, Scott remarked anxiously in a letter to James Balantyne that 'the Highlands are rather a worn out subject'.<sup>45</sup> He feared that the literary market might be satiated with stories about Scotland and that sales of *Rob Roy* might suffer accordingly.

Scott's anxiety was reasonable, under the circumstances, even if he was largely responsible for creating the vogue for Scottish fiction in the first place. In the years between the publication of *Waverley* and *Rob Roy*, readers might have enjoyed the following novels, which announced their Scottish subjects in their titles: *Monriethe; or, the Peer of Scotland* (1814), *The Scotchwoman. A Novel* (1814), *The Saxon and the Gaël; or, the Northern Metropolis* (1814), *The Castle of Strathmay* (1814), *Clan-Albin: A National Tale* (1815), *Anna; or, Edinburgh* (1815), *The Lairds of Glenfern; or, Highlanders of the Nineteenth Century* (1816), *Howard Castle; or, a Romance from the Mountains* (1817), *Reft Rob; or, the Witch of Scot-Muir* (1817), *The Wife of Fitzalice, and the Caledonian Siren* (1817) and *Strathbogie; or, the Recluse of Glenmorris* (1817). These vividly titled novels, most of which were published by the Minerva Press, joined others that did not announce their Scottish subjects as boldly, including Scott's own *Guy Mannering; or, the Astrologer* (1815), *The Antiquary* (1816) and *Tales of my Landlord* (1817), as well as Mary Brunton's *Discipline* (1815).

Yet, the flooding of the market with Scottish fiction only seemed to increase demand, and the first print run of *Rob Roy*, consisting of 10,000 copies, brought in a net profit of almost of £127,000, of which Scott received half.<sup>46</sup> Readers perceived *Rob Roy* as at once similar enough to its predecessors to be recognisable as the work of the Author of *Waverley*, thereby satisfying those who wanted more, and different enough from them to be fresh and interesting. *Rob Roy*, in E. T. Channing's opinion, provided 'proofs on all hands that the author is not exhausted, that he has not yet forsaken invention and become an artisan'.<sup>47</sup> In other words, it was not merely a well-crafted copy of earlier novels by the Author of *Waverley*, or of other, inferior Scottish novels. The novel's title marks its difference from Scott's previous works, as it is the only one of the *Waverley* novels to be titled after a real person rather than an imaginary character. In this case, as in most others concerning the *Waverley* novels, financial need determined Scott's decisions. Scott titled the novel *Rob Roy* at the suggestion of Archibald Constable, who thought, correctly as it turned out, that the title would help it sell well.

Yet Rob Roy is hardly the protagonist of *Rob Roy*, even though Nicol Jarvie informs Frank that the outlaw's exploits "wad fill a buik, and a queer ane it wad be—as gude as Robin Hood or William Wallace—a' fu' o' venturesome deeds and escapes, sic as folk tell ower at a winter-ingle in the daft days" (p. 213). This is not the book that Scott wrote in 1817, although he added a lengthy preface recounting Rob Roy's 'venturesome deeds' to the *Magnum Opus* edition of 1830.<sup>48</sup> Still, Rob Roy does not appear in his own person until the middle of the novel, and the section set in the Highlands accounts for about one third of the whole. It's difficult to imagine that the novel would have fared as well had it been called *Osbaldistone*, but it remains the case that it is less about Rob Roy the culture-hero than about Rob Roy as symbol and victim of the continuities and conflicts between feudal and commercial orders, and of Scott's own ambivalent relationship to them. 

## NOTES

1. Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey and Other Works*, ed. by James Kinsley, John Davie and Claudia L. Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), p. 147.
2. See e.g. Donald Davie, *The Heyday of Walter Scott* (London: Routledge, 1961), pp. 56–64; Francis R. Hart, *Scott's Novels: The Plotting of Historical Survival* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1966), pp. 33–48; and A. O. J. Cockshutt, *The Achievement of Walter Scott* (London: Collins, 1969), pp. 153–70.
3. Walter Scott, *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since*, ed. by P. D. Garside (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), p. 77. Subsequent references to this edition will be made parenthetically in the text.
4. Ian Duncan, 'Primitive Inventions: *Rob Roy*, Nation, and World System', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 15.1 (2002), 81–102 <<https://doi.org/10.1353/ecf.2002.0061>> (p. 100). See also Andrew Lincoln, 'Scott and Empire: The Case of *Rob Roy*', *Studies in the Novel*, 34.1 (2002), 43–59.
5. Duncan, p. 96.

6. Ibid., p. 97.
7. See Lars Hartveit, 'Interaction between Genre and Social Content in Sir Walter Scott, *Rob Roy*', in *Papers on Language and Literature Presented to Alvar Ellegård and Erik Frykman*, Gothenburg Studies in English, 60, ed. by Sven Bäckman and Göran Kjellmer (Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1985), pp. 165–82; Anna Faktorovich, *Rebellion as Genre in the Novels of Scott, Dickens and Stevenson* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2013), pp. 28–29, 78–80 and 103–08; Fiona Robertson, *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), pp. 180–87.
8. Jane Millgate, *Walter Scott: The Making of the Novelist* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), p. 134.
9. Ibid., p. 146.
10. *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, ed. by H. J. C. Grierson, 12 vols (London: Constable, 1932–37), IV, 504.
11. Eric Hayle relates the complicated history of Scott's financial entanglements in *The Ruin of Sir Walter Scott* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1968)—see pp. 85–93 for Scott's dealings with Constable.
12. *Letters of Scott*, IV, 508.
13. In his review of John Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, Carlyle accused Scott of writing 'with the ardour of a steam-engine, that he might make £15,000 a-year and buy upholstery with it', evidence that 'his life was worldly, [and] his ambitions were worldly'. See Thomas Carlyle, 'Memoirs of the Life of Scott', *Westminster Review*, 6.2 (January 1838), 293–345.
14. Novels about the Clearances include Christian Isobel Johnstone's *Clan-Albin* (1815), Felix Macdonogh's *The Highlanders* (1824) and Susan Ferrier's *Destiny* (1830).
15. David Hewitt 'Rob Roy: Trade, Improvement, and the Destruction of "Native" Cultures', in *Literary Tourism, the Trossachs, and Walter Scott*, ed. by Ian Brown (Glasgow: Association for Scottish Literary Studies, 2012), p. 95.
16. Walter Scott, *Rob Roy*, ed. by David Hewitt (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008), p. 209 <<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748628384>>. Subsequent references to this edition will be made parenthetically in the text.
17. John Sutherland, *The Life of Walter Scott* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), p. 204.
18. *Letters of Scott*, IV, 477.
19. On various schemes to employ Highlanders evicted from their homes, see Eric Richards, *The Highland Clearances: People, Landlords and Rural Turmoil* (Edinburgh: Birlinn, 2000), pp. 40–53.
20. Malcolm Gray, *The Highland Economy 1750–1850* (London: Oliver & Boyd, 1957), pp. 155 and 181.
21. Richards, p. 327.
22. On *Rob Roy* and the Caribbean, see Carla Sassi's 'Sir Walter Scott and the Caribbean: Unravelling the Silences', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 47 (2017), 224–40 <<https://doi.org/10.1353/yes.2017.0003>>; and Lincoln, *passim*.
23. This passage translates roughly as 'practice of returning stolen goods to their owner in exchange for payment, blackmail, stolen herds of cows and roving plundering'.
24. E. J. Clery, *The Rise of Supernatural Fiction, 1762–1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 54–79 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511518997>>.

25. On the feminisation of the gothic, see Bradford K. Mudge, 'The Man with Two Brains: Gothic Novels, Popular Culture, Literary History', *PMLA*, 107.1 (1992), 92–104 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/462803>>.
26. See Martin Green, *Seven Types of Adventure Tale: An Etiology of a Major Genre* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), p. 70. Green discusses the Waverley novels' place in an Anglo-American tradition of adventure fiction on pp. 83–86.
27. See Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain 1689–1746* (London: Methuen, 1980), p. 118.
28. 'Osbald 1 (Male)', in *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* <<http://www.pase.ac.uk/jsf/persons/CreatePersonFrames.jsf?personKey=9863>> [accessed 23 November 2018].
29. Robertson, pp. 3–16; and Michael Gamer, *Romanticism and the Gothic: Genre, Reception, and Canon Formation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 165–80. Peter Garside demonstrates Scott's familiarity with at least some of the Minerva Press's novels in 'Walter Scott and the "Common" Novel', *Cardiff Corvey: Reading the Romantic Text*, 3.2 (1999), 1–9 <[http://www.romtext.org.uk/articles/cc01\\_n01/](http://www.romtext.org.uk/articles/cc01_n01/)> [accessed 23 November 2018].
30. Ina Ferris, *The Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History, and the Waverley Novels* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992) <<https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501734533>>.
31. *OED*: 'adventure' definition 7a.
32. Daniel Defoe, *Robinson Crusoe*, ed. by Michael Shinagel (New York: Norton, 1994), p. 14.
33. Richards, p. 33.
34. Nassau Senior, Review of *Rob Roy, Heart of Midlothian, Bride of Lammermoor, Legend of Montrose, Ivanhoe, The Monastery, The Abbot, and Kenilworth*, *Quarterly Review*, 26 (October 1821), 110.
35. Jamison Kantor, 'Horace Walpole and the Fate of Finance', *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation*, 58.2 (Summer 2017), 135–55 <<https://doi.org/10.1353/ecy.2017.0013>> (p. 137).
36. For a fuller discussion of Rob Roy's capacity for disguise, see Judith Wilt, *Secret Leaves: The Novels of Walter Scott* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), pp. 68–69.
37. Alexander Welsh, *The Hero of the Waverley Novels* (1963; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992). For Welsh, the Waverley protagonists' passivity aligns them with the inert forces of property, stability and tradition.
38. Hewitt, p. 96.
39. Lincoln, p. 49.
40. Hewitt, p. 88.
41. Patrick Brantlinger, *Fictions of State: Culture and Credit in Britain, 1694–1994* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 150 <<https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501711794>>.
42. Senior, p. 110.
43. *Letters of Scott*, v, 5.
44. *OED*: 'coin' v. 1a, 1c, 5b.
45. *Letters of Scott*, IV, 504.

46. See William St Clair, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 510.
47. Edward Tillery Channing, Review of *Rob Roy*, *North American Review*, 7 (July 1818), 184.
48. On the effects of this preface on the experience of reading the novel, see Jane Millgate, 'Scott as Annotator: The Example of *Rob Roy*', *The Bibliothek*, 12.4 (1985), 93–102.

### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

J. SHIELDS. 'The Romance of Commerce: *Rob Roy*, 1817–18', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.101>>.

### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 19 September 2019.





MANDEVILLE, MOURNING  
AND NATIONAL MYTHS  
William Godwin's Civil War Novel  
and the Use of History

*Richard Gough Thomas*



*MANDEVILLE, a Tale of the Seventeenth Century in England* (1817) is William Godwin's most conspicuously gothic novel. Morbid and stormy at almost every turn, the narrator's downward spiral is the very picture of narrative excess. John Gibson Lockhart reflected that all of Godwin's protagonists were in some way maniacs but that Mandeville was, 'more essentially and entirely a madman than either of his brethren.'<sup>1</sup> The novel's general atmosphere of gloom is punctuated with moments of the wild and grotesque, sometimes bordering on camp, yet this should not obscure a densely allusive and historically specific text that attempts to harness the gothic mode to depict the aftereffects of societal trauma. Charles Mandeville's journey from war orphan to scarred, bitter misanthrope is the author's window into the lasting effects of religious conflict on English culture.

Central to Godwin's novel is an indictment of English sectarianism, turning the anti-Catholic logic of the early gothic on its head by depicting a Protestant education as the seed of irrationality that ultimately leads to the narrator's downfall. The author had engaged with the issue of sectarianism before, albeit obliquely, in the drama *Abbas, King of Persia* (1801). By contrast, *Mandeville* is steeped in English (and Irish) history—most specifically the cultural memory of the English Dissenters, the religious sphere in which Godwin himself was raised. The Dissenters—a catch-all term used in the author's lifetime to describe all English Protestants who refused to accept the authority of the Church of England—were a community held together (despite their theological differences) by their grievances with both the Catholic and Anglican churches.

*Mandeville* is set during the Interregnum, the years between the execution of Charles I in 1649 and the restoration of Charles II in 1660, a key period in the history of English Dissent. We see Godwin's fascination with the civil war period throughout his work, from incidental hints in the names of fictional characters (Falkland, Fleetwood) to his later *History of the Commonwealth* and biography of Cromwell (1824–28). When he proposed *Mandeville* to the publisher Archibald Constable, the author had only recently completed *The Lives of Edward and John Philips* (1815), a biography of the nephews and pupils of Milton who were themselves radical religious writers in the mid-seventeenth century. Godwin was, of course, educated as a Dissenter and recalled reading an



illustrated edition of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (a central text in the history of British Protestant martyrdom) alongside children's works by John Newbery.<sup>2</sup> Godwin's later education and experience as a political writer, philosopher, and historian allowed him to acknowledge the formative influence of his education on his understanding of the world while also responding to it critically. Godwin's works of historical research reflect the author's interest in the cultural life of the period in question, and regularly consider the question of how individuals were shaped by ideas and events (a pioneering approach in history in Godwin's time).

*Mandeville* depicts post-civil war England as a society that wallows in its history of trauma, holding up both religious and secular martyrs as role models for the next generation. Godwin argued passionately (in the *Essay on Sepulchres*, 1809) that we should honour the *lives* of great men and women; *Mandeville* seems to argue that celebrating their *deaths* ultimately poisons the cultural life of the community. Martyrdom is not, obviously, an idea unique to English Dissent: Godwin's later religious writing condemns Christianity as a whole for its glorification of suffering but, in *Mandeville*, the author destabilises the English Protestant narrative of history. In Godwin's lifetime it was still common to claim England as a Protestant Israel, a chosen people united in their resistance to popery (eliding many of the nation's religious and cultural fault lines).<sup>3</sup> Both Anglicans and Dissenters (though perhaps Dissenters most strongly) venerated Protestant martyrs as symbols of that resistance, linking English history with Biblical and early Christian persecution, as a way of reinforcing the narrative of English Protestant exceptionalism in the popular imagination. Godwin's novel depicts this narrative as divisive rather than unifying, highlighting the complicated relationship between religious and political loyalties in the Interregnum period, and challenging both its anti-Catholic and anti-Dissenter implications. In undermining a national myth, the novel also implicitly questions how history itself is read. Like most of Godwin's novels, *Mandeville* uses a first-person narrative to explore the protagonist's psyche—but this has additional resonance in the context of the civil wars, the understanding of which was heavily shaped (in Godwin's time) by partisan memoir rather than any 'settled' historical consensus. *Mandeville* is an unreliable narrative that draws attention to unreliable historical narrative, foregrounding its most irrational and sectarian elements to prompt a reappraisal of the texts that inspired it.

The novel's tone is as dark and savage as its protagonist. Many of Godwin's other fictional works, either for adults or children, contain some note of playfulness or the absurd (the 'found document' conceit of *Imogen*, Withers' ridiculous poetry in *Fleetwood*). *Mandeville*, by contrast, is the author at his most saturnine. Godwin seems to have found it a difficult book to write: he initially proposed a novel to Archibald Constable in December 1815, did not receive a contract until April the following year, and would not finish the work until the end of October 1817. Godwin's diary records bouts of giddiness and sickness during the writing period which, though not as serious as those of later years, usually indicate that the author was under significant stress.<sup>4</sup> The writing was punctu-

ated by the deaths of four significant figures in the author's life. The first was Godwin's one-time patron, the playwright and politician Richard Brinsley Sheridan, in July 1816. Sheridan's death seems to have affected Godwin greatly, and the author's diary notes a series of visits to the playwright's grave. October that year saw the disappearance and suicide of Godwin's adopted daughter, Fanny. Godwin's letters to Percy Shelley reflect the great sadness he must have felt, though all parties conspired to hush up Fanny's death (as was often the norm in such cases). Harriet Shelley's suicide came only a few weeks later. Godwin's great friend, the Irish MP John Philpott Curran, died as Godwin was finishing the novel in October 1817. The novel is dedicated to Curran as 'the sincerest friend I ever had'.<sup>5</sup> It does not, of course, follow that these bereavements gave *Mandeville* its gothic tone—we give Godwin too little credit as an imaginative writer if we assume a direct relationship between his life and work—but there is an obvious symmetry between a grieving author and the novel's use of both personal and national grief.

Charles Mandeville's life is marked over and over again by tragedy. His parents are murdered in the Irish rebellion of 1641, the protagonist himself rescued by a (Catholic) servant and taken to England by the man who will become his boyhood tutor—the fire-and-brimstone chaplain, Hilkiah Bradford. Charles is raised in the home of his uncle Audley, a recluse who nurses his own tragic story, but it is Hilkiah who provides the boy with a father figure. As Hilkiah's sole pupil, Charles is fully immersed in his tutor's own school of apocalyptic (and virulently anti-Catholic) Christianity. The one moment of brightness in Charles's dark and lonely early childhood is the brief visit of his younger sister, Henrietta, who has been raised in a happier home by their mother's friends. Hilkiah dies not long after, and Charles is sent away to school. At Winchester College, Charles's seriousness and reserve are viewed with suspicion. Charles is ostracised, bullied, and politically othered by his peers—dragging him into the constantly shifting political and religious factionalism of the age. Predominantly from Cavalier (Episcopalian and Royalist) families, the boys brand Charles a Presbyterian (the faction they accuse of starting the civil wars, now allied with the Cavaliers against Cromwell). He is further shamed when a book of anti-Royalist satire is found in his chamber—in reality the property of his Presbyterian roommate, Waller. He is spared further ignominy by the judgment of the school prefect, Clifford, for whom Charles develops a lifelong enmity. Throughout the rest of his life, Charles remains an outsider. Though his deep-seated anger attracts the likeminded Lisle and the manipulative Holloway, Charles's only real emotional bond is with Henrietta. Clifford, always a shining mirror to Charles's darkness, continually reappears to (unwittingly) thwart the protagonist's desires. Charles's disappointments are often accompanied by episodes of madness, explosions of misanthropic frustration that only Henrietta is able to calm. Charles is finally broken by the twin blows of Clifford's conversion to Catholicism (for which he receives only honours) and engagement to Henrietta. Attempting to prevent

the marriage by abducting his sister, Charles is wounded by Clifford and left with a gruesome scar to remind him of his failure.

\* \* \*

In his preface, Godwin credits Charles Brockden Brown's *Wieland* (1798) with 'the impression, that first led me to look with an eye of favour upon the subject here treated' (*Mandeville*, 62).<sup>6</sup> Though Godwin does not explain this reference, we might read it on two levels: the most obvious common theme of both novels is an implicit link between extreme religious conviction and madness, but we might also observe that in both cases these traits are passed from father to 'son'. Brown has Theodore Wieland inherit his father's strangeness; Godwin, always more concerned with the effects of environment on character, has Charles recognise Hilckiah as the true author of his spiritual self, with all the fanaticism that this entails (p. 141). We see the chaplain through Charles's eyes. Our narrator tells us of his respect for this severe but righteous man of god, but the details of his description imply something more sinister: an 'emaciated' man with no hint of healthy colour in his skin, Hilckiah's eyes sparkle with 'primitive and apostolic fury' at the mention of Catholicism (pp. 110 and 115). The chaplain's obsessions are rooted in prophecy and mysticism, searching for numerological meaning in the number 666, to the extent that even the protagonist is concerned for his tutor's mental health. The preoccupations that Charles develops are more mundane. With Hilckiah's encouragement, the protagonist studies a gruesomely illustrated edition of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*:

The representation of all imaginable cruelties, racks, pincers and red-hot irons, cruel mockings and scourgings, flaying alive, with every other tormenting method of destruction, combined with my deep conviction that the beings thus treated, were God's peculiar favourites [...] produced a strange confusion and horror in my modes of thinking. (p. 121)

Charles absorbs much of his tutor's anti-Catholic language, but it is the idea of martyrdom that truly takes root in his brain. Our narrator develops an obsessive interest in his own demise, imagining progressively more horrific deaths for himself as time goes on. More than simply a young man's morbid imagination, Hilckiah's tutelage has impressed upon Charles the idea that such an end is a glorious demonstration of piety and devotion. We might infer that this is the sentiment that encourages him to commit to Colonel Penruddock's rebellion:

[Penruddock's] countenance bespoke the purity of his heart, and expressed in striking lineaments the steadiness of a martyr. I afterwards understood, that he had had two brothers, older than himself, who had fallen in the civil wars, fighting for the late king; and he therefore regarded himself as a person consecrated and set apart, to avenge their fate, or to follow their illustrious example. (p. 199)

Narratorial hindsight seems to recognise that the Colonel's mission is doomed, Charles asserting Penruddock's nobility alongside a reference to the humiliating

nature of his death. On reflection, the narrator sees Penruddock's naivety—expecting to seize the county without bloodshed, not understanding the factionalism amongst his own allies—but it is not clear whether the younger Charles was able to intuit this. The protagonist makes an immediate personal connection with Penruddock ('now for the first time I had found a friend') and more than once calls him a martyr (p. 200). We might speculate that Charles's sudden and passionate commitment to the Colonel and his cause is born out of a need to find a cause to die for. This would at least help to characterise Charles's extreme reaction to being supplanted by Clifford in the role of Penruddock's secretary. The narrator's (at this point unstated) anti-Catholicism might also play a role: Penruddock opines that Sir Joseph Wagstaff's veto of the (Presbyterian) Charles's appointment might herald proscriptions against non-Catholics in the future.

Yet there is a hint that the narrator understands that Clifford denied the younger Charles the chance to die alongside his friend, describing it as the frustration of having the door of opportunity slammed in his face. As Clifford comes to Charles to seek forgiveness for having taken the younger man's place, Charles rages and flies from him. Unable to articulate how his honour has been wounded, the protagonist retreats again into misanthropy, but looking back on the incident as narrator realises that:

He came to me, spurred forward by all the purest sentiments that can inform a human heart. He pitied me; he loved me. Clifford was a being of no mean discernment; and he had had ample opportunity of observing my character at Winchester. He had generously resolved, that I should not perish by any mistake that it was in his power to set right. (p. 212)

Whether or not Clifford consciously takes Charles's place in a doomed expedition is not clear, but implicit in the narrator's account is the sense that his rival is the better martyr. Charles has only fury to offer—Clifford shares Penruddock's compassion, and is thus a more fitting companion for the ill-fated commander.

Charles's understanding of martyrdom is not purely religious. Penruddock commits himself to a tragic end because of a (perceived) duty to his fallen brothers. He is not alone in this. Godwin portrays Interregnum England as a place haunted by the sacrifices of previous generations: Charles's home, Mandeville House, is essentially a monument to his uncle Audley's lost love. Henrietta describes the silent and gloomy manse as 'one of the Pyramids of Egypt; and its master is like a deceased prince I have somewhere read of, whose body rose at a certain hour every night out of its coffin' (p. 136). Audley lives in perpetual mourning for his cousin, Amelia Montfort, the childhood sweetheart who was forced to marry another. After Amelia's death in childbirth, Audley arranged for her to be entombed at Mandeville House but his overwhelming grief prevents him from visiting her memorial. Sadness, the narrator tells us, has become Audley Mandeville's entire identity. The mother of Charles's Oxford contemporary, Lisle, is similarly defined by her grief. The historical Sir George Lisle was summarily executed for his part in the 1648 siege of Colchester, becoming

a (secular) royalist martyr in the popular discourse of the time.<sup>7</sup> Sir George's widow goes to great lengths to impress his memory upon her son.

It was her daily purpose, to fill his bosom with her own sentiments, and those of his deceased father. [...] All this had a strange effect upon his youthful mind. His mother spoke to him every day of the parent he had lost, and never without tears. A thousand times, while a child, he had mingled his tears with hers, from the mere uncontrollable force of sympathy. (p. 214)

We also learn that, while her son is allowed out to school, Lady Lisle herself has chosen never again to see the sun and speaks to no one but her son and a fellow widow with a story similar to her own. The family's veneration of Sir George and the late king is explicitly religious in tone ('Charles the First was his God') painting Cromwell in the most monstrous colours. The effect on young Lisle is corrosive.

Sometimes we would sit silent together for hours, like what I have heard of a Quaker's meeting; and then, suddenly seized with that passion for change which is never utterly extinguished in the human mind, would cry out as by mutual impulse, Come, now let us curse a little! In the art of cursing we were certainly no ordinary proficient; and if an indifferent person could have heard us, he would probably have been considerably struck, with the solemnity, the fervour, the eloquence, the richness of style and imagination, with which we discharged the function. (p. 217)

The narrator compares the quality of their hatred. Lisle, raised by a mother who cherished him, hates out of love for those whom his enemies have wronged. Charles imagines himself 'withered [...] dried, and stiffened', a misanthrope because he has never had the chance to feel love for another (p. 218). Their morbidity (Lisle can recite the details of his father's death) and capacity for hatred are the only things the duo actually share. They differ even over the proper object of their hatred (Charles' bitter anti-Catholicism might be problematic for Lisle's particular form of royalism were he to actually engage with it). For all their differences, however, they have had the same education: they have been taught to revere the dead for having died, and have come to regard death as an honour in itself. Lisle is quite literal in this, referring to the execution of Penruddock and his fellow conspirators as an 'honourable sentence [...] which every man who draws his sword in the cause of virtue should be prepared to meet' (p. 226). Charles seems to accept his logic. It might seem that such an upbringing is an inevitable consequence of the trauma around them. The psychic and cultural wounds of the civil wars are still bleeding, as episodes such as Penruddock's rebellion remind us. Not every character is so negatively affected, however. Those characters that escape the cycle of mourning and martyrdom have been taught reverence for life, rather than death.

Clifford's father fell at Edge Hill, the first pitched battle of the civil wars. Clifford's mother, like Lisle's, declines to take a new husband despite the (gen-

teel) poverty that this consigns them to. Bright and charismatic, at school Clifford dismisses the importance of wealth and status in favour of independence. Even as a boy, Charles saw this as naive but could only look on in horror as his schoolfellows adopted Clifford's sentiments uncritically. As an adult, Clifford is more pragmatic (Charles sees it as hypocritical) but his bravery, honesty, and generosity of spirit mean that he is welcomed in places where Charles is only tolerated. The narrator tells us nothing about Clifford's life before school. The boy's social grace suggests he did not have Charles's cloistered childhood, but (in contrast to the novel's other major male characters) we have no sense of what the young Clifford was taught about his father's death. Perhaps the point is simply that there is nothing remarkable to tell. Clifford has no legend to live up to and no grisly end to dwell on.

Henrietta has less control over her own destiny but, like Clifford, has avoided the scars of emotional trauma that mark so many others. Charles describes Beaulieu as Edenic, but the New Forest idyll where Henrietta is raised is not a place untouched by the wars. As Henrietta's guardians (the Willises and the Montagus) are introduced, the narrator explains that the late Lord Montagu died a political prisoner and that his grandson would one day die fighting the Dutch (in 1665). Nor is Beaulieu obviously a retreat from the world in a general sense, as Mandeville House so clearly is. Henrietta and the younger Montagus have not been conspicuously sheltered from the reality of the civil war world but, as Charles writes of his sister's home, 'Every thing I saw was frank, and easy, and communicative, and sensitive, and sympathetic' (p. 150). Under (implicitly) the tutelage of Mrs Willis, Henrietta has imbibed a dramatically different philosophy to her brother:

We know not what destiny is reserved for us. But we shall meet it with quick imaginations and a beating bosom; and the disappointment of all that have gone before us, will not prevent us from anticipating joy, with as sanguine a spirit, as inspired the first man, before history had yet written one solitary page of warning and example. (p. 136)

It can be no coincidence that Godwin allows both Clifford and Henrietta (the characters least harmed by the past) the space to articulate some kind of philosophy. Henrietta's monologue in the novel's second volume is remarkable for Godwin's conscious use of anachronism: the quotations peppered throughout the rest of the text are very deliberately chosen to create the impression of the narrator looking back from a specific point in time, but Henrietta's sermon to her brother quotes a passage from Shaftesbury not published until 1711 (the author confesses to this deliberate prolepsis in an endnote). Henrietta (paraphrasing Shaftesbury) argues for a form of universal benevolence, expressed as simple gratitude for the benefits of being in society. She goes on to advocate a form of determinism, then stoicism. Tilottama Rajan has argued that Henrietta's philosophy is incoherent, a bricolage of early Enlightenment platitudes (*Mandeville*, 243–35 [editor's footnotes]). If so—and in this scene, Henrietta does appear to try a range of arguments in the hope of leading Charles away



from his misanthropy—it would seem to complicate a straightforward reading of Henrietta as the novel's moral centre. Godwin uses a similar strategy in *Fleetwood*: the protagonist's advisors are well-intentioned, but their advice is not unproblematic. The same is true in *Mandeville*. Henrietta is the most significant character in the novel to display the moral and emotional resources to live a positive and happy life. Her advice is forgiving, forward-looking, and genuine, yet ultimately ineffective. While Charles submits to his sister's guidance when she is close at hand, he rapidly veers away from it when he is left to his own devices. The protagonist is easily led and quick to accept direction that reinforces his existing worldview, as evidenced by his hostility to but eventual dependence on Holloway and Mallison (who stoke his hatred for Clifford). It does not matter how genuine or how caring Henrietta's advice is, because it comes from a place alien to Charles's experience and she lacks the empathy and wisdom necessary to reach him. Henrietta, perhaps, repeats the lessons that resonated with her but has not yet understood that they do not constitute a consistent philosophy, or that they are unlikely to make a lasting impression on her unforgiving, saturnine, brother. In the end, however, Henrietta's counsel is benign and offers a stark contrast to the bitter and paranoid culture that Charles encounters everywhere else.

In a more general sense, Henrietta's philosophy speaks to a tension that runs throughout Godwin's work: our understanding is shaped by what has gone before (people in the present are shaped by culture and experience in the past) but we must look forward (imagine new things) if we are to do anything more than repeat the mistakes of our ancestors. Charles has been shaped by sectarianism and political vendetta. Rejected or suspected by royalists for being 'the wrong kind of Protestant', Charles is encouraged to turn more and more violently against Catholicism while maintaining his loyalty to the (crypto-Catholic) House of Stuart, a problem which the narrator acknowledges but sees no way to resolve (p. 329). The protagonist is caught between contradictory causes, a crisis made existential by the belief that the proper way to commit to something is to die for it. Clifford, by contrast, lives for the things he believes in: he aids in the escape of the other conspirators rather than dying with Penruddock. Clifford is depicted as taking a pragmatic attitude to sectarianism, converting to Catholicism because it will allow him to do more good (with an inheritance) than he could as a poor Episcopalian. The narrator suggests that Clifford's Protestant upbringing was no more than an accident of history, striking a typically Godwinian note about the importance of deeds over arbitrary loyalties (p. 333). These sentiments had a contemporary resonance when the novel was published. Dissenters and Anglicans still commemorated their historic resistance to Catholicism (Godwin had been a member of the Revolution Society, formed on the centenary of James II's overthrow in 1688) while Anglicans attempted to exclude Dissenters from public life with the same logic that they excluded Catholics (the nation could not expect loyalty from people whose religious and political allegiances were not vested in the same object). Godwin's friend John Philpot

Curran, to whom the novel is dedicated, saw this acutely. An Irish Protestant who, as a barrister, defended Catholics from Protestant abuses and vocally supported Irish home rule, Curran was regularly forced to contend with the most offensive legal inequalities and regarded the government's management of them as a deliberate strategy of 'divide and rule' (pitting Protestant against Catholic to deny rights to both).<sup>8</sup>

The novel greatly simplifies the religious divisions of the Commonwealth era. The controversies over episcopacy and independent worship that had rocked Britain since at least the 1630s were, to a significant degree, battles for the heart and soul of the established church. Godwin does not give names to the many political and theological factions within the English (and Scottish) church at the time, presenting instead the very personal conflict between Mandeville and Clifford under nominal religious 'flags'. Charles, as narrator, does not articulate his own religious position and Hilckiah's creed is characterised largely by its anti-Catholicism alone.<sup>9</sup> The protagonist's own sectarianism lies dormant until it is stoked. As narrator, Charles reports his mentor's teachings (and describes his own internal rebellion against them) but usually describes the Catholics he encounters in neutral terms. Charles's anti-Catholicism only erupts when others provoke it: Lisle encourages him to give voice to his misanthropy; Mal-lison seeks to use Charles's hatred of Clifford to his own advantage. In either case, Hilckiah's lessons give Charles's hatred a language, but the sectarian 'mode' appears more an inflection to his unfocused anger than the source of it. The episode at Oxford seems to illustrate this. Though the narrator describes how he poured down curses on the Catholic church, he could not voice the true object of his hatred—Clifford.

Oh, if I could have pronounced the name of Clifford, if I could have told the griefs that had flowed to me from him, if I could have given vent to the various emotions he had excited within me, I should have become a different man [...] (p. 221)

In 1817, the Protestant Dissenting Deputies (the elected committee of representatives from London Dissenting congregations) resolved to mount a new campaign against the Test and Corporation Acts that excluded non-Anglicans from public life. Godwin had been on the edge of such a campaign in 1790; if he was aware of this one he does not seem to have noted it (he would declare himself retired from 'practical politics' to Lady Caroline Lamb in early 1819).<sup>10</sup> Sectarian violence was, however, on his mind while he wrote *Mandeville*: over 5-6 July that year he read Maria Edgeworth's *Harrington* (1817), which culminates in a recreation of the Gordon Riots of 1780. The Gordon Riots were certainly sparked by a public backlash against the erosion of anti-Catholic legal 'protections' but were just as certainly underwritten by unemployment, inflation, and inequality—forces harder to name (or confront) than the Catholic other.

The second work that Godwin refers to in his preface is Joanna Baillie's tragedy *De Monfort* (1798). Representing 'hatred' in Baillie's series on the passions, Godwin saw the play twice during its initial run in 1800 and studied the printed text during the writing of *Mandeville*.<sup>11</sup> Many of the elements that drive the novel towards its conclusion (Charles's possessive love for Henrietta and one-sided rivalry with Clifford) are drawn directly from Baillie's play. *De Monfort* is a more consciously schematic text than Godwin's novel, however, at least in its published version. Baillie's preface to the volume is a philosophically-inclined discourse on human nature, roughly as long as one of the plays it precedes. *De Monfort* itself is structured in such a way as to present a discussion of its own themes: the play's major confrontation takes place in act three, and the murder happens off-stage in act four. The fifth and final act explores the crime's emotional fallout; the final scene allows each of the surviving characters to offer comment on how hatred had affected the title character emotionally, socially, and physically. What few ambiguities remain are settled by *De Monfort*'s sister, Jane, who provides the play's closing statement. By contrast, *Mandeville* is much more dependent on the reader. We are dragged along with the story and are offered little space within the text to reflect on what is happening, Godwin's use of the first person forces the reader to take their own critical stance (outside the text) on Charles' narrative. Going beyond a merely unreliable narrator, Charles' wild irrationality actively discourages the reader from taking his story at face value. If Godwin's musings on the 'moral' and 'tendency' of literary works in *The Enquirer* (1797) offer us some insight into his theory of fiction then it is possible to read *Mandeville*, not as an homage to *De Monfort*, but as a challenge to it. In *The Enquirer*, Godwin argues that a text may purport to say something (it may offer a moral) but the act of reading is inescapably one of interpretation. The reader draws inference from the overall tendency of the work, and thus draws their own conclusions about its meaning. If this is the case, then a work such as *De Monfort* appears to pre-emptively police its own interpretation: it is clear what conclusions we are supposed to draw from the play. *Mandeville* provides comparatively little scaffolding of this kind. Though it is arguably difficult to dismiss certain intended readings within the novel (it is abundantly clear that the adult Charles is mentally ill, for example), we are relatively free to interpret the novel's themes.

It is worth noting that, although Godwin refers to 'hints' that he received from *Wieland* and *De Monfort*, the author is vague about what he has taken from each. Where Baillie's preface is relatively clear about the conceptual aims of the collected plays, Godwin's offers only anecdotal comments on how the novel came to be written. For Godwin, this is atypical: *Imogen* uses its preface as a framing device that playfully foreshadows some of the author's literary indulgences; the original (cancelled) preface to *Caleb Williams* stresses the novel's contemporary political relevance; *St Leon*'s preface is an addendum to *Political Justice* with obvious relevance to the novel itself; *Fleetwood*'s insists that the novel be read as social commentary rather than a pathology, and Godwin

would return to the ‘preface as argument’ in *Cloudesley*. None of this is to claim that the preface to any of Godwin’s novels is an outright statement of the work’s meaning (such a thing would be completely at odds with the author’s view of literature) but rather that they often indicate the spirit in which the book has been written. Perhaps Godwin’s nods to Brown and Baillie are intended to do this in the most gentle way, but it is interesting to observe that *Deloraine* (1833) follows the same model as *Mandeville*, and notably *Deloraine* also centres on an almost wholly unsympathetic, unreliable, narrator. It seems possible that Godwin (in *Mandeville*) consciously eschews comment on the novel’s themes so as not to signpost a ‘correct’ reading. The author’s reasons for doing so may not have been entirely literary—his introductions to both *Fleetwood* and *St Leon* were used against him by hostile critics and the family was still the subject of scandalous (Shelley-based) rumours—but if so, this necessity coincides with Godwin’s literary theory.

According to Godwin’s theory, an author’s attempts to dictate the meaning of their work are futile. Even the most explicit statement can be read quixotically, and many texts are remarkable for things they do not say, rather than for things they do. What an author can do is attempt to convey emotional truth, to depict the life of a fictional character’s mind in a way that is relatable to the reader. As Godwin argues throughout his critical writing, fiction can offer greater insight into character than any historical record while providing better moral instruction than any didactic text. An invented psychology, if believable to the reader, can portray the twists and turns of the human mind more ‘accurately’ than an author speculating about a real person’s thoughts. The author’s essay ‘Of History and Romance’ (1797) expounds upon this:

Romance, then, strictly considered, may be pronounced to be one of the species of history. The difference between romance and what ordinarily bears the denomination history, is this. The historian is confined to individual incident and individual man, and must hang upon that his invention or conjecture as he can. The writer collects his materials from all sources, experience, report, and the records of human affairs; then generalises them; and finally selects, from their elements and the various combinations they afford, those instances which he is best qualified to portray, and which he judges most calculated to impress the heart and improve the faculties of his reader.<sup>12</sup>

The moral value of literature (be it fictional or historical) in part stems from the reader’s opportunity to vicariously and empathetically share the experience of others. Learning about other people’s lives provides us with the material to reappraise our own. Earlier in the same essay, Godwin writes:

It is only by comparison that we come to know any thing of mind or ourselves. We go forth into the world; we see what man is; we enquire what he was; and when we return home to engage in the solemn act of self-investigation, our most useful employment is to produce the materials we have collected abroad, and, by a sort of magnetism, cause

those particulars to start our to view in ourselves [*sic*], which might otherwise have laid for ever undetected.<sup>13</sup>

Literature allows us to venture far further abroad than we might otherwise, even into situations we could not possibly experience for ourselves. In his preface to *Bible Stories* (1802) Godwin is clear that we can learn as much from the fantastic as we can from the realistic, and that the imaginative exercise that the fantastic affords is crucial in developing our ability to see beyond our existing experience. The psychological 'delve' of the first-person narrative is an example of this: it is impossible for us to know what goes on inside someone else's head, but fiction allows us to explore the idea of it. From this, however, there is a tension that Godwin does not openly acknowledge: an autobiographical account has the potential to be a psychologically faithful record of real events, and thus offer a better insight than either a fictional creation or a historian's reconstruction. We would obviously be wise to read such a text sceptically, even if we could establish its honesty, with an eye to sifting through the self-deceptions and rationalisations that a subjective narrative would struggle to escape. Yet even a dishonest text could be revealing and instructive, if read critically.

In the case at hand (that is, the history of the civil wars and the Interregnum) the two major texts available to readers in Godwin's lifetime were the Earl of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* (published 1702–04), and the *Memoirs* of the parliamentarian Edward Ludlow (published 1698–99). Neither work was the first to document the period, the best-known earlier work being Bulstrode Whitelocke's *Memorials of the English Affairs from the Beginning of the Reign of Charles I* (1682), a notoriously dry text, but one which reprints a wealth of period documents. Clarendon and Ludlow's works have parallel claims to authority: Clarendon was party to many of the major events of the period as an advisor to both the executed Charles I and his son. Ludlow, by contrast, served as one of the judges at Charles I's trial (though later broke with Cromwell after the Protector dismissed parliament in 1653). Clarendon's book mixes personal memoir with an authoritative but clearly partisan historical narrative. He began to write a history of the conflict in the mid-to-late 1640s but left it unfinished, returning to it after his banishment in 1668 and incorporating material from his separately-written autobiography. It is clearly coloured by contemporary concerns. Clarendon foregrounds his loyalty to the crown despite his exile, while criticising the late king's (pragmatic) compromise on religious issues as a warning to his successors. Ludlow's *Memoirs* offer a much more personal narrative of the period than Clarendon's *History*. A bestseller at the turn of the eighteenth century, the book remained a key parliamentarian account of the civil wars for some 250 years. Ludlow's work seemed ahead of its time, offering a thoughtful commentary on political (though not so much religious) issues at the turn of the eighteenth century, despite the author having died in 1692. What was suspected at the time, but not proven until the late twentieth century, was that Ludlow's work had been re-shaped by an anonymous editor to fit the concerns of period Whigs. When a Ludlow manuscript was uncovered



at Warwick Castle in 1970 (a substantial autobiographical fragment detailing events later than those found in the *Memoirs*, but overlapping with them) it became clear that the 1698–99 volumes had been both ruthlessly abridged and heavily rewritten. The *Memoirs* present their author as a measured and mostly secular observer who placed patriotism and liberty ahead of religious conviction: in short, a model Whig whose resistance to the rule of both the Stuarts and Cromwell offered lessons during the reign of William III. The manuscript, entitled *A Voyce from the Watch Tower*, reveals a passionately spiritual Ludlow who justifies his actions and beliefs with Biblical citations. In a typical passage, he explains Charles I's crimes:

That he was an enemy to the Commonwealth, appears in that he was a supporter of all corrupt interests who united themselves to extirpate what was most deare to the good people of the nation, either as men or Christians; and not only so, but in appropriating to himselfe those powers and attribuits which are only due to the Lord, thereby doing what in him lay to make God their enemy; the people being oftentimes punished for the sins of the magistrate, 2 Kng. 23, 26, 1 King 18. 18, 15 Jer. 4.<sup>14</sup>

The historian Blair Worden's detailed study of Ludlow's manuscript and the *Memoirs* attributes the revisions to the freethinker John Toland (biographer of Milton, James Harrington, and Algernon Sidney), an author whom Godwin had no doubt been reading since his student days in the 1770s.<sup>15</sup> We know that Godwin read both Clarendon and Ludlow's *Memoirs*, with references in Godwin's diary dating back as far as the 1790s (he refers to Clarendon and Whitelocke in 'Of History and Romance').<sup>16</sup> The author took an acute interest in the historiography of the civil wars, reading extensively in this area since at least 1804. John Oldmixon's *Clarendon and Whitlock Compared* (1727) appears in the catalogue of books Godwin owned, and his diary contains references to Oldmixon (though not explicitly this text) in the period he is writing and researching his biography of the Philippses.<sup>17</sup> Godwin may have suspected that Ludlow's *Memoirs* had been rewritten. Even from its initial publication, critics had alleged that the work had been doctored or fabricated. Some pointed to the translator Isaac Littlebury as the editor, among them later the Whig philanthropist Thomas Hollis (1720–74).<sup>18</sup> Hollis's close friend and eventual heir, Thomas Brand, was in turn a friend to Godwin. Toland was suggested by others, and the first edition of Ludlow's *Memoirs* held at the Bodleian library contains an annotation to that effect (attributed to the antiquary Charles Godwyn, who bequeathed the volumes).<sup>19</sup> Godwin visited Oxford and the Bodleian while writing *The Lives of Edward and John Philips* (1815) but, since he owned his own copy of Ludlow, it seems unlikely that the author consulted the specific tome in question.<sup>20</sup> A similar note has been added to Toland's entry in a Bodleian-owned translation of Pierre Bayle's *Dictionary* though (frustratingly) Godwin's diary suggests that Godwin read Bayle at the British Museum rather than the Bodleian.<sup>21</sup> Godwin may have some knowledge of the history of



Whig publishing and pamphleteering, having been part of the trade himself in the 1780s: one of the author's Juvenile Library pseudonyms (Edward Baldwin) seems to nod towards Richard and Abigail Baldwin, Whig publishers active in the 1690s, associated with 'Calves-Head Club' republicans such as the Philips brothers, Littlebury, and Toland. While composing *Mandeville* Godwin was also reading into another publishing controversy of the 1690s, on the authorship of Charles I's 'spiritual autobiography' *Eikon Basilike*.<sup>22</sup> None of the evidence here rises above the level of speculation and possible coincidence but, given the density of *Mandeville*'s historical and literary allusions, no possible reference should be discounted.

Strangely, *Mandeville* more closely resembles the unpublished *Voyce from the Watch Tower* than it does any of the memoirs that we are certain Godwin read before composing the novel. *Mandeville*, like Ludlow's *Voyce*, is rich in Biblical references (there are at least twenty-five quotations or paraphrases from the Bible in the novel, very few of them fully attributed). The verisimilitude with which Godwin channels the voice of seventeenth-century England is striking, as Charles weaves scripture (and significant quantities of Milton) into his explanations. Examples abound: Audley's death provides Charles with a revelation he compares with Samson pulling down the temple; the English are endowed with 'the liberty with which Christ has made us free' (Galatians 5. 1); Charles raves of bringing down 'the wrath of the lamb' on Lord Bristol (Revelations 6:16). Notably this use of language intensifies as the novel goes on (quotations are relatively sparse in the first volume but a constant presence by the third), as befits a narrative that becomes increasingly manic towards the novel's climax.

Godwin was not, however, reliant on published sources for his research into the civil wars. Since 1811 the author had been a frequent visitor to the Red Cross Library (now Dr Williams's Library, after its founder), a place originally established to support Dissenting ministers and students but by Godwin's later years also an extensive collection of manuscripts and ephemera for researchers interested in the history of Protestant Dissent.<sup>23</sup> Godwin's reading of (relatively secular) memoirs was probably supplemented by a study of seventeenth century religious pamphlets, and perhaps even diaries and private correspondence, and it feels as if this is what *Mandeville* aims to channel.

The narrator's Biblical rhetoric goes some way in distancing Charles from the reader—contemporary reviews of the novel were frequently uneasy with the narrator's language—reinforcing the idea that Godwin wants us to read Charles critically at every stage.<sup>24</sup> It may also be calculated to give the novel a ring of authenticity. *Mandeville* is, of Godwin's novels, the work most particularly drawn as a memoir. The earlier first-person narratives are framed as confessions, but *Mandeville* is locked into a much more specific temporality that affords the reader clues to a fictitious date of 'composition'. As we should reading Clarendon or Ludlow (with or without the suspicion of tampering), we are encouraged to position the narrator in time and consider the context in which the words are 'written': to interrogate Charles's motivation for telling his story years after the

fact. Perhaps because it imitates the patchiness and inconsistency of memoir, contemporary readers found the novel incomplete. A response to Lockhart's review in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* claimed that, had 'THE END' not been printed at the bottom of the page, they would have turned over expecting more (p. 476). Godwin's story details only the protagonist's childhood and early years of adult life, despite hinting at many more decades after. An unofficial/unauthorised 'fourth volume' of *Mandeville*, published anonymously in 1818 under the title *Last Words of a Maniac*, borrows further from *De Monfort* and concludes with Charles's murder of Clifford. Ironically this continuation ends as abruptly as Godwin's original novel, but it suggests that readers sought a resolution that the author refused to give.<sup>25</sup> In a larger sense, this signposts a tension between historical memoir and historical fiction: readers are more inclined to accept a partial memoir, or a memoir that leaves unanswered questions, than they are a fictional narrative that does the same things. The author of historical fiction is thus incentivised to create a self-contained narrative space. The reader should not have to immerse themselves in the period to understand how the characters think (except where it can be quickly explained for the purposes of novelty), and the plot should resolve itself by the final chapter (with an optional epilogue to place the story in historical context). Such tidiness suggests how easily historical fiction establishes and reinforces national myths. If the author is to satisfactorily close the narrative without tragedy, it helps if the protagonist is on the right side of history. Furthermore, the very conceit of concluding the narrative implies that said historical moment has ended—that this chapter of history is settled. Walter Scott's novels often exemplify this, as Carmel Murphy has identified, presenting British history as a gradually unifying evolution towards an Anglican, capitalist, (constitutional) monarchy.<sup>26</sup> Murphy reads *Mandeville* as an attempt to keep alive the memory (warts and all) of the seventeenth-century republican experiment as an imaginative 'political possibility'. Murphy's interpretation sets *Mandeville* directly against Scott's recently published *Old Mortality* (1816), which presents a less troubling version of seventeenth-century royalism and religion. Godwin perhaps hoped to contest Scott's version of history (the novels address different events but similar themes) but *Mandeville* seems to reach for something more fundamental about historical memory.

In his essay, 'History, Trauma, and the Limits of the Liberal Imagination', Gary Handwerk argues that, in Godwin's historical fiction, prejudices persist because history grafts itself onto personal trauma and encodes that trauma as part of a larger historical text (Charles's childhood traps him in the ongoing story of sectarian violence).<sup>27</sup>

Both St Leon and Mandeville are strikingly insightful about the patterns and processes that entrap them, yet are never able to find the place from which they could change the world around them or even their own responses to it; the mood of malaise that characterizes most of Godwin's fiction arises from their realization of this. This incapacity may mark the limits of Godwin's liberal imagination in

its inability to conceive recursiveness except as traumatic repetition and thus to assimilate its own Romantic insight.<sup>28</sup>

Handwerk's reading, however, engages with Godwin's historical novels as 'closed' texts. It is possible for us to read *Mandeville* as a conventional novel—with a beginning, middle, and end—and recognise the cycle of trauma that Handwerk identifies and Godwin no doubt intends to depict. That does not mean, however, that this is the only reading available to us. Godwin understood that no matter how carefully a work is crafted, its readers are free to interpret it how they wish. The novel's 'fourth volume' demonstrates that this freedom is not even constrained by the boundaries of the text itself. It may be that Godwin, as Handwerk sees his characters, was conscious of the limits of his own imagination and unable to see a way to avoid history repeating itself (the author's thoughts on causality, as they appear in *Political Justice*, are strongly deterministic). It is, however, just as likely that Godwin set out to craft a work with the imaginative potential to help a reader break the cycle instead. The author described his essays in *The Enquirer* as not 'dicta' but 'the materials of thinking'.<sup>29</sup> The same could be said for any of Godwin's published works.

History defies the idea of a closed narrative. Events and ideas echo through time, questions go without answers, subjects are reinterpreted in the light of new evidence or changing attitudes. Our understanding of history, however, seeks boundaries: periodisation, a consensus of interpretation, lessons that can be learned from the past. National or cultural myths are perhaps accepted out of a desire to order the past so that it can explain the present, but 'real' history is messy and confusing, and many debates in the present are merely modern attempts to work through the issues that troubled our ancestors. *Mandeville* attempts to imitate both fictional narrative and historical memoir. It clothes itself in the trappings of memoir (in language and style) while combining, with only partial success, the structure of memoir and novel (Godwin privileges the narrator's distinctive voice over dramatic unity). It is a novel that demands to be read critically in order to signpost the need to read history critically. It is a story that counters the idea of British history as a story, foregrounding the awkward, marginalised, and unpalatable reality behind the patriotic legend. In all this, we might consider the novel a failure: it failed to find the audience of Godwin's earlier works and its anti-sectarian themes went unacknowledged for over a century. It remains, however, a challenging and experimental work. ☒

## NOTES

1. John Gibson Lockhart, *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 2.9 (December 1817), 268–79, quoted in *William Godwin Reviewed: A Reception History 1783–1834*, ed. by Kenneth W. Graham (New York: AMS Press, 2001), p. 340.
2. Godwin uses its colloquial title, Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, in his autobiography, but its original one in *Mandeville*. William Godwin, *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin: Volume 1* (London: Pickering, 1992), p. 18.

3. This is discussed at length in Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837* (London: Pimlico, 2003), pp. 30–33 and 368–69.
4. ‘Curran, John Philpot’, in *The Diary of William Godwin*, ed. by Victoria Myers, David O’Shaughnessy and Mark Philip (Oxford: Oxford Digital Library, 2010) <<http://godwindiary.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/people/CUR01.html#CUR01-notes>> [accessed 9 December 2019]. The entry for 3 July 1816 also notes the cryptic ‘Somnium post 24 horam’ (a day when the author was also clearly working on *Mandeville*) which suggests a long period without sleep.
5. William Godwin, *Mandeville*, ed. by Tilottama Rajan (London, ON: Broadview Press, 2016), p. 59.
6. It should also be noted that Godwin read Brown’s *Edgar Huntly* (1799), *Jane Talbot* (1801), and *Clara Howard* (under its 1807 Minerva Press title, *Philip Stanley; or, the Enthusiasm of Love*) while composing *Mandeville*.
7. One of several royalist commanders at Colchester, only Lisle and Sir Charles Lucas were executed after the surrender. Their deaths came at the order of Sir Thomas Fairfax, who justified the executions with reference to Lucas’s offences earlier in the wars. The historiography of competing claims regarding the incident is discussed in J. H. Round, ‘The Case of Lucas and Lisle’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 8 (1894), 157–80.
8. This is implicit in Curran’s rhetoric on Catholic Emancipation, particularly his speech of 18 February 1792. See *Speeches of the Right Honourable John Philpot Curran*, ed. by Thomas Davis (Dublin: Duffy and Co., 1865), pp. 138–43.
9. Rajan notes that Hilksiah’s dress suggests a Puritan separatist, but Charles’s reference to the (singular) Church of England (p. 113) implies that his mentor did not reject the established church entirely. Given the specificity of other historical details within the novel, it seems likely that Godwin leaves this deliberately ambiguous.
10. Godwin to Caroline Lamb, 25 February 1819, MS Abinger c. 12, f. 43.
11. The first volume of Joanna Baillie’s plays was published in 1798 under the title *A Series of Plays: In Which It Is Attempted to Delineate the Stronger Passions of the Mind*, and it is this volume that Godwin probably consulted. It is available in a modern edition as Joanna Baillie, *Plays on the Passions*, ed. by Peter Duthie (London, ON: Broadview, 2001).
12. William Godwin, *Political and Philosophical Writings of William Godwin, Volume 5: Educational and Literary Writings*, ed. by Mark Philip (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 296.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 292.
14. *Edmund Ludlow, a Voyce from the Watch Tower, Part Five: 1660–1662*, Camden Society Fourth Series, 21 (London: Royal Historical Society, 1978).
15. Blair Worden, *Roundhead Reputations: the English Civil Wars and the Passions of Posterity* (London: Allen Lane, 2001).
16. There are 105 references to Clarendon in Godwin’s diary (though it is not always clear which refer to his history and which to his collected state papers). Ludlow is referenced thirty times. In 1804, Godwin read Clarendon’s *History* throughout April and Ludlow in July.
17. *Diary of William Godwin*, 22 April 1813 and 15 March 1815.
18. Worden, p. 93.
19. Worden (p. 95) for some reason attributes the bequest to Francis Godwyn, his sixteenth-century ancestor, but his dates are correct for Charles.

20. Ironically, the Godwin scholar H. N. Brailsford would later question the authenticity of the *Memoirs* in his own work on the civil war period. See Brailsford's essay in Christopher Hill's collection *The Levellers and the English Revolution* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961).
21. *Diary of William Godwin*, 24 May 1813, 'Museum; Bayle, Plutarch & Boyer: call on Sheldon; adv. Towers. W C Brown calls na.'
22. Specifically, Godwin's diary records that he was reading Thomas Wagstaffe's (1691) defence of the king's authorship on three occasions in 1816.
23. Godwin's diary records his first visit to the library in 1802, but notes seventeen visits from 1811 to 1816, mostly during the research for *Lives of the Philipses*.
24. An anonymous response to Lockhart's review refers to it as 'pervading anachronism in the style', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 2.10 (January 1818), 402–08, quoted in *Mandeville*, p. 476.
25. A review of *Last Words* praised the continuation for attempting to give a 'more satisfying conclusion'. See *British Lady's Magazine*, 3rd ser., 2 (1819), 174–45, quoted in *Godwin Reviewed*, p. 344.
26. Carmel Murphy, 'Possibilities of Past and Future: Republican History in William Godwin's *Mandeville*', *Keats–Shelley Review*, 28.2 (September 2014), 104–16 <<https://doi.org/10.1179/0952414214Z.00000000049>>.
27. Gary Handwerk, 'History, Trauma, and the Limits of the Liberal Imagination: William Godwin's Historical Fiction', in *Romanticism, History, and the Possibilities of Genre*, ed. by Tilottama Rajan and Julia M. Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 80.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 81.
29. Godwin, *Political and Philosophical Writings*, p. 78.

### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

R. G. THOMAS. 'Mandeville, Mourning and National Myths: William Godwin's Civil War Novel and the Use of History', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.102>>.

### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 23 September 2019.



# READING *FRANKENSTEIN* IN 1818

## From Climate Change to Popular Sovereignty<sup>1</sup>

*James Grande*



QUESTIONS OF CHRONOLOGY, of time and of place, are always at stake in our readings of *Frankenstein*. Shelley's novel has come to occupy multiple chronotopes,<sup>2</sup> ranging from Lake Geneva, 1816, its legendary moment of creation, to Europe in the 1790s—the partially redacted (but decipherable) diegetic dates—to the English Opera House (now the Lyceum Theatre), just off the Strand, London, in 1823, when the novel was transformed into Richard Brinsley Peake's melodrama *Presumption; or, the Fate of Frankenstein*, the forerunner of countless screen and stage adaptations.<sup>3</sup> It was here that Shelley's supremely eloquent Creature who, as Marilyn Butler writes, 'speaks impressively, with the dignity, even authority, appropriate to a witness brought back from the remote past', was transformed into a mute monster, anticipating Boris Karloff's iconic performance of this role in the 1930s Hollywood films.<sup>4</sup> Tracking back from these films to the eighteenth-century sentimental mode, James Chandler has written of how 'Mary Shelley [...] poises her novel on a delicately balanced question: will no one sympathize with the creature because he is a monster, or is he a monster because no one will sympathize with him?'<sup>5</sup> Peake's melodrama (and the adaptations that follow it) insist on the former possibility, while the paradigmatic modern reading of the novel tips the balance towards the latter—at least, this is surely the accepted interpretation today, when *Frankenstein* holds the title of the most frequently taught novel on the Anglophone curriculum.<sup>6</sup> Its very ubiquity makes the novel appear uncannily proleptic, as the subject of seminal works of feminist literary criticism, theories of female authorship and the gothic, and—even more broadly—as a modern myth, concerned not just with the dangers of reckless scientific advance, but with questions of procreation, race, reproductive rights and the rights of the child.<sup>7</sup>

In view of these proliferating chronotopes, and the different modes of historicism (or present-ism) they engage, 1818, the year of the novel's first publication remains in many ways a neglected context for the novel, overshadowed as it is both by *Frankenstein's* varied afterlives and by the moment of its conception. Despite the global interest in the bicentenary of 1818, this date will always be overshadowed by a much more intensely imagined moment in literary history: 1816, the 'Year without a Summer', and the Shelley–Byron *ménage* at Villa Diodati. As Shelley's Preface informed readers of the 1831 third edition, it was here, confined indoors, reading ghost stories, and discussing 'the nature of the



principle of life, and whether there was any possibility of its ever being discovered and communicated', that *Frankenstein* was born (p. 195). For readers in 1818, however, this paratext, which has overdetermined readings ever since, was unavailable. Instead, Shelley's novel appeared on 1 January 1818, in an edition of just 500 copies, with only the names of the publishing firm Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor and Jones, on the title page. These conditions of *Frankenstein's* first appearance shape our understanding of a novel that is profoundly occupied both with uncovering secrets—'with unrelaxed and breathless eagerness, I pursued nature to her hiding places'—and with questions of authorship: about what it means to create, discover, or author a new place, a new being, a new self (p. 36).

In what follows, however, I want to focus not on authorship but readership. I take my cue here from an essay by William St Clair on 'The Impact of *Frankenstein*', which poses the following question: 'How [...] can we trace the historical and cultural influence of *Frankenstein* without becoming presentist, determinist, circular, or anecdotal? How can we retrieve readerships?'<sup>8</sup> St Clair goes on to give a compelling, empirical account of the progress of *Frankenstein* over the nineteenth century, through stage adaptations and, once copyright restrictions expired in 1880, through cheap editions of the novel. I wish to return to this question in a similarly historicist, but also necessarily speculative, spirit, with one specific, often overlooked, readership in mind: the readers of 1818. Writing to Percy Shelley in August 1818, Thomas Love Peacock described how, on a visit to Egham racecourse (close to where the Shelleys had been living the previous year at Marlow), he had been pestered by 'a multitude of questions concerning "Frankenstein" and its author. It seems to be universally known and read'.<sup>9</sup> Perhaps more known than read, we might infer, with a reputation developed in part through the substantial excerpts given in reviews. As St Clair reminds us, the novel was not the instant bestseller it is often claimed to have been, existing as it did in a mere 500 copies.<sup>10</sup> Even if we factor in shared reading practices and circulating libraries, the audience for the novel in 1818 amounts to a vanishingly small group of readers—especially when set against the millions who have read the novel or seen adaptations on stage or screen in the two centuries since. Nonetheless, attempting to understand the experience of these readers might help us historicise the novel in new ways. What did *Frankenstein*, or perhaps more accurately, what *could Frankenstein* have meant to its first readers, before it had become a popular melodrama, a modern myth, or a recognised part of the Godwin–Wollstonecraft–Shelley oeuvre? How do we recover these meanings, and why might they matter?

In the attempt by the 'Romantic Novels 1818' project to reconstruct the fictional landscape of 1818, *Frankenstein* features as the sole canonical novel, alongside *Florence Macarthy* by Sydney Owenson, Patrick Brontë's *The Maid of Killarney*, Susan Ferrier's *Marriage*, Anna Maria Porter's *The Fast of St Magdalen* and Charles Maturin's *Women*. For these texts, the issue is first of all one of recovery, but *Frankenstein's* inclusion prompts a different set of questions: what does it mean for a novel that has transcended literary history and achieved

mythic status to be re-situated as one of the novels of 1818? What different meanings might this approach generate and what methodological problems does it pose? In this essay, my focus is not on these contemporary novels—compelling intertexts though they might be—but on some of the other contemporary frames of reference, which have received uneven levels of attention in the vast field of *Frankenstein* criticism, but may all have shaped the way that *Frankenstein*'s first audience read the novel.

The most well known of these connects the conception of *Frankenstein* with the moment of its initial reception. In recent ecocritical readings, the April 1815 eruption of Mount Tambora, in modern Indonesia, looms large. Tambora is now known to be among the most powerful and lethal volcanic eruptions of the past 80,000 years. Beyond the catastrophic effect on the surrounding area, the eruption sent vast volumes of sulphurous dust into the stratosphere, forming a veil over the whole planet. This dust veil took several years to disperse and produced a marked cooling effect at the earth's surface. By the summer of 1816, there was frost and snow—a lurid brown and orange—in central Europe. The harvest failed and, a year after Waterloo and the end of a generation of war, Europe was plunged into a subsistence crisis, with widespread famine and disease. Nobody at the time could link cause and effect, and it is these seemingly apocalyptic changes in the climate—evidence, to some contemporary witnesses, that the earth was freezing—that shape the environment of Shelley's novel. Gillen D'Arcy Wood has even claimed *Frankenstein* as the first climate change novel, reading the Creature as a figure for the homeless, starving poor of Europe in the fallout from Tambora.<sup>11</sup>

What Wood's study further emphasises is that these were not just the conditions of the novel's genesis in that famously cold, wet Genevan summer of 1816 but also of its publication; indeed, we need to treat the 'Tambora event not as the natural disaster of a single year, 1816, but as a three-year episode of drastic climate change'.<sup>12</sup> Storms and gale-force winds continued in January 1818, the month of *Frankenstein*'s publication, pummelling Edinburgh and flattening St John's Chapel in the city. At the beginning of March, a tempest swept through southern England, and newspapers reported the destruction of a 100-foot tree in Plymouth, 'shivered to pieces by the electrical fluid'—a real-life echo of the lightning strike that the 15-year-old Victor Frankenstein witnesses, an event which 'completed the overthrow' of the Renaissance alchemists and cabbalists 'who had so long reigned the lords of my imagination', and set him on the path to modern science (p. 25).<sup>13</sup> For *Frankenstein*'s first readers, these extreme weather conditions were perhaps not so shocking as they had first been in 1816, having by this point continued for more than two years. They had become, it seemed, the new normal.

That we know about the weather in Britain at this period in such detail is largely due to the records of Luke Howard, a Tottenham Quaker and the so-called father of meteorology, who published the first volume of his *Climate of London* in 1818. His records go on to show that the apocalyptic weather ended

as abruptly as it had begun. By June 1818, the dust cloud had lifted and Howard was recording dry, warm weather—the most clement for a decade—which eventually produced a good harvest.<sup>14</sup> Only readers in the first few months of *Frankenstein's* existence read the novel under the shadow of Tambora.

At the same time that many parts of the globe were experiencing unusually cool temperatures, reports began to arrive of the Arctic sea ice breaking up, another effect of the Tambora eruption. This phenomenon seemed to hold out the promise that polar seas might soon be navigable, leading to renewed optimism about the possibility of discovering the fabled Northwest Passage. In February 1818, John Barrow, Second Secretary to the Admiralty, published an article in the *Quarterly Review* promoting the search for the Northwest Passage as a suitable project for naval officers in peacetime. In the final sentences of *Persuasion* (1817), Austen's novel of the Peace, posthumously published a few days before *Frankenstein*, it is the 'dread of a future war' which forces Anne Elliot to 'pay the tax of quick alarm' for being a sailor's wife, or 'belonging to that profession which is, if possible, more distinguished in its domestic virtues than in its national importance'.<sup>15</sup> Barrow had now, however, identified an alternative—if equally dangerous—occupation for out-of-work sailors like Captain Wentworth. The February 1818 issue of the *Quarterly* sold a record 12,071 copies on its first day of publication.<sup>16</sup> For readers who bought *Frankenstein* or borrowed the novel from a circulating library in the early months of 1818, Shelley's frame narrative took on a topicality that could not have been foreseen even a year earlier; indeed, Walton's quest must have seemed strangely prophetic of the arctic fever which gripped the British imagination with unprecedented intensity between 1818 and 1822.

Adriana Craciun has identified 1818 as a 'watershed year' in Britain's Arctic history, inaugurating a new era of state-sponsored scientific exploration in place of the commercial speculation that characterised British arctic endeavour in the eighteenth century.<sup>17</sup> *Frankenstein*, she argues, was 'strategically timed' in an effort to reach a new audience for arctic adventures (although there is no evidence that either Shelley or Lackington conceived of it as such).<sup>18</sup> For Craciun, the publishing house of John Murray represents the centre of 'polar print culture'.<sup>19</sup> Murray famously turned down the chance to publish Shelley's novel and John Wilson Croker, Barrow's superior as First Secretary to the Admiralty, wrote a scathing review of the novel in Murray's *Quarterly Review*, describing it as 'a tissue of horrible and disgusting absurdity' and identifying it as a work of Jacobin fiction:

It is piously dedicated to Mr. Godwin, and is written in the spirit of his school [...] Mr. Godwin is the patriarch of a literary family, whose chief skill is in delineating the wanderings of the intellect, and which strangely delights in the most afflicting and humiliating of human miseries.<sup>20</sup>

Croker included in the course of his plot summary a satirical connection to Barrow's theory of an open polar sea, as set out in the preceding issue of the *Quarterly*:

the monster, finding himself hard pressed, resolves to fly to the most inaccessible point of the earth; and, as our Review had not yet enlightened mankind upon the real state of the North Pole, he directs his course thither as a sure place of solitude and security.<sup>21</sup>

Over the next few years, the failure of expeditions led by Captains Ross and Buchan, Edward Parry and, most famously, John Franklin must have strengthened the cautionary reading of the novel, and Frankenstein's speech to strengthen the resolve of Walton's crew assumed a grim irony. Instead, it is Frankenstein's final words to Walton that seem to be vindicated by the real-life arctic voyagers: 'Seek happiness in tranquillity, and avoid ambition, even if it be only the apparently innocent one of distinguishing yourself in science and discoveries' (p. 186).

Extreme weather and polar exploration constitute two of the most pressing contexts for Shelley's novel in 1818, but there was another, even more pertinent context, operating at the level of allusion and allegory, which has not attracted the same level of attention in recent criticism. Political readings of *Frankenstein* have tended to treat the novel as a French Revolution allegory, with Victor Frankenstein a figure for the liberal leader—perhaps one of the Girondin friends of Shelley's mother, Mary Wollstonecraft—who unwittingly creates a violent, uncontrollable mob. For instance, Anne Mellor's influential study claims that, 'Mary Shelley conceived of Victor Frankenstein's creature as an embodiment of the revolutionary French nation, a gigantic body politic originating in a desire to benefit all mankind but abandoned by its rightful guardians'.<sup>22</sup> The sheer fact of historical distance, of viewing the history of the 1790s through the prism of the post-war moment, seems to lead inexorably to a reading of the novel as firmly anti-revolutionary: 'By representing in her creature both the originating ideals and the brutal consequences of the French Revolution, Mary Shelley offered a powerful critique of the ideology of revolution'.<sup>23</sup>

This version of the novel can be traced back to a pioneering essay by Lee Sterrenburg in the volume that inaugurated modern criticism of Shelley's novel, *The Endurance of Frankenstein* (1979). For Sterrenburg, writing before the advent of the new historicism, 'Mary Shelley translates politics into psychology. She uses revolutionary symbolism, but she is writing in a post-revolutionary era when collective political movements no longer appear viable'.<sup>24</sup> Instead, the conflicts of the 1790s are interiorised and reduced to the scale of the individual, in a way that turns against the political dualisms of the earlier period:

Viewed in its wider cultural context, Mary Shelley's shift from politics to psyche in *Frankenstein* should be seen, not merely as a reaction against the utopianism of Godwin, nor against the conservatism of Burke, but rather a reaction against this entire world-view of the revolutionary age'.<sup>25</sup>

This makes *Frankenstein* an apolitical novel, set against the competing claims of ideology—which, of course, is also to classify it as a conservative novel, albeit one of greater sophistication than the identikit anti-Jacobin fictions of the 1790s. Ronald Paulson similarly reads the novel as a summation of recent European history:

a retrospect on the whole process of maturation through Waterloo, with the Enlightenment-created monster leaving behind its wake of terror and destruction across France and Europe, partly because it had been disowned and misunderstood and partly because it was created unnaturally by reason rather than love within the instinctive relationships of the Burkean family.<sup>26</sup>

Here, the account of *bildung* in the novel is cast in the terms of the revolution controversy, with the Creature the product of (Wollstonecraftian, Godwinian) reason, cultivated at the expense of the ‘domestic affections’ that Edmund Burke identified as the germ of social feeling and that Victor warns Walton not to neglect.

In these and many other readings, the central fact of *Frankenstein* is its belatedness, its re-visiting of the events and debates of the 1790s from a post-revolutionary perspective. There are, of course, good reasons for reading *Frankenstein* in dialogue with the 1790s, from the blatant—the dedication to Godwin, a paratext that flaunts the novel’s Jacobin affiliations—to the hidden: the submerged chronology of the 1790s that can be pieced together from the dates in the narrative. This takes us from the beginning of Frankenstein’s studies at Ingolstadt and Walton’s training for his voyage in 1789, through the animation of the Creature in 1792—the year of the September Massacres in Paris, the publication of the second part of Paine’s *Rights of Man* and Wollstonecraft’s *Rights of Woman*, as well as the birth of Percy Shelley—to Victor’s voyage to Scotland, and Wollstonecraft’s expedition to Scandinavia in 1795, and finally the telling of the story in August and September 1797, the months of Shelley’s birth and Wollstonecraft’s death.<sup>27</sup>

While the 1790s offers a compelling context for the novel, one consequence of reading *Frankenstein* through the 1790s is that it gives us, almost *de facto*, a Burkean, anti-Jacobin novel: it is hard to read the novel with this degree of belatedness and hindsight and not produce, as in the accounts cited above, an interpretation of *Frankenstein* as a critique of revolutionary ideas. This political reading is one that would be crystallised and reified through the nineteenth century in visual satire: from James Parry’s 1833 lithograph, *REFORM BILL’S FIRST STEP AMONG HIS POLITICAL FRANKENSTEINS*, to the Punch cartoons of ‘The Brummagem Frankenstein’ (1866) and ‘The Irish Frankenstein’ (1882), images which show Frankenstein as the political leader who creates an uncontrollable mob. In doing so, they are indebted less to Shelley’s original novel than its adaptations for the stage, which invest it with the Manichean moral structure of melodrama.

For the readers of 1818, however, it is the unfolding events of post-Waterloo Britain, not the French Revolution, that constitute the overriding political context. Moreover, this frame of reference produces a more ambivalent novel—one that reflects what Percy Shelley claimed to be ‘the direct moral of the book’:

Treat a person ill, and he will become wicked. Require affection with scorn;—let one being be selected, for whatever cause, as the refuse of his kind—divide him, a social being, from society, and you impose upon him the irresistible obligations—malevolence and selfishness. It is thus that, too often in society, those who are best qualified to be its benefactors and its ornaments, are branded by some accident with scorn, and changed, by neglect and solitude of heart, into a scourge and a curse.<sup>28</sup>

We do not have a single-year history of 1818, in the manner of James Chandler’s *England in 1819* or Malcolm Chase’s *1820: Disorder and Stability in the United Kingdom*. However, what Chandler suggests of the writing of 1819 might also hold true for *Frankenstein* in 1818. For Chandler,

[L]ike the literature of the larger period we call Romanticism, but with a particular intensity, English writing from 1819 is aware of its place in and as history. Much literary work of England in 1819, in other words, seems concerned with its place in England in 1819—concerned, that is, with a national operation of self-dating, or -redating, that is meant to count as a national self-making, or -remaking.<sup>29</sup>

As a novel of 1818, *Frankenstein* reflects on multiple levels the widespread distress of the post-war years, the crisis in political representation, the sense that Britain might be on the brink of revolution and the project of ‘national self-making’ with which literature in these years is engaged.

If we surmise that the most pertinent political context for the novel in 1818 was not the French Revolution (tempting as this allegorical framework is) but the events of England in 1818, this more immediate, pressing context produces a more open-ended political novel, one that speaks to a nation in a radically unsettled state. While we lack the kind of single-year study of 1818 along the lines of the (otherwise very different) works by Chandler and Chase for the following two years, we might identify the immediate political context for the novel in a period beginning with the Pentrich rising in June 1817, continuing through the imprisonment and trials of radical reformers in subsequent months, under the terms of the Habeas Corpus Suspension Act and often using evidence collected by spies and informers, and continuing on to the widespread cotton workers and coal miners’ strikes in the summer of 1818.<sup>30</sup> We might consider how these events were mediated in radical and conservative print culture and explore the resonance of individual events, protests and trials, keeping in mind Justine’s trial in the novel, a Godwinian scene of injustice that depends on a forced confession: ‘Ever since I was condemned, my confessor has besieged me; he threatened and menaced, until I almost began to think that I was the monster that he said I was’ (p. 66).



In the blasphemous nature of Frankenstein's discovery, Shelley's novel revolves around a bitterly contested term, making its entrance in the world a few weeks after William Hone's celebrated acquittal in three trials on charges of blasphemous libel, on 27, 28 and 29 December 1817.<sup>31</sup> Hone conducted his own defence, based on the audacious argument that the targets of his satire in *John Wilkes' Catechism*, *A Political Litany* and *The Sinecurists' Creed* were not texts of holy scripture but corrupt politicians. As such, he capitalised on the fact that he had been charged with blasphemy, not sedition, making the brazen claim that his satirical catechism, creed and litany were not ridiculing religious forms but instead mocking the government. The trial demonstrated the complex relationship between religious and political dissent, but also the authority that literary history could have within the courtroom. Hone cited an impressive list of precedents for using the Bible as part of political satire, including Milton, 'who himself was a parodist on the Scripture' in writing *Paradise Lost*.<sup>32</sup> This became, then, part of the currency of Milton in 1818, and in the aftermath of Hone's trials, Shelley's dialogue with Milton throughout *Frankenstein* may have taken on a more radical set of meanings to its earliest readers.<sup>33</sup>

Alternatively, we might consider the novel in the light of debates over population, political economy and the Poor Laws, a newly urgent topic in the post-war context of demobilisation, unemployment, failed harvests and high food prices. In what Isobel Armstrong has described as the 'Malthusian curbing of reproduction', through Frankenstein's refusal to allow the Creature a female partner, Shelley engages with the debate over Thomas Malthus's *Essay on the Principle of Population*, a controversy that had re-ignited in 1817 with the publication of the fifth edition of Malthus's essay, the first in a decade.<sup>34</sup> As Armstrong argues in relation to Victor Frankenstein's confrontations with the Creature:

It is impossible to rinse out the monster's personhood. Every encounter with him becomes an inquiry into the borders of the human, and correspondingly the borders of the non-subject. Every encounter alters the criteria for inclusion and exclusion in the category of the human [...] Despite Frankenstein's glimmering of understanding that he might share species being with the monster, and that his own freedom is predicated on the freedom of the monster to reproduce, he is unable to bring himself to this recognition of equality.<sup>35</sup>

In the post-war moment, Malthusian questions about the category of the human and the right to reproduce were highly topical. In the remainder of this essay, however, I want to explore one specific intertext in more detail, William Hazlitt's essay 'What is the People?', the first version of which appeared in three parts in the radical newspaper *The Champion*, under the editorship of Joseph Clayton Jennyns, in October 1817, before being revised and republished in John Hunt's *Yellow Dwarf* in March 1818 and then in Hazlitt's *Political Essays* (1819).<sup>36</sup>

Hazlitt's essay begins with a brilliant riposte to the question in his title, creating a vivid sense that the reader has just walked in on an impassioned tavern or

coffee-house debate over popular rights, or joined a crowd listening to a speaker such as Henry ‘Orator’ Hunt on the radical platform:

—AND who are you that ask the question? One of the people. And yet you would be something! Then you would not have the People nothing. For what is the People? Millions of men, like you, with hearts beating in their bosoms, with thoughts stirring in their minds, with the blood circulating in their veins, with wants and appetites, with passions and anxious cares, with busy purposes and affections for others and a respect for themselves, and a desire of happiness, and a right to freedom and a will to be free. And yet you would tear out this mighty heart of a nation to lay it bare and bleeding at the foot of despotism: you would slay the mind of a country to fill up the dreary aching void with the old, obscene, drivelling prejudices of superstition and tyranny: you would tread out the eye of Liberty (the light of nations) like ‘a vile jelly’, that mankind may be led about darkling to its endless drudgery, like the Hebrew Samson (shorn of his strength and blind) by his insulting taskmasters: you would make the throne every thing, and the people nothing, to be yourself less than nothing, a very slave, a reptile, a creeping cringing sycophant, a court favourite, a pander to Legitimacy—that detestable fiction, which would make you and me and all mankind its slaves or victims.<sup>37</sup>

The emotional rhetoric, use of the master–slave dialectic, sublime imagery of popular sovereignty and contrasting language of abjection all chime with Frankenstein’s debate with the Creature on the glacier near Mont Blanc, when the Creature demands a mate ‘with whom I can live in the interchange of those sympathies necessary for my being’ and refuses ‘the submission of abject slavery’ (pp. 118–19).

Kevin Gilmartin has observed that Hazlitt’s essay ‘skirts any endorsement of specific democratic institutions of government’, instead operating on a level of symbolism and abstraction:

[W]here Hazlitt’s *negative* treatments of popular mobilization were often grounded in specific events (Birmingham in 1793, London in 1820), it is striking that the *positive* urban Leviathan was advanced as a supposition or figural ‘type and image,’ without direct reference to celebrated radical episodes in the era of Peterloo—events that were available to him, and that suffused the periodicals in which his essays appeared.<sup>38</sup>

The primary context for Hazlitt’s essay may be the campaign for parliamentary reform but the power of his essay is based not on prosaic debates about representation but on a visceral imagining of the popular Leviathan, which arises out of Hazlitt’s essay like Frankenstein’s patchwork Creature:

If we could suppose society to be transformed into one great animal (like Hobbes’s Leviathan) each member of which had an intimate

connection with the head or government, so that every want or intention of every individual in it could be made known and have its due weight, the state would have the same consciousness of its own wants and feelings, and the same interest in providing for them, as an individual has with respect to his own welfare. Can any one doubt that such a state of society in which the greatest knowledge of its interests was thus combined with the greatest sympathy with its wants, would realise the idea of a perfect commonwealth? But such a government would be the precise idea of a truly popular or representative government. (p. 329)

Hazlitt's principal antagonist in the essay is Robert Southey and his 'rhapsody against the old maxim, *vox populi vox Dei*' in the *Quarterly Review* of October 1816 (in fact published February 1817), in an article eliding the war against Napoleon abroad with the repression of the parliamentary reform movement at home (p. 320). In reading Hazlitt's representations of metropolitan liberty in relation to Wordsworth, Percy Shelley and Hazlitt's own writing about the Alps, Gilmartin argues that 'Southey's phrase reinforces the relevance of Alpine sublimity to Hazlitt's expansive urban populace', turning as it does on an interpretation of divine voice. Such a connection is particularly suggestive for a reading of Hazlitt's essay alongside Mary Shelley's novel, given the Alpine setting.<sup>39</sup>

Hazlitt's utopian projection of the 'perfect Commonwealth' gives us a much more sympathetic image of Shelley's Creature as a figure for the people than any reading of *Frankenstein* and the French Revolution allows, and the Creature's demands resonate with the claims for the people in Hazlitt's essay:

The people are not subject to fanciful wants, speculative longings, or hypochondriacal complaints. Their disorders are real, their complaints substantial and well-founded [...] They do not cry out till they are hurt [...] For any thing we could ever find, the people have as much common sense and sound judgment as any other class of the community. Their folly is second-hand, derived from their being the dupes of the passions, interests, and prejudices of their superiors. [...] The people do not rise up till they are trod down. They do not turn upon their tormentors till they are goaded to madness. (p. 337)

Hazlitt's defence of popular discontent is paralleled in Shelley's novel by the Creature's Miltonic defiance, which revolves around the mutual obligations between sovereign and subject:

'I am thy creature, and I will be even mild and docile to my natural lord and king, if thou wilt also perform thy part, the which thou owe'st me. Oh, Frankenstein, be not equitable to every other, and trample upon me alone, to whom thy justice, and even thy clemency and affection, is most due. Remember, that I am thy creature: I ought to be thy Adam; but I am rather the fallen angel, whom thou drivest from joy for no misdeed. Every where I see bliss, from

which I alone am irrevocably excluded. I was benevolent and good; misery made me a fiend. Make me happy; and I shall again be virtuous.' (*Frankenstein*, 77–78)

Just as the Creature vows to 'revenge my injuries' (p. 119) if Frankenstein fails to fulfil his duty towards him, Hazlitt's defence of popular rights extends to a justification of the use of violence, which can only be averted by parliamentary reform:


They are violent in their revenge, no doubt; but it is because justice has been long denied them, and they have to pay off a very long score at a very short notice [...] The errors of the people are the crimes of governments. They apply sharp remedies to lingering diseases, and when they get sudden power in their hands, frighten their enemies, and wound themselves with it. They rely on brute force and the fury of despair, in proportion to the treachery which surrounds them, and to the degradation, the want of general information and mutual co-operation, in which they have been kept [...] Timely reforms are the best preventatives of violent revolutions. ('What Is the People?', 337–38)

Mary Shelley had known Hazlitt all her life as her father's friend, a socially awkward though friendly visitor to the Godwin household at Skinner Street.<sup>40</sup> By the time she wrote the novel, Hazlitt was a member of the Shelley circle and part of their conversations about reform in England—a less famous, but perhaps just as formative, sequel to those conversations with Byron in Geneva. On 9 February 1817, while staying with Leigh and Marianne Hunt in the Vale of Health, Hampstead, Shelley records in her journal: 'Several of Hunt's acquaintances come in the evening—Music—after supper a discussion untill 3 in the morning with Hazlitt concerning monarchy & republicanism'.<sup>41</sup> No doubt they would have talked in the terms later elaborated in 'What Is the People?'. Just two days later, the issue of the *Quarterly Review* containing Southey's article was published and Hazlitt worked on his response over the next few months.<sup>42</sup> On 18 March 1817, the Shelleys moved in to Albion House in Marlow and Shelley records 'Write every day' in her journal, drafting the final section of her novel, from Victor's destruction of the female Creature on Orkney to the end. By early April, the draft was complete.<sup>43</sup>

While the topics discussed in February 1817 made it into Hazlitt's essay of later that year, my aim here is not to argue for influence in either direction. Instead, I want to suggest that the rival claims of monarchical authority and popular sovereignty, which Hazlitt engages in his essay, were part of the public debate in 1818 and operate throughout Shelley's novel, giving it a particular topicality in its first moment of publication. 'What Is the People?' may be one of the most compelling intertexts from the moment of *Frankenstein's* first publication, evidence of the radical discourse that is coeval with Shelley's novel of ideas. This context produces a more radical text, in which the Creature appears as a figure for the people, demanding justice, not a French revolutionary

mob: a menacing presence, perhaps, but one insistently demanding answers to its questions, in the present tense. The *Edinburgh Magazine* famously reviewed the novel in the following terms:

Here is one of the productions of the modern school in its highest style of caricature and exaggeration. It is formed on the Godwinian manner, and has all the faults, but many likewise of the beauties of that model [...] it possesses a similar power of fascination, something of the same mastery in harsh and savage delineations of passion, relieved in like manner by the gentler features of domestic and simple feelings. There never was a wilder story imagined, yet, like most of the fictions of this age, it has an air of reality attached to it, by being connected with the favourite projects and passions of the times.<sup>44</sup>

While 'the favourite projects and passions of the times' has often been read as a reference to scientific discovery and polar exploration, it might also take in the political debates that convulsed England in 1818. This national debate was the context into which *Frankenstein* was first received, and situating it within the politics of 1818 turns Shelley's novel into a radical, highly topical text. 

## NOTES

1. I am grateful to the editors of this special issue, members of the 'Romantic Novels 1817 and 1818' seminar series at the University of Greenwich who responded to an early version of this essay, the two anonymous readers for *Romantic Textualities*, who offered many useful and insightful comments and to my students at King's College London on the 'Family, Authorship and Romanticism' module.
2. M. M. Bakhtin, 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics' [1937–38], in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, trans. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), pp. 84–258. For Bakhtin, '[i]n the literary artistic chronotope, spatial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the moments of time, plot and history' (p. 84).
3. Sarah Hibberd has explored the use of music and mime to communicate the vitalism debate, in 'Good Vibrations: *Frankenstein* on the London Stage', in *Sound Knowledge: Music and Science in London, 1789–1851*, ed. by James Q. Davies and Ellen Lockhart (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2017), pp. 175–202 <<https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226402109.003.0008>>.
4. Marilyn Butler, 'Introduction', to Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein, or, the Modern Prometheus: The 1818 Text* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. xxxvi. All subsequent references to the novel will be to this edition, with page numbers in parentheses.
5. James Chandler, *An Archaeology of Sympathy: The Sentimental Mode in Literature and Cinema* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), p. 247 <<https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226035000.001.0001>>.

6. *Frankenstein* appears as the most frequently assigned novel on the corpus of six million syllabi analysed by the *Open Syllabus Project* <<https://opensyllabus.org/>> [accessed 10 October 2019].
7. Influential accounts of these topics include (though are by no means limited to) Ellen Moers, 'Female Gothic', in *The Endurance of Frankenstein*, ed. by George Levine and U. C. Knoepfelmacher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), pp. 77–87 <<https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520341562-007>>; Barbara Johnson, 'My Monster/My Self', *Diacritics*, 12.2 (1982), 2–10 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/464674>>; Mary Jacobus, 'Is There a Woman in this Text?', *New Literary History*, 14.1 (1982), 117–41 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/468961>>; H. L. Malchow, 'Frankenstein's Monster and Images of Race in Nineteenth-Century Britain', *Past & Present*, 139 (1993), 90–130 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/past/139.1.90>>; Anne K. Mellor, 'Frankenstein, Racial Science, and the Yellow Peril', *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, 23 (2001), 1–28 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/08905490108583531>>; and Eileen Hunt Botting, *Mary Shelley and the Rights of the Child* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017).
8. William St Clair, 'The Impact of *Frankenstein*', in *Mary Shelley in her Times*, ed. by Betty T. Bennett and Stuart Curran (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), pp. 38–63 (p. 39).
9. Cited in Radu Florescu, *In Search of Frankenstein* (London: New English Library, 1977), p. 155.
10. St Clair, p. 42.
11. Gillen D'Arcy Wood, *Tambora: The Eruption that Changed the World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014). See also David Higgins, *British Romanticism, Climate Change, and the Anthropocene* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), ch. 3 <<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67894-8>>.
12. D'Arcy Wood, p. 10.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 59–60.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
15. Jane Austen, *Persuasion*, ed. by James Kinsley (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 203.
16. William Gifford to George Canning, 27 March 1818; cited in Jonathan Cutmore, 'Quarterly Review Archive: Volume 18, Number 35 (October 1817)' [in fact published 21 February 1818], *Romantic Circles* (University of Maryland, 2005) <<https://romantic-circles.org/reference/qr/index/35.html>> [accessed 25 July 2019].
17. Adriana Craciun, *Writing Arctic Disaster: Authorship and Exploration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), p. 5 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316410790>>. See also Jessica Richard, "'A Paradise of my Own Creation": *Frankenstein* and the Improbable Romance of Polar Exploration', *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, 25.3 (2003), 295–314 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/0890549032000167826>>; Siobhan Carroll, 'Crusades against Frost: *Frankenstein*, Polar Ice, and Climate Change in 1818', *European Romantic Review*, 24.2 (2013), 211–30 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509585.2013.766402>>; and Katherine Bowers, 'Haunted Ice, Fearful Sounds, and the Arctic Sublime: Exploring Nineteenth-Century Polar Gothic Space', *Gothic Studies*, 19.2 (November 2017), 71–84 <<https://doi.org/10.7227/GS.0030>>.
18. Craciun, p. 83.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 85.



20. [John Wilson Croker,] 'Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus', *Quarterly Review* (January 1818), 379–85 (p. 381). This number was published on 9 June 1818: see Cutmore, 'Quarterly Review Archive: Volume 18, Number 36 (January 1818)', *Romantic Circles* (University of Maryland, 2005) <<https://romantic-circles.org/reference/qr/index/36.html>> [accessed 25 July 2019].
21. [Croker], p. 382.
22. Anne K. Mellor, *Mary Shelley: Her Life, her Fiction, her Monsters* (New York: Methuen, 1988), p. 82.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 84.
24. Lee Sterrenburg, 'Mary Shelley's Monster: Politics and Psyche in *Frankenstein*', in *The Endurance of Frankenstein*, ed. by George Levine and U. C. Knoepfelmacher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 143–71 <<https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520341562-010>> (pp. 145 and 159).
25. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
26. Ronald Paulson, *Representations of Revolution, 1789–1820* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), p. 239.
27. See Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, *The Annotated Frankenstein*, ed. by Susan J. Wolfson and Ronald L. Levao (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), 'Introduction', p. 37.
28. Percy Bysshe Shelley, 'On "Frankenstein"', *The Athenaeum*, 10 November 1832, p. 730.
29. James Chandler, *England in 1819: The Politics of Literary Culture and the Case of Romantic Historicism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), p. 5.
30. The best recent account of this period is given by Robert Poole as part of the sequence of events leading to Peterloo. See *Peterloo: The English Uprising* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), ch. 7: 'Conspirators' and ch. 8: 'Strikers'. See also Robert G. Hall, 'Tyranny, Work and Politics: The 1818 Strike Wave in the English Cotton District', *International Review of Social History*, 34.3 (1989), 433–70 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/S002085900009469>>.
31. For the fullest account of this episode, see Ben Wilson, *The Laughter of Triumph: William Hone and the Fight for the Free Press* (London: Faber and Faber, 2005).
32. *The Three Trials of William Hone* (London: Hone, 1818), p. 35.
33. On Shelley's dialogue with Milton, see John B. Lamb, 'Mary Shelley's Frankenstein and Milton's Monstrous Myth', *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, 47.3 (1992), 303–19 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/2933709>>; and Lucy Newlyn, *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
34. Isobel Armstrong, *Novel Politics: Democratic Imaginations in Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 44 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198793724.001.0001>>. On *Frankenstein* and Malthusian population theory, see also Clara Tuite, 'Frankenstein's Monster and Malthus' "Jaundiced Eye": Population, Body Politics, and the Monstrous Sublime', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 22.1 (1998), 141–55; and Maureen McLane, *Romanticism and the Human Sciences: Poetry, Population, and the Discourse of the Species* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), ch. 3.
35. Armstrong, pp. 43–44.
36. 'What Is the People?' was first published in *The Champion* for 12, 19 and 26 October 1817, reprinted in two parts in the *Yellow Dwarf* for 7 and 14 March 1818, and included in *Political Essays* (August 1819). There are some variants between these different versions; the text cited here is the original *Champion* essay, which

- appeared under the Miltonic motto, 'Let not England forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live.'
37. W[illiam]. H[azlitt]., 'What is the People?', *The Champion*, 12 October 1817, p. 321. All subsequent references to the novel will be to this version of the essay, with page numbers in parentheses.
  38. Kevin Gilmartin, *William Hazlitt: Political Essayist* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 265 and 273 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198709312.001.0001>>.
  39. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
  40. See Duncan Wu, *William Hazlitt: The First Modern Man* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 75.
  41. Paula Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert (eds), *The Journals of Mary Shelley, 1814–44*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 1, 163. Godwin's diary records a similar gathering a week later, on 16 February 1817: 'Dine at L Hunt's, w. Shelleys, Hazlitts & B Montagu'; see Victoria Myers, David O'Shaughnessy and Mark Philp (eds), *The Diary of William Godwin* (Oxford: Oxford Digital Library, 2010) <<http://godwindiary.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/diary/1817-02-16.html>> [accessed 16 October 2019].
  42. This number was published on 11 February 1817 and sold out (a total of 7587 copies) on the first day of sale: see Cutmore, 'Quarterly Review Archive: Volume 16, Number 31 (October 1816)' *Romantic Circles* (University of Maryland, 2005) <<https://romantic-circles.org/reference/qr/index/31.html>> [accessed 7 October 2019].
  43. These dates follow the account given in Charles E. Robinson, 'Frankenstein Chronology', *The Shelley–Godwin Archive* <<http://shelleygodwinarchive.org/contents/frankenstein/frankenstein-chronology/>> [accessed 7 October 2019]. As Shelley's recent biographer comments, 'the months from February to June 1817 are more intellectually communal and creative than any hitherto'; see Fiona Sampson, *In Search of Mary Shelley: The Girl Who Wrote Frankenstein* (London: Profile Books, 2018), p. 155.
  44. *Edinburgh Magazine and Literary Miscellany; a New Series of The Scots Magazine*, 2 (March 1818), 249–53.

### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

J. GRANDE. 'Reading *Frankenstein* in 1818: From Climate Change to Popular Sovereignty', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.103>>.

### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 9 December 2019.



FLORENCE AND THE MACHINE  
Female Authorship, Popular Culture and  
Technological Modernity in Sydney Owenson,  
Lady Morgan's *Florence Macarthy* (1818)

*Sonja Lawrenson*



ON 3 FEBRUARY 1819, MARY RUSSELL MITFORD wrote a letter to her friend and fellow author, Barbara Hofland, in which she derided Lady Morgan's recently published novel *Florence Macarthy: An Irish Tale* (1818) as 'not only long but tedious'. She followed this terse dismissal with a more detailed yet no less scornful elucidation:

You know, of course, the *Dramatis Personæ*,—a hero, compounded of Buonaparte and General Mina; a hero, en second, Lord Byron; a villain, Mr Croker; and a heroine, Lady Morgan herself;—this, with a plot half made of 'O'Donnel' and half 'Guy Mannering,'—a vast deal of incredible antiquarianism, and Ireland! Ireland! Ireland! as the one single sauce to all these viands,—forms the principal ingredients of this puffed-off novel.<sup>1</sup>

Mitford was not the only contemporary author to excoriate the text and its author. Describing the novel as 'a shameful mixture [...] of the highest talent & the lowest malevolence', fellow Irish novelist, Maria Edgeworth, lambasted Morgan for possessing 'the most despicable disgusting affectation & *impropriety*—& disregard of the consequences of what she writes'.<sup>2</sup>

She concluded by evincing the 'wish never more to be classed with novel writers when the highest talents in that line have been so disgraced'.<sup>3</sup> The critical reception of Morgan and her novel was equally derisive and damning. The *British Review* sardonically asserted that 'the interest is kept up far enough into the fourth volume to satisfy the most rigorous canons to which the writers for the Minerva Press can be supposed to be subject'.<sup>4</sup> Though professing that 'it is not an agreeable task to animadvert with severity on the writings of a woman', this anonymous reviewer wryly observes that Morgan 'continually vaunts of the immense profits she has reaped from the sale of her books', whilst giving 'pretty intelligible intimations that her daily bread depends, in a great measure, on those profits'. Facetiously confessing that 'Lady Morgan, or any other lady, may, for aught we care, deluge the town with her crudities', s/he nonetheless interposes 'but when she comes forward as an instructress and a reformer [...] she enters a field where it becomes our duty to meet her'.

Despite its remarkable asperity, *Florence Macarthy's* initial reception was lamentably predictable. Both contemporary and later commentators have repeatedly remarked upon the especial rancour with which critics of Lady Morgan—formerly known as Sydney Owenson—admonished her works.<sup>5</sup> Yet, despite the personal and professional vituperation that greeted the publication of *Florence Macarthy*, Morgan heralded her latest novel as a ‘success with a vengeance’ and ‘a triumph after the persecution I have undergone’.<sup>6</sup> Reprimanding her younger sister, Olivia, for not showing ‘a little proper spirit’<sup>7</sup> in defending her against her many critics, she claims that those who have read it in Paris ‘think it my *chef-d’oeuvre*’. She also exults in the *Morning Chronicle's* report that ‘the whole of the first edition was bespoke before it was published, and a second came out in five days after’.<sup>8</sup> This defiant response was entirely characteristic of Morgan, who had penned a sprightly retort to critics of her earlier fiction in the controversial travelogue *France* (1817). Indeed, the torrent of critical hostility that cascaded upon *Florence Macarthy* was the inevitable backlash against Morgan’s supposed presumption in rebuking professional reviewers in her former work.

As Claire Connolly notes, however, Morgan’s clashes with reviewers were ‘not so much obstacles on the path to fame as constitutive of her writing identity and celebrity’.<sup>9</sup> Undoubtedly, *Florence Macarthy* serves as striking evidence of this fact. Here, Morgan dexterously weaves her longstanding conflict with her most vociferous professional critic, John Wilson Croker, into the intricate fabric of her fictional narrative by caricaturing him as the provincial Irish toady, Conway Crawley. Indeed, as the aforementioned reactions of rival authors and critical opponents attest, much of the invective against *Florence Macarthy* specifically targets Morgan’s unabashed blurring of the boundaries between both the public and the personal, and the popular and the belletristic. By investing the text’s eponymous heroine with some of the more controversial traits of her own authorial persona, Morgan struck at the heart of contemporary anxieties regarding the literary and cultural legitimacy of Romantic prose fiction. As Jacqueline Belanger states:

Morgan has been called the first professional Irish woman writer. This claim certainly might be disputed, but it is clear that Morgan saw her literary activity as a career that held the potential to generate both income and fame. [...] In publicizing the financial and social successes she gained from her writing, Morgan appeared to reviewers to reduce authorship to its most basic economic terms. Almost every aspect of the production and marketing of Morgan’s work seemed to provide evidence of an increasingly commercial literary culture, one that was far removed from the model of the gentlemanly ‘republic of letters’ favored by reviewers.<sup>10</sup>

This article explores the ways in which *Florence Macarthy* responds to and ultimately repudiates such critical distinctions. Boldly asserting its allegiance to the precariously feminised domain of popular romance, the text simultaneously posits a challenge to more prestigious—and implicitly masculine—models of textuality. While the critical establishment balked at ‘the rapid expansion of the literary marketplace and the changing demographic of readers’,<sup>11</sup> *Florence Macarthy* revels in its own syncretic and synthetic modernity. Replete both in extra-literary controversy and inter-textual allusivity, Morgan’s text embraces the spectacle, sensation and simulation so vociferously denounced by critics of popular fiction in the period. More specifically, in its self-reflexive scrutiny of the material processes of its own production, *Florence Macarthy* interrogates its own position within an increasingly commercialised and mechanised publishing industry. In order to elucidate the text’s engagement with such contemporary concerns, the article contextualises *Florence Macarthy* in relation to a more famous and blatantly more technologically-oriented text of 1818, Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*. Responding to Mark Hansen’s description of *Frankenstein* as a ‘machinic text’, it suggests that Morgan’s fiction is likewise ‘a text constructed from materials (most centrally language, but also materially concrete institutions [...] and indeed technology itself)’. However, whereas Hansen interprets Shelley’s work as a ‘fundamental deterritorialisation of the human perspective’, Morgan’s text disavows such philosophical skepticism and remains fastened to a literary agenda that is decidedly and decisively populist.<sup>12</sup> The materials out of which Morgan constructs *Florence Macarthy* derive from an evolving popular cultural industry that is increasingly characterised by mass reproduction and performative display.

In asserting the centrality of such commercial and mechanical modernity to Morgan’s aesthetic, this article departs from previous scholarly discussions of her oeuvre. For, although modern criticism has offered a much more nuanced and sensitive analysis of Morgan’s literary achievement than that bestowed by her contemporaries, it has become somewhat of an axiom to locate Morgan’s work in a ‘Gaelocentric tradition of cultural nationalism’,<sup>13</sup> as Joep Leerssen avers. Leerssen further describes Morgan’s most well-known fiction, *The Wild Irish Girl* (1806), ‘as a clearing house through which most pre-romantic appreciations of Ireland, and its inhabitants and its antiquities, passed from out-of-date modes of discourse into the realm of literature’.<sup>14</sup> For Leerssen this ‘constant automatism of explaining Ireland in terms of its past’<sup>15</sup> is typical of the Romantic national tale, where ‘Gaelic Ireland is set both in a spatial and in a chronological distance, neither in the present, nor in the past, but in adventure time, in an anachronistic time warp’.<sup>16</sup> In contrast, more recent scholarship has reassessed the complex spatio-temporal manoeuvrings undergirding Morgan’s antiquarian romances. Natasha Tessone, for example, argues that Morgan’s ‘heightened museological imagination’ may have enabled her to ‘stage her vision of a displayable Irish nation’, but ‘her project of appropriating such museological practices to promote Ireland’s national character contains significant ambiguity’.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, there is

a 'complexity and multivalence in both the spectacular nature of Morgan's antiquarianism and the spectacular aspect of Irish nationhood as it was construed in the early nineteenth century'.

Certainly, Morgan's mobilisation of this antiquarian aesthetic—or 'aesthetiquarianism',<sup>18</sup> as Katie Trumpener terms it—requires further scrutiny. Heather Braun suggests that Morgan 'reinvests a language of ancient myth and romance with a parodic sense of its own contrivance, further suggesting the need to adopt fluid and autonomous forms that more accurately re-imagine an increasingly adaptable Irish narrative'.<sup>19</sup> Drawing on such critical interventions, this article asserts that *Florence Macarthy* invokes a Romantic aesthetiquarian perspective only to interrogate its function within a rapidly evolving print culture, both in Britain and in Ireland. Moreover, whereas Tessone argues that 'the antiquarian movement forged a tight link between Ireland's material culture and national feeling',<sup>20</sup> this article contends that Morgan simultaneously parades and problematises this link in *Florence Macarthy*. Throughout this fiction, Morgan openly vaunts the fact that her museological display of Ireland is not anchored in antiquarian retrospection. Instead, it emerges out of an effervescent literary marketplace in direct competition with new arenas of spectacular entertainment driven by the 'rapid innovation' and 'democratization' of mechanical arts in the period.<sup>21</sup> Rather than promote an atavistic and anachronistic cultural nationalism, the surface narrative's flirtation with the romance of Irish antiquity is continually disrupted by an underlying acknowledgement of the competing literary, political and historical narratives at play within the national tale. Synchronising and synthesising these competing discourses for the popular reader, *Florence Macarthy* registers the hybridity of its own romance as a distinctly modern yet sophisticated form of mechanical reproduction that cannot be dismissed as the mere automatism of an antiquarian reflex.

Of course, as her critics were quick to point out, Morgan treads well-worn plot terrain in *Florence Macarthy*. The national marriage device that *The Wild Irish Girl* inaugurated is revisited in this tale, which sees its dashing hero journey incognito from his sloop's docking place in Dublin bay to the wilds of Connemara. Here, somewhat predictably, he encounters an alluring Irish gentlewoman with a keen intellect and even keener social conscience. However, though contemporaries readily accused Morgan of trotting out a crude and unreflective pastiche, the tale's textual eclecticism is both deliberate and determined. Connolly observes that 'a great many novels in the 1810s veer between parody and pastiche'<sup>22</sup> and *Florence Macarthy* is no exception. From the very outset, the text plays host to a political and aesthetic contest between vying modes of Romantic sensibility. Commencing with the description of the docking of a ship in the 'silvery'<sup>23</sup> Irish dawn, the opening paragraphs introduce the enigmatic General Walter Fitzwalter as the text's protagonist, and the Byronic De Vere, as its somewhat desultory deuteragonist.

With his 'square chest', 'fine bust' and 'vehement passions' (p. 5), Fitzwalter exudes a heroic masculinity that would embellish any Minerva romance. Yet,



Morgan also endows this character with a distinctly political salience. Sailing under the soubriquet of 'The Commodore' on a ship called *Il Librador*, Fitzwalter is immediately identifiable as a revolutionary leader of Spanish American independence in the mould of 'El Libertador', Simón Bolívar. In *Spanish America and British Romanticism, 1777–1826* (2010), Rebecca Cole Heinowitz observes that 'the cause of Spanish American independence bridged political gaps' in Britain,<sup>24</sup> with both liberal and conservative voices triumphing in the defeat of their Spanish rivals. As stated above, critics accused Morgan of drawing liberally upon her sympathetic portrayal of Napoleon in *France* for the character of Fitzwalter. Yet, as well as Bolívar and Napoleon, Fitzwalter also possesses more local political resonance as a kindred spirit to the newly mythologised hero-martyrs of the 1798 United Irishmen Rebellion.

Intriguingly, the hero of *Florence Macarthy* shares his name with a character in Morgan's later fiction, *The O'Briens and the O'Flahertys* (1827): the Irish revolutionary, Lord Walter Fitzwalter. As Connolly notes, Irish literature of the later Romantic period often depicted such figures as victims of their own heightened sensibility as opposed to violent insurgents.<sup>25</sup> In particular, the dashing United Irish leader, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, looms as a 'shadowy presence behind' the latter Fitzwalter.<sup>26</sup> However, Fitzgerald haunts Morgan's earlier fiction too. Like Fitzgerald, Morgan's hero in *Florence Macarthy* is eventually revealed to be an Irish aristocrat whose experiences in the Americas kindle a revolutionary zeal.<sup>27</sup> Fintan Cullen argues that early nineteenth-century visual representations of Fitzgerald served to transform him 'from an impressive political and military strategist to a tragic yet romantic innocent'.<sup>28</sup> In many ways, Morgan's fictional Fitzwalters borrow their romantic allure from this popularised version of Fitzgerald.

In contrast, 'the precise arrangement' of De Vere's 'glossy auburn curls left it difficult to decide whether its fanciful and fashionable possessor was more fop or philosopher, dandy or poet' (p. 7). On observing the Irish coastline from the ship's helm, this 'ideologue' exhibits his poetic temperament by professing 'a singular attraction in the aspect of an unknown firmament'. When Fitzwalter contends that 'remembrances of country' are 'as precious and important,' De Vere remonstrates:

'Can you not credit then the existence of a creature placed by nature or circumstances beyond the ordinary pale of humanity [...]—one so organized, so worked on by events, and thwarted in feelings, so blasted in his bud of life, as to stand alone in creation, matchless or, at least unmatched, whose joys, whose woes, whose sentiments and passions, are not those of other men, but all his own, beyond the reach of affection, or the delusions of hope?'

Heavily redolent of Byron's most celebrated work, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1812–18), a reader might well suspect that this pastiche of 'Promethean'

Romanticism is teetering on the edge of parody. The Commodore's rejoinder confirms such suspicions:

'He, who wants the appetites and passions common to all men, with the sympathies and affections that spring from them, is something better or worse, angel or demon, but he is not man [...] poets feign it, or vain men affect it; but it has no real existence in nature or society. Man is always man; and he who pretends to be more, is rarely placed by nature at the head of his species—he is in fact usually less.' (p. 7)

In this moment, the text converts its romantic pastiche into a superbly bathetic parody of the Byronic hero. Of course, Morgan was not the only author of the period to interrogate this figure. Her friend, Caroline Lamb, had reproached her former lover in the controversial *roman-à-clef*, *Glenarvon* (1816), where she loosely fictionalised Byron as a United Irish leader who betrays his comrades. In fact, by the fourth canto of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1818), even Byron sought to distance himself from 'the Pilgrim of [his] Song'.<sup>29</sup> Perhaps even more intriguingly, by interrogating this figure, *Florence Macarthy* displays a remarkable thematic contiguity with an otherwise unrelated fiction of 1818, Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. Although Morgan and Shelley were not to become closely acquainted until later in life, it is entirely possible that the former read *Frankenstein* (which was published in January 1818), prior to completing *Florence Macarthy* (which was published eleven months later). On the other hand, Julia M. Wright points out that a number of recent critics have argued that *Frankenstein* owes a significant debt to Morgan's earlier novel, *The Missionary* (1811).<sup>30</sup> Whatever direction the flow of influence ran, the underlying preoccupations of these, in other respects, widely divergent texts are curiously concordant. After all, not only does *Frankenstein* commence with a markedly similar opening dialogue but it also delivers a corresponding rebuke to the solipsism of male Romantic endeavour:

[If] no man allowed any pursuit whatsoever to interfere with the tranquillity of his domestic affections, Greece had not been enslaved; Caesar would have spared his country; America would have been discovered more gradually; and the empires of Mexico and Peru had not been destroyed.<sup>31</sup>

The high Romantic ideal of creativity as both autonomous and transgressive is nimbly unmasked as just another form of tyranny and destruction. Observing that Shelley's 'Prometheus figure is strikingly different from the creations of her romantic contemporaries',<sup>32</sup> Harriet Huftis argues that Shelley's preface to the 1831 edition of *Frankenstein* lays bare this distinction:

Invention, it must be humbly admitted, does not consist in creating out of void, but out of chaos; the materials must, in the first place, be afforded: it can give form to dark, shapeless substances but cannot bring into being the substance itself.<sup>33</sup>

Here, the Romantic pursuit of originality and individuality is undermined by Shelley's gender-inflected 'conception of what it means to create, a performance premised on her refashioning or 'modernising' of the legend of Prometheus.'<sup>34</sup> Like Shelley, Morgan refutes the Romantic ideal of authorship. Instead, both writers champion an inherently modern model of female authorship that is more a form of palimpsestic rewriting than a celebration of creative autonomy. However, though both favour intertextuality over originality, Morgan consciously embraces an almost bric-a-brac eclecticism. Like Shelley, Morgan's literary allusiveness engages poets revered by the Romantics, including Milton, Spenser and Shakespeare, but it also encompasses diverse modes of popular culture—both folkloric and consumerist. After all, as Martha Woodmansee observes, it was as much changes in the material conditions surrounding book production as the emergence of the Romantic concept of literary genius that engendered the notion of individualised authorship in this period. Due to concomitant developments in both printing technologies and literacy rates, literary production became increasingly commercialised with new laws regarding property and copyright reinforcing its capitalist economy.<sup>35</sup>

Unlike many of her contemporaries, Morgan does not shrink from the commercial modernity of the nineteenth-century literary marketplace in *Florence Macarthy*. Rather, she astutely recognises that both the conceptual authority of the critical reviews and the actual diversity in Romantic literary production arise out of the same commercially evolving print culture. Moreover, she exploits this fact to expose the superciliousness of those who would disavow the interconnectedness of the popular and literary spheres; from the theatrical dilettante, Lord Risbron, who renders himself a target of ridicule by speaking only in Shakespearian verse, to the sniping critic, Conway Crawley, who is regularly 'born away by the shallow rapidity of his own exhaustless volubility' (p. 141). In contrast, Morgan playfully interlaces self-consciously literary epigraphs with knowing allusions to popular comic performances and songs of the era. In so doing, she acknowledges the diversity of reading practices in the era of the industrial printing press, where even the Irish peasantry living 'amidst the savage mountains of the Galties' (p. 51) may enjoy profligate textual variety. As General Fitzwalter and De Vere observe on examining the 'whitewashed walls' of a 'wild and remote' Munster inn:

The history of many a saint, the sufferings of many a martyr, were here detailed in bright vermilion and yellow ochre; and angels and devils, hymns and homilies, were mingled promiscuously with the amatory history of 'Cooleendas,' 'Croothenamœ,' the 'Connaught daisy,' the 'last dying speech of Captain Dreadnought,' bloody and barbarous murders, and a favourite song, called 'Ma chere amie,' as sung by Mrs. Billington. (p. 52)

Of course, as the above quotation also evidences, *Florence Macarthy* does not allow such popular printed ephemera to supersede the prior claims of Irish folk culture. On the contrary, these amatory fictions and broadsides curiously com-

plement the Irish hymns, homilies and hagiographies that deck the ramshackle inn's interior. Indeed, Irish antiquarianism plays as prominent a role in this narrative as it did in Morgan's earlier *National Tales*. As Jenny McAuley delineates in the introduction to her recent edition of the text, its eponymous heroine inherits her name from the historical Irish Earl, Florence MacCarthy Reagh, known in Ireland as Fínghin mac Donnchadh Mac Cárthaigh (1560–1640). As the Taniist (successor) to the Barony of Carbery in Munster, MacCarthy's perilous political manoeuvrings during the Nine Years' War (1595–1603) eventually led to his imprisonment in the Tower of London. Here, in 1608, he wrote an epistolary essay on the antiquities of the Irish nation that reiterated claims regarding the Scythian and Milesian origins of the Gaels as previously asserted in Irish medieval pseudo-histories such as the *Lebor Gabála Éirenn* [*The Book of Invasions*].

The historical MacCarthy and his genealogical researches intrude upon the fictional world of the text in multifarious ways. Not only commemorated through the patronymic inheritance of his fictional female descendants, MacCarthy becomes a pivotal figure in his own right in the third volume of the novel. This volume commences with a show trial in which the villainous Conway Crawley attempts to frame General Fitzwalter for sedition. Having arraigned a group of disaffected local peasants known as 'Padreen Gar's Boys', Crawley accuses them of 'feloniously assembling for purposes of rebellion' (p. 203). He then charges the local 'pedagogue' (p. 93) Terence Oge O'Leary of leading them in 'a plan of insurrection' that is aided and abetted by the supposed 'foreign incendiary' (p. 203), Fitzwalter. However, Crawley exposes himself to public ridicule when he mistakenly cites MacCarthy's sixteenth-century correspondence regarding an uprising against Elizabeth I as evidence of a pact between Fitzwalter and O'Leary. Given Crawley's pretensions to scholarly erudition, his absolute ignorance of local history renders him absurd. Significantly, it also serves to expose the perduring association of Catholic Ireland with violent insurrection; whether the accused be sixteenth-century Gaelic lords or nineteenth-century impoverished agrarians.

Serving as a direct foil to Crawley, the hedge schoolmaster Terence O'Leary ensconces himself in 'national and traditionary lore' (p. 147). From ancient Irish mythology to the dynastic lineages of extant Gaelic families, O'Leary's antiquarian knowledge proves an important agent in redressing historical wrongs. His recondite genealogical inquiries alert him to the hidden identities of both General Fitzwalter and De Vere, who are revealed as Walter de Montenev Fitzadelm and Adelm Fitzadelm respectively. Unknown to each other before this propitious visit to Ireland, these latterly estranged cousins belong to an Old English, or Norman Irish, family that has suffered a rapid decline due to the profligacy and vice of their fathers, Lord Walter Fitzadelm, and his brother, Lord Gerald Fitzadelm. Habitually viewing the world through 'the mind's eye' (p. 100), O'Leary retains crucial memories of the Fitzadelm brothers that confirm the Spanish American hero's suspicions concerning the dark secret behind his almost forgotten exile from Ireland. As foster father to Walter de Montenev

Fitzadelm in his youth, O'Leary served as an innocent pawn in an ignominious scheme contrived by the Fitzadelm patriarchs. Heavily debt-ridden, Lord Walter Fitzadelm was encouraged by his younger brother to conceal the existence of his son 'in order to raise money on the little that was left of his estate' (p. 102). On his impecunious death shortly after this event, Gerald abducts the young Fitzadelm heir and arrogates the family's hereditary wealth and titles to himself. Sold into slavery, the disinherited Walter de Monterey fortuitously escapes and eventually becomes the South American Guerrilla Chief, Captain Fitzwalter, also known as 'The Commodore'. However, O'Leary remains haunted by this treacherous deed and spends the remainder of his days 'wandering in the mountains [...] and bothering the world with the MACARTHIES and FITZADELMS' (p. 58).

In many ways, the perfidy of the brothers serves as a metaphor for the trauma of colonial dispossession and oppression of Gaelic culture. In fact, the newly rediscovered Lord Walter De Montenay Fitzadelm explicitly declares that, 'my story is not without its parallels in the history of the land':

[M]y story [...] belongs to the history of a long disorganised country, where, under the influence of political misrule, the moral relations of society too often sit loosely: and where the demoralisation of the people is a necessary dogma in the code of those who rule by national debasement and disunion. (p. 363)

Here, Morgan emphasises the importance of cultural rejuvenation to the constitutional stability of Ireland. However, if the text does wield cultural nationalism as a political tool, the antiquarian realm of imagination that O'Leary inhabits is nonetheless viewed with a deep, if benevolent, scepticism. A rich repository of Gaelic culture and learning, O'Leary is both a sympathetic and inscrutable character. Respectfully described by the local peasantry as a scholar and bard, they nonetheless regard him as either 'possessed' or 'out of his mind' and are convinced that 'larning cracked his brain' (p. 57). Whilst deeply affected by his reunion with O'Leary, even his former foster son laments his credulous reiteration of Ireland's national origin legends and pseudo-histories:

'And yet,' said the Commodore,' with an half-repressed smile, 'there are some sceptics of opinion that there has always existed a perfect identity between the Irish and the Anglo-Saxon; that in fact the Irish received their ancient alphabet from the Britons; and that their pretensions to an eastern origin is a groundless notion, generated in ignorance, and idly cherished by a mistaken patriotism, which might be better directed.' (p. 85)

Morgan's South American hero unambiguously refutes the cultural and political import of O'Leary's archaic epistemology, but the text is also concerned to highlight the narrow discursive parameters upon which this antiquarian knowledge rests. If *Florence Macarthy* parodically pastiches the insular and blinkered reading practices of Romantic aesthetes, critical reviewers and aristocratic dilettantes, the text is no less critical of O'Leary's monological and logocentric thinking. Through such variegated portraits of the narrow, and

decidedly masculine, pursuit of exclusive and exclusionary knowledge systems, the narrative exhibits an acute distrust of patriarchal modes of literary production and representation.

More specifically, *Florence Macarthy* envisages a model of modern female authorship that disrupts patrilineal channels of influence, imagination and interpretation. In its delicate imbrication of canonical allusions, scholarly erudition, popular culture and folklore, the text signals the constructedness of its own fragile modernity. Collating fragments from these diverse literary and cultural traditions, Morgan evidently delights in assembling the synthetic fabrics out of which she crafts her narrative. In this way, *Florence Macarthy* once again reveals its propinquity to Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. For, as Mark Hansen argues, Shelley's novel confronts 'the necessity, for a female ideology of creation, to part with the male model of the expressive and autonomous self'.<sup>36</sup> 'Contextualiz[ing] the feminist deconstruction of the romantic self against the background of the industrial revolution', Hansen further observes that *Frankenstein* 'self-reflexively interrogates the so-called romantic ideology'<sup>37</sup> by 'embodying the experiential impact of the industrial revolution'.<sup>38</sup> In so doing, Shelley demonstrates 'the severe limitations of a literary model of invention and [...] correlat[es] the materiality underlying such a demonstration with the advent of industrialization':

Shelley's text construes romantic sublimation as an ideological strategy whose very plausibility derives from the suspect ontology of technological change it advances [...] More precisely, the text puts into question the ideological supposition that technology's (decidedly negative) effects can be overcome through the rejuvenating effects of great literature. In so doing, it reveals the costs of approaching industrialization exclusively as a threat to cultural values.<sup>39</sup>

Admittedly, Morgan's fiction does not achieve nor, in fact, aspire to the radical 'deterritorialization of thought' that Hansen claims for Shelley's work, which is more directly concerned with technological modernity and its discontents.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, Morgan's commitment to the cultural and political narrativisation of Irish nationhood disallows for such an outright rejection of Romantic representational strategies and techniques. Instead, via playful pastiche, irreverent parody, promiscuous intertextuality and unflinching self-reflexivity, *Florence Macarthy* both refashions and synthesises the diverse array of textual materials that constitute Irish print culture of the early nineteenth century. Indeed, the 'mongrel heterogeneity' that Leerssen ascribes to *The Wild Irish Girl's* 'unblended accumulation of superimposed discursive sediments', also manifests itself in Morgan's later fiction.<sup>41</sup> As Braun remonstrates, however, Leerssen's 'breakdown of the 'textual traditions' at work throughout this novel' does not fully address the novel's 'subversive aspects',<sup>42</sup> as embodied in the text's exoticised Gaelic heroine, Glorvina. Braun, in contrast, argues that



Glorvina helps locate a distinct, feminised danger that engages with such genres as mythology, romance, Orientalism, and the Gothic. It is through this contradictory character—as well as the hybrid form of the novel as a whole—that Owenson consistently resists the narrow parameters of what Terry Eagleton identifies as an ‘ideological dilemma’ between Realist and Romantic projects.<sup>43</sup>

Respecting this, it is worth reflecting that the eponymous heroine of *Florence Macarthy* not only inherits such generic hybridity from her literary predecessor but also exceeds the latter in terms of self-performativity and spectacular display. Moreover, although ostensibly unrelated, Frankenstein’s monster and Morgan’s later heroine generate curiously similar contradictions and excesses that expose the fault line between Romantic aesthetics and the nascent modernity of Romantic print culture. Morgan evidently shares Shelley’s perception that ‘technological change just cannot be marshalled poetically, especially not in its high romantic form as expression of man’s sublime encounter with nature’.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, though highly disparate in terms of genre and mode, both *Frankenstein* and *Florence Macarthy* openly confront technology’s impact upon creative production in the period. Just as *Frankenstein* forges a link between industrial technology and the suspension of representation’s jurisdiction—a link which surfaces in the textual contradictions generated by the monster’,<sup>45</sup> *Florence Macarthy* likewise ‘forges connections which exceed textual strategies of legitimation’<sup>46</sup> through its elusive and allusive heroine.

Introduced somewhat belatedly into a narrative that bears her name as its title, *Florence Macarthy* makes her first acknowledged appearance in the dramatic court scene delineated in volume three (and described above). Held under a false accusation of insurrection by the contemptible Crawleys, she effortlessly charms her way out of trouble and straight into the good graces of the fashionable set residing at Dunore Castle, the most recent seat of the Fitzadelm line. Encouraged to participate in an amateur production of *As You Like It* that the Shakespeare buff, Lord Rosbrin, organises to stave off ennui, she aptly undertakes the role of the protean Rosalind. A consummate performer, it is eventually revealed that Florence has in fact been assuming multiple guises throughout the course of the narrative. Secretly manoeuvring to restore Walter to his rightful legacy, she practices minor deceptions upon the text’s two peripatetic heroes, haunting them as a spectral voice among the ruins of the long-abandoned Court Fitzadelm and harrying them as the evangelical convert, Mrs Magillicuddy. Known by a variety of titles including Lady Clancare and the ‘Bhan Tierna’ (White Lady), she enacts a curious kind of doubling in her relationship with other female characters, including her cousin and namesake, the Spanish nun, Florence Macarthy Reagh, and the whimsical yet volatile matriarch of the Fitzadelm family, Lady Dunore. Of course, as the *British Review*’s critic waspishly remarked, Morgan’s heroine ‘shadowed out a resemblance to herself, and some of the recent occurrences in her own life’, as much as anything or anyone else.<sup>47</sup> As a female novelist who is forced to wield her pen against hostile critics and in defence of her native land,

*Florence Macarthy* is an unapologetic self-portrait of the equally chimerical and capricious Lady Morgan. The author's critics must have been galled to read the novel's final page, where the fictional Florence audaciously asserts: 'I shall take the liberty of *putting myself in my own book*, and shall record the events of this last month of my life under the title of Florence Macarthy' (p. 364). And yet, this heavily stylised self-characterisation is arguably more sophisticated and nuanced than Morgan's contemporaries credited. As Terry Eagleton astutely notes, Lady Morgan imbues the aforementioned Lady Dunore with as many of her own traits as she does Florence Macarthy, 'thus slyly exculpat[ing] herself by an act of fictional projection'.<sup>48</sup> Nevertheless, by ostentatiously writing herself into this text and redeploying her usual (and by this stage, somewhat shop-worn) sources in parody and pastiche, Morgan interrogates her own writerly tools and agenda.

In so doing, she also translates *Florence Macarthy* into a metatextual exploration of the role of the female author in the literary marketplace of the early nineteenth century. The ambivalence with which she views this creative enterprise is articulated in Florence's account of her both literal and metaphorical spinning:

With Ireland in my heart, and epitomising something of her humour in my own character and story, I do trade upon the materials she furnishes me; and turning my patriotism into pounds, shillings and pence, endeavour, at the same moment, to serve her and support myself. Meanwhile my wheel, like my brain, runs round. I spin my story and my flax together; draw out a chapter and an hank in the same moment; and frequently break off the thread of my reel and of my narration under the influence of the same association; for facts, will obtrude upon fictions, and the sorrows I idly feign are too frequently lost in the sufferings I actually endure. (p. 274)

Drawing on the classical association between the act of writing and the act of spinning, Morgan reminds her readers that spinning and weaving are, after all, Penelope's crafts and thus a particularly resonant symbol of female creativity. Moreover, the trope of the female spinner had been harnessed recurrently in eighteenth-century Ireland to refute British restrictions on Irish trade, the most famous example being Jonathan Swift's invocation of Arachne in *A Proposal for the Universal Use of Irish Manufacture* (1720). In her own earlier fictions, Morgan similarly deployed the figure of the Irish spinner as an agent of subversion against English political, cultural and economic hegemony. In the aforementioned national tale, *The Wild Irish Girl*, the English hero, Horatio, falls in love with the Irish princess, Glorvina, as she 'sits at her little wheel, by her father's side.'<sup>49</sup> However, this self-satisfied young gentleman is also forced to confront his gender and national biases in a less agreeable fashion when he accidentally intrudes upon an Irish spinning circle:

[A] group of young females were seated round an old hag who formed the centre of the circle; they were all busily employed at their *wheels*, which I observed went merrily round in exact time with their song [...] Supposing that some one among the number

must understand English, I explained with all possible politeness the cause of my intrusion on this little harmonic society. The old woman looked up in my face and shook her head; *I* thought contemptuously—while the young ones, stifling their smiles, exchanged looks of compassion, doubtlessly at my ignorance of their language [...] *I* never felt myself less invested with the dignity of [a man], than while I stood twirling my stick, and ‘biding the encounter of the eyes,’ and smiles of these ‘spinners in the sun.’<sup>50</sup>

In *The Wild Irish Girl*, then, the English traveller’s confidence in his superior knowledge, manners and civility is confounded by his encounter with these Irish women. Their quiet dignity in the performance of this homespun industry serves to elevate Irish folk culture both in the eyes of the hero and the reader. However, whilst this discursive strategy necessarily reinforces the hoary old dichotomy between England’s masculine modernity and an antiquated and feminine Irish culture, Morgan’s later fiction repeatedly ruptures such binarism. Though *Florence Macarthy* still engages the romance of an illusory Irish past, it deliberately interpolates such elegiac mythmaking with the disorienting dislocations of a dynamic modernity. Florence’s evocation of the spinning wheel may initially connect her writing to the ‘rude rustic work’ (p. 273) of an Irish cottage industry but her admission that she does ‘trade upon’ Ireland, turning her patriotism into ‘pounds, shillings and pence’ alerts us to the fact that she actually operates under the matrix of a transnational capitalist economy. According to Julie Donovan, Morgan’s fictions repeatedly play upon the link between text and textile, thereby implicating ‘not just Owenson but also her consumers in complex networks of commodification and exchange’.<sup>51</sup> This ‘politics of style’ enables Morgan to ‘interweave Irish history with the physical world of material objects’. In particular, textiles and clothing provide Morgan with ‘a kind of master trope [...] because of their very material nature—their ability to be circulated and exchanged, restitched and refashioned’. Morgan’s ‘provocative materialising of history’ is therefore, simultaneously, ‘malleable, portable and transformable’.<sup>52</sup> Ina Ferris likewise recognises the paradox of the author’s ‘rootless nationality’.<sup>53</sup> She argues that Morgan’s later heroine might still ‘double’ as the Irish nation, but in an unsettling and disruptive manner that clearly distinguishes Florence from her literary predecessor, *The Wild Irish Girl*’s heroine, Glorvina:

[B]oth Ireland and the performative heroine become detached from the unifying figure of place and reconstructed in the disjunctive temporal terms of mobility and metamorphosis [...] the Irish nation now ‘appears’ in different locations and among different groups, an internally stratified and dispersed category. The heroine herself undergoes a similar scattering, as Glorvina’s *thereness*—her fullness of being, her rootedness, her iconic visibility—gives way to an oddly elusive and deterritorialized being who belongs nowhere, exactly, and who typically operates in the interstices of culture, keeping herself hidden and in reserve.<sup>54</sup>

Considering this, it is curious to note Florence's equivocal reaction to Fitzwalter's suggestion that she must embrace her habitual solitude given that she possesses 'an imagination to create around you a perpetual Paradise' (p. 274). In response, Florence immediately abandons the motif of traditional Irish spinning for a product of technological innovation—the kaleidoscope:

'An imagination,' she interrupted eagerly, 'to exalt every anguish, to exaggerate every suffering [...] to oppose the dreariness and privation of a rude and ungenial solitude, to all the refined and elegant tastes of polished social life, whose details passing through the prismatic medium of fancy, like the broken and worthless particles flung into the kaleidoscope, arrange themselves in symmetric beauty and harmonic colouring, to charm and to deceive, and to assume forms, hues, and lustre, beyond their own intrinsic qualities.


Invented by Sir David Brewster in 1815, the kaleidoscope was soon replicated as a 'philosophical' toy using mass production techniques. As Jonathan Crary observes, Brewster had conceived of the kaleidoscope 'as a mechanical means for the reformation of art according to an industrial paradigm'.<sup>55</sup> However, for later artists and thinkers such as Baudelaire, 'it figured as a machine for the disintegration of a unitary subjectivity and for the scattering of desire into new shifting and labile arrangements'.<sup>56</sup> Significantly, in her appropriation of the kaleidoscope as a metaphor for her own imaginative production, Florence appears to recognise not only the dual, and seemingly contradictory, functions of the kaleidoscope but also the fact that

the abstraction necessary for Brewster's industrial delirium is made possible by the same forces of modernization that allowed Baudelaire to use the kaleidoscope as a model for the kinetic experience of 'the multiplicity of life itself and the flickering grace of all its elements'.<sup>57</sup>

By representing her own imagination as kaleidoscopic, Florence acknowledges the intrinsic modernity of her literary output. Furthermore, her description of the kaleidoscope as an instrument that creates beauty out of the deceptive rearrangement of 'broken and worthless particles' registers contemporary concerns regarding the commercialisation of art in the early nineteenth century. Identifying the emergence of a mass visual culture and entertainment industry in this period, Gillen D'Arcy Wood delineates the Romantic ideological reaction against this 'new visual-cultural industry of mass reproduction, spectacle and simulation'.<sup>58</sup> He argues that the sudden popularity and availability of new visual media confounded 'Romantic expressive theories of artistic production, emphasizing original genius and the idealising imagination'.<sup>59</sup> This resulted in an 'educated literary sensibility outraged by the spectacle of bourgeois consumption of art, and by the increasing influence of a decidedly middle-class taste for visual novelty and the "real"'.<sup>60</sup>

Evidently, Morgan does not collude with this 'Romantic anti-visual culture prejudice'.<sup>60</sup> As evidenced throughout *Florence Macarthy*, Morgan's writing unashamedly embraces the ephemerality, performativity and derivativeness that was derisively attributed to this nascent market of popular cultural entertainment. In so doing, her fiction fundamentally rejects the Romantic ideal of autonomous authorship and foregrounds the prolific productivity of mass publishing and printing technologies over the, by then, calcifying concept of the republic of letters. At the same time, Florence's underlying ambivalence regarding her writing process, or rather, writing performance, is persistently underscored. Whether the sorrows she idly feigns 'are too frequently lost in the sufferings she actually endure[s]' or the 'broken and worthless particles' of her imagination only serve to deceive, the fictional novelist unabashedly confronts the vulnerability of the woman writer within the literary marketplace. Though seemingly disparate tropes, the rich tapestry produced by the spinning wheel and the synthesis of particles flung together in the kaleidoscope both testify to female authorship as a precarious commercial enterprise. The means of material production of fiction may be shifting in the new Industrial Age, but the woman writer remains 'the mere creature of circumstances [...], friendless, unprotected, and dependent upon [her] own exertions for subsistence' (p. 277). Significantly, on her eventual marriage to the Commodore, latterly revealed as Walter de Montenay Fitzadelm, Lord Dunore, the narrative's conclusion sees Florence relinquish her pen with a typically theatrical gesture:

I would fain, like one of my own heroines, wind up the denouement of my story with some touch of humour or pathos—some appeal to the feelings I address, which should enable me to retire with applause: but hitherto adversity has been my muse, and now, placing her hand in Lord Dunore's, 'she deserts me.' (p. 364)

If she ever decides to write again, Florence continues, it will be in 'the calm of my dull prosperity, [...] with my own amusement for my object, and my husband for my critical reviewer'. Arguably, then, *Florence Macarthy* only envisages a happy ending for its novel-writing heroine under the auspices of a benevolent patriarchal reviewer. And yet, *Florence Macarthy's* persistent and deliberate conflation of protagonist and author renders such declamatory professions as shrewdly performative. After all, Florence's final assertion, seconds later, that she 'shall take the liberty of *putting [her]self in [her] own book*' somewhat complicates her professed conformity to this narrowly domestic role. Indeed, as her critics caustically observed, Lady Morgan's real-life marriage to a peer did not diminish either her literary output or ubiquity. Whilst endowing her fictional counterpart with 'all the brightness and evanescence of a rainbow' (p. 274), Lady Morgan simultaneously reminds both readers and reviewers of her enduring effervescence within the literary marketplace. 

## NOTES

1. Henry Fothergill Chorley (ed.), *Letters of Mary Russell Mitford*, 2 vols (London: Bentley, 1872), I, 42.
2. Christina Colvin (ed.), *Maria Edgeworth: Letters from England 1813–1844* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), p. 166.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 167. For further discussion of the political and literary differences between the two Irish novelists, see Thomas Tracy, *Irishness and Womanhood in Nineteenth-Century British Writing* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); and Mary Jean Corbett, *Allegories of Union in Irish and English Writing, 1790–1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511484766>>.
4. [Anon.], Review of *Florence MacCarthy: An Irish Tale*, *British Review*, 13 (May 1819), 487.
5. For example, when Robert Southey discovered that a scathing review of Morgan's *France* (1817) had been wrongly attributed to him, the poet vociferously retorted that he 'would rather have cut off [his] right hand than have written anything so unmanly and disgraceful'. See Jacqueline E. Belanger, *Critical Receptions: Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan* (Bethesda: Academica Press, 2007) for a detailed exploration of the 'exceptionally fraught' reception history of the author's works, p. 1.
6. Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan, *Passages from my Autobiography* (London: Bentley, 1859), p. 216.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 289.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 216.
9. Claire Connolly, "I accuse Miss Owenson": *The Wild Irish Girl* as Media Event.' *Colby Quarterly*, 36.2 (2000), 98–115 (p. 113).
10. Belanger, p. 18.
11. Christina Morin, 'Regina Maria Roche', in *Lost Souls of Horror and the Gothic*, ed. by Elizabeth McCarthy and Bernice M. Murphy (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2016), pp. 186–89 (p. 187).
12. Mark Hansen, "Not Thus, after All, Would Life Be Given": "Technesis", Technology and the Parody of Romantic Poetics in *Frankenstein*, *Studies in Romanticism*, 36.4 (1997), 575–609 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/25601255>> (p. 578).
13. Joep Theodoor Leerssen, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1997), p. 66.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
17. Natasha Tessone, 'Displaying Ireland: Sydney Owenson and the Politics of Spectacular Antiquarianism', *Eire-Ireland: A Journal of Irish Studies*, 37 (2002), 169–86 <<https://doi.org/10.1353/eir.2002.0021>> (p. 184).
18. Katie Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and The British Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 144 <<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691223247>>.
19. Heather Braun, 'The Seductive Masquerade of The Wild Irish Girl', *Irish Studies Review*, 13.1 (2005), 33–43 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/0967088052000319490>> (p. 48).
20. Tessone, p.169.



21. Joanna Wharton, 'Maria Edgeworth and the Telegraph', *European Romantic Review*, 31 (2020), 747–65 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509585.2020.1831164>> (p. 749).
22. Claire Connolly, 'Irish Romanticism, 1800–1830', in *The Cambridge History of Irish Literature, Volume 1: To 1890*, ed. by Margaret Kelleher and Philip O'Leary (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 407–48 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521822220.012>> (p. 417).
23. Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan, *Florence Macarthy: An Irish Tale* (1818), ed. by Jenny McAuley (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), p. 5. Further references to this text are given after quotations in the text.
24. Rebecca Cole Heinowitz, *Spanish America and British Romanticism, 1777–1826: Rewriting Conquest* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010), p. 1 <<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748641611>>.
25. Claire Connolly, *A Cultural History of the Irish Novel, 1790–1829* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 97 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511800085>>.
26. Connolly, 'Irish Romanticism,' p. 416.
27. Daniel Gahan states that the common view in the Romantic period was that Fitzgerald gained his revolutionary principles from his visit to America. "Journey after My Own Heart": Lord Edward FitzGerald in America, 1788–90', *New Hibernia Review/Iris Éireannach Nua*, 8.2 (2004), 85–105 <<https://doi.org/10.1353/nhr.2004.0042>>.
28. Fintan Cullen, 'Lord Edward FitzGerald: The Creation of an Icon', *History Ireland*, 6.4 (1998), 17–20 (p. 19).
29. Lord Byron, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage: A Romaunt*, 4 Cantos (London: Murray, 1818), IV. 164. 1 (p. 85).
30. Julia M. Wright, 'Introduction', in *The Missionary: An Indian Tale*, by Sydney Owenson (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2002), p. 43. Wright cites Joseph W. Lew, 'The Deceptive Other: Mary Shelley's Critique of Orientalism in *Frankenstein*', *Studies in Romanticism*, 30 (1991), 255–83 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/25600894>>; D. S. Neff, "Hostages to Empire": The Anglo-Indian Problem in *Frankenstein*, *The Curse of Kehama*, and *The Missionary*', *European Romantic Review*, 8 (1997), 386–408 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509585.1997.12029235>>; and William D. Brewer, 'Unnationalized Englishmen in Mary Shelley's Fiction', *Romanticism on the Net*, 11 (1998) <<https://doi.org/10.7202/005812ar>>.
31. Mary Shelley, *Frankenstein, or, the Modern Prometheus: The 1818 Text*, ed. by Marilyn Butler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 7 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199537167.001.0001>>.
32. Harriet Huftis, 'Responsible Creativity and the "Modernity" of Mary Shelley's Prometheus', *Studies in English Literature, 1500–1900*, 43.4 (Autumn 2003), 845–58 <<https://doi.org/10.1353/sel.2003.0040>> (p. 845).
33. Mary Shelley, 'Appendix A: Author's Introduction to the Standard Novels Edition', in *Frankenstein*, p. 195.
34. Huftis, p. 856.
35. Martha Woodmansee, 'The Genius and the Copyright: Economic and Legal Conditions of the Emergence of the "Author"', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 17.4 (1984), 425–48 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/2738129>>.
36. Hansen p. 577.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 579.

38. Ibid., p. 603.
39. Ibid., p. 580.
40. Ibid., p. 590.
41. Leerssen, 'How *The Wild Irish Girl* Made Ireland Romantic', in *The Clash of Ireland: Literary Contrasts and Connections*, ed. by C. C. Barfoot and Theo D'haen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1989) pp. 98–117 (p. 100).
42. Braun, p. 40.
43. Ibid., p. 33.
44. Hansen, p. 598.
45. Ibid., p. 603.
46. Ibid., p. 581.
47. *British Review*, p. 487, cited in Belanger, p. 208.
48. Terry Eagleton, *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture* (London: Verso, 1995), p. 178.
49. Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan, *The Wild Irish Girl: A National Tale*, ed. by Kathryn Kirkpatrick (1806; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 121.
50. Ibid., p. 21.
51. Julie Donovan, *Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan and the Politics of Style* (Palo Alto: Academica Press, 2009), p. 3.
52. Ibid., pp. 19–20.
53. Donovan, p. 13.
54. Ina Ferris, *The Romantic National Tale and The Question of Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 75–76 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/owc/9780199537167.001.0001>>.
55. Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990), p. 116.
56. Ibid., p. 113.
57. Ibid., p. 116.
58. Gillen D'Arcy Wood, *The Shock of the Real: Romanticism and Visual Culture, 1760–1860* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), p. 7.
59. Ibid., p. 13.
60. Ibid., p. 8.

#### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

S. LAWRENSON. 'Florence and the Machine: Female Authorship, Popular Culture, and Technological Modernity in Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan's *Florence Macarthy* (1818)', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.104>>.

#### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 6 November 2019.



‘START NOT, GENTLE READER!’  
Re-reading Alicia LeFanu’s *Helen Monteagle* (1818)

*Anna M. Fitzler*



‘READ HELEN MONTEAGLE’, NOTES MARY SHELLEY in a journal entry of January 1818.<sup>1</sup> Alicia LeFanu’s three-volume novel had arrived at the printers in Clerkenwell in the Autumn of 1817, at around the time Shelley was reading its immediate predecessor, LeFanu’s first work of fiction, *Strathallan* (1816). *Strathallan* was in its second revised edition by November 1816, and had run to a third in 1817. Shelley was perhaps persuaded to give *Helen Monteagle* swifter attention than she had LeFanu’s first novel by an early notice printed in the *Literary Gazette* which ‘safely’ recommended it ‘to the perusal of all who received delight from *Strathallan*’.<sup>2</sup> A then 19-year-old Claire Clairmont, on the other hand, was certainly not convinced of its merits and in her journal roundly dismissed *Helen Monteagle* as a ‘Stupid foolish Book’.<sup>3</sup> If this is a verdict which arguably belies the wit of LeFanu’s novel, it is one which did not anticipate its author’s enduring presence in the literary marketplace for the next twenty years. *Helen Monteagle* is one of six multi-volume novels LeFanu completed in the period 1816 to 1826, before turning to poetry, essays and short stories published in the popular and periodical press in the 1830s. LeFanu had begun her career much earlier at the age of eighteen with *The Flowers; or, the Sylphid Queen: A Fairy Tale. In Verse* (1809). In 1812, *Rosara’s Chain; or the Choice of Life. A Poem*, went on sale in the Juvenile Library established by Clairmont’s mother Mary, and William Godwin. LeFanu would have been amongst the first to discountenance the idea that quantity of literary output was any measure of its quality or worth, but *Helen Monteagle* is a far from stupid novel which focuses upon and practises deviation from predictable courses of action.

This article is the first to re-read *Helen Monteagle* as a contribution to understandings of the variety of prose fiction published in the Romantic period. Its circulation in print coincided with that of *Frankenstein* and *Northanger Abbey*, and its disappearance is typical of the many novels produced by a generation of writers who did not achieve the distinction of Shelley or Austen. *Helen Monteagle* is not radical or revolutionary, but it is ambitious and, in its interest in what Henry Fielding referred to as ‘the Science of *Authoring*’, curiously experimental.<sup>4</sup> Tracing the eponymous heroine’s defiance of parental authority, the article begins by exploring how this shadows forth other incidents of female transgression in *Helen Monteagle* which in turn serve the broader purpose of articulating reflections on authorship in the early nineteenth century, and about women novelists in particular. The tendency of LeFanu’s fictionalised author–narrator

to intervene in the romance narrative she is otherwise purposed to write is seen to anticipate the increasingly self-reflexive mode adopted in *Leolin Abbey*, the novel LeFanu completed in 1818, and which was published the following year. Both texts are considered against the backdrop of LeFanu's attempts to retain some agency in the process of her professionalisation.

LeFanu was connected by birth to a distinguished line of celebrated writers, which included her maternal grandmother, the novelist and dramatist Frances Sheridan, and her uncle, Richard Brinsley Sheridan; the Victorian novelist Joseph Sheridan Le Fanu was related to her as the grandson of her maternal aunt. *Helen Monteagle* is the work of an intelligent and proficient reader of literary history, and in its comical portrayal of literary pretension LeFanu develops *Strathallan's* lively interest in writers and readers. It also, as this article suggests, betrays a greater apprehension of the threat amateurism was presenting to the integrity of LeFanu's immediate literary culture.

*Women Writers and the 'siren arts'*

*Helen Monteagle* weaves its narrative around a triumvirate of female characters, the eponymous heroine's experience of elopement and estrangement intersecting with the lives of her sister, Adeliza Marchmont, and a brilliant actress, Cordelia Clifford, who has retreated from public life to the home of the Marchmonts' widowed neighbour, Angelica Temple. Set principally in Wales and Scotland in the decade following the War of the Second Coalition (1798–1801), the domestic action is shadowed by references to the Mediterranean locations of military and off-duty conflict as experienced by Helen's husband, Edmund Monteagle, and Angelica's enigmatic cousin, Sir Almaric Douglas.<sup>5</sup> Monteagle is an honourable and distinguished army captain disinherited as heir to his uncle's estate for refusing to abandon military life. Douglas is similarly a warrior at once celebrated and unsuitable. A veteran of British diplomacy and intervention in North Africa, Douglas is a respectful admirer of the places he has chosen to visit: Algiers, Tripoli, Tunis and Egypt. However, his laudable military record is offset by scurrilous speculation about his travels. Adeliza eventually falls in love with this troubled man, though it is Helen's initial courtship by Monteagle, and the circumstances of their marriage, which form the basis of what appears to be principal of the novel's three plotlines.

This tale originates with the usually sensible Helen's resolve to defy her father's objections to Monteagle, whom she agrees to marry in secret. Helen is naively unaware of the elaborate plans Monteagle has put in place for their elopement, the success of which depends upon his friend—Douglas's young impulsive cousin, Edric—acting as a decoy in company with Helen's maid-servant. When Helen's father, Lord Rosstrevor, discovers that he has been pursuing the wrong couple, he assumes her complicit in such a wicked deception, and is distraught. Promptly disowning Helen, Rosstrevor forbids that she return to Rock Trevor, the family home in South Wales, or to his seat at Marchmont Hall near Edinburgh. She becomes in his estimation 'a blasted monument of

beauties, graces, talents, bestowed in vain' and 'too conscious of transgression to find happiness in herself'.<sup>6</sup> Helen's anxiety at the scrutiny to which her once inviolable reputation is subject, is replaced by the deprivations she experiences as one amongst 'that most pitiable race of human beings, the wives or widows of soldiers' (III, 289). A new recruit, Helen feels isolated in their peripatetic and garrulous company, and realises that romantic love alone is a fragile defence against the unfounded jealousies and suspicions which beset her marriage to a man profoundly committed to his calling.

Ultimately, Helen disproves the adage that 'two years, in a soldier's wife, is, generally, too long a time for beauty to last' (III, 291), and is happily reconciled with Monteagle and her father. However, with Monteagle invalidated out of active service, Helen's happiness—and, arguably, LeFanu's interest in its depiction—is compromised. Helen is overjoyed at Monteagle's return but a fuller portrait of her pleasure is left to the reader's imagination on the grounds that

[l]anguage, which has so many forms and shades to define and describe all that is painful, and all that is wrong, becomes barren, flat, and limited, when the picture to be represented requires only the tints dedicated to beauty, to virtue, or happiness. (II, 466)

As one of several interventions from LeFanu's narrator, this comment acknowledges the preternatural quality of an impossibly idealised femininity. At the same time, it betrays a reluctance to dwell upon the sometimes tiresome fictional heroines an author is obliged to place centre stage.

In the novel's more intriguing subplot, LeFanu investigates all that is painful and wrong about Cordelia, the reluctant actress living in a state of near nervous exhaustion at Angelica's Welsh villa, Caerlaverock. Although Cordelia is, like Helen, a woman whose choices test the limits of female propriety, her actions are guided by filial duty rather than romantic love. Cordelia's heart is decidedly 'dried up and dead' (I, 261) and for years her captivating performances under the stage name 'Miss Evelyn' have been dedicated to earning money sufficient to clear her father's debts. Once a prosperous merchant living at the Tuscan port of Livorno or 'Leghorn' on the Ligurian Sea, Cordelia's father suffered under its occupation by French forces in the summer of 1796. Left behind by many compatriots whose escape was successfully effected by the British navy, he was stripped of his assets and, upon returning to England, consigned to prison. At the time of Cordelia's semi-retirement from stage life, he is still living there with her Italian-born mother and brother Emilio. Cordelia's father has consistently welcomed his daughter's very public acts of selfless enterprise, the success of which is measured in the rage for 'Miss Evelyn' related merchandise—'the Evelyn robe, the Evelyn scarf, the Evelyn sandal' (II, 199). However, pride and an increasingly righteous fervour prevents her mother from sharing his enthusiasm, and Emilio's bitter taunts and cruel sarcasms conspire to aggravate Cordelia's already troubled sense of prejudicial assumptions about female players. Her sensitivity to the kind of press criticism which is designed 'to hurt, not to correct' adds to the complex web of private and public opinion in which she is

enmeshed (II, 251). Cordelia's eventual breakdown, however, is also caused by the indignities of success: 'To have my talents ostentatiously brought forward' in the newspapers 'would be in itself sufficiently painful', she observes (II, 249). But to this is added the torment of having 'any imputed advantages of person I may possess, dwelt upon with inconsiderate, and exaggerated eulogium, enumerated with the exactness of a dealer in pictures, and appreciated in the language of a connoisseur' (II, 249–50).

Cordelia's anxiety reflects how 'regular reviews of both performances by and portraits of well-known actresses contributed to the extraordinary visibility of those public figures' whose 'private lives were often plundered for narratives which provided tales both of social mobility and adulterous liaisons'.<sup>7</sup> Cordelia actively pursues neither, but the fact that Lord Rosstrevor wishes to make her his second wife, and Almaric Douglas considers her a 'justly dreaded enchantress' (I, 222) threatens to compromise her innocence. Cordelia's retreat from public scrutiny and initial reluctance to advise on and participate in Rosstrevor's private theatricals perhaps bears traces of real-life actress Elizabeth Farren (1759/62–1829). She met her future husband, the Earl of Derby, at his friend the Duke of Richmond's private theatre at the height of her fame in the late 1780s. Farren's chaste lifestyle was a matter of public record, and she sustained an impeccable reputation throughout a career which included, among numerous comic roles, that for which Cordelia is most celebrated, Hermione in the *Winter's Tale*. Farren's transformation, however, to Duchess of Derby upon the death of the Duke's estranged first wife in 1797, inevitably attracted suspicion that it was motivated by a long-nurtured desire to move in circles above her station.<sup>8</sup>

There is another public story relevant to that of Cordelia which has a very personal dimension for LeFanu, concerning as it does Eliza Sheridan, *née* Elizabeth Linley (1754–92) who, prior to marrying LeFanu's uncle, Richard Brinsley, gained celebrity as a soprano and was revered for both her beauty and extraordinarily expressive voice. From the point of her stage debut in Bath at the age of eight, Linley was worked hard by her music-master father, Charles Linley, and as a fêted but guileless 17-year-old was betrothed to Walter Long, a man over forty years her senior. When she successfully implored Long to break off the engagement, Linley found herself re-imagined onstage as 'Kitty Linnet' in Samuel Foote's farce, *The Maid of Bath* (1771), and was once again harassed by Captain Mathews, a married man who had previously proposed that she be his lover. In 1772, Elizabeth determined upon running away to a convent in St Quentin and was escorted as far as Lille (before falling ill) by a lovelorn Sheridan, whom she had approached as the trusted brother of her neighbouring friend. Their apparent elopement, prudent marriage, and the two duels Sheridan fought with Mathews upon his return to London, made for an entertaining national scandal.

Joseph Roach has observed that the writer Frances Burney (the name of whose first fictional protagonist, Evelina, is echoed in Cordelia's stage persona) 'consciously or unconsciously identified some of her own aspirations and anxie-



ties about public performance' with Linley, 'the prodigy she at first called "the Syren"'.<sup>9</sup> In *The Wanderer* (1814), Burney reflects upon the ambiguities of performance through her initially disguised heroine who acquires the name 'Ellis' but is actually Juliet Granville. She prompts further anxiety when, having agreed to participate in a private theatrical performance of *The Provok'd Husband*, she proves herself a consummate actress, and later accompanies herself on the harp 'in a slow and plaintive air, with a delicacy, skill, and expression, at once touching and masterly'.<sup>10</sup> Ellis invites suspicion in an exclusively non-commercial context but her performance 'retroactively', as Nora Nachumi puts it, 'calls into question the apparent authenticity' of her ladylike demeanour offstage, and Burney 'reveals a culture that cannot reconcile its notions of feminine modesty with the spectacle of a woman performing in public'.<sup>11</sup> In another novel of 1818, Charles Maturin's *Women; or, Pour et Contre*, this spectacle is transmuted into the significant threat to life posed by Zaira, a celebrated actress and opera singer. Whereas for Burney and LeFanu the contests which centred on the real-life performers of the previous generation pertain in complex ways to their own public displays of make-believe, questions of legitimacy in Maturin's novel are appropriated to a tale in which Zaira is, albeit unwittingly, a rival in love for the broken-hearted heroine she only later discovers to be her own daughter. However indirectly, she is implicated in her daughter's death and mired in sexual scandal.<sup>12</sup>

LeFanu's portrait of Cordelia, a woman made wretched by her work, explores the contradictions Jennie Batchelor has identified as inherent to the perceptions and experiences of the female professional in the latter stages of the eighteenth century.<sup>13</sup> An actress 'whose manners might fascinate all, while her situation, some parents might disapprove' (II, 227), Cordelia's financial rewards further complicate estimations of her inspired performances; the intelligence she brings to her roles, at odds with her baldly commercial imperative. This double bind is further complicated by her lack of authoritative control: though an active agent of the marketplace, Cordelia is paradoxically also its object. LeFanu arguably traces an analogy here with women writers for whom a genuine literary talent is the potential source of both intellectual satisfaction and much needed capital. As Batchelor observes, Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776) 'laid down the foundation for a new kind of literary authority', from which emerged the 'modern author' as a 'disinterested professional' not 'adversely implicated in the trucking and bartering practices to which commercial man was supposed to be naturally inclined'. In the final decades of the eighteenth century, 'the literary' appeared to be 'increasingly associated with the "masculine" [...], with those traditionally "male" subjects such as economics and politics that were held to be superior to such inferior, ubiquitous and feminine productions as the novel'.<sup>14</sup>

Cordelia's most severe critic is the dashing and enigmatic hero, Almaric Douglas. Some years prior to the action of the novel, a friend of Douglas had developed an unreciprocated and, ultimately, fatal passion for Cordelia. Though Cordelia was brought 'to the brink of the grave' by that friend's suicide (III, 307), Douglas is merciless in demonising her part in it. His distrust of Cordelia's

profession clearly influences his interpretation of her conduct in private. The 'diabolical arts' by which Cordelia 'had quenched the love of fame' and a 'thirst for glory' (III, 306–07) are commensurate with 'the syren arts, the cold-hearted triumphs of coquetry' he assumes were the means by which she wilfully destroyed the most 'delicate and discerning' of men (III, 305). But Douglas woefully misreads Cordelia's part in this tragedy. Naturally disinclined to exploit any passion her beauty often and unwittingly excites, Cordelia had, in this instance, prudently distanced herself from a would-be lover driven to distraction by his own 'frenzied' obsession (III, 311). That Douglas perseveres in such a contemptuous and uncorroborated view of a woman he does not know, makes for a significant flaw in a character otherwise functioning as the male embodiment of romantic 'virtue, valour' and 'heroism' (III, 313). But this is perhaps LeFanu's point. As Jacqueline Pearson observes, the sexualisation of women's acts of creativity became, particularly in the years 1817–20, a characteristic of Byron's surreal and obscene 'outbursts against literary women', and Douglas arguably represents a wider community of sceptical, if more respectable, male authorities.<sup>15</sup> The opening of Walter Scott's *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since* (1814), for example, with its "elaborate suppression of prior", mostly female "narrative models" is cited by Pearson as indicative of a heightening of anxiety about literary women in the second generation of Romantics.<sup>16</sup> Douglas's much lamented friend, and supposed victim of Cordelia's artfulness, was a man of knowledge and taste who 'would have undoubtedly contributed much to enlarge the sphere both of arts and literature' (III, 304). Cordelia's propensity for deception, like the woman writer's pretensions to fiction, rival and displace a male prerogative.

#### *Gentle Readers and 'soft sympathy' Novels*

In light of these contexts *Helen Monteagle* is less a 'stupid foolish book' than it is a romance which simultaneously sustains an interest in perceptions of novel writers and their readers. In the guise of *Helen Monteagle's* narrator, LeFanu defends the novel genre as a 'much abused and misrepresented species of writing' (III, 273), a phrase which recollects the observation included in *Northanger Abbey* (1818), that 'no species of composition has been so much decried'.<sup>17</sup> Cordelia-like, she works with professional integrity. But she too forcibly acts a part, implementing the conventions of a romance novel, with its emphasis on domesticity and sympathy, whilst questioning its objectives. *Helen Monteagle's* principal female and male protagonists, wronged by the world and divested of their rightful inheritance are, for instance, duly vindicated, and true lovers prosper at the expense of others' venality and pride. But LeFanu's narrative interventions suggest ambivalence about the adequacy of that fictional framework. When, for instance, Helen is described as resembling Monteagle 'too much to be a fit wife for him', the narrator pre-empts the reader's surprise:

Start not, gentle reader! for surely the readers of 'soft sympathy novels,' ought to become gentle, if not so by nature, yet from the constant income-tax we levy on their sensibilities. (I, 311)

The allusion to hard currency is a fitting one, the narrator proceeding to explain the Monteagles' mutual tendency 'to spend money, and there is no money, on either side, to spend'. LeFanu most likely does sympathise with the kind of profligacy her narrator is obliged to censure, but she is also playfully invoking the assumption that readers and, in particular, women readers, are debilitated by literary consumption. This Laurence Sterne-inspired address to the reader also incorporates a different kind of emphasis on fidelity and betrayal. LeFanu is true to the spirit of earlier fictions of sensibility, but is acutely aware of their shortcomings. In addition, she implies that for every talented practitioner of prose there are innumerable imitative writers whose inferior efforts negatively influence perceptions of modern fiction.

In this respect, LeFanu takes her place as successor to the satirical novelists of the previous century for whom careless approximations of 'soft sympathy novels' were a cause for concern. William Beckford's *Modern Novel Writing, or the Elegant Enthusiast* was published in 1796 and followed, in 1797, by *Azemias: A Descriptive and Sentimental Novel. Interspersed with Pieces of Poetry. By Jacquetta Agneta Mariana Jenks*. As announced on the title page of Beckford's first 'rhapsodical romance', the heroine and 'elegant enthusiast' is Arabella Bloomville, whose 'interesting emotions', also 'interspersed with poetry', are to be related by the fictional author, Lady Harriet Marlow. The opening chapter of *Modern Novel Writing* reveals the retired location of Arabella's cottage, '[a]t the foot of a verdant declivity overshadowed by woodbine, jessamine and myrtle, and softly inundated by a sapphire rivulet that wandered through the neighbouring woods in serpentine simplicity'.<sup>18</sup> The description of its inhabitant is similarly effusive. Arabella's

complexion was neither the insipid whiteness of the lily-bosomed Circassian, nor the masculine shade of the Gallic brunette; the freshness of health glowed upon her cheek, while the lustre of her dark blue eyes borrowed its splendour from the unsullied flame, that gave her mind the perfection of intellect! (p. 46)

Arabella's lips, teeth, hair, fingers, arms and bosom are considered in turn, and 'her little feet were so enchantingly pretty, that they ravished all beholders' (p. 47). The most important of her admirers is Henry Lambert, a military hero distinguished by the kind of relentless 'suavity which operates beyond the shafts of courage, or even the prevalence of despair' (p. 42). As is clear from the outset, Beckford's design 'seeks to debunk the (bad) "Modern" fad for "Novel Writing" by reformulating the paradoxical criticism that its "novelty" is formed of existing materials recycled to the point of redundancy'.<sup>19</sup>

The opening paragraph of *Helen Monteagle* defaults to the kind of idyllic scene-setting mocked by Beckford, transporting LeFanu's reader to a remote and 'delightful villa, romantically situated in the Principality of Wales'. It is immediately established, however, that 'a party of gay young people' lately arrived there, at the invitation of its owner, Angelica Temple, 'came to the following wonderful and astonishing resolutions':

That no sentimental novels, doleful ditties, horrifying romances, or soul-harrowing poetry, should be read or recited in that society which was formed entirely for the support of harmless recreation and innocent mirth. (I, 1–2)

LeFanu is more explicit than Beckford in distancing her own novel from fictional works of dubious quality and potentially detrimental effect, but incorporates in her ensuing narrative close and ironic imitations of their worst excesses. The arrival of Helen Monteagle on the scene of Angelica Temple's utopia, for example, is heralded by an unattributed quotation from Thomas Tickell's mock-heroic poem *Kensington Garden* (1722), uttered by an impressed Edric Douglas. Helen is, by association, possessed of 'A faultless beauty, and an angel mind' (I, 55). A reference to the fairy Prince Azuriel in Tickell's poem, the line in LeFanu's hands (substituting 'angel' for the original 'spotless'), at once confirms Helen's superior qualities and implies that such qualities are unattainable and therefore unmatched in the real human lives of her readers. Helen's *incredibility* is further underlined by the following account of her appearance: 'Helen was a brilliant *blonde*; with blue eyes, and a glow of complexion, united to all the graces and fascinating vivacity of a brunette.' (I, 55) As is the case with the earlier description of Beckford's Arabella, this paints the heroine in accordance with specific reference points only to produce a rather blurry picture. It is not quite clear what these young women look like. As the narrator of Charlotte Smith's novel, *Marchmont* (1796), observes: it is 'difficult' for 'a novelist to give to one of his heroines any very marked feature which shall not disfigure her!'<sup>20</sup> Ultimately, LeFanu's Helen is developed in the novel as a sincerely drawn character capable of speaking for herself ('the bees of eloquence and poesy' have, after all, 'shed their honey upon her lips' [I, 86]), but she is also the object of her creator's occasional acts of self-parody.

If the present readership were in any doubt that LeFanu is knowingly invoking, rather than straightforwardly practising the language Beckford saw fit to burlesque, her third novel, *Leolin Abbey* (1819), confirms her inclination to subvert expectations. LeFanu was working on the novel by August 1818 and it was published early in the summer of the following year. Its hero is the grown-up Alured Vere, recently bereaved of his father and facing an uncertain future in Dublin with his stricken mother, Emmeline. Across the first two chapters, Emmeline discloses to Alured the identity of her own father, Lord Trelawney, and his seeming to have persevered, throughout Alured's life, in punishing her for marrying against his wishes. His revenge is apparently exacted at the expense of Alured, whom Emmeline has not been able to fix in any profession on account of Trelawney's covert influence. Aware that she herself is dying, Emmeline's only hope is that her brother—whose own history is outlined in chapter three—will honour his promise to look after Alured's interests. By the close of the fourth chapter, Alured has left Ireland for his grandfather's seat, Leolin Abbey, and LeFanu's narrator is sure that she has 'endeavoured to make the reader as well

acquainted with every branch of my hero's family as I am myself'.<sup>21</sup> It is a comment, however, which provokes dissatisfaction:

'Bless me!', my fair reader returns, 'that is exactly what you ought *not* to do. Who cares for a man that knows his parents from the very beginning? No; I'll tell you what you ought to have done. The beautiful Emmeline, you say, married against her father's consent: Captain Vere should die abroad—Emmeline, feeling herself about to leave this world likewise, (observe, all this ought to take place during the hero's infancy,) should cast about for some contrivance to recommend the young orphan to his flinty-hearted grandfather. She might either leave him in a basket, and place him (as the Turkish incendiaries do a lighted match) at the entrance of a door, or on the sill of the window. You authors know how to manage the details of those things,—somehow with a spring; or if he was either bought of a gypsy, or fished out of a horsepond, or saved from a shipwreck, or discovered descending in a balloon,—that would be delightful; and then he might be called, "The Child of Doubt;" or "The Child of Mystery," you know, which would be so pretty, and, above all things, so new'. (I, 52–53)

Warming to her borrowed theme, the reader has further ideas as to how such doubt or mystery might be resolved. As he matured, Alured would bear an increasingly uncanny resemblance to those distinguished predecessors whose portraits grace the walls of Leolin Abbey, and his true lineage would thus be triumphantly restored. At this point, LeFanu's narrator puts a stop to such fervent enthusiasm for novelty:

Patience, patience Madam, 'I would not have you be too sure,' as Puff says in the Critic, that my hero *does* know his parents. All I have as yet written may have been purely *pour vous désorienter*. Leaving these matters to a future consideration, I now request your sympathy and indulgence in favour of Alured, for the first time introduced to the formidable ordeal of a family circle. (I, 53–54)

The reader's proposed revisions are hackneyed, formulaic and clearly popular. The child in possession of something or other was a recurrent motif of writing in the last decades of the eighteenth century.<sup>22</sup> Minerva had published *The Child of Providence* in 1792 and the trend prevailed with *The Child of Hope* (1800), attributed to Mary Pilkington and, in 1808, the very title suggested by LeFanu's reader appeared as, *The Child of Mystery, a Novel, in Three Volumes, Founded on Recent Events*, by Sarah Scudgell Wilkinson.<sup>23</sup> The response of *Leolin Abbey's* narrator is to conjure Mr Puff, the panegyrist turned playwright of Richard Brinsley Sheridan's final play *The Critic* (1779), who instructs a company of players in the performance of his tragedy, *The Spanish Armada*. The line quoted in *Leolin Abbey* is the answer Puff gives to the theatre critic, Sneer. He has accompanied the writer Sir Fretful Plagiary to a rehearsal of *The Spanish Armada* by actors given leave by Puff 'to cut out or omit whatever they found



heavy or unnecessary to the plot'. When the underprompter informs Puff that 'they have taken very liberal advantage of your indulgence', he concedes that the actors are, 'in general, very good judges'.<sup>24</sup> Upon delivery of a risibly short four-line soliloquy by a Beefeater—only later revealed to be a privateer, and the eventual assailant of the play's Spanish leading man, Whiskerandos—Sneer remarks: 'A most sentimental beefeater that, Mr Puff'. Puff replies: 'I would not have you be too sure that he *is* a beefeater'. Sneer's 'What! A hero in disguise?' is met with Puff's 'No matter; I only give you a hint' (III. 1. 97–100).

The allusion to Puff sees LeFanu mine sources rich in debates about literary innovation. *The Critic* was successor to what Michael Corder describes as 'a series of metatheatrical playscripts' originating with George Villiers's Restoration play, *The Rehearsal* (1671).<sup>25</sup> Sheridan's Puff is adapted from Villiers's character Bayes, a playwright and satirical distortion of John Dryden, whose new play in rehearsal confuses the actors at every turn. Whereas Bayes is an advocate of new directions in dramatic writing—for which he is ridiculed—Puff is uninspired 'to strike out anything new'. His approach is inimical to probability and historical accuracy; 'but', he asserts, 'I take it I improve on the established modes' (II. 1. 458–59). Puff is reliant on literary precedent and, by aligning herself with him, the narrator of *Leolin Abbey* seemingly admits to her own limited powers of creative imagination. She also hints that she is in the business of disorientating the reader, though this is to the ultimate end of, maybe, giving that reader what she wants. It is a tease which is highly inventive. It threatens the kind of confusion Puff's literary precursor, Bayes, caused with his radically new departures from established modes of dramatic writing, at the same time as it accentuates the decidedly conservative expectations of a reader for whom 'new' is a rehash of familiar and rather tired fictional tropes.

If LeFanu's novels of 1818 and 1819 suggest some affinities with earlier eighteenth-century satirists, they were also published at a time when, as Lisa M. Wilson's study has demonstrated, continuities were emerging across a range of satirical novels written by women. Despite the political and literary differences between, for example, Mary Robinson, famed actress and mistress of the Prince of Wales, and Sarah Greene, author of *Romance Readers and Romance Writers* (1810) and *Scotch Novel Reading* (1824), Wilson argues that they deploy comparable satirical strategies. Robinson emerges from this picture as a particular kind of self-satirist who, in *The Natural Daughter* (1799) 'satirises the popular taste for just the kind of novel that she is often accused of writing: the tell-all satire that ridicules her acquaintances and capitalises on the reading public's prurient interest in the private lives of the celebrated'.<sup>26</sup> An illustration of this sees Robinson's heroine, a novelist, advised by her duplicitous and venal publisher that a tale spun from any real-life scandal and billed with a familiarly salacious title will sell. There is a nice correspondence between this and the pert recommendations of *Leolin Abbey's* reader to its narrator which hints at LeFanu's interest in fellow Longman novelist Robinson, not only as a stage, but also literary performer. The terms of engagement are different, however. Rob-



inson's fictional publisher is subjected by her to the very lance of ridicule he suggests the novelist-heroine should swap for her pen. LeFanu's fictional reader is insubordinate; operating at a superior level of narration and, by implication, with greater influence in the literary marketplace of 1819.

*Leolin Abbey* develops the formal disruption of narrative LeFanu experiments with in *Helen Monteagle*, and signifies her increasing familiarity with a market characterised by surplus supply and reader-driven demand. Nearly a decade had elapsed between LeFanu's first publication, *The Flowers*, and the sale of *Helen Monteagle*, and during this time LeFanu had begun to appreciate that there was not a direct correlation between a book's merit, and its potential to turn a profit. LeFanu's increasingly astute understanding of the terms of success is an important context in which to understand her technique; a technique which bears traces of that 'mingling of satiric derision and self-implication' Corder identifies as at work in Sheridan's *The Critic*.<sup>27</sup> Early reviewers of *Strathallan* in 1816 had been quick to publicly acknowledge a correspondence of talent between niece and uncle. Conscious of this, perhaps LeFanu enjoyed another private joke in her allusion to Puff, recalling, at a time when her view of the writing profession was at its most sceptical, the very play in which Sheridan's ingenuity was as much in evidence as his 'diminishing' faith 'in theatre itself'.<sup>28</sup>

*'Forming connexions in the literary line'*

In an 1859 review of 'lithographed mock-sentimental drawing-room ballads of the usual calibre', the *Literary Gazette* attends to one of the title-page emblems with barely concealed derision. It describes an 'impossibly fair youth' leaning upon the 'frail shoulder' of an 'ideally perfect young lady', with the 'impossible tenderness of pressure (looking, however, "intensely nowhere") [...] in a wholly impossible posture'. This is mere segue to the review's damning opinion of a previous generation of women writers. This 'ravishing picture' is one

upon which Louisa Sydney Stanhope, Nella Stephens, Alicia Lefanu, Rosa Matilda, or any other of the Leadenhall tribe of petticoat novelists who long since enriched the Minerva press, would have constructed a romance in three volumes, with graceful induction, and 'most saddest sequel'.<sup>29</sup>

LeFanu would have been disappointed to read her name in association with Minerva, a press which, though it dominated the market primarily in women's writing across a range of genres, persisted into the nineteenth century as a byword for inferior, widely circulated and ultimately forgotten fiction. Notwithstanding the business acumen and influence of its founder, William Lane, Minerva—the name Lane adopted for his premises at 31 Leadenhall Street in 1790—became 'a common term to describe a particular type of light society romance or thriller, much condemned in conduct literature'.<sup>30</sup> According to William St Clair, many advice manuals familiar to eighteenth-century readers—by such as James Fordyce, John Gregory and Hester Chapone—and which generally advised against novel reading, enjoyed long print runs in the Romantic

period. Reissued after the French Revolution 'to meet a new demand for older certainties',<sup>31</sup> conduct books of the previous generation were supplemented by new titles which perpetuated the idea that 'Minerva' and the business of the circulating library were synonymous. As successor to Lane, A. K. Newman gradually shifted the company's publishing priorities, but he had also inherited the circulating library at Leadenhall Street, where the system had been mobilised by Lane as early as 1784.<sup>32</sup> His 'main catalogue and six additional parts, printed between 1814 and 1819, list 7,967 items, including more than 3,500—or 40%—fiction titles'.<sup>33</sup> In 1819, twenty years after first warning of the dangers of reading for young girls in the oft reprinted *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education*, Hannah More thought the proportion sufficient to identify the circulating library as 'no unfrequented road' to the divorce court.<sup>34</sup>

Despite this, of the women writers listed in the *Literary Gazette*, only Stanhope is a Minerva author in the strictest sense. In a career spanning 1806–1827, she published almost exclusively with the press through its various incarnations, including nine novels under the Minerva imprint by 1818.<sup>35</sup> LeFanu's association with Minerva comes in part from her dealings with 'A. K. Newman & Co. Leadenhall Press', with whom she published in 1823 *Tales of a Tourist, or Fashionable Connexions*, and *Don Juan de Las Sierras*, as well as her last known novel, *Henry the Fourth of France* (1826). Antony King Newman had been an apprentice of Lane's, and became a publishing partner in 1801. His name appears in 'Minerva Press' title-pages of 1802 alongside that of his employer. Subsequent changes to the name under which Newman operated were occasioned by the incorporation of other partners, and by Lane's retirement in around 1808 and his death in 1814.<sup>36</sup> Newman continued to honour Minerva's long-standing commitment to publishing novels, romances and adventures but, after 1820, dispensed with the reference to 'Minerva Press' altogether, and specialised in instructive 'Juvenile Prize books'.<sup>37</sup> LeFanu's connection with the 'Leadenhall tribe', like that of Nella Stephens, began at this phase in the company's history.

Recent scholarship has sought to redress the balance in favour of Minerva authors. Notably, Anthony Mandal's account of Minerva regular Elizabeth Meeke invites reconsideration of a woman 'whose literary career acts as a metonym for the ways in which women novelists found themselves continually inscribed, erased, and reinscribed at the time, without leaving a trace of them for posterity'.<sup>38</sup> In LeFanu's case the author finds herself written into a history of which she was never fully a part. Similarly, Rosa Matilda, the pen-name of Charlotte Byrne, more commonly known by her other pseudonym, Charlotte Dacre (1782?–1825), was not a Minerva author. The opprobrium she excited upon publication of Gothic fantasies in verse and prose in the first decade of the nineteenth century was, however, a sufficient link to a supposedly discreditable organisation. For LeFanu, several decades on and yet still within her own lifetime, the relatively positive reputation she achieved as a novelist of the Romantic period was being undermined by prevailing prejudicial attitudes towards a press she had herself deliberately avoided.

*Helen Monteagle* was published with Sherwood, Neely and Jones, the partnership also responsible for *Strathallan*, and the anonymously-authored *Lucy Osmond* (1809) which I have argued for elsewhere as written by LeFanu's mother, Elizabeth.<sup>39</sup> Sherwood, Neely and Jones published across a more diverse range of disciplines, incorporating economics and agriculture as well as history, drama and fiction. From the point of view of an author, publication 'by a house other than Minerva [...] provided an invitation for its critics to view it as at least potentially non-detrimental'.<sup>40</sup> From Sherwood's perspective, *Helen Monteagle* was certainly a low risk investment. *Strathallan* had received generally positive reviews which had acknowledged LeFanu's distinguished heritage as well as her ingenuity. In 1816, for example, the *Anti-Jacobin Review* had been particularly emphatic: 'Intellectual excellence is not often hereditary, but in the family of Sheridan, it has shone forth for now more than half a century. Miss Lefanu is the last, but not the least, of those claimants to renown.' The review continued that if *Strathallan* perhaps 'exhibits sometimes the imperfections of an unpractised pen, it always betrays the exuberance of an original and cultivated mind—nothing is borrowed', and concluded with an assertion of LeFanu's potential, declaring *Strathallan* 'to be among the best works of fiction which have issued from the press for many years'.<sup>41</sup>

William Sherwood had expanded his business ten years earlier, having taken over from Henry D. Symonds—one of several publishers imprisoned in the early 1790s for selling Thomas Paine's *The Rights of Man*—to trade with Symonds's son-in-law, Samuel Dunbar Neely, and Robert Jones at 20 Paternoster Row.<sup>42</sup> As LeFanu was completing *Helen Monteagle*, however, Sherwood courted his own controversy and found himself at the centre of what has since been described as 'the most decisive single event in shaping the reading of the romantic period'.<sup>43</sup> In February 1817 Sherwood sold pirated copies of Robert Southey's *Wat Tyler*. The manuscript of Southey's republican verse drama had been suppressed since the 1790s by radical publisher James Ridgway, who had already served a sentence in Newgate for printing the work of Paine. Created poet laureate in 1814, Southey was at risk of embarrassment given the sympathies of *Wat Tyler* and tried to ban Sherwood's version and sue for damages. His failure proved not only lucrative for LeFanu's publisher, but also for the sellers free to trade in cheap, pirated copies: 'And the readership spanned the whole nation.'<sup>44</sup>

*Helen Monteagle* attracted fewer though no less favourable notices than *Strathallan* upon its publication in 1818 and perhaps LeFanu's change of publisher in this year owed more to her ambition than it did to reluctance on Sherwood's part to negotiate for *Leolin Abbey*. In August 1818, LeFanu first made the acquaintance of Thomas Moore whose recent oriental verse romance, *Lalla Rookh* (1817), and satirical *The Fudge Family in Paris* (1818), had been published by Longman. The occasion of their meeting was Moore's work on his biography of Richard Brinsley Sheridan, who had died in 1816. Unlike Sheridan's first posthumous biographer, John Watkins, Moore was keen to consult his family. LeFanu's mother, Elizabeth, had been annotating her copy of Watkins's

biography, correcting his mistakes in a state of exacerbated contempt for what she perceived to be his distorted account of Sheridan history. But the desire to publish any riposte had been overwhelmed by further bereavement and failing health. Her younger daughter—LeFanu's sister Harriet—died in February 1818 in her twenty-second year. Five months previously, the LeFanus had received news from Dublin of the death of Elizabeth's older sister and, within the same week, of the demise of her nephew, Tom Sheridan. By September 1818 Alicia LeFanu's increasing responsibilities saw her also undertaking, on her mother's behalf, to select, annotate and copy materials for Moore. In this she answered not only his specific requests for family papers relating to Sheridan's political life, but also entrusted him with private correspondence which she thought provided insights on the other personalities with whom he was dealing.

Moore and LeFanu had enjoyed each other's company upon his visit to her Warwickshire home, and he was no less discouraging of her literary ambitions than she was of his plans to resurrect her uncle's reputation. Habituated to receiving appeals from aspiring writers desirous of his influence, Moore did not number LeFanu among the 'paupers, and poets, and poetesses that accumulate on me' in the course of their 'begging' and 'bothering letters'.<sup>45</sup> He willingly agreed to her request that he read the manuscript of *Leolin Abbey* in advance of its submission to Longman, an 'establishment publisher' as Moore put it, which specialised in respectable religious and school books.<sup>46</sup> Jane Porter, whom LeFanu greatly admired, had been a Longman author since publication of *Thaddeus of Warsaw* in 1803, and both she and her sister Anna Maria continued their association with the partnership throughout the 1820s. Upon eventual completion of *Leolin Abbey* in December 1818, however, Moore was away from home and advised LeFanu against any delay his looking over it might incur. Moore also encouraged a realistic perspective on the extent of his influence with Longman as market leaders: 'as the booksellers are to be your grand jury, either to find the bill or throw it out, you had perhaps better, in the first instance, send the manuscript to them, and you may depend upon my backing it with all the recommendations which my opinion of your talents, as well as my warm interest in yourself, incline me to give it'.<sup>47</sup>

Longman numbered *Frankenstein* among the many literary works rejected but, in 1818, LeFanu was offered the terms upon which Moore had published with them since *Lalla Rookh*, for which he was paid £3000. She was to share any profits equally with the publisher and, although the initial print run of 500 copies was, by early nineteenth-century standards, relatively modest, her prospects looked good.<sup>48</sup> Within the year, however, Longman had shifted just over half its stock. Although there was a residual advertising budget, in the spring of 1821 LeFanu was informed of the decision to sell off all remaining copies to trade.<sup>49</sup> LeFanu retained credit enough with Longman to elicit a commitment to at least advise on her next manuscript, and Longman did initially accept what was, in all likelihood, *Tales of a Tourist*, pending minor revision of the title page. But LeFanu wanted to renegotiate her terms, desirous of relinquishing copyright

rather than continuing with the previous arrangement of publishing on shares. After consideration Longman sent LeFanu word of its decision not to enter into terms on a new work on the basis of the scant success of *Leolin Abbey*.<sup>50</sup> The letter, dated 28 August 1821, arrived less than a month after the death of LeFanu's father, Henry, a half-pay officer. That it was LeFanu who 'discontinued her dealings' with Longman, is the phrase used by her mother Elizabeth upon soliciting the advice of Thomas Wilkie as to the chances of their securing another 'respectable' publisher.<sup>51</sup> It was mid-November and the women's sense of isolation was exacerbated by it not being in LeFanu's 'power' as Elizabeth put it, 'to go to London on her own business, and our long residence in the country has gradually estranged us from all knowledge of the best manner of forming connexions in the literary line'. Grief, the pride of a family once renowned in 'the literary line' and a carefully managed frustration inform the widowed Elizabeth's need to facilitate her daughter's 'earnest desire to dispose' of her new work by the end of the year. As things proved with Newman, the timescale, and ambition to establish a relationship on a more permanent footing were achievable.

*'In these days who is not an author?'*

As a novel set in 'vile, money-jobbing times' (I, 95), it is tempting to read *Helen Monteagle's* comic portrayal of an aristocratic 'knot of literati' in whose company Lord Rosstrevor, 'always so *blue* and attic' becomes 'dyed of a deeper blue, and more brilliant and attic than ever' (II, 344), as in dialogue with the sentiments of the poet and novelist Charlotte Smith, for whom 'amateurism and merit were incompatible'.<sup>52</sup> Although unlike LeFanu, Smith used her prefaces as the means of openly admitting to the impecunious circumstances in which she published 'from necessity'—as it is phrased in *Marchmont*—she firmly believed that 'only professional writers could lay claim to literary excellence, and only those who subscribed to authorship's demanding work ethic could count themselves as one of this group'.<sup>53</sup> LeFanu's own inventive reference to writing as labour comes in one of *Helen Monteagle's* now familiarly abrupt references to the mechanisms of authoring. The narrator reflects on the years which have elapsed since Edmund Monteagle's posting abroad: 'years which I shall follow the example of my most illustrious as well as my most insignificant fellow-labourers, in passing slightly over' (III, 362–63). This nicely plays on the ambiguity of the terms illustrious and insignificant; each can be as readily applied to writers distinguished only by virtue of rank, as they can to professional authors past and present whose actual literary worth is at risk of being overlooked.

In *Strathallan*, LeFanu had satirised the aspirations of the provincial *salonnière* and, in *Helen Monteagle*, depicts Lord Rosstrevor's utterly delusional belief in his literary ability as a means of diminishing the authority of a man who, with all the 'self-deceit of parental ambition' is blinded to 'the cruelty of this conduct' towards his daughters (I, 291). In Helen's absence, Rosstrevor inflicts his attempts at poetry and drama on his younger daughter, Adeliza. This he creates in his 'Ivy Bower', a folly with a rotational floor built on the site of a



former windmill. It allows him access to every sun- or moonlit vantage point, and causes mistrust among servants quick to rename it the 'whirligig'. For her part, 'there was nothing Adeliza dreaded so much' as her father's spending time there (III, 20). A 'formidable rhymester' (III, 220) Rosstrevor is inspired 'like Pope' when he is least equipped to write anything down (I, 230), and applies to himself Isaac D'Israeli's proposition that a literary collection might be made of the nocturnal thoughts which visit 'the minds of men of genius' (I, 231). It is only 'after tiring out three French valets, and two secretaries' with his twilight musings, that Rosstrevor 'was obliged to have a pen and ink constantly by him, that he might not be cheated of any of his intellectual treasures by the affected deafness, or real drowsiness of his attendants' (I, 231). D'Israeli's estimation of male genius and its social significance had formed the basis of his *Essay on the Manners and Genius of the Literary Character*, first published in 1795 and revised in 1818. His prose fiction, which included the romance, *Mejnoun and Leila* (1797), might also be figured in Rosstrevor's own self-penned, tragic take on Persian history, 'Vachtanga, Prince of Georgia, or the Fatal Vow'. When this masterpiece is all but finished Adeliza takes a chance upon her father giving her a fair hearing on Helen's situation. LeFanu's narrator intervenes in apparent agreement:

Every author knows (and, in these days, who is not an author?) that a person who seizes the happy moment in which one of that vain and moon-struck race has just perfected to his satisfaction some exquisite and laboured performance, is as likely to obtain a gracious hearing, whatever may be the nature of the request, as from an adventurer who has just gained a prize in the lottery. (II, 333)

In a sequence of further analogies the moonstruck author is compared to individuals of varying backgrounds whose satisfaction is, in most cases, only the result of luck and circumstances beyond their immediate control.

LeFanu's particular identification of 'Vachtanga' as the ultimate symbol of Rosstrevor's ridiculous estimation of his literary abilities works in curious relation with another of *Helen Monteagle's* 'eastern' tales. This term best describes the interpolated story of Euphemia Melrose, a relative of Almaric Douglas and rightful heiress to the family estate. Her introduction clarifies that episode in his history which has remained, for much of the novel, a source of mystery and harmful speculation. The history of Euphemia—or 'Zenaida' as she becomes known—serves to redeem the hero, but is also important to what this article has sought to define as *Helen Monteagle's* preoccupation with novel writing and its contexts. Together with 'Vachtanga', the tale of Zenaida is an experiment in writing inspired by the 'East' which reflects Romanticism's fascination with Turkey, Persia and the expanding eastern Mediterranean empire. In the context of a discussion of pretensions to authorship, it is also a story in which LeFanu explores the implications of this fascination for her own literary culture.

In brief, Euphemia's experience of kidnap, sexual aggression and near-fatal violence originates with one woman's transgression against another. Euphemia's



father, the Earl of Glenaladale, is stationed at Gibraltar during the first years of his marriage. Here, his wife appoints as nurse to their infant daughter her favourite servant, Rachael, 'a Jewess' whom she had discovered and brought back with her following a trip to Ceuta on the North African coast (III, 159). Rachael is, however, preoccupied with her lover ('a Moor') and, disgruntled at Lady Glenaladale's protesting at her neglect of the child, conspires with him to return to Ceuta with stolen Glenaladale heirlooms and its young heiress (III, 160). Their troubled fortunes take them to Morocco, Mecca and eventually Algiers where, her lover having died, a repentant and compassionately drawn Rachael gives up the child to a 'Mahometan protectress', namely the widowed sister of the sovereign Prince (III, 172). Rachael also entrusts her with the stolen heirlooms as proof of the child's lineage. Zenaida (as she is then renamed) is 'initiated into the acquirements, the opinions, and the religion of those whose humanity had, probably, saved her from destruction'. However, growing up in the court seraglio, she attracts the notice of the tyrannical Prince, to whom she is betrothed. Although a fire provides her means of escape into the purely paternalistic arms of Almaric Douglas, who has lately arrived at Algiers 'in the course of a tour of pleasure' (III, 174), Zenaida fears endangering his life further, and attempts to kill herself with a dagger. She recovers and, in running away, thinks she is sparing Douglas the damage to his reputation misunderstandings of his role in her tragedy nevertheless cause. Zenaida finds a trusted female friend of Rachael's, by whom she is hidden for her own protection in an underground grotto, but both women are tricked by a 'wily priest' (III, 192) determined only upon their conversion, and he forcibly commits Zenaida to a convent in Cadiz. The chance arrival of Edmund Monteaule as a serving officer entitled to shelter at the convent, leads to him successfully rescuing Zenaida (by his adopting the guise of a friar), and to her reunion with her mother.


The fate of Euphemia/Zenaida is, like that of her namesake in Charlotte Lennox's *Euphemia* (1790), implicated in the protection and defence of British interests abroad. The adventures of LeFanu's infant Euphemia begin in territory fought over by Britain and Spain, and Lennox's heroine initially travels to New York on account of her husband's military obligations in a novel set prior to the American revolution. Adelaide O'Keeffe and Sydney Owenson also situate narratives of empire in the historical past, and the oriental aspects of their fiction give fuller expression to those depictions of eastern tyranny and religious conversion touched upon in LeFanu's interpolated tale. O'Keeffe's reworking of the life of the Jewish third-century regent and antagonist of the Roman Emperor, *Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra*, was published in 1814, three years after Owenson's popular novel, *The Missionary* (1811), located the tragedy of the Hindu priestess Luxima, and the increasingly infatuated Franciscan missionary tasked with her conversion, in seventeenth-century India. Recent scholarship has recognised the ways in which these novelists articulate a sophisticated engagement with assumptions about eastern culture and colonial oppression, and both O'Keeffe and Owenson are seen to explore analogies between the historical subjugation

of nations and the relationship between Britain and Ireland.<sup>54</sup>

If LeFanu's tale of Euphemia Melrose is a genuine if limited effort to 'stick to the East', as Byron put it to Thomas Moore in 1813, because 'the public are orientalizing, and pave the path for you', it is at least exciting and compellingly written.<sup>55</sup> There are satirical overtones, however, which suggest that it is part of LeFanu's more elaborate conceit. The story relies upon exactly the kind of plot contrivances discussed between the narrator and reader-character of *Leolin Abbey*. Euphemia Melrose is effectively a 'child of mystery'. Her kidnap is successful because the Melroses are unaware of it: Rachael improbably substituted their infant for the dead child of a destitute widower whom she pays off, and convinces the Melroses that 'Euphemia' died in front of her very eyes from a seizure. The important coincidence of Douglas arriving in time for the first rescue, and of Monteagle for the second, is relied upon again when Euphemia's mother happens to be present at the very inn her daughter visits upon arriving at Portsmouth. Euphemia's religious conversion from 'a nominal protestant, a good Mahometan, and an indifferent Catholic' (III, 204) and back again is as dizzying and pointless as a turn in Rosstrevor's whirligig. Joy gives way to tragedy when Euphemia's mother dies shortly after regaining her long lost child, but all ends well given that Edric Douglas fulfils her dying wish that Euphemia is restored to the estate allocated, in her absence, to him as a distant heir.

Read in this way, the tale seems designed to disorientate and invite awareness of the difference between sensitive and token appropriations of eastern culture. A generally positive review of *Leolin Abbey* thought LeFanu culpable of the latter, and took exception to its heroine's keeping a tame lion brought back from India. It did so not upon the reasonable grounds of improbability, but because '*lions* are not natives of the East Indies'. Notwithstanding the actual whereabouts of Asiatic as opposed to African lions in the early nineteenth century, and the confusion of vague geographical boundaries, the reviewer is more concerned to attribute this apparent mistake to the regrettable situation of 'ladies planning scenes in countries that often the most glaring incongruities prove they have never visited'.<sup>56</sup> Perhaps LeFanu's parodic rendering of eastern adventures betrays her suspicion that many of the other writers profiting from exotic settings were virtual tourists too. On a conventional level, Euphemia's tale in *Helen Monteagle* is essential to a re-reading of Almaric Douglas. By means of this (and his accidental reconciliation with Cordelia) Douglas is exonerated for actions which seemed to compromise female reputation and is deemed truly deserving of the love of Adeliza Marchmont. Their romance is, in fact, enabled by a mutual appreciation of eastern literature. When Adeliza finds verses Douglas has written in response to *Gulistan*, a collection of cautionary tales, rhymes and analogies composed by the Persian Sufi Saadi Sheikh (1184–1291), she instinctively selects 'to suit *his* taste' (II, 426) passages from the poem 'Palestine' (1803) by Reginald Heber, later Bishop of Calcutta (1823–26). But again, although the vogue for the East is recognised, LeFanu is ambivalent about the success of its application. As it turns out, Douglas is troubled by the

memories such readings excite, and calls for their singing together a ballad of his native Scotland, 'For lack of gold she left me'.<sup>57</sup>

In a now familiarly self-conscious move, the narrator of *Helen Monteagle* draws 'the variegated tissue of our narrative [...] to a close' with time to spare in volume three for the 'clear[ing] up of the few remaining circumstances that have been unexplained respecting the personages who have acted a part in it' (III, 303). If this indicates that she might well have made a good dramatist—as some of her early reviewers observed—it also serves as a reminder that LeFanu writes complicated and densely populated romantic adventures. Informed by serious and extensive reading, LeFanu's is a learned, inventive and assured voice, which expresses its delight in storytelling alongside another which intelligently questions the limits of fiction. The result is a curious harmony. Naturalistic in places, ironic in many others and sometimes very funny, *Helen Monteagle* values the bonds of sympathy which unite families, military communities and literary circles, at the same time as maintaining a realistic sense of the fissures and fractures which are part of the tissue of real life. Or, at least real life as we know LeFanu encountered it. *Helen Monteagle* did not have an afterlife in translation as *Strathallan* and *Leolin Abbey* did in Paris editions published, respectively, in 1818 and 1824, but is at the very least deserving of a re-reading in the bicentenary year of her more celebrated contemporaries. 

## NOTES

1. Shelley abbreviates Helen to 'H.' in the entry for 7 January 1818, in *The Journals of Mary Shelley: Volume 1: 1814–1822*, ed. by Paula R. Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 192; cited in 'Anecdotal Records' for Alicia LeFanu's *Helen Monteagle* (1818), in P. D. Garside, J. E. Belanger and S. A. Ragaz, *British Fiction, 1800–1829: A Database of Production, Circulation & Reception*, designer A. A. Mandal (Cardiff: Cardiff University, 2004), record no. 1818A038 <<http://www.british-fiction.cf.ac.uk/titleDetails.asp?title=1818A038>>.
2. 'Literary Intelligence', *Literary Gazette*, 46.6 (December 1817), 367.
3. 8 February 1818, in *The Journals of Claire Clairmont*, ed. by Marion Kingston Stocking (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), p. 82; cited in 'Anecdotal Records' for Alicia LeFanu's *Helen Monteagle* (1818), DBF 1820A061.
4. See *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews* (1742), in *Joseph Andrews and Shamela*, ed. by Douglas Brooks-Davies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 79.
5. A phase in the French revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, the Second Coalition signalled the allegiance of Britain, Russia, Turkey and Austria against France. In 1802, a treaty signed at Amiens aimed to recognise and organise the territorial rights of Britain, France, Spain and the Netherlands, and secured a relatively quiet fourteen-month interval of peace between European nations.
6. Alicia LeFanu, *Helen Monteagle*, 3 vols (London: Sherwood, Neely and Jones, 1818), II, 415. All subsequent references are to this edition.
7. Gill Perry, 'Ambiguity and Desire: Metaphors of Sexuality in Late Eighteenth-Century Representations of the Actress', in *Notorious Muse: The Actress in British*

- Art and Culture 1776–1812*, ed. by Robyn Asleson (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), pp. 57–80 (pp. 62–63).
8. For a more recent and compelling fictional reworking of Farren's story, see Emma Donoghue, *Life Mask* (London: Virago, 2004).
  9. Joseph Roach, "'Mistaking Earth for Heaven": Eliza Linley's Voice', in *Bluestockings Displayed: Portraiture, Performance and Patronage, 1730–1830*, ed. by Elizabeth Eger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 123–40 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667428.009>> (p. 129).
  10. Fanny Burney, *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties*, ed. by Margaret Anne Doody, Robert L. Mack and Peter Sabor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 315. Burney apparently began the novel in the late 1790s and worked on it over a fourteen-year period.
  11. Nora Nachumi, *Acting Like a Lady: British Women Novelists and the Eighteenth-Century Theater* (New York: AMS Press, 2008), p. 140.
  12. Christina Morin has recently argued for a renewed evaluation of the impact and influence of Maturin's lesser known writings in *Charles Robert Maturin and the Haunting of Irish Romantic Fiction* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011). In later fiction, the 'best' actress in terms of talent is also 'the woman who winds up on stage by accident rather than design, who acts unselfconsciously with no view toward the audience, and whose deepest wish is not for fame or fortune but a home in which she can more properly exercise and display her virtue'. See Lauren Chattman, 'Actresses at Home and on Stage: Spectacular Domesticity and the Victorian Theatrical Novel', *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 28.1 (1994), 72–88 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/1345914>> (p. 72).
  13. See Jennie Batchelor, *Women's Work: Labour, Gender, Authorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010) <<https://doi.org/10.7228/manchester/9780719082573.001.0001>>.
  14. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
  15. Jacqueline Pearson, *Women's Reading in Britain, 1750–1835: A Dangerous Recreation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 40 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511582899>>.
  16. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
  17. Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey*, ed. by Marilyn Butler (London: Penguin, 1995), p. 34.
  18. *Modern Novel Writing, or the Elegant Enthusiast*, ed. by Robert J. Gemmet (Stroud: Nonsuch Publishing, 2008), p. 37. All subsequent references are to this edition. To give its full title, *Modern Novel Writing, or the Elegant Enthusiast; and Interesting Emotions of Arabella Bloomville. A Rhapsodical Romance; Interspersed with Poetry. In Two Volumes. By the Right Hon. Lady Harriet Marlow* was published for G. G. and J. Robinson, and reiterates the phrasing of Ann Radcliffe's popular and influential *Mysteries of Udolpho: A Romance; Interspersed with Poetry*, published in 1794. In addition to Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* and, on account of the episode involving his Man of the Hill, Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones*, Beckford had in his sights the 'general proliferation of sentimental Gothic novels in the 1780s and 1790s, particularly if they were authored by women' (p. 18). The title of the second edition of *Azemia* (1798) was revised and expanded to: *Azemia, a Novel: Containing Imitations of the Manner, both in Prose and Verse, of Many of the Authors of the Present Day; with Political Strictures. By J. A. M. Jenks.*

19. Mary-Celine Newbould, *Adaptations of Laurence Sterne's Fiction: Sterneana 1760–1840* (London: Routledge, 2016), p. 108.
20. Charlotte Smith, *Marchmont: A Novel*, 4 vols (London: Low, 1796), 1, 178.
21. Alicia LeFanu, *Leolin Abbey. A Novel*, 3 vols (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1819), 1, 52. All subsequent references are to this edition.
22. See James Thistlewaite, *The Child of Misfortune; or the History of Mrs Gilbert*, 2 vols (London: Murray, 1777); Elizabeth Norman, *The Child of Woe*, 3 vols (London: Symonds, 1789); J. H. Wynne, *The Child of Chance; or, the Adventures of Harry Hazard*, 2 vols (London: Hookham, 1789).
23. The title was resurrected in 1837 for Hannah Maria Jones's *The Child of Mystery; or, the Cottager's Daughter. A Tale of Fashionable Life*, as listed in Montague Summers, *A Gothic Bibliography* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1964).
24. *The Critic*, in Richard Brinsley Sheridan, *'The School for Scandal' and Other Plays*, ed. by Michael Corder (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), II. 1. 48–52. All subsequent references to *The Critic* are to this edition.
25. Corder, 'Introduction', in *ibid.*, p. xxxix.
26. Lisa M. Wilson, 'British Women Writing Satirical Novels in the Romantic Period: Gendering Authorship and Narrative Voice', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840* (Summer 2007), 24–46 <[http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/rt17\\_n02.pdf](http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/romtext/articles/rt17_n02.pdf)> [accessed 26 April 2019] (p. 34).
27. Corder, p. xli.
28. *Ibid.*, p. xlv.
29. 'New Musical Publications', *Literary Gazette*, 2.41 (April 1859), 473.
30. William St Clair, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 244.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 275.
32. See Dorothy Blakey, *The Minerva Press 1790–1820* (London: Bibliographical Society, 1939), p. 18.
33. Christopher Skelton-Foord, 'Circulating Libraries in Britain between 1790 and 1830', *Literatur und Erfahrungswandel 1789–1830*, ed. by Rainer Schöwerling, Hartmut Steinecke and Günter Tiggesbäumker (Munich: Fink, 1996), pp. 31–43 (p. 34).
34. See *Moral Sketches of Prevailing Opinions and Manners, Foreign, and Domestic* (1819), quoted in St Clair, p. 283. More's work was popular: in the two years since its initial publication, *Moral Sketches* had, at nine alleged editions, at least matched the number achieved in the same period by *Strictures*.
35. See the records for Louisa Sidney Stanhope in *DBF* <<http://www.british-fiction.cf.ac.uk/authorTitles.asp?author=778>>.
36. Blakey, p. 22.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
38. Anthony Mandal, 'Mrs Meeke and Minerva: The Mystery of the Marketplace', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 42.2 (2018), 131–51 <<https://doi.org/10.1215/00982601-4384591>> (p. 132).
39. See Anna M. Fitzer, 'Revealing Influence: The Forgotten Daughters of Frances Sheridan', *Women's Writing*, Special Issue: Beyond Influence, 1680–1830, 20.1 (2013), 64–81 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/09699082.2013.754258>>.
40. Julie Shaffer, 'Non-Canonical Women's Novels of the Romantic Era: Romantic Ideologies and the Problematics of Gender and Genre', *Studies in the Novel*, 28.4 (1996), 469–92 (p. 486).



41. *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 52.227 (1817), 126–27.
42. See Ralph A. Manogue, 'The Plight of James Ridgway, London Bookseller and Publisher, and the Newgate Radicals 1792–1797', *Wordsworth Circle*, 27.3 (1996), 158–66 <<https://doi.org/10.1086/TWC24042936>>.
43. St Clair, p. 316.
44. *Ibid.* p. 317.
45. Entry for August 1824, in Thomas Moore, *Notes from the Letters of Thomas Moore to his Music Publisher, James Power* (New York: Redfield, 1853), p. 113.
46. St Clair, p. 159.
47. Entry for 21 December 1818, in *Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore*, ed. by John Russell, 8 vols (London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, 1856), VIII, 251–52.
48. This is the same number of copies contracted for the first edition of *Frankenstein*, with net profits divided between the author and publisher at one- and two-thirds respectively. See St Clair, p. 359.
49. See 'Publishing Papers' for Alicia LeFanu's *Leolin Abbey* (1819), *DBF* 1819A044 <<http://www.british-fiction.cf.ac.uk/titleDetails.asp?title=1819A044>>.
50. *Ibid.*
51. Elizabeth LeFanu to T. Wilkie, 11 November 1821; London, British Library, Add. MS 29764, f. 46.
52. Batchelor, p. 100. There are interesting echoes of Smith's *Marchmont* in *Helen Monteagle*, which include, in addition to Adeliza's and Helen's family name, the coincidence of 'Everleigh'—where Helen rents a rundown cottage—and *Marchmont's* neglected Eastwood–Leigh estate. Here another rebellious daughter, Althea Dacres, peruses Mrs Trevyllian's library: 'where there were more than mere books of amusement' and these had 'given her thoughts a direction which in the common intercourse of the world they would perhaps never have taken' (III, 60–61).
53. Smith, *Marchmont*, I, vi; Batchelor, p. 100.
54. See e.g. Donelle Ruwe, 'Zenobia, Queen of Palmyra: Adelaide O'Keeffe, the Jewish Conversion Novel, and the Limits of Rational Education', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 36.1 (Winter 2012), 30–53 <<https://doi.org/10.1215/00982601-1457093>>. James Watt describes *The Missionary* as a 'remarkable novel' which 'itself exerted an important influence on the work of poets such as Thomas Moore and P. B. Shelley'. See 'Orientalism and Empire', in *The Cambridge Companion to Fiction in the Romantic Period*, ed. by Richard Maxwell and Katie Trumpener (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 129–42 (p. 137). Morgan's influence on Shelley is traced in Nigel Leask's *British Romantic Writers and the East* (Cambridge University Press, 1992). For discussion of Lennox's novel, see Susan Kubica Howard, 'Seeing Colonial America and Writing Home about It: Charlotte Lennox's *Euphemia*, Epistolary, and the Feminine Picturesque', *Studies in the Novel*, 37.3 (Fall 2005), 273–91.
55. Nigel Leask, 'East's', in *Romanticism: An Oxford Guide*, ed. by Nicholas Roe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 137–48 (p. 137).
56. *La Belle Assemblée; Being Bell's Court and Fashionable Magazine*, n.s., 20 (September 1819), 141–42 (p. 141).
57. *Gulistan* was variously translated in editions of the 1770s as the 'Bed of Roses' or 'Rose Garden'. Heber's 'Palestine' was in 1812 the basis for the composer William Crotch's celebrated oratorio of the same name. The ballad was attributed to



Dr Austin in *Select Melodies of Scotland*, ed. by George Thomson, 6 vols (London: Preston; and Edinburgh: Thomson, 1822–25), II, 23. This edition gives the variant title ‘For the sake of gold’.

#### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

A. M. FITZER. “Start not, gentle reader!”: Re-reading Alicia LeFanu’s *Helen Monteagle* (1818), *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.105>>.

#### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

**Date of acceptance:** 23 September 2019.



# SHADOW AND SUBSTANCE

## Restoring the Literary Output of Robert Pearse Gillies (1789–1858)

*Peter Garside*



### I

‘I HAD LOST UTTERLY WHAT THE WORLD in its wisdom is pleased to term substance, and consequently, was henceforth only a Shadow’.<sup>1</sup> This passage occurs at a crucial turning point in Robert Pearse [or Pierce, Pearce] Gillies’s *Memoirs of a Literary Veteran* (1851), when, during September 1827 after taking a fond farewell of Edinburgh and making a poignant last visit to Walter Scott at Abbotsford, Gillies stood at the onset of a final move to London and a bleaker existence marked by debt and fragmentary literary production. The use of the term ‘Shadow’ along with ‘Shadowism’ permeates the rest of his narrative, and might now at first bring to mind the concept recently advanced by Ian Duncan of Scottish writers of the period such as Gillies or James Hogg necessarily operating in the shadow of Scott’s outstanding literary fame, either in the form of lame imitation or a more aggressive kind of latching on.<sup>2</sup> In Gillies’s case, however, it more obviously applies to his loss of gentlemanly status and financial means, which hitherto had enabled an independent literary existence centred on Edinburgh.

Heir to a substantial landed property in NE Scotland, Gillies attended Edinburgh College, studying under Dugald Stewart and others, and was admitted into the Faculty of Advocates in 1813. Moving more permanently to Edinburgh, he occupied a number of New Town residences, cultivating a literary career which for a while might seem to parallel Scott’s, and building up an impressive personal library. In fact, it is the irreparable loss of such resources through financial imprudence and misfortune that perhaps underlies most sharply the overriding sense of shadow/ism in the later stages of the *Memoirs*. Immediately prior to the first emergence of the term, as quoted above, Gillies painfully describes the boxing-up of books and manuscripts as a result of the re-letting of his old apartments in Great King Street:

My books, which had been valued and assigned to my trustees, were rapidly packed up in boxes, making an enormous load. Others, not included in the valuation, copies of my own works, [...] an enormous bulk of manuscript papers and letters [...] were all deposited hastily in a dark room, of which I was allowed the key, and which was sealed up, on the understanding with my trustees

that the door was never to be opened or the contents meddled with, except in my own presence. (III, 171–72)

Notwithstanding such assurances, Gillies's absence in London and accumulating financial difficulties there left him vulnerable, and a footnote records how 'This apartment was afterwards broken open by legal functionaries without one word of intimation to me, and the private property all thrown into the hands of an auctioneer' (III, 172n).

A similar incident is described later when in London Gillies's residence was invaded in 1834 as a consequence of his further indebtedness following the failure of publishers Richter and Co: 'Bailiffs fought like demons, tearing the books and flinging them at one another's heads, trampling on them, and each party endeavouring to get them heaved and shovelled into their carts like brickbats' (III, 250). Though his present publisher Richard Bentley must have been mainly on the lookout for tasty recollections of other celebrities, it is hard not to sense a pressing need throughout the *Memoirs* on Gillies's part to recover his own literary credentials, one which is frequently frustrated by the absence of tangible materials to hand. To give just two of many instances, employing the above examples: the dispersal of the contents of Great King Street leaves Gillies lamenting 'especially the poem of "Oswald," (now utterly lost)' (*Memoirs*, III, 172); while the 1834 London raid results in the loss of 'The only copy in existence of the second part of my "Winter Night's Dream" [which] had been left in a back parlour, where the last vestige of it was in the fragment of a *fidibus* [i.e. pipe lighter] which had been used by a possession man' (III, 250). Notwithstanding his advanced age and accumulating insecurities when writing *Memoirs*, Gillies's memory proves sharp on a number of occasions, though inevitably incidents are sometimes blurred and phases of activity are left unrecorded. The aim of the present article (supported by its end Listing) is to arrive at more complete picture of Gillies's literary output, and, more particularly, to compensate for a number of errors, omissions and misattributions as found in the present-day bibliographic record. In so doing, it is hoped to restore his significance on a number of key fronts: as a Romantic poet closely associating with figures such as Scott, Hogg and Wordsworth, and leading exponent of Germanism in literary circles, while throwing light on previously unexplored areas such as his input into bibliographical researches during the 1810s and record as an early Victorian campaigner against legal injustice.

Even with the advantage of hindsight, there are potential impediments standing in the way of providing a full and stable record. One is represented by Gillies's preference for anonymity when originally publishing his work. Indeed he himself recognised this as a barrier when facing the prospect of making a living as a jobbing author in London: 'having inflexibly withheld my name from every production [...] I had little or no literary reputation' (*Memoirs*, III, 190). The *English Catalogue of Books 1801–1836* (1914) lists only six titles under his name, two of which can now be demonstrated as not actually his. Use of initials was a common feature of his earlier work, with 'H. F. A.' being probably the

most used signature, featuring both in contributions to *The Ruminator* of Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges (1762–1837), primarily in 1812, and the Preface to the first edition of his own hallmark longer poem *Childe Alarique* (1813); though it would be hard for an uninformed contemporary to connect these different vehicles or (presumably) to relate the initials to a distinct personage.<sup>3</sup> His guard slipped slightly with second edition of *Childe Alarique*, where the Preface is signed ‘R. P. G.’, and these correct initials are also employed in the case of a number of articles contributed to other of Brydges’s publications such as *The British Bibliographer* (4 vols, 1810–14). This in turn is extended to ‘R. P. Gillies, Esq.’ in the full title of *The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie* (1814), a facsimile-type antiquarian limited edition, full disclosure no doubt licensed by the acceptability of this kind of endeavour as a gentlemanly pursuit.

Use of his proper name in the case of poetry in volume form, however, is not found until *A Winter Night’s Dream* (1826), where an introductory ‘Note’ observes how ‘for the first time in my life, I [have] inscribed my name on a title-page’, offering as a somewhat specious-sounding reason a desire to avoid accusations of personal satire in the contents. More probably this represented a last throw of the dice on the Edinburgh scene at a time publishers were withdrawing from imaginative literature as a result of the financial crash of 1825–26, and when Scott’s own anonymity was effectively outed by insolvency. Muddying the waters still further through all this is the employment of a number of alternative initials (such as ‘B. E. S.’, or just ‘R.’), an activity which found an even more dizzying framework through his participation in *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* during the 1820s; and at no point did Gillies achieve the kind of linkage that Scott attained as a novelist as the ‘author of *Waverley*’. The use of ‘the author of’ label was later employed as a means of holding together and identifying serialised contributions in *Fraser’s Magazine*, but never to the extent of offering a clear-cut and transferable trademark. Reference to the end Listing in Part II of this essay will show that the only other time in which Gillies’s full name features on a title page (other than as Translator of *German Stories* [1826]) is in case of the *Memoirs of a Literary Veteran* itself.

Another difficulty is presented by the present scarcity of a number of Gillies’s publications. The first (quarto) edition of *Childe Alarique* (1813) is now virtually unattainable, the present survey being dependent on a copy preserved in the Abbotsford Library. Much the same is true of the first edition of his *Illustrations of a Poetical Character* (1816), comprising four tales, despite evidently being aimed at a wider distribution through its use of a smaller format. To some extent this must reflect poor commercial sales, or, failing that, a low retention of copies by owners. Some titles bear signs of having been effectively private publications, the financing of which in Gillies’s halcyon days would have been within his means. The possibly unique copy of *Wallace, a Fragment* (1813) held by Edinburgh University Library bears the inscription ‘Dugald Stewart From the auth[or]’ on its half-title. An advert for *The Essaye of a Prentise* in the *Monthly Magazine*, 1 August 1814, describes the edition as ‘limited to 150’; while in the case of *Guilt*;

or, *the Anniversary* (1819), a play translated from the German, the impression was evidently restricted to just fifty copies issued on a trial basis.<sup>4</sup> According to the *Memoirs, Oswald* (1817), though 'beautifully printed in quarto [...] never was published, the 'hundred copies which I still possessed in 1826' being 'now utterly lost' (II, 217; III, 172).

Turning from volume to periodical publications, an additional complication is provided by the range of Gillies's contributions to this sector, representing in some cases a seemingly impenetrable web. Publications such as A. L. Strout's *Bibliography of Articles in Blackwood's Magazine* and the *Wellesley Index of Victorian Periodicals* provide invaluable help in the case of established journals such as *Blackwood's*, the *New Monthly Magazine*, *Foreign Quarterly Review*, *British and Foreign Review* and *Fraser's Magazine*, to all of which Gillies submitted materials.<sup>5</sup> Far less support is available for tracking contributions to now more obscure literary magazines or compilations of the period. Notable here are the publications produced under the aegis of Sir Egerton Brydges, many first issued as individual numbers but now mostly accessible in combined volume form, these ranging from his *Censura Literaria. Containing Titles Abstracts, and Opinions of Old English Books* (10 vols, 1805–09) to *Restituta: Or, Titles, Extracts, and Characters of Old Books in English Literature Revived* (4 vols, 1814–16; but first issued in monthly parts from 1 March 1814). In the case of *The Ruminator: Containing a Series of Moral, Critical, and Sentimental Essays* (2 vols, 1813), beginning with recycled materials from the *Censura* but then incorporating a swathe of material mainly from Gillies, Gillies claimed to have been effectively the co-author, though this is not reflected to the extent of his appearing on the actual titles of the book version. Modern standard bibliographies of Gillies's work, such as the entries in the new *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*,<sup>6</sup> tend at best to outline his output in this direction, leaving the constituent parts unexplored.

Two resources have nevertheless more recently enhanced the prospects for ascertaining his output more accurately. One comes in the form of the Archives of the Royal Literary Fund, now made accessible to scholars in microfilm. From June 1831 into the 1850s Gillies made a number of appeals for support (Case File 708), several while incarcerated or in exile for debt, and supported by details of publications vouching his authorial credentials. Significant lists are found in the case of items 5 (April 1838), 8 (November 1846) and 19 (January 1850), the last two on printed forms supplied to applicants. The final listing in the file comes as part of an appeal by his surviving daughter in November 1858 (item 28).<sup>7</sup> Details in these concerning the publication dates, format, etc. of his primary works are generally correct, a symptom of the clarity of Gillies's memory, and/or indicating perhaps that he retained a core list for such purposes. If there is any exaggeration it is found in a tendency to amplify his own part in collaborative efforts (it is here for instance that Gillies makes his claim to have written *The Ruminator* 'jointly' with Egerton Brydges). Viewed in an opposite direction, absences in these listings can be useful in distinguishing cases where authorship

has been wrongly attributed to Gillies, in particular a sequence of novels to be discussed more fully later.

The second resource is found in Scott's Abbotsford Library, now searchable online, and the contents of which are now more freely available to scholars through the auspices of the Advocates Library in Edinburgh.<sup>8</sup> From his permanent residency in Edinburgh commencing in early 1813 to his departure to London in the late 1820s to take up a new editorial career, Gillies was in virtually constant contact with Scott in seeking support and literacy advice, one symptom of which is the large number of presentation copies, some of them in a pre-publication state, sent to his chosen patron by Gillies. In all, Abbotsford contains copies of fourteen verifiable individual works by Gillies, ranging from 1813 to 1824, no less than eight of which bear inscriptions to Scott from the author. Such an inscription in the *Old Tapestry* (1819), combined with three mentions in listings for the Royal Literary Fund, now offers watertight evidence of Gillies's authorship of this novel, though it has been commonly attributed to a supposed other author. Another interesting feature is the presence of three sheet-length pamphlets containing drafts of three of the tales that featured in *Illustrations of a Poetical Character* (1816), two containing proof marks apparently by the author. One of these tales, 'Egbert; or, the Suicide', is referred to in a letter to Gillies from William Wordsworth of 23 November 1814 (see *Memoirs*, II, 145),<sup>9</sup> which points towards Gillies having sent pre-publication versions to Wordsworth as well as Scott as a poetical mentor. The third of such pamphlets—*Further Illustrations of the Same Character. By the Author of Egbert and Albert*—noticeably includes a footnote, keyed to the title, stating '[t]he last hundred and ten verses of Egbert were supplied by a friend', strongly indicative of an input by James Hogg into this series of tales.<sup>10</sup> Abbotsford likewise contains copies of two rare occasional poems written by Gillies in the mid-1810s, the first in response to Lord Byron's poem 'Fare Thee Well', on leaving England, and the other anticipating the funeral of Princess Charlotte of Wales. One final feature worth noting here is the presence in the library of several black-letter books bearing Gillies's signature, the product presumably of loans or gifts between fellow bibliophiles.

Untangling the minutiae of Gillies's individual contributions to periodicals has also been enhanced by the word-searching opportunities provided by online resources such as the HathiTrust. In this way it becomes possible to follow up brief hints in the *Memoirs*, pursue initials known to have been used by Gillies (albeit with caution) and chase up earlier sources for the shorter poems which Gillies was prone to supply as appendices in his volume publications. Gillies's first successful submissions were probably those made to *The Poetical Register for 1808–09*, under the editorship of Richard Alfred Davenport, which included four sonnets and an ode under his name when eventually published in 1812. The main conduit here would have been Dr Robert Anderson, whom Gillies describes as acting 'as editor-general to all incipient poets' (*Memoirs*, I, 179), and who had similarly been instrumental in securing access for the Edinburgh poet Janet Stewart.<sup>11</sup> A certain hesitancy in the *Memoirs* about the exact sequence



of publication (see II, 3–4) is perhaps due to the element of delay subsequently experienced, especially galling to a novice author. Writing to Dr Anderson on 31 March 1812 Gillies asks: ‘What has become of Mr Davenport’s Register? Had I known beforehand of such a delay I w[oul]d perhaps have been tempted to rescue some of the most unworthy of the Poems formerly offered to him, & to propose others in their place.’<sup>12</sup> An alternative channel had by then been provided by the newly founded *Edinburgh Annual Register*, an initiative of Walter Scott’s in association with James and John Ballantyne, who acted as printer and publisher respectively. Three poems by Gillies, all unsigned, appeared in the issues for 1808 and 1809 (actually published in 1810 and 1811), two of them immediately adjacent to acknowledged pieces by Scott. Though hitherto unrecognised, Gillies’s close association with the Ballantynes probably resurfaces as late as 1817 in the case of three initialled contributions to the weekly sheet *The Sale-Room*, issued by John after re-establishing himself as an auctioneer in Hanover Street.

Long before then, however, Gillies had found a major outlet outside Scotland through forging a close relationship with Sir Egerton Brydges. The main trigger was his enthusiasm for *Censura Literaria*, to which according to the *Memoirs* he began subscribing in 1806, and ‘which I valued infinitely more than the far-famed “Edinburgh Review”, or any other periodical’ (I, 251 and 335). The same account describes how he had written an anonymous letter to Brydges, ‘which he forthwith printed, and which appeared in the very next *livraison* of the “Ruminator”, a series of essays accompanying the “Censura Literaria” (II, 4). This almost certainly represents the piece headed ‘Letter to the Ruminator’, end-signed ‘Musarum Amator | May 9 1809’, now found in the tenth volume (1809) of the *Censura* and the second of the *Ruminator* (1813), both with the number LXXIII (and later republished in *Censura* under the title of ‘Seclusion amid Magnificent Scenery’). In his Preface to the *Ruminator* Brydges acknowledges that the essays up to no. LXXIII were carried over from the *Censura* while the remainder, with a handful of exceptions, were ‘by the author’s friend, R. P. Gillies. Esq.’. The main body of contributions by Gillies, all marked by the signature ‘H. F. A.’, are found between LXXVIII and xcVIII (constituting fifteen numbers in all), with dates running from September 1812 into early 1813, this being followed by a final sonnet for no. CIII, the penultimate number in the series. In a Postscript, Brydges acknowledges that ‘at least a fourth’ of the papers have originated from his ‘eloquent and highly valued friend’, though in terms of new contributions to the compilation the proportion is higher than this. In developing the trope of the isolated artist escaping from or vulnerable to the corruptions of the social world these pieces can be seen as laying the foundation for much of Gillies’s later original poetry and fiction. The *Memoirs* also contains a number of letters from Brydges relating to the supply of copy as printing proceeded. Evidently delighted by this regular flow of materials, Brydges wrote on 15 November 1812 asking if he could persuade Gillies ‘to take the *principal* part with me in a new set of moral and critical essays, to be published periodically’ (II, 108). This must relate to *The Sylvan Wanderer; Consisting of a Series of Moral, Sentimental, and*

*Critical Essays* (2 vols, 1813–15), to which Gillies contributed two sets of two sonnets, with his own initials.

The multifarious publications in number form by Brydges also provided a vehicle for Gillies's bibliographical interests. In fact, there is reason to believe that his first direct communication came in the form of the submission early in January 1812 of an article on John Bellenden's translation of Hector Boece's *History and Chronicles of Scotland* to the *British Bibliographer* (see *Memoirs*, II, 89), as published in its second volume (1812). Brydges's acceptance of this article is noted by Gillies in letters to both Scott and Robert Anderson in February and March 1812.<sup>13</sup> According to the author's preamble (the article consisting mainly of large extracts), 'the copy from which this account is taken wants the title',<sup>14</sup> this possibly referring to a personally owned book. Having inherited a country-house library, Gillies in Edinburgh became a major purchaser of antiquarian books from John Ballantyne and other booksellers, eventually combining all these resources in his library in Northumberland Street. Scott in nearby Castle Street consequently became a frequent visitor, according to Gillies 'sometimes walk[ing] away with a load of books, stowing three or four volumes into each capacious pocket, and carrying others on his arm' (*Memoirs*, II, 123), the two forming 'a bond of union' as collectors.<sup>15</sup> Gillies also received institutional support as a result of his education and training in Edinburgh. His next contribution to the *British Bibliographer*, on 'Poems by Sir Richard Maitland', contributed at much the same time though delayed for publication (*Memoirs*, II, 100), came as a result of a series of queries made about the papers of Drummond of Hawthornden in the Library at Edinburgh College, during which Gillies offered his own services as an unpaid researcher but without the offer being taken up (II, 7–10). Another repository came to hand with his qualification as a lawyer, and a number of previously unrecorded contributions to Brydges's *Restituta*, belonging to 1814 and bearing the signature 'R. P. G.', clearly feed on resources in the Advocates Library. On several occasions Gillies can be found pressing Scott to contribute to Brydges's bibliographical publications, though Scott clearly preferred to plough his own considerable furrow closer to home. On the other hand, there are signs of Scott actively encouraging Gillies to cultivate this kind of activity in opposition to the solipsistic verse with which Gillies was associated at this time. One symptom of this is the beautifully produced edition (1814) of *Essayes of a Prentise*, consisting of poems by James VI of Scotland, mostly in Scots but also Latin and French, based on an *editio princeps* of 1584, most probably owned by Gillies and shared with Scott. In some ways this anticipates the editions produced by the Bannatyne Club from the 1820s under Scott's aegis; though a somewhat effusive Prefatory Memoir in which Gillies depicts himself walking in the hills around Edinburgh in harmony with previous giants of Scottish poetry hardly suggests the temperament required for detached editorship.

Undoubtedly, Gillies's own primary aim at this period would have been to achieve fame as a poet in his own right, for which ambition there could

be no stronger exemplar than Scott himself. An initial attempt at communication came in the form of a manuscript copy of his poem 'Impromptu; on receiving the Lady of the Lake', end-signed 'Musarum Amator | May 12, 1810', sent through John Ballantyne only days after the publication of Scott's most successful poem, and transcribed by Ballantyne for Scott's attention.<sup>16</sup> When direct correspondence commenced in 1812, Gillies can be found bombarding Scott with verse in draft, while nervously signalling his rapid composition of a 'rhapsody' in Spenserian stanzas 'intituled Childe Alarique'.<sup>17</sup> Framed in three Cantos with accompanying 'Notes', on publication (1813, 1814) this work mirrored in presentation aspects of Scott's longer poems, with an expensive quarto edition being followed by a potentially more widely saleable octavo (the use of the antique-sounding 'Childe' in the title also adding an echo of Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*). Evidently this first effort gained a moderate success, receiving full notices in the *Monthly* and *Eclectic* reviews, both of which interestingly identify R. P. Gillies as the likely author.<sup>18</sup> The use of a yet smaller format for *Illustrations of a Poetical Character* (1816), and the expansion of the original four tales to six in a second edition, indicates an effort to acquire wider popularity, though in the event this work seems to have sunk virtually without trace. One downside for contemporaries may have been a continuation of the maudlin aspect of his earlier work, despite the intention to focus on external characters and the input provided by James Hogg, himself at a highpoint in the aftermath of the outstanding success of his *Queen's Wake* (1813). Gillies's poetry published in volume form during the later 1810s increasingly has the air of a privately manufactured endeavour. His retention of 100 copies of *Oswald* (1817) and claim that it was never published hardly seem to square with its Preface's bold claim to represent the first of a series in full preparation. One common reason for authors holding multiple copies of their own work was that they had been repurchased from the publisher after negative sales or a failure of the latter to offload shares on a second publisher. Among the incidental poetry issued by Gillies at this period is the pamphlet-like *Extempore to Walter Scott, Esq. on the Publication of the New Edition of 'The Bridal of Triermain,' &c.* [1819], a rare copy of which survives in the Abbotsford Collection in the National Library of Scotland, docketed in Scott's hand 'Verses Too good for the Subject'.<sup>19</sup> A eulogy of Scott, triggered no doubt by an earlier rumour that Gillies was author of the *Bridal* on its first publication in 1813, these verses were subsequently reprinted in *The Juvenile Keepsake* for 1830, attributed for the first time to R. P. Gillies. Gillies's last throw of the dice came with *A Winter Night's Dream. The Seventh Day* (1826) where, as noted, Gillies made an exception by placing his own name on the title page. Loosely based on a Swedish original, the first part of the text had previously appeared in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, though Gillies adds to the whole poem as published a sequence of Coleridge-like marginalia notes. This also has advertisements at the end for three further works 'In the Press, by the same Author', including 'The Seventh Day, Canto Second', none of which appear to have actually been printed.<sup>20</sup>

Gillies's interest in the novel as a form runs virtually parallel with his activity as a poet during this period. His letter to Robert Anderson of 31 March 1812 finds him lamenting 'such a dearth of Novels as at Edinburgh';<sup>21</sup> and there are several instances of his providing copies of original novels to Scott in the early 1810s. In the same letter describing progress on *Childe Alarique* to Scott, in May 1812, he reports having 'stitched together a long series of hints for a Novel', adding cautiously how he has 'sent what I thought wd. be enough for a sheet to Mr. Ballantyne: but I am pretty sure he will reject it'.<sup>22</sup> In spite of being brushed off in the *Memoirs* as 'a woeful attempt at a prose novel in two volumes' (II, 134–35), *The Confessions of Sir Henry Longueville* (1814), published almost simultaneously with Scott's *Waverley*, and sharing the same printer and publisher, throws an interesting light on the development of Scottish fiction at this juncture. Reminiscent of the high sentimentalism of predecessors such as Henry Mackenzie in tracing its protagonist's apparent descent into madness and suicide, its fragmented narrative structure and internal ambiguities at the same time look forward to the complexities of the Scotch novel in the 1820s, not least to Hogg's similarly three-sectioned *Private Memoirs and Confessions of a Justified Sinner* (1824). It also tracks Scott's poetic output up to *The Lady of the Lake*, with a sizeable intake too of what is evidently Gillies's own verse. Compared with the massive sales ultimately achieved by *Waverley*, however, the Longman records show only a marginal success, with the impression of 500 copies being mostly dispersed by the end of the year, but with no call for another.<sup>23</sup> *Old Tapestry* (1819), now unmistakably identifiable as Gillies's own work, has been previously attributed to an otherwise unknown M. W. Maskell, primarily on the basis of its Dedication signed 'M. W. M. Brazen-Nose College, Oxford'. Viewed in context though this can be seen as part of a facetious game, as found in the framework of some of the *Waverley* novels and soon to become commonplace within the pages of *Blackwood's Magazine*. More particularly, the mock genesis story provided by the Dedication, featuring a go-between who 'has for a considerable period regularly thrown away about five hundred per annum in printing books which nobody reads', points stealthily to Gillies's presence as the hidden true author. In its main narrative this novel depicts a neighbourhood in NE Scotland noticeably similar to the Balmakewan of Gillies's youth, cheerily satirising the foibles of insiders and outsiders in a manner reminiscent of Thomas Love Peacock's contemporaneous fictions. In keeping with its predecessor, Scott is picked out in conversation as the one individual of 'real genius' ('those who know him best admire him the most!') in Scotland.<sup>24</sup> Gillies's three works of fiction in the 1820s were all translations, and are perhaps best viewed as an offshoot of his activities as a Germanist contributing to *Blackwood's Magazine* (see below). Of these, *The Magic Ring* (1825), based on Baron de la Motte Fouqué's *Der Zauberring*, has not been attributed to Gillies until recently, though the archives of Oliver & Boyd provide a detailed record of its commissioning, printing and sale.<sup>25</sup> The final novel that can confidently

be attributed to Gillies, *Basil Barrington and his Friends* (1830), will feature later in this essay.

Arguably the most significant step in Gillies's career occurred through his reintroduction to periodical writing as a contributor to *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*. At the onset this proved to be far from propitious. In his *Memoirs* Gillies describes having written a review of Hogg's *Dramatic Tales* (1817) for the *Magazine's* original editors, Cleghorn and Pringle, 'which was forthwith printed' (II, 231); though no such review can be found in the pages of *Blackwood's*, in spite of a notice on the verso of the title of the second number, for August 1817, anticipating its imminent publication. A clue to what might have happened appears in a notice 'To Correspondents' at the beginning of the number for February 1818, after the editorship had been taken over by J. G. Lockhart and John Wilson, somewhat disingenuously stating that 'The Review of Mr Hogg's *Dramatic Tales* came unfortunately a little too late for this number'. Any disappointment this might have caused, however, would have been allayed by the following paean of praise: 'Its author has shewn himself to be capable of understanding the true purpose and merits of works of genius. We shall at all times be happy to receive the communications of such a writer upon such a subject.'<sup>26</sup> Most likely this was written by Lockhart, who as a Germanist himself had probably caught wind of Gillies's enthusiasm for a new and prolific wave of German literature, which Gillies describes in his *Memoirs* as instigating a turning-point in his literary development (see II, 222–23). The first manifestation was a review by Lockhart based on Gillies's experimental *Guilt; or, the Anniversary*, translated from the German of A. G. A. Müllner, in which copious extracts from the drama were interspersed within Lockhart's commentary. Homage was duly paid to Gillies as translator at the end of the review with the added hope that a favourable reception will 'stimulate Mr. Gillies to further efforts in the same style';<sup>27</sup> and effectively this set the template for the ensuing 'Horae Germanicae' series, in which Gillies was undoubtedly the major participant, both as a provider of translated material and commentator.<sup>28</sup> This endeavour is presented as the centrepiece in Gillies's subsequent appeals to the Royal Literary Fund, where in 1846 he claims to have written 'nearly the entire series', and in 1850 'the whole series from its beginning to 1827, one number only excepted'. (In fact, several more of the series running to no. XXIII can be identified with different contributors, two of these appearing while Gillies was away in Germany during 1821–22.)

To some degree participation in this project masks a larger endeavour on Gillies's part. A footnote to the second number of 'Horae' observes how '[w]e have been permitted to make use of a MS. translation of this play [*The Ancestress*] by Grillparzer by Mr. Gillies. We have also been promised the use of several other versions of fine German tragedies which he has already executed—all of them in a manner quite worthy of his fine talents'.<sup>29</sup> When listed in 'New Publications' in December 1819, *Guilt; or the Anniversary* featured as 'the first of a series on NEW GERMAN DRAMA', and there is evidence enough indicating that the



excerpts given in the 'Horae' series came from more complete translations. By 1820 too, Gillies was purchasing foreign originals at a great rate from the London bookseller John Henry Bohte, delighted that he could source books there rather than abroad, and with a special interest in Scandinavian literature, his orders including a 'Dictionary of Scandinavian Mythology' and works by the Danish poet and playwright Adam Oehlenschläger (1799–1850).<sup>30</sup> Oehlenschläger's *Hakon Jarl* (one of the purchases) then appeared in extracted form in the first of a parallel 'Horae Danicae' series, to which Gillies contributed to all numbers. Gillies also engaged in *Blackwood's* more individually, entering into its spirit of playfulness at an early point with an illustrated 'Sonnet. On Seeing a Spark fall from Mr Hogg's Pipe', humorously imploring his longstanding collaborator to adopt one of his own favoured verse forms. (Gillies was also soon to feature in the 'Noctes Ambrosianae' as Kemperhausen alongside Hogg's the Shepherd.) Gillies might also just possibly have had a hand in an unfavourable review (normally attributed to Lockhart) of J. H. Bohte's publication, *Popular Tales of the Northern Nations* (1823), at least in that part exonerating Bohte personally as a 'most spirited and most useful bookseller'.<sup>31</sup> Two late individual contributions to *Blackwood's* appear to interconnect with the *Winter Night's Dream* project, involving a Swedish prototype, though there are certain textual dissimilarities and ambiguities concerning the precise point of origin which invite further specialist investigation.<sup>32</sup> Gillies in his 1838 application to the Royal Literary Fund noticeably refers to 'Various original poems in Blackwood's Magazine, some of which (for example a "Winter Nights Dream" 1824) have been ascribed to other authors'. As with other periodicals, but perhaps in view of the densities of *Blackwood's* more so than usual, there is always a possibility that the Listing below omits a number of items now beyond recognition.

At no point did Gillies lose sight of larger ambitions which would have helped seal his reputation as a leader in Germanic studies. An outlet of sorts was provided in the case of prose writers in the form of two works of fiction published by William Blackwood in Edinburgh: *The Devil's Elixir* (1824), a translation of E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Die Elixiere des Teufels*, issued contemporaneously with Hogg's *Confessions of a Justified Sinner* and sharing with it a doppelgänger as a central motif;<sup>33</sup> and *German Stories* (1826), an anthology of contemporary German tales. A letter to Lockhart of 9 January 1825, speculating a collection based on 'about 25 plays of which specimens were published in Blackwood', moots the possibility 'that this Book wd. answer better pub[lished] in London'.<sup>34</sup> Lockhart was on the point of removing to London to edit the *Quarterly Review*, ahead of a larger exodus of Scottish writers later that decade, and in the same letter Gillies touches on the possibility of himself working there. The prospect became more of a reality in 1827 on Gillies becoming the editor of the *Foreign Quarterly Review*, a new venture to be published Treuttel & Würtz (Bohte's successors): this position being acquired with Scott's guarded encouragement. The project, as outlined in a Prospectus dated 1 March 1827, was ambitious, attempting among other things a 'catalogue raisonné' of new publications in



European languages; but Gillies felt fairly confident that an annual budget of £600 would be enough to maintain himself and pay other contributors. In the earliest numbers he began breezily enough, with long reviews on Swedish literature and German dramatists, and shorter notices on current almanacs, etc., while his credentials were no doubt boosted by an ability to bring in Scott. Even so, according to the Wellesley Index, as early as March 1830 he had ceased to be even the nominal editor. It would be wrong however to attribute this entirely to an unsuitability for the job. After leaving in summer 1827 for London, Gillies found himself having to return to an Edinburgh to which he felt strongly drawn, while struggling to find suitable lodgings for himself and his family in a new city, devoid of his usual writing resources. Such an unstable existence underlies *Basil Barrington and his Friends* (1830), the last novel with which he can be safely associated. As Gillies describes in the *Memoirs* in relation to a return to London at Christmas 1829:

the first use I made of my little gasp of time was to finish a book, 'Basil Barrington' for which Mr. Colburn had already paid me 200*l.* before it was written. But it was eventually spoiled, not for want of good will or industry on the part of the author, but because during the whole time which ought to have been devoted to it (namely, the six months previous), I was inevitably occupied in pecuniary arrangements, and in travelling about from London to Edinburgh, from Edinburgh to Aberdeen, and *vice versa*. At length my publisher became impatient for his book, which ought to have been completed long ago, and I fed the press with hasty scrolls till the stipulated number of pages were filled. Thus it turned out little better than a piece of mere mechanical work, and a good opportunity was lost. (III, 213)

Not untypically, in a 'Preface by the Editor' Gillies concocts a story about the novel being written by a dwarf he had encountered while travelling between Edinburgh and other places: 'It forms a sort of literary curiosity; for never was there a story written under more unfavourable auspices, as any one may prove who tries to write in a mail-coach. Had the dwarf survived, of course he would have improved his work greatly' (I, viii).

Most crippling of all was the shadow of debt which hung over Gillies even in the earliest days of the *Foreign Quarterly*. Scott on 14 April 1828, having himself experienced insolvency, implored his friend to 'find a more correct chart to steer by [*sic*] on the present occasion' rather than allow difficulties 'always to occupy your individual attention'; but Gillies replying on 9 May could perceive 'no chance of avoiding imprisonment and a very ruinous termination of my prospects'.<sup>35</sup> By June 1831 Gillies was supplicating the Royal Literary Fund from King's Bench Prison. For his remaining years in England, which included a short period in Brighton, it might be claimed that debtor's prison more than any other single residence provided a home for Gillies. In such circumstances, without books and with his original papers dispersed, hopes for a subscription edition of

his German and Danish translations seemed futile, and Gillies found no outlet other than taking up 'the occupation of a scrap-writer', supplying material for an essentially new world of magazine literature in London (*Memoirs*, III, 251). An early participation in the then-burgeoning world of keepsakes and annuals can be found in an apparently original contribution to the *Friendship's Offering: A Literary Album* for 1829, as edited by his fellow Scotsman Thomas Pringle, though there is little evidence of his engaging much further in this field. In more general periodicals, he managed on several occasions to highlight the injustices of the current English law on debt, as in an authoritative-seeming article on 'Law of Debtor and Creditor. Arrest for Debt' for the *British and Foreign Review* of July 1837. He likewise appears to have brought his legal training (never fully exercised in Edinburgh) to bear in co-authoring a sequence of pamphlets on the question of the *Legality or Illegality of Imprisonment for Debt*, also published in 1837; while his appeal to the Literary Fund of the following year refers to printed petitions relating to the House of Lords. The *Memoirs* also mentions his spending five months 'writing "leaders" for a weekly newspaper' as a means of remuneration, but no particular vehicle has been located (III, 256). A more reliable support during these later years was found in *Fraser's Magazine*. One early contribution there, 'O'Hanlon and his Wife', provides a harrowing story of the tragic consequences of imprisonment for debt, based on the experiences of a close acquaintance. Two longer sequences revisited Gillies's previous life in Scotland: his sometimes vividly personal 'Recollections' of Scott subsequently being issued in book form, the 'Humours of the North' series providing some of the materials for the 1851 *Memoirs*. In a contribution of 1840 he also recalls his visit to Germany in the early 1820s, when he travelled to Hamburg, Berlin and Dresden, meeting Tieck and being received by Goethe at Weimar.

In the early 1840s, Gillies found refuge residing in Boulogne, free from the immediate threat of arrest. During odd moments of stability it seemed almost as if he had attained the haven for study and writing that he had long craved. Among other things this appears to have encouraged a new phase of sonnet-writing, a selection of which duly appeared near the end of the *Memoirs* (III, 270–77). He also turned his mind to accomplishing one final major project, an annotated translation of Immanuel Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*. Publication of this was a main priority on his return to London, with the prospect of realising a long-held dream: 'Thirty-five years ago I had insisted that unremitting labour, even in the most unfrequented and neglected paths of literature, was not without its utility, but would one day or another meet with reward' (III, 305). In the event, Gillies was met with a whirlwind of old troubles, involving a failure to find a suitable home, one last lonely visit to Edinburgh and his eventual re-arrest for debt. Scrambling to its conclusion, the *Memoirs* ends with himself 'a Shadow, even in his very decadence of Shadowism' (III, 330). Paradoxically the work for which Gillies is perhaps now best known is one that ends with his despair at having failed to achieve anything lasting.

In attempting to re-establish Gillies's true output, it is important as well to encounter a number of cases where it would seem work has been *wrongly* attributed to him. Outstanding here is a sequence of five novels beginning with *Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean* (1826), which by association of titles extends to *Palmario; or, the Merchant of Genoa* (1839), 'By the Author of "Tales of an Arctic Voyager"' (for fuller details see Part II: Listing below, 'Doubtful and Suppositious Works'). Published in three volumes by Henry Colburn, the Arctic voyaging element in the first title is mainly a device on which to hang a series of tales told by travellers, none of which suggest any tangible kind of connection with Gillies. On 15 June 1825 Gillies can be found proposing 'a novel in three volumes' to Oliver & Boyd,<sup>36</sup> but the most likely outcome of this is *German Stories* published with Blackwood in the following year. Colburn, the leading publisher of novels in the later 1820s, would certainly have been known to Gillies before leaving Edinburgh, and an article on German Drama in Colburn's *New Monthly Magazine* in 1822 from internal evidence seems to be Gillies's, a decade before a longer sequence there on 'The Debtor's Experience'. Nonetheless negotiating publication of a novel in London from afar during the flux of 1825–26 would have been difficult. And if he were the author it seems strange there is no mention of this novel or its successors in either the *Memoirs* or the various appeals to the Royal Literary Fund, especially granted that space is given in both to *Basil Barrington*, also published by Colburn, itself a title no more or less respectable than these others. Another novel of the period *Tournay; or Alaster of Kempercairn* (1824) is ascribed to Gillies in the old printed *Catalogue of the Library at Abbotsford* (1838). This work contains a Dedication to Sir Walter Scott, but it is a printed one, and the most likely author is James Wilson (d. 1858), who had been admitted into the Faculty of Advocates in 1807 and who can be found in 1824 writing to J. G. Lockhart from Lincoln's Inn Fields expressing his willingness to fill up his vacation with literary work:

In this matter you could serve me much, by letter of introduction to the quarters which you think most likely to serve my views.—Since I have the misfortune to enjoy so little, if any, of the acquaintance of Sir Walter Scott, it would perhaps be idle in me to hope that he would interest himself in my favour.<sup>37</sup>

Rather than diminishing the Gillies canon, removal of such items alongside the recovery of others positively rebalances his contribution, as made evident in the following Listing in Part II. Among other advances it is possible to trace more accurately Gillies's earlier phase of writing for the periodicals, this involving a fuller record than previously available of his collaboration with Egerton Brydges, as well as the recovery of hitherto unknown items such as those in John Ballantyne's Edinburgh weekly *The Sale-Room*. Examination of extremely rare or even unique volumes of poetry also enables a more complete account of Gillies's attempts to promote himself as a major poet, on an equivalent plane to Scott and Wordsworth, unsuccessful though this proved to be in the long run. Clarification of his input as a writer of fiction likewise places him more

squarely in the publishing phenomenon known as the Scotch Novel. And while much indebted to the previous researches of Alan Strout and the editors of the *Wellesley Index*, the more visible record assembled below of Gillies's translations from German and Scandinavian literature for *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, combined with other essays on foreign literature, helps highlight the originality and extent of his engagements in this area. Even his patchier involvement in early Victorian periodical literature when viewed as a whole reveals him as a sharp observer of contemporary issues as well as an early and unusually accurate memorialist of the preceding age, this in turn adding substance to the shadow that he feared he had become.

## II

### A LISTING OF THE WORKS OF ROBERT PEARSE GILLIES

Surviving literary manuscripts of Gillies, for reasons largely explained in Part I, are patchy in the extreme. One exception (not noted above) is his 'Epilogue' written at Scott's suggestion for John Pinkerton's 1813 play *The Heiress of Strathern, or the Rash Marriage* (NLS, MS 1712, ff. 3-4). NLS also contains letters by Gillies to correspondents including William Blackwood (MSS 4003-06, 4008, 4012, 4014, 4017, 4019, 4718), J. G. Lockhart (MSS 392, 394), John Pinkerton (MS 1709) and Walter Scott (MSS 3882, 3896-97, 3903-05, 3907-10). The present writer is in possession of three holograph letters written by Gillies to the London bookseller J. H. Bohte in 1820 in search of materials for *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*. The Wordsworth Trust, Grasmere holds five letters from Gillies to William Wordsworth 1814-16 (WLMS A/Gillies, R. P./1-5). Handwritten statements from Gillies in support of appeals in 1831 and 1838 survive in the archives of the Royal Literary Fund (Case File 708, items 1 and 5).

The present Listing is devoted primarily to printed works, with publications in volume form (including pamphlets) being treated separately from periodical contributions. Items in each category are listed in chronological order according to year of first publication. Descriptions are based on copies actually seen, unless otherwise indicated by a preceding asterisk. In the case of pagination the last roman and arabic number in volumes are normally recorded. Titles for journal articles are usually taken from the main heading, though running headlines or content lists are occasionally used when deemed more appropriate. Dates as found in end-signatures are standardised (e.g. as 9 Aug 1831) unless surrounded by quotation marks.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BEM	<i>Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine</i>
BL	British Library
EUL	Edinburgh University Library
NLS	National Library of Scotland
t.p.	title page
trans.	translation/translated
unn.	unnumbered

## A. VOLUME PUBLICATIONS

*Poetry and Drama*

1. *Childe Alarique, a Poet's Reverie* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for William Blackwood, South-Bridge-Street; and John Murray Albemarle-Street, London, 1813), 4to, 100pp; 2nd edn, *With Other Poems, 'Corrected and Enlarged'* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London; and John Anderson and Co., 1814), 8vo, ii + 276pp; Philadelphia (M. Carey, 1815), 12mo, 88pp. [evidently from 1st edn]. [Preface] to 1st and Philadelphia edns signed H. F. A.; Preface to 2nd edn end-signed 'R. P. G. | March 1st, 1814'. 1st edn also includes 'On Reading The Lady of the Lake, May 12, 1810' and 'To Sir S. E. Brydges, K.J., M.P., On Reading "Hasty Lines," &c', plus 'Fragment'. 2nd edn contains multiple extra materials, including 'Wallace: A Fragment', an assortment under 'Varia', and four sonnets.
2. *Wallace, a Fragment: With Other Poems* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1813), small 8vo, xii + 100pp. Main body of text preceded by four sonnets, matching those in 2nd edn of *Childe Alarique* (see above). Preface (unn.), stating the main work to have been 'suggested by Miss Porter's excellent romance, "The Scottish Chiefs"', dated 3 July 1813. 'Notes' (pp. [35]–42) consist of long extracts from Jane Porter's novel. Also containing 'The Exile' and 'Childe Arthur. A Fragment', both of which feature under 'Varia' in 2nd edn of *Childe Alarique* (see above). EUL copy has inscription on half-title 'Dugald Stewart From the auth[or]'.
3. *Albert, a Tale*, 8vo, 15pp. Abbotsford copy has no t.p., title from drop-head; copy bound with *Lines to \*\*\*\* \* Occasioned by a Poem Entitled "Fare Thee Well!"* (see below). Inscribed at top right corner to 'Walter

- Scott, Esq. From the Author'. With proof correction on p. [1] apparently in author's hand.
4. *Egbert; or, the Suicide. A Tale*, 8vo, 15pp. Abbotsford copy has no t.p., title from drop-head; bound with *Lines to \*\*\*\* \* Occasioned by a Poem Entitled "Fare Thee Well!"* (see below). Inscribed at top right corner: 'Walter Scott Esqr. With the Author's most respectful Compts'. With proof correction on p. 7 apparently in author's hand. ESTC wrongly identifies as [London? 1800?]. Date more accurately reflected by letter of 23 Nov 1814 from Wordsworth: 'I have to thank you [...] for "Egbert", which is pleasingly and vigorously written' (*Memoirs*, II, 145).
  5. *Further Illustrations of the Same Character. A Tale. By the Author of Egbert\* and Albert*, 8vo, 17pp. Abbotsford copy has no t.p., title from drop-head; bound with *Lines to \*\*\*\* \* Occasioned by a Poem Entitled "Fare Thee Well!"* (see below). Footnote keyed to asterisk in title reads: 'The last one hundred and ten verses of Egbert were supplied by a friend'. Inscribed at top-right corner: 'Walter Scott Esq. From the Author'. Same tale as 'Alfred' in *Illustrations of a Poetical Character*, 1st edn, pp. [42]–64, and 'A Third Tale, Illustrative of Poetical Character' in *Illustrations*, 2nd edn, pp. [75]–96 (see both below).
  6. *Illustrations of a Poetical Character, in Four Tales: With Other Poems* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for Archibald Constable and Co.; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1816), small 8vo, xiv + 152pp; 2nd edn, *In Six Tales. With Other Poems, Corrected and Enlarged* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for Alexander Jameson; and Longman [etc.], London, 1816), small 8vo, 255pp. Preface to 1st edn end-dated 21 Mar 1816; also introduced by four sonnets. Tales in 1st edn comprise 'Egbert; or, the Suicide', 'Albert', 'Alfred' and 'Isidore, a Fragment'; this is followed by a section of 'Poems', amounting to 36 items, mostly sonnets. 2nd edn has dedicatory Sonnet 'To James Hogg, Author of "The Queen's Wake," &c. &c. &c.'. Additional tales in 2nd edn comprise: 'Introductory Tale. John of Manor', 'The Story of Lucia, a Fragment' and 'The Story of Montalban'. 'Alfred' also appears under the title 'A Third Tale, Illustrative of Poetical Character'. 2nd edn also includes 'Sixty-Seven Original Sonnets'. Abbotsford copy of 1st edn inscribed on front endpapers: 'Walter Scott Esqr.—With the greatest respect from his obliged & faithful h[umble] s[ervant] The Author'. 'Albert, a Tale', 'Egbert; or, the Suicide' and 'Further Illustrations of the Same Character: A Tale [Alfred]' also exist as separate printings at Abbotsford (see above).



7. *Lines to \*\*\*\* \*\*\*\*\* Occasioned by a Poem Entitled "Fare Thee Well!" by Lord Byron. Fragment of a Sketch from Imaginary Life. To which are added Some Other Verses* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. Sold by John Ballantyne, Prince's Street; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1816), 8vo, 25pp. Drop-head title to first item reads: 'Lines to . . . (And on Hearing at the Same Time that a Certain Lady of High Rank intended to "Publish her Case.") April 25, 1816.' Other integral items are 'Fragment of a Sketch from Imaginary Life, Composed April 28, 1816' (pp. 8–13) and 'Parody' [evidently of Byron] (pp. 14–15); 'Recollections, a Fragment' (pp. 16–19); 'To a Flower in a Garden near Edinburgh, April 19, 1816' (pp. 20–23); plus two sonnets. Containing bound volume at Abbotsford also includes 'Albert, a Tale', 'Egbert; or, the Suicide' and 'Further Illustrations of the Same Character. A Tale' (see as separate items above).
  
8. *Rinaldo, the Visionary, a Desultory Poem* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for Alexander Jameson, 138 High Street; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1816), small 8vo, 63pp. In 2 Parts. 'Postscript' (pp. [59]–63), stating that he had 'deliberately resolved not to exceed sixty-four pages', dated 25 Oct 1816. NLS copy bears stamp of Advocates Library on front cover.
  
9. *Oswald, a Metrical Tale. Illustrative of a Poetical Character. In Four Cantos* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. and sold by John Ballantyne, Hanover-Street; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1817), 4to, 91pp. 'Postscript' (pp. [85]–91), offering the 'first of an intended series of tales, (of which the second is in forwardness), in which the author's design was to relate incidents from common life', end-dated 'Edinburgh, March 30, 1817'. Abbotsford copy inscribed on half-title: 'Walter Scott Esq. With most respectful compts. From his ever obliged & faithful s[ervan]t the author'.
  
10. *Fragment, Suggested by a Bright Gleam of Sunshine, November 17th, 1817, Two Days before the Funeral of the Princess Charlotte of Wales* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co., for William Blackwood, Prince's Street; and John Murray, London, 1817), 4to, 16pp. T.p. with black border. Abbotsford volume has also bound in untitled separately paginated 8pp. text, in different font, inscribed at head: 'Walter Scott Esq. from the Author. Fragment supposed to be written by the Hero of one of the preceding Tales'. This latter is partly reproduced as item 1 under 'Poems' in *Illustrations of a Poetical Character* (both edns: see above).
  
11. *Extempore to Walter Scott, Esq. on the Publication of the New Edition of "The Bridal of Triermain," &c.* [Edinburgh, 1819], 4to, 3pp. End-signed

'S. K. C. | Edinburgh, March 13, 1819'. Copy in NLS, MS 922, ff. 14–15, is addressed in panel on final blank page to Scott at Abbotsford in Gillies's hand, postmark 'March 20(?) 1819'. This is docketed by Scott 'Verses Too Good for the Subject'. BL copy has R. P. Gillies written in hand under the initials. Reprinted in *The Juvenile Keepsake*, MDCCLXXX, ed. by Thomas Roscoe (see below).

12. *Guilt; or, the Anniversary: A Tragedy. In Four Acts. From the German of Adolphus Müllner* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co., 1819), small 4to, v + 103pp. Trans. of A. G. A. Müllner, *Die Schuld*. 'Advertisement' (unn.) states: 'There are several inaccuracies of versification and expression, which fall to be corrected if the work should ever be regularly published; the present impression being limited to fifty copies.' 'Stanzas Introductory' end-dated '\*\*\*\*\*', near Edinburgh, | Nov. 2, 1819'. 'Sonnet Valedictory' follows after play.
13. *A Winter Night's Dream: The Seventh Day. By R. P. Gillies, Esq.* (Edinburgh: Printed by John Stark, 1826), 4to, 31pp. Loosely trans. from Swedish? For earlier manifestations, see entries 64, 66 and 67 under *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, below. 'Note' on verso of t.p. observing how 'for the first time in my life, I inscribed my name on a title-page'. Advertises on final recto for three works 'In the Press by the same Author': 'The Memory of Burns', 'The Universal Question' and 'The Seventh Day, Canto Second'.

#### *Novels and Translated Fiction*

14. *The Confessions of Sir Henry Longueville. A Novel. In Two Volumes* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1814), 12mo, 220, 204pp.
15. *Old Tapestry; a Tale of Real Life. In Two Volumes* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for W. and C. Tait, Prince's Street; and G. and W. B. Whittaker, Ave-Maria-Lane, London, 1819), 12mo, xiii + 325, 319pp. Dedication 'to Flint Popham, Esq.', signed 'M. W. M. Brazen-Nose College, Oxford, March 1819'. Wrongly ascribed on this basis to M. W. Maskell. Abbotsford copy inscribed on front endpaper of vol. 1: 'Walter Scott Esqr. From the Author'.
16. *The Devil's Elixir. From the German of E. T. A. Hoffmann* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, and T. Cadell, London, 1824), 12mo, vii + 379, 339pp. Trans. of *Die Elixiere des Teufels* (Berlin, 1815–16). Abbotsford copy has

inscribed dedication to Walter Scott Esqr. from translator on half-title of vol. 1.

17. *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), 12mo, xv + 319, 344, 332pp. Trans. of *Der Zauberring* (Nürnberg, 1813).
18. *German Stories: Selected from the Works of Hoffmann, De la Motte Fouqué, Pichler, Kruse, and Others. By R. P. Gillies, Esq. In Three Volumes* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, and T. Cadell, Strand, London, 1826), 12mo, xiv + 333, 358, 363pp. Introduction end-dated 'Edinburgh, October 10, 1826'.
19. *Basil Barrington and his Friends. In Three Volumes* (London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, 1830), 12mo, viii + 300, 303, 314pp. 'Preface. By the Editor', end-dated London, Aug 1830.

#### *Other Works*

20. *The Essayes of a Prentise, in the Divine Art of Poesie. With a Prefatory Memoir, by R. P. Gillies, Esq., F.S.A.E.* (Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co., 1814), small 4to, xviii + [120] pp. A facsimile-style reprint of the 1584 edition of James VI of Scotland's work published in Edinburgh by Thomas Vautroullier.
21. *Legality or Illegality of Imprisonment for Debt? Section I. The Case of the Prisoners Stated* (London: Cunningham and Salmon, Printers, Crown-court, Fleet-street, [1837]), small 8vo, 34pp. For this and three following pamphlets, see *Memoirs*, III, 259 (indicating collaboration with a Mr Thomas Halls).
22. *Legality or Illegality of Imprisonment for Debt? Section II. The Case of the Prisoners Reconsidered* (London: Cunningham and Salmon, Printers, Crown-court, Fleet-street, [1837]), small 8vo, 40pp.
23. \**Legality or Illegality of Imprisonment for Debt? Section III. The Question Re-considered with Reference to Principles—Moral and Political* (London: W. Barnes, 1837), 22pp.
24. \**Legality or Illegality of Imprisonment for Debt? Section IV. The Question Re-considered and Abridged into the Form of Syllogism, or Sorites* (London: W. Barnes, 1837), 17pp.

25. *Recollections of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* (London: James Fraser, 215 Regent Street, 1837), 8vo, xvi + 303pp.
26. *Memoirs of a Literary Veteran; Including Sketches and Anecdotes of the Most Distinguished Literary Characters from 1794 to 1849.* By R. P. Gillies. *In Three Volumes* (London: Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, 1851), 12mo, viii + 344, vi + 340, vi + 334pp.

## B. PERIODICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

### *Poetical Register, and Repository of Fugitive Poetry*

- a) *Poetical Register [...] for 1808–09* [vol. 7] (London, 1812), as follows:
  1. ‘Sonnet Written in October. By R. P. Gillies, Esq. [How wild thywoodlands, Autumn, all inrolled]’, p. 161.
  2. ‘Sonnet to the Rev. John Black. By the Same [Through the dim forest’s leafy walks I stray]’, p. 162.
  3. ‘Sonnet to a Favourite Author. By the Same [It is not city toil, nor worldly pride]’, p. 163. Footnote to penultimate line identifies ‘Bard of Wootton’ as Sir Egerton Bridges [*sic*].
  4. ‘Sonnet Written by Moonlight. By the Same [Once more, I woo the fragrant gales of night]’, p. 164.
  5. ‘Ode to the Muse. By R. P. Gillies, Esq. [O Thou, who led my willing way]’, pp. 212–13.
- b) *Poetical Register [...] for 1810–11* [vol. 8] (London, 1814), as follows:
  6. ‘The Fair Reaper. By R. P. Gillies, Esq. [She scarcely seemed of mortal birth]’, p. 149.

### *Edinburgh Annual Register*

7. ‘Elegy.—Original [With what delight, ’mid yonder shades serene]’, *Edinburgh Annual Register, for 1808*, 1.2 (Edinburgh, 1810), xxxvii–xxxviii. Unsigned. Immediately after Scott’s ‘The Resolve’ (signed).

8. 'Ode. To The River N\*\*\*\*\*—Original [N\*\*\*\*\*! along thy flowery side]', *Edinburgh Annual Register, for 1808*, 1.2 (Edinburgh, 1810), xl–xli. Unsigned.
9. 'Fragment, written in Glenfinlas [That restless fire was in my breast]', *Edinburgh Annual Register, for 1809*, 2.2 (Edinburgh, 1811), 644–47. Unsigned. Immediately after Scott's Epitaph in memory of Anna Seward (signed).

*Censura Literaria*

10. No. LXXIII 'Letter to the Ruminator', 10 vols (London, 1805–09), x, 400–02. End-signed Musarum Amator | 9 May 1809. Reproduced in *The Ruminator* (London, 1813), II, 157–60, also as no. LXXIII (see below).

*The Ruminator*

*The Ruminator. Containing a Series of Moral, Critical and Sentimental Essays*, by Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges, K.J., M.P., 2 vols (London, 1813). Gillies's contributions, signed 'H. F. A.', run in vol. 2 as follows:

11. No. LXXVIII 'Story of an Eccentric Character', pp. 178–85. Headed 28 Sept. 1812.
12. No. LXXIX 'On Apparitions', pp. 186–90. Headed Oct. 1812.
13. No. LXXX 'On the Maladies of Men of Genius', pp. 191–95. Headed Oct. 1812.
14. No. LXXXI 'On the Culture of Taste and Imagination', pp. 196–98. Headed Oct. 1812.
15. No. LXXXII 'On the Effects of Rural Scenery, particularly the Scottish Highlands', pp. 199–203. Headed Oct. 1812.
16. No. LXXXIII 'On the Effects of Neglect and Censure on Certain Minds', pp. 204–06. End-dated Oct. 1812.
17. No. LXXXVI 'Minds of Certain High Endowments Unfit for Ordinary Society', pp. 215–23. Headed 12 Nov. 1812.

18. No. LXXXVII 'Lives of Literary Men Abundant in Materials for Biography', pp. 224–28. Undated.
19. No. LXXXIX 'On the Passion for Posthumous Fame', pp. 234–38. Undated.
20. No. XCI 'On Inordinate Expectations in Life', pp. 245–48. Headed Edinburgh, 7 Dec. 1812.
21. No. XCII 'On Posthumous Fame', pp. 249–52. End-dated 11 Dec. 1812.
22. No. XCIII 'On Reserve in Conversation', pp. 253–55. Undated.
23. No. XCIV 'On Sensibility', pp. 256–58. Undated.
24. No. XCV 'Men of High Endowments Cannot Often Raise the Sympathy of Common Minds', pp. 259–62. End-dated 17 Jan. 1813.
25. No. XCVIII 'On the Character of Rousseau', pp. 275–76. End-dated Edinburgh, 20 Feb. 1812 [*sic*].
26. No. CIII 'Sonnet. Address to Solitude [I that have long held commerce with the crew]', p. 313. End-dated 10 Apr. 1812. Footnote states: 'Alluding to the Sorcerer, in Childe Alarique'.

*The British Bibliographer*

*The British Bibliographer*, by Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges, K.J., M.P., 4 vols (London, 1810–14). Gillies's contributions are as follows:

27. 'Bellenden's Translation of the History of Scotland, from the Latin of Boetius', II (1812), 634–42. End-signed R. P. C. [*sic*]
28. 'Poems by Sir Richard Maitland', IV (1814), 114–18. End-signed R. P. G.
29. [possible collaborator] 'Catalogue of Early Scottish Poets, to the End of the Sixteenth Century', IV (1814), 300–13. Introduction signed D. L. E. | Apr. 1813. Includes an account of *Ane Abregement of Roland Furious*, as purchased by the Advocates Library at the Roxburghe Sale in 1812, and the subject an article by Gillies later printed in *Restituta* (see below).



*The Sylvan Wanderer*

30. No. IX, headed 6 Sept 1813, includes 'two beautiful Sonnets, received this morning from the eloquent, and highly gifted author of "*Childe Alarique*"', viz. 'To the Redbreast [And thou already hast renewed thy lay]', p. 53, headed 24 Aug. 1813; and 'On Visiting the Ruined Castle of Finella, Countess of Angus [When on the melancholy heath no ray]', p. 54. Both end-signed R. P. G.
31. No. XVIII, 28 Aug. 1815, includes two more from the same 'ingenious Author', viz. Sonnet I [As to the captive, that for many a day], p. 117, headed Balmakewan, 12 Aug. 1815; and Sonnet II [The sun is now abroad; the butterflies], p. 118, headed Balmakewan, 15 Aug. 1815. Both end-signed R. P. G.

*Reſtituta*

*Reſtituta: Or, Titles, Extracts, and Characters of Old Books in English Literature Revived*, by Sir [Samuel] Egerton Brydges, 4 vols (London: Printed by T. Bensley for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1814–16). First issued in monthly parts. Gillies's contributions as follows:

32. 'Wither's Motto, 1621' (item 19), I, 113–26, end-signed R. P. G. | Edinburgh, 10 Mar. 1814.
33. 'Rolland's Sevin Seages, 1578', I, 177–91, end-signed R. P. G. | 14 Mar. 1814.
34. 'Ane Abregement of Roland Furious', I, 313–17, end-signed R. P. G. | Advocates' Library, 27 May 1814. Conclusion (316–17) notes how 'Some account of this volume and a catalogue of its contents have already appeared in an article on Scottish poetry, in the concluding number of the *British Bibliographer*'. For details, and Gillies's possible involvement, see under *British Bibliographer* above.
35. 'Poems of a Norfolk Gentleman, 1597', I, 367–75, end-signed R. P. G. | Edinburgh, 10 May 1814.
36. 'Roswall and Lillian, 1663', I, 450–55, end-signed R. P. G. 'Taken from a copy printed in black letter, in the Advocate's [*sic*] Library, Edinburgh, June 1814' (450n).

*The Sale-Room*

37. No. VIII, Saturday, 22 February 1817. 'To the Conductor of the Sale-Room', pp. 55–61, end-signed H. F. A. [on apparitions]. Cites Brydges's *Ruminator*; and refers to own Highland upbringing.
38. No. XXI, Saturday, 24 May 1817. 'To the Conductor of the Sale-Room', pp. [161]–68, end-signed A. F. H. [*sic*] Edinburgh, 20 May 1814 [on English poetry].
39. No. XXV, Saturday, 21 June 1817, 'To the Conductor of the Sale-Room', p. 200, end-signed H. F. A. [on Byron's *Manfred*].

*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*

a) 'Horae Germanicae' series, also involving J. G. Lockhart in varying degrees, as follows:

40. No. I 'Müllner's Guilt; or, the Anniversary', 6 (November 1819), 121–36.
41. No. II 'The Ancestress: A Tragedy. By Grillparzer', 6 (December 1819), 247–56.
42. No. III 'Müllner's Twenty-Ninth of February', 6 (January 1820), 397–408.
43. No. IV 'The Cypress Crown, A Tale. By the Baroness, Caroline de la Motte Fouqué', 6 (February 1820), 525–35.
44. No. VI 'The Opening of [Müllner's] King Yngurd', 7 (July 1820), 407–18.
45. No. VII 'King Yngurd, a Tragedy, from the German of Augustus Müllner', 7 (August 1820), 54–61.
46. No. IX 'Rosamunda—a Tragedy; by Charles Theodore Körner', 8 (October 1820), 45–58.
47. No. X 'Darkness; or The Venetian Conspiracy—a Tragedy. By Professor Raupach, St Petersburg, 1819', 8 (January 1821), 384–94.
48. No. XI 'Zriny; a Tragedy. By Theodore Charles Koerner [*sic*]', 8 (February 1821), 543–61.

49. No. XIV 'Müllner's "Albaneserin"', 12 (August 1822), 218–25. End-signed 'G.' Gillies describes himself as 'sedulously preparing' such as article in letter of 1 July 1822 to Blackwood (NLS, MS 4008, f. 247r).
50. No. XIV [*sic*] 'The Light-Tower. A Tragedy, in Two Acts. By Ernst von Houvald', 13 (January 1823), [3]–14.
51. No. XV 'Klingemann's Faust', 13 (June 1823), 649–60.
52. No. XVI 'Wallenstein, translated by Coleridge', 14 (October 1823), [377]–96. Mostly commentary and the quotations directly from Coleridge's translation.
53. No. XVII 'Schiller's Fiesco', 16 (August 1824), 194–202.
54. No. XXII 'Ernest, Duke of Suabia. A Tragedy, by Ludovic Uhland', 21 (February 1827), 214–26.
55. No. XXIII, 'Werner's Twenty-Fourth of February', 21 (April 1827), 464–72. Gillies?

b) 'Horae Danicae' series, as follows [no. III not found]:

56. No. I 'Hakon Jarl, a Tragedy; by Adam Oehlenschlaeger', 7 (April 1820), 73–89.
57. No. II 'Corregio—a Tragedy. By Adam Oehlenschlaeger', 8 (December 1820), 290–305.
58. No. IV 'Hagbarth and Signa; a Tragedy. By Adam Oehlenschlaeger', 8 (March 1821), 646–60. End-signed L. M. F.
59. No. V 'Masaniello; a Tragedy. By B. S. Ingeman', 9 (April 1821), 43–59.

c) Individual contributions, as follows:

60. 'Poems and Plays by the Duchess of Newcastle', 4 (December 1818), 309–13. End-signed S. K. C.
61. 'Time's Magic Lantern. No. VIII. Dialogue between Ben Jonson and Drummond of Hawthornden', 4 (February 1819), 558–60. End-signed B. E. S.

62. 'Sonnet. On Seeing a Spark Fall from Mr. Hogg's Pipe', 5 (May 1819), 205. End-dated 1 April 1819; signed R. P. Gillies.
63. 'The Field of Terror; a Tale. By Frederick Baron de la Motte Fouque [*sic*]', 8 (November 1820), 131–37. Headnote signed 'Your friend, R. P. G.'
64. 'Fragment. From the Swedish of J. H. G. Akenthal', 13 (January 1823), 14. End-signed 'R.' Footnote states: 'We have received a translation of a poem of considerable length by this author, from which these introductory lines are copied. It is entitled "A Winter Night's Dream," and is to be found in the "Phosphoros," for November, 1814.' *Phosphoros* was a monthly journal published in Uppsala.
65. 'Popular Tales of the Northern Nations' [review], 14 (September 1823), 293–94. J. G. Lockhart, possibly with input from Gillies. See Introduction.
66. 'On Moonlight. From the Swedish of Ingelrain', 15 (March 1824), 295. Three 8-line stanzas, end-signed 'G.' End footnote states 'This fragment is the commencement of a poem of 100 stanzas, containing remembrances from the author's own life'.
67. 'A Winter Night's Dream', 18 (October 1825), [393]–400. End-signed M. M. Text matches the earlier section of the version published individually in 1826 (see A:13 above).

*New Monthly Magazine*

68. 'On the German Drama', n.s., 4 (February 1822), 145–54. End-signed M. M.
69. 'The Debtor's Experience'. No. I, n.s., 40 (March 1834), 322–28; Part II, n.s., 40 (April 1834), 478–86; Part III, n.s., 41 (June 1834), 149–54; [unn.], n.s., 41 (July 1834), 353–59; No. IV Conclusion, n.s., 41 (August 1834), 483–88.

*Foreign Quarterly Review*

70. 'Schubert's *Travels in Sweden, &c.*', 1 (July 1827), 189–214.
71. 'Modern German Tragedy', 1 (November 1827), 565–95.

72. 'Russian Literature', 1 (November 1827), 595–631. Perhaps with John Smirnov.
73. 'The German Pocket-Books for 1828', 1 (November 1828), 641–46.
74. 'Reise-bilder. Von H. Heine (Heine's Travelling Sketches)' [review], 2 (February 1828), 370–71.
75. 'Works of Henry Kleiſt', 2 (June 1828), 671–96.
76. 'Van der Veldt's *Lebenslauf und Briefe* (Van der Veldt's Life and Letters)' [review], 3 (September 1828), 318.
77. 'Dramatische Dichtungen, von Grabbe (Dramatic Poems. By Grabbe)' [review], 3 (September 1828), 319–20.
78. 'Revolutions of Naples in 1647 and 1648', 4 (August 1829), 355–403. Walter Scott, with translated passages by Gillies.

*Friendship's Offering*

79. 'The Warning. A German Legend. By R. P. Gillies, Esq.', vol. for MDCCCXXIX, ed. by Thomas Pringle (London, 1829), pp. 93–105. Distinct from 'The Warning' in *German Stories* (see A:18 above), III, 321–63.

*The Juvenile Keepsake*

80. 'Hasty Lines Addressed to Sir Walter Scott, on the Publication of the New Edition of "The Bridal of Triermain," &c' [...] By R. P. Gillies, Esq.', vol. for MDCCCXXX, ed. by Thomas Roscoe (London, 1830), pp. 228–30. See also pamphlet version, A:11 above.

*British and Foreign Review*

81. 'Courts of Local Jurisdiction. Constitution and Procedure', 3 (December 1836), 400–46. Link from next item encourages attribution to Gillies.
82. 'Law of Debtor and Creditor. Arrest for Debt', 5 (July 1837), 64–89.
83. 'Tytler's Reigns of Edward VI. and Mary', 9 (October 1839), 590–619.


*Fraser's Magazine*

84. 'Recollections of Sir Walter Scott. I.—His Boyhood and Youth', 12 (September 1835), 249–66; 'His Early Manhood', 12 (November 1835), 502–15; 'Honour, Love, Obedience, Troops of Friends', 12 (December 1835), 687–703; 'The Sere and Yellow Leaf', 13 (January 1836), 104–20. Published subsequently in volume form (see A:25 above)
85. 'Goethe's Tasso', 13 (May 1836), 526–39.
86. 'O'Hanlon and his Wife', 14 (August 1836), 184–201. End-signed 'W. F. | Maidstone, June 1836'.
87. 'Humours of the North. No. I. Baron Kalchenvogel at Edinburgh', 15 (January 1837), 20–29; 'No. II. Hints on Parsimony', 15 (February 1837), 161–69, end-signed 'W. F.'; 'No. III. Recollections of the Earl of B. [Buchan]', 15 (March 1837), 355–61; [no No. IV]; 'Nos V. and VI. John Philip Kemble.—Sir Brooke Boothby', 15 (May 1837), 591–99; 'No. VII. Notanda respecting the Order of W. S. S.', 16 (September 1837), 323–30. 'No. VIII. Recollections of Dugald Stewart', 19 (January 1839), 50–56; 'No. IX. Scotch Lairds Forty Years Ago', 22 (December 1840), 658–65.
88. 'German Philosophy', 15 (June 1837), 716–35 [mainly on Kant].
89. 'Respectability. A Sketch'. By the Author of "O'Hanlon and his Wife", 16 (October 1837), 417–32.
90. 'John Bull's Castle. A Sketch, by the Author of "O'Hanlon and his Wife"', 20 (August 1839), 152–66.
91. 'Some Recollections of James Hogg. By the Author of "Humours of the North"', 'No. I', 20 (October 1839), 414–30 (incorporating 'No. II').
92. 'Recollections of Germany. No. I. The Lünenberg Heath and Berlin', 21 (January 1840), 53–70 (incorporating 'No. II. Potsdam, and the Palace of Sans Souci'; 'No. III. Dresden, Weissenfels, and Weimar').

## C. DOUBTFUL AND SUPPOSITIOUS WORKS

1. *Tournay; or Alaster of Kempencairn. By the Author of the Fire-Eater* (Edinburgh: John Anderson, jun., 55, North Bridge Street; and Simpkin & Marshall, London, 1824). Dedication to Sir Walter Scott, dated Edinburgh, 18 May 1824. For further details, see Introduction.



2. *Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean. In Three Volumes* (London: Henry Colburn, New Burlington Street, 1826). The first of a sequence of novels commonly attributed to Gillies, but for which no contemporary corroboration can be found. For further details, see Introduction.
3. *Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean. Second Series. In Three Volumes* (London: Henry Colburn, New Burlington Street, 1829).
4. *Ranulph de Rohais. A Romance of the Twelfth Century. By the Author of "Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean."* *In Three Volumes* (London: William Kidd, 6, Old Bond Street, 1830).
5. *Thurlston Tales: by the Author of "Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean."* *Three Volumes* (London: John Macrone, St. James's Square, 1835). 'L'Envoi to the Reader' signed 'B. T.' and dated July 1835.
6. *The Siege of Antwerp. A Historical Play. In Five Acts* (London: Edward Moxon, 1838). Attributed to Gillies along with William Kennedy in OCLC WorldCat; but Kennedy given alone on t.p.
7. *Palmario; or, the Merchant of Genoa. By the Author of "Tales of an Arctic Voyager" &c. &c. In Three Volumes* (London: T. & W. Boone, 29, New Bond Street, 1839). 

## NOTES

1. R. P. Gillies, *Memoirs of a Literary Veteran; including Sketches and Anecdotes of the Most Distinguished Literary Characters from 1794 to 1849*, 3 vols (London: Bentley, 1851), III, 179. Subsequent references are given in parentheses within the main text.
2. Ian Duncan, *Scott's Shadow: The Novel in Romantic Edinburgh* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007) <<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400884308>>.
3. An exception here will be found in the case of his early contributions to the *Poetical Register for 1808–09* and *1810–11* (see B:1–6), where his full name of 'R. P. Gillies, Esq.' applies; though it is possible that the decision to use it here was beyond his control.
4. See an undated letter from Gillies to William Blackwood asking him to intervene on his behalf with James Ballantyne as printer: 'The 50 Copies shd be done up handsomely in b[oar]ds in a kind of Dilettanti manner' (NLS, MS 4718, f. 25r).
5. Alan Lang Strout, *A Bibliography of Articles in Blackwood's Magazine [...] 1817–25* (Lubbock: Texas Technological College, 1959); *The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals, 1824–1900*, ed. by Walter E. Houghton, et al. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966–89). *The Wellesley Index, with Corrections and Additions*, can now be searched online through *The Nineteenth Century Index* (Ann Arbor: Proquest, 2005–19) <<http://wellesley.chadwyck.co.uk/>>.

6. *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature Vol. 4 1800–1900*, 3rd edn, ed. by Joanne Shattock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). This provides listings under both Early Nineteenth-Century Poetry and Novel. The present writer was responsible for the latter and its inadequacies (mostly carried over from preceding editions).
7. *The Royal Literary Fund 1790–1918: Archives* (London: World Microfilms, 1984), reel 22. Thanks are due to the library staff at Cardiff University, and to Anthony Mandal, for facilitating use of this resource.
8. Acknowledgments are due to the Faculty of Advocates Abbotsford Collection Trust, and in particular Angela J. Schofield, for arranging access to a body of books relating to Gillies in the Abbotsford Library.
9. A fuller version of this same letter, from the original MS, is printed in *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: VIII. Supplement of New Letters*, ed. by Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 154–56.
10. Hogg appears to have been responsible for the endings of both ‘Egbert; or, the Suicide’ and ‘Further Illustrations of the Same Character’ [later ‘Alfred’]. For further details, see Peter Garside, ‘Hogg’s Collaboration in R. P. Gillies’s *Illustrations of a Poetical Character* (1816)’, *Studies in James Hogg and his World*, 27–28 (2018–19), 71–83.
11. See Richard D. Jackson’s article, ‘The Poems of Janet Stewart, Poet and Novelist (1781–1835)’, *Journal of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society*, 9 (2014), 87–96.
12. NLS, Adv. MSS 22.4.11, f. 117v.
13. NLS, MS 3882, f. 51v; Adv. MS 22.4.11, f. 117v.
14. Sir Egerton Brydges, *The British Bibliographer*, 4 vols (London: Bensley, 1810–14), II, 634 (vols 2–4 with Joseph Haslewood).
15. *Recollections of Sir Walter Scott, Bart.* (London: Fraser, 1837), p. 197.
16. NLS, MS 921, ff. 34–35.
17. NLS, MS 3882, f. 160r.
18. *Monthly Review*, n.s., 73 (March 1814), 272–77; *Eclectic Review*, n.s., 2 (December 1814), 617–24. Gillies also appears by name in the listings of New Publications in the *Edinburgh Review* (September 1814) and *Quarterly Review* (October 1814).
19. NLS, MS 922, ff. 14–15.
20. The Preface to *The Bijou; or Annual of Literature and the Arts* (London: Pickering, 1828) notes that ‘Mr. Gillies’s beautiful Poem called “The Seventh Day”, is, for want of space, reserved for the next volume’, though nothing is to be found later. This may well of course refer to the earlier part already published in 1825 and 1826 (see Listing).
21. NLS, Adv. MSS 22.4.11, f. 118r.
22. NLS, MS 3882, f. 160r.
23. Longman Archives, Reading University Library, Divide Ledger 1D, p. 306.
24. *Old Tapestry; a Tale of Real Life*, 2 vols (Edinburgh: Tait, and London: Whittaker, 1819), I, xi and I, 98–99.
25. NLS, Acc. 5000/140 (Letter Book No. 1, Agreements, 1814–48), pp. 137–38.
26. *BEM*, 2 (February 1818), ‘To Correspondents’ (unn.). Gillies had written on 20 January 1818 to William Blackwood expressing discontent with some of the contents of the previous number, but offering to renew ‘his former plans provided my style is sufficiently disguised and newly modified’ (NLS, MS 4003, f. 49r). He also states that he is working on ‘a Bibliographical article’ (f. 49r).
27. *BEM*, 6 (November 1819), 136.

28. While in most instances Strout in his *Bibliography* (see above) attributes the numbers to Lockhart and Gillies in tandem, evidence in Gillies's letters to Blackwood indicates that the main burden fell on him alone. Strout's index of Contributors also has a distorting effect in prioritising Lockhart.
29. *BEM*, 6 (December 1819), 247n.
30. Letters from Gillies to J. H. Bohte of 14 and 29 February and 9 March 1820, in the present writer's possession. Gillies's promises to pay later suggest that purchasing was already in danger of extending beyond his financial capabilities, though some financial support evidently came from William Blackwood. I am grateful to Graham Philip Jefcoate for help in interpreting Gillies's orders from Bohte, which mainly relate to the latter's *Catalogue of Books* (1820). Thanks are also due to Gillian Hughes and Michael Wood for help received during the composition of this article.
31. *BEM*, 14 (September 1823), 293.
32. For an authoritative, though still incomplete account, see David Groves, 'Robert Gillies and *A Winter Night's Dream*', *Notes & Queries*, 40.4 (December 1993), 473–74 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/nq/40-4-473b>>.
33. In letters from Germany to Blackwood in 1821 Gillies twice expresses a desire for his translation to be considered 'an *original work*' (NLS, MS 4006, ff. 296r, 298r). For affinities with Hogg's *Confessions*, see Reinhard Heinritz and Silvia Mergenthal, 'Hogg, Hoffmann, and their Diabolical Elixirs', *Studies in Hogg and his World*, 7 (1996), 47–58.
34. NLS, MS 934, ff. 194–95.
35. NLS, MS 23118, f. 20r; MS 3909, fol. 9v. Gillies's foreboding proved to be justified, and on 31 May 1829 he was writing to J. G. Lockhart from the King's Bench Prison about payments to Scott for articles in the *Foreign Quarterly Review* (MS 924, no. 135).
36. Gillies to George Boyd, 15 June 1825; NLS, Acc. 5000/191.
37. NLS, MS 935, f. 272. For further details relating to this identification see 'The *English Novel, 1800–29 & 1830–1836*: Update 8 (August 2009–July 2021)' in the present issue of *Romantic Textualities*.

### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

P. D. GARSIDE. 'Shadow and Substance: Restoring the Literary Output of Robert Pearse Gillies (1789–1858)', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.106>>.

### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 16 September 2019.



## FUGITIVE TEXT

Robert Southey and S. T. Coleridge's *Ballad of the Devil*

Robert William Rix



### I

A RUNAWAY SUCCESS OF 1799 WAS THE SATIRICAL BALLAD 'The Devil's Thoughts', published anonymously in the *Morning Post and Gazetteer* (no. 9569) on 6 September. The poem (written in fourteen four-line ballad stanzas) is narrated from the perspective of the Devil, who has ascended to the surface of the earth one morning. This is to see 'how his stock went on', that is to say, he gleefully observes the rampant inequities in the city expecting a good yield in Hell.<sup>1</sup> The poem aims its barbs at lucrative professions, such as lawyers, apothecaries, and booksellers, but government policies of prisons and support for the war with France are also criticised. The issue of the *Morning Post* in which the poem appeared was given a second print run to keep up with demand.<sup>2</sup> However, only few readers at the time would have known that the ballad was jointly written by S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey. Over a period of almost four decades, the ballad was transcribed, reprinted and imitated (the number of imitative poems practically constitutes a minor genre). But despite the fact that it became one of the most popular texts either of the two Romantic poets wrote, modern criticism has given it only cursory attention.

This article makes up for this lacuna by examining the circulation, editing, and revisions of the text. In the idiom of the day, Southey and Coleridge's devil-ballad can be called 'fugitive', a nineteenth-century descriptor for a text that dealt with ephemeral matters of only passing interest (*OED* 5). However, the term was broadened to mean a poem reprinted several times, often with no certainty about its authorship. Both meanings hold true in the case of 'The Devil's Thoughts', which was written as a topical squib to fill the pages of a newspaper on a given day, and yet the anonymous ballad was still being reprinted decades later without the authors' consent. In contrast to readings that tie the great Romantic ode or the meditative lyric to the individual genius of its author, we have yet to fully account for the complexities of disposable poems whose lease of life extends beyond what the authors intended or even desired—that is, fugitive texts. Focusing on the textual variants of 'The Devil's Thoughts' and its copies, I will discuss how the print market came to treat an anonymous ballad as public property and how each new version of the text introduced features that altered readers' interpretive perspectives.

The essay will proceed in four stages. First, I will examine how the ballad's allegories were instrumental in securing the text a prolonged life (the poem's

*transsexuality*, as Gérard Genette would have it).<sup>3</sup> Second, I will explore the trajectory of the text through its reproductions and probe the nexus of reasons for Southey's and Coleridge's apparent reticence about acknowledging authorship of the ballad. This will be followed, in the third section, by an analysis of the revised versions Southey and Coleridge eventually decided to publish independently of each other. In the fourth and final part, I will look at the entrepreneurs who cashed in on the popularity of the ballad by churning out a number of imitative compositions in hasty succession. This 'afterlife' of the ballad is interesting not only because it has never been studied, but also because it provides a unique insight into how original literary ideas of the romantic-period could be copied and exploited in the market for popular print.

### *Allegory as a Means for Textual Transmissions*

The argument I want to present in this first section is that the ballad consists of a series of allegories that invite to a certain structure of reading that helped to secure its longevity because new readers could reinterpret its allusions to fit new signifiers. Allegory and fable were modes of writing often used in satire of the 1790s as a safeguard against government prosecution, as the Pitt regime, in fear of insurrection, was wont to take legal action against radical publications.<sup>4</sup> Thus, satire would lodge its message in representations that would trigger associative bands, but effectively sever representations from any direct or singular signification. That is to say, readers were invited to collude with texts that excelled in oblique hints, feeling themselves on the 'inside' of an interpretive community that could decode the message. This was a strategy that meant the author and bookseller could avoid charges. Perhaps the way in which Southey and Coleridge stake the claim that government supporters would end up in Hell for their crimes was appreciated by readers. At least, Coleridge could write to Southey a few months after publication: 'Our "Devil's Thoughts" have [*sic*] been admired far & wide—most *enthusiastically* admired!'<sup>5</sup>

Throughout, the ballad relies heavily on the Bible for its allegories. The first stanzas are general indictments of ignoble professions. For example, the Devil observes a lawyer killing a viper, the two being so alike that the scene is inevitably compared to Cain's fratricide on Abel. The Devil also sees an apothecary (a profession notorious for dishing out suspicious medicines) on a white horse like one of the horsemen of the Apocalypse (as a note tells us), who will bring death and destruction. In the final stanza, the Devil sees an agitated General's 'burning face' and mistakes this for the 'General Conflagration' to come at the end of time. This image is a pun on the belief that the whole world will eventually be burned up, at which time all men will be judged. The Devil's misreading of the situation makes him hurry back to Hell to prepare himself for the people he expects to receive there. The fact that the ballad is concluded with the Devil's glaringly erroneous interpretation forces readers to question the sanity of all the Devil's observations so that it becomes difficult for potential conservative

detractors to determine whether anything in the poem is to be interpreted at face value.

This textual strategy is especially important in relation to the attacks on the government and Prime Minister William Pitt. The most political part of the ballad is stanza 10, in which the Devil observes a pig swimming down the river, who at every stroke was ‘cutting his own throat’. This appears to allude to the Prime Minister keeping his own head above water while he is damaging the country he represents. This interpretation is underscored by its correlation with another Coleridge’s essay ‘Pitt and Buonoparte’ (published in the *Morning Post* on 19 March 1800), in which he targets Pitt for claiming ‘prosperity’ as one of his ‘general phrases’, but incapable of documenting the country’s success by ‘one single fact of real national amelioration.’<sup>6</sup> The use of animal imagery in political satire was not unknown: a 1797 cartoon by James Gillray, for example, shows William Pitt as ‘the learned pig’, and a print by Richard Newton from 1795 depicts both Charles James Fox and Pitt as pigs.<sup>7</sup>

The animal fable, from which the ballad borrows, is a genre that was given meaning and shape at a historical moment in a socially specific environment. ‘The artistic act’, as Mikhail Bakhtin has it, ‘lives and moves not in a vacuum but in an intense axiological atmosphere of responsible interdetermination.’<sup>8</sup> The idea of representing politics through the vehicle of animal fable (with its studious indeterminacy as to the exact tenor of the represented) was a response to a particular legislative and constitutional situation. James Epstein and David Karr have argued that the policing of publications and the willingness to prosecute seditious statements were restrictive measures that dictated ‘strategies of indirection, the adaptation of language and behaviour “on the margins of legal sanction”’. In this way, government attempts to contain free expression were, ironically, productive of textual inventiveness and creative interpretation.<sup>9</sup> Most incendiary was the fable ‘King Chanticleer; Or the Fate of Tyranny’ (1793) by Coleridge’s one-time associate John Thelwall. In this allegorical tale, a domineering gamecock drives ‘his subjects’ into ‘foreign wars’ to ‘snatch every little treasure’ but is eventually decapitated for his despotism. The government understood the gamecock to be a representation of George III and therefore prosecuted the printer, Daniel Isaac Eaton, for sedition. Eaton was eventually acquitted, however, as the prosecution failed to prove that the allegory pointed unequivocally to the King.<sup>10</sup>

With this example of government paranoia in mind, it is worth noting that the pig in ‘The Devil’s Thoughts’ is ‘cutting his *own* throat’ (emphasis added), indicating that violent action is not necessary, as the Prime Minister will sink of his own accord—together with the country he misgoverns. At no point does the ‘The Devil’s Thoughts’ push its allegories into the rubric of sedition. Although the ballad is critical of government—tax levies, the war with France and the management of prisons—it expresses no Jacobin or revolutionary sentiments. In this way, the ballad averts the threat that Coleridge had levelled at Pitt in an earlier allegorical poem from the *Morning Post*, ‘Fire, Famine, and Slaughter.



A War Eclogue' (8 January 1798), in which the Prime Minister's death is violently imagined: 'the multitude [...] shall seize him and his brood [...] They shall tear him limb from limb!'<sup>11</sup>

The usefulness of allegories as reusable vehicles unto which new meanings could be grafted is highlighted in stanza 11 of 'The Devil's Thoughts', in which the Devil recalls his two children 'Taxation' (alluding to the taxes Pitt introduced in response to the national debt in 1798) and 'Victory' (the hoped-for outcome of the war with France). The humour here relies on the parallel with John Milton's allegory of Satan's two children in *Paradise Lost*: Sin and Death. This is not as highbrow an allusion as it first seems: Milton's allegory was well-known and had been used for the purpose of political satire by Gillray in his popular cartoon 'Sin, Death, and the Devil' (1792), a critique of Pitt's dismissal of his Chancellor after disagreement over tax policies. In relation to *Paradise Lost*, it is pertinent here to note Kenneth Borris' argument that it was the 'allegorical modulation' of the poem that extended its 'longevity' by 'enhancing its adaptability' for posterity. Yet the abstract quality of allegory is also what laid the poem 'open to usage for betokening meanings that may even question or subvert the authority of the host itself'.<sup>12</sup> I will contend that the allegories used in 'The Devil's Thoughts' gave it a prolonged life as a republished text, as later nineteenth-century readers were able to reinscribe it with new indictments of contemporary government abuses. In a recent book, Cassie LeGette has examined how several Romantic poems of the 1790s were repurposed to new political ends, long after their original publication. For example, poems by Wordsworth, Southey and Coleridge appeared in excerpt in Thomas Wooler's *Black Dwarf*, alongside Chartist prints, and other radical publications between the 1820s and 1840s, although the poets themselves had turned to conservatism at this time. Coleridge's allegorical 'Fire, Famine, and Slaughter' was reprinted. So were his 'Religious Musing' and 'Fears in Solitude', but excerpting them in such a way that only the censure of the British government is preserved, while the criticism of French aggression is left out.<sup>13</sup> What we will discover in the following section is that the interpretive possibilities of the devil-ballad were also expanded as it was copied into variant versions beyond the control of its authors.

### *Textual Transmission*

The ballad's circulatory life from 1799 to the late 1830s is revealing because it shows how anonymously published texts could be usurped by others in the book market. I contend that in order to reuse the ballad as a commercial commodity, it was necessary to elevate it to a more respectable and bookish piece. This happened primarily through framing the piece with and within various *paratexts*.<sup>14</sup> The appropriation of the ballad in new settings was helped by Southey and Coleridge effectively disowning their text for many years. The reason for this cannot be pinned down to a single motive, but—I will argue—must be understood as a nexus of reasons closely tied in with the socio-historical conditions

for satirical texts in the arena of early nineteenth-century textual production and reproduction.

As the original issue of the *Morning Post* became unavailable, the ballad continued to circulate in transcript (see further below). This testifies to the fact that Romantic-period readers did not entirely surrender to print economy; the avalanche of print did not supplant manuscript culture as a means of literary dissemination, and Coleridge was especially active in this practice.<sup>15</sup> Despite the fact that the ballad seems to have continued to receive attention, Coleridge did not reprint it or acknowledge authorship until 1817. The admission was made in the collection *Sibylline Leaves* in connection with the reprinting of the more incendiary 'Fire, Famine, and Slaughter'. Coleridge's disclosure of his authorship of that poem was very much a forced confession. It was prompted by Leigh Hunt's unauthorised printing of the poem in *The Examiner* for 24 November 1816 with the clear intention to embarrass the conservative Coleridge, who by this time was distancing himself from his political satires of the 1790s. In an aptly titled 'Apologetic Preface', Coleridge assures his readers that no malignity was intended when he wrote 'Fire, Famine, and Slaughter', avowing that 'there was never a moment in my existence in which I should have been more ready, had Mr. Pitt's person been in hazard, to interpose my own body, and defend his life at the risk of my own.'<sup>16</sup> In the same preface, Coleridge divulges that he was also one of the authors of 'The Devil's Thoughts'. The confession to this was surely made because he was expecting that his authorship of this other poem from the *Morning Post* would be found out, and he therefore wanted to preempt his detractors. Coleridge explicitly apologises for the potential hurt he had caused to the 'religious feelings of certain readers'. This statement comes after Coleridge had become high Tory, supportive of a position on Church and state that saw the two as an organic unity, a point he wrote vigorously about. In stanzas 12 and 13 of 'The Devil's Thoughts', the allegorical figure of Religion (written as '—', rhyming with 'pigeon') was depicted as a harlot or prostitute. The context was the Church's willingness to consecrate military battle standards for victory in the war with France.<sup>17</sup> In the 'Apologetic Preface', Coleridge admits his parenthood of the ballad while presenting it as an errant piece. He says that what he once 'dared beget', it would only be 'manly' and 'honourable' to now accept as a 'father'.<sup>18</sup> The underlying parable invoked here is that of the biblical tale of the Prodigal Son, who is mercifully accepted back by his father despite his riotous life as a wanderer. The analogy was apposite, of course, when referring to a poem that had circulated in manuscript for years. But important here is the rhetorical sleight of hand by which Coleridge posits the ballad as an entity that had strayed from the author's control, as if it had a life and will of its own.

Coleridge's reluctance to actually reprint the ballad in *Sibylline Leaves* (1817) and to wait for another decade afterwards made it possible for the satirical piece to continue to drift nomadically. But as handwritten manuscripts are expected to have a closer relation to the hand that wields the pen than printed pages that are perceived to introduce distance between text and author, the anonymous

devil-ballad soon became associated with the name of an author, a misattribution that came to determine the reception of the ballad. In *Humorous Tales in Verse* (1818), which claims to be the first printed version of the ballad, the verse lines are accompanied by an anecdote. We are told that the poem was written by the classical scholar Richard Porson at a dinner party where he supposedly hammered out the poem *extempore*. The printing is said to be an authoritative version corrected by Porson himself in contrast to 'other MS copies with material variations.'<sup>19</sup> The spurious origin tale was repeated in later reproductions of the ballad.<sup>20</sup> It is possible that Porson had transcribed the poem in a manuscript that others perhaps copied.<sup>21</sup> At least, the printed versions that credit Porson as the author contain verbal differences from the *Morning Post* version and the misplacement of a stanza. Manuscript culture was just as happy to nurture authorial discretion as the print market, and unsigned manuscripts may have circulated, accompanied by rumours of who the author may be. But Porson had died in 1808 and could therefore not weigh in on the matter.

Connecting Porson with the poem made sense insofar as he was known for his oppositional political views and had published an unknown number of unsigned articles in the *Morning Chronicle*. The prefatory note added to the ballad in *Humorous Tales in Verse* can be classified as what Genette terms a *peritext* (a textual element surrounding the body of a text) that establishes a new framework for interpreting the ballad. The story of Porson and the dinner party presents the verse lines as written by a highly respected Cambridge professor, who purportedly had churned out the verses in the spirit of lighthearted fun. In this way, the ballad (by nature a 'low' form associated with the politics of the streets and taverns) is disconnected from contact with the radical satires of the 1790s—the type of composition Michael Scrivener refers to as 'seditious allegories', of which it otherwise bears the hallmarks.<sup>22</sup> This may have been important in 1818 when William Hone (whose political and religious satires were the descendants of the allegories published in the 1790s) was on trial for *The Late John Wilkes's Catechism of a Ministerial Member* (1817), *The Political Litany* (1817) and the *Sinecurist's Creed* (1817), which were considered harmful to public morality, and the *habeas corpus* was still suspended amidst fear of insurrection.

A significant development in the devil-ballad's history is the publication of a series of highly popular illustrated versions during 1830–31. The poem was now retitled *The Devil's Walk*, edited by H. W. Montagu and published by London booksellers Marsh and Miller in collaboration with Edinburgh-based Archibald Constable (Walter Scott's publisher). In the early editions (see the appended Chronological List in Part II of this essay), the ballad is attributed to Porson, and a four-page memoir of the classical scholar (including the anecdote of the dinner party) is inserted as a preface. The edition is a collated text with variant readings for several of the stanzas, which was necessary because the ballad had 'appeared in several publications and it had circulated in MS with various alterations and interpolations'.<sup>23</sup> It was customary at the time to sell older works by hiring well-known editors, and Montagu had recently achieved

some literary success. Hence, it is as 'Author of *Montmorency, a Tragic Drama* [1828]' that his editorship is advertised on the title page. Montagu's own ambitions as literary author interfere with the presentation of the editorial material, so that annotations to verse lines often run over several pages, and on more than one occasion are used to introduce new satire on contemporary victims. In this way, the annotations veer between what Genette distinguishes as the 'allographic' note (scholarly comments by an editor) and the 'fictional' note (creative or pseudo-comments).<sup>24</sup> For instance, there is a general mockery of both contemporary politicians and celebrities, whose identities are only vaguely obscured by blanking out letters in their names. This is a textual act akin to what Genette calls 'proximation': the relocation of a text to bring it into closer proximity with the temporal context of expected readers.<sup>25</sup> Only in this case the transposition is not changing the original text but adding *paratext*. This method of intrusive editing effectively makes Montagu co-author of a satirical palimpsest. The reason for bringing a 30-year-old text back into circulation was likely the increased alertness to social privilege and political mismanagement in the years leading up to the Reform Act of 1832.

The illustrated *The Devil's Walk* features six black-and-white wood engravings designed by (Isaac) Robert Cruickshank, showing the Devil engaged in various city activities. The co-presence and interaction of pictures with the text create a hybrid form—variously called 'iconotext', 'word-bound text', 'imagetext' and other denominations.<sup>26</sup> The engravings elevate the original newspaper skit to a more respectable format. The hermeneutic shift was also signalled through repackaging the text in a standalone edition, furnished with a frontispiece, preface, annotations and appended adverts for the 'elegantly bound, full gilt' books that were also published by Marsh & Miller. The illustrations were probably commissioned to appeal to the same group of readers who had enjoyed Pierce Egan's well-received publication *Life in London* (a series running from 1821 to 1828), furnished with illustrations by both George and Robert Cruickshank.<sup>27</sup>

The fact that Montagu wrongly attributed the devil-ballad to Richard Porson meant that Southey and Coleridge were robbed of recognition for what was not only a long-standing satirical classic, but now a commercial success as well. When their authorship was finally acknowledged in a later edition, Montagu states in the preface (signed October 1830) that a staggering 15,000 copies of the poem has been sold.<sup>28</sup> The change was urged by Coleridge himself, who had arranged for a letter about the matter to be sent to Montagu.<sup>29</sup> The overwhelming popularity of the poem and the fact that Montagu's handsome edition (though not expensive) was a sufficiently gentrified version of the ballad seem to have swayed Coleridge to claim the poem. Furthermore, Coleridge had already authorised a reprinting of the devil-ballad in the second volume of his *Poetical Works*, published in 1828. However, Montagu's recognition of Southey and Coleridge on the title page of the bestselling edition was only an empty gesture, as no monetary compensation would have been paid to them: they did not hold any copyright over an anonymous, 30-year-old poem.

The question why neither Southey nor Coleridge was eager to claim the ballad at an earlier stage is a moot point. But over the following pages I will discuss a number of possible explanations, as they will help to illuminate some important dynamics of the Romantic-era book market. One reason why the poem was not embraced is its origin as a joint work. Today, we are comfortable with texts that do not fit in with myths of the isolated and solitary genius in the Romantic period. Several critical studies have established how a large proportion of Romantic works were composed as a part of a sociable activity or in response to communal interaction.<sup>30</sup> But, as Alison Hickey has noted, co-authored texts were hard to square with the 'ideas of genius' prevalent at the time of Romanticism.<sup>31</sup> The devil-ballad was a collaborative effort with input from both Southey and Coleridge, and it is possible that this was a reason why neither Southey nor Coleridge was able to claim full ownership over it, especially after they had drifted apart. In this respect, the collaborative poem sat uneasily with Coleridge's later unswerving insistence on the singular author's inalienable right to literary property and Southey's strident advocacy of the author's perpetual rights.<sup>32</sup> In fact, a manuscript Coleridge owned of 'The Devil's Thoughts' shows that he kept a meticulous record of the respective stanzas he and Southey had individually contributed.<sup>33</sup>

But more so than an unsettled question of authorship among former friends, it is relevant to consider whether the literary and aesthetic codes associated with popular satire were contributing factors in the authors' long-held silence on their authorship. Already when Coleridge accepted the position of what he called 'a hired paragraph-scribbler' for the *Morning Post* in 1798, he aired his misgivings about both the quality and political positioning it entailed:

[I]f any important Truth, any striking beauty occur to my mind, I feel a repugnance at sending it garbled to a newspaper: and if any idea of ludicrous personality, or apt anti-ministerial joke, crosses me, I feel a repugnance at rejecting it, because something must be written, and nothing else suitable occurs.<sup>34</sup>

Arguably, the venue and circumstance for publication affected how Coleridge viewed his own production. In 1802, he writes in a letter that the 'greater number' of occasional verses to be sent to the *Morning Post* 'will be such as were never meant for anything else but peritura charta'.<sup>35</sup> The Latin phrase plays on the two possible meanings 'perishable paper' and 'ephemeral writing', correlating the quality of the writing with the quality of the paper on which it was printed. This corroborates the literary historian John Guillory's analysis of Romantic writers' urge to distinguish firmly between literary and subliterate genres, a distinction based on both aesthetic evaluation and a sense of what constituted cultural capital in the bourgeois literary market.<sup>36</sup> Southey and Coleridge both wanted to distance themselves from the 'low' literature of the popular market, which dovetailed their pursuit of careers as writers of meditative poetry. Satire was anathema to the work of the serious poet, as one critic at the time expressed

it by pouring praise on the Lake School's 'contemplative turn' as a bulwark against popular satires.<sup>37</sup>

Before H. W. Montagu corrected the misattribution of *The Devil's Walk* to Porson, he actively denied the rumour that Southey and Coleridge could be the authors of the ballad: the rumbustious satire had 'nothing in common with the works of the very talented persons [Southey and Coleridge] to whom it is ascribed', he writes in the preface.<sup>38</sup> Montagu's (erroneous) deduction leads us to consider Michel Foucault's essay 'What is an Author' (1969), in which he argues that the name of an author does not point to a physical person, but has the function of evoking the works written under that person's name. Thus, the function of the author's name on the cover is to create a sense of homogeneity among his or her texts.<sup>39</sup> Foucault's observation is particularly pertinent to the nineteenth century, as an author was often identified not by name but through reference to a former successful work from him or her (in the style of 'by the author of . . .'). Coleridge and Southey may both have been reluctant to insert the devil-ballad in the chain of works that would defile their professional identities as authors of meditative verse. Coleridge certainly wanted to distance himself from the market of 'low' and 'popular' publications. The issue came up in connection with the publication of Mary Robinson's posthumous four-volume *Memoirs* (1801), in which Coleridge's poem 'A Stranger Minstrel' (written in November 1800) was printed. In a letter of 1802, he laments the decision to associate his name with the gothic productions that the poem's sombre tone brings to mind: 'I understood that an excessively silly copy of Verses, which I had absolutely forgotten the very writing of, disgraced me & the volumes'.<sup>40</sup> That Coleridge should have forgotten a poem he wrote less than two years earlier seems insincere, but he is really reflecting on the fact that as soon as one's name was attached to a publication, it would freeze that name in time and at some point leave it out of sync with the opinions of the living and developing author. From 1802, Coleridge often used the signature 'ΕΣΤΗΣΕ', ostensibly Punic Greek, which—he explained in a letter—meant '*He hath stood*'. This was a signature in which he invested great significance: 'in these times of apostacy from the principles of Freedom [...] it is in truth no more than S.T.C. written in Greek. *Es tee see*'.<sup>41</sup> However, Coleridge could not let these signs 'stand' in the 1810s, as he slipped away from his earlier Jacobin/oppositional stance to a Tory position, becoming the very apostate he had condemned.

That Southey and Coleridge seemingly wanted to dissociate themselves from the devil-ballad cannot be separated from their turn towards a more conservative and authoritarian position. In *The Friend* for 19 October 1809, a reactionary Coleridge would criticise 'vapid satires' and condemn satirical 'scribblers' who wrote libels from 'envy and malevolence'.<sup>42</sup> Southey published the essay 'On the Rise and Progress of Popular Disaffection' (1817), in which he turned his ire towards the satirist 'Junius', whom he saw as 'the most influential and most pernicious English writer of his age', and whose libel against the authorities had caused ruinous political unrest.<sup>43</sup>



*Southey's and Coleridge's Revised Versions*

Important moments in the plurality of intertexts that 'The Devil's Thoughts' engendered are Southey's and Coleridge's own revisions of the ballad. In the following, I will argue is that they both attempted to mitigate the low status of the ballad and take the edge of its oppositional politics.

Coleridge reprinted the devil-ballad in the second volume of his *Poetical Works* (1828). At this point in time, Coleridge and Southey had been called out as the authors of the ballad in an 1826 printing of the ballad in the influential *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, so in compiling a three-volume collection of his poetry, omission of the devil-poem would seem disingenuous.<sup>44</sup> But, significantly, Coleridge produced a redacted version, reducing the ballad to just ten stanzas, which meant leaving out (as Coleridge explains in a note) verses that were 'grounded on subjects that have lost their interest—and for better reasons'.<sup>45</sup> The omitted stanzas were primarily those that had lost their topicality, such as those alluding to the slave trade (less relevant after the passing of the Slave Trade Act of 1807) and the war with France (concluded in 1815). Coleridge also adds textual notes to the poem that, if anything, help to obfuscate the prosaic politics of the original ballad and place it more securely in the domain of the literary. This is done by referring the reader to *Paradise Lost* and including quotations in Latin and Greek letters. The last time that Coleridge exerted any control over his collected poems was in the 1835 Pickering edition of his works, edited just before his death.<sup>46</sup> Here, the ballad is expanded to 17 stanzas, restoring what was left out in 1828. The fact that this reprinting appeared after Montagu's full version of the poem had become a smash, selling by the thousands, made the withholding of any material seem futile—and it would also disappoint those who had read and admired the longer version.

In a discussion of a text that became plural it is relevant to take into account Jack Stillinger's proposal that one needs to 'grant the legitimacy and interest [...] of *all* the versions' of a Romantic textual object to fully understand it as *text*.<sup>47</sup> Plurality is particularly pertinent to a consideration of the political charge of the last stanza, which Coleridge had penned. The Devil observes a 'General ——'s burning face', which he mistakes for the 'General Conflagration' to come at the end of time. As a consequence, the dark lord hurries back to Hell in expectation of the many people he will be receiving there. The excision of a proper name by replacing it with dashes was a strategy that had migrated from political to satirical writing, exploiting a loophole in libel laws that allowed innuendos to escape prosecution.<sup>48</sup> In the notes to his 1828 reprinting, Coleridge added the assurance that the empty spaces were never meant to be filled by any particular name; he had simply wanted to refer to 'a red-faced person' he had seen in a dream.<sup>49</sup> This explanation tries to conceal the ballad's origin in political satire where empty spaces were routinely used to target public persons. The disclaimer was surely a response to the pirated versions of the ballad in which different names had been inserted by editors, and Coleridge is now vying to regain control of a text that had roamed freely. When the ballad was printed in *The Tickler* (January 1819),

the dashes were replaced by the name 'General Gascoigne'—referring to one Isaac Gascoyne (1763–1841), a British Army commander who was also a Tory politician in opposition to the abolition of the slave trade.<sup>50</sup> Yet this can hardly be the name originally intended in 1799, since Gascoyne did not attain the rank of Major-General until 1802. In a manuscript version transcribed in the *British Critic*, we find the name 'General Gage', invoking Thomas Gage (1718–87), on whose orders Charlestown was burnt in the American War, a fact that would explain Coleridge's pun on destructive fire.<sup>51</sup> Likewise, in one of Coleridge's own manuscript copies of the ballad, the name 'General Tarleton' is given—Banastre Tarleton (1754–1833), who was known for his military service in the American War, not least for the burning of villages.<sup>52</sup> In another manuscript copy, the name is written out as 'General Burrard', for Harry Burrard (1755–1813), who was involved in the signing of the Convention of Sintra (1808), an agreement Coleridge commented upon with much vehemence.<sup>53</sup> It goes without saying that this insertion of Burrard's name was a post-1799 revision, which speaks to the fact that Coleridge's disavowal of the last stanza as a pointed political satire does not hold up.<sup>54</sup>

Like Coleridge, Southey was also outed as the author of the devil-ballad. In private, Southey decided to revise the ballad and sent an expanded version to his friend Grosvenor C. Bedford in a letter dated 24 February 1827. This was perhaps in reaction to being explicitly named as the author in the 1826 printing of the ballad in *Blackwood's Magazine*.<sup>55</sup> Southey's own version was retitled 'The Devil's Walk' and contains 57 stanzas, incorporating the original ballad, but adding a welter of new ideas. The length of Southey's revised version and his abandonment of the simple ballad stanzas made the new version resemble the format of neoclassical verse satire, which was still held in high regard. Even so, Southey still felt the need to disown any artistic investment in the composition. In the letter to Bedford, he does his utmost to present the poem as a hack job that was dashed off in a hurry:

I am almost doubtful whether you can decipher the detestable character in which it is scrawled and scratched rather than written. It has been lying on my table some three weeks before I could make up my stomach to send it.<sup>56</sup>

The new and substantially longer version was not printed until it was included in the third volume of Southey's *Poetical Works, Collected by Himself* (1838).<sup>57</sup> Southey adds a preface that explains how he and Coleridge had composed the poem that went on to become a publication success. This is repeated within the poem itself (stanzas 37–40) as a jocular metafictional account of how the two poets had met at Nether Stowey, in Somerset, and thrashed out the original poem while shaving and having breakfast. This representation of the ballad's compositional history is the poet laureate's opportunity to claim that the ballad was spontaneously composed rather than written as a calculated and well-organised attack on authorities. The longer version is also an attempt to dilute the oppositional content of the original ballad: in addition to challeng-

ing government and taxes, the new lines also shore up the powers of authority. For instance, the original attack on 'Religion' is now more univocally aimed at religious dissent that 'lets down' the Anglican Church and its moral principles and religious doctrines.<sup>58</sup> In this way, Southey's revised version becomes a palimpsest that restrains the original text by subsuming it.

### *The Devil's Imitators*

H. W. Montagu, the editor of the illustrated *The Devil's Walk*, claimed that the ballad was 'one of the most strikingly original poems that ever appeared'.<sup>59</sup> This is a paean to the Romantic ideology of originality. A collateral of originality is copying, and an important dimension of the ballad's *transfextuality* is its many imitations and sequels. Despite the fact that the exploitation of creative originality by imitators and book-market impresarios is integral to an understanding of the Romantic period, this is often a neglected area of discussion. The remainder of this article will examine how a number of *hypertexts* (texts that allude, derive from, or relate to an earlier work) appropriated Southey and Coleridge's ballad.

The first imitation was written by Percy Bysshe Shelley, who may have seen 'The Devil's Thoughts' when he visited Southey at Keswick in 1811. A year later, he arranged for 'The Devil's Walk: A Ballad' to be printed in Dublin as an anonymous broadside. Shelley's third stanza on the lawyer killing a viper is almost identical with stanza 3 of the original version, and he incorporates the pig and an allusion to the general conflagration destroying the world. By flagging up the generic marker 'ballad' in the title, Shelley signalled that the text had communal ownership, as textual variations (wording and narrative) among broadside ballads from different printers, and even between printings by the same printer, were commonplace.<sup>60</sup>

Shelley's version moves in a dangerously radical direction. Most critically, the Devil observes 'a brainless King', and his overweight son, who ruled Britain with a 'maudlin brain'. These allusions to the mentally ill George III and the later George IV may partly be a provocation guided by Shelley's dissatisfaction with Southey's turn to conservatism.<sup>61</sup> In any case, Shelley knew he was going too far, and the broadside does not display the required details of the publisher (who would be the one who could be charged with sedition for disseminating the print). Shelley tried to distribute the ballad both by hand and mail together with the incendiary *Declaration of Rights*, at the time he resided in the village of Lynmouth, West Devonshire, in 1812.<sup>62</sup> This came to an end on the evening of 19 August, when his Irish servant Daniel Healey was arrested for distributing and posting the two documents in Barnstaple, because they did not have the imprint of the printer's name and therefore were illegal. Healey was tried and convicted to serve six months, because he was unable to pay the fine. We know that Shelley and his group also launched bottles into the sea and by air in hot air balloons which appear to have contained 'The Devil's Walk' (these launchings are celebrated in the sonnets 'On Launching Some Bottles Filled with Knowledge into the Bristol Channel' and 'To a Balloon Laden with Knowl-

edge'). This method of distribution may seem less curious when one considers the penalty to be incurred if caught circulating them in person. Apprehensive about the authorities' interest in their activities, Shelley and his companions finally decided to destroy most of the existing copies. In fact, only one copy survives in the Public Record Office where it was found in 1871.

One of the most imitated authors of the age was George Lord Byron, whose texts were used for imitations such as *Childe Harold in the Shades* (1818), *Harold in the New World* (1831) and not least Lamartine's *The Last Canto of Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1825, English translation 1827). But Byron himself also found inspiration in popular works: he drafted the poem 'The Devil's Drive' on 8 December 1813 and made a fair copy of it the following day. Byron, who by this time had already established himself as a successful satirist of authorities, writes a version in which the Devil has returned to Hell after his morning walk and then decides to ride out in a coach the same evening. This way of referencing the previous poem may invite us to classify it as a *continuation*, which, according to Genette, is different from a sequel (*suite*) in that it works from the presupposition that the original poem is not finished but can be continued and its narrative possibilities thereby fulfilled.<sup>63</sup> Byron lashes out at a number of named contemporaries, both politicians and royals. However, the poem remained in copy and was not published during Byron's lifetime. In fact, it did not appear in its entirety (27 stanzas) until a manuscript, held by the Earl of Ilchester, was transcribed in a 1904 edition of Byron's poems. Given that Byron would viciously satirise Southey in *The Vision of Judgment* (1822), it is ironic that Byron—probably without realising it—had in fact used a satire by Southey for inspiration.

David A. Brewer has theorised that a 'fictional archive' of reusable literary characters developed in the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century print market.<sup>64</sup> The Devil could be seen as one such fictional character, who could be easily sent out on new itineraries as a roaming observer of social and political mores. This could take place in new settings, as we see in 'The Devil's Walk in Philadelphia' (1826), which directs the satire towards local matters in what was the American financial and cultural centre at the time.<sup>65</sup> But most imitations in Britain appeared in the wake of Montagu's successful illustrated version. These appropriations may usefully be discussed under the category of 'viral literature', a capacious notion that includes paraphrases, reworkings, parodies, quotations and other manifestations of a text's life.<sup>66</sup> More concretely, the imitations are akin to what Kyle Grimes has dubbed 'hacker satire': compositions written primarily to exploit a successful idea by responding 'quickly and massively to momentary and fleeting opportunities in the public sphere'.<sup>67</sup> We may begin with an imitation that carries the Bunyanesque title *The Devil's Progress*, published in 1830 with illustrations by Robert Seymour (who would later achieve fame for his designs to Charles Dickens' *The Pickwick Papers*). The preface points specifically to Southey and Coleridge's composition as an inspiration, and the first verse of their original ballad is quoted.<sup>68</sup> This poem uses the Devil's travels to criticise the clergy and lawyers, as was also the case in the original, but it also jibes at

high-society ladies and celebrities, the identities of whom are thinly disguised through substituting asterisks for some of the letters in their names.

Another imitation entitled *The Real Devil's Walk* was issued by the radical publisher Effingham Wilson in 1830. This publication continued along the tracks laid down by the original ballad, targeting the Church, Parliament, the courts and high society. The unnamed author takes his starting point in the public debate over who wrote the original devil ballad and now offers a 'real' account of the Devil's walkabout. It is declared in the first stanza:

Of the Devil's Walk there's been much talk  
And folks seem mighty curious  
Now this is the real Devil's Walk  
And all the rest are spurious'.<sup>69</sup>

This is what today would classify as a 'reboot' of the Devil's adventures, effected through a tongue-in-cheek rejection of the original ballad as fake. This disingenuity is a send-up of the period's talismanic notions of 'originality' by a canny book-market entrepreneur. *The Real Devil's Walk* was also furnished with illustrations by Robert Cruikshank, presumably to appeal to the same buyers who had bought Montagu's illustrated version a few months earlier. Effingham Wilson also published *Walks about Town* (again with drawings by Cruikshank) in an attempt to revive fictionalised narratives featuring an outsider who observes and comments on experiences in London, a trend that was popular in the late eighteenth century. He includes a reference to *The Real Devil's Walk*, which obviously was an inspiration, and three stanzas from an unpublished poem entitled 'The Devil in London' are also cited.<sup>70</sup>

A new edition of *The Real Devil's Walk* was published by William Kidd, a London bookseller known for his inventive, but also controversial, publishing ventures.<sup>71</sup> Kidd's edition introduces a self-mockery of the poem's derivativeness by including a 'CAUTION TO THE PUBLIC' (a standard phrase used by publishers to warn against counterfeit prints), admonishing the reader that another 'Bookseller' is 'guilty of *purloining* the first stanza from the *Real Devil's Walk* and affixing it to the Wrapper of a *spurious* publication of his own called the Devil's Walk' [Montagu's edition had been issued in drab paper wrappers].<sup>72</sup> In this way, the confusion over the original poem's authorship was utilised to provide the plagiariser with a gag on what was in fact his own piggybacking on a successful publication.

Kidd further capitalised on the public's appetite for illustrated Devil poems by reissuing Robert Burns' *Address to the Deil* (1830), a humorous portrayal of the Devil addressed through the pulpit oratory of the Presbyterian Church. This poem was originally published in 1786, but was now furnished with illustrations by Thomas Landseer. Landseer also provided ten etchings for another print seller and book publisher, F. G. Harding, who published an 1831 version of Southey and Coleridge's original ballad.<sup>73</sup> In a telling remark, a reviewer of this edition commented on the excessive attention given to the ballad in recent years that 'we have had the Devil walking upon earth till we fancy he must be nearly tired'.<sup>74</sup>



In 1831, Kidd also published *The Devil's Visit*, a poem originally printed in *The Intelligence* the year before. Evidently, market opportunities now made it a saleable commodity as a standalone publication. This poem claims to be a sequel to Southey and Coleridge's original poem by referring to the Devil's 'first Visit' in the first line and then declaring that the Devil is now 'resolved to return to earth | To resume his perambulation'.<sup>75</sup> The anonymous author fires rounds at famous actors, the Attorney General and Parliament (which the Devil proclaims as his dominion). Again, Robert Cruikshank was hired to illustrate the poem. Later in 1831, Kidd collected and bound the remainder copies of the devil-themed poems as part of a two-volume duodecimo edition that he sold under the title of *Facetiae; being a General Collection of the Jeux d'esprits which Have Been Illustrated by Robert Cruikshank* (1831). Volume 2 includes an edition of *The Devil's Walk* (Kidd probably bought unsold copies, which he bound with his own publications). This collection offered the book buyer a cheap way of acquiring several works that would have been more expensive to buy individually.

Most of the imitations focus as much on mocking socialites and celebrities, their fashion and public scandals (which is a tendency observable in much of the satirical work published in the 1830s), as they concern themselves with political and social issues. In 1833, however, another imitation was printed in *Cobbett's Magazine*, entitled 'The Devil's Visit', which reinvigorated the political verve. The first lines are directly taken from Southey and Coleridge's poem, followed by an updated criticism of the government: 'Then a view of the Court, afforded much sport | And he [the Devil] thought of a suffering nation; [...] | All savour'd of grinding taxation | Realizes he is inferior to man'.<sup>76</sup>

To conclude, we may briefly consider how Southey and Coleridge's verses stimulated developments in the market for periodicals. During 1832, a weekly magazine in thirty-seven issues was published under varying titles: *The Devil in London; Asmodeus, or the Devil in London*; and *Asmodeus in London*, seemingly capitalising on both the devil-ballad and Alain-René Lesage's popular 'devil-on-two-sticks' satire. The periodical functioned as a running commentary on issues such as parliamentary reform and national manners. The first six numbers contained twenty-four woodcuts designed by Kenny Meadows and Robert Cruikshank. At this time, publishers realised that the combination of satirical verse with comical illustrations of the Devil in various London settings was a recipe for success. A commentator even dubbed Cruikshank: 'Robert the Devil', and wrote that it is to his pictorial designs that the dark Lord owes his 'warm reception' on earth.<sup>77</sup> Finally, with direct reference to Southey and Coleridge's ballad, three numbers of a journal entitled *The Devil's Walk* were published by the radical London bookseller Benjamin Steill during 1832. This was a miscellany, illustrated by George Cruikshank, containing political poetry, articles on reform, and reviews of new publications. However, after the passing of the Reform Act, the interest in the Devil's perambulations appears to have died down—perhaps more from exhaustion of the satirical model than from an actual lack of objects to satirise.



\* \* \*

What emerges from examining the various versions and imitations of the fugitive ballad, published over almost four decades, is that the original anonymity of the poem and the seeming flexibility of the allegorical representations encouraged reprinting, while the possibility of an ever-expandable ballad structure invited continuations. For the authors themselves, their satirical invective remained an outlier in their oeuvre, even if they both eventually came to accept paternity of the orphaned poem. I have not attempted to systematically document all the minute differences. But one thing is clear, in terms of the ballad's impact the majority of readers would have come to the poem through a reprinted version with alterations or a revised version. In fact, Southey's expanded revision was frequently anthologised in the latter half of the nineteenth century (after the expiry of his copyright), such as *A Budget of Humorous Poetry* (1866), *British Poets* (1866), *The Humorous [sic] Poetry of the English Language* (1870), *The Cyclopaedia of Wit and Humor* (1875), *The Family Library of Poetry and Song* (1880), and other collections for the popular market. It is ironic, of course, that although Southey and Coleridge both would pursue a career in meditative poetry, one of their most popular poems was their early squib, which remained more a burden than an object of pride to them.

## II

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF VERSIONS OF *THE 'DEVIL'S BALLAD'**A. Published Versions*

1. Anon., 'The Devil's Thoughts', *The Morning Post and Gazetteer* (no. 9569), 6 September 1799.
2. Richard Porson, 'The Devil's Walk', in *Comic and Humorous Tales in Verse, Selected from the Most Approved Authors* (London: R. Wilks, 1818), pp. 309–10.
3. Richard Porson, 'The Devil's Walk', *The Tickler, or, Monthly Compendium of Good Things, in Prose and Verse*, 1.2 (January 1819), 31–32.
4. Richard Porson, 'Extemporaneous Lines Ascribed to the Late Professor Porson', in *The Cambridge Tart: Epigrammatic and Satiric-Poetical Effusions by Cantabs* (London: J. Smith, 1823), pp. 22–25.
5. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', *The British Critic*, n.s., 19 (June 1823), 576–77.  
[Review of item 4.]

6. S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey, 'The Devil's Walk', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 19.109 (February 1826), 135–36.
7. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', in *The Poetical Works of Coleridge*, 2 vols (London: William Pickering, 1828), II, 89–91.
8. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', in *The Poetical Works of Coleridge, Shelley, and Keats. Complete in One Volume* (Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1829), pp. 214–15.
9. Robert Southey, 'The Devil's Walk', in *The Poetical Works of Robert Southey. Complete in One Volume* (Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1829), p. 723.
10. Richard Porson, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu [1st edn, 1st issue] (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830). [1st edn, 1st issue. Error in pagination on pp. 21–22.]<sup>78</sup>
11. Richard Porson, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu [1st edn, 2nd issue] (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830). [1st edn, 2nd issue. Error in pagination on pp. 21–22 corrected.]
12. Richard Porson, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu, 2nd edn (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830). [Error in pagination on pp. 21–22 is repeated, though this had been corrected in the 2nd issue of the 1st edn.]
13. S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by S. T. Coleridge, Esq. and Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. &c.*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu, 3rd edn (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., 1830).
14. S. T. Coleridge and Robert Southey, *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by S. T. Coleridge, Esq. and Robert Southey, Esq. LL.D. &c.*, ed. with biographical memoir and notes by H. W. Montagu, 4th edn. London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co. [the words 'Second Edition' appear above the imprint].
15. *Ten Etchings Illustrative of The Devil's Walk by Thomas Landseer* (London: F. G. Harding, 1831).


16. *The Devil's Walk*, in *Facetiae; being a General Collection of the Jeux d'esprits which Have Been Illustrated by Robert Cruikshank* (London: William Kidd, 1831).  
[Remainder copies of the 4th edn of Montagu's version were bound with other devil-poems published by Kidd.]
17. S. T. Coleridge, 'The Devil's Thoughts', in *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, 3 vols (London: William Pickering; Boston: Hilliard, Grey, 1835), II, 83–87.
18. Robert Southey, 'The Devil's Walk', in *The Poetical Works, Collected by Himself*, 10 vols (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1838), III, 83–100.

*B. Manuscripts of 'The Devil's Thoughts' Mentioned in this Essay*

1. S. T. Coleridge's MS given to Sara Hutchinson. The text contained in this MS is transcribed in George Whalley, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson and the Asra Poems* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1955), pp. 20–23 (see also n. 33).
2. MS copy taken at Highgate by Derwent Coleridge, in June 1820. The text is transcribed under the title 'The Devil's Thoughts. [MS. copy by Derwent Coleridge.]', in *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Including Poems and Versions of Poems now Published for the First Time*, ed. by Ernest Hartley Coleridge, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), I, 319–23.

*C. Imitations*

1. Percy Bysshe Shelley, *The Devil's Walk* ([n. pl.]: [n. pub.], 1812).  
[A single copy survives in the Public Record Office.]
2. George Gordon, Lord Byron, 'The Devil's Drive', in Journal entry for 8 December 1813.
3. Anon., 'The Devil's Walk in Philadelphia', in *Philadelphia; or, Glances at Lawyers, Physicians, First-Circle, Wistar-Parties, &c &c.* (Philadelphia: R. H. Small, 1826), pp. 112–15.

4. Thomas Kibble, *The Devil's Progress. A Poem* (London: Lupton Relfe, 1830).
5. Anon., *The Real Devil's Walk* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1830).
6. 'The Antiquated Trio', *Walks about Town: A Poem in Two Cantos, with Notes and a Memoir of the Authors* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1830). [Authorial attribution in foreword.]
7. Anon., *The Real Devil's Walk not by Professor Porson* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1831).
8. Anon., *The Real Devil's Walk not by Professor Porson*, 2nd edn with additions (London: William Kidd, 1831).
9. Anon., *The Devil's Visit: A Poem* (London: William Kidd, 1831).
10. *Facetiae; being a General Collection of the Jeux d'esprits which Have Been Illustrated by Robert Cruikshank* (London: William Kidd, 1831). [Collects all of Kidd's publications.]
11. Anon., 'The Devil's Visit', *Cobbett's Magazine: A Monthly Review of Politics, History, Science, Literature, and Rural and Domestic Pursuits*, (Dec 1834), 378–42. 

## NOTES

1. Unless otherwise noted, references will be to the poem as it was published in the *Morning Post*, available electronically in an edition by Donald H. Reiman and Neil Fraiſtat on the *Romantic Circles* website <<https://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/shelley/devil/devil.stc1799.html>>.
2. Wilfrid Hope Hindle, *The Morning Post, 1772–1937: Portrait of a Newspaper* (1937; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1974), p. 89.
3. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), p. 1.
4. See Jon Mee, *Print, Publicity, and Popular Radicalism in the 1790s: The Laurel of Liberty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), pp. 1–60.
5. Coleridge to Southey, 10 Nov 1799, in *Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, ed. by Ernest Hartley Coleridge, 2 vols (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1895), I, 318.
6. Citation rptd in *Political Essays: With Sketches of Public Characters*, ed. by William Hazlitt (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1822), pp. 398–400.
7. See Jan Bondeson, *The Feejee Mermaid and Other Essays in Natural and Unnatural History* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1999), p. 28.

8. Mikhail Bakhtin, 'Art and Answerability', in *Art and Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, trans. by Vadim Liapunov (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), p. 275.
9. James Epstein and David Karr, "'Playing at Revolution": British Jacobin Performance', *Journal of Modern History*, 79 (September 2007), 495–530 <<https://doi.org/10.1086/517980>> (p. 530).
10. Michael Scrivener, *Seditious Allegories: John Thelwall and Jacobin Writing* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), pp. 11–20.
11. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Sibylline Leaves: A Collection of Poems* (London: Rest Fenner, 1817), pp. 115–16.
12. Kenneth Borris, *Allegory and Epic in English Renaissance Literature: Heroic Form in Sidney, Spenser, and Milton* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 74.
13. On the reprinting of Coleridge's texts, see Casie LeGette, *Remaking Romanticism: The Radical Politics of the Excerpt* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), pp. 84–93 <<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46929-4>>.
14. Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 3–4.
15. See Lynda Pratt, 'Non-Publication', in *The Oxford Handbook of British Romanticism*, ed. by David Duff (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 495–512 (esp. pp. 498–99).
16. Coleridge, 'Apologetic Preface', in *Sibylline Leaves*, p. 97.
17. See Morton Paley, *Apocalypse and Millennium in English Romantic Poetry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), p. 148.
18. Coleridge, 'Apologetic Preface', p. 98.
19. 'The Devil's Walk', in *Comic and Humorous Tales in Verse, Selected from the Most Approved Authors* (London: Wilks, 1818), pp. 309–10.
20. See 'Extemporaneous Lines Ascribed to the Late Professor Porson', in *The Cambridge Tart: Epigrammatic and Satiric-Poetical Effusions by Cantabs* (London: Smith, 1823), pp. 22–25.
21. A correspondent to *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 19.109 (February 1826), 135–36, accused Porson of having repeated the poem 'in such a way as to lead people to believe it was his own'.
22. Michael Scrivener, *Seditious Allegories: John Thelwall and Jacobin Writing* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001).
23. *The Devil's Walk: A Poem. By Professor Porson* (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable and Co., 1830), p. viii.
24. Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. by J. E. Lewin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 337–39 and 340–43 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511549373>>.
25. Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 303–04.
26. For a survey of terms and the critical discussion, see Christina Ionescu, 'Introduction: Towards a Reconfiguration of the Visual Periphery in the Eighteenth-Century Illustrated Text', in *Book Illustration in the Long Eighteenth Century: Reconfiguring the Visual Periphery of the Text*, ed. by Christina Ionescu (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars, 2011), pp. 1–50.
27. Proofs on India Paper of Cruickshank's devil illustrations were also issued separately at 2s 6d; see Thomas J. Wise, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (1913; London: Dawsons, 1970), 137.

28. 'Advertisement', *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by S. T. Coleridge Esq. and Robert Southey Esq. L.L.D and &c.*, ed. by H. W. Montagu, 2nd edn (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co.; Dublin: Milliken, 1830), p. v.
29. The letter from April 1830 can be seen on the Texas Christian University Digital Repository website <<https://repository.tcu.edu/handle/116099117/6117>>.
30. See e.g. Tim Fulford, *Romantic Poetry and Literary Coteries: The Dialect of the Tribe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015) <<https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137518897>>; Jon Mee, *Conversable Worlds: Literature, Contention and Community, 1762–1830* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); David Fairer, *Organising Poetry: The Coleridge Circle, 1790–1798* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) <<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199296163.001.0001>>; and Felicity James, *Charles Lamb, Coleridge and Wordsworth: Reading Friendship in the 1790s* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
31. Alison Hickey, 'Coleridge, Southey, and Co.: Collaboration and Authority', *Studies in Romanticism*, 37.3 (1998), 305–49 <<https://doi.org/10.2307/25601342>> (p. 306).
32. For Coleridge's ideas of literary property, see Lior Zemer, *The Idea of Authorship in Copyright* (2007; London: Routledge, 2017), pp. 12–22 <<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315239095>>. For Robert Southey, see his article 'An Inquiry into the Copyright Act', *Quarterly Review*, 21 (1819), 196–213.
33. The MS version of the ballad owned by Sara Hutchinson has the four stanzas Coleridge says were composed by Southey marked in the margin with the Greek sign sigma; see George Whalley, *Coleridge and Sara Hutchinson and the Asra Poems* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955), pp. 20–22.
34. Coleridge in letter to Josiah Wedgwood, January 1798, in *Collected Letters*, ed. by E. L. Griggs, 6 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956–71), I, 365.
35. Coleridge to T. Sotheby, 26 August 1802, in *ibid.*, II, 867.
36. John Guillory, *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 132–33 <<https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226310015.001.0001>>; see also Tilar J. Mazzeo's considerations in *Plagiarism and Literary Property in the Romantic Period* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), pp. 49–85 <<https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812202731>>.
37. Anon., 'A Literary Essay on Wordsworth and the Lake School of Poetry', in *The Living Poets of England: Specimens of the Living British Poets, with Biographical and Critical Notices and an English Poetry*, 2 vols (Paris: Baudry, 1827), I, 280.
38. *The Devil's Walk: A Poem by Professor Porson*, ed. by H. W. Montagu (London: Marsh and Miller; Edinburgh: Constable & Co., [1830]), p. viii.
39. Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, trans. by D. F. Bouchard and S. Simon (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 121 and 123.
40. Coleridge to Miss Robinson, 27 December 1802, in *Gothic Readings: The First Wave, 1764–1840*, ed. by Rictor Norton (London and New York: Continuum, 2000), p. 254.
41. Coleridge to William Sotheby, 10 September 1802, in *Collected Letters*, II, 867, Griggs notes that the Greek signifies 'He hath placed', not 'He hath stood'.
42. Coleridge's criticism of satire is reprinted in a note to *Biographia Literaria: Or, Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life and Opinions* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1817), p. 20.



43. Robert Southey, 'On the Rise and Progress of Popular Disaffection', *Quarterly Review*, 16 (January 1817), 511–52 (p. 530).
44. *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 19.109 (February 1826), 135–36. Even more provocative was the French pirate publishers J. A. and W. Galignani's later decision to print a short eight-stanza variant of the poem under the heading 'Suppressed Poems' in their edition *Poetical Works of Robert Southey. Complete in One Volume* (Paris, 1829), p. 723.
45. *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, 3 vols (London: Pickering, 1828–29), I, 91.
46. *The Poetical Works of S. T. Coleridge*, 7th edn, 3 vols (London: Pickering; Boston: Hilliard, Grey, 1835), II, 83–87.
47. Jack Stillinger, *Romantic Complexity: Keats, Coleridge, and Wordsworth* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2006), p. 150.
48. Anne Toner, *Ellipsis in English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p. 59 <<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139680974>>.
49. Coleridge, *Poetical Works* (1828–29), I, 91.
50. *The Tickler*, 1.2 (January 1819), 32.
51. Review of *The Cambridge Tart*, *British Critic*, n.s., 19 (June 1823), 577.
52. An MS copy made by Coleridge's son Derwent at Highgate in June 1820; see S. T. Coleridge, *Poetry & Prose*, ed. by H. W. Garrod (Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: H. Milford, 1925), p. 181.
53. Whalley, p. 22. On the Convention of Sintra, see Coleridge to Thomas Poole, in *Collected Letters*, III, 132.
54. For a discussion of Coleridge as an inveterate reviser of his texts, see Mark Ve-Yin (ed.), Tee, *Coleridge, Revision and Romanticism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009).
55. See n. 44, above.
56. Quoted in an anonymous entry: 'The Devil's Walk', *Notes and Queries*, 216 (March 1866), 197–98.
57. Robert Southey, *The Poetical Works, Collected by Himself*, 10 vols (London: Longman, 1838), III, 83–100.
58. *Ibid.*, III, 93.
59. *Devil's Walk*, p. viii
60. David Atkinson, *The English Traditional Ballad: Theory, Method, and Practice* (New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 21–24 <<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315086675>>.
61. For this argument, see Peter A. Schock, *Romantic Satanism: Myth and the Historical Moment in Blake, Shelley and Byron* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 80–84.
62. The following information is taken from *The Poems of Shelley: Volume One: 1804–1817*, ed. Geoffrey Matthews and Kelvin Everest (London and New York: Routledge, 1989), pp. 230–37.
63. Genette, *Palimpsests*, pp. 161–65.
64. David A. Brewer, *The Afterlife of Character, 1726–1825* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), pp. 25–52 <<https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812201437>>.
65. The poem (which takes lines from the original poem as its epigraph) is included as the 'Finale' in Robert H. Small and James Maxwell, *Philadelphia; or, Glances at Lawyers, Physicians, First-Circle, Wistar-Parties, &c &c.* (Philadelphia: Small, 1826), pp. 112–15.
66. Ryan Cordell, 'Viral Textualities in Nineteenth-Century US Newspaper Exchanges', in *Virtual Victorians: Networks, Connections, Technologies*, ed. by Veronica

- Alfano and Andrew Stauffer (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 29–56 <[https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137393296\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137393296_3)>.
67. Kyle Grimes, 'Verbal Jiu-jitsu: William Hone and the Tactics of Satirical Conflict', in *The Satiric Eye: Forms of Satire in the Romantic Period*, ed. by Steven E. Jones (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 174–75.
  68. [Thomas Kibble Hervey], *The Devil's Progress. A Poem*, 2nd edn (London: Relfe, 1830), p. 7.
  69. *The Real Devil's Walk* (London: Effingham Wilson, 1830).
  70. 'Antiquated Trio', *Walks about Town: A Poem in Two Cantos, with Notes and a Memoir of the Authors* (London: Wilson, 1830), p. 21 [cf. p. 29n, pp. 32–33].
  71. See Robert L. Patten, *George Cruikshank's Life, Times, and Art*, 2 vols (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992–96), I, 369–72.
  72. *The Real Devil's Walk not by Professor Porson*, 2nd edn with additions (London: Kidd, 1831), p. 8.
  73. *Ten Etchings Illustrative of The Devil's Walk by Thomas Landseer* ([London]: Harding, 1831). A stanza from the poem is at the foot of each illustration.
  74. *National Omnibus and General Advertiser*, 6 (June 1831), cited by E. H. Barker in 'Mr S. T. Coleridge and Dr R. Southey and Mr Professor Porson', *Monthly Magazine*, 28 (May 1838), 485.
  75. *The Devil's Visit* (London: Kidd, 1830), p. 5.
  76. 'The Devil's Visit', *Cobbett's Magazine* (December 1833), 378–42.
  77. 'A Hypochondriac', 'Preface', *The Blue Devils, or, New Police* (London: Henderson, 1830), p. 5.
  78. For discussion of the editions by H. W. Montagu, see Thomas J. Wise, *A Bibliography of the Writings in Prose and Verse of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London: Dawsons, 1970), pp. 135–40.

### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

R. W. RIX. 'Fugitive Text: Robert Southey and S. T. Coleridge's *Ballad of the Devil*', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.64>>.

### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 16 September 2019.



## BOOK REVIEWS



Vincent Carretta (ed.), *The Writings of Phillis Wheatley* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), lix + 226pp. ISBN 978-0-1988-3499-1; £110 (hb).

PHILLIS WHEATLEY PETERS (1753?–1784) is a name now known to many, due to her remarkable legacy as the first African American woman to have written a book of poetry. Sold into enslavement as a child, Wheatley Peters was transported from Gambia, West Africa to Boston, USA, where she was bought to become a servant for the Wheatley family. Her literary talent was soon discovered and at 18 years old she had twenty-eight poems in preparation for publication. She was emancipated in late 1773 after a trip to London to see the publication of her poetry collection, and died after marriage to John Peters in 1784, whilst her husband was in prison. Her collection, *Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral*, was her sole publication, although her later years saw her preparing to publish a second collection. Her untimely death at the age of around thirty-one ensured this was never finished. The manuscript ultimately went missing and has never been recovered.

Although renowned in her day, in the twentieth century Wheatley Peters experienced a revival as the renewed popularity of her poems ensured her place in the canon, alongside being recognised as one of the foremost poets of early transatlantic literature. Editions of her works have previously been published by Julian D. Mason, John C. Shields and Carretta (a Penguin Edition in 2001). In the twenty-first century, interest in Wheatley Peters continues to increase, thanks in part to scholars including Honorée Fanonne Jeffers and Shields, who have reflected on Wheatley Peters both creatively and critically. The poet's life and works have been explored equally, with creative writers such as Jeffers and Alison Clarke's *Phillis* (2020) centring on her life, plus the religious and philosophical upheaval she encountered. Critics have focused most recently on her poetical style, discussions of race and slavery, and her remarkable creative influence on many European Romantic figures, including Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who it is thought 'borrowed' many of her ideas.

Carretta's edited volume thus contributes to ongoing interest in and scholarship on Wheatley Peters, and completely overwrites previous editions of her works. Indeed, his effort proves the fullest in scope and ambition, by collating the entirety of Wheatley Peters' extant corpus in one volume.<sup>1</sup> Carretta, an expert in eighteenth-century transatlantic authors of African descent, edited Wheatley's works after publishing editions of Ignatius Sancho, Olaudah Equiano and Quobna Ottobah Cugoana's writings. He is also the author of the most recent biography of Phillis Wheatley Peters, *Phillis Wheatley: Biography of a*


*Genius in Bondage* (2011). As such, Carretta is perfectly placed to provide the extensive notes required for this edition, and to engage with ongoing debates surrounding colonialism and structural racism in study of the long eighteenth century. Indeed, his sensitively drawn allusions to contemporary discussions of race, enslavement and sexism must be recommended.

The collection of Wheatley Peters' writings begins with a carefully researched chronology of the poet's life, before Carretta's comprehensive and informative introduction explores Wheatley Peters' childhood and career, alongside details of her works. Carretta emphasises the manuscript culture Wheatley Peters was part of, circulating her verse to her network of female friends, alongside those in positions of power. Her poem 'To His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, on the Death of his Lady. March 24, 1773' Carretta notes was probably distributed privately to Andrew Oliver (1706–74), 'lieutenant governor of Massachusetts' (p. xxvii) following his wife's death. Through references to numerous archival sources, Carretta strikingly demonstrates how Wheatley Peters was 'very active' (pp. xxvi and xxix) in the marketing and promotion of her book of poetry. Indeed, the sense of Wheatley Peters which Carretta conjures is that of a determined and acute woman who knew how to market her work successfully, savvily autographed copies to prevent loss of profits from them being pirated, and actively pursued her own freedom following her trip to London (following Granville Sharp's intervention in 1772 'that no slave brought to England from its colonies could legally be forced to return to them as a slave' [p. xx]).

References to Wheatley Peters' obviously anti-enslavement views are frequent, and Carretta focuses on her race and gender throughout his introduction, culminating in discussions of the poet as a celebrity in London in the 1770s and 1780s. Despite her return to Boston, during this period Wheatley Peters was consistently compared to the bluestocking coterie in general, and Hannah More in particular (p. xxxv), which contemporary colonial reviewers derided. Her gender is significantly alluded to in discussions of her husband, who Carretta appears to suggest stifled Wheatley Peters' creativity and business acumen (owing to the fact that the advertisements for her proposed second book markedly did not include references to Wheatley Peters' maiden name).

The volume then turns to Wheatley Peters' writings. All of her known writings are included in this volume, with some of them, such as a variant of her popular poem 'Hymn to Humanity', located at the Emory University, USA, only recently discovered. Forty-six of the fifty-seven known poems were published in Wheatley Peters' lifetime, and this collection is the first to publish all of these poetical works, alongside their authoritative variants. Carretta has also included all of Wheatley Peters' known prose writings, in the form of twenty-three letters and four subscription proposals. Her writings are presented chronologically so readers can follow Wheatley Peters' creative progression. Only three letters are extant that were written to the poet, and these are also included in the volume. Indeed, the entirety of Wheatley Peters' writings takes up only 144 pages. The remainder of Carretta's work consists of extensively detailed textual and

explanatory notes, which provide historical context, further nuggets of information regarding Wheatley Peter's composition and publication practices, and biographical information concerning those Wheatley Peters writes about and to.

Building on the scholarship of the editions that have come before, including his own, Carretta has created a considered, authoritative, and exciting collection of Wheatley Peters' work. Through the original research into 'new' Wheatley Peters variants, and Carretta's thorough notes, *The Writings of Phillis Wheatley* is truly remarkable in its content and scope and will successfully take its rightful place as a key teaching tool, alongside becoming the new standard text for those interested in Wheatley Peters' work. As interest in Wheatley Peters and her writings continues to increase, it will be interesting to observe whether new manuscript variants, or even her lost second collection will come to light in archives worldwide. If that is the case, I look forward to further work on Wheatley, and future editions of her work, which will undoubtedly build on Carretta's excellent volume. 

## NOTES

1. As a side note, it is Jeffers who has stated the case that Wheatley should be referred to as Wheatley Peters. This is because she appears to have chosen to use her husband John Peters' surname, whilst her other names were given to her as a condition of her enslavement; for example, she was named after 'The Phillis' slave ship on which she was transported to America. I have chosen to refer to Wheatley Peters as such for this review.

Amy Wilcockson

*University of Nottingham*

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.107>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 4 November 2021.



**Manu Samriti Chander, *Brown Romantics: Poetry and Nationalism in the Global Nineteenth Century* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2017), xvi + 179pp. ISBN 978-1-61148-821-0; \$100 (hb).**

ONE OF THE SATISFACTIONS of undertaking a 'late' review—four years after first publication—is the opportunity to look back at a work widely reviewed at its appearance and now finding its place in a rapidly developing field. The arresting title of *Brown Romantics* signals Chander's intention to ground his analysis on the opposition of colonial literatures to the canonical works of the Romantic 'imperial centre'. This is achieved by means of three case studies, focusing on the work of H. L. V. Derozio, the 'East Indian' poet of colonial Calcutta; the Afro-Guianese Egbert Martin; and the Australian writer Henry Lawson.

These colonial literatures are more complex than at first might appear, and here both words of the main title repay further investigation. On the epithet 'brown', Chander sets out to 'ironize what might, at face value, be taken as a rather crude descriptor of racial difference', aiming 'by thus calling attention to racial identity, [to] challenge that basis for considering their poetry as a simple expression of it' (p. 3). He advances, therefore, a maximalist, transcultural understanding of marginalisation, which allows him to propose a commonality between his three main exemplars. Derozio, Martin and Lawson are not to be thought of as 'marginalized because they are brown' but "'brown" because they are marginalized' (p. 3). The weight of the burden borne by marginality is exemplified by the case of Lawson, son of a Norwegian–Australian father and an Australian mother, whose initial 'anti-British sentiment' was replaced by a virulent 'antipathy toward the Empire's cultural others' (p. 81). Despite this, Lawson becomes for Chander evidence that it was possible to 'be white and still not be white enough to escape the mark of difference' (p. 91).

The 'Romantics' element of the title similarly is not quite what it first appears to be. The timespan of *Brown Romantics* begins in the latter years of the Romantic period as usually conceived, with Derozio's short life (1809–31), and stretches through Martin's work in the 1880s to end with Lawson in the early decades of the twentieth century. Temporally as well as globally expansive, Chander's approach posits 'Romanticism' as 'a nineteenth-century development but one that happens as dynamic public spheres emerge in other places and define themselves in a fraught relation to the English republic of letters' (p. 12).

This Romanticism, in both its 'English' and its colonial varieties, is male-centred and male-dominated. While current scholarship tends to focus on a broad array of 'Romantic-period' texts and writers, Chander reinscribes the Romantic as the preserve of six male poets, four of whom—Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats and Shelley—provide the book's four epigraphs, as familiar as they are evocative, on the role of the poet (p. 1). Derozio is described as asserting 'the right of a Brown poet to speak as a man within an imagined community founded on cosmopolitan ideals' (p. 9), but Felicia Hemans and Letitia Landon hover awkwardly at the edges of this imagined community, each meriting two brief entries each in the index. While locating the Brown Romantics alongside the 'women and working-class writers of the nineteenth century' in a common exclusion from the central category of Romantic poet, Chander briefly entertains the parallels between them:

The aspiring national poet, compulsory native informant and conflicted cosmopolitan are arguably positions that authors such as Felicia Hemans and Anna Laetitia Barbauld assume, even though the role of the nation's literary 'ambassador' [...] was almost invariably figured as that of a man [...] (p. 13)


A degree further out—a shade browner, perhaps—the women of the wider Empire are doubly silenced, as Chander acknowledges when he chooses the figure



of the ‘Dominican poet and educator Salomé Ureña’ to serve as ‘a synecdoche of all the poets necessarily excluded from this study’ (p. 13).

The ‘positional symmetry’ of the relationship between ‘the Brown Romantic and his English counterpart—the White Romantic’ (p. 3) is achieved at the cost of oversimplifying other complexities. Chander notes Derozio’s participation ‘in a cosmopolitan conversation with such men as Moore, Shelley, and Byron’ (p. 30). He does not dwell on the fact that Derozio also participated in other cosmopolitan conversations: with Landon, for instance, whose ‘Improvisatrice’ (1824)—as Chander points out—takes up the theme of *sati*; and also with Emma Roberts, Landon’s contemporary and correspondent, whose own *sati* poem written in India, ‘The Rajah’s Obsequies’ (1830), was seen through the press by Derozio. As Mary Ellis Gibson has argued, Derozio’s *Fakeer of Jungheera* (1828) had a shaping impact on Roberts’s poem, which ‘deliberately triangulates British, Indian, and Anglo-Indian political concerns’.<sup>1</sup> The triangularity of this exchange offers a different kind of symmetry, where the weight of literary influence is more evenly distributed between two points no longer uncomplicatedly to be figured as centre and periphery.

Similarly, while Thomas Moore is lined up alongside Shelley and Byron, recent work such as McCleave and Caraher’s edited collection *Thomas Moore and Romantic Inspiration* (2018) reminds us that his multifaceted output in several genres does not fit easily into any one category. The author of *Lalla Rookh* (1817) was also the writer of *Irish Melodies* and *National Airs*; and the poet whose Irish persona in ‘Corruption’ (1808) might also find a place among the ‘Brown Romantics’: ‘We hear you talk of Britain’s glorious rights, | As weeping slaves, that under hatches lie, | Hear those on deck extol the sun and sky!’<sup>21</sup> By the time Chander’s Conclusion invokes a ‘Brown Keats’, the categories of brownness and whiteness, centre and margin, Britain (or ‘England’) and the colonies, have become unstable.

This instability could well be described as a strength rather than a weakness of Chander’s work, highlighted by the unexpectedly personal Afterword tracing how the book took shape in the context of its author’s development as a scholar of Romanticism. Among its takeaways for current scholarship is the impulse to re-examine Romantic values, perhaps even the key Romantic value of originality: as Chander writes, ‘the formal characteristics of Brown Romanticism that initially struck the critics as derivative and imitative actually served to expose the Eurocentric racism informing the very tradition in which they wrote’ (p. 91). Above all, though, *Brown Romantics* reminds us of the imperative to read outwards, valuing the cosmopolitan and the hybrid, and seeking ‘new constellations of poets’ to trouble both canonicity and what Chander terms the ‘fantasy of coherent national identity’ (p. 112). 

## NOTES

1. Mary Ellis Gibson, *Indian Angles: English Verse in Colonial India from Jones to Tagore* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2011), p. 92.

2. Thomas Moore, *Corruption and Intolerance: Two Poems, with Notes, Addressed to an Englishman by an Irishman* (London: Carpenter, 1808), p. 2.

Máire Ní Fhlathúin

University of Nottingham

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.108>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 4 November 2021.



Linda Colley, *The Gun, the Ship, and the Pen: Warfare, Constitutions, and the Making of the Modern World* (London: Profile Books, 2021), 512pp. ISBN 978-1-8466-8498-2; £10.99 (pb).

HISTORIAN LINDA COLLEY'S SWEEPING NEW BOOK *The Gun, the Ship, and the Pen: Warfare, Constitutions, and the Making of the Modern World* is over four hundred pages, covers almost four hundred years and spans the globe to show how developments in warfare drove the act of writing constitutions around the world. Colley tells her story at a page-turning pace. She writes that the spread of constitutions from the eighteenth century onwards 'has generally been put down to the impact of revolutions, not war' (p. 4). This orthodox approach, Colley argues, is 'unduly narrowing and mislead[ing]'. She argues instead that changes in warfare led to the writing of constitutions. As Colley anchors this process in war instead of revolution, she divorces constitutions from democracy; some constitutions and democracy go in hand in hand, but it is not taken for granted—by Colley or by the writers of constitutions themselves—that they do. The wide geographic swath and long timeframe of *The Gun, the Ship, and the Pen* are essential to Colley's narrative of the central role of war in the creation of political documents that are widely assumed to be based in revolutionary contexts and democratic impulses, but need not be.


Colley scans the globe as she chronicles how war makes constitutions. She first sets her scene in Corsica where she finds Pasquale Paoli 'drafting a ten-page constitution, a term (*costituzione*) he explicitly employed' (p. 18). In Haiti, she locates a political revolution that was 'remarkable' both because it brought about 'a Black-ruled polity equipped with a constitution' and acted as a 'confirmation of trends and developments [of maritime reach] [...] in other regions of the world' (p. 44). Moving to Russia, Colley shows that Catherine the Great was deeply invested in writing a constitution, her *Nakaz*, as a woman monarch determined to secure her own authority amidst the 'shocks and trails of escalating levels of war' (p. 68). In South America, Colley identifies states that were not only writing constitutions, but self-consciously using print and the printing of constitutions as part of their political projects. Colley also locates meaningful constitutional

innovations on Pitcairn Island, in Tahiti, on the Hawaiian Islands, in Tunisia, in Ethiopia and in Japan. France, Britain and America all certainly get some of Colley's attention, but they do not exert a magnetic pull in her narrative; there are too many other places to visit.

Colley's broad geographic reach is part of how she splits off the writing of constitutions from revolution, democracy and state-building. The sheer breadth of places where constitutions were written vividly dramatises the shortcomings of yoking that activity to any specific political project, or version of political causation. The specifics and content of the documents themselves certainly get their due in Colley's hands, but it is the very fact that they were written at all and written in so many places that stands out.

Colley's concerns—war, constitutions and the modern world—are vital today, but *The Gun, the Ship, and the Pen* is a densely detailed, fast-moving narrative about the past. Colley begins in 1775: that date might suggest that her jumping off point is the US Constitution, but it is not. In fact, she uses the 1750s, 60s and 70s to chart developments in warfare and the political fallout of warfare. For Colley, these decades show why 'responses to these war-related disturbances and shifts increasingly take the form of new written texts' (p. 55). The Napoleonic Wars are crucial for Colley because the combination of land and naval warfare increased the geographic reach of violence. After the revolutions of 1848 (and the big exception to revolution, England), Colley highlights the sheer volume of violence and reach of warfare in the 1860s. For Colley, the time between the long 1860s and the First World War is a time of 'armed violence', 'audacity' and innovation (p. 400). Her discussion of the First World War emphasises its massive geographic scale, the lethality of the weaponry employed in it and the revolutionary political documents drafted in the wake of cataclysm. When she does turn to today in the Epilogue, she is less concerned with how technology is changing warfare, the importance of non-state actors, conflict below the threshold of war or even resurgent nationalism—any and all of which might be suggested by what came before in the book. Instead, Colley focuses on the fact of writing and the role of print to emphasise how the screen today dominates how people get their political news and engage with politics in our digital age. She also highlights the profound effects of altering political documents to shore up the power of a single individual; she uses Vladimir Putin's changes to the Russian constitution to particular effect.

Colley is British by birth, but teaches at Princeton. For both Britons and Americans, the idea that the political and constitutional order is strained by war should resonate strongly and loudly in a post-9/11 age of the breakdown of historic instruments of power. Jill Lepore sums it up in the *New Yorker*: 'But, for genuine illumination about the promise and the limits of constitutionalism, consider, instead, Colley's Rule: Follow the violence'. Not everyone, however, is as committed to Colley's Rule as Lepore. The *London Review of Books* strips war from its assessment of the text's contemporary resonances: 'The book comes at the right moment. Constitutional storms are massing over the old United

Kingdom'. Colley's book and the rule Lepore finds there is too densely specific and too nuanced to be easily applied to today. The constitutions about which she writes are so varied, they appear in so many places, and so many different kinds of people—reformers, reactionaries, revolutionaries—write them that easy traffic between then and now, the past and today, is inadvisable. Even so, the clarity, simplicity and strength of her argument exert their own force; the temptation is to map yesterday on to today. My own reading of Colley suggests that using her framework in today's context means considering the drafting, revising and doing away with constitutions around the world as responses to political upheavals wrought by an age of ongoing and ever-developing warfare. 

Katherine Voyles

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.109>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 4 November 2021.



**Richard de Ritter, *Imagining Women Readers, 1789–1820: Well-Regulated Minds* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015), 240pp. ISBN 978-0-7190-9033-2; £80 (hb).**

THE SUBTITLE OF RICHARD DE RITTER'S STUDY of women readers, 'well-regulated minds', is drawn from Priscilla Wakefield's *Mental Improvement* (1798), a set of educational dialogues that range across a striking range of topics: from whaling and fisheries, to the uses of trees and metals, and the production of salt, sugar, wool and glass. Mrs Harcourt, one of Wakefield's educational parents, states that 'a well regulated mind is marked by the judicious disposal of time, converting even amusement into instruction' (qtd on p. 8). The relationship between amusement and instruction—between what it means to read at surface-level and deeply; or between reading for pleasure and for moral improvement—is at the centre of de Ritter's study of 'the place of the female reader in British culture between 1789 and 1820' (p. 1). Exploring cultural representations of reading by Anna Lætitia Barbauld, Maria Edgeworth, Elizabeth Hamilton, Mary Hays, Hannah More, Charlotte Smith, Jane West, Wakefield, Mary Wollstonecraft and Jane Austen, the book is a welcome addition to existing scholarly work on women's reading, building most of all on Jacqueline Pearson's landmark study, *Women's Reading in Britain, 1750–1835: A Dangerous Recreation* (1999). Drawing on previous work on women's lives by Angela Keane, Nancy Armstrong, Harriet Guest and others, De Ritter's main concern is to challenge previous accounts of reading as a predominantly private, domestic activity for women; rather, as 'a form of symbolic labour [...] conceptualised through the discourses of work and professional specialisation',

reading cannot be so easily separated from the public sphere (p. 199). For De Ritter, imagined female readers are ‘fractured figures’ and ‘representing them throws a range of binary oppositions into disarray’ (p. 199).

Chapter 1 opens with a discussion of Locke’s famous concept of the mind as *tabula rasa*, emphasising how the ‘materialist, and significantly bibliographic, image of the mind as ‘white paper’ implies that the reader and the book are in some ways interchangeable’ (p. 17). If the mind is a blank page, then it is both attractively and dangerously open for population by the written pages of purchased books. De Ritter draws our attention to Locke’s observation in *Of the Conduct of the Understanding* (1706), that ‘[r]eading furnishes the mind only with the materials of knowledge; it is thinking makes what we read ours’—a distinction that underpins many of the attacks on women’s unregulated reading collected throughout the book (quoted p. 18). Tracing Lockean ideas of influence in Thomas Gisborne’s popular conduct book, *An Enquiry into the Duties of the Female Sex* (1797) as well as instructive articles on reading habits in the *Lady’s Magazine*, De Ritter demonstrates how concerns that female readers ‘would fail to undertake the labour of active thought as they read’ (p. 19) were a product of inherited Enlightenment principles and more recent market developments, as readers gained new access to books through circulating libraries, themselves often soiled and dirtied by use: ‘[t]he circulating book, the (female) body and the mind imagined as a blank sheet were thus conflated by the potential legibility of their surfaces’ (p. 21). The corruption of the *tabula rasa* paradigm by new ‘habits of consumption’ offers a useful way of approaching Mary Hays’s *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (1796), a text in open dialogue with Locke. The complication of any easy separation between the female mind and the body is suggestively taken up at the end of the chapter through a turn to Hannah More’s criticism of ‘shallow’ anthologies of ‘hackney’d quotations’ (p. 41), and her promotion of more diligent reading through images of social utility, moral responsibility and careful labour.

Chapter 2 investigates these ‘responsible, labour-intensive modes of reading’ in more detail. Staying with More, her *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (1799) again warns against ‘relaxing reading’ and promotes ‘invigorating reading’: the latter, De Ritter argues, via Burke, imagines reading as ‘an act of sublime effort for women’, which ‘challenges the separation of labour and leisure’ (p. 59). Reading itself becomes gothic, ‘constantly haunted by the presence of the body’ (p. 83). More’s stumbling block is how to ‘transcend the language of the body: seemingly, at every point at which she extols the labour of the mind, she encounters metaphors of materiality’ (p. 62). A similar conservative anxiety about bodies at work can be traced Priscilla Wakefield’s *Reflections on the Present Condition of the Female Sex* (1798), which advocates for ‘productive’ reading by the middle-class woman, but warns that those in what she calls the ‘third class’, working in manual employment, should avoid

play and novels as 'A BANEFUL POISON' (qtd on p. 70). As De Ritter concludes, 'reading becomes an impediment, rather than a complement, to labour' (p. 70).


If chapter 2 dealt with the potential 'products of reading' (p. 83), chapter 3 turns more overtly to politics in considering of the effects of the French Revolution on educational philosophies developed by Maria and Richard Lovell Edgeworth in *Practical Education* (1798) and Elizabeth Hamilton in *Letters on the Elementary Principles of Education* (1801–02). As De Ritter points out, 'the pedagogical relationship [...] might be viewed as a microcosmic exploration of the use and abuse of power, and of the reaction it provokes' (p. 91). How best to teach disciplined reading in a post-revolutionary world is a key concern, taken up by the Edgeworths as they move away from Locke's recommendation that parents instil 'fear and awe' in the child in order to have 'first Power over their minds', and towards the cultivation of a more 'sociable domestic environment' (p. 97). The discussion of how the Edgeworths and Hamilton revise and reappraise Locke's educational theories in the aftermath of revolutionary hope and disappointment emphasises the close relationship between educational and political reform. The chapter also returns to Hays's *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* to compare Emma's restricted access to books in childhood with William Godwin's promotion of curious, self-directed reading to empower the child in his essay 'Of Choice in Reading' (p. 107), and in doing so illustrates the difficulties in devising a suitable 'ethics of parental authority' in the aftermath of Revolution (p. 11).

Chapter 4 continues with the Edgeworths to investigate 'the extent to which women's internalisation of professional ethics legitimised their reading practices' (p. 134). This chapter engages most closely with Jürgen Habermas's theory of the 'bourgeois public sphere' and its exclusionary implications for women; however, in challenging the distinction between public and private, and advocating for a wider definition of reading as 'symbolic labour', De Ritter's argument is more subtly in conversation with Habermas throughout the book. It is difficult to surpass Harriet Guest's influential reading of Edgeworth's *Letters for Literary Ladies* in *Small Change: Women, Learning and Patriotism, 1750–1810* (2000), but there is much to learn from De Ritter's nuanced reading of Edgeworth's representation of 'a somewhat paradoxical state of affairs in which women's "wisdom"—the currency of their social utility—can only be acquired in terms of "leisure"' (p. 139). This forms the background for tracing the promotion of 'leisured wisdom' in *Belinda* (1801), as Belinda's ability to think for herself comes from her concentrated perusal of books in the domestic setting—an 'ethic of intellectual labour' (p. 161), albeit one that remains 'distinctly class-bound' (p. 134).

Chapter 5 turns from intellectual labour to consider the pleasures of the text though a focussed comparison of Barbauld's and Austen's attitudes to novel reading. De Ritter's attention to Barbauld's 'On Female Studies' and 'On the Origin and Progress of Novel-Writing' (her introduction to *The British Novelists*) demonstrates how much there is to gain from Barbauld's essay



writing: her vigorous remarks on reading Radcliffe's novels deserve to be better known among scholars of the gothic. Some fascinating parallels emerge between Barbauld's comments on the shame experienced after binge-reading a Radcliffe novel ('once we have read it, it is nothing; we are ashamed of our feelings' [qtd in p. 173]) and *Northanger Abbey*, as both display 'a pattern of narrative pleasure abruptly curtailed by embarrassment and shame' (p. 177). Austen's readers, both imagined and real, have been particularly well served by Katie Halsey's *Jane Austen and her Readers, 1786–1945* (2012) and Olivia Murphy's *Jane Austen the Reader: The Artist as Critic* (2013), but De Ritter still has much to offer us here, raising the good question of whether we should assume that Catherine ever finishes *The Mysteries of Udolpho* (1794). For De Ritter, 'this unwritten moment is displaced on to the 'awaken[ing]' Catherine experiences after having been reprimanded by Henry Tilney' (p. 179). While this might seem like a minor plot quibble, the ambiguity surrounding Catherine's progress with *Udolpho* is potentially significant: if 'Austen allows Catherine's reading of that text to continue to flourish in the silent spaces of her novel', then 'the possibility of the reader's pleasure is never foreclosed' (p. 180), and the kind of 'shame' in finishing a gothic novel that De Ritter has shown us in Barbauld is resisted by Austen.

While the focus of the book is clearly on the imagined woman reader, De Ritter incorporates several experiences by readers drawn from diaries and letters, and from the excellent *UK RED: UK Reading Experience Database* <<https://www.open.ac.uk/Arts/reading/UK/>>. Chapter 4 also tantalisingly discusses practical access to Bristol Library for women in the 1780s and 1790s (pp. 130–01). These deepen our understanding of the theoretical reader as a construction, but appear relatively infrequently throughout the book, and the distinction between the 'real' and constructed reader could have been more firmly addressed at those points. But this does not lessen the benefits of De Ritter's excellent study, which provides a fascinating account of 'the social and cultural specificity' of women's reading in the Romantic period (p. 2), and how Enlightenment, Revolutionary and economic discourses shaped its metaphors. 

Katie Garner

*University of St Andrews*

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.110>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 4 November 2021.



**Hrileena Ghosh, *John Keats' Medical Notebook: Text, Context, and Poems* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2020), 320pp. ISBN 978-1-789-62061-0; £85 (hb).**

'THE POSITION OF THE HAND IN DISSECTING should be the same, as in writing or drawing; and the knife, held, like the pen' (*The London Dissector*, 1811). John Keats, as a medical student and surgeon's apprentice at Guy's Hospital (between October 1815 and March 1817), was thus advised to hold his surgeon's scalpel exactly as he held his poet's pen (p. 269). The hand that dissected rotting corpses, handled living bodies in crisis (such as pulling a bullet from a woman's neck, p. 169), and recorded anatomical details and physiological processes in his medical notebook, was the same 'living hand, now warm and capable' that scribbled poetry.<sup>1</sup> Hrileena Ghosh's book articulates how Keats' poetic creativity was—inescapably—enabled and enhanced on a practical level through his intricate, intimate knowledge of the physical human body—its fevers, its pulses, its nerves, its sensations. (His medical notebook reveals Keats' working physiological comprehension of all four: 'If there be in Fever a determination of Blood to the Head the Pulse will increase' [p. 46]; and 'Lectr 10. Physiology of the Nervous System. The 1st office is that of Sensation' [p. 32].)

Ghosh's book includes the first annotated transcription of Keats' medical notebook (pp. 19–86), taken from lectures on 'Anatomy, and the Operations of Surgery' by the pre-eminent surgeon of the period, Astley Cooper, at Guy's Hospital. 'The source from which Keats derived his medical notes has always been something of a puzzle', a conundrum that Ghosh solves (pp. 151–56). The only previous edition of Keats' medical notebook, Maurice Buxton Forman's from 1934, is not annotated—and, furthermore, it quietly smooths out some of the revealing oddities of the manuscript (that Keats wrote from both the front and back ends of the notebook, for instance [p. 10])—making Ghosh's expansively annotated edition, which takes care to indicate the distinctive arrangement of Keats' notes, welcome. Ghosh's careful explications help guide the reader through the sometimes obscure and complex medical material, while the provision of concise biographical detail and relevant intellectual context of the people mentioned is also helpful. Clear explanations of terminology are not only essential for non-medical literary scholars, the contextualisation of nineteenth-century medical vocabulary will surely be welcomed, too, by those with a knowledge of modern-day medicine.

The extensive contextualisation of Keats' time at Guy's Hospital, in the chapters that follow the annotated notebook, adds significantly to our understanding of Keats' intellectual environment.

So efficacious was the notorious, medically-themed attack in 'The Cockney School of Poetry IV'—which diagnosed Keats with debilitating metromania and mocked his medical background ('back to the shop Mr John, back to "plasters, pills, and ointment boxes", &c.')

<sup>1</sup>—that Keats' nineteenth-century admirers sought to expunge medical elements from their biographies and inter-

pretations of his poetry (pp. 239–41).<sup>2</sup> Such eschewing has perhaps contributed to traditional accounts of Keats, and understandings of his poetry (and indeed thinking), which characterise him as a poor, apathetic, or even uninterested medical student. Ghosh's book—which builds upon the recent scholarship of Nicholas Roe, John Barnard and Richard Marggraf Turley, as well as Donald Goellnicht—demonstrates conclusively that in fact the opposite was the case. The first chapter's analysis of the notebook, as a bibliographic artefact and working document, argues convincingly that Keats was an engaged, attentive and active student. Contrary to the assertions of earlier, influential critics, such as Walter Jackson Bate (who concluded that Keats' notes show that 'he was either completely indifferent or hopelessly confused' [p. 114]), Ghosh looks beyond the ostensibly chaotic appearance of Keats' notebook, reveals how carefully annotated and cross-referenced the notes actually were, and explains how they illustrate Keats' process of synthesising his learning (which operates as much in his poetry as his notebook).

Chapter 2, 'Guy's Hospital Poetry', considers Keats' poetic writing while he remained at Guy's, in an attempt to establish the relationship between 'Keats' two callings' (p. 119)—Keats as poet and as practising physician. It outlines what Keats' day-to-day life would have been like as a trainee surgeon and dresser: the duties, responsibilities and timetable. Ghosh shows that the role was incredibly hands-on. On 'taking-in day', for instance, a contemporary dresser records that one 'took charge of all the surgical cases, which were received at ten o'clock', including attending to 'all the accidents and cases of hernia', 'dressed hosts of out-patients, drew innumerable teeth, and performed countless venesections [blood lettings]' (p. 121).

Ghosh scrupulously dates Keats's poetic compositions during his time at Guy's (pp. 124–28) and charts his gravitation from the Mathew circle (his 'pre-Guy's poetic friends' [p. 128]), via his re-acquaintance with Charles Cowden Clarke, to his engagement with the Hunt circle ('Joining Hunt's Circle in autumn 1816 lent impetus to Keats' determination to leave his medical training and focus on poetry' [p. 140]). The chapter delineates Keats' afterlife (pp. 130–37), and so places into context the influential and none-too-flattering 1847 account by Henry Stephens, which remains the only first-hand description we have of Keats at Guy's. Stephens was Keats' fellow student and sometime housemate, and would go on to have a long medical career, including publishing treatises on hernias (1829) and cholera (1849). Stephens' report diminishes Keats' medical ambitions and emphasises his poetical 'Aspirations', painting Keats as an arrogant so-and-so who thought 'Medical Knowledge was beneath his attention': 'amongst mere Medical students, he would walk, & talk as one of the Gods might be supposed to do, when mingling with mortals'.<sup>3</sup> Stephens recalled his 'surprise' at Keats having passed his licentiate examination first time, a reaction perhaps coloured by that fact that Stephens had not himself achieved this feat (p. 138). Ghosh argues that Stephens' diatribe against 'the Poet John Keats' (the pointed phrase Stephens used at both the opening and

closing of his letter)<sup>4</sup>—should be read against its own contemporary background of post-*Adonais* mythmaking (p. 137).

Ghosh is content to chronicle Keats' two occupations running in parallel, and to focus less on their coalescences. Apart from the intriguing observation that 'I stood tip-toe upon a little Hill' (which was written 'certainly while he was fulfilling his dresser's duties at Guy's') articulates a concern for the heath-giving effects of cooling air (pp. 147–48)—as, for example, in the lines

The breezes were ethereal, and pure,  
 And crept through half closed lattices to cure  
 The languid sick; it cool'd their fever'd sleep,  
 And soothed them into slumbers full and deep.  
 Soon they awoke clear eyed: nor burnt with thirsting,  
 Nor with hot fingers, nor with temples bursting:  
 And springing up, they met the wond'ring sight  
 Of their dear friends, nigh foolish with delight (ll. 221–28)


there is little textual engagement with the poetry itself. The information provided by Ghosh, however, will surely prove invaluable to scholars wishing to undertake such analysis themselves.

Chapter 3, 'Keats' Medical Milieu', will be enriching for readers seeking an account of the intellectual environment that flourished in London's teaching hospitals at the time that Keats was a student; including the Vitalism debates (pp. 162–66); the contention over John Brown's theories of excitability, and the likely rejection by surgeons of a Brunonian system that rendered local interventions—i.e. surgeries—pointless (pp. 166–69); and Cooper's insistence on the importance for medical students of dissecting human corpses ('Dissection alone affords a good practical kno[w]ledge of anatomy'—*The Lectures of Astley P. Cooper Esqr on Surgery*, manuscript qtd on p. 170). The account of the 'Physical Society of Guy's Hospital' and its up-to-date library is particularly illuminating (pp. 158–60).

Keats' medical notebook provides evidence not only of his intellectual development but also of his writerly process, notably his skill in fusing and distilling imagery. Ghosh draws this out particularly in chapter 4, 'Scholar and Poet', by comparing Keats' own concise notes with those of a contemporary, Joshua Waddington, who was a more prosaic notetaker. Waddington's wordy descriptions—for instance, 'Volition does not reside altogether in the Brain but in part in the Spinal Marrow; this is proved by taking off the Head of an Animal, & placing it upon its back, when it will be found to turn upon its Belly; but if you carry a wire down the Spinal Marrow, the animal will cease to have the power of turning itself' (p. 199)—slip easily from the mind when compared with Keats' memorable truncation of the same moment in Cooper's lecture—'Volition [...] does not reside entirely in the Brain but partly in ye spinal Marrow which is seen in the Behaviour of a Frog after having been guilliteened [*sic*]' (p. 35). The chapter articulates how Keats' concision—his 'well-condensed expression', in the words of Horace Smith, or his 'poetical

concentrations' as Leigh Hunt would later put it (p. 197)—was a technique that he developed and honed through the process of medical notetaking.

Ghosh contends persuasively that the way in which Keats' poetry conveys direct evocations of extreme emotional states through specific bodily description is an essential component of 'their enduring vitality' (p. 203); as, for example, in Saturn's 'old right hand [that] lay nerveless, listless, dead, | Unsceptred' in *Hyperion* (pp. 199–201). This physiology of emotion is interrogated more fully, and in specific relation to *Endymion*, in chapter 5, 'The Physiology of Passion'. Here Keats' hospital experience is shown to be reflected in Niobe's 'trembling knee | And frantic gape', which displays a 'Bedlam vision' to use Lord Byron's phrase (pp. 225–26). The depiction of sympathetic 'midnight spirit nurse' Peona, meanwhile, is revealed as congruous with contemporary medical textbooks on ethical conduct; such as, *The Hospital Pupil's Guide, Being Oracular Communications, Addressed to Students of the Medical Profession* (originally 1816), produced by Guy's Hospital, which advocated a similar tending to patients with 'benevolence of disposition and unwearied diligence' (pp. 228–32).

The reader is repeatedly assured that Keats' medical notebook strikingly prefigures aspects of his 'mature' poetry, yet when we arrive at chapter 6, 'The Only State for the Best Sort of Poetry'—which one might anticipate would be the culmination of this enticing line of enquiry (and after an excursion through 'The Biographical Angle' of the production of the 1820 volume, pp. 234–54)—comparatively little space is granted to the poems' exploration (pp. 254–68). This is prone to leave one—with 'A burning forehead, and a parching tongue' ('Ode on a Grecian Urn', l. 30)—wanting more. The analysis that is present is richly suggestive: 'Isabella's anatomically accurate account of the disintegration of Lorenzo's face (that eyelashes remain after eyeballs have rotted [p. 255]); Madeline's 'distracted attention' in 'The Eve of St Agnes' and the narrative voice's 'undistracted attention' in 'Ode to a Nightingale' provoking different kinds of 'waking dream or reverie', as discussed in contemporary medical textbooks such as John and Charles Bell's *The Anatomy and Physiology of the Human Body* (1802–04, pp. 256–60); and the paradox implicit within pharmacological *materia medica*, that deadly toxins and poisons—such as wolfsbane, nightshade, yew-berries, peonies—can be used to cure and restore, which informs Keats' understanding of the ambiguities of 'the melancholy fit' (l. 11) in 'Ode on Melancholy' (pp. 260–68). No doubt, given the obvious importance of this annotated edition and the wealth of contextualising medical material that Ghosh has assembled, further readings on the effects of Keats's medical training on his poetic imagination will spring from this work. As the author tantalisingly suggests, within the medico-poetical vein there is much in Keats' oeuvre that remains 'warm and still to be enjoy'd' ('Ode on a Grecian Urn', l. 26). 

## NOTES

1. John Keats, 'This living hand, now warm and capable', in *The Poems of John Keats*, ed. by Jack Stillinger (London: Heinemann, 1978), p. 503 (l. 1).
2. 'Z' [John Gibson Lockhart], 'Cockney School of Poetry IV', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* (August 1818), 519–24 (p. 524).
3. Henry Stephens to George Felton Mathew, March[?] 1847, in *Keats Circle*, ed. by Hyder Edward Rollins, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), II, 206–21 (pp. 208–09).
4. *Ibid.*, II, 206 and 214.

Octavia Cox

University of Oxford

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.111>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 27 September 2021.



Daisy Hay, *The Making of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 2019), 128pp. ISBN 978-1-8512-4486-7; £12.99 (pb).

IT IS WELL KNOWN THAT THE LITERARY LEGEND *FRANKENSTEIN* was produced during the Genevan summer of 1816 when Mary Shelley was enjoying an evening of ghost stories with friends at Byron's house, the Villa Diodati. Daisy Hay's *The Making of Mary Shelley's Frankenstein* celebrates the two hundredth birthday of *Frankenstein* by tracing the journey of Mary Shelley's creation from her manuscripts to pop culture standby. It showcases five chapters, revealing the complex story of the novel's birth through an assemblage of objects and images which are mainly drawn from the collection of the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Hay takes a historical approach by tracing the inspiration of the story back to a heterogeneous mixture of things, the material bases which Mary appropriates for literary creation. Hay points out that Mary's novel writing is parallel to Frankenstein's construction of his creature—an assortment of body parts are purloined to form a new whole.

The opening chapter 'Time' gives us an investigation about the external things she internalised and incorporated into her imaginative visions. Hay presents how in *Frankenstein*, Mary Shelley drew upon ghost stories she read including the anthology *Fantasmagoriana* (1812) and Coleridge's 'Christabel' (1816). She also drew on 'a visual grammar of Gothic monstrosity that developed in the second half of the eighteenth century', including paintings by artists Francisco de Goya and Henry Fuseli (p. 21). Hay argues that *Frankenstein* displays scientific ideas Mary percolated in her time. Three interconnected strands of influences on the science of *Frankenstein* are identified: Galvani's




pioneering work in the field of electrophysiology; Erasmus Darwin's 'theory of spontaneous vitality'; and Captain Cook's thwarted 1776 attempt to circumnavigate North America from the Pacific. Importantly, Hay calls attention to the political significance of both gothic and scientific elements in the novel. The monstrousness bore a metaphor for revolutionaries, implying 'first the potential and then the vainglorious corruption of Revolutionary ambition' (p. 26). The public debate about the origins of life can also be framed in political terms—the materialist approach to 'the vital spark of life' denied the supremacy of God, and posed a threat to the hierarchies that prevented Britain from turning into 'anarchy of revolution' (p. 32).

Chapter 2 presents people who exerted influences on Mary Shelley's works via a series of anecdotes. Being the daughter of the disseminator of feminist philosophy Mary Wollstonecraft—the author of *The Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792)—Mary Shelley never got to know her mother in person who died shortly after giving birth. Left in the care of her father, the anarchist William Godwin, and growing up in an unconventional household, she became 'the epitome of a radical idea' (p. 37). She made great use of her literary pedigree and the family's substantial library holdings. Her literary talent and imagination were sustained by the intellectual circle of Romanticists ranging from Coleridge and Wordsworth to Percy Shelley. Hay shows that Mary's works reflect the tangle of voices around her, such as 'the conversational fireworks of Shelley and Byron' (p. 51), Byron's doctor John Polidori's talk about the origins of life, and Matthew Lewis' debate with Byron about slave trade. Mary also conveys her thoughts about parents' responsibilities and reproduction anxieties, which are reminiscent of her real-life experiences such as her loss of children, her mother's death and the suicides of Fanny Imlay and Shelley's estranged wife, Harriet.

The following chapter discusses how Mary adapted the tropes and devices of aesthetic theories in her representations of landscapes and nature. As Hay comments, landscape in Mary's works is 'more than source and setting', but rather made as 'an idea which united the novel's intertwined strands of commentary on creativity, egotism and community' (p. 61). Chapter 4 then concentrates on the manuscripts of *Frankenstein*. Arguments are illustrated with images of the *Frankenstein* Notebook and manuscripts in their original form. *Frankenstein* manuscripts, which are regarded as animate objects, bear a resemblance to Frankenstein's Creature. Yet at the same time, the manuscripts of the novel embody 'a narrative of sociable creation' that differs from 'the model of egotistical creativity depicted in the novel itself' (p. 93).

Daisy Hay's nuanced readings of Mary Shelley's works, combined with photographs of manuscripts, books or physical artefacts from the collection, give readers a vivid picture of Mary Shelley's time and how she translates life into art. As Hay in the concluding chapter argues, *Frankenstein*—as a productive, ethical and political metaphor—articulates the anxieties of an age inundated with emerging technologies, innovations and sudden changes.

Visual iterations and adaptations in today's pop culture make it endure as a reminder of human's extraordinary faculty of imagination and its frightening consequences. 

Jingxuan Yi

*University of Nottingham*

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.112>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 17 June 2021.



**Anna Mercer, *The Collaborative Literary Relationship of Percy Bysshe Shelley and Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley* (London: Routledge, 2019), 244pp. ISBN 978-0-3672-7795-6; £29.59 (eBook) / £96 (hb).**

ROMANTIC SCHOLARS HAVE FREQUENTLY REFERRED to the deep collaborative relationship between Mary and Percy Shelley in the authors' literary pursuits. Anna Mercer's debut monograph, *The Collaborative Literary Relationship of Percy Bysshe Shelley and Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley*, reminds us—through the writings of Charles Robinson and Timothy Morton, among others—that this relationship has not been thoughtfully enough considered. Much to the detriment of currently available research on the Shelleys, this deficiency has been 'acknowledged' (p. 3), but not yet fully examined. The introduction to Mercer's work dexterously asserts the extent to which '[t]heir experiences as a literary couple reflect their artistic intimacy', a communion of literary genius that 'provide[s] a beguiling example of how creativity flourishes and develops when provided with the support of an emotional and literary partner' (p. 24). Mercer delivers on her promise to fill a void in our understanding of the Shelleys' working and personal relationship, as well as how the complex and often unfortunate circumstances of their lives together produced inimitable affection and literary success.

Mercer's powerful suggestion that the Percy and Mary Shelley's mutual respect for each other's work engenders an authentically collaborative creative process that flourishes through both their lives. Mercer argues that it is 'evident that the Shelleys engaged in a reciprocal process of creative idea-sharing, drafting, reading, and copying, which had a hugely important effect on the works that they produced' (p. 30). This explicates further upon the extant scholarship on their relationship by making inseparable Mary's influence over her husband's work and his over hers. This theme is consistently drawn throughout Mercer's chapters, the first of which covers the period between 1814 and 1818, by the end of which it becomes increasingly clear how profound a connection they shared in life and creativity. Yet Mercer is careful not to

overdo the implications of their collusion. She writes, 'such intertwined creativity reveals a rich continuity between their works as well as important differences as both authors construct and mould their individual voices as writers, [and] is particularly important to consider' (p. 70), distinctions which become more evident as their lives together mature. Collaboration in their writings, in other words, does not eliminate the subjectivity of either author, but rather strives (almost desperately at times) to enhance, shape and perfect each's subjectivity in both craft and personhood.


Mercer reminds without redundancy that, while in Italy, the Shelleys endured extensive trauma that severely damaged their personal relationship. Existing scholarship contends that they continued to collaborate as a means of reconciling their private hardships; Mercer pushes a bit further. It is exceedingly admirable the methods through which she collects archival evidence to support her argument about the 1818–22 period, that 'the Shelleys provided both supportive, enthusiastic contributions and stimulating challenges to each other's writings' (p. 80). By the end of the chapter, the claim is abundantly clear that the Shelleys' collaborative lives are not merely a reconciliation, but a period of accelerating development and maturation.

Current scholarship tends to emphasise the ways in which their collaboration often bred turbulence, especially as (as individuals) they sought to negotiate and orient the boundaries of their own individualities. This crucial dilemma plays out within the Shelleys' marriage and as they continue their collaborative journeys. Pushing this tension quite a bit further, Mercer notes that 'the Shelleys continued to write and to be present in each other's lives', and that '[e]ven their antagonism in its own way provided creative stimulation' (p. 99). So whether or not Mary and Percy developed any sense of enmity toward one another, even this anxiety was creative. It is not evidently clear in Mercer's argument, however, the magnitude of their shared hostility nor how precisely this antipathy built upon their working relationship. It seems somewhat hasty to presume that a causal link exists between their alienation from one another and their literary output. Yet, the thrust of Mercer's compelling argument does not depend on this point; rather, her diligent readings of the manuscripts of 1818 and 1822 expose a careful erudition and specificity. Their manuscripts and letters demand that the Shelleys' continued to share common interests and practice collaborative efforts throughout these years. Mercer's research insists that, '[w]hile it has long been recognised that PBS revised MWS's writing she, in turn, revised his work, not just to his dictation but probably following discussion with him, perhaps on occasion with his agreement, and sometimes through her own determination' (p. 131). It cannot be overstated how crucial this observation is, especially as it evinces a characterisation of Mary Shelley as a shrewd and forceful editor of her husband's work, an observation upon which the future of Shelleyan and Romantic criticism can assuredly rely.

It is no less important to remark upon the final two chapters of Mercer's book, which consider posthumous editing as a form of collaboration (chapter 4) and the spectral influence of Percy Shelley over Mary's later novels (chapter 5) as further evidence of the inextricability of the Shelleys' creative bonds. After Percy drowned in July of 1822, Mary continued the work of posthumously collecting, editing and publishing his work. This is, of course, an argument of definition, one that has serious implications over the larger umbrella of literary studies. Does Mercer demonstrate that Percy's poetry after his death constitutes what we normally think of as collaboration? I'm not so convinced, but neither would I rule it out. I am most compelled by Mary's own considerations, the language of which indicates a collaborative enthusiasm; she speaks as if Percy were still alive. So, the following claim by Mercer deserves careful scrutiny:

I argue that the term 'collaboration' still applies to the Shelleys' relationship after PBS's demise because MWS's editing produced the first full edition of PBS's works: both of the Shelleys' creative input contributed to the posthumous texts as MWS's role included taking fragmentary, sometimes almost incomprehensible manuscript drafts and providing a version fit for publication. (p. 139).

The merit of this argument rests in Mary's own attitude toward her continued collusion with her husband, even after his passing.

To believe Mary's personal belief in her ongoing collaborative relationship with the now-deceased Percy has enormous implications and potentialities for the study of literature. Mercer here enters a serious debate that extends beyond the Shelleys and the Romantics, one that questions the very definition of collaboration. This wonderfully rhetorical gesture begs further study and evaluation. 

Stephen J. Pallas

*Stony Brook University*

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.113>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 25 March 2021.



**Kathryn Sutherland (ed.), *Jane Austen: The Chawton Letters* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 2017), 128pp. ISBN 978-1-8512-4474-4; £14.99 / \$25 (hb).**

IN THIS SUMPTUOUSLY PRINTED SELECTION OF AUSTEN'S LETTERS, Sutherland has encapsulated Austen's gifts as a correspondent. Few match her qualifications to edit such a volume. Scholars of Austen and bibliography are


likely to be familiar with her book *Jane Austen's Textual Lives* (Oxford University Press, 2005), a masterclass is the essential role played by bibliography in literary studies and reception. Sutherland was also project director and principal investigator for *Jane Austen's Fictional Manuscripts*, a digital (and later print) edition of the extant manuscripts of the juvenilia and unfinished works like *Sanditon* and *Lady Susan*. Readers and fans of Austen, however, will recognise Sutherland as a fellow enthusiast. She has written online and in the popular press on the appreciation of Austen, and sharp readers may even recognise her as the editor of several paperbacks, including *Mansfield Park* (Penguin, 2003) and *Teenage Writings* (Oxford World's Classics, 2017).

A selection of letters annotated by Sutherland will have a great deal to interest scholars, though naturally this *libellus* cannot replace the comprehensive collection in Deirdre Le Faye's fourth edition of *Jane Austen's Letters* (Oxford University Press, 2011). But this elegant little book, characterised on its cover as 'a delightful keepsake of correspondence for one of the world's best loved writers', will be read and re-read with perhaps even keener interest by fans and aficionados. Its incisive annotations display a few of the many delights found in the full correspondence of Austen. The book is beautiful not only for the prose style of the letters themselves and for Sutherland's adroit commentary, but also for its facsimile reproductions of the letters in Austen's manuscript handwriting. The regularity of her hand slowly uncovers the fluidity of her expression—in the sections reproduced here, there are very few words or phrases crossed out, and similarly few later additions. Austen's flow of ideas is here as deliberate, straightforward and measured as her handwriting.

The thirteen letters included in this volume were composed on a variety of different occasions, and allow readers to observe the many purposes served by familiar letters in Austen's time. Among the eleven by Austen herself, seven are to her sister Cassandra, her most intimate confidante. In these letters, the reserve of the novels, where her voice is omnipresent yet nearly inscrutable, a *deus absconditus* discerned only in the effect, never the cause—disappears, and Austen can be observed at her most unguarded. Two are epistles in verse, poems written to congratulate: her brother Henry, posted overseas, on the birth of his son, and her friend Catherine Bigg, on her marriage. Two are to James Stanier Clarke, domestic chaplain and librarian to the Prince Regent, including one that was written but never posted. With a reply of Stanier's own, these three letters form a group that includes her famous (but not sent) description of her art. In reply to his presumptive suggestion that she write a historical romance on the House of Saxe-Coburg, with the implied imprimatur of the Prince Regent himself, Austen declines. She insists on writing 'such pictures of domestic Life in Country Villages as I deal in', and defends the integrity of her artistic vision with ironic humility: 'I could no more write a Romance than an Epic Poem [...] No—I must keep to my own style & go on ^in my own way;—and though I may never succeed again in that, I am convinced that I should totally fail in any other' (pp. 118–19). The final letter

is from Cassandra to Austen's beloved niece Fanny Knight, where she relates the details of her sister's funeral with moving pathos. Cassandra is grateful in detail for the comforts of family and religion, but the letter itself must be consulted in order to conceive the irreplaceable loss that Cassandra felt.

In the letters to Cassandra included here, readers can observe the author juggling the seemingly mundane and trivial duties of communicating 'mere' news with the demands of a muse that identified the essential disclosure that the 'merest' of news might convey. In both the introduction and commentary, Sutherland compares Austen's letter to Cassandra, dated 29 January 1813, with the loquacious chatter of Miss Bates in *Emma*. The talkative spinster becomes a cipher for Austen herself, in Sutherland's reading, and this re-evaluation of Miss Bates's status asks readers to reevaluate the novel itself in light of Austen's correspondence. Sutherland's circumspect notation of the parallels allows the reader to speculate about the manner by which Austen transformed experience into art. But it also encourages speculation about the extent to which Austen deprecated herself in these fictional representations of her own epistolary practice. The web of these parallels and equivocations between the novels and the letters merely complicates the act of interpretation required by such intertextual reading.

The editorial work and notes by Sutherland helps the reader to gather these various textures of language into something like an Austenian voice. At the same time, however, these notes paradoxically scatter these traces of her voice across characters and narratives that can seem self-contradictory and even incoherent. The close parallels between Austen's letters and Miss Bates from *Emma* provide a perfect example—such parallels can even seem to disrupt the image of Austen derived from the novels alone. Perhaps the signal achievement of Sutherland's volume is not the encompassing of seemingly incompatible modes of speech and writing into a single authorial mode, but prompting us to recognise that Austen worked in human expression, where context can make trivial things serious and even profound. 

Christopher Vilmar  
*Salisbury University, Maryland*  
 <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.114>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 13 November 2021.





Angela Wright, *Mary Shelley, Gothic Authors: Critical Revisions* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2018), 192pp. ISBN 978-1-7868-3173-6; £24.99 (pb).

THE RADICAL PURPOSE OF ANGELA WRIGHT'S BOLD NEW BOOK, *Mary Shelley*, is 'to significantly revise our understanding of [Shelley's] engagement with the Gothic' through examining 'a broader range of her works than have to date been included in the Gothic canon' (p. 1). Wright suggests that themes emerging from *Frankenstein; or, the Modern Prometheus* (1818) recur throughout Shelley's subsequent writings (p. 2), which Wright urges readers not to overlook. Her compelling examination of these neglected texts makes a persuasive case for considering how the gothic permeates the writing of Mary Shelley beyond the work with which she has become synonymous.

Building on her useful chronology of Shelley's life, Wright investigates how her 'unique and exceptional literary heritage' was shaped by her parents Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin, her husband Percy Bysshe Shelley and architects of the gothic like Ann Radcliffe and Matthew Lewis, who all became components of her 'literary imagination' (p. 12). Wright juxtaposes the 'striking originality' of Shelley's childhood compositions with her self-confessed skill as a 'close imitator', and this fusion of emulation and innovation in her work is one which Wright carefully, and rewardingly, threads throughout the text.

Although the argument here is that Shelley's fascination with the gothic was not limited to *Frankenstein*, her foundational work is an apt starting point. In chapter 1, Wright conducts a sophisticated reading of the novel and the ways in which it 'seeks to expose the limitations of story-telling and of language itself' (p. 20). She teases out the dichotomies underlying the text—external and internal, scientific and supernatural, horror and terror—and the 'liminal spaces' which separate them (p. 21). The creature is mired in liminality: he is nameless because he is 'ultimately undefinable' (p. 26), and so embodies the gothic's quest to investigate the 'inexpressible and contradictory impulses of human nature' (p. 32). Exploring as it does the 'uncharted elements of human character, the space where a soul might reside' (p. 35), the novel may be considered a search for the source—of life, of inheritance, of self.

All three are persistently denied, however, to the women of *Frankenstein*. 'Who writes this, and why does it matter?', is a question which Wright stresses must be asked of any text (p. 44). This is where her book is at its most powerful, spotlighting Shelley's metatextual focus on women's invisible endeavours: writing, editing and curating manuscripts. This was a labour which Shelley knew well, as Anna Mercer has since detailed in her monograph, *The Collaborative Literary Relationship of Percy Bysshe Shelley and Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley* (2019). Margaret Walton Saville, who notably bears Shelley's initials, 'collate[s] and curate[s]' the documents that tell the story (p. 45). Wright persuasively asserts that Shelley's 'most transformative' advancement is in framing women as the 'source of rational judgment and authorship', and calls

on us to participate in what she terms 'the Gothic quest of *Frankenstein*' by following Margaret's editorial lead (pp. 48–49).

Incest was not uncommon in gothic fiction of the time (see: the collected works of Horace Walpole), but the 'reciprocity' of the proto-Freudian desire in *Matilda* made it scandalous. In Chapters 2 and 3, Wright explores how the novel's titular heroine, as both an investigator and unveiler of secrets, exerts 'a strong sense of agency' in a way which '[r]evers[es] *Frankenstein*'s particularly masculine narrative' (pp. 63–64). She contends that women writers like Shelley, Jane Austen and Ann Radcliffe, 'renegotiated the porous boundaries of romance, historical novel and "Gothic Story" in order to explore the hidden, often Gothic histories of women' (p. 68). What might be termed Shelley's 'radical gothic' foregrounds the lived experiences of women that might otherwise have been lost, giving women chroniclers like herself the space to express their traumas, their passions and their ambitions. This is apparent in *Matilda*, and also in *Valperga* through its dual heroines, Euthanasia and Beatrice, the latter of whom is not easily categorised as either 'tragic heroine' or 'female devil' (p. 82). Wright brilliantly conveys how Shelley reframes female friendship as a mutually healing bond: Euthanasia ensures that through her testimony the 'tale of two uncelebrated women' survives, and thus 'challenges [the] Gothic narrative' that only material possessions are worthy inheritances (p. 87).

Chapter 4 scrutinises Shelley's cathartic process of writing through grief, exemplified by her essay 'On Ghosts' (1824) and her dystopian novel *The Last Man* (1826), written after the deaths of Percy, Lord Byron and three of her children. The latter manifests grief as an apocalyptic landscape: a barren and unending desert that must be traversed and ultimately moved beyond (pp. 93–95). Through the writing of this novel, Shelley is arguably engaging in what we might assume the creature is doing after *Frankenstein* ends: evolving and transforming through grief. 'On Ghosts' is her articulation of this 'dynamic' process.

Wright identifies Shelley's subtle, subtextual refusal to pit women against each other (p. 99), instead portraying women as uncompetitive, independent and mutually supportive in contrast to the antagonistic, and ultimately destructive, fruits of ruthless male ambition. For Wright, '[t]he governing act of editorship provides a strong thematic link between *Frankenstein*, *Valperga* and *The Last Man*', wherein 'the final authoritative manuscript comes from the pen of a female' (p. 107). Chapter 5 traces this throughout later works, such as *The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck* (1830), which embody her 'repositioning' of the oft-forgotten heroine (pp. 109–10). The revised 1831 edition of *Frankenstein* transforms Elizabeth Lavenza, Victor's cousin in the 1818 original, into an orphan 'gifted' to Victor by his mother. This change vividly underscores 'the terrors of the disposability of the female' (pp. 113–14). The doubles in these texts, antagonistic to the male characters therein, also work to 'relegat[e] the females to the margins' (p. 118). Shelley powerfully redresses this 'through the transformative experiences of female friendship' (p. 125).

Mary Shelley once modestly said, ‘I cannot *teach*—I can only *paint*’ (qtd on p. 121). In essence, she—like Wright—does both. Wright’s book succeeds in painting a ‘truer picture’ of Shelley that offers both an excellent introduction and a bold and sagacious contribution to scholarship on one of gothic fiction’s finest innovators.

Barbara Hughes-Moore  
*Cardiff University*

<<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.115>>

This review is © 2022 The Author and is the result of the independent labour of the scholar credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 9 April 2021.



# THE ENGLISH NOVEL, 1800–1829 & 1830–1836

## Update 8 (April 2000–June 2023)

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



THIS REPORT, LIKE ITS PREDECESSORS, relates primarily to the 2nd vol. of *The English Novel, 1770–1829: A Bibliographical Survey of Prose Fiction published in the British Isles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) [EN1/2], co-edited by Peter Garside and Rainer Schöwerling, with the assistance of Christopher Skelton-Foord and Karin Wünsche. It also refers to the online *The English Novel 1830–1836* [EN3] (<http://www.romtext.org.uk/resources/english-novel-1830-36/>), which effectively serves as a continuation of the printed Bibliography. The procedure followed derives generally from the activities of the research team who helped produce *The British Novel 1800–1829: A Database of Production, Circulation, and Reception* [DBF] ([www.british-fiction.cf.ac.uk](http://www.british-fiction.cf.ac.uk)), first made publicly available in 2004, though only materials found in Updates 1–4 are incorporated in that database. The present report comes twenty-three years since the release in March 2000 of the printed Bibliography, and some nineteen years after the original launch of DBF. Its primary aim is to consolidate all the preceding seven Updates into one final composite statement. At the same time, in assembling these materials, reference has been made to a number of additional sources, including for the first time in full Rolf and Magda Loeber's magisterial *A Guide to Irish Fiction 1650–1900* (Dublin, 2006) [Loeber]. It is worth reflecting on the relative paucity of accessible (especially online) resources at the start of this whole bibliographical project. The present reporter recalls how emailing only became practicable late in the collaboration with Paderborn University over the printed Bibliography, and his resistance then of the use of attachments as a means of exchanging materials. Even during preparation of the database, consultation of resources such as the OCLC WorldCat database could require the assistance of a willing and patient librarian.

The entries below are organized in a way that matches the order of material as supplied in the *English Novel, 1770–1829*. Sections A and B concern authorship, the first of these proposing changes to the attributions as given in the printed Bibliography, and the second recording the discovery of information of interest that has nevertheless not led to substantively new attributions. Section C includes some 25 additional novels, which appear to match the criteria for inclusion and should ideally have been entered into the main listings in the printed Bibliography. Section D in turn lists over 20 titles already in the

Bibliography for which a surviving copy could not previously be located, while section E provides additional information about existing entries such as is usually found in the *Notes* field of entries. The present Update however does not follow its predecessors in providing a section on hitherto unrecorded subsequent editions, mainly on the grounds that this would better be done now exhaustively using a range of resources rather than in a piecemeal fashion. By means of the present all-embracing Update, owners of the printed Bibliography will now have the means of fully updating and annotating their copies. Newer materials included, especially those following on from Update 4, likewise have the potential to enhance and further correct the DBF database if that opportunity ever arose. 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 additional titles discovered being picked out in blue. Reference numbers (e.g. 1801: 60) are the same as those in the *English Novel, 1770–1829*, and in its 1830–36 online continuation; those given in bold refer to entries provided in the present Update. Abbreviations generally match those listed at the beginning of vol. 2 of the *English Novel*.

This last report was prepared by Peter Garside, with inputs mainly from Sharon Ragaz, whose work on the University of Toronto Libraries' online 'Jackson Bibliography of Romantic Poetry' <<https://jacksonbibliography.library.utoronto.ca/>> has offered valuable new insights; and from Anthony Mandal, without whose expertise none of these updates would have been fully possible. Numerous informants have previously supplied specific information, whose names can generally be found at the beginning of the relevant Update to which their contribution was made. Further information is always welcome, but from now on will be more appropriately directed to the editors of *Romantic Textualities*, as in the form of smaller reports (please email [Editor@romtext.org.uk](mailto:Editor@romtext.org.uk)).

#### A: NEW AUTHOR ATTRIBUTIONS

1800: 4

[?PILKINGTON, Mary.]

THE CHILD OF HOPE; OR, INFIDELITY PUNISHED. A NOVEL. BY A LADY. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Vernor and Hood, No. 31, Poultry, by J. Cundee, Ivy-Lane, 1800.

I 226p; II 239p; III 239p. 12mo. 10s 6d (Bent03); 10s 6d sewed (CR).

CR 2nd ser. 31: 115-16 (Jan 1801); WSW I: 23-4.

Corvey; CME 3-628-47263-6; ESTC t212844.

*Notes.* List of 'Novels published by T. [*sic*] Crosby' (2 pp. unnn.) at end of vol. 1 of Corvey copy of *Frederick Montravers* (1803: 77) lists 'Child of Hope by Mrs Pilkington, 3 vols., 10s 6d'. This could refer either to Mary Pilkington (1766–1839), then mainly writing children's stories, or the shadowy Miss Pilkington, who appar-

ently operated as a Minerva authoress between 1790 and 1802. Publication of the present work, an epistolary novel, by Vernor and Hood would seem to argue in favour of the former. See 1797: 66, 1798: 56, 57; 1799: 73, 74, for an uninterrupted succession of juvenile works by Mrs [Mary] Pilkington and with the imprint of Vernor and Hood. The same publishers are also found in the case of Pilkington's *The Asiatic Princess* (2 vols., London, 1800), omitted from vol. 2 according to the tighter rules for inclusion operating there for specialist fiction aimed at children. This title is not listed in the titles of subsequent adult works of fiction by Mary Pilkington, however, and any attribution to her must be tentative.

1800: 14

[VENTUM, Harriet.]

SELINA, A NOVEL, FOUNDED ON FACTS. BY A LADY. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for C. Law, Avemaria-Lane, by Bye and Law, St. John's-Square, Clerkenwell, 1800.

I viii, 239p; II 268p; III 254p. 12mo. 10s 6d (Bento3); 10s 6d sewed (CR, MR). CR 2nd ser. 30: 230 (Oct 1800); MR n.s. 32: 93 (May 1800); WSW I: 109. Corvey; CME 3-628-48643-2; EM 131: 3; ESTC t066392 (BI BL; NA IU).

*Notes.* Preface describes its author as 'a new writer' about to 'enter the lists of public applause in a species of composition, wherein few, among a host of competitors, have been successful' (p. [v]). For the attribution to Harriet Ventum, see *Justina; or, the History of a Young Lady* (1801: 66), which states on its title-page 'by Harriet Ventum, author of *Selina* &c. &c.'. It is possibly a misreading of this which has led to the wrong attribution of *Selima, or the Village Tale* to Ventum: see ESTC and 1794: 30, for the correct attribution to Margaret Holford, the elder. Excluding the falsely attributed *Selima*, apart from this work the earliest recorded publications of Ventum are *Justina* (London, 1801) and *The Amiable Tutoress, or, the History of Mary and Jane Hornsby* (London, 1801). Most of her following works were for children, though one exception is *The Dangers of Infidelity; a Novel* (see 1812: 62). Tyrrell's Circulating Library Catalogue (1834) significantly lists *Dangers of Infidelity* as 'by the Author of "Selina"'.

1800: 41

[KELLY, Isabella.]

EDWARDINA, A NOVEL. IN TWO VOLUMES. DEDICATED TO MRS. SOUTER JOHNSTON. BY CATHERINE HARRIS.

London: Printed for the Author, at the Minerva-Press, by William Lane, Leadenhall-Street, 1800.

I iv, 229p; II 263p. 12mo. 7s (Bento3); 6s 6d boards (CR). CR 2nd ser. 31: 354-5 (Mar 1801).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47629-1; EM 1005: 14; ESTC n003448 (NA CrY-BR, MH-H, PU &c.).



*Notes.* ‘List of Subscribers’ (4 pp. unnn.) at beginning of vol. 1, including 60 names. The *Orlando* database attributes this title to Isabella Kelly, on the basis that she told the Royal Literary Fund that she was the author. Kelly herself appears under the name Hedgeland in the RLF archives, Case 632, and ‘2 Vol: Edwardina 1810’ features in a list of her works appended to an appeal to the RLF in Aug 1832 (item 10). Alongside this entry is also added in the same hand ‘Written in the name of Miss Harris to benefit her in dis[tress]’. Notwithstanding the apparent misdating of 1810, the number of volumes matches, and mention of the work having been written in the name of Harris unmistakably connects it with the present novel. The presence of a ‘Mrs Kelly’ in the subscription list is also intriguing, and comparison with the similarly sized list in Kelly’s acknowledged *Ruthinglenne* (1801: 37) indicates support from similar social circles. Yael Shapira’s article, ‘Isabella Kelly and the Minerva Gothic Challenge’, *Romantic Textualities*, 23 (Summer 2020) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.78>>, points to the similarity between the engagement with the Gothic in this title and a number of other novels by Kelly written for the Minerva Press.

1800: 47

?L[UCAS], C[harles].

THE FAUX PAS, OR FATAL ATTACHMENT. A NOVEL. IN TWO VOLUMES. BY C. L.

London: Printed for the Author, at the Minerva-Press, by William Lane, Leadenhall Street, 1800.

I 272p; II 267p. 12mo. 7s (Bent03).

CtY-BR In.F275.800; xESTC.

*Notes.* The initials ‘C. L.’ also appear as the signature to the Introduction to *The Castle of Saint Donats* (see 1798: 44), which is generally attributed to Charles Lucas, and is likewise a Minerva imprint. Lucas’s first fully acknowledged fiction, *The Infernal Quixote* (1801: 45), another Minerva production, describes him on its title-page as ‘Author of the Castle of St. Donats, &c.’ The Revd Charles Lucas gained his MA from Exeter College, Oxford, in 1793, and was stipendiary curate at Avebury, Wilts, by 1795 <<https://theclergydatabase.org.uk/jsp/search/index.jsp>>. For another previously unidentified work possibly by Lucas, see also *The Strolling Player* (1802: 13), below.

1800: 55

[MEEKE, Elizabeth.]

ANECDOTES OF THE ALTAMONT FAMILY. A NOVEL. IN FOUR VOLUMES. BY THE AUTHOR OF THE SICILIAN, &C.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for William Lane, Leadenhall-Street, 1800.

I 250p; II 266p; III 306p; IV 365p. 12mo. 16s (Bent03).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47059-5; EM 221: 1; ESTC t089386 (BI BL; NA NjP).

*Notes.* Now attributed to Elizabeth Meeke, a step-sister of Frances Burney, following conclusive arguments offered by Simon Macdonald, in ‘Identifying Mrs

Meeke: Another Burney Family Novelist', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 64:265 (2013), 367–85 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/res/hgs141>>. This replaces the previous identification of Mary Meeke, the wife of a Staffordshire clergyman, whose death in 1816 preceded the conclusion of the prolific output of this novelist. [Similar alterations to Meeke's forename are required, with a cross-reference to the updated *Notes* to 1800: 55, in the case of the following original novels: 1801: 50, 51; 1802: 42, 43; 1804: 46, 47, 48, 49; 1805: 53; 1806: 46; 1808: 77; 1809: 48; 1811: 53; 1812: 48; 1814: 40; 1815: 36; 1819: 48; 1823: 63. The same applies to translations by Meeke at 1803: 28; 1804: 34; 1807: 15, 22.]

1801: 4

[BULLOCK, Mrs.]

DOROTHEA, OR A RAY OF THE NEW LIGHT. IN THREE VOLUMES. London: Printed for G. G. and J. Robinson, Paternoster-Row; by R. Noble, in the Old Bailey, 1801.

I 204p; II 183p; III 161p. 12mo. 10s 6d sewed (CR, MR); 10s 6d (ECB).

CR 2nd ser. 34: 238 (Feb 1802); MR n.s. 37: 425 (Apr 1802).

Corvey; ECB 169; NSTC D1596 (BI O).

*Notes.* Listed in Newman Catalogue of 1814 under 'Bullock's (Mrs.)', together with *Susanna; or, Traits of a Modern Miss*, this providing the source for the attribution of the latter to Mrs Bullock in Blakey (p. 173). EN1 also gives Mrs Bullock as the author of *Susanna* (see 1795: 15). In terms of equivalence, there appears to be a case for a similar attribution of this previously unidentified novel.

Further edn: Dublin 1801 (BL C.193.a.43).

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 vol. 1, p. 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 vol. Little else has been discovered about Janetta Philipps, other than that Shelley praised her poems and was active in collecting subscribers for the 1811 vol. (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).

1802: 13

[?LUCAS, Mr.]

THE STROLLING PLAYER; OR, LIFE AND ADVENTURES OF WILLIAM TEMPLETON. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed by B. M'Millan, Bow-Street, Covent-Garden; sold by H. D. Symonds, Paternoster-Row, 1802.

I 293p; II 262p; III 294p. 12mo. 12s boards (MR); 12s (ECB).

MR n.s. 40: 208 (Feb 1803); WSW I: 116.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48680-7; ECB 566; NSTC T 476 (BI BL).

*Notes.* BLC and NUC both list under Templeton, William, but text indicates that this name is part of the fiction. A fairly confident attribution is nevertheless found in *The Flowers of Literature for 1803*, a critical journal published by B. Crosby & Co. According to its Introduction: 'The author of the *Strolling Player*, we understand Mr. LUCAS, a young writer of good talents and virtuous intentions, has painted human nature, in most instances, admirably correct; but sometimes injudiciously, in those situations and scenes in which she ought to be screened from the public eye. From such a writer, however, we have, in his future productions, every thing to expect; and we consider the above-mentioned novel as the first emanation of extraordinary talents' (p. xlvi). Noticeably, in the short Notice (p. 461) in the main part of the journal, the publisher is given as Crosby himself, though no copy with such an imprint has been discovered. The same attribution to 'Mr Lucas' is also found in an advert by Crosby in the *Dorchester and Sherborne Journal* on 26 Aug 1803. However, Crosby's list of 'Novels' (2 pp. un.) at end of vol. 1 of the Corvey copy of *Frederick Montravers* (1803: 77) lists 'Strolling Player, by Mr White, 3 vols., 10s 6d'. Even if Mr Lucas is accepted as the more confident attribution, there must be considerable uncertainty about his identity. Charles Lucas, while a not unlikely author for a masculinist picaresque novel such as this, had already published under his own name with *The Infernal Quixote* (1801: 45); while little is known about William Lucas, author of the didactic *The Duellists* (1805: 51). For another previously unidentified work possibly by Charles Lucas, see also *The Faux Pas* (1800: 47), above.

1802: 14

[EARLE, William (jun.).]

WELSH LEGENDS: A COLLECTION OF POPULAR ORAL TALES.

London: Printed by J. D. Dewick, Aldersgate-Street, for J. Badcock, Paternoster-Row, 1802.

vi, 280p, ill. 12mo.

MR n.s. 40: 109 (Jan 1803); WSW I: 129.

Corvey; CME 3-628-51169-0; ECB 176; NSTC W1193 (BI BL).

*Notes.* Frontispiece carries the legend: 'Publish'd as the Act directs Nov. 1 1801 by Earle and Hemet, Albemarle Street Piccadilly.' 5 legends included, the 2nd of which is in verse. ECB dates 1801, and gives Earle as publisher, as well as attributing to William Earle as author. Re-examination of the series of appeals by

William Earle jun. to the Royal Literary Fund (Case 654) written 1829–31 now makes it clear that he was almost certainly the author of these tales, which may well have been published earlier singly. In a letter of 6 May 1829, from the Fleet Prison, he describes himself as 'son of Mr. William Earle formerly the Bookseller in Albemarle Street', and continues: 'I am the author of several novels and Legendary Tales published at a very early age and successful in their day particularly the "Welchman" a novel in Four Volumes and "Obi or Three Fingered Jack" in one volume long since out of print and a collection of "Welch Legendary Tales"'. In another appeal, dated 23 Aug 1830, he writes: 'In that same year [1799] I wrote a most successful little work which was published in numbers by John Badcock of Paternoster Row, Earle & Hemet Albemarle Street and Cobbett and Morgan Booksellers of Pall Mall entitled "Welch Legends"'. In this, as in other more immediately verifiable instances, Earle's recall seems to be sharp and precise, and there can be little reason now to doubt his claim to authorship. Collates in sixes. MR also gives 10s 6d for 8vo, but not discovered in this form.

**1804: 18**

GENLIS, [Stéphanie-Félicité, Comtesse] de; [?HALL, Agnes Crombie (*trans.*) or ?LENNOX, Charles (*trans.*)].

THE DUCHESS OF LA VALLIERE. AN HISTORICAL ROMANCE. BY MADAME DE GENLIS. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed for John Murray, No. 32, Fleet-Street, 1804.

I xxxv, 264p; II 319p. 12mo. 8s boards (CR); 10s 6d sewed (ER); 10s 6d (ECB); 9s boards (ER).

CR 3rd ser. 3: 239 (Oct 1804); ER 4: 498 (July 1804), 5: 252 (Oct 1804); WSW I: 239–40.

CtY-BR Hfd29,351.V; ECB 225; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Trans. of *La Duchesse de la Vallière* (Paris, 1804). ECB and ER both state translated by Charles Lennox. Translator is also identified by Summers as Charles Lennox. This work however is listed by Agnes Crombie Hall as one of her translations in a list submitted to the Royal Literary Fund in 1843 (Case 555, item 46). This would seem to be supported by record of a payment to 'Mrs Hall' of £31.10s relating to this publication in a Divide Ledger entry of 9 June 1804 in the Murray Archives (NLS, MS 42724, p. 17). DBF 1804A018 wrongly transcribes this as Mr Hall. For fuller details on Agnes Crombie Hall, and her probable use of Rosalia St. Clair as a pseudonym for original novels, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59. Preface is evidently Genlis's own, and no indication is given there of translator.

**1805: 42**

LAFONTAINE, August [Heinrich Julius]; [HALL, Agnes Crombie (*trans.*)]. DOLGORUCKI AND MENZIKOF. A RUSSIAN TALE. IN TWO VOLUMES. FROM THE GERMAN OF AUGUSTUS LA FONTAINE.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for Lane, Newman, and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1805.

I 314p; II 305p. 12mo. 8s sewed (ER); 8s (ECB).

ER 5: 501 (Jan 1805).

BL 12554.aa.38; ECB 326; NSTC L148.

*Notes.* Trans. of *Fedor und Marie, oder Treue bis zum Tode* (Berlin, 1802). ECB dates Nov 1804. Listed as one of her translations by Agnes Crombie Hall in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund in 1843 (Case 555, item 46). For further information on Mrs Hall, and her probable use of the Rosalia St. Clair pseudonym for original fiction, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59.

1805: 43

LAFONTAINE, August [Heinrich Julius]; [HALL, Agnes Crombie (*trans.*)]. HERMANN AND EMILIA, A NOVEL. FROM THE GERMAN OF AUGUSTUS LA FONTAINE. IN FOUR VOLUMES.

London: Printed at the Minerva Press, for Lane, Newman, and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1805.

I vii, 311p; II 344p; III 265p; IV 240p. 12mo.

NNS Ham L1659 H3; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Trans. of *Herrmann et Emilie, traduit de l'allemande* (Paris, 1802), original German title *Herrmann Lange* (Berlin, 1799). *Literary Journal*, Sept 1805, p. 1002, gives price as 18s and comments: 'This is said to be a translation from the German of Augustus La Fontaine, who, if everything be his that is laid to his charge, must be allowed to be a most indefatigable novel writer.' Listed as one of her translations by Agnes Crombie Hall in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund in 1843 (Case 555, item 46). For further information on Mrs Hall, and her probable use of the Rosalia St. Clair pseudonym for original fiction, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59. Copy (previously not located) from the Hammond Collection, New York Society Library.

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 1C, 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.

1806: 12

[GRAINVILLE, Jean Baptiste François Xavier Cousin de.]

THE LAST MAN, OR OMEGARUS AND SYDERIA, A ROMANCE IN FUTURITY. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed for R. Dutton, 15, Gracechurch-Street, 1806.

I 220p; II 204p. 12mo. 7s (ER).

CR 3rd ser. 8: 443 (Aug 1806); ER 8: 479 (July 1806); WSW I: 64.

Corvey; CME 3-628-47899-5; NSTC L528 (BI BL, O).

*Notes.* Trans. of *Le Dernier Homme* (Paris, 1805). A reprint of the Dutton 1806 edn. appeared in 1978 in the Arno 'Lost Race and Adult Fantasy Fiction' series. The identification is also made in Morton D. Paley, 'Mary Shelley's *The Last Man*: Apocalypse Without Millenium', *Keats-Shelley Review* (Autumn 1989), 1–25; electronically available as <<http://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/mws/lastman/paley2.htm>>. See also Amy J. Ransom, 'The First Last Man: Cousin de Grainville's *Le Dernier Homme*', *Science Fiction Studies*, 41:2 (July 2014), 314–40 <<https://doi.org/10.5621/sciefictstud.41.2.0314>>. Newman Catalogue of 1814 states 'from the French of Volney', this reflecting the influence of Count Constantin François de Volney's *Les Ruines* (1791) on the source work.

1807: 25

ANON.

BARON DE FALKENHEIM. A GERMAN TALE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for Lane, Newman, and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1807.

I 304p; II 303p. 12mo. 9s (ECB); 9s sewed (ER).

ER 9: 500 (Jan 1807).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47106-0; ECB 41; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Originally attributed with reservation to GUÉNARD, Elisabeth, though no French original for this title was discovered. See new note to 1808: 51, below, for the greater likelihood that this is by an unknown English author.

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 1D, 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 Edinburgh Magazine*.

1808: 18

[?SMITH, Orton.]

SKETCHES OF CHARACTER, OR SPECIMENS OF REAL LIFE. A NOVEL, IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, Paternoster-Row; B. Crosby, Stationer's-Court: and J. Lansdown, Bristol, by Mills & Co. St. Augustine's-Back, Bristol, 1808.

I x, 282p; II 308p; III 392p. 12mo. 15s (ECB).

CR 3rd ser. 15: 88-92 (Sept 1808) full review; WSW I: 112.

PU PR.3991.Ar.S54.1808; ECB 541; NSTC S2186 (BI BL).

*Notes.* MS note on fly-leaf in ViU copy (PZ2.S556.1808) reads, in contemporary hand, 'By Richard Brinsley Sheridan, author of Critic'; this copy has the Preface mistakenly bound near end of last vol. NUC entry states 'also attributed to Amelia Opie'. Yet an alternative possible authorship, hitherto unrecorded, is discoverable in the Longman Letter Books, in a letter to Orton Smith, dated 4 Feb 1814, which states 'The Sketches of Character is selling very well with us' (I, 98, no. 131). The same letter also asks the recipient (who might conceivably have been an agent rather than author) to enquire after 'a MS entitled "Penrose", which was in the possession of the late Mr Eagles of Bristol', and which the firm had earlier rejected—this suggesting that Smith had connections with Bristol (see also Section E, 1815: 54, below). Longman Divide Ledger entry 23 Apr 1813 records: '6 copies bds sent to O. Smith, Esq.'. It is worth noting too, perhaps, the similarity of the imprint of the 1st edn. above to those found in a sequence of novels attributable to the Revd Mr Wyndham (see e.g. 1805: 72). See also 1815: 12, below. Further edns: 2nd edn. 1813 (Corvey), CME 3-628-48753-6 [with Longmans alone on imprint]; 3rd edn. 1815 (NSTC).

1808: 51

ANON.

MYSTERY UPON MYSTERY. A TALE OF EARLIER TIMES. IN FOUR VOLUMES. BY THE AUTHOR OF THE BARON DE FALKENHEIM.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for Lane, Newman, and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1808.

I 271p, ill.; II 268p; III 280p; IV 259p. 12mo. 20s (ECB).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48185-6; ECB 403; NSTC M3825 (BI BL).

*Notes.* Originally attributed with reservation to GUÉNARD, Elisabeth, and considered as a trans. of her *Mystères sur mystères, ou les onze chevaliers* (Paris, 1807). Caspar Wintermans of The Hague, Netherlands, writes in a personal letter, however, that having consulted a rare copy of *Mystères sur mystères* from the Library of the Castle of Oron, Vaud, Switzerland, he has ascertained that it is completely different from *Mystery upon Mystery*. The present title, and two other novels in the same chain (see 1807: 25, 1811: 36), most probably then are the work of an anonymous English author. ECB dates Dec 1807, and lists under title only.

1808: 79

[MONTOLIEU, Jeanne-Isabelle-Pauline Polier de Bottens, Baronne de; [HALL, Agnes Crombie (*trans.*)].

CHRISTINA; OR, MEMOIRS OF A GERMAN PRINCESS. BY THE AUTHOR OF CAROLINE OF LICHTFIELD. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Henry Colburn, Conduit-Street, New Bond-Street, 1808.

I 208p; II 272p. 12mo. 10s (ECB); 9s (ER).

CR 3rd ser. 13: 443 (Apr 1808); ER 11: 504 (Jan 1808).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47282-2; ECB 114; NSTC M2956 (BI BL).

*Notes.* Trans. of *La Princesse de Wolfenbützel* (Paris, 1807), itself based on Johann Heinrich Daniel Zschokke's *Die Prinzessin von Wolfenbützel* (Zurich, 1804). ECB dates Nov 1807. Included (as 'Christina of Wolfenbützel') in a list of her translations by Agnes Crombie Hall in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund in 1843 (Case 555, item 46). For further information on Mrs Hall, and her probable use of the Rosalia St. Clair pseudonym for original fiction, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59. Further edn: 2nd edn. 1809 (NSTC).

1809: 7

[JACOB, Catharine.]

THE MONK AND THE VINE-DRESSER: OR, THE EMIGRANTS OF BELLESME. A MORAL TALE. BY A LADY.

Edinburgh: Printed for Manners & Miller, A. Constable & Co. and Brown & Crombie; and Constable, Hunter, Park, & Hunter, London, 1809.

ii, 183p. 12mo. 3s (ER).

ER 15: 528 (Jan 1810); WSW I: 78.

E Hall.278.e; NSTC L103.

*Notes.* 'Address to the Public', dated Oct 1809. Listed as one of her works on the title-page of *Poems* (Southampton, 1821), 'by Mrs. Jacob, (Late Miss C. Kunison, of Southampton)'. At an earlier point in her life Catharine Jacob appears to have lived at Rosebank, near Edinburgh, close to the historical boundary with Leith, a fact alluded to in 'Lines, Written at my father's cottage, Rosebank, near Edinburgh' in her *Poems* (p. 55). This might help explain the choice of the polite Edinburgh firm of Manners & Miller as publishers. Collates in sixes.

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 1D, 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' (pp. 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* (1831: 57) by William Ogilvie Porter, this would place four of the Porter siblings as writers of fiction.

1809: 24

[LIPSCOMB, George.]

MODERN TIMES; OR, ANECDOTES OF THE ENGLISH FAMILY. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for J. Budd, Bookseller to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, at the Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall; and Sharpe and Hailes, No. 186, Piccadilly, 1809.

I xxiv, 264p; II 230p; III 261p. 12mo. 15s (ECB, ER).

ER 15: 529 (Jan 1810); WSW I: 78.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48219-4; ECB 390; NSTC M2772 (BI O).

*Notes.* Preface dated Buen-Retiro, Sept 1809. Originally attributed to 'John English' on the basis of title-page information in *The Grey Friar, and the Black Spirit of the Wye* (1810: 42) and *Castletorpe Lodge; or, the Capricious Mother* (1816: 27). This name, however, now turns out almost certainly to have been the pseudonym of Dr George Lipscomb, MD (1773–1846), author of *The History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham* (1847). Authorship of these three novels was acknowledged by Lipscomb in a letter of appeal to RLF (Case 905, item 1) of 4 Dec 1837. Jack English is a character in the novel, who is supposedly the author of *Modern Times* (see vol. 3, p. 234), Lipscomb thus developing a Shandean-like joke. Further edn: 1810 (NUC).

**1809: 27**

GENLIS, [Stéphanie-Félicité, Comtesse] de; [HALL, Agnes Crombie (*trans.*)]. ALPHONSO; OR, THE NATURAL SON. BY MADME. DE GENLIS, AUTHOR OF SAINCLAIR, THE SIEGE OF ROCHELLE, THE RECOLLECTIONS OF FELICIA, THE EARL OF CORK, &C. &C. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Henry Colburn, English and Foreign Library, Conduit-Street, Bond-Street, 1809.

I iv, 174p; II 183p; III 190p. 12mo. 13s 6d (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 15: 242 (O&T 1809); QR 3: 267 (Feb 1810).

BL 12511.c.20; ECB 225; NSTC B4973.

*Notes.* Trans. of *Alphonse, ou le fils naturel* (Paris, 1809). In a letter of 22 May 1810 to the Royal Literary Fund (Case 223, item 7) Agnes Crombie Hall refers to 'the Alphonso of M. Genlis' as one of two novels translated by her for Mr Colburn, and for which she receives 'about 10/6 the English sheet'. The other translation mentioned is 'the Convent [*sic*] of St Ursula' (see 1810: 39 below). Also listed as one of her translations by Hall in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund in 1843 (Case 555, item 46). For further information on Mrs Hall, and her probable use of the Rosalia St. Clair pseudonym for original fiction, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59.

**1810: 39**

[DUCRAY-DUMINIL, François-Guillaume]; [HALL, Agnes Crombie (*trans.*)]. THE NOVICE OF SAINT URSULA. BY THE AUTHOR OF "A TALE OF MYSTERY," "JEANNETTE," &C. IN FOUR VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Henry Colburn, English and Foreign Public Library, Conduit-Street, New Bond-Street, 1810.

I 224p; II 232p; III 264p; IV 205p. 12mo. 21s (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 16: 259 (Apr 1810), 16: 510 (Aug 1810); QR 4: 277 (Aug 1810).

IU 845.D856.OnE; ECB 173; xNSTC.

*Notes.* French original not discovered. Drop-head title reads: 'Elvina, or the Novice of Saint Ursula' [misspelt Ursulu in vol. 1]. QR lists as 'The Novice of St. Ursula, or Elvina'. In a letter of 22 May 1810 to the Royal Literary Fund (Case 223, item 7) Agnes Crombie Hall refers to 'the Convent [*sic*] of St Ursula' as one of two novels translated by her for Mr Colburn, and for which she receives 'about 10/6 the English sheet'. The other translation mentioned is 'the Alphonso of M. Genlis' (see 1809: 27 above). For further information on Mrs Hall, and her probable use of the Rosalia St. Clair pseudonym for original fiction, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59.

**1810: 42**

[LIPSCOMB, George.]

THE GREY FRIAR, AND THE BLACK SPIRIT OF THE WYE: A ROMANCE. IN TWO VOLUMES. BY JOHN ENGLISH, ESQ. OF BLACKWOOD HALL.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for A. K. Newman and Co. (Successors to Lane, Newman, and Co.) Leadenhall-Street, 1810.

I 276p; II 299p. 12mo. 10s (ECB, QR).

QR 3: 268 (Feb 1810).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47568-6; ECB 188; NSTC E1008 (BI O).

*Notes.* For the attribution to Lipscomb rather than, as previously, John English (actually a pseudonym), see notes to the same author's *Modern Times* (1809: 24), above.

1811: 36

ANON.

THE BLACK BANNER; OR, THE SIEGE OF CLAGENFURTH. A ROMANTIC TALE. IN FOUR VOLUMES. BY THE AUTHOR OF THE BARON OF FALKENHEIM, MYSTERY UPON MYSTERY, &C. &C.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for A. K. Newman and Co. (Successors to Lane, Newman, & Co.) Leadenhall-Street, 1811.

I 272p; II 290p; III 288p; IV 322p. 12mo.

Corvey; CME 3-628-47198-2; NSTC G2325 (BI BL).

*Notes.* Originally attributed with reservation to GUÉNARD, Elisabeth, though no French original for this title was discovered. See new note to 1808: 51, above, for the great likelihood that this is by an unknown English author. It now also seems more likely that *La Bannière noire; ou le siège de Clagenforth* (1820), though attributed by BN to Guénard, is in fact a French *translation* of this title.

1812: 11

[JACOB, Catharine.]

OLD TIMES AND NEW; OR, SIR LIONEL AND HIS PROTEGÉE. A NOVEL. IN FOUR VOLUMES.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for A. K. Newman and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1812.

I viii, 238p; II 268p; III 272p; IV 268p. 12mo. 22s (ECB, ER).

ER 20: 502 (Nov 1812); WSW I: 86.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48573-8; ECB 422; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Listed as one of her works on the title-page of *Poems* (Southampton, 1821), 'by Mrs. Jacob, (Late Miss C. Kunnison, of Southampton)'. For further details, see 1809: 7, above. 'Introduction' also indicates female authorship.

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. A. F. Stewart, 2 vols. (London, 1908), vol. 2, p. 262. Further edn: Philadelphia 1812 (NUC).

1813: 6

[HUGHES, Mrs ?Harriet.]

SHE THINKS FOR HERSELF. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, 1813.

I 263p; II 261p; III 345p. 12mo. 16s 6d (ECB, ER).

ER 21: 258 (Feb 1813); WSW I: 110–11.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48650-5; ECB 532; NSTC S1607 (BI BL).

*Notes.* Two letters in the Longman Letter Books addressed to Mrs Hughes indicate strongly that she is the author. The first, dated 18 Nov 1812, states that the publisher's reader 'has given so favourable a report of your MS, that we are induced to undertake the publication'. The same letter offers settlement on a half profits basis, adding 'If this plan be agreeable to you we will put the work to press immediately & print 500 or 750 copies'. It also advises 'the omission of the Introductory Chapter', and 'that the title be "She thinks for herself" simply with the motto' (I, 97, no. 377). The second, dated 26 Nov 1812, makes the concession that the author should receive twenty rather than the usual dozen copies, while supplying further details about costs, and concludes 'The work may be finished we believe before the end of the Year' (I, 97, no. 381). Notwithstanding Longmans' advice in their first letter, the novel as published opens with an 'Introductory Chapter'. In this the author describes herself as plain, bookish, an 'old maid', and alone: 'At the age of forty, having lost my remaining parent, I retired to the village of Heathdale, on the western side of Sussex, where I now reside' (pp. 3–4). The title-page, on the other hand, matches Longmans' recommendation. This Mrs Hughes is given as Mrs Harriet Hughes in the typed index to the Letter Books prepared by Michael Bott. ECB dates Feb 1812.

1813: 60

[SCHULZE, Friedrich August and others; UTTERSON, Sarah Elizabeth (*trans.*).]

TALES OF THE DEAD. PRINCIPALLY TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

London: Printed for White, Cochrane, and Co., Fleet-Street, 1813.



viii, 248p. 8vo. 9s (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 22: 246 (Oct 1813); QR 10: 297 (Oct 1813).

BL 12547.d.8; ECB 576; NSTC U261 (BI O).

*Notes.* Mainly translated and adapted from of *Fantasmagoriana, ou recueil d'histoires, d'apparitions de spectres, revenants ... traduit de l'allemand, par un Amateur* [by Jean Baptiste Benoit Eyriès] (Paris, 1812). 'Advertisement', pp. [i]–ii, states: 'The first four tales in this collection, and the last, are imitated from a small French work, which professes to be translated from the German ... The last tale has been considerably curtailed ... The fifth tale ... is founded on an incident similar in its features, which was some years since communicated to me, by a female friend of very deserved celebrity'. 'Preface of the French Translator', pp. [iii]–viii. Six tales in all: 'The Family Portraits', [3]–63; 'The Fated Hour', [64]–93; 'The Death's Head', [94]–120; 'The Death-Bride', [121]–177; 'The Storm', [178]–192; 'The Spectre Barber', [193]–248. In the Introduction to the 1831 edn. of her *Frankenstein*, Mary Shelley mentions that a reading of the French version of this work in the company of Byron, Polidori and Percy B. Shelley, in Italy in 1816, prompted their decision to write ghost stories. A German source for the French *Fantasmagoriana* of 1812, and authorial origin for four of the tales in the present work, is described in Terry Hale's Introduction to his edn. of *Tales of the Dead: The Ghost Stories of the Villa Diodati* (Chislehurst, 1992). According to Hale's account, Friedrich Schulze was the author of three of the stories in *Tales of the Dead* ('The Fated Hour', 'The Death's Head', and 'The Death-Bride'), these being published in the first two vols. of the 5-vol. *Gespenssterbuch* (Leipzig, 1811–15), which was jointly edited by Schulze (under the pseudonym of Friedrich Laun) and the playwright Johann Apel. Another story in *Tales of the Dead* ('The Spectre Barber'), also published in the *Gespenssterbuch*, is identified as by the veteran German author Johann Karl August Musäus.

1815: 12

[?SMITH, Orton.]

VARIETIES OF LIFE; OR, CONDUCT AND CONSEQUENCES. A NOVEL. IN THREE VOLUMES. BY THE AUTHOR OF "SKETCHES OF CHARACTER."

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster Row, 1815.

I 346p; II 270p; III 295p. 12mo. 18s (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 25: 278 (June 1815); QR 13: 531 (July 1815), 14: 554 (Jan 1816); WSW I: 125–6. Corvey; CME 3-628-48860-5; ECB 610; NSTC V132 (BI BL, C).

*Notes.* The attribution is encouraged by a letter from the publishers, addressed to Orton Smith Esq, dated 9 Apr 1821: 'As we have now little or no demand for Varieties of Life, we beg leave to inform you that it is our intention to include the remaining copies in a sale which we shall make to the trade in a few days; to which we conclude you can have no objection' (Longman Letter Book I, 101, no. 132). See also additional note to 1808: 18, above.

Further edn: Philadelphia 1816 (NSTC).

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 edn., the following translation has been made’ (pp. [v]–vi). OCLC WorldCat (No. 5381478) identifies the translator as probably Edward Augustus Kendall (1776?–1842). This identification is substantiated by the Longman Divide Ledger 2D, p. 76, where ‘Mr Kendall’ receives payment of £31. 10. 0. as the ‘Translator’.

1816: 27

[LIPSCOMB, George.]

\*CASTLETHORPE LODGE; OR, THE CAPRICIOUS MOTHER. INCLUDING THE CURIOUS ADVENTURES OF ANDREW GLASMORE, A NOVEL, IN THREE VOLUMES. BY THE AUTHOR OF “MODERN TIMES, OR ANECDOTES OF AN ENGLISH FAMILY;”—“THE GREY FRIAR, AND THE BLACK SPIRIT OF THE WYE,” &C. SECOND EDITION.

London: Printed and published by Allen and Co. No. 15, Paternoster-Row, 1816. I 237p; II 216p; III 208p. 12mo.

Corvey; CME 3-628-47237-7; xNSTC.

*Notes.* For the attribution to Lipscomb rather than, as previously, John English (actually a pseudonym), see new notes to *Modern Times* (1809: 24), above. Drop-head title reads: ‘The Capricious Mother’. A novel titled *The Capricious Mother; or Accidents and Chances*, 3 vols., 15s, is listed in ER July 1812 and QR Mar 1812; and this probably represents the 1st edn. of this work, though no copy with this title has been located. Listed in Tyrrell’s *Circulating Library Catalogue* (1834) as ‘Capricious Mother; or Accidents and Chances’. Lipscomb himself also gives the

title of this novel as 'The Capricious Mother' in his letter of appeal to the Royal Literary Fund (Case 905, item 1) of 4 Dec 1837.

**1817: 11**

[JERDAN, William and NUGENT, Michael.]

SIX WEEKS AT LONG'S. BY A LATE RESIDENT. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for the Author; and sold by all Booksellers, 1817.

I xii, 235p; II 230p; III 226p. 12mo. 21s (ECB, QR).

ER 28: 268 (Mar 1817); QR 16: 557 (Jan 1817); WSW I: 143.

O 12.Ö.1841-1843; ECB 540; NSTC 2B9426.

*Notes.* Previously attributed to Eaton Stannard Barrett, but acknowledged otherwise in *The Autobiography of William Jerdan*, 4 vols. (London, 1852-3): 'At this period the satirical novel called "Six Weeks at Long's", in the doing of which ... I had a hand with Michael Nugent ... was published' (vol. 2, pp. 176-7). This new attribution is referred to by Gary Dyer in his *British Satire and the Politics of Style* (Cambridge, 1997), p. 189, n. 23, and mentioned by him again in 'Parody and Satire in the Novel, 1770-1832' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Eighteenth-Century Novel*, ed. J. A. Downie (Oxford, 2016), p. 577. Contains portraits of contemporary literary figures: Lord Leander (Byron) is first encountered reading Scott. ECB lists as 'Six weeks at Long's Hotel', and gives Colburn as publisher; but not discovered in either form.

Further edns: 2nd edn. 1817 (Corvey), CME 3-628-48750-1; 3rd edn. 1817 (NSTC).

**1817: 23**

DUCRAY-DUM[I]NIL, [François-Guillaume]; [HALL, Agnes Crombie (*trans.*)].

THE BLIND BEGGAR; OR THE FOUNTAIN OF ST. CATHERINE. A NOVEL. IN FOUR VOLUMES. BY DUCRAY DUMENIL, AUTHOR OF JULIEN, OR MY FATHER'S HOUSE; LITTLE CHIMER; TALE OF MYSTERY; VICTOR, OR CHILD OF THE FOREST, &C. &C.

London: Printed at the Minerva Press for A. K. Newman and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1817.

I 263p; II 240p; III 291p; IV 280p. 12mo. 22s (ECB).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47492-2; ECB 61; NSTC 2D21007 (BI BL, C).

*Notes.* Trans. of *La Fontaine Sainte-Catherine* (Paris, 1813). Previously entered as a translation by Rosalia St. Clair [pseud.], on the grounds of an attribution in the title of *The Son of O'Donnell* (1819: 59). Identification of Mrs Hall as the probable user of the St. Clair pseudonym (see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59) makes it possible to disclose the real name of the translator. The omission of this title among a list of her translations in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund in 1843 (Case 555, item 46) is probably the result of an oversight. This is the last of seven translations of fiction now directly attributable to Hall.

**1818: 11**

[HARRAL, Thomas.]

MANDEVILLE; OR, THE LAST WORDS OF A MANIAC! A TALE. OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY IN ENGLAND. BY HIMSELF. VOLUME IV.

London: Printed for Effingham Wilson, 88, Royal Exchange; and sold by all other Booksellers, 1818.

216p. 12mo.

WSW I: 71.

Corvey; CME 3-628-47849-9; NSTC 2G11519 (BI O).

*Notes.* A parodic '4th volume' to Godwin's *Mandeville* (see 1817: 29). Listed by Thomas Harral (1774–1853) as one of his works in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund of 12 May 1845 (Case 761, item 3). Thanks are due to Andrew Ashfield's work in making this apparent. Collates in sixes.

Further edn: Philadelphia 1818 (NSTC).

**1819: 18**

[?EDWARDS, Mr.]

ROBIN HOOD; A TALE OF THE OLDEN TIME. IN TWO VOLUMES. Edinburgh: Oliver &amp; Boyd, High Street; G. &amp; 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 pagged advs. at the end of vol. 2.

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

**1819: 47**

[GILLIES, Robert Pierce.]

OLD TAPESTRY; A TALE OF REAL LIFE. IN TWO VOLUMES.

Edinburgh: Printed by James Ballantyne and Co. for W. and C. Tait, Prince's Street; and G. and W. B. Whittaker, Ave-Maria-Lane, London, 1819.

I xiii, 325p; II 319p. 12mo. 12s (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 31: 556 (Mar 1819); QR 21: 268 (Jan 1819).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48253-4; ECB 422; NSTC 2M18581 (BI BL, C, E, O).

*Notes.* Dedication 'to Flint Popham, Esq.' signed 'M. W. M. Brazen-Nose College,' Oxford, Mar 1819. Normally attributed to M. W. Maskell, matching the initials of the Dedication. This title, however, was claimed as Gillies's at least twice during appeals to the Royal Literary Fund. 'Old Tapestry. A Novel. 2 vols. 1816 [*sic*]' features in a 'List of Works' sent as part of an appeal in Apr 1838 (Case 708,

item 5); and again as part of a completed list of ‘Titles of Published Works’ on a form dated 2 Jan 1850, this time as ‘Old Tapestry a Novel—12mo. Edinb. 1819’ (Case 708, item 19). The Edinburgh manufacture and management of the work also accords with Gillies’s career. A primary factor also is the presence of a copy in the Abbotsford Library inscribed in Gillies’s hand on the front endpaper of vol. 1: ‘Walter Scott Esqr. From the Author’. Following on from the adulation exhibited in Gillies’s preceding novel, *The Confessions of Sir Henry Longueville* (1814: 23), Scott in this novel is picked out in one conversation as the sole true genius living in Edinburgh (vol. 1, pp. 98–9). Elsewhere reference is made to the German writer Wieland (p. 125), reflecting Gillies’s own interests; *Blackwood Edinburgh Magazine* (p. 160), for which he was a major contributor; and the poetry writing of a would-be lawyer character living (like Scott) in Castle Street (vol. 2, pp. 259, 278). For a fuller account of Gillies’s literary career and publications, ‘Shadow and Substance: Restoring the Literary Output of Robert Pearse Gillies (1789–1858)’, by the present reporter, in *Romantic Textualities*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.106>>.

### 1819: 59

[HALL, Agnes Crombie.]

THE SON OF O'DONNELL. A NOVEL. IN THREE VOLUMES. BY ROSALIA ST. CLAIR, AUTHOR OF THE BLIND BEGGAR, &C. &C.

London: Printed at the Minerva Press for A. K. Newman and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1819.

I 220p; II 215p; III 244p. 12mo. 16s 6d (ECB).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48501-0; ECB 511; NSTC 2S2000 (BI BL).

*Notes.* The first of 12 original novels listed by Agnes Crombie Hall (1778–1846) in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund in 1843 (Case 555, item 46), all but the last of which appeared under the pseudonym of Rosalia St. Clair and all of which were published by A. K. Newman. Agnes Hall was a native of Roxburghshire and wife (then widow) to the surgeon and medical writer Robert Hall (1763–1824), who likewise made a sequence of appeals to the Fund from 1808 up to his death. Some leeway perhaps ought to be allowed to the possibility that in making her appeal Hall had falsely appropriated the output of another author, but this would seem out of keeping with the general accuracy of her other claims. Mrs A. C. Hall is specifically associated with two novels written as by St. Clair in an obituary published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for Jan 1847: ‘Among many original novels and romances, all inculcating the purest morals, and the most patriotic and virtuous principles, we may mention one founded on the Massacre of Glencoe [see *The Doomed One* (1832: 72)]; and *First and Last Years of Wedded Life* [see 1827: 59], which exhibits an intimate acquaintance with political economy,—the state of Ireland—her evils, and their safest remedies. The scene was laid during George IV’s visit to Ireland’ (vol. 27, p. 98). The use of Rosalia St. Clair as a pseudonym is also noted in M. Clare Loughlin-Chow’s entry on Agnes C. Hall in *ODNB*, first published in 2004; and she is acknowledged as the underlying author in

Anne Frey's 'The National Tale and the Pseudonymous Author: Mobile Identity in the "Rosalia St. Clair" Novels', *European Romantic Review*, 25:2 (2014), 181–99 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509585.2014.882049>>. In addition to the above it is perhaps worth noting that an appeal after her death made to RLF on behalf of her daughter makes the claim that an element of co-authorship existed between the two: 'For the last twenty years of her mother's life Miss Hall aided her literary labours, and was joint authoress with her mother of several of the novels which appeared with her mother's name, or rather as her mother's work, for they were published under fictitious names' (Tom Taylor to Octavian Blewitt, 1 June 1855: Case 223, item 25). [Similar alterations to the author attribution are required in the case of the following original novels: 1820: 61; 1822: 65; 1824: 81; 1827: 58, 59; 1828, 69; 1829: 69; 1830: 94; 1831: 61; 1832: 72. In each case, the following should be added at the start of the *Notes* field: 'Listed by Agnes Crombie Hall as an original novel by her in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund of 1843 (16: 555, item 46). For further details of Hall, and her probable use of the Rosalia St. Clair pseudonym, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59.']

1820: 7

[DRISCOLL, Miss.]

NICE DISTINCTIONS: A TALE.

Dublin: Printed at the Hibernia Press Office, 1, Temple-Lane for J. Cumming 16, Lower Ormond-Quay; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1820.

vii, 330p. 8vo. 10s 6d (ECB, ER).

ER 33: 518 (May 1820), 34: 263 (Aug 1820).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48223-2; ECB 413; NSTC 2N7355 (BI BL, C, Dt, O).

*Notes*. Preface to 'Jedediah Cleishbotham', dated Dublin, 30 Sept 1819. A review in the *Dublin Magazine*, 1: 378 (May 1820), ends with the following short paragraph: 'We now take our farewell of D—I's nice distinctions; but we sincerely hope that we may again see characters as *nicely distinguished* as this work promises.' The copy of the novel in Trinity College, Dublin, has a pencil annotation identifying the author as 'Miss Driscoll'. Loeber D186 also attributes to Driscoll, Miss —.

1820: 10

[?DIBDIN, Thomas John or ?HALES, J. M. H.]

TALES OF MY LANDLORD, NEW SERIES, CONTAINING PONTE-FRACT 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. A letter from Robert Cadell to Archibald Constable, written at the height of the furore over this allegedly spurious publication,



opens up the possibility of authorship by Thomas John Dibdin (1771–1841). Cadell on 30 Oct 1819 writes: ‘You will see by the Morning Chronicle of this day that John B[allantyne] has got a reply to his letter, it is causing some laughing—and the best is to say nothing more on the subject at present—it is now no quizz—I hear that Thos Dibdin is the author’. Additional support for an attribution to Thomas John Dibdin has been found in OCLC’s attribution of the follow-up work in this spurious ‘new series’ to Dibdin (see *Notes* to 1821: 17 below). As an actor, playwright, and manager of the Surrey Theatre in London, Dibdin adapted a number of Scott’s novels for the stage, this probably representing a main reason for his being connected with the present publication. However, as Sharon Ragaz argues in ‘The Spurious *Tales of My Landlord*’, *The Library*, 7th series, 10:1 (Mar 2009), 41–56 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/library/10.1.41>>, the style in this novel is markedly different from that in known works by Dibdin. As an alternative, Ragaz suggests J. M. H. Hales, whose *The Astrologer; or the Eve of San Sebastian* (1820: 30) bears a number of similarities with the above and was also published by Fearman. Without further corroboration the matter must remain uncertain, with the present weight of secondary evidence probably in favour of Hales, whose other acknowledged novel was *De Willenberg; or, the Talisman* (1821: 42). 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 WorldCat (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 and the *Secret History* were 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: 24

[GALT, John] and VALLADARES [DE SOTOMAYOR, Antonio].

ANDREW OF PADUA, THE IMPROVISATORE; A TALE FROM THE ITALIAN OF THE ABBATE FURBO. AND THE VINDICTIVE FATHER, FROM THE SPANISH OF LEANDRA OF VALLADERRAS.

London: Printed for Sir Richard Phillips and Co. Bride Court, Bridge Street; sold by W. Sams, opposite St. James's Palace, and to be had of all Booksellers, 1820. xiv, 294p. 12mo. 'Price 6s. half-bound and lettered' (t.p.).

BL 1458.d.12; NSTC 2F18650 (NA MH).

*Notes.* Half-title missing, but the following is readable by being faintly mirrored on the preceding blank page: 'The Periodical Novelist, or Circulating Library. Vol. III. Andrew of Padua and the Vindictive Father'. Cf. 1820: 26 and 28(a), below. Preface by the Translator to the first tale, pp. [v]–vii, plus 'Biographical Sketch of the Abbate Furbo', ix–xiv. 'The Vindictive Father, or Lorenzo and Claudia' is without preliminaries, and begins on p. [195]. For a convincing attribution of the first tale to John Galt, see Angela Esterhammer, 'London Periodicals, Scottish Novels, and Italian Fabrications: *Andrew of Padua, the Improvisatore* Re-membered', *Studies in Romanticism*, 48:3 (2009), 469–90. In the same article, Esterhammer identifies the source of the second tale as 'Claudia y Don Lorenzo', one of several inset stories in the 9-vol. novel *La Leandra* written by the Spanish Enlightenment writer Antonio Valladeres de Sotomayor (1738–1820), and published in Madrid 1797–1807; she also speculates whether John Galt might have been the translator in this case. 'Andrew of Padua' has subsequently been edited by Esterhammer as part of her *John Galt, Three Short Novels* (Edinburgh, 2020), pp. 134–223.

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 &amp; 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. Christina Colvin (Oxford, 1971), p. 173). Mrs Blair (1749-1827) was born as Mary Johnson: *ODNB*. See Section B, 1825: 17 for further commentary on the Blairs, and their daughter, the novelist Mary Margaret Busk.

#### 1821: 1

[MATCHAM, George.]

ANECDOTES OF A CROAT.

London: Published by Sherwood, Neely, and Jones, Paternoster Row, 1821.

iv, 425p. 12mo. 5s (ECB).

C Rom.6.31; ECB 19; NSTC 2A12592.

*Notes.* George Matcham (1753-1833) is given as the author in an obituary in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 103: 276-8 (Mar 1833). ECB dates Dec 1821.

Further edn: reissued in an extended form as *Anecdotes of a Croat; or, The Castle of Serai, Comprehending Hints for the Improvement of Public Works, Agriculture, and Domestic Life*, 2 vols., Simpkin & Marshall (compare 1823: 2).

#### 1821: 13

[STEWART, Janet.]

ST. AUBIN; OR, THE INFIDEL. IN TWO VOLUMES.

Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, High-Street; sold also by G. & W. B. Whittaker, Ave-Maria-Lane, London; and W. Turnbull, Glasgow, 1821.

I 316p; II 348p. 12mo. 12s (ECB); 14s boards (ER); 12s boards (ER, QR).

ER 35: 266 (Mar 1821), 35: 525 (July 1821); QR 25: 276 (Apr 1821); WSW II: 32.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48593-2; ECB 511; NSTC 2S1527 (BI BL, NCU).

*Notes.* Copyright Ledger 1, 1818-1826, in the Oliver & Boyd papers (NLS Accession 5000, item 1) includes an entry for this novel on pp. 129-30 which credits payment to Miss Stewart. A letter from Miss Stewart among unsorted papers of the same firm in Accession 5000/191, dated 11 Nov 1824 and written from 'Water of Leith', also enquires as to the success of the work. A letter from James Hogg to 'Miss J. Stuart' of 10 Oct [1808?] is addressed to her at 'Water of Leith', this apparently connecting the author of *St Aubin* with the Jessie Stewart who in 1804 published *Ode to Dr. Thomas Percy, Lord Bishop of Dromore, Occasioned by Read-*

*ing the Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, and who later contributed to Hogg’s periodical *The Spy* (1810)—see ‘Notes on Contributors’ under ‘Janet Stuart’, in *The Spy*, ed. Gillian Hughes (Edinburgh, 2000), p. 569. The above information has been generously contributed by Dr Hughes. This novel has more recently been under reprinted under the author’s name along with a Literary Biography by Richard D. Jackson (Kilkerran, 2013). ER gives price as 14s boards in Mar 1821, and as 12s boards in July 1821. Further edn: 2nd edn. 1824 (NUC).

**1821: 17**

[?DIBDIN, Thomas John or ?HALES, J. M. H.]

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 WorldCat entry (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, and alternatively to J. M. H. Hales, see 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: 25**

[HALL, Agnes (Miss).]

THE MIDNIGHT WANDERER; OR A LEGEND OF THE HOUSES OF ALTENBERG AND LINDENDORF. A ROMANCE. IN FOUR VOLUMES. BY MARGARET CAMPBELL.

London: Printed for A. K. Newman and Co. Leadenhall-Street, 1821.

I 227p; II 224p; III 222p; IV 257p. 12mo. 22s (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 35: 266 (Mar 1821), 36: 280 (Oct 1821); QR 24: 571 (Jan 1821).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47209-1; ECB 95; NSTC 2C4895 (BI BL, C).

*Notes.* A free trans. of *Alexina, ou la vieille tour du château de Holdheim* (Paris 1813), by Mme. Louise Marguerite Brayer de Saint-Léon (Summers). NUC (but not NSTC) catalogues *The Midnight Wanderer* under Brayer de Saint-Léon’s authorship. According to a letter of appeal to the Royal Literary Fund, work on this title derived singly from Agnes Hall, daughter of Agnes Crombie Hall: ‘Miss Hall herself is the authoress of a novel in 3 vols. called “the Midnight Wanderer”, published under the name of Margaret Campbell, by Newman’ (Tom Taylor to Octavian Blewitt, 1 June 1855: Case 223, item 25). For fuller details on Agnes Crombie Hall, and her probable use of Rosalia St. Clair as a pseudonym for original novels, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59 above.

Further edn: According to a note in BN, this work was re-translated into French as a work by Ann Radcliffe under the title of *Rose d'Alternberg, ou le spectre dans les ruines* (Paris, 1830).

**1821: 67**

SOUZA[-BOTELHO], [Adélaïde-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, f. 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).

**1822: 10**

[HACK, Mrs William.]

REFORMATION: A NOVEL. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, 1822.

I 362p; II 303p; III 333p. 12mo. 18s (ECB, ER).

ER 38: 522 (May 1823); WSW II: 30.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48523-1; ECB 484; NSTC 2R5611 (BI BL, C).

*Notes.* A draft letter to William Hack of 1 Aug 1822 in the Longman Letter Books reads: ‘On the other side you have the opinion of our literary friend respecting the Novel you sent us. As it is the first production of the Author we requested our friend to go into detail & if she will make the proposed alterations, we shall be happy to see the MS again, when it is very likely we shall engage in the publication. The MS is forwarded by this nights coach’ (I, 101, no. 311A). The letter is addressed to Hack at Market St., Brighton. The Longman Divide Ledger entry for this novel indicates a balance due to ‘Mrs Hack’ of £7. 8. 6. (dated 1 Feb 1825): this points to the likelihood that *Reformation* was the work of the wife or a female relation of William Hack. It might even be possible to attribute the novel to Maria Barton Hack (1777–1844), a prolific writer of children’s literature, though her

acknowledged first work, *Winter Evenings: Or Tales of Travellers*, appeared in 1818. Mention of the present item being 'a first work' is made in another letter to William Hack, evidently later in 1822, sending further recommendations from the reader and returning the MS (no. 296B).

**1823: 2**

[MATCHAM, George.]

ANECDOTES OF A CROAT; OR, THE CASTLE OF SERAI, COMPREHENDING HINTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, AGRICULTURE, AND DOMESTIC LIFE. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Published by W. Simpkin and R. Marshall, Stationers' Hall Court, 1823. I iv, 425p; II 396p. 12mo. 12s (ECB).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47058-7; ECB 19; NSTC 2C43423 (BI BL).

*Notes.* An extended version of 1821: 1; vol. 1 is identical to the earlier publication, apart from a new t.p. George Matcham (1753–1833) is given as the author in an obituary in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 103: 276–8 (Mar 1833). ECB dates this version May 1823.

**1823: 3**

[LESASSIER, Alexander Hamilton.]

EDWARD NEVILLE; OR, THE MEMOIRS OF AN ORPHAN. IN FOUR VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row, 1823.

I 514p; II 424p; III 442p; IV 418p. 12mo. 28s (ECB, QR); 28s boards (ER).

ER 39: 272 (Oct 1823); QR 29: 280 (Apr 1823); WSW II: 9.

Corvey; CME 3-628-47511-2; ECB 180; NSTC 2N3642 (BI BL, O).

*Notes.* The author is identified, with evidence from the Longman Papers, in Lisa Rosner's *The Most Beautiful Man in Existence: The Scandalous Life of Alexander Lesassier* (Philadelphia, 1990): see especially pp. 154–60.

**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.

**1823: 20**

[?ASHWORTH, John Harvey or ?FRENCH, Augustus.]

HURSTWOOD: A TALE OF THE YEAR 1715. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, Paternoster-Row, 1823.

I v, 241p; II 250p; III 218p. 12mo. 16s 6d (ECB, ER).

ER 39: 512 (Jan 1824); WSW II: 42.

Corvey; CME 3-628-47753-0; ECB 290; NSTC 2A17728 (BI BL, C, O; NA DLC, MH).

*Notes.* Dedication to Archer Clunn, Esq. of Griffynhavel, dated Hallcar, County of Radnor, June 1823. Attributed to Ashworth in H&L and generally in catalogues and bibliographies. However, a letter of 12 Sept 1823 addressed to the Revd Augustus French in the Longman Letter Books, concerning terms, makes no mention of any other author: 'Agreeably to my promise I have examined the MS of "Hurstwood" [*sic*] and the house is willing to engage in the speculation on the terms I explained to you—namely, that the house should be at the expense & risk of Paper, Printing &c &c and that the profits of the first & future editions be divided equally with the author—you will please to inform me if the terms are agreed to, as the Work should appear as early as possible' (1, 101, no. 381A) The letter is addressed to French at Westbury, near Bristol.

**1823: 81**

[WALKER, Anne.]

RICH AND POOR.

Edinburgh: William Blackwood, and T. Cadell, London, 1823.

401p. 8vo. 10s 6d (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 39: 272 (Oct 1823); QR 29: 280 (Apr 1823); WSW II: 198.

Corvey; CME 3-628-48570-3; ECB 492; NSTC 2R8959 (BI BL, C, O; NA MH).

*Notes.* The author is identified as Miss Anne Walker, of Dalry, an intimate friend of Susan Ferrier, in *Memoir and Correspondence of Susan Ferrier 1782–1854*, ed. John A. Doyle (London, 1929), p. 169. See Section B, 1828: 6, for James Hogg's association of this title with 'our lady novelists'.

#### 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: 2

[O'DRISCOL, John.]

THE ADVENTURERS; OR, SCENES IN IRELAND, IN THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, Paternoster Row, 1825.

I iv, 341p; II 321p; III 322p. 12mo. 21s (ER, QR).

ER 42: 514 (Aug 1825), 43: 356–72 (Feb 1826) full review; QR 32: 549 (Oct 1825).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47021-8; NSTC 2A4376 (BI C, E, O).

*Notes.* Identified as O'Driscol's through a sequence of letters in the Longman Letter Books. In a letter to J. O'Driscol Esq of 14 June 1823, the firm state: 'We shall be happy to publish the Tale to which you allude on the plan upon which we publish your work on Ireland, dividing the profits of every edition' (I, 101, no. 369). That the 'tale' relates to the above novel is evident from a sequence of other letters from Longmans written to the widow and her representatives after the author's death. In the last of these, to a Mr N. Vincent, Owen Rees on 31 Oct 1829 writes: 'we will thank you to pay her the inclosed £60, taking a proper receipt, stating it to be a settlement in full for all the Interest of the said John O'Driscol in "Views of Ireland" "The Adventurers" & "The History of Ireland" first edition' (I, 102, no. 106D). O'Driscol's other works include *Views of Ireland, Moral, Political, and Religious* (London, 1823) and *The History of Ireland* (London, 1827), both of

which were published by Longmans. John O'Driscoll had been sent to Dominica as Chief Justice and died there on 3 Jan 1828 (as reported in the *Dublin Evening Packet* of 17 July 1828), this explaining why the subsequent correspondence was with his widow. This is one of four novels which are together given full reviews in ER (Feb 1826) under the page-top heading 'Irish Novels'.

**1825: 5**

[?KNAPP, Henry Hartopp.]

EVERY DAY OCCURRENCES. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Charles Knight, Pall Mall East, 1825.

I 227p; II 262p. 12mo. 14s (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 42: 513 (Aug 1825); QR 32: 267 (June 1825).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47652-6; ECB 194; NSTC 2E14745 (BI BL, C, E, O; NA MH).

*Notes.* Copy at UCLA (PR3991.A1.E93: not seen) identifies author as Rev. Mr Knapp of Eton College. Henry Hartopp Knapp (1782–1846) taught at Eton 1808–34; he was the acknowledged author (as H. H. Knapp) of *Tempora Subsevera: Verses Serious and Comic* (London, 1835). OCLC WorldCat entry (No. 13240061) also attributes to H. H. Knapp on basis of UCLA copy. Colophon of Charles Knight, Printer, Windsor.

**1825: 15**

[DODS, Mary Diana.]

TALES OF THE WILD AND THE WONDERFUL.

London: Printed for Hurst, Robinson, and Co. 5 Waterloo-Place, Pall Mall; and A. Constable and Co. Edinburgh, 1825.

x, 356p. 8vo. 10s 6d (ECB).

WSW II: 53–4.

Corvey; CME 3-628-51167-4; ECB 576; NSTC 2B41787 (BI BL, C, O; NA DLC, MH).

*Notes.* Dedication to Joanna Baillie. Wolff's proposal (vol. 1, p. 111; item 601) of Dods, a friend of Mary Shelley and a contributor to *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, as an alternative solution to the contested issue of George Borrow's authorship of this work, finds incontestable support in two sources. In two letters to William Blackwood, of 16 Jan and 5 May 1825, David Lyndsay discusses details of the work as its author (NLS, MS 4015, ff. 27, 29). David Lyndsay in turn is identified as a pseudonym of Mary Diana Dods by Betty T. Bennett in her *Mary Diana Dods, a Gentleman and a Scholar* (New York, 1991), where this collection of tales is discussed directly as Dods's own (see pp. 23, 64–8). ECB dates Oct 1825. Further edn: Philadelphia 1826 (NSTC).

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 &amp; 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. This title forms part of lists accompanying three appeals by Gillies to the Royal Literary Fund (Case 708, items 5, 8, 19). ECB dates Nov 1825.

Further edn: another trans. 1846 (NSTC).

1825: 83

[WALKER, Anne.]

COMMON EVENTS: A CONTINUATION OF RICH AND POOR.

Edinburgh: William Blackwood, and T. Cadell, London, 1825.

382p. 8vo. 10s 6d (ECB, QR); 10s 6d boards (ER).

ER 42: 266 (Apr 1825); QR 32: 267 (June 1825).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47276-8; ECB 128; NSTC 2W1903 (BI BL, C, E, O; NA DLC).

*Notes.* The author is identified as Miss Anne Walker, of Dalry, an intimate friend of Susan Ferrier, in *Memoir and Correspondence of Susan Ferrier 1782–1854*, ed. John A. Doyle (London, 1929), p. 169n.

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 WorldCat (No. 27635457) attributes New York edn. 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).

1827: 29

[CROWE, Eyre Evans.]

VITTORIA COLONNA: A TALE OF ROME, IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. IN THREE VOLUMES.

Edinburgh: William Blackwood, and T. Cadell, London, 1827.

I 278p; II 247p; III 252p. 12mo. 18s (ECB, QR); 18s boards (ER).

ER 46: 534 (O&T 1827); QR 36: 603 (O&T 1827).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48919-9; ECB 616; NSTC 2E1362 (BI BL, C, O; NA DLC, MH).

*Notes.* The arguments of Wolff (vol. 1, p. 323) for attributing this title to Crowe, as opposed to Charlotte Anne Eaton, find substantial support in the Blackwood Papers, where letters between Crowe and Blackwood directly relating to the composition and production of the novel are found between Mar 1825 and June 1827 (see NLS, MSS 4014, 4106, 4019). In the last of these, Crowe complains that '[t]he second title ... is rather aping Constable's Rome in the 19th Century' (MS 4019, f. 65), this itself alluding to Charlotte Anne Eaton's successful travelogue, *Rome in the Nineteenth Century*, first published by Archibald Constable & Co. in 1820. Confusion caused by the two titles offers the most likely explanation of why Eaton's name became associated with this novel at all.

Further edn: German trans., 1828.

1827: 51

[MAGINN, Daniel Wentworth.]

THE MILITARY SKETCH-BOOK. REMINISCENCES OF SEVENTEEN YEARS IN THE SERVICE ABROAD AND AT HOME. BY AN OFFICER OF THE LINE. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Henry Colburn, New Burlington Street, 1827.

I 347p; II 347p. 12mo. 21s (ECB).

IU 823.M.5991; ECB 384; NSTC 2S3536 (BI BL, C, E, O).

*Notes.* Wrongly attributed in Block and in some library catalogues to William Maginn, but more convincingly identified in Loeber M237 as by Daniel Wentworth Maginn, military surgeon, possibly Irish. Not to be confused with the Revd Henry Woodward, who used the same authorial description, 'an officer of the Line', in the title of *Sketches, Scenes and Narratives. Chiefly of a Religious Tendency* (Dublin, 1828), which as a didactic (evangelical) and partly miscellaneous work was not included in EN2. See also 1829: 58 below. ECB dates Apr 1827.

Further edns: 2nd edn. 1831 (NSTC); New York 1827 (NUC).

1827: 60

[CHETWODE, Anna Maria.]

BLUE-STOCKING HALL. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Henry Colburn, New Burlington Street, 1827.

I iv, 320p; II 328p; III 258p. 12mo. 27s (ECB); 27s boards (ER).

ER 46: 534 (O&T 1827).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47264-4; ECB 63; NSTC 2S6000 (BI BL, C, Dt, O).

*Notes.* Identified as by Miss Chetwode, rather than by William Pitt Scargill, in Rolf Loeber and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber, *18th–19th Century Irish Fiction Newsletter*, January 1998, No. 1. As stated there, Miss Chetwode was the daughter of the Revd John Chetwode of Glanmire (Co. Cork) and the novel is mostly set in Co. Kerry. Loeber C202 reaffirms attribution, adding that author's probable first names were Anna Maria. In the Bentley Publishing Records, however, authorship of the new edn. is ascribed to 'Mrs. WILMOT': see *A List of the Principal Publications Issued from New Burlington Street during the Year 1830* (London, 1893), where the month of publication for a new edn. is given as Aug [1830]. A note there also states: 'A reference to Mrs. Wilmot, or Clifton, will be found in Bentley's Miscellany, volume xvi, page 38'. It is also worth noting that in the earlier manuscript Catalogue of Bentley Publications held by the British Library (Add MSS 46637) the name of William Pitt Scargill was first entered against this publication, and then replaced with 'Miss Wilmot' written in pencil. The name of Mrs Wilmot is expanded to that of WILMOT, afterwards BRAND, Barbarina Baroness Dacre (1768–1854), in Michael Turner's *Index and Guide to the Lists of Publications of Richard Bentley & Son 1829–1898* (Bishop Stortford, 1975), p. 218. This title, however, is not attributed to Barbarina Brand/Dacre/Wilmot in *ODNB*, *CBEL*<sub>3</sub>, or *FC*, and there is no mention of any involvement with this or related works in *A Family Chronicle Derived from the Notes and Letters Selected by Barbarina, the Hon. Lady Grey*, ed. Gertrude Lyster (London, 1908). In view of all the evidence it seems best to stay with the reattribution to Miss Chetwode. Loeber C202 in reaffirming the attribution to Chetwode suggests that instead it is more plausible that Chetwode's sister, Elizabeth as Mrs Wilmot, mediated transactions on her behalf with Bentley. Under its entry 'WILMOT, Mrs —', Loeber (p. 1371) adds 'that a Mrs Wilmot ... was the ascribed author of *A Word to the Landholders of Ireland* (Cork, 1822)' [an attribution which is actually tentative]. For a similar reattribution, see 1829: 74, below.

Further edns: 2nd edn. 1829 (NSTC); New York 1828 (NSTC).

#### 1828: 4

[?CHALKLEN, Charles William and/or ?CHALKLEN, Miss.]

THE HEBREW, A SKETCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: WITH THE DREAM OF SAINT KENYA.

Edinburgh: Printed for W. Blackwood, and T. Cadell, Strand, London, 1828. viii, 232p. 12mo. 5s 6d (ECB).

Corvey; CME 3-628-51037-6; ECB 262; NSTC 2H15773 (BI BL, E, O).

*Notes.* Pp. [221]–232 contain 'The Dream of Saint Kenya' (poem). Surviving letters in the Blackwood papers indicate that the author was either the Revd Charles William Chalklen or his sister. In the first of these, dated 5 Sept 1827, Chalklen urges William Blackwood for a response to manuscripts sent: 'It is odd I shd not yet have heard from you anything of ye "Hebrew" now in your hands—at least in your house. It is by a Lady and my Sister ... I must hear from you a decisive answer



as to whether you will risque ye publication of ye // 1. *Hebrew* // 2. *Sworn Brothers* // 3. *Shadow* // in one volume' (NLS, MS 4019, f. 27). This letter gives Chalklen's address as Kingstead, near Thrapston, Northants. Chalklen's statement that 'The Hebrew' is the work of his sister is repeated in a similar letter of 1 Nov 1827 (f. 29), which refers to 'The "Hebrew" a Tale by my Sister—in my handwriting'; but any authorship other than that by the sender appears to receive sceptical treatment in the reader's report sent by David Macbeth Moir to Blackwood on 3 Oct 1827: 'I return you Charles Chalklands [*sic*] alias Williamson, alias —s MSS which I have carefully read over' (MS 4020, f. 39). No mention of a sister can be found in two letters from Chalklen's father, on 8 Jan and 11 Mar 1828, concerning what appears to be a private financing of 'The Hebrew' with Blackwood handling the public launch (MS 4021, ff. 84, 86). Altogether it is not clear whether *The Hebrew* was primarily written by Chalklen's sister (whose surname might then of course have been different), or by Chalklen himself, though the latter is perhaps more likely. Charles William Chalklen's acknowledged works include *Babylon, a Poem* (London, 1821) and *Semiramis, an Historical Morality, and Other Poems* (London, 1847). ECB dates Mar 1828.

**1828: 7**

[BURDETT, Sarah.]

MARCELLA: OR, THE MISSIONARY ABROAD AND AT HOME. CONTAINING SKETCHES AND INCIDENTS FROM LIFE. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly, 1828.

I 343p; II 287p. 12mo. 15s (ECB, QR).

QR 38: 601 (Oct 1828).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48084-1; ECB 367; NSTC 2M13848 (BI BL, C, E, O).

*Notes.* Listed as the first of her works by Sarah Burdett in an appeal to the Royal Literary Fund of 20 May 1848 (Case 799, item 12). She was also the author of *Poems, with Biographical Notes* (London, 1841). Notice (1 p. un.) after t.p. lists donations (totalling £25) to be made to four Charities, 'If this Work should pass through a Second Edition.'

**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 Gabriel Alexander 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’ (Case 789, item 1). James Rennie, writing on his behalf on 20 Apr 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.

1829: 52

[ROBERTON, Mrs.]

FLORENCE: OR THE ASPIRANT. A NOVEL, IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Whittaker, Treacher, and Co. Ave Maria Lane, 1829.

I 296p; II 293p; III 311p. 8vo. 24s (ECB, QR); 24s boards (ER).

ER 49: 529 (June 1829); QR 41: 287 (July 1829).

Corvey; CME 3-628-47797-2; ECB 209; NSTC 2K3090 (BI BL, C, E, O; NA DLC, MH).

*Notes.* Dedication to the King. NSTC 2R12236 attributes to 'Mrs Robertson', while Wolff (item 5918) lists under 'Robertson, Mrs.'. Towards the end of the novel, Admiral Stanhope, a fierce Protestant, selects 'an arm-full of books and threw them on to the fire' (vol. 3, p. 310). The heroine Florence, however, has the last word: "I shall imagine that the lives of the saints and of martyrs, and the works of highly-talented men, are sending forth a flame as pure as the religion which they professed, and to which they did such honour. But stay—I see a volume which is not worthy to mingle its flames or its ashes with those of such precious matter," and stepping forward she withdrew from the heap "Father Clement." (vol. 3, p. 311) The work is strongly in favour of Catholic Emancipation, featuring Scottish characters and setting, and narrated in a highly polemical tone. Grace Kennedy's death in 1825 and the presence here of a publisher not used for any of Kennedy's other novels argues strongly in favour of this different authorship.

1829: 58

[MAGINN, Daniel Wentworth.]

TALES OF MILITARY LIFE. BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE MILITARY SKETCH BOOK." IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Henry Colburn, New Burlington Street, 1829.

I vii, 335p; II 322p; III 331p. 12mo. 31s 6d (ECB); 31s 6d bound (ER); 28s 6d (QR).

ER 49: 529 (June 1829); QR 41: 287 (July 1829).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48864-8; ECB 575; NSTC 2M9549 (BI BL, C, Dt, E; NA DLC, MH).

*Notes.* I Vandeleur; II Vandeleur; III Vandeleur concluded; Gentleman Gray. Dedication 'to the Colonel of the 42nd (Royal Highlanders,) Lieutenant-General the Right Hon. Sir George Murray, G.C.B. and G.C.H.'. Preface mentions the author having spent the 'greatest part' of his life in the army. Wrongly attributed in Block and in some library catalogues to William Maginn, but more convincingly identified in Loeber M238 as by Daniel Wentworth Maginn, military surgeon, possibly Irish. Wolff (item 7574) had also suggested that the attribution of this title to William Maginn is likely to be wrong. See also revised entry on the *The Military Sketch-book* (1827: 51). It should also be noted that the 1849/51 *Tales of Military Life* (Wolff, item 7575), previously listed as a further edn. under 1829: 58, actually represents yet another work.

Further edns: 1834.

1829: 74

[CHETWODE, Anna Maria.]

TALES OF MY TIME. BY THE AUTHOR OF BLUE-STOCKING HALL. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, New Burlington Street, 1829.

I 297p; II 311p; III 351p. 12mo. 28s 6d (ECB); 28s 6d boards (ER).

ER 50: 284 (Oct 1829); QR 41: 557 (Nov 1829).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48871-0; ECB 575; NSTC 2S6011 (BI BL, C, Dt, E, O; NA DLC).

*Notes.* I Who Is She?; II Who Is She?; The Young Reformers; III The Young Reformers. Identifiable as by Miss Chetwode, rather than by William Pitt Scargill, as a consequence of the identification of 1827: 60 to Chetwode in Rolf Loeber and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber, *18th–19th Century Irish Fiction Newsletter, January 1998, No. 1*. 'The Young Reformers' is set initially in Ireland, and its main character, Albert Fitzmaurice, a Church of Ireland minister, as a young man is introduced to the United Irishmen [from plot summary communicated by Rolf Loeber and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber]. Loeber C203 reaffirms attribution, adding that author's probable first names were Anna Maria. In the Bentley Publishing Records, however, authorship is ascribed to 'Mrs. WILMOT': see *A List of the Principal Publications Issued from New Burlington Street during the Last Three Months of the Year 1829* (London, 1893), where the date of publication is given as 23 Oct. The note there also states parenthetically 'Wrongly attributed in the Bodleian Catalogue to Mrs. Loudon, and in the British Museum catalogue to William Pitt Scargill'. The name of Mrs Wilmot is expanded to that of WILMOT, afterwards BRAND, Barbarina Baroness Dacre (1768–1854), in Michael Turner's *Index and Guide to the Lists of Publications of Richard Bentley & Son 1829–1898* (Bishop Stortford, 1975), p. 218. This title, however, is not attributed to Barbarina Brand/Dacre/Wilmot in *ODNB*, *CBEL3*, or *FC*, and there is no mention any involvement with this or related works in *A Family Chronicle Derived from the Notes and Letters Selected by Barbarina, the Hon. Lady Grey*, ed. Gertrude Lyster (London, 1908). In view of all the evidence it seems best to stay with the re-attribution to Miss Chetwode. Loeber C203 in reaffirming the attribution to Chetwode suggests that instead it is more plausible that Chetwode's sister, Elizabeth as Mrs Wilmot, mediated transactions on hers behalf with Bentley. *OCLC World Cat* (No. 13336186) states also attributed to Mrs J. C. Loudon. See also revised *Notes* to 1827: 60.

#### 1834: 66

[HALL, Agnes Crombie.]

THE PAUPER BOY; OR, THE UPS AND DOWNS OF LIFE. A NOVEL. BY ROSALIA ST. CLAIR, AUTHOR OF BANKER'S DAUGHTERS OF BRISTOL; FIRST AND LAST YEARS OF WEDDED LIFE; ELEANOR OGILVIE; ULRICA OF SAXONY; SON OF O'DONNELL; SOLDIER BOY; SAILOR BOY; FASHIONABLES AND UNFASHIONABLES; CLAVERING TOWER; DOOMED ONE; &C. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for A. K. Newman and Co., 1834.

I 287p; II 296p; III 314p. 12mo. 18s (ECB).

ECB 511 (June 1834).

Corvey; CME 3-628-48498-7; NSTC 2S1998 (BI BL, O); xOCLC.

*Notes.* Previously listed under 'ST. CLAIR, Rosalia [pseud.]'. For identification of Agnes Crombie Hall as the author underlying this pseudonym, see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59 above. Unlike all the preceding novels using the pseudonym, this title is not listed by Hall in her appeal to the Royal Literary Fund of 1843 (Case 555, item 46). However the novels given in the present title as works by the same author, as well as the publisher, make its provenance clear. List of 'New Publications' (1 p. unnn.) at end of vol. 1. Printer's marks and colophons of J. Darling, Leadenhall Street.

B: NEW INFORMATION RELATING TO AUTHORSHIP, BUT  
NOT LEADING TO ATTRIBUTION CHANGES

1800: 22 [CARVER, Mrs], THE OLD WOMAN. A NOVEL. BY THE AUTHOR OF THE HORRORS OF OAKENDALE ABBEY. For an attribution of this novel and three apparent predecessors to the surgeon Sir Anthony Carlisle, see Don Shelton's Report 'Sir Anthony Carlisle and Mrs Carver', *Romantic Textualities*, Issue 19 (Winter 2009) <[http://www.romtext.org.uk/reports/rt19\\_n04/](http://www.romtext.org.uk/reports/rt19_n04/)>.

1801: 10 ANON., MYSTERIOUS FRIENDSHIP: A TALE. Newman Catalogue of 1814 attributes to 'Miss / Mrs. Helme'. It is noticeable that Elizabeth Helme's *St. Margaret's Cave* (1801: 32), where she appears as a named author, was similarly published by Earle & Hemet; but, apart from this, there seems to be little else to connect the two works.

1801: 17 [COLPOYS, Mrs], THE IRISH EXCURSION, OR I FEAR TO TELL YOU. A NOVEL. Loeber C273 expands author name with initial 'A.', though without finding a clear identity.

1802: 41 [MARTIN, H.], HELEN OF GLENROSS; A NOVEL. BY THE AUTHOR OF HISTORIC TALES. Loeber M287 expands forename to **Harriet**. Also notes that part of the story was serialized under the title of 'The history of Mr. Frazer' in the *Universal Magazine* (1802) [Mayo, item 616].

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 trans-

lation of his Travels'. This latter presumably relates to Karamzin's *Travels from Moscow, through Prussia, Germany, Switzerland, France, and England* (London, 1803)—see OCLC WorldCat 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 in 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 edn. 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, laboring 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'.

1803: 75 [WHITFIELD, Henry], LEOPOLD; OR, THE BASTARD. The 'Correspondence' section at the end of Sept 1804 number of the *Monthly Review* includes the following notice: 'The Rev. H. Whitfield requests us to correct the surmise introduced in our last number, p. 424, by stating that he is *not* the author of the Novel intituled *Leopold*' (n.s. vol. 42, p. 112). This in turn casts doubt most immediately on *But Which? or Domestic Grievances of the Wolmore Family. By the Author of "Leopold"* (1807: 67); while other 'Whitfield' titles are also perhaps worth now questioning again (see, e.g., 1816: 58). The only title attributed directly to Henry Whitfield on the original title-page is *A Picture from Life: Or, the History of Emma Tankerville and Sir Henry Moreton. By Henry Whitfield, M.A.* (1804: 70). Noticeably the Preface (pp. [v]–xiv) of this latter offers a scholarly defence of the novel form, followed by 'a Dialogue between a Friend of the Author and himself' (xv–xvii) concerning the use of the author's name (liberally sprinkled with Latin). Another acknowledged publication is *The Christmas Holidays; and Black Monday, or the Boy's Return*



to *School*. In *Blank Verse* (London, 1804), 'By Henry Whitfield, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge'.

1804: 8 ANON., *THE REFORMED REPROBATE*. A NOVEL. Newman Catalogue of 1814 attributes to 'Kotzebue'; but see existing *Notes* to entry for greater likelihood of a connection with August Lafontaine. J. F. Hughes, the co-publisher, was quite capable of encouraging false attributions to high-profile authors, such as August von Kotzebue.

1804: 67 THOMSON, [Anna? or Harriet?], *THE PRIDE OF ANCESTRY: OR, WHO IS SHE? A NOVEL*. BY MRS. THOMSON, AUTHOR OF *EXCESSIVE SENSIBILITY—FATAL FOLLIES—THE LABYRINTHS OF LIFE—GERALDINE—AND ROBERT AND ADELA*, &C. The alternative attribution to Harriet Thomson (née Pigott) now looks highly unlikely. As the *ODNB* entry makes clear Harriet Pigott (1775–1846) never married and her first clear publication was *The Private Correspondence of a Woman of Fashion* (1832). Ann Thomson on the other hand was the wife of the writer William Thomson (1745–1817), and herself a prolific author of novels, apparently beginning with *Excessive Sensibility* (1787: 50). In a postscript to a letter of appeal to Royal Literary Fund of 8 Jan 1817, on behalf of her husband, she adds 'I have written eighteen Volumes of *Trash—Novels—to help out*' (Case 357, item 2). In these circumstances it seems fitting to attribute the authorship exclusively to 'THOMSON, [Anna]'.

1804: 71 WIELAND, C[hristoph] M[artin]; ELRINGTON, John Battersby (*trans.*), *CONFESSIONS IN ELYSIUM, OR THE ADVENTURES OF A PLATONIC PHILOSOPHER*. The question of the identity of John Battersby Elrington, and/or of a connection with Andreas Andersen Feldborg, 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 Crespigny; while advertisements also found in the *Morning Chronicle* and *Star* newspapers for 6 Dec 1805 state that the novel was 'Corrected and revised by Lady Crespigny'. This evidently formed part of a marketing ploy, however, and no mention of direct assistance is found in the ultra-respectful Dedication of the novel to Lady Crespigny signed 'M. C.'. Lady Mary Champion de Crespigny (1748?–1812), née Mary Clarke, is one of most commonly found persons in subscription lists

to novels early in the 19th century. Apart from writing *The Pavilion. A Novel* (1796: 35), she was also the acknowledged author of *A Monody to the Memory of the Right Honourable the Lord Collingwood* (London, 1810).

**1805: 11** ANON., ROSETTA, A NOVEL. BY A LADY, WELL KNOWN IN THE FASHIONABLE WORLD. This title is tentatively attributed to Eliza Parsons by the *Flowers of Literature for 1804*, in a footnote addendum to 'A List of Mrs Parson's Publications': 'We believe, but on this point we cannot be certain, that Mrs Parson's has written "The Wise-ones Bubbled; or, Lovers Triumphant," in two volumes, duodecimo—and another novel, intitled "Rosetta" (p. 27). No other trace of "The Wise-ones Bubbled" has been discovered.

**1805: 68** TEMPLE, Mrs {F.}, FERDINAND FITZORMOND; OR, THE FOOL OF NATURE. A review in the *Flowers of Literature for 1806* identifies the author as the same Mrs Temple whose *Poems* it had reviewed in 1805: 'Her preface is here signed F. Temple: the *Poems* appeared under the name of Laura Sophia Temple' (p. 502). The title is also mentioned in an introductory section on 'Novelists' in the same issue of the journal: 'Mrs. Temple, the fair author of some excellent poems, of which we took ample notice in our preceding volume, has produced a ponderous novel, in five volumes, entitled *Ferdinand Fitzormond*' (p. lxxvii). The combined attribution also gains some credence in view of all three works involved, *Flowers of Literature*, *Ferdinand Fitzormond*, and *Poems* (1805), being issued by the same publisher, viz. Richard Phillips. On the other hand, Laura Sophia Temple (bap. 1783) was only married to Samuel B. Sweetman in 1816, which does not accord with the 'Mrs' in the titles of *Ferdinand Fitzormond* or the initial 'F.' as found in its 'Advertisement'. Sophia's mother (d. 1812), the wife of Lieutenant-Colonel Richard Temple, however was born Frances Hoare, and was evidently the author of a commemorative elegy to her elder daughter Maria Catherine in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 92: 854 (Sept 1802). In these respects there is a much stronger likelihood that she is the true author of the present work. The address 'To the Reader' in *Poems* (London, 1805) is dated 'Chelsea, Dec. 16, 1804'; the 'Advertisement' to *Ferdinand Fitzormond*, London, May 1805. Laura Sophia Temple herself was later author of *Lyric and Other Poems* (London, 1808) and *The Siege of Zaragoza, and Other Poems* (London, 1812).

**1805: 72** [?WYNDHAM, Revd], MEN AND WOMEN, A NOVEL. BY THE AUTHOR OF "WHAT YOU WILL", "TOURVILLE", &C." For a possible alternative to Wyndham as the author of this novel, and others apparently in the same chain (e.g. 1800: 79, 1804: 73), see additional note to Section A, 1808: 18, above.

**1806: 16** ANON., TWO GIRLS OF EIGHTEEN. BY AN OLD MAN. Newman Catalogue of 1814 (in addition to ECB and NCBEL) attributes to George Walker, the author and bookseller, and publisher of the present work.

However, there are distinct differences between this anonymous and now rare title, in terms of its production history, and surrounding novels by Walker, which usually were acknowledged, listed other works by the author in the title, and entered into subsequent edns. It may or may not be significant that vol. 2 of the Corvey copy contains at the end a 1-page advertisement list of 'Books Published and Sold by G. Walker', which begins with four novels by Walker himself, all plainly accredited there as his. The novel itself is a fairly confident direct narrative account of trials and tribulations in contemporary middle-rank society, and has a slightly ogling manner in describing its young heroines. The persona of the 'old man' ('I am too old to write for fame, and too indolent to write for profit': vol. 1, p. 8) is only occasionally obtrusive, and in literal terms does not match the circumstances of Walker, then in his early thirties.

1806: 34 HAMILTON, [Ann] M[ary], THE FOREST OF ST. BERNARDO. BY MISS M. HAMILTON. Attributed to Ann Mary Hamilton on the basis of NSTC etc. However Loeber (p. 553) speculates that Ann Hamilton and Mary Hamilton might represent two separate individuals. Certainly the only clear link with this title in the following chain of novels is *The Maiden Wife: or, the Heiress of De Courcey* (1813: 21), also given on its title-page as by 'Miss M. Hamilton', and described there as 'Authoress of the Forest of St. Bernardo. &c. &c.'. This opens up the possibility of a distinct chain by Mrs Ann Hamilton, for which see entry on 1810: 49 below.

1806: 43 LATHY, T[homas] P[ike], THE INVISIBLE ENEMY; OR, THE MINES OF WIELITSKA. A POLISH LEGENDARY ROMANCE. Casper Wintermans indicates in a personal letter that this is an unacknowledged trans. of Jean-Louis Lacroix de Niré's *Ladouski et Floriska* (Paris, 1801). Comparison between the two texts shows a close resemblance at the beginning, with an apparently wide divergence in plotting and character names thereafter. Probably still best attributable to Lathy, on the basis that this at the most represents a loose translation.

1807: 5 ANON., THEODORE; OR, THE ENTHUSIAST. Newman Catalogue of 1814 states 'from the German of La Fontaine'. A possible clue to a German origin might lie in the Dedication 'to Her Serene Highness the Reigning Duchess of Saxe-Weimar'; but no direct evidence connecting this work with August Lafontaine has been discovered. The plot is distinct from that of *Lobenstein Village* (1804: 34), translated 'from the French [*sic*] of Augustus La Fontaine' by Elizabeth Meeke, this presumably stemming from *Le Village de Lobenstein* (Paris 1802), which itself in its larger title wording claims to be based on the 'roman allemand intitulé *Théodor*', the root German text in EN2 being given as Lafontaine's *Theodor, oder Kultur und Huminität* (Berlin, 1802). The plot proper of *Theodore; or, The Enthusiast* begins at Ch. 2: 'In a village in Swabia, not far from the banks of the Danube, there lived an honest and respectable

family of the name of Rosenthal. The youngest son was 'Theodore'. The main parts have the all the marks of a standard bildungsroman, with Theodore having fantasies about being a soldier, visiting a monastery, etc., and with a number of conversations involving marked speakers ('Fr Anthony'/Rosenthal/Theodore). Its denouement has Theodore revealed as brother of Theresa; and ends with him lying cold on Leonora's grave. Another Theodore is the hero of *Lobenstein Village*, but the story has no similarities with *Theodore; or, the Enthusiast* as described above. This Theodore is abandoned at the doorstep of the philosopher Lindner and his sister Sabina, who decide to adopt him. The village gossips do not believe the story, and rumour that Theodore is the illegitimate child of Sabina (who has recently been ill) and Lindner's friend Senk. This precipitates Senk, who loves Sabina, to propose to her to protect her virtue, and she accepts—after accepting his motives were amorous, not simply exigent. The rumours die eventually, as Lindner brings up Theodore. In the second part of the story, the adult Theodore falls in love with Eloisa, but because of the mysterious circumstances surrounding his birth, Eloisa's mother blocks their union. It transpires that his parents were aristocrats from warring sides, and that Eloisa is Theodore's cousin. Even when his grandfather accepts him, the snobbish Baroness refuses to accept the truth, until a written confession by his mother and an in-person one by his father explaining the circumstances which led them to such extreme measures makes everything satisfactory. The Baroness repents. Theodore and Eloisa marry, and enjoy the benefits of having two fathers in life. Ultimately, this novel is more of a comedy which unravels the mysteries of Theodore's birth, than a tragic bildungsroman. It is entirely possible that *Theodore; or, the Enthusiast* is German in origin, but it is distinct from *Lobenstein Village* apart from having a similarly named hero, and it would seem that this later work is probably not by August Lafontaine. It is not listed as an English translation of Lafontaine in Dirk Sangmeister, *Bibliographie August Lafontaine* (Bielefeld, 1996).

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: 65 (Oct 1807), it was 'written by the same author' 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 (1: 69), drawing in as well *The Royal Investigation; or, Authentic Documents Containing the Official Acquittal of H.R.H. the Princess of Wales* (London, 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'.

1807: 66 THOMSON, [Anna? or Harriet?], LAURETTE; OR, THE CAPRICES OF FORTUNE. A NOVEL. BY MRS. THOMSON. See 1804: 67 above, for a clear attribution to 'THOMSON, Anna'.

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]. This opened up the possibility that this represents a re-translation back, through the French, of Charles Lloyd's *Edmund Oliver* (1798: 42), itself translated into German as *Edmund Olliver, Seitenstück zu Rousseaus Heloise* (Erfurt, 1800); but no further progress to report.

1808: 33 BYRON, ['Medora Gordon'], THE ENGLISH-WOMAN. A NOVEL. The *Orlando* database tentatively lists Julia Maria Byron (1782–1858) as the possible author of the chain of novels by 'Miss Byron', noting also the apparent link of those published as by 'A Modern Antique'. This claim is repeated in Bernard Quaritch Catalogue, 1442 (2020), itemizing a copy of the 3rd edn. of *Celia in Search of a Husband* (1809: 15 below). According to the commentary there, it 'seems unlikely' that a person named Medora Gordon Byron existed, but that Miss Byron may however be 'Julia Maria Byron (later Heath) cousin of the poet and niece of Robert Charles Dallas'. The NYPL Archives & Manuscripts website lists two autograph letters of Julia Maria Byron in the Pforzheimer Collection, the second to R. C. Dallas, signed 9 Apr 1812, discussing Cantos 1–11 of *Childe Harold*. In its entry it also describes her as first cousin to Lord Byron, and states that in May 1816 she married Revd Robert Heath, Fellow in St. John's College. Further information about Julia Maria Byron, and more particularly evidence of any literary output, are however needed before making a positive attribution. With this secured, authorship adjustments would also be required for items 1809: 15; 1809: 16; 1810: 30; 1812: 26; 1814: 15; 1815: 18; and 1816: 21.

1808: 41 DOHERTY, [Ann], RONALDSHA; A ROMANCE. Further information on the author can be found in a note on her from the *Romantic Circles* edn. of Southey's letters, in relation to the following letter: <[https://romantic-circles.org/editions/southey\\_letters/Part\\_Six/HTML/letterEEed.26.3616.html](https://romantic-circles.org/editions/southey_letters/Part_Six/HTML/letterEEed.26.3616.html)>. Under the heading of 'Attersoll, Ann [also known as Ann Holmes, Ann Hunter, Ann Doherty, Ann de la Piguliere] (c. 1786–1831/1832)' it reads: 'Daughter of Thomas Holmes (1751–1827), a wealthy East India merchant, who changed his name to Hunter on inheriting the Gobions estate in Hertfordshire in 1802 from his wife's grandfather. The same year, Ann Holmes eloped, aged sixteen, with Hugh Doherty, an impecunious thirty-year-old Irishman and officer in the Light Dragoons. Their marriage soon broke down, and Doherty published his account of events in *The Discovery* (1807). This revealed how, in an attempt to



prevent the elopement, Ann had been confined by her parents in a “madhouse”, from which he had helped her escape. After her separation from her husband, Ann Doherty (as she was then known) published a number of novels, including *Ronaldsha* (1808), *The Castles of Wolfnorth and Mont Eagle* (1812) and *The Knight of the Glen* (1815). Her personal life remained complex. In 1811 Hugh Doherty successfully sued the architect Philip William Wyatt (d. 1835) for “criminal conversation” with his wife. Her relationship with Wyatt did not last and by 1818 she was referring to herself as Ann Attersoll, probably because she was living with John Attersoll (c. 1784–1822), a wealthy merchant, banker and MP for Wootton Bassett 1812–13. At this time she corresponded with Southey, sending him a copy of her *Peter the Cruel King of Castile and Leon: An Historical Play in Five Acts* (1818). By 1820 (possibly earlier) she was living in France and had dropped the name of Attersoll and adopted that of Madame St. Anne Holmes (much to Southey’s confusion). A French translation of *Roderick, the Last of the Goths*, published in 1821 by Pierre Hippolyte Amillet de Sagrie (1785–1830), was dedicated to her. She remained in France and was later known by the surname de la Pigueliere.’ Authorship of *Peter the Cruel King of Castile and Leon, an Historical Play in Five Acts* (Angers, 1818) is accordingly attributed to Mrs Attersoll in the University of Toronto Libraries’ online ‘Jackson Bibliography of Romantic Poetry’. While this new information does not disqualify the use of the name Ann Doherty for the authorship of this item as well as that of *The Castles of Wolfnorth and Mont Eagle* (1812: 31), ‘by St. Ann’, and *The Knights of the Glen* (1815: 22), it does indicate that the latter two titles were written at a time when that name was probably not in use, as well as providing a link to at least one other work by the same author in a different genre.

1808: 47 GENLIS, [Stéphanie-Félicité, Comtesse] de, SAINCLAIR, OR THE VICTIM OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF MADAME DE GENLIS. According to the concluding comment to a notice of Genlis’s *The Siege of Rochelle* (1808: 48) in the *Critical Review*, the above title was also translated by Robert Charles Dallas: ‘This novel, as well as ‘Sainclair’, which we have already noticed, is translated, as we understand it, by Mr. Dallas, the author of Percival, &c.’: App. to 3rd ser. 13: 525–8 (Jan–Apr 1808). Unlike 1808: 48, however, the present title-page does not attribute the translation to Dallas, and the *Critical Review*’s assertion should be regarded with some scepticism in view of this inequality.

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, below.



**1809: 15** [BYRON, 'Medora Gordon'], CELIA IN SEARCH OF A HUSBAND. BY A MODERN ANTIQUE. Item 18 in Bernard Quaritch Catalogue, 1442 (2020), describing a same-year 3rd edn. of this work, tentatively proposes the true author as Julia Maria Byron. For further details, see entry for **1808: 33** above.

**1809: 41** LATHY, T[homas] P[ike], \*LOVE, HATRED, AND REVENGE; A SWISS ROMANCE. Casper Wintermans indicates in a personal letter that this might turn out to be an unacknowledged trans. of François Pagès's *Amour, haine et vengeance* (Paris, 1799). Such a work is quoted by Maurice Lévy, *Le Roman 'gothique' anglais, 1762–1824* (Paris, 1995), p. 477, but no further information about this French title has been discovered.

**1809: 61** ?RADCLIFFE, Mary Anne or [?KER, Louisa Theresa Bellenden], MANFRONÉ; OR, THE ONE-HANDED MONK. A ROMANCE. BY MARY ANNE RADCLIFFE. The Corvey copy of the 2nd edn. (1819) has on its title-page 'by Mary Anne Radcliffe, Author of The Mysterious Baron, &c, &c.'. This would appear to refer to *The Mysterious Baron, or the Castle in the Forest* (**1808: 91**), whose author is given as 'Eliza Radcliffe' on its title-page. Both authorial names have a spurious feel to them, but behind might lie a common author. See **Addendum 2** for a report on the tangled issue of the authorship of *Manfroné* and other related titles.

**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.

**1810: 49** HAMILTON, Ann [Mary], THE IRISHWOMAN IN LONDON, A MODERN NOVEL, IN THREE VOLUMES. BY ANN HAMILTON. Attributed to Ann Mary Hamilton on the basis of NSTC etc. However Loeber (p. 553) speculates that Ann Hamilton and Mary Hamilton might represent two separate individuals. Unlike *The Forest of St Bernardo* (**1806: 34**; see above) the author here is described as 'Ann' rather than 'Miss M'. Hamilton, a nomenclature which is followed through with **1811: 37, 38, 39** (all by 'A. Hamilton') and **1812: 32** ('by Mrs. Hamilton'). This sequence of novels also forms a unit though linkage of other works as 'by the author' on the title-pages. Loeber notes a possible connection with an Irish author of verse named Ann Hamilton. Irish components are also found in the above novel along with **1811: 37** and **1812: 32**; whereas this is presumably not the case with **1806: 34** and **1813: 21** as associated with 'M. Hamilton'. However as both novels at the head of these two chains were published by J. F. Hughes, a notorious inventor of names, care perhaps need so be taken before establishing 'real' authorial identities.

**1810: 74** SCOTT, Honoria [pseud.?], *A WINTER IN EDINBURGH; OR, THE RUSSIAN BROTHERS; A NOVEL*. Further support for identification of the author as Susan Fraser can be found in a contemporary review of her *Camilla de Florian, and Other Poems* (London, 1809), 'By an Officer's Wife', in *The Satirist, or, Monthly Meteor*, 5: 300–3 (Sept 1809): 'Mrs. Fraser, the author of the little volume now under our consideration ... it appears is the lady of an officer in the 42d regiment; that gallant body of hardy Highlanders, who, wherever the British standard has been unfurled have covered themselves with glory. From an address to the reviewers, prefixed to the work, we learn that Capt. Fraser is now in an ill state of health, produced by wounds received in the service of his country' (p. 301). *Camilla de Florian* itself contains a dedication to the Duchess of York signed Susan Fraser, as well as a list 'Subscribers' Names'. Its publisher, J. Dick of Chiswell Street, London, also features in the imprint of the present title as well those of 1810: 72, 1810: 73, and 1813: 54, the other three novels supposedly written by Honoria Scott. In light of the above evidence, and the interest shown in both the Spanish Peninsular War and Scottish themes across both genres, it seems reasonable now to replace the author line of the four novels involved with '[?FRASER, Susan]'.

**1811: 31** Edgeworth, Mrs, *FATHERLESS FANNY; OR, THE MEMOIRS OF A LITTLE MENDICANT, AND HER BENEFACTORS. A MODERN NOVEL, IN FOUR VOLUMES. BY MRS. EDGEWORTH. AUTHORESS OF "THE WIFE; OR, A MODEL FOR WOMEN," &C. &C.* London 1821 edn., published by Thomas Kelly, on its main title-page gives as 'by the Author of "The Old English Baron," &c. &c.' [i.e. Clara Reeve]. Loeber R25 describes a lost manuscript novel by Reeve, speculating that the theme or parts of this may have been used later in *Fatherless Fanny*.

**1811: 47** [?JOHNSTONE, Anthony Gregory], RHYDISEL. *THE DEVIL IN OXFORD*. Author's forename should be 'Andrew' not 'Anthony', this corrected name now accurately reflecting that in the Bodleian Library Catalogue, which itself may result from special knowledge. Restoration of the correct name now makes it possible to move further to a possible identification of the author. Andrew Gregory Johnston[e], who died 1850 in his 65th year, is listed as the owner of a slave plantation in Anchovy Valley, Portland, Jamaica (see 'Legacies of British Slave-ownership' <<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/person/view/2146630665>>). According to this record, he was in Britain until c. 1830, and had bought Fritton Hall [in Suffolk] in 1819. He is also listed as owning slaves in Portland, Jamaica, in the 1817 Jamaica almanac; and ownership may well have come earlier in the form of an inheritance. In this light it is interesting to note two incidents in the novel touching on slavery. In the first, a Henry lord Olbion talks fulsomely about emancipating all slaves, while 'a young gentleman just arrived from West Indies' accepts the basic principle but argues for a more gradual approach in view of the economic ramifications: 'I know with what ease a speculator traverses the

continent of Africa in imagination, and disposes the government of his country to communicate liberty and equality to all the inhabitants; but let it be remembered that he is no loser by his philanthropy: whereas, every gentleman in the West Indies, that liberates a slave ... resigns a considerable part of his estate, and also presents the enfranchised man with an annuity for life' (vol. 1, pp. 27–8). A sense that the above represents an authorized viewpoint is reinforced when Olbion in the aftermath, on a hurry to make chapel, abuses a beggar woman and knocks out one of the eyes of her child. The subject comes into view later in the novel (and with a hint of personal knowledge) through the story of a man in the West Indies who usurps property there, depriving his nephews of their rights, and, having returned to England and married, later considers endowing a College. In the process he is bitten by a mad dog, leading to further reduction of his rear through surgery: 'cutting, carving, burning, and cauterizing, till he had scarce any thing left to sit or lie on' (vol. 2, pp. 197–8). Allowing two years in advance of the actual publication of the novel in July 1811, the 'West Indian' Johnstone would have been about 23 at the time of writing. This identification gains further support from the British Library copy which reportedly bears the following attribution on the verso of its title-page: This novel was written by my dear [ingenious?] friend Andrew Gregory Johnstone when a very young man. W. A. D. H.' In view of this, it would seem reasonable now to give the author as '[JOHNSTONE, Andrew Gregory]', that is with the forename as Andrew and minus the question mark.

**1811: 69** ROSE, Edward [H.], THE SEA-DEVIL, OR, SON OF A BELLOWS-MENDER. TRAGI-COMIC ROMANCE OF THE PRESENT DAY. BY EDWARD ROSE, SEAMAN. Loeber R264 expands 'H.' in author name to 'Hampden', placing his death in 1810 at Naval Hospital, Stonehouse (Scotland); though acknowledging that this would make the appearance of the present work posthumous.

**1812: 10** ANON., MY OWN TIMES, A NOVEL. The Longman 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: 17** ANON., \*WILLIAM AND AZUBAH; OR, THE ALPINE RECESS, A NOVEL. Newman Catalogue of 1814 attributes to A. J. Montrion. But for a fuller attribution, see new entry for this novel under **Section D**.

**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 immediate credence from the record of the latter's appeals to the Royal Literary Fund. A letter of 27 Aug 1814 to the Fund (Case 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' (Case 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 Bayley's last desperate appeal to the RLF 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 Apr 1815, 'Malcolm Douglas. In 3 Volumes. Printed for Hookhams 15 Old-Bond Street' is listed as one of seven published works by her (RLF, Case 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?].

1812: 63 [?WATSON, Miss], ROSAMUND, COUNTESS OF CLARENSTEIN. The question mark qualifying the attribution, hitherto based on the MS inscription in the Harvard copy, can now be removed in the light of two letters by Dorothy Wordsworth. The first, to Jane Marshall of 2 May 1813, reads: 'I write merely to request that you will send Miss Watson's Novel as soon as

you have done with it' (*The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: III: The Middle Years*, ed. Ernest De Selincourt, 2nd edn., rev. by Mary Moorman and Alan G. Hill (Oxford, 1979), vol. 2, p. 95). Another letter of 18 Feb 1815 to Sara Hutchinson, commenting on Anna Maria Porter's *The Recluse of Norway* (1814: 46), states: 'There is a good deal of Miss Watson in the colouring of the Ladies [i.e. Porter sisters]; and when love begins almost all novels grow tiresome' (ibid., vol. 2, p. 203). Support for this definitely being the daughter of Richard Watson (1737–1816), Bishop of Llandaff, is found in a later letter of 26 Feb 1826, where Dorothy writes of 'Watson's of Calgarth (the Bishop's Daughter)', the Watsons having settled at Calgarth in 1789 (*The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: V: The Later Years*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, 2nd edn., ed. and rev. by Alan G. Hill (Oxford, 1979), vol. 1, p. 95).

**1813: 1 ANON., DEMETRIUS, A RUSSIAN ROMANCE.** Some light is thrown on the authorship in a letter of 6 Jan 1813 to Revd William Manley in the Longman Letter Books: 'We were duly favored with your letter & the life of Demetrius which we have perused with pleasure; and if you & the authoress approve we will undertake the publication of it on the same plan as we publish the works of Mrs Opie & several other of our authors—we to print the work at our own risk & divide the profits of every edition with the author. // We could put the work to press as soon as we receive your answer. // The title we consider as rather of two [*sic*] classical an appearance for a novel & we would recommend the author to think of a more popular nature' (1, 98, no. 4). Taken at face value, this indicates female authorship, with Manley acting as a go-between; on the other hand, some room ought perhaps to be allowed for Manley himself having a more direct hand in the composition than acknowledged. Evidently, in this case Longmans' advice over the title led at best only to modification.

**1813: 14 COXE, Eliza A., LIBERALITY AND PREJUDICE, A TALE.** A subscription novel published by B. & R. Crosby & Co., and the only work normally accredited to the author. But did she possibly follow on from this very competent performance with other (anonymous) publications? A letter in the Longman Letter Books to 'Miss Cox', dated 9 Apr 1821, is tempting in this respect: 'As we have now little or no demand for two or three of your novels, it is our intention to dispose of the remainder in a sale which we shall be making to the trade which will enable us to settle the account with you' (1, 101, no. 112). Another contender might be Frances Clarinda Adeline Cox, the identified author of *The Camisard; or, the Protestants of Languedoc* (1825: 21), though in this instance the publisher was G. B. Whittaker. At the same time, the present title might relate to yet another author, whose identity is otherwise unknown.

**1813: 37 JOHNSON, Mrs D., \*THE BROTHERS IN HIGH LIFE; OR, THE NORTH OF IRELAND. A ROMANCE, IN THREE VOLUMES. BY MRS D. JOHNSON.** University of Reading holds copy of 1813 1st edn., with imprint

'London: Printed for G. Kearsley, No. 46, Fleet Street, 1813'. See new entry under **Section D**. Loeber J32 expands author name to Mrs David Johnson.

**1813: 47** [PHIBBS, Mary], *THE LADY OF MARTENDYKE; AN HISTORICAL TALE OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY. BY A LADY*. Loeber P55 provides secondary evidence concerning the family of William Harloe Phibbs (probably the same as William H. Phibbs, one of the subscribers), sheriff of Co. Sligo in 1814, while summarizing the Irish ingredients in the novel. A connection with Mary Phibbs, named author of the drama *Alice Western; or, the Dangers of Coquetry* (London, 1855) is also mentioned. The possibility of a childish game being involved in the autograph substitution of Mary Phibbs for 'A Lady' in the ViU copy however still remains.

**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 *An Invisible Traveller, or Peep into Bond-Street*: "Why—the book! Don't you know, that the P\*\*\*\*\* is the vilest fellow that ever breathed; and the dear charming P\*\*\*\*\* the most virtuous and most injured creature in the whole world ..." (vol. 1, pp. 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'.

**1814: 36** [JOHNSTONE, Christian Isobel], *THE SAXON AND THE GAËL; OR, THE NORTHERN METROPOLIS: INCLUDING A VIEW OF THE LOWLAND AND HIGHLAND CHARACTER*. A near-contemporary acknowledgment of Johnstone's authorship can be found in Mrs Hughes of Uffington's *Letters and Recollections of Sir Walter Scott*, ed. Horace G. Hutchinson: 'A Mrs. Johnson is the author of the Saxon and the Gael (of which Sir W. and Hogg spoke well)' (London, 1904), p. 328. For Hogg himself referring to the work, but without mentioning an author, see Peter Garside 'Reviewing Scott: A Hogg Notice of *Guy Mannering* in the *Caledonian Mercury*', *Studies in Hogg and His World*, 19 (2008), 66–80. One rumour in Edinburgh, reported by J. G. Lockhart to a friend in a letter of 28 Feb 1815, claimed that the author was John Pinkerton, 'on account of his notorious scurrility and hatred of Edinburgh': *The Life and Letters of John Gibson Lockhart*, ed. Andrew Lang, 2 vols. (London, 1897), vol. 1, p. 74.



1816: 22 CONSTANT DE [REBECQUE], Benjamin [Henri]; [WALKER, Alexander (*trans.*)], ADOLPHE: AN ANECDOTE FOUND AMONG THE PAPERS OF AN UNKNOWN PERSON, AND PUBLISHED BY M. BENJAMIN DE CONSTANT. An account of this first English translation, together with valuable details concerning Alexander Walker, the translator, can be found in C. P. Courtney, 'Alexander Walker and Benjamin Constant: A Note on the English Translation of *Adolphe*', *French Studies*, 29:2 (Apr 1975), 137–50. As Courtney describes, Walker (1779–1852) was a medical student in Scotland, and contributor to several medical journals, who came to London to seek literary work, and was in communication with Constant (who had also studied at Edinburgh University) during the latter's visit to England (Jan–July 1816). Walker went on to have a prolific literary career of his own, writing or contributing to a variety of medical and scientific works, and acting from 1824 as the general literary editor of the hugely ambitious though short-lived *European Review*, whose aim was to publish edns. simultaneously in four different languages. Walker was evidently committed to the Encyclopaedic ideal, and a strong sense that all knowledge is related underlies a succession of more popular informational works produced in the 1830s, including *The Nervous System* (1834), *Intermarriage* (1838), *Women Psychologically Considered* (1839), and *Female Beauty* (1837), the last nominally at least by Mrs Alexander Walker. Library catalogues, however, have sometimes failed to link the translator of Constant with the 'physiologist' Alexander Walker, and indeed there has been a more endemic failure to bring the whole *oeuvre* under one single identified author. A copy of Walker's somewhat eccentric pamphlet *The Political and Military State of Europe, 1807; an Address to the British Nation* (Edinburgh, 1807) reportedly contains a list of other works by Walker in preparation, including novels, though without precise titles for the novels being given.

Additional information about the original edns. of *Adolphe* in French that shortly preceded the above translation can be found in Courtney's meticulously detailed *A Bibliography of Editions of the Writings of Benjamin Constant to 1833* (London, 1981), pp. 47–62. Whereas the 1816: 22 entry merely states 'Paris, 1816' for the French original, in actuality there were clearly two separate edns. in French, one published from London and one from Paris, the London edn. slightly ahead of the other. The first of these (Courtney 18a) bears the imprint of Henry Colburn (London) and Tröttel [*sic*] & Wurtz (Paris); this was entered at Stationers' Hall on 7 June 1816, having been delivered on 30 Apr to the London printers Schulze & Dean. The first Paris edn. (Courtney 18b), published by Treuttel & Würtz in association with Colburn, and presumably set from proofs sent from London, appears to have been published on or about 15 June 1816. A 2nd edn. (Courtney 18c), effectively a reissue of the first Colburn French edn., with new preliminaries and the addition of a 'Préface de la seconde édition', was probably first issued in July or Aug [additional source: first advertisement in *Morning Chronicle*, 17 Aug 1816]. Walker's translation (Courtney 18i), another Colburn production, incorporates the same Preface, and a copy was apparently

entered at Stationers' Hall on 3 Sept 1816. A useful summary of the chronology of the different edns. can also be found in C. P. Courtney, 'The Text of Constant's *Adolphe*', *French Studies*, 37:3 (July 1983), 296–309 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/fs/XXXVII.3.296>> (pp. 296–7); while similar bibliographical information also features in the Introduction to the same author's edn. of *Adolphe* (Oxford, 1989).

**1817: 13** [?BELL, Nugent], ALEXENA; OR, THE CASTLE OF SANTA MARCO, A ROMANCE, IN THREE VOLUMES. EMBELLISHED WITH ENGRAVINGS. The author is identified as Nugent Bell on the title-page of the 2nd vol. of the National Library of Ireland copy of *Alexena* [detail initially communicated by Rolf Loeber]. This copy (press mark J823), as re-examined by Jacqueline Belanger, has 'By Nugent Bell, Esq.' in vol. 2 only, immediately after the title, with 'Embellished with engravings' being demoted to after the epigraph: each vol. also carries the imprint of A. K. Newman at the Minerva Press, and not that of Brett Smith, Dublin (as found in the last 2 vols. of the of the University of Virginia copy used for the EN2 entry). It is possible that the name of Nugent Bell also appears in the Virginia copy, but, if so, this was not recorded at the time of inspection. It definitely does not occur in the title of vol. 2 of the copy held by the University of Illinois at Urbana. The surname Nugent, which echoes the Jacobite song 'Grace Nugent' and was also that of a prominent Irish Catholic family, reinforces other indications of an Irish provenance for this work. Loeber (B140) suggests that the author may be connected with the genealogist Henry Nugent Bell (1792–1822).

**1818: 50** [?PHILLIPS, John], LIONEL: OR, THE LAST OF THE PE-  
VENSEYS. 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 Catalogue, 154, 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: 13** \*ANON., THE METROPOLIS. A NOVEL, BY THE AUTHOR OF LITTLE HYDROGEN, OR THE DEVIL ON TWO STICKS IN LONDON. See new entry under **Section D**.

**1819: 23** [BALFOUR, Alexander], CAMPBELL; OR, THE SCOTTISH PROBATIONER. A NOVEL. A useful account of this novel, and the three others written by Alexander Balfour (see 1822: 17, 1823: 21, and 1826: 12), can be found in David Macbeth Moir's 'Memoir' of the author in Balfour's posthumously-published *Weeds and Wildflowers* (Edinburgh, 1830). Whereas the above novel was published from Edinburgh by Oliver & Boyd, its three successors were published by A. K. Newman at the Minerva Press, this offering a fairly unusual instance of a domiciled Scottish fiction writer publishing in London at the height of the indigenous 'Scotch Novel' (James Hogg provides another instance). Moir offers a critical commentary on each title, with that on *Highland Mary* (1826: 12) pointing to two levels of esteem in the fiction industry: 'if we seldom find it in the boudoir of the great, the circulating-library copies are dog-eared, and thumbed to tatters,—no very uncertain criterion (whatever be Mr. Hazlitt's theory) of its merits' (p. lxxxv).

**1819: 29** [BUSK, Mrs M. M.], ZEAL AND EXPERIENCE: A TALE. See **1825: 17** below, for a positive identification of the author of this title and TALES OF FAULT AND FEELING as **Mary Margaret** Busk. Both titles are attributed to her in *ODNB*.

**1819: 49** MOORE, Mrs Robert, EVELEEN MOUNTJOY; OR, VIEWS OF LIFE. A NOVEL. OCLC WorldCat (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.

**1819: 67** [TAYLOR, Jane], THE AUTHORESS. A TALE. Attributed in the Tyrrell's Circulating Library Catalogue (1834) to 'Miss Taylor', this offering an element of contemporary support for the tentative attribution in EN2 of this and allied titles to Jane Taylor.

**1820: 28(a)** GENLIS, [Stéphanie-Félicité, Comtesse] de, PETRARCH AND LAURA. BY MADAME DE GENLIS. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH. For the possibility that the translator might be John Galt, see Angela Esterhammer, 'London Periodicals, Scottish Novels, and Italian Fabrications: *Andrew of Padua, the Improvisatore* Re-membered', *Studies in Romanticism*, 48:3 (2009), 469–90 (p. 481); and new commentary regarding **1820: 24** in Section A above.

**1820: 32** HEFFORD, John, CRESTYPHON, A THEBAN TALE: AND THE VANDAL ROBBERY, A CATHARGINIAN TALE. OCLC WorldCat (No. 13323716) attributes to both John Hefford and Mrs A. Yossy, the latter reflecting the attribution in UCLA Library Catalog to 'Madame 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"' (Case 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., London, 1815), the poor returns for which is a subject of complaint in an earlier letter of Yossy's to RLF headed 24 May 1825 (Case 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 Hefford 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. BY THE AUTHOR OF "PARGA." &C. &C. 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 is 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' (Case 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' (Case 444, item 3). All four novels in the chain are listed by title and date in a later appeal to RLF in 1842 (Case 444, item 14): the same application also listing the poem *Parga* (London, 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 ad-

dress 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: 4 ANON., CONCEALMENT. A NOVEL.** Attributed in a note by Wolff (item 7433) to Mary Fletcher (1802–?), but on a misreading of his source from *Notes & Queries*, 215 (Oct 1970), 382–3. The article in question, “The Authorship of “Concealment””, by Dorothy R. Scheele, unequivocally concerns the novel of the same title published by Bentley in 1837, which on her evidence is clearly attributable to Mary Fletcher (later Richardson), the youngest daughter of Eliza Fletcher (1770–1858), the wife of the Scottish lawyer Archibald Fletcher and herself leader of an Edinburgh intellectual-literary circle. After the publication of this 1837 novel, in a letter of Sept 1838, Eliza Fletcher wrote to Allan Cunningham: ‘He [Bentley] offered to take the risk of the publication and to share the profits with the author—at the end of a year and a half he sends her an acct. charging between £30 & £40 for advertizing the Book—ten percent upon the copies sold—which after deducting the Expense of paper and printing leaves her a profit of 10/!!! So much for a Lady’s authorship.—He owns to the sale of between 200 and 300 Copies. I mention this in confidence—you will not allow it to go further’ (NLS, MS 2617, f. 90). Along with *Concealment, or the Cascade of Llantwarryhn* (1801: 27), by the shadowy Mrs E. M. Foster, this means there were at least three novels with the lead title *Concealment* published between 1800 and 1837.

**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 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 moral-didactic 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.

**1821: 22 [BENNET, William], THE CAVALIER. A ROMANCE.** NSTC in listing the Philadelphia 1822 edn. held at Harvard notes: ‘sometimes attributed Thomas Roscoe junior’. Two further ‘Bennet’ titles, *The King of the Peak* (1823: 23) and *Owain Goch* (1827: 16), are given in CBEL<sub>3</sub> as by Thomas Roscoe (1791–1871), the son of William Roscoe. The dedication of *The King of the Peak* to the Mayor of Liverpool might also seem to promote the idea of a Roscoe/Liverpool connection. Furthermore, several of the letters addressed



to William Bennet Esq in the Longman archives appear at points to indicate that he is the agent rather than actual author. See, for example, the firm's letter of 7 Jan 1823: 'If your friend can fix on any other good title, it may be as well not to take that of "King of the Peak": for, though it may be explained away in the Preface, at first it will be considered as an adoption of part of the title of Peverell of the Peak' (Letter Book I, 101, no. 338). On the other hand, there can be no denying the Derbyshire credentials of this set of novels; and, in this particular instance, the author responded in his Preface by asserting that 'there are many respectable gentlemen in the county of Derby, who can bear witness that I intended publishing this work under the title it bears, before there was any annunciation of Peveril of the Peak' (vol. 1, p. xvi). Especially telling in this regard is the family copy described in Wolff (vol. 1, p. 71; item 385), with a note laid in saying 'These books were written by my great grandfather William Bennet under the pseudonym Lee Gibbons'. William Bennet (1797–1879) was born in Liverpool but operated as a solicitor and attorney in Chapel-en-le-Frith in the Peak District from about 1819; he is also the supposed author of the local ballad 'The Drunken Butcher of Tideswell'. Roscoe in turn published his more substantial works from the 1820s, but his known output consists mainly of translations and travel writings. In the circumstances, it seems best to stick with Bennet as the sequence of novels beginning with *The Cavalier*.

**1822: 9** ANON., NO ENTHUSIASM; A TALE FOR THE PRESENT TIMES. Bettison Catalogue states 'by the Author of Happiness'. This indicates the same author wrote *Happiness; a Tale, for the Grave and Gay* (1821: 6), whose main publisher was also Francis Westley, and for information relating to the authorship of which see **1821: 6** above.

**1822: 13** ANON., THE VILLAGE COQUETTE; A NOVEL. BY THE AUTHOR OF "SUCH IS THE WORLD." Bettison Catalogue attributes 'Village Coquet, a Novel' to 'Mrs. Macnally'. If the attribution is correct this would also affect *Such is the World* (1821: 15), as well as offering a potential link with *Eccentricity: A Novel* (1820: 50), where 'Mrs. Mac Nally' is acknowledged as author on the title and whose 'Advertisement' is signed 'Louisa Mac Nally'. But whereas *Eccentricity* is a co-publication of J. Cumming in Dublin and Longmans, the two other novels were published by G. and W. B. Whittaker alone. The signature 'F. J.' dated at Kensington in the Preface to *The Village Coquette* is also hard to square with authorship by Mac Nally, and noticeably in the same Preface the author refers to *Such is the World* as 'my first novel' (p. vi). In her own 'Advertisement' to *Eccentricity*, moreover, Mac Nally, in complaining about the association of her name with 'an anonymous Publication, not of very recent date', promises 'to annex my name (as to the present) to any future Composition which I may be inclined to present to the public'. In all, there appears to be no good reason to link Mrs Mac Nally's acknowledged novel with the two later works; though on a broader front, the possibility of there being two 'Village Coquettes', or



even two Mrs Macnallys, should perhaps not be overlooked. Stephen J. Brown, *Ireland in Fiction: A Guide to Irish Novels, Tales, Romances, and Folk-Lore* (1919; reprinted New York, 1970), lists *The Pirate's Fort* (1854) under Louisa M'Nally (see his item 1069), though as if by a separate writer of the same name. OCLC WorldCat treats the authors of *Eccentricity* and *The Pirate's Fort* as the same. Loeber (p. 844) identifies Mrs Louisa Mac Nally (b. after 1767) as the daughter of the Revd Dr Robert Edgeworth of Lissard (Co. Longford) and Charlotte Roberts, and thus distantly related to Maria Edgeworth.

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

**1822: 80** [WHITE, Joseph Blanco], VARGAS: A TALE OF SPAIN. The view that Joseph Blanco White is the author of this novel is defended by Martin Murphy, in "The Spanish "Waverley": Blanco White and "Vargas", *Atlantis: Revista de la Asociación Española de Estudios Anglo-Norteamericanos*, 17 (1995), 168–80.

**1822: 81** [WILKINS, George, and others?], BODY AND SOUL. Further evidence of an involvement by the Revd Shepherd in this work have been found in the Longman Letter Books. A letter to Revd G. Wilkins of 11 Aug 1823 begins: 'We are willing to publish the new edition of Body & Soul on the terms which were suggested by Mr. Orme to Mr. Shepherd & agreed to by your letter of the 9th—namely to pay you down half the profits on publication, by a note at 6 months' (1, 101, no. 396E). Another letter, directly to the Revd. Mr Shepherd, dated 31 Jan 1824, offers to 'publish your "Liturgical Considerations" on the same terms we did "Body & Soul"', adding later: 'As to the statement of Acc[oun]t of the final settlement of "Body & Soul", we must refer you to Dr Wilkins, who was supplied with copies of all the accounts, & with whom all settlements were made' (1, 101, no. 420). Mention of 'Liturgical Considerations' in this second letter helps identify the addressee as the Revd William Shepherd, Rector of Margaret Roding (Essex), who published *Liturgical Considerations; or an Apology for the Daily Service of the Church, Contained in the Book of Common Prayer* (London, 1824). Of course, Shepherd's interest in *Body and Soul* could have been other than as co-author, though this role seems most likely, especially in view of the use of the 'by one of the authors of Body and Soul' as an authorial description in later works (see also **1825: 88**, below).

**1823: 30** CRUMPE, Miss [M. G. T.], ISABEL ST ALBE: OR VICE AND VIRTUE. A NOVEL. BY MISS CRUMPE. Author's name should be correctly rendered as 'CRUMPE, Miss [Mary Grace Susan]' (Loeber C549).

**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 (Case 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.

**1823: 86** [WILSON, James], THE FIRE-EATER. There appear to be two possible candidates for the authorship as generally attributed to James Wilson. 1) James Wilson (1795–1856), the zoologist and younger brother of John Wilson (the 'Christopher North' of *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*). In *Peter's Letters to His Kinsfolk* ('2nd edn.', Edinburgh, 1819), J. G. Lockhart describes the young Wilson 'as no less a poet than a naturalist', adding that 'he has already published several little pieces of exquisite beauty, although he has not ventured to give his name along with them' (vol. 1, p. 258). However, the list of his publications that concludes James Hamilton's *Memoirs of the Life of James Wilson, Esq. of Woodville* (London, 1859) lists only scientific publications. Some encouragement might possibly be found in the dedication of this novel to John Wilson, though signaling one's brother in this way could have risked looking odd by the standards of the day. 2) James Wilson (d. 1858), son of Major Wilson, Royal Artillery. This Wilson is on record as having been admitted to the Faculty of Advocates in Edinburgh in 1807, then qualifying as an English Barrister, after which he served as Chief Justice of Mauritius 1835–57. The record in Stephen and Elizabeth Walker's *The Faculty of Advocates, 1800–1986* (Edinburgh, 1987) also adds that he was an 'Author' (p. 194). In this light it is interesting to note the NLS Catalogue's description of the author of *The Fire-Eater* as 'Wilson, James (Advocate)'. There is a letter presumably from the same Wilson to Lockhart of 16 Oct 1824, from Lincoln's Inn Fields. Here Wilson repeats his willingness, already expressed to Lockhart before leaving Edinburgh, to fill up his vacation with literary work: 'In this matter you could serve me much, by letter of introduction to the quarters which you think most likely to serve my views.—Since I have the misfortune to enjoy so little, if any, of the acquaintance of Sir Walter Scott, it would perhaps be idle in me to hope that he would interest himself in my favour' (NLS, MS 935, f. 272). The second (and last) novel attributed to James Wilson is dedicated to Sir Walter Scott, 18 May 1824 (see **1824: 98** below). Both these Wilson novels have French settings, and involve military situations, the first concerning a plot against the Bourbons in the wake of Waterloo, the second being set at the time of Marlborough's campaigns. This second James Wilson's father being a Major in the Royal Artillery might best explain such choices of subject, and in view of all the evidence he seems the more likely candidate for the authorship.

**1824: 8** ANON., THE HUMAN HEART. Entered under EDLMANN, Frederick J., in Wolff (item 1999), but on the rather shaky grounds of a presentation copy with the bookplate of Frederick J. Edlmann, Hawkwood, and an

inscription in hand ‘Maryann Edlmann from her affectionate brother, the Author’. As Wolff conceded, Edlmann may be the married name of the inscriber’s sister, in which case the book remains anonymous; but there is also the possibility that the inscription is fanciful of part of a family game. In these circumstances, any ascription to Edlmann must be highly speculative.

**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 Longman 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. Moore is an eye-catching pseudonym. A Dennis George Lubé was the author of *An Analysis of the Principles of Equity Pleading* (London, 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 Book 1, 202, no. 67A).

**1824: 98** [WILSON, James], *TOURNAY; OR ALASTER OF KEMPENCAIRN*. For discussion as to the identity of James Wilson as author see entry for **1823: 86** above. Interestingly this novel is attributed to R. P. Gillies in *Catalogue of the Library at Abbotsford* (Edinburgh, 1838), along with *Old Tapestry* (see Section A, **1819: 47**). Examination of the Abbotsford copy, however, reveals no handwritten inscription of the kind that might indicate Gillies, the dedication there to Scott being part of the printed text.

**1825: 17** [BUSK, Mrs M. M.], *TALES OF FAULT AND FEELING. BY THE AUTHOR OF “ZEAL AND EXPERIENCE”*. Clear identification of the author as **Mary Margaret** Busk (1779–1863) can be found in Ellen Curran, ‘Holding on by a Pen: the Story of a Lady Reviewer’, *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 31:1 (Spring, 1998), 9–30. Busk, whose literary career followed the financial

difficulties of her father (Alexander Blair) and husband (William Busk), is described there as a prolific contributor to the reviews, her many other publications including several histories, translations and children's books. It would also appear that it was this writer's parents who are being referred to by Maria Edgeworth in a letter of 4 Mar 1819: 'After spending at the rate of ten thousand a year in high London society he died almost ruined leaving his widow scarce £400 a year. She now writes novels if not for bread for butter' (*Letters from England, 1813–1844*, ed. Christina Colvin (Oxford, 1971), p. 173). For novels now identified as by Mrs Alexander Blair, see Section A, 1820: 38 and 1823: 14.

1825: 23 [?CROWE, Eyre Evans or ?PHIPPS, Constantine Henry, Marquis of Normanby], THE ENGLISH IN ITALY. Copy owned by Peter Garside has 'by Eyre Evans Crowe' written beneath the title in the 1st vol., apparently in a contemporary hand. Further evidence in favour of Crowe's authorship appears in the Bentley Publishing Records, where 'The English at Home, By the Author of "The English in Italy," etc.', entered as published on 27 May 1830, is given as 'By Eyre Evans Crowe, son of a military officer of the same name, who received £500 for the copyright': see *A List of the Principal Publications Issued from New Burlington Street during the Year 1830* (London, 1893). The same note continues: 'Mr. Crowe was French Correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle*, and afterwards Editor, for some time, of the *Daily News*. "The English at Home" was preceded by two other novels from his pen, "The English in France," and "The English in Italy." Mr. Crowe died in 1868.' It is also worth noting that the same attribution is found in the earlier manuscript Catalogue of Bentley Publications held by the British Library (BL Add MSS 46637), covering the years 1829–37. The evidence in favour of Crowe's rather than Phipps's authorship of this title, as well as of *Historiettes* (1827: 28) and *The English in France* (1828: 34), now seems overwhelming. Attributed to Crowe in Loeber C545.

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 (Case 507). See also 1823: 56 above.

1825: 88 [?WILKINS, George or ?SHEPHERD, Revd], THE VILLAGE PASTOR. BY ONE OF THE AUTHORS OF BODY AND SOUL. See 1822: 81, above, for the identification of the Revd Shepherd as William Shepherd, Rector of Margaret Roding (Essex). Re-examination of the correspondence in the Longman Letter Books indicates that early in 1825 the firm was dealing with Wilkins about the 2nd edn. of the *Two Rectors* (1824: 97) at much the same time as apparently offering terms to Shepherd for *The Village Pastor*. The full text of the key letter to the Revd Mr Shepherd on 17 Feb 1825 reads: 'We have received a letter from Dr Wilkins, in which he consents to the insertion of "by one of the authors of Body & Soul" in the title of the "Village Pastor". // The expense of advertising such small volumes being so great a proportion to the

other expences, the utmost terms we can propose you are, for an edition of 1250 copies, £50 immediately, & should the edition be sold off within twelve months after the publication £20 more' (I, 101, no. 495A). Another letter, this time to the Revd Dr Wilkins, dated 21 Feb 1825, indicates that Wilkins was threatening a change of publisher: 'We thank you kindly for your very friendly letter; and we certainly should feel concerned to see your works published by another house. Before therefore we deliver your letter to Messrs Rivington, we beg leave to propose terms, which we hope will be satisfactory to you, for an edition of 1500 copies (the number we would advise to be printed) viz—on publication of the edition, we will without your having to wait the event of the sale pay you in cash half the balance of probable profits.' (I, 101, 494B). A postscript to this letter, adding 'We have arranged with Mr Shepherd respecting the publication of his works', also encourages the view that parallel negotiations were taking place for separate works by these two Anglican clergymen. If this interpretation is followed, then it can be seen that Wilkins himself also adopted the wording 'by one of the authors of *Body and Soul*' for the 2nd edn. of *The Two Rectors* (see 1824: 97), an intention relayed in a postscript of Longmans' letter to Shepherd of 17 Feb 1825: 'Dr W. in the next edition of "The Two Rectors" intends to say "by one of the authors of B & S & the V. P.' While some problematical elements remain, it now seems more likely that William Shepherd, in addition to playing a part in the writing of *Body and Soul*, was the single author of *The Village Pastor*.

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, 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.

1826: 38 [GILLIES, Robert Pierce], TALES OF A VOYAGER TO THE ARCTIC OCEAN. NSTC 2G10257 states sometimes attributed to George Robert Gleig, though other entries there more conventionally ascribe to R. P. Gillies. Nonetheless this title, and the second series of *Tales of a Voyager* (1829: 33), seem to sit awkwardly with other contemporary works by Gillies. In his *Memoirs of a Literary Veteran* (3 vols., London, 1851), Gillies's narrative covering the years 1825–30 highlights only one novel: 'Returning to town at Christmas 1829 ... the first use I made of my little gasp of time was to finish a book, "Basil Barrington" for which Mr. Colburn paid me £200 before it was written' (III, 213). *Basil Barrington and His Friends* (1830: 50) mentions no other works 'by the author' on its title-page, which seems an odd omission since Colburn was also the publisher of both series of *Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean*. Two other works published in the early 1830s, *Ranulph de Rohais* (1830: 51) and *Thurlston*



*Tales* (1835: 46), published by William Kidd and John Macrone respectively, do however describe themselves as 'by the Author of "Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean"'. Both these latter are likewise conventionally attributed to Gillies, though whether by title association or for more substantive reasons is a moot point. Certainly, viewed as whole, the two series of *Tales of a Voyager* together with *Ranulph de Rohais* and *Thurlston Tales* appear to form a distinct group, with *Basil Barrington* lacking any visible connection with any of its constituents.

Further doubt is cast by the records of the Royal Literary Fund, which include a series of appeals made by Gillies and lastly his widow, which as a matter of course meant providing lists of his works. "Basil Barrington and his Friends" in three vols. published by Colburn' is given prominence in Gillies's first letter to the society on 20 June 1831 (Case 708, item 1), and was subsequently listed in appeals made in 1838, 1846, 1850, and 1859 (items 5, 8, 19, and 28). At no point on the other hand is there any mention of the two series of *Tales of a Voyager to the Arctic Ocean*, *Ranulph de Rohais*, or *Thurlston Tales*. Certainly in his appeal of 1850, Gillies introduced the possibility that not all his writings were included: 'I regret to say that some of these are the only part of my published works which it is *in my power* to obtain & submit to the society' (item 19). But it is unlikely all four novels would be suppressed or difficult to find; and, unless other supportive evidence can be found, Gillies's authorship of 1826: 38, 1829: 33, as well as 1830: 51 and 1835: 46, must be considered as at least doubtful. For a fuller discussion of Gillies's output, and works wrongly attributed to him, see 'Shadow and Substance: Restoring the Literary Output of Robert Pearse Gillies (1789–1858), by the present reporter, in *Romantic Textualities*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.106>>.

1826: 42 HALL, Mrs A. C., OBSTINACY. The author initials can now be confidently expanded to Agnes Crombie (for whom see updated *Notes* to 1819: 59, Section A). This work is listed separately from the original novels associated with the pseudonym Rosalia St. Clair in Hall's 1843 appeal to the Royal Literary Fund (Case 555, item 46), as 'a tale for Youth' published by Longmans. In a letter of 1828 to the Fund, Hall claimed that she had received no profit from the work: 'Calling a short time ago at Messrs Longman & co. to obtain a settlement for a small work published nearly two years ago I had the mortification to hear from Mr. Orme ... that no emolument whatever was likely to be derived from it' (item 2). Previously the terms undertaken with Longmans had been described in a letter of 6 Jan 1826 written on her behalf by George Dyer: 'I have also lying before me an agreement between Messrs Longman and Add Booksellers, and Mrs Hall dated 19 Sept 1825, and signed by both parties, relating to a Tale to be called *Obstinacy*, which waits(?) to be published by Longman and Co and the profits shared between them ... Mrs Hall has also translated a good deal from the French' (Case 223, item 20). This is evidently the only standard work of fiction to have been published under Hall's true name.



1826: 47 [HUDSON, Marianne Spencer], *ALMACK'S A NOVEL*. A different authorship is suggested by a letter of Maria Edgeworth to Miss Ruxton, 8 Apr 1827: 'I know who wrote *Almack's*. Lady de Ros tells me it is by Mrs Purvis, sister to Lady Blessington; this accounts for both the knowledge of high, and habits of low, life which appear in the book' (*Life and Letters of Maria Edgeworth*, ed. Augustus J. C. Hare, 2 vols. (London, 1894), vol. 2, p. 150). In this case, however, gossip would appear to have been misleading. (The accepted author's married name was Mrs Robert Hudson.)

1826: 58 MARTEN, Ambrose, *THE STANLEY TALES, ORIGINAL AND SELECT. CHIEFLY COLLECTED BY THE LATE AMBROSE MARTEN, OF STANLEY PRIORY, TEESDALE*. Previously attributed to Ambrose Martin, though the name is more evidently part of the fiction. Such is noted in a contemporary review in the *Literary Chronicle*, which observes how the framework is 'concocted in humble imitation of the Waverley fashion of ushering in a novel or a story'. The same review also notes that the 'collection of tales is published in monthly parts', each being 'ornamented with a respectable engraving' (21 Oct 1826, p. 661). One possible clue towards the true authorship is found in an obituary of Charles Robert Forrester in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 187: 545 (May 1850), which in listing his earlier publications notes that 'He also wrote for the "Stanley Tales"' (vol. 187, p. 545). This presumably underlies the statement in the present *ODNB* entry for Forrester that 'In 1826–7 he contributed to the *Stanley Tales*'. Forrester is the recognized author of the nearby novels *Castle Baynard; or, the Days of John* (1824: 35) and *Sir Roland. A Romance of the Twelfth Century* (1827: 30), both written under the pseudonym of Hal Willis. In view of the above information, and the possibility that multiple authorship was involved, it would seem safest for the moment to revise the author line to 'MARTEN, Ambrose [pseud.]', with additions to the *Notes* pointing to Forrester's likely involvement. The *Notes* field should also now observe publication in monthly parts.

1826: 68 [SCARGILL, William Pitt], *TRUTH. A NOVEL BY THE AUTHOR OF NOTHING*. As noted in EN2, NCBEL states not by Scargill, which in turn helped encourage there a questioning of his authorship of two others in an apparent chain, *Elizabeth Evanshaw, the Sequel of Truth* (1827: 61) and *Penelope; or, Love's Labours Lost* (1828: 70: see below). The 'Advertisement' to *Elizabeth Evanshaw*, however, leaves little doubt that it is by the author of *Truth*, and also discusses religious issues in a way which might encourage one to associate both novels with Scargill, an Unitarian minister who later became an adherent of the established church. The attribution by Rolf Loeber and Magda Stouthamer-Loeber of *Blue-Stocking Hall* (1827: 60) and *Tales of My Time* (1829: 74) to Anna Maria Chetwode, rather than to Scargill, now raises the question of whether the above three novels actually represent Scargill's true output at this time. If so, the issue also remains of their relationship to

*Truckleborough Hall* (1827: 62), *Rank and Talent* (1829: 72), and *Tales of a Briefless Barrister* (1829: 73), conventionally attributed to Scargill, and all upmarket novels published by Henry Colburn, for which see entry for 1827: 62 below.

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: 13 [ANWYL, Edward Trevor], TALES OF WELSH SOCIETY AND SCENERY. The Bodleian pre-1920 catalogue attributes this to Thomas Richards, Surgeon. Attribution to Richards also in BLC. If this were accepted, then it would have a knock-on effect with regard to *Youth and Manhood of Edward Ellis* (1829: 14), effectively the same work, and open up the possibility that Edward Trevor Anwyl, as found on the title-page of *Reginald Trevor; or, the Welsh Loyalists* (1829: 13), is a pseudonym.

1827: 28 [?CROWE, Eyre Evans or ?PHIPPS, Constantine Henry, Marquis of Normanby], HISTORIETTES, OR TALES OF CONTINENTAL LIFE, BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE ENGLISH IN ITALY." See entry on 1825: 23, above.

1827: 62 [SCARGILL, William Pitt], TRUCKLEBOROUGH HALL; A NOVEL. Notwithstanding recent doubts as to whether this title as well as *Rank and Talent* (1829: 72) and *Tales of a Briefless Barrister* (1829: 73), all upmarket novels published by Henry Colburn, should be unquestioningly treated as by Scargill, the records of the Royal Literary Fund indicate that they are almost certainly his. A letter from Mrs Scargill to C. P. Roney (4 Jan 1837), concerning subscriptions to the posthumous *The Widow's Offering* (London, 1837), gives *Truckleborough Hall* as the first work by the author to be listed in the title-page (RLF, Case 839, item 5). Two cuttings from the *Morning Chronicle* of 1855 included in the file (item 8) also give as among the author's works: *Truckleborough Hall*, *Rank and Talent*, and *Tales of a Briefless Barrister*. No mention is made at any point of *Truth. A Novel by the Author of Nothing* (1826: 68), *Elizabeth Evanshaw, the Sequel of Truth* (1827: 61), and *Penelope; or, Love's Labours Lost* (1828: 70) (see entry for 1826: 68 above; also 1828: 70 below), which are more problematically connected with Scargill.

1828: 1 ANON., DE BEAUVOIR; OR, SECOND LOVE. A letter from George Croly to William Blackwood, 21 Jan 1828, identifies the author as a female acquaintance: 'A lady, the widow of an officer, & a friend of mine, has just published a Novel, *De Beauvoir, or Second Love* which strikes me as *clever*, & of which she has prodigious anxiety to have some notice taken in the more

prominent publications. I should wish to oblige her by some *short* account of two or three pages of Criticisms in your Magazine ... The book is graceful & vigorous, a particular novel without any of the stupidities & affectations of boudoir & drawing room knowledge which have brought the name into disrepute' (NLS, MS 4021, f. 126). Longman Divide Ledger 2D, p. 46, has 'Mrs Foot, 45 Sloane Square' written at top right corner of entry for this title. 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 WorldCat (No. 47870384) interestingly describes *Amatory Proceedings of a Well-Known Sporting Colonel with Miss Foote, and Numerous Ladies of All Descriptions* [London, 1830], part of no. 3 of *Amatory Biography, or Lives of the Seductive Characters of Both Sexes of the Present Day*.

1828: 6 ANON., THE LAIRDS OF FIFE. James Hogg in his story 'Sound Morality' (1829) implies female authorship with a confidence which might indicate personal knowledge concerning this Edinburgh-published work: 'there is another person whom we have long lost sight of, like the greater part of our lady novelists, who introduce characters for the mere purpose of showing them off (*vide* The Laird o' Fife, Rich and Poor, and a thousand others)': see *Contributions to Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine: Volume 2 1829–1835*, ed. Thomas C. Richardson (Edinburgh, 2012), p. 36. For *Rich and Poor* and its new attribution to Anne Walker, see Section A, 1823: 81, above. As Richardson notes 'both novels use allegorical names for negatively-portrayed characters, such as Nabob, Mammon, the Marquis of Vainhall, the Honourable Laetitia Alicia Aloof, and Captain and Mrs Sham' (p. 367).

1828: 13 ANON., THE CAPTAIN'S LOG BOOK: INCLUDING ANECDOTES OF WELL KNOWN MILITARY CHARACTERS. Tyrrell's Circulating Library Catalogue (1834) gives the author as Capt. Frizelle; but no author of this name has been discovered.

1828: 34 [?CROWE, Eyre Evans or ?PHIPPS, Constantine Henry, Marquis of Normanby], THE ENGLISH IN FRANCE, BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE ENGLISH IN ITALY." See entry on 1825: 23 above.

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* (London, 1827), which is more positively identifiable as

by Henry Luttrell (1765?–1851). OCLC WorldCat (No. 20312659) and various entries within COPAC all currently attribute *Life in the West* to 'Deale, Mr.'

**1828: 70** [?SCARGILL, William Pitt], PENELOPE: OR, LOVE'S LABOUR LOST. A NOVEL. With regard to the problematical issue of Scargill's authorship of the chain of three novels beginning with *Truth* (1826: 68) is perhaps worth noting that Henry Crabb Robinson evidently had no doubts about this particular title, as well as an apparently 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. Edith J. Morley (London, 1938), vol. 1, p. 358.

**1829: 17** BEDINGFIELD, Mrs [Mary] Bryan, LONGHOLLOW: A COUNTRY TALE. This author published a vol. of poetry as Mrs Bryan, and there are entries for her as such in Virginia Blain *et al.*, *Feminist Companion to Literature in English* (London, 1990), and in J. R. de J. Jackson, *Romantic Poetry by Women* (Oxford, 1993), though neither say that she later published a novel. Of her life, and relationship with Walter Scott, Sharon Ragaz communicated the following. 'Mary Bryan first wrote to Scott on 10 June 1818 (NLS, MS 3889, ff. 115–17), saying that she would soon be sending him a parcel. She also enclosed an extract of a favourable notice in the *Critical Review* of her *Sonnets and Metrical Tales* (Bristol, 1815). The parcel, containing a printed vol.—probably the book of verse—and a manuscript, she sent on 27 June, with a letter identifying herself as the widow of a Bristol printer, mother of six children, and debt-encumbered. There are eight letters from her in the Walpole Collection of letters to Scott: the final one is dated 25 Sept 1827 (NLS, MS 3905, ff. 7–10). About 1819 she married James Bedingfield (a physician or surgeon—her late husband's doctor and the dedicatee of the 1815 book) and moved to Stowmarket. Her letters to Scott concern her various literary attempts; she sent him various MSS which he apparently responded to with suggestions (though none of his letters to her have been found). Scott evidently advised her to write a domestic tale, and the final letter describes how she eventually did so. She asks if she can send the MS for his perusal, and states that in writing it she "resolved to keep in mind a few general instructions you were then so good as to suggest for that purpose". This must have been *Longhollow*. The Preface to *Longhollow* includes mention of the Waverley novels that echoes comments she makes in a letter of 22 July 1818 (NLS, MS 3889, ff. 155–7). A copy of *Longhollow* is at Abbotsford.' It is worth adding that no mention of this later work is found either in Jonathan Wordsworth's Introduction to the facsimile edn. of *Sonnets and Metrical Tales* (Poole, 1996).

**1829: 31** [CRUMPE, Miss M. G. T.], GERALDINE OF DESMOND, OR IRELAND IN THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH. AN HISTORICAL ROMANCE. Author's name should be correctly rendered as **CRUMPE, Miss Mary Grace Susan** (Loeber C550.)

1829: 33 [GILLIES, Robert Pierce], TALES OF A VOYAGER TO THE ARCTIC OCEAN. SECOND SERIES. For doubts concerning Gillies's authorship of this and related titles, see to 1826: 38 above.

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

APPENDIX F: 1 [ISDELL, Sarah or ?PILKINGTON, Mary], \*FITZHERBERT. A NOVEL. Reference to this novel is possibly made, though under a slightly different name, in an appeal by the Irish author Sarah Isdell to the Royal Literary Fund in a letter of 20 Feb 1810, Case 246, item 1. In this she describes how having come to London, with two novels already to her name, she had unsuccessfully offered her 'Novel of Faulkner' to a number of publishers, ending with 'Mr Crosby' who had offered to publish it only if it could be deferred to the following year. It is not improbable then that the novel might have subsequently passed further down chain of respectability to J. F. Hughes (an ex-associate of Crosby), with whom the publication of *Fitzherbert* in 1810 is associated, nor that in such hands the original title might have been altered to one scandalously matching that of a rumoured secret wife of the Prince of Wales.

1830: 51 [GILLIES, Robert Pierce], RANULPH DE ROHAIS. A ROMANCE OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY. BY THE AUTHOR OF "TALES OF A VOYAGER TO THE ARCTIC OCEAN." For doubts concerning Gillies's authorship of this and related titles, see to 1826: 38 above.

1832: 66 [NORTON, Caroline Elizabeth Sarah; née SHERIDAN], RICHARD OF YORK; OR, "THE WHITE ROSE OF ENGLAND." The attribution to Caroline Norton has been questioned by a correspondent, and now looks doubtful. The source for the attribution is the NSTC record 2N10695, which gives the author of the New York 1835 edn. as 'Norton, Caroline Elizabeth Sarah, Hon. Mrs. George Chapple Norton—afterwards Stirling-Maxwell, Lady ... 1808–1877.' None of the other NSTC records list the 1832 edn. under Norton's name, and the attribution must be regarded as questionable. It is generally understood that between the publication of *The Undying One, and Other Poems* (London, 1830) and 1835, when her 3-vol. *The Wife and Woman's Reward* (1835: 72) appeared, Caroline Norton's work consisted only of poems and short stories published in magazines.

1833: 7 ANON., WALTZBURG: A TALE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. James Burmester Catalogue, 74 (2009), item 166, describes copy with inscription on two of the endpapers 'With the Author's love', and an inscription on the title-page reading 'by Frances Rose'. Copy reportedly has the Rose family bookplate. See also 1835: 9 below. Further information about the identity of

Frances Rose could lead to full attribution; though, for the moment, the possibility of a family game being involved remains a possibility.

**1833: 78** ZSCHOKKE, [Johann Heinrich Daniel], GOLDENTHAL: A TALE. Lady Maria Callcott (1785–1842) was evidently involved in publishing this work, and in addition to revising the text appears to have paid the printing costs. In a letter of 12 Dec 1833 to the Hon. Caroline Fox she observes: 'I myself have been paying very dear for Goldenthal—nay at nearly twice the above rate' (BL Add. MS 51962). The translator seems likely to have been Marianne Skerrett (1793–1887), who was the niece of T. J. Mathias, and later part of Queen Victoria's household, probably because of her connection, through Callcott, with the Holland House set.

**1834: 35** {H}[AYLEY], {W}[illiam] {T.}, DOUGLAS D'ARCY; SOME PAS-SAGES IN THE LIFE OF AN ADVENTURER. Author surname should be correctly spelled as 'HALEY'. Thanks are due to Marie Léger-St-Jean for pointing this out.

**1835: 9** ANON., PENRUDDOCK, A TALE. BY THE AUTHOR OF 'WALTZBURG.' James Burmester Catalogue, 74 (2009), item 165, describes copy with inscription on the title of vol. 1 to 'Philippa Rose from her affectionate mother', and an erased inscription on the same title reading 'by Frances Rose'. Copy reportedly has the Rose family bookplate. See also **1833: 7** above.

**1835: 46** [GILLIES, Robert Pierce], THURLSTON TALES: BY THE AUTHOR OF "TALES OF A VOYAGER TO THE ARCTIC OCEAN." For doubts concerning Gillies's authorship of this and related titles, see to **1826: 38** above.

#### C: NEW TITLES FOR POTENTIAL INCLUSION

**1800**

[WOOD, Sally Sayward Barrell Keating.]

\*JULIA AND THE ILLUMINATED BARON: A NOVEL FOUNDED ON RECENT FACTS, WHICH HAVE TRANSPIRED IN THE COURSE OF THE LATE REVOLUTION OF MORAL PRINCIPLES IN FRANCE.

London: W. Row, 1800–1.

2 vols. 12mo. 8s (Bento3).

No copy of first edn. located.

*Notes.* Originally published Portsmouth, NH, 1800. Details in entry from 2nd edn. at Indiana University (OCLC WorldCat No. 42940726): not seen. OCLC entry gives author as 'P. Barrell', apparently in error. Format from Bento3.

Further edn: 2nd edn. 1801 (OCLC).



1801

ANON.

THE MORAL LEGACY; OR, SIMPLE NARRATIVES.

London: Printed for William Miller, Old Bond Street, 1801.

xi, 359p. 8vo. 7s boards (CR); 7s (ECB).

CR 2nd ser. 33: 354 (Nov 1801); WSW I: 80.

BL 1578/2364; ECB 395, NSTC M3116 (BI O).

*Notes.* 'Introduction', pp. [v]–xi, signed 'Editor' and dated 'London, April 10, 1801'. This claims that contents derive from narratives collected and bequeathed by a philanthropist friend. The constituent stories (all in the first person) are: 'The Gamester', pp. [1]–35; 'The Passionate Man', 36–50; 'The Envious Woman', 5–67; 'The Vain Man', 68–99; 'The Libertine', 100–22; 'The Prodigal', 123–51; 'The Miser', 152–95; 'The Enthusiast', 196–265; 'The Adulteress', 266–359. Further edn: 2nd edn. 1808 (BL 1507/197).

1801

[?BRYER, Henry] and/or {?W., J.}.

EIGHT HISTORICAL TALES, CURIOUS AND INSTRUCTIVE: I. THE UNFORTUNATE DAMASCENES. II. JETZER. III. ARDEN OF FAVERSHAM. IV. THE GOWRIE CONSPIRACY. V. MASANIELLO. VI. THE CAMPDEN WONDER. VII. THE MYSTERIOUS LETTERS. VIII. IVAN THE THIRD.

London: Printed for J. Johnson, No. 72, St. Paul's Churchyard, by H. Bryer, Bridewell Hospital, Bridge Street, 1801.

viii, 284p, ill., map. 12mo. 4s 6d (CR).

CR 2nd ser. 35: 113 (May 1802); WSW I: 36.

BL 12612.c.2; ECB 82; NSTC T112 (BI E, O).

*Notes.* Dedication 'To that Kind Relative, Who Watched over his Helpless Youth with Paternal Care.' 'Prefatory Invitation', signed 'J. W.', notes: 'A few of these [fabled romances] are offered to your perusal; be persuaded to turn awhile from the artful fictions of the novel-writer to the volume before you' (p. v). List of 'Tales and Authorities', pp. vii–viii. 'The Unfortunate Damascenes', [1]–62; 'Jetzer', 63–84; 'Arden of Faversham', 85–130; 'The Gowrie Conspiracy', 131–58; 'Masaniello', [159]–190; 'The Campden Wonder', 191–225; 'The Mysterious Letters', 226–42; 'Ivan the Third', [243]–284. ECB lists under Bryer (H.), this probably relating to Henry Bryer, the printer, who was associated with a number of historical works at this period, including *A Lilliputian History of England, from the Norman Conquest* (1806). BLC, following signature, gives as '[By J. W.]'

1803

HUNTER, [Rachel].

LETTERS OF MRS. PALMERSTONE TO HER DAUGHTER; INCULCATING MORALITY BY ENTERTAINING NARRATIVES. BY MRS. HUNTER OF NORWICH. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed by W. Robberds, Norwich; and sold by Longman and Rees, Paternoster-Row, 1803.

I xiii, 232p; II, 222p; 256p. 8vo. 15s boards (CR).

CR 3rd ser. 3: 118 (Jan 1804); ER 3: 258 (Oct 1803).

p.c.; NSTC H3175 (BI BL, O).

*Notes.* Dedication signed Rachel Hunter, Norwich, 1 June 1803. 'Advertisement', similarly signed, refers to her preceding novels, *Letitia; or, the Castle without a Spectre* (1801: 35) and *The History of the Grubthorpe Family* (1802: 32), stating that her intention had been to reserve 'the introduction of her own name' to the present work. 'A Dialogue Between the Author and her Reader, Mr. Not-At-All' (pp. [vii]–xiii). Fourteen tales in all, some of which such as 'Hamet, an Allegorical Tale' (vol. 3, pp. 42–110) are of a considerable length. Ostensibly offering moral instruction from a mother to her daughter, these 'letters' display a range of modes with a fairly complicated layering of narrative voices, placing the work at a level of 'juvenile' literature comparable to Maria Edgeworth's *Moral Tales* (1801: 25) and Jane Taylor's *Display* (1815: 50). This title also features as one of the works 'by the author' on the title-pages of all of her four remaining works of fiction (1804: 26, 1806: 36, 1807: 30, 1811: 46), so inclusion now might be said to complete her *oeuvre* as a novelist.

Further edn: 1810.

1804

HARLEY, George [Davies].

CIRCUMSTANCES RESPECTING THE LATE CHARLES MONTFORD, ESQ. BY GEORGE HARLEY, ESQ.

Liverpool: Printed by J. M'Creery, Houghton-Street, 1804.

I 154; II 124p. 8vo. 5s (ECB).

WSW I: 298.

BL 12614.g.20; ECB 255; NSTC H589.

*Notes.* Dedication 'To the Memory of Charles Montford, This Little Volume, the Feeble Record of his Character, I Give and Dedicate.' Listed under 'Novels' in *British Critic*, 24: 559–60 (Nov 1804), which states 'There can be no doubt, that at least the greater part of these "Circumstance" are imaginary and fictitious' (p. 559). A play, purportedly written by 'my departed friend', begins with new arabic pagination: 'Love in Marriage. A Comedy, in Five Acts.' BLC and ECB treat George Harley as pseudonym. ECB dates Sept 1804.

1804

[LINDAU, Wilhelm Adolf.]

HELIODORA, OR THE GRECIAN MINSTREL. IN THREE VOLUMES. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF BARON GÖTHE.

London: (Printed by T. Plummer, Seething-Lane, Tower-Street,) for R. Dutton, 45, Gracechurch-Street, 1804.

I 235p; II 187p; III 211p. 12mo. 12s (ECB); 10s 6d sewed (ER).

ER 4: 498 (July 1804).

BL 12547.a.10; ECB 234; NSTC L1661 (BI C).

*Notes.* Trans. of *Heliadora, oder die Lautenspielerin aus Griechenland* (Meissen, 1799/1800). Half-titles read 'Heliadora, or the Grecian Minstrel'. 1p. unnl. list of 'Books, Published by R. Dutton, (Circulating Library,) No. 45, Gracechurch-Street, London' at ends of vols. 2 and 3. BLC correctly gives 'W. Lindau' as author of original work; it is possible that the association with Goethe in the present instance was aimed at stimulating greater interest. ECB lists under Goethe, as 'Helidora; or, the Genuine [*sic*] minstrel', and dates Apr 1804. Listed under 'Novels and Romances' in Kinnear's main Catalogue as 'from the German of Goethe', and reviewed under 'Novels and Tales' in the *Anti-Jacobin Review*, 18: 357 (Aug 1804).

1805

GOETHE, [Johann Wolfgang von].

HERMAN AND DOROTHEA: A TALE. TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF GOETHE.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, Paternoster-Row, by Mercier and Co. Northumberland-Court, Strand, 1805.

xii, 142p, ill. 12mo.

BL 11521.aaa.8; NSTC G1268.

*Notes.* Prose translation of Goethe's *Hermann und Dorothea*, first published in *Taschenbuch für 1798* (Berlin, 1798). 'Advertisement' to the present work remarks: 'The Public are already acquainted with the Poem of Herman and Dorothea; written by the celebrated Goethe, and translated into blank verse by Mr. Holcroft. It is replete with beauties of every kind: but the extreme simplicity of manners and of incident, which prevails throughout, is a defect in the eye of some English readers; who have not been accustomed to see the common occurrences of life written in the language of the Muses. This consideration occasioned the present translation, in prose, to be undertaken' (pp. iv–v). Thomas Holcroft's verse translation was first published in 1801.

1806

PALMER, Sarah Cornelia.

THE DREAM. BY SARAH CORNELIA PALMER.

London: Printed by E. Thomas, Golden-Lane, Barbican. For J. M'Kenzie, No. 20, Old-Bailey, and sold by W. Harris, High-Street, Shadwell, and the Booksellers in Town and Country, 1806.

iv, 123p. 8vo. 3s (cover).

C 8000.c.230; NSTC P199 (BI O).

*Notes.* Clear fictional narrative within the encompassing frame of a dream. 'Contents' (pp. [iii]–iv) lists main components, but without giving page numbers. Cambridge U.L. copy (not recorded in NSTC) is in original paper covers, with front cover supplying fuller details than the t.p. proper. This reads: 'This

day published, (3s.) *The Dream: or Sketches of Some Remarkable Personages in High Life.* ... London: Printed and Published by J. Mackenzie, Old Bailey; and Sold by Mr. Harris, Bookseller, Shadwell; Mr. Skelton, Southampton; Mr Matthews, Portsmouth; Mr. Woolmer and Mr. Rising, Exeter; Mr. Birdsall, Northampton; Mr. Sutton, Nottingham; and all other Booksellers in Town and Country, 1806.' End cover carries a full-page adv. for 'J. Mackenzie, Bookseller and Publisher', informing 'Friends & Customers, that they may be supplied with Account Books of all Descriptions, Ruled and Plain; Cyphering and Copy Books; Memorandum Books; Bibles, Testaments, and Spellings; Reading Made Easy; Watt's Divine Songs; Thomson's Seasons, and the Death of Abel, very Neat Pocket Editions, Embellished with Elegant Engravings; Gilt and Plain Paper; Black Lead Pencils, and Stationery of all Kinds, on the Most Reasonable Terms.'

1806

{SATCHELL, John.}

THORNTON ABBEY: A SERIES OF LETTERS ON RELIGIOUS SUBJECTS.

London: Printed for J. Burditt Paternoster Row. By J. W. Morris, Dunstable, 1806.

I viii, 241p; II v, 242p; III viii, 255p. 12mo.

WSW I: 120.

BL 1697/5763; NSTC S497 (BI O).

*Notes.* 'Preface', signed 'Andrew Fuller', states that 'The Author of the following work was the late Mr. John Satchell of Kettering' (p. iii). Errata for vols. 1-3, 1p. unnn. at end of vol. 3. A fiction, notwithstanding its sub-title. Collates in sixes. Wolff (item 6164) lists a 2-vol. edn. published in Portsea, n.d., which he speculatively dates as 1815; this has the subtitle 'or, the Persecuted Daughter'. For this later see also OCLC WorldCat No. 22237237.

Further edn: 2nd edn. 1814 (NSTC); Portsea [1815] (Wolff, see above). NSTC also gives 2nd edn. with 1810 imprint date held at Cambridge U.L.

1810

ANON.

TALES ORIGINAL AND TRANSLATED FROM THE SPANISH. BY A LADY. EMBELLISHED WITH EIGHT ENGRAVINGS ON WOOD.

London: Printed for J. J. Stockdale, No. 41, Pall-Mall, 1810.

391p., ill. 8vo. 12s, Large paper 21s (ER, QR).

ER 16: 509 (Aug 1810); QR 4: 277 (Aug 1810).

BL 12614.g.21; NSTC L126 (BI C).

Frontispiece dated '23rd May, 1810'. Dedication 'to Anna Eliza Chandos, Countess Temple, the Accomplished Heiress, and Worthy Representative of the Royal Magnificent, and Noble House of Chandos', by 'her Ladyship's Unknown, but Most Obedient, and Very Humble Servant, John Joseph Stockdale 31st May, 1810' (p. [1]). An 'Advertisement', dated 'Whitchurch, Hampshire, 1810', notes: 'The

following Tales are the production of a young Lady unknown in the Metropolis, and unused to writing for the public eye' (p. [3]). 'Contents and List of Cuts' follows on p. [5]. 'Philip. A Tale from the Spanish', [9]–63; 'Claudius. A Tale from the Spanish', 64–98; 'Ernest the Rebel. A Tale from the Spanish', 99–117; 'The Welsh Girls', 118–243; 'The Captive's Slave. A Tale from the Spanish', 244–342; 'Doristea's Fortune. A Tale from the Spanish', 343–91. The constituent tales are advertized separately in a 3pp. adv. list at the end of *Fatal Love* (1812, see below), with prices ranging from '1s 6d, or Royal Paper hot-pressed 2s' for *Ernest the Rebel* to '4s, or Royal Paper hot-pressed 7s' for *The Welsh Girls*. The same list also contains the present work in its complete form at 12s. Examination of the BL copy shows no sign of it having been made up from separate items.

1810

LEFANU, [Elizabeth].

THE SISTER; A TALE, IN TWO VOLUMES. BY MRS. H. LEFANU, DAUGHTER OF THE LATE THOMAS SHERIDAN, M.A.

London: Printed for Richards and Co. New Public Library, Cornhill. By J. Hartnell, Albion-Press, Bermondsey-Street, Southwark, 1810.

I 226p; II 228p. 12mo.

BL C.190.aa.15; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Not, as first suspected, a children's book. Listed anonymously under 'Novels and Romances' in Appendix (1814) to Kinnear's Catalogue.

1811

ANON.

WORTHINGHAM-LEASE: A TALE.

London: Printed by W. Lewis, Published by M. Jones, 1811.

151p.

PU 823.W89; xNSTC.

Not seen, but reported by Dan Traister, Rare Books Librarian at the University of Pennsylvania, to be a novel and one that falls within the chronological limits of EN2. Record in OCLC WorldCat (No. 249289612).

1811

[QUILLINAN, Edward.]

NEW CANTERBURY TALES; OR THE GLORIES OF THE GARRISON. BY OLIVER OUTLINE, MAJOR-GENERAL, & C & C.

London: Printed for Henry Colburn, English and Foreign Public Library, Conduit Street, Hanover Square, 1811.

185p. 12mo. 5s (ER, QR).

ER 19: 252 (Nov 1811); QR 6: 563 (Dec 1811).

p.c.; NSTC O619 (BI BL, E, O).

*Notes.* Dedication 'to Job Makepeace, Esq.'. In form of comic dialogues sketching scenes of military life, with brief narrative links, reminiscent in some respects

of Peacock's comic satires. Author identification from Bernard Quaritch Catalogue, 1442 (2020), item 89, which points out that chapter 7 ('The Ball Room Votaries') is a prose version of Quillinan's first book of verse *Ball Room Votaries; or Canterbury and Its Vicinity* (London, 1810). OCLC, NSTC, and COPAC both fail to go beyond the pseudonym. Quillinan's first wife was a daughter of Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges, after whose decease, much later in 1841, he became Wordsworth's son-in-law by marrying Dora. ER and QR both lists under 'Novels'.

## 1812

ST. RAPHAEL, Felix [pseud.?).

FATAL LOVE; OR, LETTERS FROM A VILLAGE. EDITED BY FELIX ST. RAPHAEL.

London: Printed for J. J. Stockdale, 41, Pall Mall, 1812.

401p. 12mo. 8s (*British Critic*).

WSW I: 43.

MRu R54907; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Preface apologetically states that 'if the reader be not interested in its contents, nor pleased with the style, he has only one volume to pay for, to wade through, or to throw down'. According to the *British Critic*, 39: 310 (Mar 1812): 'a terrible and melancholy tale, not however ill told, of love and madness, crosses, disappointment, and vexations innumerable'.

## 1813

ANON.

THE AGE WE LIVE IN: A FRAGMENT. DEDICATED TO EVERY YOUNG LADY OF FASHION.

London: Printed for Lackington, Allen, and Co. Temple of the Muses, Finsbury-Square, 1813.

236p. 12mo. 6s (ER).

ER 22: 246 (Oct 1813); QR 10: 296 (Oct 1813); WSW I: 8.

BL 12614.bbb.1; NSTC L24 (BI C, O).

*Notes.* Preface, signed by editor 'L. L——', notes: 'In giving the following pages to the Public, the Editor complies with the particular injunction of the writer of them. Her sun set at a very early period of her day of youth; and the present volume is the result of some of those hours of confinement that she was obliged to submit to' (p. 3). The *British Critic*, 42: 80 (July 1813) lists under 'Novels', praising 'an elegant and well-written little volume; certainly from the pen of one who knows a great deal of fashionable life'. A journal of an invalid young woman moving in beau monde circles; evidently unconnected with Louisa Sidney Stanhope's *The Age We Live In. A Novel* (1809: 69).



1814

[EGAN, Pierce.]

THE MISTRESS OF ROYALTY; OR, THE LOVES OF FLORIZEL AND PERDITA, PORTRAYED IN THE AMATORY EPISTLES, BETWEEN AN ILLUSTRIOUS PERSONAGE, AND A DISTINGUISHED FEMALE: WITH AN INTERESTING SKETCH OF FLORIZEL AND PERDITA, INCLUDING OTHER CHARACTERS.

London: Printed by and for P. Egan, 29, Great Marlborough Street; and sold by all Booksellers, 1814.

144p. 8vo.

BL C.57.b.51; NSTC E558.

*Notes.* Roman à clef relating affair between Prince Regent and Mary Robinson, in the form of letters between the pair. BL copy has author's inscription dated 'January 25, 1843' and signed 'Pierce Egan'. The handwritten dedication comments: 'With the Author's best respects, to J. Richardson, Esq. If there is any merit attached to this little Book it is from its *singularity*. The Author having, in the capacity of a Printer composed the Types, and worked it off at the Press.' A 'Memorial. Sacred to the Memory of Perdita' appears on pp. 141-4.

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 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.

1819

[JOHNSON, Thomas Burgeland.]

THE MYSTERY OF THE ABBEY; OR, THE WIDOW'S FIRE SIDE.

London: Printed for Sherwood, Neely, and Jones, Paternoſter Row. Published by R. Sutton, Paradise-ſtreet, Liverpool, and to be had of all Booksellers, 1819. 2 vols. in 1.

[not seen]; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Appeared as item 228 in Jarndyce Catalogue, 191 (Winter 2010–11). Copy described as having tipped at rear of vol. a single folded contemporary MS sheet entitled *Widow's Fire Side* and with double-column list of [subscribers?] names. The fuller title is listed amongst 'Works preparing for Publication' in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, 5 (May 1819). The novel is attributed to Thomas Burgeland Johnson (c. 1778–1840; *ODNB*), better known as a sporting journalist, in Charles Henry Timperley's *Encyclopedia of Literary and Typographical Anecdote* (London, 1842), p. 5, which also notes that he had worked formerly as a printer in Liverpool. According to Edith Birkhead the abbey in the book is 'haunted' by the proprietors of a distillery, and its horrible spectre turns out to be a harmless idiot. 'Apart from these gibes, there is not a hint of the supernatural in the whole book. It is a *picaresque* novel, written by a sportsman. The title is merely a hoax': *The Tale of Terror* (London, 1921), p. 140. OCLC WorldCat (No. 876437547) records single copy, at ViU (PR4826.J535.M9.1819.v1/2).

1819

WALL, D.

TWENTY YEARS CONFINEMENT, OR, THE TWO CASIMIRS. BY D. WALL, ESQ, CORRESPONDENT TO SEVERAL LITERARY SOCIETIES.

London: Published By J. Tallis, 7, Warwick Sque., n.d. [1819].

544p, ill. 8vo.

Hathi (NjP); NSTC 012972677 (BI BL).

*Notes.* Engraved t.p. only, from which title, headed by the words 'Founded on Facts', is taken. Purportedly based on Hungarian history, with suitably informative footnotes, but narrative written in fictional style. Originally published in 23 numbers; collates in fours. James Burmester List, 62 (2023), item 140, describes seven engraved plates additional to present engraved frontispiece.

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, now confirmed in Loeber Anon.129. Summers (p. 384) lists 'Legend of Moleiria [*sic*], The. A Tale. Minerva-Press, Newman. [1812]'; but this is not in Blakey.

Further edn: London, A. K. Newman, 1828 (OCLC). National Library of Ireland's catalogue description of a Newman '1823' edn. (Ir.82379.13) possibly contains a misprint for 1828.

1825

ANON.

DE COURCY: A TALE.

Isle of Wight: Printed for the Author, by J. Hall, Newport, and sold by Baynes and Son, 23 Paternoster Row; and Hall and Plumbly, Newport, 1825.

397p.

New York University Library [not seen]; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Evidently a rare of Isle of Wight imprint, which nevertheless has the external makings of full-length work of fiction.

1826

[DARLEY, George.]

THE LABOURS OF IDLENESS; OR, SEVEN NIGHTS' ENTERTAINMENTS. BY GUY PENSEVAL.

London: Printed for John Taylor. Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall, 1826.

330p. 8vo. 9s 6d (ECB).

O 26.238; ECB 441; NSTC 2P10662 (BI C, E, BL, O; NA DLC, MH).

*Notes.* 'Epistle Dedicatory to the Reader', pp. [3]–15, end-signed Guy Penseval, Brooklands, January 1st, 1826. ECB dates Mar 1826. Consists of seven quite varied tales, mostly dealing with love, and interspersed with a few poems. James Burmester Catalogue, 78 (2010), item 91, describes a hybrid copy, incorporating this work and Robert Dyer's *The Story of a Wanderer* (see 1826: 33), under the mantle title of *The New Sketch Book, by G. Crayon, jun.* (London, 1829). The catalogue description speculates that Darley, struggling for income, reissued the work in an attempt to revive sales, but felt that it would fare better with the circulating libraries if presented in a new dress and in 2 vols. NSTC 2P10663, however, describes as 'an unauthorised issue'.

1827

[?YU CHIAO LI]; REMUSAT, [Jean Pierre Abel] (*trans.*).

IU-KIAO-LI: OR, THE TWO FAIR COUSINS. A CHINESE NOVEL FROM THE FRENCH VERSION OF M. ABEL-REMUSAT. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Hunt and Clarke, Covent-Garden, 1827.

I xxxv, 259p; II 290p. 12mo. 14s (ECB).

O 27.261; ECB 303; NSTC 2Y2340 (BI BL, C, E; NA DLC).

*Notes.* Trans. of *Iu-kiao-li, ou les deux cousines, roman chinois traduit par M. Abel-Remusat* (Paris, 1826). Inscription in Chinese characters between half-titles and t.p. in each vol. 'Advertisement', pp. [vii]–viii; 'French Translator's Preface', pp. [ix]–xxv. Footnote to the latter states: 'Some commencing observations on

the nature and tendency of the modern novel or romance, and on the productions of Sir Walter Scott in particular, are omitted as possessing little which has not been frequently repeated by English writers' (ixn). 'Note' (unn.) states that 'A copy of *Iu-Kiao-Li* has for nearly two hundred years formed a part of the very rich collection of Oriental works in the King's Library at Paris', and asserts the authenticity of the text. Running headlines read: 'JU-KIAO-LI: OR, THE TWO COUSINS'. Explanatory footnotes passim in the main text. 'Supplementary Notes, supplied by J. H. Pickford, Esq., Member of the Asiatic Society of Paris' at end of each vol. No definitive information about an originating Chinese author has been discovered. ECB dates May 1827.

Further edn: 1830 as *The Two Fair Cousins; a Chinese Novel* (OCLC).

1829

ANON.

THREE WEEKS IN THE DOWNS, OR CONJUGAL FIDELITY REWARDED: EXEMPLIFIED IN THE NARRATIVE OF HELEN AND EDMUND. A TALE FOUNDED ON FACT. BY AN OFFICER'S WIDOW. London: Published by John Bennett, Three-Tun Passage, Ivy-Lane, Paternoster-Row; and W. Bennett, Russell-Street, Plymouth, 1829.

663p, ill. 8vo.

O Vet.A6.e.2132; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Additional engraved t.p., also dated 1829, and bearing the imprint of John Bennett alone. Introductory address (3 pp. unn.) in which the authoress acknowledges indebtedness 'to some valuable *Periodicals*, as well as to a recent and excellent work entitled the *Night Watch*' (for the latter, see 1828: 11). 'Contents' (4 pp. unn.) also precede main narrative, which itself commences on p. [3]. Engraved frontispiece, plus six other plates interleaved in text, all save one (undated) bearing the date 1829. Evidently published first in numbers. Collates in fours.

Further edn: 1834 (NSTC 2D18353).

1829

[SHEPHERD, William.]

CLOUDS AND SUNSHINE.

London: Printed for Samuel Maunder, 10, Newgate Street, n.d. [1829].

x, 324p. 12mo. 8s 6d (ECB).

O 29.196; ECB 122; NSTC 2S18889 (BI BL, C, Dt, E).

*Notes.* Correctly attributable to William Shepherd, Rector of Margaret Roding (Essex), and wrongly in NSTC to William Shepherd (1768-1847), Unitarian Minister. The Revd Shepherd in question was author of *Liturgical Considerations* (London, 1824), and almost certainly a co-author with George Wilkins of *Body and Soul* and *The Village Pastor*: see respectively 1822: 81 and 1825: 88, in Section B above. Preface states of the author's intentions: 'His simple object is to convey instruction in a pleasing manner, and maintain fairly and charitably that Doc-

trine which is accordant to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and to the Established Church, which he firmly and conscientiously believes founded on that rock of ages' (p. ix). The constituent tales are: 'The Gipsy Girl', [3]-40; 'Religious Offices', [43]-95; 'Enthusiasm', [99]-148; 'Romanism', [151]-197; 'Rashness', [201]-250; 'De Lawrence', [253]-312. 'Appendix', [317]-324 is purely theological in content.

D: TITLES PREVIOUSLY NOT LOCATED FOR WHICH HOLDING  
LIBRARIES HAVE SUBSEQUENTLY BEEN DISCOVERED

**1801: 41**

KING, Sophia [afterwards FORTNUM].

THE VICTIM OF FRIENDSHIP; A GERMAN ROMANCE. BY SOPHIA KING, AUTHOR OF TRIFLES FROM HELICON; WALDORF, OR THE DANGERS OF PHILOSOPHY; AND CORDELIA, A ROMANCE OF REAL LIFE.

London: Printed for R. Dutton, 10, Birchin-Lane, Cornhill, 1801.

I, vi, ii, 190p; II 216p. 12mo. 7s boards (CR).

CR 2nd ser. 32: 232 (June 1801); WSW I: 355.

NNS Ham F7438 V4; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Sophia King was a sister of Charlotte Dacre, with whom she published *Trifles of Helicon* (London, 1798), a collection of verse (see Jackson, p. 95).

**1802: 8** [The existing entry should be replaced with the following, and repositioned chronologically, as a result of the discovery of the original 1801 edn. as below.]

ANON.

PARENTAL TURPITUDE; OR, THE MYSTERIES OF ABRUZZO, BY THE AUTHOR OF THE CHILD OF DOUBT, &C. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed by and for R. Cantwell, 1801.

2 vols.

PU PR39991.A7.C435.1801 [not seen]; ECB 432; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Republished 1802 as *The Mysteries of Abruzzo*, this edn. forming the basis of the entry in EN<sub>2</sub> (1802: 8). 'Advertisement' there indicates female authorship. *Eliza Beaumont and Harriet Osborne; or, the Child of Doubt* (London, 1789) is by Indiana Brooks, but apart from the similarity of the sub-title no evidence has been discovered about the authorship of this title.

Further edn: 2nd edn. 1802 (Corvey), CME 3-628-48177-5.

**1802: 23**

DUCRAY-DUMINIL, [François-Guillaume].

VICTOR; OR, THE CHILD OF THE FOREST. IN FOUR VOLUMES. FROM THE FRENCH OF M. DUCRAY-DUMINIL.

London: Printed at the Minerva-Press, for Lane and Newman, Leadenhall-Street, 1802.

I ???p; II 287p; III 318p; IV 360p. 12mo. 16s boards (CR).

CR 2nd ser. 38, 115–16 (May 1803).

BL RB 23.a.23492 [not seen]; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Trans. of *Victor, ou l'enfant de la forêt* (Paris, 1797). Details from Google Books, based on BL copy; vol. 1 not found there.

1802: 25

FIÉVÉE, [Joseph].

FREDERIC; TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF M. FIÉVÉE, AUTHOR OF SUZETTE'S DOWRY, &C. &C.

London: Printed by E. Rider, Little-Britain, for Wynne and Scholey, No. 45, and James Wallis, No. 46, Pater-Noster Row, 1802.

I viii, 218p; II 275p; III 250p. 12s boards (CR).

CR 2nd ser. 36: 357 (Nov 1802).

NNS Ham F4688 F6; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Trans. of *Frédéric* (Paris, 1799). Bento<sub>3</sub> gives Wallis as publisher, and prices at 10s 6d. MR n.s. 34: 531–2 (App [Apr/May 1801]) gives full review of an edn. published in London by De Bouffe, apparently in French (though an extract quoted is in English).

1803: 49

MONTJO[I]E, F[é]lix L[ouis] C[hristophe].

MOUNT PAUSILYPP0; OR, A MANUSCRIPT FOUND AT THE TOMB OF VIRGIL. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF F. L. C. MONTJOYE, AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF THE FOUR SPANIARDS. IN FIVE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for H. D. Symonds, Paternoster-Row, by Bye and Law, St. John's-Square, Clerkenwell, 1803.

I v, 288p; II 323p; III 243p; IV 252p; V 311p. 12mo. 20s (ECB).

ER 3: 506 (Jan 1804).

Corvey; ECB 393; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Trans. of *Manuscrit trouvé au mont Pausilype* (Paris, 1802). ECB dates Oct 1803. ECB spells as Pausillyppo, ER as Pausilyppo, and Bento<sub>3</sub> as Pausilippo.

1803: 58

PIGAULT-LEBRUN, [Charles-Antoine].

MONSIEUR BOTTE. A ROMANCE. BY PIGAULT LEBRUN. AUTHOR OF MY UNCLE THOMAS, THE BARONS OF FELSHEIM, &C. &C.

London: Printed at the Minerva Press, for William Lane, Leadenhall-Street, 1803.

I v, 258; II 307; III 262p. 12mo. 12s boards (CR).

CR 3rd ser. 3: 237–8 (Oct 1804); WSW I: 366.



NNS Ham P6282 M5; ECB 335; xNSTC.

Notes. Trans. of *Monsieur Botte* (Paris, 1802). The 4-vol. 1803 edn. listed by NSTC (P1729) is in French.

1805: 15

[FELDBORG, Andersen Andreas.]

MENTAL RECREATIONS. FOUR DANISH AND GERMAN TALES. BY THE AUTHOR OF TOUR IN ZEALAND.

London: Printed for C. and R. Baldwin ... and J. Harris, 1805.

158p. 8vo. 2s 6d (ECB).

CR 3rd ser. 6: 326 (Nov 1805); WSW I: 74.

University of Alberta, PT 8127.F32.A6.E5.1805 [not seen]; ECB 381; xNSTC.

Notes. ECB, unlike CR, lists publisher as Dutton, and gives format as 12mo. CR recommends as a 'fire-screen'. Described in OCLC WordCat No. 6579925. OCLC also lists copy at Bibliotheek Universiteit van Amsterdam. *A Tour in Zealand, in the Year 1802*, 'By a Native of Denmark' (London, 1804) is generally accredited to Andreas Andersen Feldborg. For the issue of Feldborg's identity and possible output in fiction, see **Addendum 1** to this Update concerning 'Charles Sedley'.

For HERMANN AND EMILIA (1805: 43), see under Section A.

1806: 32

GENLIS, [Stéphanie-Félicité, Comtesse de].

THE IMPERTINENT WIFE: A MORAL TALE: CONTAINING ALSO, THE FAIR PENITENT, DALIDOR & MULCE, AND LOVERS WITHOUT LOVE. FROM THE FRENCH OF MADAME GENLIS.

London: Printed at the Minerva Press for Lane, Newman, and Co., 1806.

223p. 12mo. 3s 6d (ECB, ER).

ER 8: 479 (July 1806).

Georgia State University [not seen]; ECB 225.

Notes. Trans. of *L'Épouse impertinente* (Paris, 1804). In Blakey, but copy not seen. Fuller title (given above) follows ER. OCLC WorldCat (No. 45320233). OCLC also lists copy at Huntington Library (CSmH).

1808: 23

BARNBY, Mrs.

THE AMERICAN SAVAGE; OR, ORAB AND PHOEBE. BY MRS BARNBY.

London: Printed for the Author; and sold by G. Robinson, 25 Paternoster-Row, 1808.

2 vols., ill. 12mo. 9s (ECB, ER).

ER 15: 529 (Jan 1810); WSW I: 141.

Dickinson College Library, 823.B259a [not seen]; ECB 40; xNSTC.

*Notes.* ECB dates Sept 1808. Summers gives Maidstone as place of publication. OCLC WorldCat No. 55896585 lists two holding libraries.

1809: 51

MORRINGTON, ISABELLA.

FASHION'S FOOL; OR THE COTTAGE OF MERLIN VALE. A NOVEL FOUNDED ON FACTS: INTERSPERSED WITH PIECES OF POETRY. BY THE LATE ISABELLA MORRINGTON.

London: Printed by Seale & Bates, and sold by Sherwood, Neely, and Jones, 20 Paternoster Row, and may be had of every Bookseller in the Kingdom, 1809.

I viii, 180p; II 163p. 12mo. 10s (ER, QR).

ER 14: 519 (July 1809); QR 1: 461 (May 1809).

NNS Ham M8745 F2 [not seen]; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Copy at Bibliotheque de l'Université Laval, Quebec, also listed in OCLC WorldCat (No. 77286473). A correspondent from Australia also describes a private copy which appears to have come from Cary & Burrows's Circulating Library (numbered 549). The fuller title and completed author name described above from the OCLC record matches the records of circulating libraries given for this item in DBF (1809A050). Listed by Henderson as being in National Library of Wales, but not found there. ER gives sub-title as 'A History Founded on Facts'; QR as 'A Rational, Moral, Sentimental, Literary, and Entertaining History, founded on Facts'.

1810: 56

HOUGHTON, Mary.

THE MYSTERIES OF THE FOREST: A NOVEL. BY MISS MARY HOUGHTON.

London: Printed and Published by T. Gillet, 1810.

3 vols. 12mo. 18s (ER, QR).

ER 16: 509 (Aug 1810); QR 4: 277 (Aug 1810); WSW I: 329.

University of Alberta, PR 4806.H83.M99 [not seen]; ECB 284; xNSTC.

Further edn: 2nd edn. 1822 (Corvey; NSTC 2H32140), CME 3-628-47750-6. This edn. by A. K. Newman & Co. (sub-titled 'A Romance') has printer's marks and colophons in each vol. of J. Gillet, Crown-Court, Fleet-Street, London, indicating a remainder issue.

1812: 5

ANON.

FRIENDS AND LOVERS. A NOVEL. INTERSPERSED WITH OCCASIONAL VERSE.

London: Printed for C. Chapple, 1812.

3 vols. 15s (ER, QR).

ER 19: 511 (Feb 1812); QR 7: 231 (Mar 1812).

Rice University, Fondren Library [not seen].

*Notes.* OCLC WorldCat (No. 12257155).

1812: 17

MONTRIOU, A. J.

WILLIAM AND AZUBAH; OR, THE ALPINE RECESS, A NOVEL.

Grantham: Printed for the Author, by R. Storr: and sold, in London, by B. and R. Crosby, 1812.

I ii, 163p; II 155p. 12mo. 8s (ECB).

Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto, B-12 07298 [not seen]; ECB 638; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Author name from University of Toronto Libraries online Catalogue, where unclear whether on titles or not. J. A. L. Montriou was the author of *Elements of Astronomy* (Grantham, [1804]), as well as a variety of other educational books stemming from the 1780s: the present writer may possibly be his son.

1813: 37

JOHNSON, Mrs D[avid].

THE BROTHERS IN HIGH LIFE; OR, THE NORTH OF IRELAND. A NOVEL, IN THREE VOLUMES. BY MRS D. JOHNSON.

London: Printed for G. Kearsley, No. 46, Fleet Street, 1813.

I 184p; II 179p; III 186p. 12mo.

WSW I: 346.

Reading University Library [not seen]; xNSTC.

*Notes.* 1820 edn. (CtY-BR In.J631.813Bb) adds following in imprint: 'and sold by J. Jones, 4, St. Michael's Alley, Cornhill, and 24, Blackman Street, Southwark'. Title there also states 'A ROMANCE'. Pagination above taken from that edn. on basis of probability of its representing a reissue.

Further edn: 1820 (see note above).

1814: 21

[FOSCOLO, Niccolo Ugo.]

THE LETTERS OF ORTIS TO LORENZO: TAKEN FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS, PUBLISHED AT MILAN IN 1802. TRANSLATED FROM THE ITALIAN.

London: Printed for Henry Colburn, 1814.

iv, 233p, ill. 12mo. 8s 6d (ECB, ER, QR).

ER 23: 255 (Apr 1814); QR 11: 255 (Apr 1814).

C S740.d.81.5 [not seen]; ECB 342; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Trans. of *Ultime Lettere di Jacopo Ortis* (Milan, 1802). 'Preface, by the Translator' signed F. B. and dated London, 1 Jan 1814. Frontispiece portrait bears legend: 'Published Jany. 1 1814 by Henry Colburn. Conduit Street'. An Italian language version ('Londra, 1811') was reviewed in QR 8: 438–45 (Dec 1812).

Further edn: 2nd edn. 1818 (BL 12.410.ccc.29; NSTC 2O5322).

**1815: 21** [The existing entry should be replaced with the following, and renumbered, as a result of the discovery in the National Library of Ireland of the original 1814 Cork edn., complete with subscription list.]

{DESPOURRINS, M.}

THE NEVILLE FAMILY; AN INTERESTING TALE, FOUNDED ON FACTS. BY A LADY. IN THREE VOLUMES.

Cork: Printed for the Author, by W. West & Co. Nelson-Place, 1814.

I xii, iv, 250p; II 220p; III 188p. 12mo. 13s 6d (QR).

QR 13: 531 (July 1815).

D DixCork1814; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Dedication 'to the Right Honorable Lady Kinsale', signed 'M. Despourrins'. 'Subscribers' Names' (c. 325 names, mostly from Kinsale and County Cork), vol. 1, pp. [i]–xii. Collates in sixes. Details from QR almost certainly relate to the London 1815 edn. (see below).

Further edn: London 1815 (Corvey—probably a reissue with cancel t.p. and lacking the subscription list), CME 3-628-48190-2).

**1816: 7** [The existing entry should be replaced with the following, and repositioned, as a result of the discovery of the original 1808 edn. as below.]

ANON.

HENRY FREEMANTLE. A NOVEL. IN TWO VOLUMES.

London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees and Orme ... [et al.]; and J. Lansdown, Bristol, 1808.

I 192p; II 249p. 12mo.

University of Leeds, Brotherton Collection, Gen HEN [not seen]; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Reissued as *Malvern Hills; or, History of Henry Freemantle*, with imprint 'Printed for Thomas Mason, Russell-Street; and sold by A. K. Newman & Co. Leadenhall-Street; and Simpkin & Marshall, Stationers' Court, 1816': MH-H 19463.31.125; NSTC 2F15501 (BI O). Half-titles there read: 'Malvern Hills. A Novel', while running titles read: 'Henry Freemantle'. Pagination above temporarily taken from that edn. on basis of probability of a reissue.

**1819: 13**

ANON.

THE METROPOLIS. A NOVEL, BY THE AUTHOR OF LITTLE HYDROGEN, OR THE DEVIL ON TWO STICKS IN LONDON. IN THREE VOLUMES.

London: Printed for J. J. Stockdale, 41, Pall Mall, 1819.

I iv, 267p; II 273p; III 260p. 12mo.

IU 823.M56 [Hathi]; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Introduction presents the (female) narrator's account. A different work from Eaton Stannard Barrett's *The Metropolis* (1811: 18), though attributed to Barrett in some catalogues, along with *Little Hydrogen; or, the Devil on Two Sticks in London* (London, 1817), a political satire after the manner of Le Sage.

The latter, comprising just over 200 pp. and illustrated with coloured cartoons, was considered too formulaic for inclusion in EN<sub>2</sub>; however in its conclusion the character of Hydrogen looks forward to wider-embracing work ‘under the title of THE METROPOLIS. I scarcely need say that it will be a *Fashionable Novel*’ (p. 205). Both works touch on similar subjects, such as Caroline Lamb and her *Glenarvon* (1816: 40). Eaton Stannard Barrett’s death in Glamorgan (Wales) in 1820, and his previous use of *The Metropolis* as a main title, makes any connection unlikely. Also wrongly attributed to Andrew Carmichael, the author of *The Metropolis* (1805), a satire in verse on Dublin, an error reflected in OCLC World Cat (No. 23271029). ECB 383 lists 8th edn., 1819, 24s. Further edns: 2nd edn. (NSTC 2M26045); 8th edn. 1819 (NSTC).

**1824: 44**

GREEN, William Child.

THE WOODLAND FAMILY; OR, THE SONS OF ERROR, AND DAUGHTERS OF SIMPLICITY. BY WILLIAM CHILD GREEN.

London: Printed and published by Joseph Emans, No. 91 Waterloo Road, 1824. lii, 557p, ill. 8vo.

Manchester, Deansgate Library (Special Collections); xNSTC.

*Notes.* Engraved t.p. gives title as ‘The Woodland Family; or the Sons of Error and Daughters of Simplicity. A Domestic Tale’. Author’s Preface dated 30 July 1823. Every third gathering of four numbered at foot of page alongside signature from No. 1 to No. 23, indicating an issue in parts. Eight engraved plates (one missing in present copy), including Frontispiece.

Further edn: 1826 (MH 18488.8.10; NSTC 2G20225). This Harvard copy has the imprint of ‘J. M’Gowan and Son Great Windmill Street, Haymarket’.

**APPENDIX F: 3**

[COOPER, Maria Susanna.]

THE WIFE; OR, CAROLINE HERBERT. BY THE LATE AUTHOR OF THE “EXEMPLARY MOTHER.”

London: Printed for Becket and Porter, Pall-Mall; by W. Bulmer, and Co. Cleveland-Row, 1813.

2 vols. 8vo. 10s (ECB).

WSW I: 218.

Chawton House Library; ECB 98; xNSTC.

*Notes.* Previous details from Hardy (item 326). Now part of the Chawton House Library, and full text is given as part of the Library’s Novels-On-Line service <<https://chawton.org/novels/wife/>>. An epistolary novel, reportedly offering a revision of the same author’s *Letters between Emilia and Harriet* (London, 1762)—which itself had been previously revised as *The Daughter: or the History of Miss Emilia Royston, and Miss Harriet Ayres; in a Series of Letters* (see 1775:

20). The suspicion, when the text was unseen, that *The Wife* might possibly be a work directed at children proves to have been unfounded; but a chronologically distant root source, and a possibly complicated textual history, raise possible new difficulties over its suitability for inclusion in the main listings.

#### APPENDIX F: 5

MATHEWS, Eliza Kirkham.

THE PHANTOM; OR, MYSTERIES OF THE CASTLE. A TALE OF OTHER TIMES. BY THE LATE MRS. MATHEWS, OF THE THEATRES ROYAL, YORK AND HULL.

London: Printed for Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy Paternoster-Row; and I. Wilson, Hull, 1825.

iv, 248p, ill. 12mo. 4s.

BL RB23.a.20672; xNSTC.

*Notes.* End colophon of William Rawson, Printer, Hull (also verso of title-page). Price from list of 'New Publications' by A. K. Newman at end of vol. 2 of Alexander Campbell, *Perkin Warbeck; or, the Court of James the Fourth of Scotland* (1830: 36). Another copy reported by James Burmeister (who also supplied the BL copy in 1992). According to Burmeister this represents a 1-vol. reissue of a gothic novel first published in 2 vols. (but continuously paginated) in Hull in about 1798, utilizing the original Hull-printed sheets and adding a new title-page and preface. Eliza Kirkham Mathews (née Strong) was the first wife of Charles Mathews the famous comedian; they married in 1797 and shortly afterwards joined Tate Wilkinson's York circuit, which included Hull. Evidently printed while she was there, the original Hull edn. is unrecorded (at least under this name), and appears not to have survived. The BL catalogue attributes the work to Mathews's second wife Anne Jackson Mathews; another copy at the Huntington Library also contains a misleading note regarding authorship. The BL copy includes a woodcut plate, absent in both the Huntington copy and that reported by Burmeister, and which may have been inserted from another source. Discovery of this 1825 edn. introduces a number of issues about the ultimate positioning of this title, as to whether it is placed speculatively in the late 1790s or as part of the 1825 listing as a reissue with an uncertain back history.

#### E: NEW INFORMATION RELATING TO EXISTING TITLE ENTRIES

1800: 36 GENLIS, [Stéphanie-Félicité], [Comtesse] de, THE RIVAL MOTHERS, OR CALUMNY. French source title given as 'Paris 1800'. However the original imprint reads: 'Berlin: Chez F. T. de La Garde; et à Paris, chez Barba, libraire, Palais du Tribunal, Galerie de Bois, no. 225'. Therefore the correct designation would appear to be 'Berlin and Paris'.



1801: 60 SICKELMORE, Richard, RAYMOND, A NOVEL. Hathi (based on Princeton University Library copy) contains ‘List of Subscribers’, vol. 1, pp. [vii]–xii. None was found in the Corvey copy used for EN<sub>2</sub>, and DBF does not include details of this list. 135 subscribers, amongst whom 48 are females, subscribing for 140 copies. Headed by ‘His Royal Highness the PRINCE of WALES’, the list includes a high proportion of aristocrats, including the Duchess of Beaufort, Duke of Marlborough, and Lord Holland. ‘Mrs Fitzherbert’, placed fairly high up the alphabetical ordering, beneath Lady Henry Fitzroy and Hon. Miss Flower, may possibly refer to the Prince’s companion/wife.

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. Catalogue (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, Trepas, Aug. 1801.’ This apparently represents the 1st edn. and original title of the work, as now located as at University of Pennsylvania (see Section D).

1803: 11 ANON., NOTHING NEW, A NOVEL; IN WHICH IS DRAWN CHARACTERISTIC SKETCHES FROM MODERN AND FASHIONABLE LIFE. OCLC WorldCat (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 these two represent variant issues of the same novel as published in 1803. This in turn reinforces the view that *Louisa; or, the Orphan of Lennox Abbey* (1807: 1) is a reissue, in which case ideally it should not have been given a separate entry.

1803: 67(a) and (b) STÆL-HOLSTEIN, [Anne Louise Germaine] de, DELPHINE: A NOVEL. French source text in each case given as ‘Geneva, 1802’ [as published by Paschoud]. However, as is noted in John Robertshaw Catalogue, 137 (2015), item 121, there is evidence that a Paris edn. with the date ‘an xi, 1803’, was actually the first. ‘On 5th May 1802 Madame de Staël agreed a contract with Maradan to publish “Delphine”—before the appearance of the Paschoud edition. It is not known exactly when the Paschoud edition went on sale, but it is clear it was an unauthorised edition. Schazmann 30 and the Bibliothèque Nationale exhibition catalogue “Madame de Staël et l’Europe” (1966) p. 55 both state that the Maradan edition is the first. Lonchamp’s bibliography (1949) pp. 30–3 gives priority to the Geneva edition—he gives various reasons one of which is the lack of an errata in the Maradan edition, but he has failed to notice that at the end of vol. 6 there is a page of errata.’ In view of the above, it might seem more reasonable to describe the title as ‘Trans. of *Delphine* (Paris, 1803)’—though, at least until fuller investigation, there must remain a possibility that either or both of these edns. were involved.

**1804: 27** [IRELAND, Samuel William Henry], \*BRUNO; OR, THE SEPULCHRAL SUMMONS. Serious doubt is cast on the existence of this work by Jeffrey Kahan, in 'The Search for W. H. Ireland's *Bruno*', *European Romantic Review*, 24:1 (2013), 3–22 <<https://doi.org/10.1080/10509585.2013.747803>>. Kahan notes the description of such a title as 'a novel of terror' in Montague Summers's *The Gothic Quest* (London, [1938]), p. 346, followed by similar mentions by Maurice Lévy (Toulouse, 1968) and Devendra Varma (Washington, 1972), as well as the putative synopsis by Frank (item 200). However no evidence has been found as to an actual copy owned by these critics, or one to which they might have had access. As Kahan also observes, *Bruno* is absent as a work by Ireland on title-pages prior to the 2nd edn. (London, 1834) of his *The Abbess*; and the work is listed as a 3-vol. work only as late as the 1839 *London Catalogue of Books*. He also points to the existence of a short story by Ireland titled 'Legend of Bruno', elements of which might possibly belong the period 1799–1805. Kahan offers a number of conjectural explanations, amongst which bibliographical deception is a common thread. As a consequence it would seem safer to remove this item from the main chronological listings, possibly placing it in Appendix F instead.

**1804: 31** LAFONTAINE, August [Heinrich Julius], \*BARON DE FLEMING; OR, THE RAGE OF NOBILITY. FROM THE GERMAN OF AUGUSTUS LA FONTAINE. It is likely from the similarity of titles that this was translated from the French translation: *Le Baron de Fleming, ou la manie des titres* (Paris, 1803).

**1804: 44** MALARME, Charlotte de Bournon; GOOCH, [Elizabeth Sarah] Villa-Real (*trans.*). CAN WE DOUBT IT? OR, THE GENUINE HISTORY OF TWO FAMILIES OF NORWICH. BY CHARLOTTE BOURNON-MALARME, MEMBER OF THE ACADEMY OF ARCADES OF ROME. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH, BY MRS. VILLA-REAL GOOCH. The French original of this novel is *Peut-on s'en douter? ou, histoire véritable de deux familles de Norwich* (Paris, 1802).

**1806: 35** HARVEY, Jane, THE CASTLE OF TYNEMOUTH. A TALE. 2nd edn., Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1830, contains a 'List of Subscribers', the text of which can be viewed at <[https://chawtonhouse.org/\\_www/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/The-Castle-of-Tynemouth.-A-Tale.pdf](https://chawtonhouse.org/_www/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/The-Castle-of-Tynemouth.-A-Tale.pdf)>.

**1807: 1** ANON., \*LOUISA; OR, THE ORPHAN OF LENOX ABBEY. See **1803: 11** above for further evidence that this represents a reissue (and if so should not have been given a full entry).

1807: 3 ANON., \*MARGARETTA; OR THE INTRICACIES OF THE HEART. An account for this novel (under the heading 'Margaretta') is given in Longman Commission Ledger 1C, p. 42, with an intake of 300 copies itemized on 10 Aug 1807. This confirms Longmans' involvement in the work, of which several American imprints survive, though a copy with a British imprint still remains elusive.

1807: 15 COTTIN, [Sophie Rištaud]; MEEKE, [Elizabeth] (*trans.*), ELIZABETH; OR, THE EXILES OF SIBERIA. A TALE, FOUNDED ON FACTS. ALTERED FROM THE FRENCH OF MADAME DE COTTIN. The EN2 entry is based on the Minerva Press edn., located at Yale University, at that point considered to represent the first published translation. Advertisements in the *Morning Chronicle* on 23 Jan 1807 and *The Star* on 18 Feb 1807 point to a possibly earlier 1-vol. edn. issued by Oddy & Co., W. Oddy, and Appleyards. These adverts are apparently matched by the entry in OCLC WorldCat (No. 12265756), itself based on the copy at Indiana University (PQ2211.C53.E613.1807). The Indiana catalogue describes this as: *Elizabeth, or, the Exiles of Siberia: A Tale Founded upon Facts from the French of Mad. Cottin*, London: Printed for Appleyard [and 2 others], 1807, 254p. This evidently matches the copy at Glasgow University Library (Sp.Coll.Z6-1.22), with title reading *Elizabeth; or the Exiles of Siberia, a Tale, Founded upon Facts. From the French of Mad. Cottin*; and with imprint 'London: Printed for Appleyard, Wimpole Street; Oddy and Co. 27, Oxford Street; and W. Oddy, 108, Newgate Street, 1807'. Printer's mark on title-page reads: 'Burton, Printer, 82, Fetter Lane'. 'The Author's Preface' (3pp. unn.), followed by 'Translator's Address' (1p. unn.); main text 254p (12mo in sixes). Leaf advertising 'Books Just Published and Sold by Oddy and Co.' at end. Evidently a different translation from 1807: 15; and, if discovered in time, would have warranted full entry as 1807: 15(b). Furthermore an additional translator, either for this or one of several other contemporary edns., can now be claimed in Agnes Crombie Hall (for whom, see updated *Notes* to Section A, 1819: 59). According to the introduction (4 pp. unn.) to an 1874 Jedburgh edn. of her short tale *The Autobiography of a Scottish Borderer*, published under the name of Mrs Hall: 'She translated several works from the Continental languages, one of them being the tale, once a favourite "The Exiles of Siberia"—from the French of Madame Cottin.' Initially published in *Fraser's Magazine*, 8: 396–412 (Oct 1833), Hall's own original story had been first issued as a single item as *A Tale; or Autobiography of a Scottish Borderer* (Jedburgh, 1834). Though the small print used here makes this definable as a shorter tale, the page length (40 pp.) would have probably precluded entry as a full item in EN3. Like the possible extra translation, it nevertheless adds usefully to the now enlarged corpus of fiction relating to Agnes Crombie Hall.

1808: 39 COTTIN, [Sophie Ristaud], CLARA; A NOVEL. Described in entry as 'Trans. of *Claire d'Albe* (Paris, 1799)'. Imprint of private copy of the French original under that title reads: 'A Paris, Chez Maradan, Libraire, rue Pavée-André-des-Arcs, no 16 An VII.' Author accreditation there reads 'Par La C.\*\*\*'

1808: 63 HURSTONE, J. P., THE PICCADILLY AMBULATOR; OR, OLD Q: CONTAINING MEMOIRS OF THE PRIVATE LIFE OF THAT EVER-GREEN VOTARY OF VENUS! THROUGHOUT WHICH ARE INTERSPERSED ANECDOTES OF THE MOST NOTED FASHIONABLES, HIS CONTEMPORARIES. Title at foot of folding coloured illustration reads 'A View taken from the **Green** [not 'Grand'] Park'. (Verified from private copy.)

1810: 67 PLUNKETT, [Elizabeth] [née GUNNING], DANGERS THROUGH LIFE: OR, THE VICTIM OF SEDUCTION. A NOVEL. A footnote to the 'Literary Retrospection' introducing Sarah Green's *Romance Readers and Romance Writers* (1810: 46) reads: 'Vide "DANGERS THROUGH LIFE," PUBLISHED BY MRS. PLUNKETT, *as original*. This novel is a translation of "LES MALHEURS DE L'INCONSTANCE."' This refers to Claude-Joseph Dorat's *Les Malheurs de l'inconstance* (Amsterdam and Paris, 1772), first translated into English by Elizabeth Griffith as *The Fatal Effects of Inconstancy* (see 1774: 25). Compare the suspicion of the *Critical Review*: 'In looking over several of these letters, we are struck with almost a *conviction* that they are a translation, or at least a very strict imitation from the French' (3rd ser. 19: 377–83 (Apr 1810), p. 379). Examination of the plots of Plunkett's work and the above French original suggests a number of parallels, though the characters' names have become English, and there are apparently some embellishments in plotting. Had it constituted only a subsequent translation, *Dangers through Life* would not have merited inclusion as an individual entry. As things stand, pending contrary information, it is perhaps more appropriately considered as a looser reworking or 'imitation'.

1812: 56 SOANE, George, \*KNIGHT DAEMON AND ROBBER CHIEF. It has been suggested that this title might relate to Soane's 'The Stranger Knight' as serialized in 8 parts (as 'an original Romance') in the *Theatrical Inquisitor*, 1812–14. See James D. Jenkins (ed.), *The Stranger Knight, with the Bond of Blood* (Richmond, VA, 2012). Until the discovery of an actual copy, the existence the *Knight Daemon* in book form must be questionable.

1814: 16 CULLEN, Margaret, MORNTON A NOVEL. The Ricky Carter Collection Donation, Special Collections and Archives, Cardiff University Library, includes a copy bearing 'Second Edition' on the title-page, and with imprint date of 1815. In other respects, the imprint details are the same as on the 1st edn., as is also the case with the colophon. This edn. presumably fills in the gap between the 1st edn. and the 3rd edn. of 1829 noted in EN2.

**1814: 59** WARD, Catherine G[eorge], THE SON AND THE NEPHEW; OR, MORE SECRETS THAN ONE. Another edn. was published by T. Mason, 1817. This is evidently a reissue from old sheets of the original 3-vol. novel published by Sherwood, Neely, and Jones, with similar pagination and bearing the same colophon of 'Molineux, 4, Bolt Court, Fleet Street' (see <<https://archive.org/details/sonnephewormoreso1ward/>>). Unlike the original edn. the replacement title-page however does not refer to the Dedication to Mrs Boehme, though the Dedication itself does follow.

**1815: 54** [WILLIAMS, William], THE JOURNAL OF LLEWELLIN PENROSE, A SEAMAN. Longmans' letter to Orton Smith dated 4 Feb 1814 (see also **1808: 18**, Section A, above) indicates that the firm was keen at this point to procure this work via the Revd John Eagles, the son of the author's old benefactor in Bristol, Thomas Eagles, though having previously declined it: 'Some years back we had offered to us a MS entitled "Penrose", which was in the possession of the late Mr Eagles of Bristol. We then declined it. We understand that it is now in the hands of his son, & that he is disposed to part with it. If you are at all acquainted with the present Mr Eagles, we shall feel particularly obliged if you would inquire respecting it, & on what terms he would part with it. We should wish to see the MS before we determine finally respecting [it]' (Letter Book 1, 98, no. 131). It was presumably at much the same time as this that John Murray—the eventual publisher—was bargaining for it, with Walter Scott reportedly reading and approving the MS (the 'Caledonian Mercury Press, Edinburgh' colophon of the printed work may be revealing in this respect). This letter, as seen here more fully, also encourages the view that Orton Smith lived in Bristol, and at least associated with clergymen, if not being actually being one himself. The EN2 entry should have probably mentioned the presence of a diagrammatic illustration facing p. 131 of vol. 2 (as in private copy).

**1816: 7** ANON., \*MALVERN HILLS; OR, HISTORY OF HENRY FREEMANTLE. A NOVEL. SECOND EDITION. Additions in hand at end of Marshall's Catalogue include 'Henry Freemantle 2v 1808'. This would seem to corroborate Block's suggestion of an earlier publication under this title c. 1810. 'Henry Freemantle' also appears as such in the main catalogues of Newman, Godwin and Bettison. For the newly discovered original edn. of *Henry Freemantle* (1808) see **Section D** above.

**1816: 37** JOHNSTON, Mary, THE LAIRDS OF GLENFERN; OR, HIGHLANDERS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. A TALE. NLS copy (Vts.54.h.31–32) had the joint imprint: London: Printed at the Minerva Press for A. K. Newman and Co: Edinburgh: John Anderson'. John Anderson's name is missing in the Corvey copy used for EN2 entry, whose t.p. and colophons match that of a routine Minerva Press title. One possibility is the work was actually initiated in Edinburgh, and then sold on to Newman & Co.; another

that Anderson was acting as an agent for Minerva publications. If the latter it seems not to have been a regular association.

1817: 3 ANON., HARDENBRASS AND HAVERILL; OR, THE SECRET OF THE CASTLE, A NOVEL. The presence of an entry for this title in 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, & Jones imprint described in the existing entry.

1818: 47 [PASCOE, Charlotte Champion, and WILLYAMS, Jane Louisa], COQUETRY. The existing *Notes* field states: 'National Library of Scotland MS 322, f. 285v (19 Jan 1818) shows Walter Scott recommending the work to Robert Cadell (Constable's partner), having read it in MS, and suggesting "Trevanion" would be a better title'. Though not intended, this might give the impression that Scott was writing to Cadell. In fact Cadell's letter was to Constable: 'I have called on Mr Scott he spoke of a Novel written by a Lady which he thinks might do—she names it Coquetry—but he and I agreed that was nonsense—he thinks Trevanion would be better' NLS MS, f. 286v). It is likely that Scott in fact suggested 'Trevelyan' (a name in the novel itself), with Cadell mishearing. It is also apparent from the end-result that Mrs Pascoe prevailed in her original choice.

1820: 34 HOGG, James, WINTER EVENING TALES. Ian Duncan in his Introduction to the Stirling / South Carolina edn. of this work (Edinburgh, 2002), p. xx, gives the sub-title of the German trans. of 1822 as *Winter-Abend-Erzählungen*. He also states that it was ascribed to 'Sir James Hogg', had a Preface by Sophie Man, and was published first in Berlin in 1822, then again in Vienna in 1826.

1820: 37 HUIISH, Robert, FATHERLESS ROSA; OR, THE DANGERS OF THE FEMALE LIFE. Bernard Quaritch Catalogue, 1433 (Autumn 2018), item 29, describes copy with a note on the front pastedown recording the purchase of the 22 parts for 11s and binding 2s.

1821: 26 [CAREY, David], A LEGEND OF ARGYLE; OR 'TIS A HUNDRED YEARS SINCE. Add at beginning of *Notes* field: "**Advertisement**" (2 pp. unn.) concerning anonymity and authenticity.'

1821: 65 SIDNEY, Philip Francis, THE RULING PASSION, A COMIC STORY, OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY. Further information about this title has arisen through a letter addressed to 'Allison & Sidney' in the Longman Letter Books. Dated 30 Dec 1820, this reads: 'We wish you had sent us a copy of Ruling Passion. If we are not mistaken it is a translation either from the French or Italian. We have no objection to publish the work for you on the



usual terms we do such matters—to account for the books we may sell at the Trade Sale price & charge a commission of 10 P Cent on the sales, you paying all the expenses of Advertising, freight, &c. // Have you not been too sanguine of its sale having printed 2000 copies?’ (I, 101, no. 70). It is likely that Allison & Sidney are ‘the Proprietors of the Hull Packet [a weekly newspaper]’, for whom the novel was printed. Mention of the work being a translation also helps explain the presumably facetious ‘revived, revised, and edited’ incorporated in the fuller title. OCLC WorldCat (No. 8634631) identifies this work as based on *La Fuerza de la sangre* of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, which itself had been translated into English as *The Prevalence of Blood* (London, 1729), and again, more recently, as *The Force of Blood, a Novel* (London, 1800). No copy of this work with Longmans included in the imprint has been discovered, though it is possible that the firm helped in the remaindering of what is almost certainly correctly perceived to be an over-large impression.

1822: 76 TROTTER, Robert, LOWRAN CASTLE, OR THE WILD BOAR OF CURRIDOO: WITH OTHER TALES, ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE SUPERSTITIONS, MANNERS, AND CUSTOMS OF GALLOWAY. The BL copy at RB.23.b.12566, containing ‘Subscribers’ Names’, pp. [159]–168, lists 273 subscribers, amongst whom just 14 are females, with 288 copies in all subscribed. Alphabetical listing arranges gentry and those in professional class (military, medical, clergy) above often long lists under the title ‘Messrs’. It includes place names throughout, with main concentration in SW Scotland, but with significant input from NW England, and other towns in England. Noticeably also included are ‘Robert Gillespie, Esq. of New York’ and ‘James Simpson, Geneva, New York’. A family connection (possibly the author’s father) is suggested by ‘John Trotter, Esq. surgeon, Worsley Mills, two copies’. The copy at E NG.1177.f.4, which formed the EN2 entry, ended at p. 157, and so evidently lacked the subscription list.

1823: 38 [GLEIG, George Robert], THE STRANGER’S GRAVE. Richard Beaton Catalogue, 42 (2006) records Allen, 1846 reprint, 144 pp., titled ‘The Stranger’s Grave, or the Maiden’s Doom. By H. Villiers, Esq. A Tale of Illicit Love, Founded Upon Facts’. This matches the (mistaken) attribution in some catalogues to Henry Villiers. Similar accreditation found in 1845 edn., published by Geo. Peirce, 310 Strand, now available online in Google Books.

1824: 9 ANON., JAMES FORBES; A TALE, FOUNDED ON FACTS. Bernard Quaritch Catalogue, 1442 (2020), item 51, describes the dedicatee, ‘Mrs Mackinnon, of Portswood House, in the County of Southampton, and of Hyde Park Place, London’ as a friend of Anna-Maria and Jane Porter. (Transcription of Dedication details above from private copy.)

**1824: 31** DURAS, [Claire Louise Rose Bonne, Duchesse de], OURIKA. Entries a) and b) in the Bibliography describe different translations with 1824 imprints published by, respectively, James Cawthorn and Longman & Co. James Burmeister Catalogue, 71 (2008), item 125, describes another edn. published with same year London imprint of J. Robins, 12mo, 100pp, this copy bearing the distinctive ownership inscription on title of George Cruikshank, 1824. A similar imprint is listed in OCLC WorldCat (No. 612813008). If discovered in time, this might have warranted full entry as 1824: 31(c).

**1824: 74** [PEERS, John], THE CONFESSIONS OF A GAMESTER. James Burmeister Catalogue, 34 (1997), item 65, describes a copy with a 2-pp. auto-graph letter signed by Peers, and so confirming the NSTC/Bodleian attribution. 'Dated from Lambeth, 26 April, 1828, and addressed to "My dear Sir", the letter refers to a pending decision of the Court of Aldermen on the conduct of the Chaplain of the prison in Whitecross Street, central London, and begs "acceptance of a little work which I published some time since—the subject of it died in the neighbourhood of Thorn Arch".' The Burmeister entry goes on to conclude, from this and its contents, that the book 'appears to be a genuine autobiography rather than a fictional narrative'. The absence of any materials in the supplementary fields for this title in DBF also argues against its belonging to the mainstream fiction scene. As a result, in addition to deleting the question mark over authorship, there appears to be a case for removing the whole work from the main chronological entries.

**1825: 26** DE RENZY, {S.} Sparow, LIFE, LOVE, AND POLITICS; OR THE ADVENTURES OF A NOVICE. A TALE. James Burmeister Catalogue, 65 (2006), item 108, describes copy with list of subscribers, accounting for 30 copies; with the Earl and Countess of Cavan, and Sir Hussey and Lady Vivian, prominent among the subscribers. BL copy (N.300) rechecked, and lacks this list. One additional feature, previously not noted, is the colophon of Thomas Baker, Printer, Southampton, in both vols.

**1825: 38** [HÄRING, Georg Wilhelm Heinrich]; [DE QUINCEY, Thomas (*trans.*)], WALLADMOR. Advertised as to be published 'in a few days' in the *Morning Chronicle*, 21 Oct 1824; then advertised as published (first full advert) in the same paper, 18 Dec 1824. These sightings, while indicating perhaps some delay in publication, would seem to modify the statement in the existing *Notes* that the work 'almost certainly appeared early in 1825'. Subsequent sightings show the *Morning Chronicle* of 4 Oct 1824 anticipating publication 'on the 15th instant'; this being matched by adverts stating 'On the 15th October will be published' in *The Star* on 2 and 9 Oct 1824. An advert in the *Edinburgh Evening Chronicle* of 8 Jan 1825 stating 'This day published' suggests that the release in Scotland came later.

1825: 50 [LAUDER, Sir Thomas Dick], LOCHANDHU A TALE OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. John Robertshaw Catalogue, 122 (2011), item 109, describes 1828 French trans. published by Charles Gosselin, claiming in its titles to be ‘Traduction de l’anglais sur la seconde édition, par A.-J.-B. Defauconpret’. No subsequent British edn. has been discovered, prior to a ‘second edition’ published in Elgin in 1877, so this is possibly part of a ploy designed to give a sense of runaway popularity in Britain. The ascription of the work at the same time to ‘Sir Edward Maccauley’ also suggests a lack of scrupulosity, not unfitting for Gosselin, who also mass-produced translations of the Waverley novels directly under Scott’s name, accompanied by a plethora of engraved illustrations and maps.

1825: 87 [WESTMACOTT, Charles Molloy], FITZALLEYNE OF BERKELEY. A ROMANCE OF THE PRESENT TIMES. Jarndyce Catalogue, 177 (Spring 2010), item 668, describes a copy with two later newspaper cuttings and a contemporary MS note reading: ‘This relates to the family scandal of the notorious Earl Fitzhardinge, his brothers the Berkeleys, and the whole disreputable lot’.

1826: 56 [MÄMPEL, Johann C.], THE ADVENTURES OF A YOUNG RIFLEMAN, IN THE FRENCH AND ENGLISH ARMIES, DURING THE WAR IN SPAIN AND PORTUGAL, FROM 1806 TO 1816. WRITTEN BY HIMSELF. John Robertshaw Catalogue, 144 (2018), item 110, which led to personal purchase of this copy, states that ‘The preface is by Goethe’. On this basis the *Notes* field should include after ‘Trans.’ details the following sentence: ‘Preface by the Editor’ supposedly by Goethe. The title should also begin with ‘THE’, and the correct pagination for preliminaries is ‘vi’ not ‘iv’.

1827: 44 [JOHNSTONE, Christian Isobel], ELIZABETH DE BRUCE. Ian Duncan, in his *Scott’s Shadow: The Novel in Romantic Edinburgh* (Princeton and Oxford, 2007), p. 346, n. 9, points to a German version ‘nach Walter Scott’ (3 vols., Stuttgart, 1827). As he notes, this matches the earlier attribution of the Johnstone’s *Clan-Albin* to Scott, as already noted in EN2 (1815: 32).

1827: 48 [LAUDER, Sir Thomas Dick], THE WOLFE OF BADENOCH; A HISTORICAL ROMANCE OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY. John Robertshaw Catalogue, 122 (2011), item 108, describes 1828 French trans. (*Le Loup de Badenoch*) published by Charles Gosselin, claiming in its title to be ‘Traduit de l’anglais sur la troisième-édition, par A.-J.-B. Defauconpret’, though only a 2nd in-period British edn. has been discovered (see also 1825: 50 above). It also wrongly gives the author as ‘Sir Edward Maccauley’. In the original EN2 entry the pagination of vol. 1 should read ‘I vii, 299’, and it is worth adding to the *Notes* field: ‘“Preliminary Notice” stating that the novel “was advertised in June 1825, at which time it was ready for the press” [v].’

1828: 23 [BRISTOW, Amelia], EMMA DE LISSAU; A NARRATIVE OF STRIKING VICISSITUDES, AND PECULIAR TRIALS; WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES, ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE MANNERS AND CUSTOMS OF THE JEWS. 2nd edn., London, 1829 (private copy) contains extended 'List of Subscribers' (10 pp. unnumbered), with extra details alongside some names (384 copies subscribed).

1828: 57 MANZONI, Alessandro; [SWAN, Charles (*trans.*)], THE BETROTHED LOVERS; A MILANESE TALE OF THE XVIIITH. CENTURY. Entry in Bibliography describes BL copy with Pisa imprint of Nicolo Capurro, 1828; but notes also that ECB lists Rivington as publisher, adding that this indicates a circulation in Britain (providing justification for inclusion of a non-British Irish imprint). Jarndyce Catalogue, 180 (Winter 2008–9), item 258, describes a copy with London imprint, 'Printed for C. and J. Rivington', more fully establishing that this first British edn. (evidently a joint production with the Italian publisher) was also issued fully in Britain. Furthermore, item 65 in Bernard Quaritch Catalogue, 1442 (2020) in describing copy with the Italian imprint adds that the translator Charles Swan had it printed in Pisa while staying there, the title being subsequently issued by Rivington in June 1828. The Quaritch copy also reportedly contains a terminal advertisement leaf in vol. 1 for works published by C. & J. Rivington.

**Appendix F: 4** DARLING, P[eter] M[iddleton], PATERNAL LOVE; OR, THE REWARD OF FRIENDSHIP. This title is listed in the *Monthly Review*, 76: 102 (Jan 1815). 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 gypsy 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.

1830: 40 [COOPER, James Fenimore], THE WATER WITCH; OR, THE SKIMMER OF THE SEAS. A TALE. James Burmester draws attention to the fact that the proper 1st edn. of this novel, preceding both the London and Philadelphia edns., was the English-language version printed in Dresden, 1830 (published before 18 Sept). This however does not override the present entry, owing to the policy of prioritizing first British edns. in the Bibliography. There was also a Berlin 1830 edn. (as *Die Wassernixe*), which accounts for the present 'German trans., 1830' component. The same situation apparently applied to the English edn. of Cooper's *The Borderers* (1829: 27), printed in Florence, likewise reflecting Cooper's practice of having his manuscripts set by local printers

while abroad. The text of the Dresden edn. of the *Water Witch*, together with a commentary, can be viewed at <<http://external.oneonta.edu/cooper/texts/dresden.html>>.

#### ADDENDUM I: CHARLES SEDLEY

*Jacqueline Belanger and Peter Garside*

‘Charles Sedley [pseud.?’] is credited with the authorship of six titles in vol. 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 (Sept 1987), 240–58 <<https://doi.org/10.1093/library/s6-IX.3.240>>. All six ‘Sedley’ titles featured a dated preface or dedication, indicative of a fashionably mobile person: *The Mask of Fashion*, London, Nov 1806; *The Infidel Mother*, London, Mar 1807; *The Barouche Driver and His Wife*, Brighton Cliffs, 19 July 1807; *A Winter in Dublin*, Ramsgate, 17 Oct 1807; *Asmodeus*, London, Apr 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 ‘Postscript’ [*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’ (vol. 2, p. 182). Hughes’s own presence tends to be increasingly invasive in the later titles.

Who then might Sedley have been? Though a number of modern catalogues list it without indicating pseudonymity, the name most probably derives from the Restoration rake, Sir Charles Sedley (1639–1701), with several OCLC WorldCat entries anachronistically attributing to him authorship of these novels! Sedley was also commonly used as a name for licentious characters in contemporary fiction. For instance, Frances Burney’s Sir Sedley Clarendel in *Camilla* (1785: 4), or



Isaac D'Israeli's Sedley in *Vaurien* (1797: 37), whose 'life was a system of refined Epicurism' (vol. 2, p. 58). Research carried out during the preparation of DBF, especially by Jacqueline Belanger, brought us tantalizingly 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, laboring 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 Gloucester [*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 realized, in a species of erotic description that may or may not derive from Wieland: 'She [an "amorous Priestess"] half reclined upon a sofa magnificently embroidered ... and richly spangled with pearls and variegated precious stones ... There was an easy negligence in her dress' (vol. 2, p. 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 financial 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, Nov 1807, p. 185). Likewise, apropos *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, 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 Section B, 1807: 19 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, Jan 1809, p. 1).

Edward Pope has subsequently written to say that in his archival research he has found evidence of the real existence of John Battersby Elrington. A person of that name was in debtor’s prison (Fleet and Kings Bench) from 23 Jan to 22 Aug 1811, as well as being in a list of debtors in Newgate Prison June 1813. Also, there are two baptisms of children of a John Battersby Elrington in Jamaica in 1792 and 1793, mother’s name Isabella Parker. Finally, evidence has been discovered of the birth of a John Battersby Elrington in Dublin on 6 Feb 1765.

In view of this new information, the case for a qualified attribution of the Sedley titles to Elrington, along possibly with *Tell-Tale Sophas* (1814: 12) by ‘John Battersby’, becomes more compelling.

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 under Section B, 1803: 38 above, 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 from Moscow, through Prussia, Germany, Switzerland, France, and England* (London, 1803), for the accomplishment of which he expresses gratitude to ‘her royal Highness the Duchess of York’ (p. v). Correspondence in the Murray archives 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 Section D, 1805: 15. Feldborg's departure from Britain near the end of the decade also matches evidence within another of his productions, *A Dane's Excursions in Britain* (London, 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 Aug 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!' (vol. 2, p. 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* (1988; Oxford, 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 "extremely 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 realized. 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 unregularized 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., vol. 1, pp. 105–10), feeds on an account supposedly given by a ‘*Femme de Chambre*’ in an early issue of *The Pic Nic* (vol. 1, no. 6, 12 Feb 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 2nd vol. 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, Case 400, items 6, 10, 11), written between 1822 and 1824, list 'Manfrone 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.

The issue is further complicated by the title-page attribution of the 1819 2nd edn. of *Manfrone*, as reprinted by A. K. Newman, 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 Radcliffe', 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 Walpolean romance style of *The Mysterious Baron* and the more fraught high Gothic manner of *Manfrone*. 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 title-pages) of *The Female Advocate; or An Attempt to Recover the Rights of Woman from Male Usurpation* (London, 1799) and of *The Memoirs of Mrs Mary Ann Radcliffe; in Familiar Letters to a Female Friend* (Edinburgh, 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 Edinburgh 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 EN1, though neither supplies an author on the title-page: *The Fate of Velina de Guidova* (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', *Mystery and Detection Annual* (Beverly Hills, 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* (London, 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* (Oxford, 1993) and *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English* (London, 1990), ed. Blain, Grundy, and Clements, both supply single entries, though with inbuilt qualifications regarding the novels involved. Isobel Grundy, author of the *Feminist Companion* entry, has subsequently personally expressed the opinion 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 1' novels, especially as found in contemporary circulating library catalogues. In Part Two (London, [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 *Catalogue* (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'. Reinforcing this 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'. *Manfrone* 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* (London, 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 50 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 for rejecting the idea that the memoirist MAR had any connection *Manfrone* (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 & 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 words 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, 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 (now fairly confidently identified as the 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*.'

(vol. 3, pp. 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, a good proportion of catalogues 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 Radcliffe' 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 Oct 1819 (RLF, Case 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] dramattick pieces ...

This application is supported by P. Boulanger, who affirms his knowledge of 'the Brazen Bust and several other applauded dramattick pieces', but mentions nothing else. Further listings are supplied in relation to applications in Apr and Nov 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* (Paris, 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) itemizes 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) <[http://www.romtext.org.uk/reports/cc12\\_n03/](http://www.romtext.org.uk/reports/cc12_n03/)>).

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 Oct 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 Roxburghe (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 Ker 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 Oct 1823 carries a further notice on Ker's second court appearance, at which an official from the Mendicity Society was in evidence. The official had viewed Ker's apparently squalid place of abode,

where a number of letters were found. It was determined that Ker 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 Ker was sent home to her parish (not identified) and urged to abandon the life she had adopted. Sharon Ragaz has more recently located an article in the *Morning Advertiser* for 4 May 1836 (p. 3) stating that she was again before the court for writing begging letters.

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'.

Much of this Report has been taken on board and developed by Dale Townshend in 'On the Authorship of *Manfroné*' (pp. 265–94) appended to his edn. of the novel for Valancourt Books (Richmond, VA, 2007). Townshend locates another contender as author in a Mary Ann Ratcliffe of Durham. 

#### REFERRING TO THIS ARTICLE

P. D. GARSIDE, with J. E. BELANGER, A. A. MANDAL and S. A. RAGAZ. 'The English Novel, 1800–1829 & 1830–1836: Update 8 (August 2000–June 2023)', *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*, 24 (Winter 2021) <<https://doi.org/10.18573/romtext.116>>.

#### COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

This article is © 2023 The Authors and is the result of the independent labour of the scholars credited with authorship. For full copyright information, see page 2.

Date of acceptance: 14 April 2023.



## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS



**Susan Civale** is Reader in Romanticism at Canterbury Christ Church University. Her research interests lie in women's writing of the long nineteenth-century, life writing, gothic literature and literary afterlives. Her monograph *Romantic Women's Life Writing: Reputation and Afterlife* (Manchester University Press, 2019) considers how the publication of women's 'private lives', through diaries, auto/biographies, letters and memoirs, influenced their literary reputations. She is now writing a book on Mary Shelley as a popular author.

**Dr Octavia Cox** is Honorary Fellow at the University of Nottingham and teaches at the Department for Continuing Education, University of Oxford. She has published various peer-reviewed chapters and articles. Recent publications include chapters on the *Ladies Poetical Magazine* (in *Women's Periodicals and Print Culture in Britain, 1690–1820s* [Edinburgh University Press, 2018]), historicising Keats' opium imagery through medical and literary discourses (in *Psychopharmacology in British Literature and Culture, 1780–1900* [Palgrave Macmillan, 2020]) and the reverse-Robinsonade and the Woman of Colour (in *Transatlantic Women Travelers, 1688–1843* [Bucknell University Press, 2021]). Her article examining the influence of Alexander Pope's *Iliad* on the poetic taste of Southey, Coleridge and Wordsworth will be published in *Romanticism* in 2022. Her first monograph, *Alexander Pope in the Romantic Age*, is forthcoming. She is also currently researching a book provisionally titled *Jane Austen and Counter-Genre*.

**Anna M. Fitzer** is Senior Lecturer in Eighteenth-Century Literature at the University of Hull. She is editor of *Eugenia and Adelaide* (Routledge, 2019), the only modern edition of a novel completed in her youth by LeFanu's grandmother, Frances Sheridan (*née* Chamberlaine), and first published posthumously in 1791. She is co-editor (with Amy Culley) of *Editing Women's Writing, 1670–1840* (Routledge, 2018) and editor of *Memoirs of Women Writers Part I* (Pickering & Chatto, 2012), a 4-volume set which includes LeFanu's *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Frances Sheridan* (1824). She is also editor of LeFanu's first novel of 1816, *Strathallan* (Pickering & Chatto, 2008).

**Katie Garner** is Lecturer in Nineteenth-Century Literature at the University of St Andrews. She is the author of *Romantic Women Writers and Arthurian Legend: The Quest for Knowledge* (Palgrave, 2017), and the co-editor (with Nicholas Roe) of *John Keats and Romantic Scotland* (Oxford University Press,

2022). She has published various articles and chapters on aspects of nineteenth-century Arthuriana.

**Peter Garside** taught English Literature for more than thirty years at Cardiff University, where he became Director of the Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research. Subsequently, he was appointed Professor of Bibliography and Textual Studies at the University of Edinburgh. He served on the Boards of the *Edinburgh Edition of the Waverley Novels* and the *Stirling / South Carolina Collected Edition of the Works of James Hogg*, and has produced three volumes apiece for each of these scholarly editions. He was one of the general editors of the bibliographical survey *The English Novel 1770–1829*, 2 vols (Oxford University Press, 2000), and directed the AHRB-funded online database *British Fiction 1800–1829* (2004). More recently, he has co-edited *English and British Fiction 1750–1820* (2015), as volume 2 of the *Oxford History of the Novel in English*; as well as an edition of Scott's *Shorter Poems* (2020), along with Gillian Hughes, for the *Edinburgh Edition of Walter Scott's Poetry*.

**James Grande** is Senior Lecturer in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture at King's College London. He is the author of *William Cobbett, the Press and Rural England: Radicalism and the Fourth Estate, 1792–1835* (2014) and co-editor of *The Opinions of William Cobbett* (2013), *William Cobbett, Romanticism and the Enlightenment: Contexts and Legacy* (2015) and *William Hazlitt: The Spirit of Controversy and Other Essays* (2021). He is a trustee of Keats–Shelley House, Rome and editor of the *Keats–Shelley Review*.

**Dr Barbara Hughes-Moore** is a Lecturer in Law at Cardiff University and Reviews Editor for *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840*. Her research interests include law and literature, criminal legal theory and gothic fiction, with a focus on the nineteenth century and the literary double. She has published on *Frankenstein*, gendered assumptions underlying partial defences to homicide, and distinct 'Welsh' values emerging from devolved health law (with Professor John Harrington and Erin Thomas). Her work has been published in the *Journal of Law and Society* and the *Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly*, and she is currently developing her doctoral thesis into a monograph.

**Sonja Lawrenson** lectures in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century literature at Manchester Metropolitan University. Her research centres on women's writing in eighteenth-century and Romantic Ireland. She has published on authors such as Frances Sheridan, Elizabeth Hamilton and Maria Edgeworth, and more broadly on Romantic Orientalism, popular fiction and the eighteenth-century Irish stage.

**Máire Ní Fhlathúin** is Professor of English Literature at the University of Nottingham. She works on the literature and culture of British India. Her current



project, 'The Lost Voices of Empire', explores the poetry of the Indian press during the nineteenth century. Recent publications include 'Late Orientalist Poetry and Politics: India in the Colonial Literary Culture of the 1830s', *MLR* (2020); an edition of the poetry of Thomas D'Arcy Morris (*Romantic Circles*, 2018), and *British India and Victorian Literary Culture* (Edinburgh University Press, 2015).

**Stephen Pallas** is a doctoral candidate of English Literature at Stony Brook University. His research focuses on British Romanticism, with particular attention being drawn to the intersection of literary empathy, rhetoric and the history of political reform. He has written and presented widely on Percy Shelley, Walter Scott and Romantic ecocriticism. Stephen's dissertation examines the ways literary empathy reflect shifting cultural attitudes towards slaves, prostitutes, prisoners and animals in the early decades of the nineteenth century.

**Robert W. Rix** has published widely in several areas relating to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: politics, religion, language, nationalism, Nordic antiquarianism, and book history. One area of interest has been the work and print culture practices of William Blake and his contemporaries, especially in relation to the subcultures of English religious radicalism. In recent years, Rix has also written on the history and perception of the Arctic. Related to this area of inquiry is his forthcoming book, which is entitled *The Vanished Settlers of Greenland: In Search of a Legend and its Legacy* (Cambridge University Press).

**Claire Sheridan** is an independent scholar based in south-east London. She has taught at Queen Mary University of London, the University of Greenwich and Canterbury Christ Church University. She is the author of articles on William Hazlitt, Mary Shelley, William Godwin and Alan Moore, among others. Her research interests include the influence of William Godwin's 'philosophical gothic' on later gothic writers, and the various communities (of readers, writers, characters and makers) associated with Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*. She co-ran the Romantic Novels 1817 and 1818 seminar series with Susan Civalé.

**Juliet Shields** is Professor of English at the University of Washington. Her most recent books are *Scottish Women's Writing in the Long Nineteenth Century: The Romance of Everyday Life* and *Mary Prince, Slavery, and Print Culture in the Anglophone Atlantic World* (both 2021).

**Richard Gough Thomas** is a writer and critic, the author of *William Godwin: A Political Life* (2019) and a contributor to *The Cambridge Guide to the Eighteenth-Century Novel, 1660–1820*. Richard has worked at every level of Britain's educational system and holds a doctorate from Manchester Metropolitan University on the role of empiricism in Godwin's educational writing. He lives in Sheffield, surrounded by more toy foxes than he cares to think about.

**Christopher Vilmar** is Professor of English at Salisbury University, Maryland. His research interests focus mainly on intersections of satire, political writing, and philology in eighteenth-century British literature. In addition to publications on Samuel Johnson, satire and pedagogy, he is an associate editor of *The Encyclopedia of British Literature, 1660–1789* (Wiley Blackwell, 2015).

**Katherine Voyles** holds a PhD in English from the University of California, Irvine. Her work appears in fora including *Victorian Literature and Culture*, *Victorian Review*, the *V21 Collective*, *Public Books* and the *Los Angeles Review of Books*. She frequently uses her background to write about the cultures of national defence and national defence in culture.

**Amy Wilcockson** is currently completing her PhD at the University of Nottingham, with an edition of the Scottish Romantic poet Thomas Campbell's letters, funded by the Midlands4Cities (AHRC) Doctoral Training Partnership. She won the 2019 Scottish Romanticism Research Award (BARS/UCSL) and has been published in *Studies in Scottish Literature*, *History Today* and the *Times Literary Supplement*. Her article on humour in Campbell's correspondence is forthcoming in *Romanticism*. She is also a 2020–22 Communications Fellow for the Keats–Shelley Association of America, and was recently elected as the Communications Officer for the British Association for Romantic Studies (BARS).

**Jingxuan Yi** is currently completing her PhD in the school of English at University of Nottingham, working under the supervision of Professors Lynda Pratt and Máire Ní Fhlathúin. Her research interests are in the field of colonial and postcolonial cultures, women writers' prose and fiction in the Romantic period, the relationship between writers and places. Her doctoral dissertation aims to look at representations of Other spaces in early nineteenth fiction by women writers.





## BOOKS RECEIVED



We have received review copies of the following books. Items that have been already assigned to reviewers are marked with an asterisk: if you are interested in reviewing one of the unassigned books, or if you would like to suggest a different book for review, please contact the Reviews Editor ([Reviews@romtext.org.uk](mailto:Reviews@romtext.org.uk)). Hard copies are available on request.

### 2022

BATCHELOR, JENNIE. *The Lady's Magazine (1770–1832) and the Making of Literary History* (Edinburgh University Press, 2022), 320pp. ISBN 978-1-4744-8766-5; open access (eBook PDF).

SUZUKI, RIEKO. *The Shelleys and the Brownings: Textual Re-Imaginations and the Question of Influence* (Liverpool University Press, 2022), 216pp. ISBN 978-1-800-85523-6; £90 (eBook PDF).

### 2021

BARTLETT, NORA and JANE STABLER (eds). *Jane Austen: Reflections of a Reader* (Open Book Publishers, 2021), 252pp. ISBN 978-1-78374-977-5; open access (eBook PDF).

COFFEY, BYSSHE INIGO. *Shelley's Broken World: Fractured Materiality and Intermittent Song* (Liverpool University Press, 2021), 248pp. ISBN 978-1-800-85758-2; £90 (eBook PDF).

LANIEL-MUSITELLI, SOPHIE and CÉLINE SABIRON (eds). *Romanticism and Time: Literary Temporalities* (Open Book Publishers, 2021), 314pp. ISBN 978-1-80064-073-3; open access (eBook PDF).

FAY, JESSICA (ed.). *The Collected Letters of Sir George and Lady Beaumont to the Wordsworth Family, 1803–1829, with a Study of the Creative Exchange between Wordsworth and Beaumont* (Liverpool University Press, 2021), 380pp. ISBN 978-1-800-85865-7; £95 (eBook PDF).

POTTER, FRANZ J. *Gothic Chapbooks, Bluebooks and Shilling Shockers, 1797–1830* (University of Wales Press, 2021), 240pp. ISBN 978-1-78683-671-0; £70 (eBook PDF).

STOKES, CHRISTOPHER. *Romantic Prayer: Reinventing the Poetics of Devotion, 1773–1832* (Oxford University Press, 2021), 256pp. ISBN 978-0-19885-780-8; £75 (eBook PDF).

2020

- \*BAINBRIDGE, SIMON. *Mountaineering and British Romanticism: The Literary Cultures of Climbing, 1770–1836* (Oxford University Press, 2020), 320pp. ISBN 978-0-1988-5789-1; £60 (eBook).
- BINHAMMER, KATHERINE. *Downward Mobility: The Form of Capital and the Sentimental Novel* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2020), 256pp. ISBN 978-1-42143-761-3; £24.64 (eBook PDF).
- CAREY, BRYCCHAN, SAYRE GREENFIELD AND ANNE MILNE (eds). *Birds in Eighteenth-Century Literature: Reason, Emotion, and Ornithology, 1700–1840* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), xiv + 284pp. ISBN 978-3-030-32792-7; £71.50 (eBook PDF).
- CHEYNE, PETER. *Coleridge's Contemplative Philosophy* (Oxford University Press, 2020), 400pp. ISBN 978-0-1988-5180-6; £70 (e-book).
- FREER, ALEXANDER. *Wordsworth's Unremembered Pleasure* (Oxford University Press, 2020), 272pp. ISBN 978-0-19885-698-6; £28.73 (eBook PDF).
- GILL, STEPHEN. *William Wordsworth: A Life*, 2nd edn (Oxford University Press, 2020), 688pp. ISBN 978-0-1988-1711-6; £25 (eBook).
- GOODE, MIKE. *Romantic Capabilities: Blake, Scott, Austen, and the New Messages of Old Media* (Oxford University Press, 2020), 320pp. ISBN 978-0-19886-236-9; £58.33 (eBook PDF).
- HATTON, NIKOLINA. *The Agency of Objects in English Prose, 1789–1832: Conspicuous Things* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), xi+247pp. ISBN 978-3-030-49111-6; £55.99 (eBook PDF).
- HUNNEKUH, PHILIPP. *Henry Crabb Robinson: Romantic Comparatist, 1790–1811*, Romantic Reconfigurations: Studies in Literature and Culture 1780–1850, 13 (Liverpool University Press, 2020), 304pp. ISBN 978-1-7896-2758-9; £108 (e-book).
- JOY, LOUISE. *Eighteenth-Century Literary Affections* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), viii + 215pp. ISBN 978-3-030-46008-2; £55.99 (eBook PDF).
- \*KEYMER, TOM. *Jane Austen: Writing, Society, Politics* (Oxford University Press, 2020), 182pp. ISBN 978-0-19-886190-4; £7.62 (eBook PDF).
- \*LEASK, NIGEL. *Stepping Westward: Writing the Highland Tour c. 1720–1830* (Oxford University Press, 2020), 368pp. ISBN 978-0-1988-5002-1; £65 (e-book).
- LUDLOW, ELIZABETH (ed). *The Figure of Christ in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), xvii + 276pp. ISBN 978-3-030-40082-8; £63.99 (eBook PDF).
- PETTITT, CLARE. *Serial Forms: The Unfinished Project of Modernity, 1815–1848* (Oxford University Press, 2020), 366pp. ISBN 978-0-19883-042-9; £54.17 (eBook PDF).
- RIGBY, EMMA. *Reclaiming Romanticism: Towards an Eco-poetics of Decolonization* (Bloomsbury, 2020), 224pp. ISBN 978-1-47429-061-6; £61.20 (eBook PDF).

YOSHIKAWA, SAEKO. *William Wordsworth and Modern Travel: Railways, Motorcars and the Lake District, 1830–1940* (Liverpool University Press, 2020), 304pp. ISBN: 978-1-78962-739-8; c. £76.10 (eBook PDF)

## 2019

CHAO, SHUN-LIANG and JOHN MICHAEL CORRIGAN (eds). *Romantic Legacies: Transnational and Transdisciplinary Contexts*, Routledge Studies in Comparative Literature (Routledge, 2019), 336pp. ISBN 978-0-3670-7672-6; £44.99 (e-book).

MCLEAN, THOMAS and RUTH KNEZEVICH (eds). *Jane Porter, Thaddeus of Warsaw: A Novel*, Edinburgh Critical Editions of Nineteenth-Century Texts (Edinburgh University Press, 2019), 440pp. ISBN 978-1-4744-4348-7; £29.99 (e-book).

NEIMANN, ELIZABETH. *Minerva's Gothics: The Politics and Poetics of Romantic Exchange, 1780–1820*, Gothic Literary Studies (University of Wales Press, 2019), 304pp. ISBN 978-1-7868-3369-3; £35 (e-book).

REJACK, BRIAN and MICHAEL THEUNE (eds). *Keats's Negative Capability: New Origins and Afterlives* (Liverpool University Press, 2019), 320pp. ISBN 978-1-786-94971-4; £90 (eBook PDF).

ROBERTS, BETHAN. *Charlotte Smith and the Sonnet: Form, Place and Tradition in the Late Eighteenth Century* (Liverpool University Press, 2019), 192pp. ISBN 978-1-789-62434-2; open access (eBook PDF).

WINCKLES, ANDREW O. *Eighteenth-Century Women's Writing and the Methodist Media Revolution: 'Consider the Lord as Ever Present Reader'*, Romantic Reconfigurations: Studies in Literature and Culture 1780–1850, 10 (Liverpool University Press, 2019), 288pp. ISBN 978-1-7896-2435-9; £90 (eBook).

## 2018

CLASON, CHRISTOPHER R. (ed.). *E. T. A. Hoffmann: Transgressive Romanticism* (Liverpool University Press, 2018), 272pp. ISBN 978-1-786-94874-8; £24.95 (eBook PDF).

YEN, BRANDON C. *The Excursion and Wordsworth's Iconography* (Liverpool University Press, 2018), 336pp. ISBN 978-1-7869-4133-6; £95 (hb).





# INSTRUCTIONS FOR AUTHORS



*Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840* is only as substantial as the material it attracts: therefore, we more than welcome any contributions that members of the academic community might wish to make. Articles and reports 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.

Contributors should note that material submitted to the journal should represent original work previously unpublished elsewhere, and must not be submitted elsewhere for publication while under consideration by *Romantic Textualities*. Material can be submitted in either print (2 copies, single sided) or electronic versions, and should be double spaced; any of the usual electronic formats (e.g. RTF, Microsoft Word, Pages, HTML, *but not* PDF) are acceptable. Authors will be contacted about editorial decisions by one of the editors. The final, revised version of an accepted manuscript must adhere to the MHRA style. Authors are advised to consult both previous issues of the journal for examples and the MHRA style guide, which is available online @ <http://www.mhra.org.uk/Publications/Books/StyleGuide/download.shtml>.

**Articles:** All article submissions are subject to the normal process of anonymous peer review; authors are advised to include their names and contact details on separate cover sheets attached to copies of their manuscripts. Papers of 5–8,000 words should be submitted in either print (2 copies) or electronic versions.


**Reports:** *Romantic Textualities* also publishes reports on individual/group projects, along with accompanying bibliographic (or similar) material, in order to publicise and disseminate relevant research in the discipline. Reports are generally *not* subject to peer review, but their suitability for publication will be assessed by the Editors. Reports can take a variety of formats, and the final presentation of material is usually a result of discussions between authors and editors.

Article/report submissions should be sent to The Editors, *Romantic Textualities*, Centre for Editorial and Intertextual Research, ENCAP, Cardiff University, John Percival Building, Colum Drive, CARDIFF CF10 3EU, Wales (UK), [Editor@romtext.org.uk](mailto:Editor@romtext.org.uk).

**Book Reviews:** Communications regarding reviews should be addressed to The Reviews Editor (at the same address), [Reviews@romtext.org.uk](mailto:Reviews@romtext.org.uk).

**Proofs** will be sent to authors of the production cycle of the journal, in the form of electronic PDF files. They should be corrected and returned to the Editor within one week. Only minor alterations to the text will be accepted.

**Copyright:** *Romantic Textualities: Literature and Print Culture, 1780–1840* is an imprint of Cardiff University Press, an innovative open-access publisher of academic research, where ‘open-access’ means free for both readers and writers. Find out more about the press at [cardiffuniversitypress.org](http://cardiffuniversitypress.org).

Original copyright remains with the contributing author. The material published by *Romantic Textualities* is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC BY-NC-ND) International Licence. This means readers are allowed to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search or link to the full texts of the articles in this journal without asking prior permission from either the publisher or the author. 

If it is the author’s wish, *Romantic Textualities* can publish material under the more generous Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 International Licence, which allows modification and commercial reuse of the author’s material without prior permission. 