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ABSTRACT

The thesis focuses on the question of why Percy Bysshe Shelley failed to publish *The Mask of Anarchy* and a series of related poems in 1819. I argue that the attempt to answer this question has major relevance for a reading of Shelley's poems because it leads to a re-evaluation of Shelley's politics, which I regard as integral to the understanding of his poems.

I argue in the introduction that tackling this subject leads to a contribution to the following areas of debate: Shelley's textual history and radicalism, publishing history and 'historicist' attempts to evaluate texts in the Romantic period. In Chapter One I re-examine previous accounts of Shelley's attempts to publish in 1819, arguing that the accounts of those closest to Shelley, Leigh Hunt and Mary Shelley, have been too influential in portraying him as a victim of censorship, and that a new view of Shelley, as someone who was an informed participator in events, and not purely a victim, is needed. In Chapter Two I go on to explore the consequences of such an argument: I suggest that, if Shelley was indeed a major player in the fate of these poems, then the publishing options available to him at the time need to be explored. I examine the means open to Shelley: self-publishing, using literary pirates, appealing directly to radical publishers, and using Leigh Hunt as the publicist of his verse via his periodical the *Examiner*. I conclude in this chapter that Shelley was consistent in attempting to get his political works published, that although he used a variety of means, he showed a tendency to use publishers who formed part of a clandestine 'underworld': an understanding of his involvement with this 'underworld' differs from previous analyses of Shelley's radicalism which attributed it mainly to the mainstream Dissenting tradition of Thomas Paine and William Godwin. In Chapter Three I explore the consequences for Shelley's poetry of this re-evaluation of his position in relation to radical literary production, producing readings of the following poems, which were all in danger of transgressing the law, and thus could have lent themselves to publishing practices at the margin of legality: *Queen Mab, The Revolt of Islam, Oedipus Tyrannus, or Swellfoot the Tyrant* and *The Mask of Anarchy*. I suggest
that these poems, like the 'clandestine' radicals, tend to try to avoid being placed within any one political tradition. I argue that this does not suggest that Shelley's thinking was muddled in any way, but instead that his poetic practice mirrors his publishing practice: both show that Shelley was indebted to a form of radical literary production which cannot be found within the ideas and publishing practices of Paine and Godwin.

Thus, I conclude that an examination of Shelley's poetry which focuses on a period in his life when he engaged most directly with contemporary history, and explores that period in terms of Shelley's publishing practice and his politics during the whole of his life has important implications for the way we view his work. I believe that this thesis helps to reconcile some of the difficulties which critics have found in reading Shelley's political poetry. I also argue that this work could be taken further, in that I have discovered that there is much work still to be done in uncovering the relationship between politics and publishing in the period. For these reasons, I believe that this thesis is a contribution to knowledge.

Total number of words in the thesis (including footnotes, bibliography, appendices) = 89,989.
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BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Introduction

This thesis claims to offer a new view of a significant portion of Percy Bysshe Shelley's work. I focus on an unresolved critical problem surrounding Shelley's poetry in the year 1819, namely his failure to publish *The Mask of Anarchy* and a series of six associated political poems. I wish to focus mainly on *The Mask of Anarchy* because it seems to show that there was an apparent division between Shelley's political views and his ability to translate those views into practice. Critics have concurred in having a high opinion of the poem, an example being Richard Holmes' comment: 'this is the greatest poem of political protest ever written in English. It also has claims to be considered as the most powerfully conceived, the most economically executed and the most perfectly sustained piece of poetry of his life.'¹ I wish to provide a new perspective on the reasons why *The Mask of Anarchy* was not published, a topic which I argue has not been adequately addressed by previous critics. The thesis differs from previous studies because it discusses Shelley's radicalism and its relationship with his poetry in a manner which focuses attention upon the means by which Shelley's poetry was published. The role of publishers will be shown to be as significant a factor in the expression of Shelley's radicalism through his poetry as the political writings which influenced Shelley.

This introduction will outline the ways in which my views differ from those of other writers in the following subject areas: accounts of Shelley's textual history and radicalism, accounts of publishing history and 'historicist' attempts to describe texts in the Romantic period. I will also endeavour in the course of this introduction to show that these subjects can be linked together, and form the basis for a sound interdisciplinary study of Shelley's poetry.

I would argue that critics of Shelley have not utilized fully what I believe is an important factor in the writing and publication of Shelley's works, his relationship with his publishers. The thesis also differs from other textual approaches to Shelley in that it

---

foregrounds the different choices which were open to Shelley when he published his poems: I explore the way that there were different modes of publishing open to the radical poet at this time - self-publishing, exploiting literary piracy, making an open stand against authority by allying himself with those radical publishers who challenged the status quo directly, and by approaching the apparently liberal publisher Leigh Hunt.

The textual history of Shelley's poems is mentioned in passing by Shelley's biographers and I have gleaned useful information from these works. However, few critics have written book-length studies which focus on this topic. The most notable exception to this statement is perhaps Stephen Behrendt's work on Shelley's audiences, where he attempts to prove that Shelley was 'an author acutely sensitive to the advantages of defining his audiences carefully and addressing them in an appropriate fashion.' I largely agree with Behrendt's conclusions about Shelley's relationship with his audiences, although I do argue that his comments about 1819 are inaccurate. Neil Fraistat is similarly concerned with the reception of Shelley's poetry, in particular after the poet's death. Again, my emphasis is different: I am concerned to portray Shelley as a person who was active in shaping the radical culture of the early nineteenth century, not simply someone who was influenced by it. Kyle Grimes is interested in the censorship of Shelley's poetry and writes: 'I shall suggest that the fear of a libel prosecution (most evident in the 1813 suppression of Queen Mab) caused Shelley to adopt ironic discursive forms wherein 'dangerous' political and religious statements could be disguised in such a way as to hide them from the censorious eye of the attorney general.' I will argue that

---


5 Kyle Grimes, Queen Mab, Libel, and Forms of Shelley's Politics, Journal of English and
Grimes' work forms part of a general critical consensus which over-emphasizes the legal constraints placed upon Shelley in his attempts to get his poems published. In fact, it will be seen that the history of the publication of Shelley's texts is as much a portrait of numerous opportunities open to the radical writer. Also, my approach is different from that of other critics because I put at the forefront of an account of Shelley's radicalism the way that the interacted with publishers, printers and editors. As will be seen below, when I briefly discuss the work which has been recently done on 'book history', it is important to consider such figures to gain a comprehensive view of the way that Shelley's texts were formed.

The thesis also differs from the approach of other writers on Shelley's textual history by placing emphasis upon the interface between politics and publishing in Shelley's works. In this sense, the thesis aims to make a unique contribution to the study of Shelley's radicalism by avoiding oversimplifying Shelley's radicalism or of neutering it. An instance of this oversimplification is Gerald Mac Niece's description of Shelley's radicalism in terms of the 'Revolutionary idea':

Shelley's passion for reforming the world was given meaning and direction by the study of the revolutionary ideas and events of the age. One might conclude, in fact, that he was more strongly influenced by the history and fate of the French Revolution than by any of his readings in Godwin, Plato, Berkeley, or Spinoza, though all of these thinkers and others too certainly helped him to define a theory of the mind and to elaborate a program for reform, both practical and ideal, which would answer the challenge of revolutionary failure and reaction.6

For Mac Niece, the greatest influence on Shelley's politics was the French Revolution, which led Shelley to believe, in Mac Niece's words, that 'revolutions, which excite turbulent passions, must be avoided as long as possible, so that the quiet work of intellectual conviction may proceed incessantly and surely toward the far goals of universal

---

enlightenment and equality. The textual history of *The Mask of Anarchy* creates problems for Mac Niece's theory. Shelley, in writing a response to the Peterloo Massacre, was writing about political circumstances which he described himself as a time of 'conflicting passions'. 'Passions', in the case of Shelley's writings of 1819, are at the heart of his poetry.

Critics have also perhaps overemphasized the influence of William Godwin on Shelley. Godwin, who became Shelley's father-in-law after his marriage to Mary, Godwin's daughter with Mary Wollstonecraft, had written one of the key political texts of the 1790s, *An Enquiry concerning Political Justice and its influence on general virtue and happiness* (1793). Shelley introduced himself to Godwin by expressing his admiration for this text in a letter dated 3 January 1812. Godwin, however, clashed with Shelley, warning him that direct involvement with political activism was against his own principles. Godwin wrote, after Shelley had sent him his pamphlet *An Address to the Irish People*, which attempted to address the ordinary people of Ireland in language they could understand, that:

> Discussion, reading, inquiry, perpetual communication, these are my favourite methods for the improvement of mankind: but associations, organized societies, I firmly condemn; you may as well tell the adder not to sting ... as tell organized societies of men, associated to obtain their rights and to extinguish opposition, prompted by a deep aversion to inequality, luxury, enormous taxes and the evils of war, to be innocent, to employ no violence, and calmly to await the progress of truth.

Shelley's response to this letter shows that he had a complex view of Godwin's principles: he had stated that he was an ardent admirer of Godwin's work, but in his letter he reminds the older man that political thinking has to adapt itself to the times. Practical considerations were as important to Shelley as abstract political principles:

---

7 Mac Niece, p. 259.
8 For a fuller account of the Peterloo Massacre, see pp. 30-34 of this thesis.
I am not forgetful or unheeding of what you said of Associations. But Political Justice was first published in 1793; nearly twenty years have elapsed since the general diffusion of its doctrines. What has followed? Have men ceased to fight, has vice and misery vanished from the earth? Have the fireside communications which it recommends taken place? Out of the many who have read that inestimable book how many have been blinded by prejudice, how many in short have taken it up to gratify an ephemeral vanity and when the hour of its novelty had passed threw it aside and yielded with fashion to the arguments of Mr. Malthus! I have at length proposed a Philanthropic Association, which I conceive not to be contradictory but strictly compatible with the principles of 'Political Justice'.

Michael Scrivener has done much invaluable work on the subject of Shelley's politics, to which this thesis is indebted, but I would argue that in Radical Shelley he has fallen into the same trap of oversimplifying Shelley's position as Mac Niece. Scrivener has discussed Shelley's politics in relation to 'philosophical anarchism', a concept which P.M.S. Dawson argues is derived from the ideas of William Godwin. For Scrivener:

Especially as revised by Shelley, philosophical anarchism establishes a political ideal, a utopia, toward which society is moving in stages; it rejects a millenarian logic whereby utopia could be achieved immediately; it accepts politics as a process of gradual reforms and compromise, as well as ethical idealism. Shelley's attempt to strike a workable balance between the possible and the ideal is more characteristic of democratic socialism than of anarchism.

Scrivener suggests that Shelley had a coherent view of politics which emphasized the role of 'gradual reform'. Again, we might ask, how does such a view of Shelley incorporate his view of politics in 1819? For example, one critic has described the poetry of 1819 as consisting of 'apocapolitics', suggesting that it is an apocalyptic poetry which describes the final unmasking of corrupt practices among the rulers of Great Britain: as such, the literature of 1819 is a literature of crisis, not of gradual reform.

14 See Morton D. Paley, 'Apocapolitics: Allusion and Structure in Shelley's Mask of
Shelley explicitly confronts the split in Shelley's thinking between a tendency towards reformism and revolution: his longest chapter is entitled 'Reform or Revolution'. Foot sees these two elements as contradictory, and writes about *The Mask of Anarchy* that:

The contradiction racks this, his most persuasive and agitational poem, as it racked Shelley himself. Was there not some way of ending the dictatorship's violence and atrocities without committing or provoking more violence and more atrocities, he continued to ask himself. Patiently, practically, he searched for such a course, straying occasionally into empty rhetoric in the process. But he never allowed this search to deflect him from his agitation of the masses out of their quietism and their acceptance of their fate.15

For Foot, unlike Mac Niece or Scrivener, Shelley was by nature a revolutionary agitator, but faced a dilemma because he saw that revolution could easily erupt into violence. Again Foot perhaps simplifies Shelley's radicalism, trying to make Shelley's politics fit his own revolutionary views. Paul Foot reads *Prometheus Unbound* as the central text which explains Shelley's radicalism. For Foot, *Prometheus Unbound* offers a myth of revolution, where a key figure is Demogorgon, a character representing the working class, who brings about the overthrow of the evil and oppressive Jupiter. Foot writes:

In this, the most wonderful of all his poems, Shelley worked out the contradiction which dogs so much of his straight political writing. Reform, the poem concludes, is impossible without revolution. The forces of wealth and power in England in 1819 would not, in the foreseeable future, concede that wealth and power. They could easily contain the movement for reform for as long as that movement confined itself to the 'enlightened few'. The only power which could not be contained was the power of the people, organized, united and confident in revolutionary action.16

Again, the textual history of *The Mask of Anarchy* challenges Foot's view of Shelley's radicalism. If Shelley did really believe in 'the power of the people, organized, united and confident in revolutionary action', why did he not ensure that the poem which would have been his most effective rallying cry to them was published?

---


P.M.S. Dawson, in contrast to other critics, is at pains to discuss the diverse elements within Shelley's radicalism. He firstly traces Shelley's politics back to the Whiggism of his family background. The Whigs, with the Tories one of the two dominant parties in the British parliament at the time, tended to sympathise with radical causes, but to believe in the kind of gradual reform outlined by Scrivener. Politics during this period were often determined as much by personal connections as by political beliefs, and Shelley's family were Whigs because they were subject to the patronage of the Duke of Norfolk, who tended to follow politics similar to those of the prominent Whig, Charles James Fox. Dawson also explores Shelley's politics in terms of 'a revolutionary movement which extended across the whole Western world and of which Tom Paine was the prophet'. In other words, Dawson is suggesting that in the wake of the French Revolution, a consistent pattern of radical ideas held sway among some groups. I discuss the radicalism of the 1790s and its influence on Shelley and his contemporaries in a later section of this thesis, but here it can briefly be said that the prime exponent of such ideas was Thomas Paine, most famous as the author of *The Rights of Man*, parts 1 and 2.17 Paine, alongside Godwin, is generally considered to be one of the key influences on Shelley's political thinking. Dawson, like Scrivener, explores Shelley's 'philosophical anarchism', as well as his practical politics (Shelley was, for instance, actively involved in the attempt to secure Catholic emancipation in Ireland) and his attempt to reconcile this activism with his role as a poet through his prose text *A Defence of Poetry*. Dawson chooses to focus at the end of his study on Shelley's poem *The Triumph of Life*, 'Shelley's last and, I believe, his greatest poem, in which the central concerns of his idealist politics are focused and confronted.18 Dawson's account of the complexities of Shelley's radicalism are reflected in his summary of Shelley's beliefs as expressed in the poem. He suggests that Shelley's thoughts are 'subtle and sceptical', and that Shelley believed in practical action, 'that there is little point in hoping for a Heaven somewhere else', but that

17 See Dawson, p. 8.
18 Dawson, p. 9.
'whether he can create his Heaven on earth cannot be known for certain, but only hoped'.

Dawson, in attempting to give credence to all the complexities of Shelley's radicalism, makes it sound ambivalent. Again, we can ask, was the poet of *The Mask of Anarchy* really someone who 'only hoped' for a Heaven on earth?

How, then, can this thesis make a specific contribution to an understanding of Shelley's radicalism? My own argument is that Shelley's political texts ultimately become amenable to explication if they are viewed as part of an attempt on Shelley's part to engage with a radical culture which tended to subvert attempts by the authorities to stop it in its tracks or, in Jon Klancher's words, 'the radical text' was one which 'tries to locate itself outside the making and unmaking of signs'.

It is difficult to identify roles for people within that radical culture as either 'Reformist' or 'Revolutionary' because often their whole *modus operandi* was to operate through means of subterfuge, to avoid such labels. In this sense, I wish to explore, not the way in which Shelley drew upon 'Reformist' or 'Revolutionary' ideas, but the way in which his radicalism is an expression of a particular culture which persistently resisted efforts to pigeonhole it. Thus, as will be seen when an exploration is made of censorship and publishing in 1819, and the different means which radicals could use to find their way into print, radicalism in the early nineteenth century was characterized by its flexibility. James Epstein's view, as will be noted later in the thesis, is that radical texts were characterised by their willingness to experiment and their pragmatism. It will be seen that the radicals' resourcefulness in finding different means to convey their ideas to their readers is mirrored in their texts' content.

In placing Shelley's texts within the politics of 1819, I have drawn upon the work of David Worrall and Iain McCalman, who discuss the 'radical underworld' of Thomas Spence and his followers. The most informative critic on Spence is Malcolm Chase,

---

who has noted the particular relevance of the Spenceans to the events of 1819: 'in all that has been written on the subject of Peterloo the extent to which the underground remained active, and elements within it committed to revolution, has gone unnoticed. The extent of "open constitutionalism" in 1819 can be exaggerated. Spenceans at least expected the Manchester meeting of 16 August to succeed where Spa Fields had failed.' He adds that, 'particularly interesting at this time is the extent of Spencean participation in the press.'

In Chapter One I discuss *The Mask of Anarchy's* relationship with poems written in the aftermath of the Peterloo Massacre which were mainly published in the Spencean press. In this thesis, I am not arguing that Shelley was a conscious Spencean, but I do, like Chase, argue that the 'underground' was more influential than some previous commentators might have thought, and that it had links with more mainstream forms of radicalism. Worrall in describing this 'radical underworld' draws upon the work of McCalman, who has defined it in the following terms:

I have used 'radical underworld' as a convenient label for a loosely-linked, semi-clandestine network of political organisations, groups, coteries and alliances, but it also has a more literal sense. 'Underworld' is defined in a modern dictionary as 'a submerged, hidden or secret region or sphere, especially one given to crime, profligacy and intrigue.' It is apt because many of these ultras were also connected in various ways with London's notorious underworld of crime and profligacy. Through activities such as theft, pimping, rape, blackmail and pornography they introduce us to a region where popular politics intersected with lumpen and professional crime.23

McCalman gives us a picture of radicalism which, although concerned with the ideal of improving the material and spiritual well-being of ordinary people, was compromised by its involvement with various forms of crime. It also, by its very nature, was a world of subterfuge, where things might not have been what they seemed.

23 McCalman, p. 2.
This thesis is also much indebted to the disciplines of 'history of the book' and 'new historicism', both of which have arisen out of, and have been influenced by, French post-war sociology. Robert Darnton, in writing about the 'history of the book', notes that there was a new development in France during the 1960s, namely the publication in 1958 of *L'Apparition du Livre*, written by Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, and writes that 'the new book historians brought the subject within the range of themes studied by the "Annales school" of socioeconomic history. Instead of dwelling on fine points of bibliography, they tried to uncover the general pattern of book production and consumption over long stretches of time.' In other words, such historians sought to examine the book as a historical phenomenon, rather than a physical object of antiquarian interest, a point which Lucien Febvre makes in his introduction to *L'Apparition du Livre*:

'The book created new habits of thought not only within the small circle of the learned, but far beyond, in the intellectual life of all who used their minds. In short we are hoping to prove that the printed book was one of the most effective means of mastery over the whole world. That is the goal of the present work and, we hope, its novelty.' Febvre and Martin's interest in the history of books as a political subject, in the book as a tool which can be used to gain mastery over other people, parallels the subject of this thesis. I am concerned to argue that the means which Shelley used to try to get his poems into print were as politically significant as his poems' content.

---


The thesis also mirrors some of the aims of the discipline of 'history of the book' because of its emphasis on the role of publishers, editors and printers in conveying radical ideas. Recent critics, as will be seen, have found both the 'author' and the 'reader' to be fluid entities which, historically described, are different from Romantic perceptions of them. Romantic writers have tended to explain their literary processes in terms of ideas like 'inspiration' and 'genius', which omit the historical circumstances of their writing, and perhaps therefore aggrandize themselves as individuals. Similarly, they have viewed their readership as a collection of idealized individuals. Recent criticism has shown that these views were in fact inaccurate, and that it is difficult to take Romantic writers' statements about their own practice on trust. I would argue, therefore, that an accurate account of Romantic writers' relationship with their texts needs to incorporate the role of printers, publishers and editors, to gain a historically accurate view of those texts.

In the thesis I hope to show that examining Shelley's relationship with his publishers will be fruitful because it will demonstrate how the array of choices available to an author wishing to publish, was crucial in determining Shelley's politics as expressed in his poetry. Also, this task is intrinsically significant, because it will reveal new or little-known information about Shelley's publishers. It will be seen that there is still much to be done in exploring the wider role of publishers in the nineteenth century, and this study could perhaps be the beginning of a wider attempt to re-evaluate political aspects of their role. There are a number of studies which focus on publishers in the Romantic period, but none of these focus specifically on the politics of the publishers concerned. Notable studies of individual publishers in the period, which I have drawn upon in this thesis, are books by Edmund Blunden and Tim Chilcott on John Taylor, publisher of John Keats and John Clare, and Charles Robinson's article on Charles Ollier, Shelley's publisher.26

Robert Darnton defines the 'history of the book' in terms of a communications circuit that runs from the author to the publisher (if the bookseller does not assume that role), the printer, the shipper, the bookseller, and the reader. The reader completes the circuit, because he influences the author both before and after the act of composition. Authors are readers themselves.²⁷ Two elements, the author and the reader, have been subject to particular scrutiny by recent critics of the Romantic period. This study does not remove the author and reader entirely from the centre of discussion: one of the tasks of the thesis is to suggest that Shelley was an actor in the drama of the failure to publish *The Mask of Anarchy*, not a passive victim. I argue that Shelley had choices open to him. However, I do wish to stress that the other elements in Darnton's 'communications circuit', in particular the publishers, printers and booksellers, are important if we wish to understand Shelley's poetry and his politics. The question of Shelley's role in the non-publication of *The Mask of Anarchy* is important because the question of the more general role of the author has played an important part within Shelley criticism. As John Mullan points out, critics writing about Shelley's poetry, particularly during the Victorian period, have often felt it necessary to assess his life at the same time. Mullan writes that:

In Shelley's case, the poetry seemed to force biography on the curious reader, and often to tempt the hostile critic to reflection on the poet's life. This was not only because the lyrical verse beloved of Victorian readers seemed to speak directly of particular occasions of rapture or dejection. It was also because some of his most self-consciously idealistic writing seemed - and, indeed, still seems - to insist that ideals should be practised, that manners of living and writing should not be dissociated. For Shelley, we could say, the personal was the political.²⁸

Yet Shelley's case is not an isolated one; the role of the author has been a more general concern within Romanticism. An example is William Wordsworth's *The Prelude*, published in 1850, which represented 'the growth of the poet's mind' in Thirteen Books. The importance of this text to subsequent accounts of Romanticism is stressed by Duncan

²⁷ Darnton, 'What is the history of books?', p. 5.
Wu, when he includes the whole thirteen books of *The Prelude* in his anthology of Romantic writings.\(^{29}\) For Wordsworth, the author's own self-consciousness was as much an epic subject as, for instance, the attempt to 'justify the ways of God to man' in *Paradise Lost*. The importance of the authorial presence in discussing literature was generally recognized by nineteenth century critics: it has already been stated above that they tended to regard Shelley's poetry as inseparable from his biography, and Jack Stillinger writes that during the Romantic period 'the personalities of the poets and the essayists were thought to be central in their works and there was widespread discussion of such topics as inspiration, originality and genius'.\(^{30}\)

This Romantic concept of the author as a figure of genius, the understanding of whom was vital for an understanding of his or her poetry, has been challenged by critics from two standpoints: first, the legal status of the author has been re-examined, and second, the author's claim to be the sole 'genius' behind his or her works has been explored. Martha Woodmansee has uncovered the way that the idea of an autonomous author arose during the Romantic period in parallel with legal and economic necessity; it was a means of individual authors asserting their rights to copyright, and therefore their right to earn a living.\(^{31}\) David Saunders and Ian Hunter make a related point in exploring the idea of the eighteenth century 'literatory', a place where one person took on a number of roles, printing, bookselling and so on, suggesting that much of writing on censorship has been inaccurate because it has tended to emphasize the role of the author at the expense of publishers and printers:


The identification of the person who creates and the person who is prosecuted is central to a cherished assumption of postromantic criticism. Whether speaking for a 'complete' personality or spoken through, by a transgressive and 'de-completing' discursivity, the author has come to embody the impetus of human development against the repressive powers of law and state. So deep is this assumption that literary histories of censorship and obscenity law do not even begin to digest the fact that the bulk of obscenity prosecutions have been launched against printers and publishers, not writers.32

David Saunders also writes in Authorship and Copyright that he wishes to pursue 'a historical and theoretical alternative' to 'Romantic historicist' views of the author, by 'writing a history that remains within the purview of positive law and actual legal systems'.33 Saunders wishes to restore a historically-minded perspective to discussions of the role of the author.

Jack Stillinger has challenged Romantic concepts of the author, examining 'the joint, or composite, or collaborative production of literary works that we usually think of as written by a single author.' Stillinger is particularly concerned to re-examine Romantic texts, having written about John Keats' Isabella, Wordsworth's Prelude and plagiarism in Coleridge.34 Jerome McGann is similarly challenging when he discusses an 'introductory statement' of the editorial guidelines laid down by the MLA's Center for Scholarly Editions (CSE), suggesting that:

Implicit in it are ideas about the nature of literary production and textual authority which so emphasize the autonomy of the isolated author as to distort our theoretical grasp of the 'mode of existence of a literary work of art' (a mode of existence which is fundamentally social rather than personal). These ideas are grounded in a Romantic conception of literary production, and they have a number of practical consequences for the way scholars are urged to edit texts and critics are urged to interpret them. The ideas are also widespread in our literary culture, and since they continue to

---

34 See Stillinger, Multiple Authorship, p. v, also chapter 2, 'Keats and His Helpers: The Multiple Authorship of Isabella', pp. 25 - 49, chapter 4, 'Multiple "Consciousnesses" in Wordsworth's Prelude', pp. 69 - 95, chapter 5, 'Creative Plagiarism: The Case of Coleridge', pp. 96 - 120.
go largely unexamined in fundamental ways that seem to be necessary, they continue to operate at the level of ideology.  

For McGann, the idea of the autonomous author forms part of the 'Romantic ideology', 'an uncritical absorption in Romanticism's own self-representations'. McGann argues that subsequent critics have been overly influenced by statements made by the Romantics. Thus, we might say that recent critics have tried to establish an alternative view of authorial 'creativity' shaped, in part, by outside influences. Stephen Behrendt has mentioned the idealized nature of the concept of the reader in the Romantic period, suggesting that during Shelley's most active period of writing, between 1817 and 1822, audiences were shifting, and that 'writers frequently were left without any clear view of who their actual readers might be and with a disheartening sense of the scarcity of ideal readers.' He adds, 'they were left, in other words, with audiences with virtual readers whom they needed in large measure to invent'. Jon Klancher is also concerned to challenge such a concept of the reader, arguing that it needs to be mediated by a historically-conceived concept of audience:

The terms 'reader' and 'audience' are hardly neutral; they have come to mean, in post-Romantic critical discourse, two wholly contradictory and seemingly irreconcilable intellectual frameworks: the one hermeneutic or 'critical', the other empiricist or 'sociological'. My analysis in this book is both critical and sociological, hermeneutic and empirical. But to restore the relation of these lines of approach, we need to ask why the 'reader' has become historically detached from his audience in the first place.

Leaving aside the question of which is the correct critical term, 'audience' or 'reader', the quote from Klancher shows that he, like Behrendt, makes an argument for a historically aware account of Romantic texts. Implicit in this thesis is their view of the diverse nature of audiences, which is reflected in the diverse means through which writers could get their

---

37 Behrendt, p. 4.
works published. Here, though, the emphasis is on those elements of the 'communications circuit' which Saunders and Hunter have argued have been neglected, publishers, printers and editors. Instead of emphasizing, as Kyle Grimes and Neil Fraistat have done, the reception of Shelley's works, I am concerned to watch Shelley in the act of making his own works, because I hope to show that this process has important implications for a view of his radicalism.

Behrendt and Klancher's call for a historically aware criticism is in line with the aims of 'new historicism', a theoretical discipline within English studies which has, like book history, drawn upon the work of French sociologists.\(^{39}\) In this thesis' approach to Shelley's texts, then, it can be seen that I draw upon two theoretical disciplines which have a common basis because both are concerned to emphasize the material nature of texts. But I also wish to show here how my work is different from that of critics working within the field of 'new historicism'.

It can be broadly said that Renaissance new historicists have drawn principally upon the work of Michel Foucault, and that Romantic scholars have tended to find the work of Pierre Bourdieu more useful.\(^{40}\) Jerome McGann, perhaps the most expansive recent theorist of the historicist approach to Romantic literature, has defined his own approach as follows:

First, we must reconceive the literary 'text' as the literary 'work', i.e. as a related series of concretely determinable semiotic events that embody and represent processes of social and historical experience. Second, and following from this, is the concept of a critical methodology as embracing two large and related fields: the history of the literary work's textualizations and the history of its reception. Both of these histories occupy themselves with three important heuristic distinctions: between the work at its point of origin, the work through its subsequent transmissions, and the work situated in the immediate field of a present investigation. Third, these


\(^{40}\) For the differentiation between the influence of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu on Renaissance and Romantic new historicists see, for example, *Historicizing Blake*, edited by Steve Clark and David Worrall (New York and Basingstoke, 1994), p. 13. Jon Klancher also makes this distinction in 'English Romanticism and Cultural Production' (pp. 77 - 88), ed. Veeser, *The New Historicism*, p. 77.
topics and focuses of a critical work must be seen as moments in a dialectical investigation. They cannot be pursued in isolation; they must be integrated into a critical process which encourages various points of view to comment upon and critically illuminate each other. Finally, 'meaning' in the literary experience will also be reconceived as the process by which literary works are produced and reproduced. Meaning in poetry is neither the ideology of the poem nor the ideology of the critic; it is the process in which those ideologies have found their existence and expression. All the meanings which have ever been ascribed to poems will only be understood and comprehended when these meanings have been grasped as parts of the histories which poems reflect and reproduce.  

This statement shows the influence of Bourdieu, who in his book *Distinction, a social critique of the judgment of taste* surveyed attitudes towards cultural artefacts among different social classes in France in 1960s, and found that 'taste', which we might like to flatter ourselves is a matter of personal preference, was to a large degree conditioned by a person's social class. He was also concerned with the idea of the 'field of cultural production', which emphasizes the materiality of a literary work or cultural artefact. Randal Johnson has noted that in this respect Bourdieu's thinking differentiates him from the Renaissance 'new historicists':  

Bourdieu's work coincides in a number of ways with the 'New Historicism', identified primarily with Stephen Greenblatt and the journal *Representations*. Like Bourdieu, the New Historicism has attempted to develop a methodology that would avoid the reductionism both of internal, formalist and of external, more frankly sociological or Marxian paradigms of criticism. It has sought to refigure the literary field, especially that of the English Renaissance, by resituating works 'not only in relationship to other genres and modes of discourse but also in relationship to contemporaneous social institutions and non-discursive practices.' It posits, again like Bourdieu, that formal and historical concerns are inseparable, that human consciousness and thought are socially constituted, and that possibilities of action are socially and historically situated and defined. But Bourdieu would almost certainly take issue with New Historicism's 'post-structuralist textualization of history', which ultimately downplays the importance of an

---

extra-textual social and historical ground and the mediating role of the field of cultural production.43

McGann has drawn upon Bourdieu's idea of cultural production in defining the 'social text': 'this means that the particular projects and intentions of different individuals - most crucially, those of the author and of the author's various readers - become incorporated into many interactive networks. The "social text" is the field ... where the various interactions play themselves out.'44 Bourdieu writes that 'the sociology of art and literature' has to consider not only the producers of the work (the authors) but also the critics, publishers and so on, and the social conditions in which those people work, and that 'in short, it is a question of understanding works of art as a manifestation of the field as a whole, in which all the powers of the field, and all the determinisms inherent in its structure and functioning are concentrated.'45 For both McGann and Bourdieu, a satisfactory reading of a work of art has the ambitious task of taking into account all the determining factors making up its 'field', its appearance as a 'social text'.

This concern with the 'field of cultural production', with the literary text as a material object, has been shared by other critics of Romantic texts. David Simpson has suggested that such critics, in their application of a version of 'a historical method to the explanation of Romantic poetry', might be seen as sharing 'a collective project'.46 Forest Pyle has also generalised about the 'historicist' approach as applied to Romantic studies, suggesting that it should be seen in materialist terms:

The New Historicism is consistently motivated by a desire for the material of history, and it is the significant stress placed on the material of history which distinguishes new historicism from the traditional historicisms of its predecessors. In the most compelling works of the historically-oriented romantic critics, the return to history offers an engagement with a materiality which complicates the complementarity of 'text' and 'context'

45 Bourdieu, The Field of Cultural Production, p. 37.
and which thus opens critical attention to the 'textuality' of that which is traditionally relegated to a stable and explanatory 'context'.

Marjorie Levinson has also written in general terms about 'a historicist project' where 'reflection' 'is set in the field of material production'. In other words, for Levinson, a Romantic concept like the 'imagination', a product of the mind, needs to be understood within a historical approach, not in terms of abstract universals. In the sense, then, that the 'new historicism' of Romantic critics mirrors the concern of book historians with the materiality of texts, it echoes also the concerns of this thesis. One of the major tasks of this thesis is to restore a sense of the materiality of Shelley's texts of 1819.

However, I would also like to differentiate my work from that of others, by making a distinction between two approaches within 'new historicism' as it is applied to Romantic texts. One approach argues that Romantic writers tried to evade the claims of history, the other that Romantic writers were highly aware of history, and incorporated this awareness into their writings. The first of these approaches is that taken by Jerome McGann and Marjorie Levinson. For instance, McGann writes about his text *The Romantic Ideology*: 'the ground thesis of this study is that the scholarship and criticism of Romanticism and its works are dominated by a Romantic Ideology, by an uncritical absorption in Romanticism's own self-representations'. McGann's work consistently wishes to uncover instances of the 'Romantic Ideology', as was seen in his arguments about the role of the Romantic 'author', as outlined above. Marjorie Levinson is also concerned to uncover the 'Romantic Ideology' in writing about William Wordsworth's poem *Lines written a few miles above Tintern Abbey*: 'what Wordsworth presents as mythic, uninterpretable givens - eg. "vagrant dwellers in the houseless woods" - are the result of socioeconomic conditions whose causes were familiar to the poet and his readers.' In other words, for Levinson,

---

Wordsworth seeks to mislead his readers about the historical circumstances surrounding Tintern Abbey in the late eighteenth century by omitting important historical facts.

I would argue that McGann and Levinson's approach to Romantic texts, although perhaps part of a larger 'collective project', essentially differs from those of James Chandler, Alan Liu and David Simpson. These writers are all concerned to rediscover Romanticism's own sense of history. For instance, Chandler has written that 'like 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.'

Liu and Simpson have found a similar sense of history present in the work of William Wordsworth. Liu concedes that Wordsworth's poems have an 'overdetermined and agonic denial of historical reference', but also states, 'both these propositions are true: first that Wordsworth's largest, most sustained theme is the realization of history; and second, that his largest theme is the denial of history'.

Simpson argues that 'as the Wordsworthian imagination is ... social, and defined even in its isolation by its relation to others, so it is also historical, defined in relation to particular others and at specific moments.' Both writers are concerned to restore a sense of history to a reading of Wordsworth which they argue was present in Wordsworth's own thoughts about his time.

So, then, does this study wish to unmask Shelley's 'Romantic Ideology' in 1819, or does it wish to restore Shelley's sense of history? Neither - or, rather, both. I would agree with Chandler that works of 1819 contain a sense of history within them: we cannot accuse them of possessing a 'Romantic ideology' which denies the fact of their historicity. So, for instance, one of Shelley's poems shares its title with Chandler's book, *England in 1819*, it foregrounds its position within a particular historical moment. However, my concern here is not the same as that of Chandler, Liu and Simpson, to emphasize Shelley's own sense of history. In a sense, my project has similarities with those of Levinson and

McGann, in that it seeks to restore a sense of their materiality to Shelley's texts. Although Shelley's 1819 poems are very much in and of their time, their publication history seems on the surface to reinforce a sense of the timelessness of the poems. *The Mask of Anarchy* was not read by ordinary readers until 1832, and thus its politics were claimed by a later readership. I argue here that because of the poems' history, subsequent writers and critics have made Shelley appear to be the archetypal victim figure, a poet who had less understanding of the events of his own time than other commentators, like Leigh Hunt, who were living in England, and was therefore subdued by events. It is my belief that a stress on the materiality of Shelley's poems will restore to Shelley a sense that he was an agent in history, not simply someone who was acted upon by circumstances.

The thesis falls into three sections: 'Shelley in 1819', 'Shelley and Publishing' and 'Shelley, his Politics and his Poetry'. The first section outlines previous accounts of the publishing history of *The Mask of Anarchy* in 1819, and argues that many critical accounts in the nineteenth and twentieth century derive ultimately from the accounts of Leigh Hunt in 1832 and Mary Shelley in 1839. It then goes on to argue that the accounts of Hunt and Mary Shelley are unreliable. I present evidence from the letters of Shelley and his contemporaries and from *The Mask of Anarchy* and its sources which bears this argument out. I suggest that Shelley was far more well-informed and aware of political events in 1819 than critics have suggested.

This leads me on to the second section of the thesis, 'Shelley and Publishing', where I argue that, if Shelley was not simply the victim of Hunt's intransigence, then he had other options available to him. Using Byron's example in getting *The Vision of Judgment* published, I explore Shelley's knowledge of four methods of publishing, all of which Byron also used or tried to use. The first of these is 'self-publishing', which on the surface appeared to be an autonomous, and radical, means of publishing. I show that Shelley was not in fact autonomous in his self-publishing ventures, that he was dependent upon a network of acquaintances. This leads me on to a second alternative method of publishing a controversial work: to use literary pirates, who specialised in publishing works for which they did not hold the copyright. This practice was illegal, and therefore such publishers
tended to form part of McCalman's 'radical underworld'. I show that a division between copyright and non-copyright works in the period was blurred, and that Shelley was aware of this blurring, and was in a position, had he wished to, to take advantage of it. The third area which I explore is that of using an ultra-radical publisher, and again I show Shelley's willingness to make contact with McCalman's 'radical underworld'. Having shown that Shelley did have options open to him other than using Leigh Hunt, I then re-examine the relationship between Shelley and Leigh Hunt in 1819, suggesting that the decision not to publish was a joint one by Shelley and Hunt, Shelley being aware of Hunt's reservations and feeling that his hands were tied. This second chapter of the thesis demonstrates, then, that as well as being well-informed about the events of 1819, Shelley was well-placed to understand the various publishing options available to him, and that these were in the main options which transgressed the law. I argue that his use of these options shows that Shelley was closer to the Regency 'radical underworld' than might otherwise be thought, and that he was consistently willing to use this 'underworld' to get his texts published.

In the third section of the thesis I re-examine four of Shelley's poems which were all in danger of transgressing the law. In my view, it is important to explore these poems because they lead to a reassessment of the relationship between Shelley's poetry and politics: the content of such poems can be seen to be consistent with Shelley's radicalism, as expressed in his publishing practice. The aesthetics of Shelley's political poems can be seen to be mainly conditioned not by the radicalism of Paine and Godwin, but by Shelley's involvement with the 'radical underworld', a world of subversiveness, where the tenets of openness held by Paine and Godwin did not hold sway. The first of these poems is *Queen Mab*. I discuss the poem in terms of the apparent discrepancy between its genre and politics, and argue that the discrepancy can be reconciled through an understanding of the poem in terms of the literary underground of the European Enlightenment. I then go on to discuss *The Revolt of Islam* in terms of this literary underground, and its implication for the placing of the poem, whose publishing history means that it stands in an equivocal relationship to early nineteenth century radicalism. I then discuss *Oedipus Tyrannus* in relation to its publisher, James Johnston, and to other works of the 1820s, including those
published by William Benbow, who published a number of editions of Shelley in the 1820s.

Finally I return to *The Mask of Anarchy* in the light of the evidence previously put.
Chapter 1 - Shelley in 1819

Preamble - Mary Shelley, Leigh Hunt and their influence on critical tradition

To restate the question at the beginning of this thesis: why did Shelley feel so passionately about the Peterloo Massacre of 16 August 1819, but fail to make a public response to that event via his poetry? I wish to demonstrate in this first section that critics, in trying to reconcile this contradiction, have largely relied upon two accounts which are highly influential because they are by the two people who were closest to Shelley's creative process at the time: his wife Mary Shelley and his editor, Leigh Hunt. The misleading consequences of this reliance will be shown in the next section.

Sources for these two accounts are Leigh Hunt's preface to the first edition of The Mask of Anarchy, published in 1832, after the Great Reform Bill,¹ and Mary Shelley's notes to her four volume edition of Shelley's collected poems in 1839. Leigh Hunt wrote:

This Poem was written by Mr. Shelley on occasion of the bloodshed at Manchester, in the year of 1819. I was editor of the Examiner at that time, and it was sent to me to be inserted or not in that journal as I thought fit. I did not insert it because I thought that the public at large had not become sufficiently discerning to do justice to the sincerity and kind-heartedness of the spirit that walked in this flaming robe of verse. His charity was avowedly more than proportionate to his indignation; yet I thought that even the suffering part of the people, judging, not unnaturally, from their own feelings, and from the exasperation which suffering produces before it produces knowledge, would believe a hundred-fold in his anger, to what they would in his good intention; and this made me fear that the common enemy would take advantage of the mistake to do them both a disservice.²

¹ Leigh Hunt comments on the date of his Preface in its text, suggesting that the Great Reform Bill has brought about the change that Shelley was searching for: 'the success he anticipates has actually occurred, and after his very fashion; for there really has been no resistance, except by multitudinous protest. The Tories, however desirous they showed themselves to draw their swords, did not draw them. The battle was won without a blow.' Percy Bysshe Shelley, The Masque of Anarchy a Poem, edited by Leigh Hunt (London, 1832), p. ix.
Hunt's statement is significant for three reasons. It tells us about whether Shelley wished or did not wish to see *The Mask of Anarchy* in print, about his confidence or otherwise in his own judgment about the poem's possible readership, and about Hunt's reasons for not publishing the poem. Shelley's wish that the poem be published in Hunt's *Examiner*, a political-cum-literary journal, was not strongly felt: it was 'to be inserted or not in that journal as I thought fit'. This indifference implied that Shelley felt himself not a fit judge of where to place the poem. Hunt implies that he was altruistic in choosing not to publish the poem. Hunt states that his decision was to the benefit of Shelley and the ordinary people because 'the suffering part of the people' would have recognised Shelley's 'anger' but not his 'kind-heartedness'. It is therefore implied that the result of the poem's publication would have been violence, and further repression by 'the common enemy', the establishment who had already been guilty of the Peterloo Massacre. Shelley's own reputation would also have suffered, according to Hunt.

Mary Shelley quoted Leigh Hunt's preface in her edition of Shelley's poems, calling it 'valuable and interesting', and supplied additional information. She said that

Shelley loved the people, and respected them as often more virtuous, as always more suffering, and, therefore, more deserving of sympathy, than the great. He believed that a clash between the two classes of society was inevitable, and he eagerly ranged himself on the people's side. He had an idea of publishing a series of poems adapted expressly to commemorate their circumstances and wrongs - he wrote a few, but in those days of prosecution they could not be printed.\(^3\)

This statement refers to a 'series of poems', not just, as Hunt's preface does, to *The Mask of Anarchy*. She also says that the threat of prosecution was the reason why the poems were not published.

Thus, there are two different, apparently authoritative, accounts of the failure to publish in 1819, one which suggests that Hunt was in a superior position to Shelley, knowing better than Shelley that his work was inflammatory, and acting with kindness towards his author, and the other suggesting that Hunt was afraid of prosecution. One

---

account suggests that Hunt was altruistic, the other that he was serving his own self-interest. If later accounts of Shelley's attempt to publish in 1819 are examined, it can be seen that they reflect one or both of these views. A chronological account, taking the critics' views as they stand, without comment, will help to reinforce my argument, that critical opinion has been largely shaped by Leigh Hunt and Mary Shelley as seemingly reliable authorities.

A relatively early attempt to unravel the reasons why Shelley did not publish in 1819 was made by Walter Edwin Peck in 1927. He wrote that at the time Shelley wrote *Prometheus Unbound*, he was 'at the period of his intensest hopes for man'. Peck contrasted this optimism on Shelley's part with the grounds for pessimism in Shelley's immediate political circumstances. Peck stated that 'the Manchester Massacre had been the extremest expression of the Conservatives anxious to bolster the rich against the poor, the powerful against the weak; freedom of the press was a dead letter as Hone's trials of 1817, and Carlile's in 1819 abundantly testify.'\(^4\) Mary Shelley's account, depicting her husband as powerless in the face of overwhelming odds, is consistent with Peck's depiction of the history of the early nineteenth century as a bleak time for ordinary people.

Newman Ivey White wrote in 1947 about the poem's failure to be published and attempted to reconcile the views of Mary Shelley and Leigh Hunt. White suggested that there was a distinction to be made between the publication history of *The Mask of Anarchy* and the other political poems of 1819. He mentioned the possibility that Hunt's statements about *The Mask of Anarchy* may have been inaccurate, and that the threat of prosecution may have been a factor in the suppression of *The Mask of Anarchy*, but in the end he accepted Hunt's explanation since 'in view of the fact that he had printed strong statements of his own on the same subject his decision can hardly be charged to cowardice.'\(^5\) White argued in favour of Hunt's account by creating a consistent picture of

---

4 Walter Edwin Peck, *Shelley, His Life and Work*, 2 Vols (Boston and New York, 1927), 2, p.141. As will be seen later in the thesis, although Carlile was imprisoned in 1819, Hone was acquitted of libel in 1817, and the case was seen by contemporaries as a significant victory in the struggle to establish freedom of the press.

5 White, p.107.
a separation between the 'six other poems equally vigorous and simple' written in 1819 and *The Mask of Anarchy*. According to such a reading, Hunt would have taken his decision about *The Mask of Anarchy* on the basis of political judgment, whereas the six other poems were suppressed as a result of a fear of prosecution. White implies that Charles Ollier, Shelley's bookseller, as the only other likely prospective publisher, was responsible for the 'six other poems'. For White, Shelley's poetry was not published because of Hunt's superior judgment *and* the poor political situation attested to by Peck.

Edmund Blunden, writing in 1965, and Richard Holmes, writing in 1974, accepted Mary Shelley's account. Blunden's opinion was that 'it is not wonderful that John and Leigh Hunt, who between them spent several years in prison and many hundreds of pounds in the cause of reform, did not risk publishing this republican challenge at this stage in their paper', and Holmes asked himself the rhetorical question: 'why did Hunt not publish *The Mask*? The short answer is clearly that he feared political prosecution.'

Donald Reiman gave another explanation of the immediate context of *The Mask of Anarchy* in 1985 which reiterates the point about prosecution and states that Leigh Hunt was a more knowledgeable partner than Shelley. He wrote that 'Shelley in Italy knew little of the financial penalties and criminal prosecutions that faced antigovernment journalists, publishers, and printers under the political reaction that followed Peterloo.' For Reiman,

---

6 Charles Ollier had a publishing business in partnership with his brother James. Charles took the artistic decisions, whereas, as the *Dictionary of National Biography* states, 'James was the man of business'. Shelley almost invariably used Charles and James Ollier for his poetry during the years 1817 to 1822, and they published the following volumes: *Laon and Cythna* (1817, co-published with Sherwood, Neely and Jones), reworked as *The Revolt of Islam* (1817), *Rosalind and Helen* (1819), *The Cenci* (1819), *Epipsychidion* (1821), *Adonais* (1821), *Hellas: A Lyrical Drama* (1822). The exception was *Oedipus Tyrannus*, published by James Johnston in 1820. For accounts of Charles Ollier's career see Robinson, 'Percy Bysshe Shelley, Charles Ollier, and William Blackwood', and the *Dictionary of National Biography*.


8 Holmes, p.540.

Shelley was exiled in Italy, and was therefore relatively ignorant of the effects of the 'political reaction' in 1819. He contrasted Leigh Hunt's state of awareness with this:

Leigh Hunt, who knew the state of the country and could feel the readership of his moderately liberal *Examiner* slip away, as the people who read periodicals were polarized into a large reactionary majority and a small radical contingent, thought it best not to risk the survival of *The Examiner* (and the welfare of his and his brother John's families) by publishing *The Mask of Anarchy* during the time of panic reaction among his bourgeois readership.10

Leigh Hunt, according to Reiman's portrayal, was aware of the difficulties that a periodical faced in publishing controversial material, and Shelley was not.

The general approach of Stephen Behrendt, writing in 1989, offers a different view of Shelley's relationship with Leigh Hunt:

Too often Shelley has been portrayed as an impulsive and self-indulgent writer who neither cared nor understood very much about his readers. A close reading of his works, however, and especially of his private and public prose, reveals an author acutely sensitive to the advantages of defining his audiences carefully and addressing them in an appropriate fashion.11

Shelley, in Behrendt's opinion, was a writer 'acutely sensitive' to his audiences; hardly the kind of person who would carelessly submit copy to Leigh Hunt to publish 'as he thought fit'. However, Behrendt has concurred with other critics in arguing that this sensitivity did not stretch to a knowledge of the harsh facts of life in Regency England in 1819: 'From his removed position in Italy Shelley could not fully appreciate Hunt's very practical reasons for suppressing the poems.'12

Paul Foot adds to a general picture of Shelley as somewhat naive about political events in England. In his preface to his edition in 1990 of Shelley's political writings of 1819, Foot wrote that Hunt 'calculated, no doubt correctly, that any one of Shelley's "popular songs" and any line of the *Philosophical View of Reform* would be instantly prosecuted.' Foot stated that, 'he knew of no one to turn to except Hunt, and Hunt was

---

11 Behrendt, p.1.
12 Behrendt, p.188.
not amenable.\textsuperscript{13} According to Foot, Shelley tried to publish, but Hunt did not publish and Shelley was left with no means of rectifying matters, knowing no one except Hunt whom he could contact.

It can be seen, then, that writers have concurred in one way or another with the accounts of Mary Shelley and Leigh Hunt, and perhaps the only moment of possible dissent is in Behrendt's statement that Shelley was sensitive to various audiences. In the next few sections, I wish to suggest that in fact Behrendt's general view of Shelley is more consistent with Shelley's actual practice than either the accounts of Hunt and Mary Shelley or their advocates in critical tradition.

Shelley in 1819

In this section I wish first to go over the narrative of the events leading up to the Peterloo Massacre in 1819, and its aftermath. This will have a bearing on the two main arguments which I make in this chapter: that the accounts of Hunt and Mary Shelley were affected by their own personal and political circumstances in the 1830s, and cannot claim to be objective; and that Percy Bysshe Shelley was a far more informed observer of political events in 1819 than might be otherwise inferred. The events of the Massacre have a bearing on both these arguments, because it is necessary to understand the politics of the 1830s in the light of events of 1819, and because a knowledge of what happened in 1819 is useful in comprehending Shelley's own response to events.

The Massacre has provoked much subsequent literature, because historians have disagreed about its social significance, and have also differed in their accounts of its immediate causes in 1819, but Donald Read's account is generally recognised as the most reliable twentieth century study of the Massacre. Read also, as he stated himself, was the first writer to ask 'why it was that these crowds came together or how they were brought together'. Read's account of the wider causes of the Massacre can be briefly summarised. He suggested, firstly, that the economic circumstances in Manchester in 1819 were not conducive to harmony between the classes. There was a division between masters and men in the cotton trade, and, as Read states 'in the spring of 1819 all types of operatives were feeling the effects of a trade depression'. Added to this, the rate of weavers' wages had fallen by about 50% between 1810 and 1819, while prices had remained fairly stable. Against this background, there was a growth in nonconformist religion, which tended to be associated with political radicalism, nonconformists not enjoying the same privileges in society as Anglicans. In these circumstances, political

radicalism among working-class people flourished, and, as Read notes, 'the remedy for all
the economic burdens of the operatives lay, according to Radical teaching, in political
reform at the seat of government'.15

Historians have differed in analysing the immediate causes of the Massacre. They
have examined the question of whether there was either a clear chain of command, passed
on from the Home Office minister, Lord Sidmouth, to the Manchester magistrates, to the
soldiers and yeomanry, that the meeting should be brutally put down, or whether the
Massacre was an accident which occurred because of panicky local magistrates and/or ill-
trained soldiers. To suggest that the government of the day was directly responsible is to
imply that the Massacre formed part of a consistent policy of violence and repression, part
of a war between one class and another. If the Massacre was an accident, then it might be
said that its violence was an anomaly, not part of the general social policy of the
government of the day. As Robert Walmsley has noted, E.P. Thompson's view was that
the suppression of the Manchester meeting was 'class war'. Walmsley's own view of the
Massacre was based on a re-examination of the role of the magistrates, and in particular of
William Hulton, their chairman. Read, like Walmsley, wanted to give an even-handed
picture, and Walmsley notes that he 'had practically exonerated the Government'.16

Walmsley suggests a reason for these differing views of the Massacre, stating that
'in spite of the richness, the lavishness of the literature of Peterloo, ... it is also true to say
that no incident in English history has been so completely misunderstood, largely because
much of the what-is-thought-to-be contemporary documentation is misinformed.'

Another critic has written that: 'There can be few such short episodes in English history so
thoroughly documented'.17 It might be said that the events of the Massacre were so

---

15 For the general circumstances leading up to the Peterloo Massacre, see Read, pp. 1 -
92. Specific quotes from Read come from pp. vii, 16 and 41. The figures for wages and
prices are on p. 17.
16 Walmsley, p. 22.
17 Humphry House commented on the documentation of Peterloo in All in Due Time.
The quote from Walmsley comes from the same page.
controversial at the time that everyone wished to put their own gloss on them, which was not conducive to objective reporting, whether from a radical point of view or from a position loyal to the government of the day.

Shelley's poem was derived from what was perhaps the most reliable account, that of John Tyas, who sat on the hustings with Henry Hunt, the chief orator at the meeting, and recorded the events soon afterwards, in *The Times* of 19 August 1819. His account is reprinted in Appendix A, being too long to quote here. I shall give a reading of this text (which Shelley read when it was reprinted in the *Examiner*) in relation to *The Mask of Anarchy* below, because it is helpful to my argument that Shelley was as well-informed as most of his contemporaries.

Donald Read's twentieth-century narrative gives another reliable summary of the facts as they are known. Read notes that a similar meeting to that held at St Peter's Field, Manchester, on 16 August 1819, was held on 18 January 1819 at the same venue, against a background of economic hardship. Henry Hunt was the chief speaker in January, as he was to be in August, and 8,000 people were present. The magistrates in Manchester showed no concern that there might be any violent expression of protest. However, there were a number of subsequent meetings at provincial towns outside Manchester, and by August, the stipendiary magistrate was beginning to worry that armed insurrection might be imminent. Another meeting was proposed for 9 August 1819 at St Peter's Field and, in the light of their concerns, the local authorities declared it illegal. In response, the radicals decided to reconvene it on the 16th, without the sanction of the authorities. Many people gathered and made processions from the towns surrounding Manchester. The exact number of people who gathered at St Peter's Field is not known, but claims were made for numbers between 60,000 and 150,000. Whatever the numbers, compared with the 8,000 who gathered in January, the crowd must have seemed massive to those attending. The meeting had additional significance, and can be seen as a national event, because

---

18 Walmsley suggests that he was 'accepted by all as an honest chronicler'. Walmsley, p. xvii.
newspaper reporters from towns outside Manchester, and even from London itself, attended. Read states that 'this was the first time that newspapers from distant towns had ever sent special reporters to cover a political meeting.' Read notes that it is unfortunate that the people who first arrived on the scene to keep the peace were volunteers from the local area, members of the middle class who formed the yeomanry cavalry. These people were not as well-trained as professional soldiers, and they had also been drinking in the morning. After Henry Hunt had begun to speak, the yeomanry went into the crowd to arrest the speakers on the platform, which they did without resistance. However, after reaching the hustings, they became enveloped by the crowd, and this is when both the crowd and the yeomanry began to panic. The yeomanry began to charge people, cutting them down with their sabres, and received brickbats and stones in reply. Eleven people were killed, and it has been estimated that four hundred were injured. Sixty-seven of the military were injured, and twenty of their horses received injuries. One of the casualties was a child which a woman was holding in her arms: the yeomanry brushed past her on their way to the meeting, dashing it to the floor and killing it.

The influence of the Massacre on subsequent history has been a matter of dispute. Donald Read refers to the fact that after the Massacre many of the leaders of the Radical movement were imprisoned, and states that:

The calm with which the people accepted the prosecution and conviction of their erstwhile heroes was due in part no doubt to the sudden engrossing of public interest in 1820 in the Queen's Affair. But even more it showed how superficial had been much of the working-class Radical influence over the popular mind. It held its grip only so long as economic distress was at its very worst: with a slight easing of popular suffering in 1820 came an immediate slackening of interest in Radical Reform.

---

19 Read, p. 132.
20 The attempt by the King, George IV, to divorce his wife, Caroline, for having committed adultery, became a radical cause célèbre. The radicals took Caroline's part in the quarrel, as a stance against established authority.
21 Read, p. 154.
Read underplayed the Massacre's significance as a cultural event, suggesting that the Manchester meeting was mainly a spontaneous response to economic sufferings. E.P. Thompson, on the other hand, writes about 1819 as part of the process of the 'making' of the 'English Working Class', as part of a process where class-consciousness was formed by the people themselves. He states that '1819 was a rehearsal for 1832. In both years a revolution was possible', and that the Massacre was 'without question a formative experience in British political and social history'.22 More locally, the Peterloo Massacre had an important bearing on Shelley's career in the sense that it helped to shape the politics of Leigh Hunt and Mary Shelley. It is important to remember, in assessing the reliability of their accounts which looked back to 1819, that they were both written at times when the parliamentary reform sought by radicals at Peterloo was still a topical issue. Leigh Hunt was writing in 1832, the year of the Great Reform Bill, and Mary Shelley was writing in 1838, the year after the Chartists had presented their petition to parliament.

The Great Reform Bill of 1832 was passed after very similar circumstances to those which had led to the Peterloo Massacre. The Whigs, under the leadership of Lord Grey, came to power at the end of 1830, after a long period of Tory rule and a brief period when a fall in employment and wages 'combined with high bread prices to revive memories of the depressed years immediately after Waterloo.' The year 1830 saw unrest among agricultural labourers, manifested in the 'Captain Swing' riots, as well as agitation for reform. According to Robert Stewart: 'Eric Hobsbawm has written that in 1831-32 England, for the first time since the 17th century, found itself in a "political crisis when something like a revolutionary situation might actually have developed" and E.P. Thompson believes that the country was "within an ace of revolution".'23

Hunt suggests in his Preface to *The Mask of Anarchy* that 1832 was different from 1819 because on this occasion the reformers were successful: 'the success he anticipates has actually occurred, and after his very fashion'. William Cobbett had anticipated that

---

when Reform was brought about in 1832, it would restore an England where it would be possible 'once more to see the labouring man with meat and bread, and a bed to lie on, and a Sunday coat to wear'. However, as John Phillips notes, Cobbett did not anticipate the accompanying reforms to the Poor Law. As a result of these reforms, working people in the 1830s were no better off than their predecessors, the reformers at Peterloo, and the Chartists stated this fact in their first petition:

We are bowed down under a load of taxes; which, notwithstanding, fall greatly short of the wants of our rulers; our traders are trembling on the verge of bankruptcy; our workmen are starving; capital brings no profit and labour no remuneration; the home of the artificer is desolate, and the warehouse of the pawnbroker is full; the warehouse is crowded and the manufactory is deserted.  

This petition was put forward in 1838, and rejected on 12 July 1839.

Thus, Leigh Hunt's Preface is inaccurate in suggesting that the reforms of 1832 had fully met the grievances of 1819. An argument has been made that the reforms of 1832 were an attempt to drive a wedge between middle class reformers like Hunt and those demanding more radical reform; that Lord Grey, in deciding that the Bill should be 'of such a scope and description as to satisfy all reasonable demands, and remove at once, and for ever, all rational grounds for complaint from the minds of the intelligent and independent portion of the community', was seeking to divide the 'intelligent and independent' middle class from what he would have perceived as the more ignorant and dependent working class. Leigh Hunt's sympathies in 1832 lay more with the middle class than with radical, working class reformers. His commentary on the events of 1819 is unreliable because of his attempt to recreate Shelley in his own image as a moderate reformer, happy to accept that the battle had been won, even in the face of increasing poverty. Mary Shelley was also unsympathetic to radical demands for reform in the 1830s. In 1838, the year

before she wrote her Note on *The Mask of Anarchy*, she wrote that: 'since I lost Shelley I have no wish to ally myself to the Radicals - they are full of repulsion to me. Violent without any sense of justice - selfish in the extreme - talking without knowledge - rude, envious & insolent - I wish to have nothing to do with them.'  

Given such views, it would not have been entirely surprising if Hunt and Mary Shelley had tried to minimise an 1830s audience's awareness of Shelley's radicalism. Even if Mary Shelley had been sympathetic to radical reform in the 1830s, it would have been very difficult for her to write a Preface explicitly supportive of efforts to gain such reform in 1819. When Mary Shelley's husband died in 1822, she was left in an invidious financial position. She had previously had a guaranteed source of income in the form of an allowance, granted to Shelley by his estranged father, Sir Timothy. Mary Shelley then asked Lord Byron to intercede with Sir Timothy to ask him to grant her an allowance to bring up his grandson, Percy Florence. At first, Sir Timothy demanded that the child should be separated from his mother and brought up in a way approved by himself, but later he relented, and gave Mary Shelley an allowance of £200 a year. This money, although beyond the dreams of those labourers who were later to campaign for Chartist reforms, was not very much to give a boy an aristocratic upbringing: the fees for Percy Florence's preparatory school in Kensington were £45 per annum, and although Mary Shelley's allowance did later increase, so did Percy Florence's school fees. Her life was made potentially easier when in September 1826 Charles Shelley, Percy Bysshe Shelley's heir, his son by his first wife Harriet, died, and Percy Florence became Sir Timothy's heir. But Percy Florence was not to receive his inheritance until Sir Timothy died on 23 April 1844.

---

So Mary Shelley was in a difficult financial position, attempting to bring up a child in the aristocratic traditions of his family, with little left aside for her own maintenance. Her position was made doubly difficult by the constraints put upon her source of independent income, her writing. Sir Timothy was anxious that his family’s name should not be brought into disrepute by any unwanted publicity, and he abruptly cut off her allowance of £200 when her novel *The Last Man* was published in 1826. Although anonymity was desired by both herself and Sir Timothy, the novel was advertised as 'by the author of *Frankenstein*', and Mary was mentioned by name in the reviews. The allowance was later restored. Sir Timothy had also banned any attempt by Mary to publish her husband’s works, and this ban was only lifted in August 1838. Thus, Mary Shelley knew that she was skating on thin ice in even publishing her husband’s poems. To take his attitude towards radical reform at all seriously in her Prefaces may have jeopardised her position beyond repair.29

The accounts by Mary Shelley and Leigh Hunt of the failure to publish *The Mask of Anarchy* in 1819 are also open to scrutiny because, more generally, they might be seen as part of what Neil Fraistat describes as a nineteenth century ‘cultural apparatus’, which sought to rewrite the Romantic period in its own image. Fraistat argues that the etherealized poet who appears in Mary Shelley’s prefaces to the poems was ‘the cultural product of an entire cultural apparatus’ which was ‘sponsored by a nascent set of middle-class Victorian ideological positions’.30 Susan Wolfson has concurred with this view,


29 For the incident involving *The Last Man* and the ban on Mary Shelley publishing her own works, see Feldman and Scott-Kilvert, eds., *The Journals of Mary Shelley*, 2, pp. 498 and 481.

30 Fraistat, 'Illegitimate Shelley', p.410.
saying that it was Mary Shelley who first created the 'ineffectual angel' described by Matthew Arnold.31

The 'cultural apparatus' can be seen at work in the writings of a number of Shelley's other contemporaries who subtly modified a later generation's view of the Romantic period. Leigh Hunt's Preface to The Mask of Anarchy was part of a more general change in his opinions later in life. Mark Garnett, in discussing the transformation in Leigh Hunt's politics from the early radicalism of the Examiner (1808 to 1825) to the almost apologetic stance of his later Autobiography, first published in 1850, is concerned to portray Hunt's later politics in a sympathetic light. Garnett argues that Hunt's later politics were consistent with his earlier radicalism because both spring from aesthetic and emotional political instincts. Garnett admits, however, that some critics may see Hunt's later 'philosophy of cheer' as 'a rather cloying manifestation of Victorian sentimentality'.32 Hunt's 1832 statement about the Reform Bill having achieved all that Shelley had wished to achieve perhaps marks an early stage in his desire to sentimentalise harsh realities.

Thomas Love Peacock is another of Shelley's contemporaries who perhaps rewrote the past to suit himself. Peacock, the author of a number of nineteenth century satirical novels, wrote Nightmare Abbey (1818), which featured a lighthearted caricature of Shelley in the character of Scythrop. He was particularly friendly with Shelley during 1817, when Shelley lived near him in Marlow in Buckinghamshire. Peacock first published a series of 16 letters in Fraser's Magazine in March 1860, and later collated these, with additional letters, in his Memoirs of Shelley. He stated that Shelley wrote him 'scarcely less than fifty' letters from Italy and that thirty existing letters were included in his Memoirs.33 One of

these letters was from Shelley to Peacock on 24 August 1819. Peacock in his preface said that he had exercised some editorial discretion in not publishing parts of the letters which only referred to himself, but the following omitted passage tells us as much about Shelley as about Peacock. Shelley wrote, referring to political events of 1819 (omitted sentences in italics):

England seems to be in a very disturbed state, if we may judge by some Paris Papers. I suspect it is rather overrated, but when I hear them talk of paying in gold - nay I dare say take steps towards it, confess that the sinking fund is a fraud & c. I no longer wonder. But the change should commence among the higher orders, or anarchy will only be the last flash before despotism. I wonder & tremble. You are well sheltered in the East India Co[mpan]y. No change could possibly touch you.34

These words did refer to Peacock's personal circumstances, his employment by the East India Company, but they are also informative about Shelley's state of mind in 1819. Shelley accused Peacock of being 'well sheltered'. This seems odd at first, because Shelley was in Italy, and therefore more remote geographically from political events in England than Peacock in his office in London. But, it can be argued, Shelley referred here to his sense of political commitment, which Peacock lacked. It would appear that Peacock suppressed this part of Shelley's letter because it accused Peacock of 'cowardice'. Whether or not the letter's accusation was just, Peacock may not have wished to leave himself a hostage to fortune as far as his 1860 readers were concerned.

Thornton Hunt's edition of Leigh Hunt's Correspondence can be seen as another manifestation of the way that later editors and writers wished to gloss over unpleasant truths relating to Shelley's life. Hunt's edition has inexactitudes relating to the year 1819. Donald Reiman has drawn attention to one of these inexactitudes. Hunt suppressed part of Leigh Hunt's letter to the Shelleys in February 1820, which threw light on the uneasy relationship between Hunt and Ollier. More significant, perhaps, is an omission to which

Reiman does not refer. Hunt wrote to Percy Bysshe Shelley on 2 December 1819 (section omitted by Thornton Hunt in italics):

I will write more speedily, and tell you about your political songs and pamphlets, which we must publish without Ollier, as he gets more timid and pale every day; - I hope I shall not have to add time serving; but they say he is getting intimate with strange people.35

The omission sanitizes Leigh Hunt - he does not in the 1862 version include a possible excuse for not publishing The Mask of Anarchy and the six other political poems, the intransigence of Charles Ollier, and is not now seen conniving with Shelley against his bookseller.

It can be said, then, that Leigh Hunt and Mary Shelley have provided the first answers to the question of why Shelley's political writings were not published in 1819, but there is reason to suspect that their narratives are not entirely reliable. Both writers had a vested interest in downplaying Shelley's earlier radicalism, for political and personal reasons, as did later editors of the correspondence of Leigh Hunt and Shelley. It will be useful, then, to re-examine the views of critics who have followed their accounts to see whether their opinions have independent and accurate evidence from the period to back them up.

One strand which runs through critics' accounts of 1819 is that Shelley was unaware of, and even indifferent to, developments in England relating to the freedom of the press, a view which echoes Leigh Hunt's account. Edmund Blunden, Stephen Behrendt and Donald Reiman all support this argument. More specifically, to recap the passage quoted earlier, Donald Reiman has stated that 'Shelley in Italy knew little of the financial penalties and criminal prosecutions that faced antigovernment journalists, publishers, and printers under the political reaction that followed Peterloo.36

36 P.M.S. Dawson, reviewing this edition, rightly praises Reiman's comments on editing and the overall usefulness of the work, but suggests that Reiman is 'less happy in his
I would like to suggest that this portrait of Hunt being aware of current affairs in England and Shelley ignorantly distanced from events in Italy is misleading. There is in fact considerable evidence to suggest that Shelley was an avid reader of newspapers from England, and that press prosecutions were of special interest to him. Donald Reiman's account of Shelley's circumstances in 1819 can be shown to be only partially correct. For instance, Reiman assumes that, in the main, Shelley received what news he could from England in the form of clippings, rather than whole newspapers. Shelley's sense of a context for contemporary events would have been seriously limited if this had been the case, and Hunt's perhaps highhanded attitude towards *The Mask of Anarchy* would have been justified. Reiman comments on a letter from Shelley to Peacock: 'We do not know which clippings Peacock sent to Shelley, but they may have included those from the *Morning Chronicle* and *Cobbett's Political Register*.37 Reiman assumes that 'clippings' were sent, but Shelley's letters would seem to hint at the opposite, that whole newspapers were sent. Shelley's letters to Charles Ollier and Thomas Love Peacock in September 1819 are the earliest evidence we have that he knew about the Peterloo Massacre. Shelley wrote to Ollier on 6 September 1819:

> The same day that your letter came, came the news of the Manchester work, and the torrent of my indignation has not yet done boiling in my veins. I wait anxiously [to] hear how the country will express its sense of this bloody murderous oppression of its destroyers. 'Something must be done. What yet I know not.'38

In his letter to Peacock on 9 September 1819, he wrote further:

---

37 ed. Reiman, *Shelley and His Circle*, 6, p. 900. Cobbett edited the *Political Register* between 1802 and 1835. He changed the name of it from time to time: during his stay in America from 1816 to 1818 it was published in New York and variously known as *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register* and *Cobbett's American Political Register*. The London editions of the periodical were variously titled *Cobbett's Annual Register*, *Cobbett's Political Register*, *Cobbett's Weekly Political Pamphlet*, *Cobbett's Weekly Political Register* and *Cobbett's Weekly Register*. To avoid confusion, I have consistently referred to Cobbett's periodical as the *Political Register*.

Many thanks for your attention in sending the papers which contain the terrible and important news of Manchester. These are, as it were, the distant thunders of the terrible storm which is approaching...Pray let me have the earliest political news which you consider of importance at this crisis.39

Shelley uses the word 'papers' to describe the information he received, and I shall argue that Peacock sent Shelley complete sets of the *Examiner* and the *Political Register*. Peacock's letter of 5 July 1818 stated that he was sending a complete set of the *Political Register* and Hunt's *Examiner*. He writes, 'I have sent off a small box directed to Mr Gisborne for you, containing the 'Cobbetts' and *Examiners* from your departure to the present time'. He also gave practical advice about how Shelley could in future receive all the copies of the *Examiner*, 'through the medium of the London Post-office'. He reported that he had asked Charles Ollier to arrange this.40 On 19 July he writes: 'No number of "Cobbett" has been published for three weeks'.41 On 15 September 1818 he states that he has sent Shelley ""Cobbett", eight numbers, all that had been published between Midsummer and November 9".42 The 'Cobbetts' were again mentioned in Peacock's letter of 15 December 1818.43 On 4 December 1820 he refers to a bill from Thomas Hookham, the bookseller who had refused to publish *Queen Mab*. This includes an amount for £27, which 'is for the books I have sent you in Italy'. Shelley must have been still regularly receiving the *Examiner* and the *Political Register*, because Peacock wrote that he was sending them at his own expense and 'shall continue to do so'.44

Additionally, Shelley's circle generally took a keen interest in events in England. Mary Shelley's journals refer to the following periodicals read on the following dates: 5 August 1819, the *Edinburgh Review*; 6 August 1819, the *Quarterly Review*; 24 June 1820,

41 ed. Brett-Smith and Jones, p.201.
42 ed. Brett-Smith and Jones, p.208.
44 ed. Brett-Smith and Jones, p.221.
the Quarterly Review.\(^{45}\) The list is obviously incomplete because neither the Examiner nor 'Cobbett' appear. But both the Shelleys must have read these because Mary refers to political news in her letters. In her letter to Marianne Hunt of 28 August 1819 she wrote: 'We see the examiners regularly now four together just two months after the publication of the last - these are very delightful to us.'\(^{46}\) She wrote a long and humorous letter to Marianne Hunt on 24 February 1820, where 'the Courier newspaper' is referred to as the 'prime organ' of 'God Cant'. She suggests jokingly that Englishmen and women should have been renamed 'Castlereaghishmen' and women and that: 'The form of their oath sh[oul]d be - The King shall have my wealth - Castlereagh my obedience - his parliament my love - the Courier my trust - the Quarterly my belief - Murray my custom - down with the Whigs & Radicals'. Another part of her mock creed reads: 'I believe in all that Cant teaches, as it is revealed to me by the Courier, & the Quarterly, and sold to me by Murray - whom Cant bless.'\(^{47}\) Her letter shows awareness of the Tory politics of the Quarterly and the Courier.

The Gisbornes, friends of the Shelleys living in Italy, also took a keen interest in the news and gossip of England. John Gisborne writes to Shelley on 11 January 1822, saying that he has read the Quarterly Review's review of Prometheus Unbound, and suggesting that Shelley has been unduly pessimistic about its readership, because of the seriousness with which the Quarterly has dealt with the poem. Gisborne was not just acting as a sounding-board for Shelley's anxieties, because independently of any prompting from Shelley, he wrote, 'have you seen the extraordinary abusive review of "Adonais" in the "Literary Gazette"?' Maria Gisborne also acted as a source of news for the Shelleys, informing Mary Shelley on 8 April 1823 that 'The "British Critic" of this month abuses Lord Byron most scurrilously'.\(^{48}\)

\(^{45}\) ed. Feldman and Scott-Kilvert, Mary Shelley Journals, 1, pp. 294 and 323.
\(^{46}\) The Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, 2 Vols., edited by Betty T. Bennett (Baltimore and London, 1980), 1, p. 103.
\(^{48}\) Maria Gisborne and Edward E. Williams: Their Journals and Letters, edited by Frederick L. Jones (Norman, Oklahoma, 1951), pp. 74 and 98.
Members of Shelley's expatriate community also commonly read entire numbers of Cobbett's *Political Register*, which can be considered the most influential left-leaning journal of the time. The Whig *Edinburgh Review* referred to it in a survey of newspapers in May 1823: 'Of the WEEKLY JOURNALISTS, Cobbett stands first in power and popularity.' The twopenny radical *White Hat* stated: 'Thanks to Cobbett! The commencement of his two-penny register was an era in the annals of knowledge and politics, which deserves eternal commemoration.' Cobbett himself, with characteristic immodesty, wrote that 'for more than twenty-five long years, I was the great and constant and only really sharp and efficient thorn in the side of that system which, at last, brought this country to the edge of convulsive ruin.' Edward Williams, the friend of Shelley who died with him on the *Don Juan*, wrote in his Journal on 29 October 1821, 'took up some of Cobbetts Pamphlets'. Similarly, on 13 March 1819 Claire Clairmont wrote in her Journal, 'read Cobbett, which is a strange book to read with one's head full of the ruin of Rome.' The *Political Register* is described as a 'book', which suggests that Claire read the *Political Register* in its entirety, and it seems safe to assume that, if Claire read the whole *Register* on this occasion, there is no reason why she should not have done so at other times.

Thus, it is probable that Shelley regularly read the entire *Examiner* and *Political Register*, both of which would have kept him informed about press prosecutions, and he may have read some or all of a number of other papers, bearing in mind the fact that often early nineteenth century papers reproduced one another's reports, so that Shelley may not

---

necessarily have had to read the *Courier* to know what its views were: these, if controversial enough, would be reported in the *Examiner*. This method of blending accounts from different sources was used by Leigh Hunt in the *Examiner* when he published its response to the Peterloo Massacre.\(^5^4\) Shelley and his circle's lively interest in current events in England, then, belies Hunt's picture of him as somewhat ignorant of the effect his poem would have had on an English audience. An examination of *The Mask of Anarchy* itself and its sources adds to this impression, showing that Shelley, rather than being indifferent to current events, was in fact a scrupulous reader of information about England.

Richard Brimley Johnson pointed out one source for the poem in 1928: the poem echoes Leigh Hunt's editorial, 'Disturbances at Manchester', in the *Examiner* no. 608, 22 August 1819. Its title echoes his phrase 'Men in the Brazen Masks of power'. Johnson also noted a similarity between Hunt's statement that, if sufficiently provoked, the crowd might have 'risen in the irresistible might of their numbers', and *The Mask of Anarchy*'s final rallying cry: 'Rise like Lions after slumber/In unvanquishable number'.\(^5^5\)

A close reading of *The Mask of Anarchy* shows that Shelley was influenced by other parts of the *Examiner* as well. *The Mask of Anarchy* begins with an allegoric depiction of three government ministers, Viscount Castlereagh, the Foreign Secretary, Lord Eldon, the Lord Chancellor and Viscount Sidmouth, the Home Secretary, as Murder, Fraud and Hypocrisy. Then, the character Anarchy, who has no direct human counterpart in Regency England but stands for the forces which have brought about the Peterloo Massacre, appears. As Shelley is beginning to give his audience a poetic rendering of the events of the Peterloo Massacre, he starts to echo the language of a report printed in *The

\(^5^4\) See Appendix B for the contents of the 22 August 1819 *Examiner*.

Times on 20 August 1819, and reprinted in the Examiner. Shelley echoes The Times in describing Anarchy's progress:

With a pace stately and fast,
Over English land he past,
Trampling to a mire of blood
The adoring multitude.

And a mighty troop around,
With their trampling shook the ground,
Waving each a bloody sword,
For the service of their Lord.

And with glorious triumph, they
Rode through England proud and gay
Drunk as with intoxication
Of the wine of desolation.

O'er fields and towns, from sea to sea
Passed the Pageant swift and free,
Tearing up, and trampling down;
Till they came to London town.
(lines 38-49)

Shelley repeats the emotive word 'trampling' three times: the word may have had an extra resonance for his readers if they recalled the words of the most widely read contemporary news report. The Times stated that 'the Yeomanry Cavalry ... trampled down and cut down a number of the people.' Shelley's linking of Anarchy and his gang and the Government and the Yeomanry Cavalry is unequivocal. Again, Shelley's use of the phrase 'the adoring multitude', echoes the language of the Times, which refers to 'the female part of the multitude'. It is probable also that both writers were aware of the political connotations of the word 'multitude', which had been used by Edmund Burke to describe the lower orders in his phrase 'a swinish multitude'. Shelley cleverly inverts the phrase so that it is not the multitude who behave like pigs, but the soldiers, whose 'trampling'
suggests a herd of animals. The ironic use of the word 'adoring' emphasizes further the
difference between the crowd and their oppressors.\textsuperscript{58}

Shelley continues his narrative with his vision of a force which is capable of
countering Anarchy, in the form of a Shape which rises up after Hope has lain down in
front of the horses' hooves. The Shape is described as a neuter creature and is linked with
natural imagery, as though it is a part of nature itself, an inevitable reaction to Anarchy
which springs up in the same way that in Shelley's poem \textit{England in 1819} 'a glorious
Phantom may/Burst, to illumine our tempestuous day' from the 'graves' created by the
people's governors:

\begin{quote}
It grew - a Shape arrayed in mail
Brighter than the Viper's scale,
And upborne on wings whose grain
Was as the light of sunny rain.

On its helm, seen far away,
A planet, like the Morning's, lay;
And those plumes its light rained through
Like a shower of crimson dew.
\end{quote}
(lines 110-117).\textsuperscript{59}

Shelley's reference to the Shape as a 'planet' interestingly echoes \textit{The Times}'s use of
metaphor in connection with Henry Hunt, and perhaps by association the metaphor links
the Shape with Hunt. An eyewitness report states that by one o'clock in the afternoon the


\textsuperscript{59}This image has similarities with the ending of Shelley's prose pamphlet \textit{An Address to the People on the Death of the Princess Charlotte} (1817), which also uses an amorphous figure to symbolise revolution: 'Let us follow the corpse of British Liberty slowly and reverentially to its tomb: and if some glorious Phantom should appear, and make its throne of broken royal swords and sceptres and crowns trampled in the dust, let us say that the Spirit of Liberty has arisen from its grave and left all that was gross and mortal there, and kneel down and worship it as our Queen.' \textit{The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley}, Vol. 1, edited by E.B. Murray (Oxford, 1993), p. 239. See also pp. 149-150 of this thesis, where I note that such spectre-like figures would seem to derive ultimately from Volney's \textit{Ruins}. 
crowd 'were now beginning to be impatient for the arrival of Hunt, and the other orators who were to follow in his train, like the satellites which attend on some mighty planet.'

Shelley in the poem seems to be suggesting that if the people keep faith with their leaders, then they will cause 'Anarchy' to 'lay dead earth upon the earth' (lines 130-131).

The narrative of the poem continues with the words of Earth, exhorting the people not to despair and to carry out a campaign of passive resistance. Earth's speech as a whole may at first glance seem to demonstrate most clearly Donald Reiman's point that Shelley was 'forced' to 'idealise and universalise his poem' because of his distance from events, with its appeal to abstract concepts like patriotism, freedom and justice. But it can be seen below that Shelley's poem is largely a reflection of the events themselves, as mediated through contemporary news reports. Earth, like the Shape, can be seen to be not only an idealised figure, but partly a picture of a genuine political agitator, the chief speaker at St Peter's Field, Henry Hunt. She uses the language of patriotism, beginning her speech, 'men of England' (line 147) and, at intervals, reminding her audience that they are English: England and Englishness are mentioned in lines 204, 225, 232, 242, 271, 313 and 331. Henry Hunt similarly tried to appeal to the crowd's sense of patriotism before being interrupted by the arrival of the yeomanry. As *The Times* reports, 'he commenced his address by calling the assembly "gentlemen," but afterwards changed the term to "fellow countrymen". The rhetoric in the poem also echoes contemporary journalism. Shelley asked the people to 'rise like Lions after slumber', and Richard Carlile, in a passage from *The Republican* of 27 August 1819, urged his readers, 'fellow Countrymen, rouse from this fatal apathy'.

---

60 The morning star appears elsewhere in Shelley's poetry. See Glenn O'Malley, *Shelley and Synaesthesia* (Evanston, 1964), chapter 3, 'Melody of Light', pp. 58-88. The star is also, of course, often identified symbolically with revolution.


62 *Republican*, 1, 1819, pp. 3-5 and HO 42/203/500-503. Whether Shelley read the *Republican*, and whether he had any contact with Richard Carlile in 1819 must remain conjecture, although it should be noted that an early pamphlet of Shelley's, the *Declaration of Rights*, did appear in the *Republican* in 1819. See *Republican*, 1, 1819, pp. 75-78. Carlile is likely to have come across the *Declaration of Rights* at the same time as *Queen
Earth's speech also reflects *The Times*’s account of the Manchester meeting because she advises Shelley's putative audience by appealing to abstract concepts, for example, 'Slavery', 'Freedom' and 'Justice'. The concept of slavery, and the idea that ordinary people in 1819 were being made to live like slaves, originates with the reformers themselves, rather than Shelley. *The Times* reported that a flag of the Oldham Union was held by a group of women and was inscribed, 'Let us die like men, and not be sold like slaves'. Shelley's concept of slavery can be said to be founded in fact, rather than his imagination. He describes it in the following terms:

'Tis to work and have such pay  
As just keeps life from day to day  
In your limbs, as in a cell  
For the tyrants' use to dwell

So that ye for them are made  
Loom, and plough, and sword, and spade,  
With or without your own will bent  
To their defence and nourishment.

'Tis to see your children weak  
With their mothers pine and peak,  
When the winter winds are bleak,-  
They are dying whilst I speak.  
(lines 160-171)

Shelley sets against this vision of slavery a portrait of freedom which includes the following lines:

For the labourer thou art bread,  
And a comely table spread  
From his daily labour come  
In a neat and happy home.  
(lines 217-220)

Shelley's account of slavery as a bread-less state, where labourers remember happier times, are paid just enough to keep themselves alive, and have to watch their children starve, echoes a description of the state of the Frame-work knitters of Nottingham in the *Examiner* of 22nd August 1819:

After working from 14 to 16 hours per day, we have earned only from 4s. to 7s. per week to maintain our wives and families, and that though we have substituted meal and water or potatoes and salt, for that more wholesome food an Englishman's table used to abound with, we have repeatedly retired, after a hard day's labour, and been under the necessity of putting our children supperless to bed, TO STIFLE THE CRIES OF HUNGER. We can most solemnly declare, that for the last eighteen months we have scarcely known what it was to be free from the pains of hunger. Think what must be our feelings, when our little ones cling around our knees for bread, which we are unable to give them; our partners in life, the poignancy of whose grief may be conceived but cannot be described, looking on the pale and meagre form of her husband; her child, perhaps at her breast, feebly sucking for that nourishment which nature almost refuses to bestow.63

The use of the concept of freedom in the poem also echoes the reformers' demands for liberty, as exemplified in the words on a banner celebrating the chief speaker at the meeting, Orator Henry Hunt: 'Hunt and Liberty'. 'Justice' is another abstract concept which was meaningful to the reformers, as the *Times* reports that there was a large white silk banner where, 'in one compartment of it was Justice, holding the scales in one hand, and a sword in the other, in another, a large eye, which we suppose was impiously intended to represent the eye of Providence.'

The section which defines 'Slavery' and other abstract concepts is indebted to another of the periodicals which Shelley regularly read, William Cobbett's *Political Register*. Cobbett had an obsession with the replacement of gold by paper money, which he felt was a ruse to defraud the nation. Shelley is reflecting Cobbett's views when he writes the following lines:

Paper coin - that forgery
Of the title deeds, which ye

63*Examiner*, 608, 1819, p. 536.
Hold to something of the worth
Of the inheritance of Earth.
(lines 180-183)

A specific example of Shelley's indebtedness to the *Examiner* again occurs in the following lines:

Then it is to feel revenge
Fiercely thirsting to exchange
Blood for blood - and wrong for wrong -
Do not thus when ye are strong.
(lines 193 -196)

One of the alternatives to the reply 'blood for blood' was, as Shelley put it in lines 323-6, to:

Let the laws of your own land,
Good or ill, between ye stand
Hand to hand, and foot to foot,
 Arbiters of the dispute,...

Here, Shelley was taking sides in a general argument among radical activists about whether to adopt constitutional measures or violence in response to the Massacre.64 A meeting reported by the *Examiner* of 22 August 1819 formed part of that argument:

Yesterday there was a very numerous Meeting of the Reformers at the Crown and Anchor: Mr Waddington in the chair. - Major Cartwright, Mr Wooler, Mr Gale Jones, & c. spoke on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, and on the late outrage on the Reformists at Manchester.

Some voice in the course of the Meeting exclaimed, "We'll have blood for blood!" upon which Mr Wooler said, "No: we have laws, and the laws will give us redress. Let no blood be shed but that which the law shall require as sacrifice for the offence." (Much applause.)65

---

64 For a discussion of the aftermath of the Peterloo Massacre and the political splits in the radical movement, see Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, pp. 755-768.
65 *Examiner*, 608, 1819, p. 536. The cry 'Blood for Blood' was also reported in the *Black Dwarf*, 34, 1819, p. 560, and is also mentioned by Kevin Gilmartin in *Print Politics: The press and radical opposition in early nineteenth-century England* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 20-21. Shelley had used the same phrase in *The Revolt of Islam* Canto 5 Stanza 32, line 2000, and it was used by the Luddites during their protests against worsening conditions in
The phrase 'blood for blood' is used in almost exactly the same context as the *Examiner* article.

Shelley's poem again echoes the *Times* report, as read by Shelley in the *Examiner*, in his request to the people that they should:

Stand ye calm and resolute,  
Like a forest close and mute,  
With folded arms and looks which are  
Weapons of unvanquished war,  

And let Panic, who outspeeds  
The career of armed steeds  
Pass, a disregarded shade  
Through your phalanx undismayed.  
(lines 319-326)

In the same way that Shelley's representation of concepts like 'Justice' and 'Liberty' are inspired by the rhetoric of the radical reformers themselves, his request to them to be calm is partly inspired by his knowledge derived from *The Times* that, although the crowd were not perfect, they did show considerable restraint. *The Times* describes the approach of the Yeomanry cavalry to the crowd as follows:

At this stage of the business the Yeomanry Cavalry were seen advancing in a rapid trot to the area: their ranks were in disorder and on arriving within it, they halted to breathe their horses, and to recover their ranks. A panic seemed to strike the persons at the outskirts of the meeting, who immediately began to scamper in every direction.

The people at the Manchester meeting at this point behaved as Shelley requested that they should not do, with panic, but a few lines later, *The Times* reported that after the cavalry rode into the main body of the crowd, 'not a brickbat was thrown at them - not a pistol was fired during this period: all was quiet and orderly, as if the cavalry had been the friends of the multitude, and had marched as such into the midst of them.'

the stocking-making trade (1811-13). Their activities were initially directed against the machines which made the trade less skilful, and encouraged shoddy workmanship, and hence lower pay, but later they murdered one of the factory owners. For an instance of the use of the phrase by the Luddites, see Alan Brooke and Lesley Kipling, *Liberty or Death, Radicals, Republicans and Luddites c. 1793-1823* (Honley, 1993), p. 46.
Shelley in the poem contrasts the cowardice of the yeomanry with professionally trained soldiers who fought in real wars, and suggests that real soldiers would have been 'friends of the multitude', there to protect people, not to kill them:

And the bold, true warriors  
Who have hugged Danger in wars  
Will turn to those who would be free,  
Ashamed of such base company.  
(lines 356-359)

In connection with this turnabout of the soldiers in Shelley's idealised depiction, he also describes how the cowardly soldiers who dare to 'Slash, and stab, and maim, and hew' (line 341) will be shamed by 'every woman in the land' who 'will point at them as they stand' (lines 351-2). Again, Shelley's depiction has a close resemblance to the actual tactics of the reformers at the meeting. 'The Female Reformers of Manchester' wrote an open letter to Henry Hunt, published in the Examiner, where they exhorted him: 'May your flag never be unfurled but in the cause of peace and reform; and then may a female's curse pursue the coward that deserts the standard.'66 As in Shelley's poem, anyone who antagonised the reformers was to be shamed by their women.

Thus, it can be seen that Shelley's narrative of the events at Manchester follows the Examiner very closely, and I have also noted a couple of instances where his rhetoric is in accord with other radical literature, as written by William Cobbett and Richard Carlile. Shelley, then, can in the poem be shown to be an interested and intelligent observer who, far from being ignorant about events in England, grounds his poem firmly in the facts as reported to him. This sense that Shelley was fully in touch with literature relating to politics in England can be reinforced by examining the way that the rhetoric of his poetry reflects that of other writers. As well as being aware of the events of Peterloo, Shelley was aware of the way that a depiction of such events could be shaped for a popular audience. Again, he shows himself to be as aware as, if not more aware than, Leigh Hunt in his grasp of the political situation in 1819.

66 Examiner, 608, 22 August 1819, pp. 539-41.
In exploring how Shelley transformed the events of Peterloo into poetry, it will be useful first to explore the similarities and differences between Shelley's approach to the task and those of other radical poets. I have chosen here to discuss, as a representative selection, a number of radical poems from Michael Scrivener's anthology of poetry from 1792-1824 entitled *Poetry and Reform*. Scrivener includes a number of poems written in response to the Peterloo Massacre, and I shall discuss some of these poems here. The poems compiled by Scrivener were all published in 1819, and are as follows: *Address to "The Rabble",* from the *Medusa* (pp. 245-6); *Blood Field of Peterloo*, from the *Theological and Political Comet* (pp. 218-9); *Manchester Massacre*, from the *Black Dwarf* (pp. 265-6); *New Song* from the *Theological and Political Comet* (pp. 225-6); *Ode to Plotting Parson* from the *Black Dwarf* (pp. 274-6); *On a Bloody Massacre* from the *Medusa* (pp. 246-9); *Paddy Bull's Epistle* from the *Medusa* (pp. 246-9); *Peterloo Man* from the *Black Dwarf* (p. 266); *Saint Ethelstone's Day* from the *Theological and Political Comet* (pp. 224-5).67

Michael Scrivener suggests that *The Mask of Anarchy* can be compared with radical poetry written for periodicals in the 1790s, and also with poems such as William Blake's *Songs of Innocence and of Experience* (1789-94) and Samuel Taylor Coleridge and William Wordsworth's *Lyrical Ballads* (1798 and 1800) in the sense that all such poetry turns 'the formerly legitimate authority into the agency of rebellion' and that 'there is both a redefinition of values and the replacement of one social group, once dominant, with another, now insurgent'. For Scrivener, Blake's *Songs* are 'an elaborate and involved enactment of transgression, appropriation, and revision of tradition, repression of guilt, and the symbolic destruction of one order and the celebration of another, emergent order', and in the *Lyrical Ballads* a poetic revolution is announced as a countryside movement, true to nature and the eternal rhythms of the countryside, in opposition to the innovating forces of the city. The seemingly innocent ballad stanzas quietly undermine the literary

foundations of an aristocratic culture'. Similarly, it might be said that *The Mask of Anarchy* uses the language of the aristocracy to attempt to overthrow it in favour of working class radicals. Shelley, for instance, uses the language of the New Testament in the poem, and makes it clear that he wishes to appropriate it for radical purposes; the Biblical references are differentiated from the corrupt world of the ruling classes, that of Anarchy, and his identification with 'God, and King and Law.' (line 37)

Scrivener also notes that, as far as radical writers were concerned, 'material was not the product of individual authors but in the public domain, so to speak, of common frames of reference, ideology, and symbolism'. These 'common frames of reference' have also been termed by Kevin Gilmartin a 'plebeian counterpublic sphere'. The 'public sphere' was a term first used by the philosopher Jürgen Habermas to describe public life in the eighteenth century. He suggested that it was similar to public life in ancient Greece, because 'citizens ... interacted as equals with equals'. Critics have raised doubts as to whether this 'public sphere' ever really existed, but it can certainly be said that after the French Revolution there was a new awareness that public life was carried out on unequal terms. Working-class people began to realise, in particular, how poorly represented they were in parliament. Thus, it can be said that a need was felt for places where radical reformers, although excluded from the mainstream of politics, could at least speak to each other.

---

69 For instance, the New Testament is appropriated in the following lines to make a radical point: 'Asses, swine, have litter spread/And with fitting food are fed;/All things have a home but one -/Thou, Oh, Englishman, hast none!' (lines 201-204). As Donald Reiman points out, these lines are an ironic reference to a saying of Jesus: 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head' (Matthew 8:20; Luke 9:58). See *Shelley's Poetry and Prose*, edited by Donald H. Reiman and Sharon B. Powers (New York and London, 1977), p. 306.
70 ed. Scrivener, p.29.
other, and this new 'public sphere' was perhaps best represented by the journals of the 1790s onwards which Gilmartin has described in his work.

I hope to show, then, that *The Mask of Anarchy* formed part of this 'plebeian counterpublic sphere' which had its origins in the 1790s. A number of key features of the rhetoric of the 'counterpublic sphere' in the 1790s can be shown to persist into the early nineteenth century. James Epstein writes about Thomas Paine, who wrote the key text *The Rights of Man*: 'Paine made possible a vernacular language of popular democracy'.

Paine's language in *The Rights of Man* was deliberately spare, and contrasts in its language with the text which it sought to attack, Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*.

Epstein also notes that 'during the 1790s, as middle-class reformers turned away from the more radical tones of Enlightenment thought, works such as Paine's *Age of Reason*, Volney's *Ruins of Empires*, and d'Holbach's *System of Nature* joined *The Rights of Man* as cherished texts among sections of plebeian radicals.' Epstein also identifies 'natural-rights reasoning' as one of the features of 1790s radicalism, and this element is derived from such texts. Paine's *Age of Reason* stressed the importance of holding beliefs which were derived from observation of the natural world, rather than from revealed religion. Volney's *Ruins of Empires* similarly encouraged people to cast off what was perceived as superstition, and to use their enlightened reason instead. D'Holbach's *System of Nature* consistently appeals to 'nature' as a basis on which to establish atheistic, rather than religious beliefs. So a key feature of the radicalism in the 1790s can be identified as a transposing of 'nature' or 'natural rights' as the belief of an 'insurgent' group in place of the 'once dominant' views of revealed religion and its concomitant political structures.

---


73 For the arguments between Paine and Burke from a radical and an establishment perspective, and other writings of the 1790s which responded to the French Revolution, see Marilyn Butler, *Burke, Paine, Godwin, and the Revolution Controversy* (Cambridge, 1984).

74 Epstein, *Radical Expression*, p. 100.
Another key feature of radicalism of the 1790s, which persists into the period when Shelley was writing, is its complexity and diversity, and its tendency to adopt a pragmatic approach to the process of opposition. Mark Philp describes it as 'protean stuff', suggesting that a key element in its makeup was its reaction to the loyalist presses, and that it did not have 'well worked-out opposing principles', but rather was concerned with 'experimentation'. For Kevin Gilmartin, this pragmatism led to an 'orientation towards an unfolding pattern of events' which meant that the weekly newspaper, as a 'register' of events, became of paramount importance.75

Paine's legacy of 'vernacular language' can be seen in *The Mask of Anarchy* and other poems of 1819 because their language is deliberately plain, and they often take the form of songs, indicating that they share in a popular, oral tradition of poetry. 'Experimentation' is a feature of such poetry because of the wide variety of verse forms and techniques employed, and these writers have faith in the medium of the newspaper to convey their ideas. The content of the poems also suggests the emergence of an 'insurgent' group. Shelley and other radical writers claim, for instance, that heroism is not to be found among professionally trained soldiers, but among ordinary people. It has already been shown that the soldiers in Shelley's poem have an ambivalent role; they are shown in their metaphorical aspect as agents of Anarchy, 'trampling' people, but they also have the potential to be true soldiers willing to embrace Danger. The poem *The Bloody Field of Peterloo! A New Song* by Robert Shorter describes the yeomanry ironically as 'heroes of Manchester', emphasizing their cowardice in killing unarmed people.76 In the Robert Shorter poem the 'heroes of Manchester' become, through implication, the innocent people injured and killed, rather than the soldiers who should be there to protect them, much as 'Anarchy' in Shelley's poem becomes, not the possibility of lawlessness among the populace, but the forces of law and order themselves. Linked to Shelley's concept of

---

76 ed. Scrivener, p.218.
'Anarchy', of course, is the concept of the 'Mask' which hides the true nature of 'Anarchy' and is torn off by the events of Peterloo, and, as Michael Scrivener notes, this image occurred to another writer. 'Hibernicus' in his *Stanzas Occasioned by the Manchester Massacre* uses the abstract image of 'Tyranny' instead of 'Anarchy' and writes, 'The mask for a century worn,/Has fallen from her visage at last.'77

Heroism's association with an archaic past also comes under pressure from the radicals.78 In Earth's address to the people in *The Mask of Anarchy* she addresses the ordinary people frequently as 'ye' rather than 'you'. Shorter uses the word 'ye' ironically in his address to the 'heroes of Manchester', the yeomanry cavalry, and uses the word 'methinks' three times at the beginning of stanzas. The poem *An Address to 'The Rabble'* reads very much like Earth's speech, in its use of the phrase 'ye English warriors' at the beginning, and again invokes the language of heroism with its references to 'Patriots' and 'Hampden'.79 The similarity of Shelley's poem to Robert Shorter's *A New Song* and *Stanzas Occasioned by the Manchester Massacre* by Hibernicus is emphasized by Shelley's use of short four line stanzas and ballad metre, a popular form of poetry.

Another instance of the writers of 1819 sharing 'common frames of reference, ideology, and symbolism' is in the references to the children present at the massacre. Perhaps there are echoes of 1790s natural rights discourses in the contrast employed between the innocence of children as natural beings, and people who would have been viewed by radicals as their persecutors warped by a corrupt political system, the yeomanry cavalry. Shelley frequently evokes images of children in *The Mask of Anarchy*. The following stanzas are almost certainly a reference to the decision by Lord Chancellor

---

77 The poem appears on pp.265-6.
78 The idea of a heroic past was championed by Edmund Burke in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, and he lamented that 'the age of chivalry is gone'. This backward-looking approach was attacked by Thomas Paine in *The Rights of Man*.
79 ed Scrivener, pp. 245-6. John Hampden (1594-1643) was one of the members of the radical pantheon. During the English Civil War he was most famous as a leading figure in the opposition to Charles I's attempt to extend a measure of taxation, ship money, from maritime counties to those inland. He was much lamented when killed in action during the Civil War. For his biographical details, see the *Dictionary of National Biography*. 
Eldon, who was famous for shedding tears in public, not to allow Shelley the custody of his children after the death of his wife Harriet:

Next came Fraud, and he had on,
Like Eldon, an ermined gown;
His big tears, for he wept well,
Turned to mill-stones as they fell.

And the little children, who
Round his feet played to and fro,
Thinking every tear a gem,
Had their brains knocked out by them.

(lines 14 - 21)

For Shelley, Eldon was doubly culpable. He had injured Shelley and his children by separating them, and was responsible for the injuries inflicted on children at Manchester in August 1819. Shelley's vision of the cruelty of those whom he felt responsible for Peterloo is reinforced by constant reminders of the presence of children. 'Father Time' is described as having had 'child after child', (lines 90 and 94), and the misery of people is described in terms of the sufferings of their children. Slavery is defined as being 'to see your children weak' (line 168), and misery is a state where 'women, children, young and old/Groan for pain, and weep for cold' (lines 277-278). Robert Shorter creates a contrast between children and the yeomanry in *A New Song*: 'Children shall lisp the yeomen's name,/As Hero[e]s all of Peterloo!' (lines 11-12). *The Peterloo Man* also describes children in these terms:

'When women, and children, and grandsires hoary,
Fell beneath the fierce sword of the Peterloo Man!

How brave were the heroes, what muse can relate;
On the breast of its mother, he bade the babe bleed!
And the mother herself would in vain shun the fate,
That awaited her under the hoofs of his steed.80

(lines 7-12)

---

80 ed. Scrivener, p.266.
Samuel Bamford mentions children in his poem *Ode to a Plotting Parson* when he refers to them metaphorically as 'The lambs thou mayst sell'. (line 10)\(^81\)

Thus, it can be seen that Shelley in writing *The Mask of Anarchy* was meticulous in using his major source, *The Examiner*, to create his poetry, and that his poetry was in tune with a general radical response to events. Although his poem does to some extent idealize the events of the Massacre - for instance, the people do not panic at all, nor do they respond with brickbats and stones - he was not 'forced' into such idealization, as Donald Reiman has suggested.

In the remaining part of this chapter I wish to examine another point which Reiman makes about Shelley: 'Shelley in Italy knew little of the financial penalties and criminal prosecutions that faced antigovernment journalists, publishers, and printers under the political reaction that followed Peterloo.'\(^82\) This opinion is perhaps implicit in the approach of other critics to the subject of Shelley and 1819 because they tend to discuss the central role of Hunt, without taking Shelley's views into account. In fact, Shelley was greatly aware of censorship issues. Shelley responded to a number of libel cases, which I shall outline in greater detail below: the case of the Irish journalist Peter Finnerty in 1811; Daniel Isaac Eaton's trial in 1812; the prosecution of the Hunt brothers in 1812; and, most pertinently, he was interested in the trial of Richard Carlile in October 1819. Shelley took an active interest in the case of Peter Finnerty. Finnerty had accompanied the Walcheren expedition as special correspondent for the *Morning Chronicle* in 1809 and, when he was shipped home because of his too-faithful reports, blamed his return on Lord Castlereagh. As a result he was prosecuted for libel and decided to plead guilty. Charles Phillips writes that 'libel was the pabulum on which he fed from his cradle' and that, far from being put off by his prosecution, he collected further hostile accounts of Castlereagh from other Irishmen and decided that he would use them at his trial. He was found guilty and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment in Lincoln gaol on 7 February 1811. Because of his

\(^81\) For Bamford's poem, see ed. Scrivener, pp.274-6.
\(^82\) See p. 27 of this thesis.
demeanour at his trial he obtained a public subscription of £2,000.83 One of the contributors to the subscription was Shelley. He advertised a poem called *A Poetical Essay on the Existing State of Things* in a number of newspapers: in *The Oxford Herald* on 9 March 1811; in *The Morning Chronicle* on 15 and 21 March 1811 and in *The Times*, 10 and 11 April 1811. Charles Kilpatrick Sharpe, resident in Oxford at the same time as Shelley, had identified him as the author in a letter to a friend. The poem was advertised in the *Oxford Herald* as 'A Poetical Essay on the Existing State of Things. By a gentleman of the University of Oxford. For assisting to maintain in Prison Mr Peter Finnerty, imprisoned for a libel. London, sold by B.Crosby and Co., and all other booksellers, 1811.'84 The poem was also mentioned in the *Dublin Weekly Messenger* in the context of Shelley's attendance at a meeting in Dublin:

> Mr Shelly [sic] commiserating the sufferings of our distinguished countryman, Mr. Finerty, [sic] whose exertions in the cause of political freedom he much admired, wrote a very beautiful poem, the profits of the sale of which we understand, from undoubted authority, Mr Shelly remitted to Mr. Finerty; - we have heard they amounted to nearly an hundred pounds. - this fact speaks a volume in favour of our new Friend.85

The 'very beautiful poem' is most probably the 'poetical essay', given that it had been advertised as being sold for the benefit of Finnerty.

83 These biographical details about Peter Finnerty can be found in the *DNB* and in Charles Phillips, *Curran and his contemporaries* (Edinburgh, 1851), pp. 230-234. Finnerty was also tried in 1797 for remarks made in the United Irishmen's newspaper the *Press* about the trial of William Orr. See Thomas MacNevin, *The Lives and Trials of Archibald Hamilton Rowan, The Rev. William Jackson, The Defenders, William Orr, Peter Finnerty, and other eminent Irishmen* (Dublin, 1846), pp. 481-545.

84 For this information see MacCarthy, p. 105. MacCarthy was the first biographer to uncover many of the facts now known about Shelley's early life.

85 *Dublin Weekly Messenger*, 7 March 1812, p. 75. The veracity of the *Dublin Weekly Messenger*'s statement is open to doubt. McCarthy has stated that, 'it is utterly impossible such a statement could have passed uncontradicted if it were not true'. See MacCarthy, p. 106. McCarthy is no doubt correct that Finnerty would have written to the *Dublin Weekly Messenger* if he had not in fact received the £100, but, as Roger Ingpen has pointed out, a copy of the poem is not extant, which suggests that its circulation, if there was a circulation at all, was not very wide; there cannot have been many copies. Ingpen, p. 150. Shelley may have been using the poem as a means of hiding the fact that he was spending his father's money.
Shelley's interest in such cases can additionally be seen in his response to the trial of John and Leigh Hunt on 9 December 1812 for an attack on the Prince Regent in the *Examiner*.\(^{86}\) Again, Shelley felt the need for active intervention to counteract what had occurred. He wrote to Thomas Hookham on 19 February 1813: 'I am boiling with indignation at the horrible injustice & tyranny of the sentence pronounced on Hunt & his brother, and it is on this subject that I write to you. Surely the seal of abjectness & slavery is indelibly stamped upon the character of England'. The importance which Shelley placed on the idea of the freedom of the press is further shown in his next sentence, where he said, 'altho I do not retract in the slightest degree my wish for a subscription for the widows & children of those poor men hung at York, yet this 1000£ which the Hunts are sentenced to pay is an affair of more consequence.'\(^{87}\) Shelley enclosed £20 with his letter to Hookham, and his first meeting with Hunt in prison was the beginning of his lifelong friendship with him.

Another instance of Shelley's interest in press issues is his pamphlet *A Letter to Lord Ellenborough*, written in response to the trial of Daniel Isaac Eaton, in 1812, for publishing the 'third part' of Thomas Paine's attempt to debunk Christian mythology, *The Age of Reason*.\(^{88}\) His indignation at what had occurred can again be seen in the emotive

---


\(^{87}\) ed. Jones, 1, p. 353. 'Those poor men hung at York' - trials began on 6 January 1813 in York in the wake of an attack on Rawfords Mill by Yorkshire Luddites, the most violent act being the shooting of one of the mill-owners, William Horsfall, on his horse. Fourteen men were hung on 17 January 1813, and Angela Bull notes: 'That of the hundred and fifty men involved in the attack only five - apart from Mellor, Thorpe and Smith [the killers of Horsfall] - should be singled out to die, seems grossly unfair.' Angela Bull, *The Machine Breakers The Story of the Luddites* (London, 1980), p. 110. See chapter 13, 'The Trials at York', pp. 105 - 111, for an account of the trials; also Brooke and Kipling, *Liberty or Death*, pp. 36 - 49.

\(^{88}\) Ellenborough was the judge who heard the case. During the trial itself, doubt was cast on the authenticity of the authorship of the 'third part' of *The Age of Reason*. Eaton published an account of his trial. See the *Trial of Daniel Isaac Eaton for Publishing the Third and Last Part of Paine's Age of Reason before Lord Ellenborough, In the court of*
language which he uses; in his last sentence he writes: 'I raise my solitary voice to express my disapprobation, so far as it goes, of the cruel and unjust sentence you passed upon Mr. Eaton; to assert, so far as I am capable of influencing, those rights of humanity, which you have wantonly and unlawfully infringed.'

Finally, and most conclusively, evidence for Shelley's likely knowledge of press issues in 1819 can be found in his letter to Leigh Hunt on 3 November 1819 concerning the trial of Richard Carlile, again in connection with the publication of *The Age of Reason*. Carlile was tried on 12, 13, 14 and 15 October 1819 on a charge of publishing all three 'parts' of *The Age of Reason* and, like Eaton, published his own account of his trial. Shelley's invective against the establishment is so powerful that Paul Foot has described it as 'one of the greatest essays in support of free speech ever written in our language'. The letter is several pages long, and the strength of Shelley's interest in the idea of the freedom of the press is again seen. In 1813 he had suggested that the crime committed against the Hunts was more worthy of his interest than that against the men hung at York, and in 1819 he suggests that the crimes of suppression of the written word and murder are equivalent:

> Post succeeds post, & fresh horrors are forever detailed. First we hear that a troop of the enraged master manufacturers are let loose with sharpened swords upon a multitude of their starving dependents and in spite of the remonstrances of the regular troops that they ride over them & massacre without distinction of sex or age, & cut off women's breasts & dash the heads of infants against the stones. Then comes information that a man has

---


89 ed. Murray, *Shelley's Prose*, p. 73. *The Letter to Lord Ellenborough* had a lasting influence, because, as Richard Holmes notes, the work was used in campaigns against blasphemous libel 'in New York, 1897, when the editor of the *Truth Seeker* was imprisoned for thirteen months; and in London, 1883, when the editor and staff of the *Free Thinker* suffered similar persecution.' See Holmes, p. 155.


been found guilty of some inexplicable crime, which his prosecutors call blasphemy; one of the features of which, they inform us, is the denying that the massacring of children, & the ravishing of women was done by the immediate command of the Author & preserver of all things.92

Shelley suggests, as he had done in relation to Finnerty and the Hunts, that 'a subscription will be put on foot for him, as there was for Mr. Hone'93 Shelley had given five guineas, and Leigh and John Hunt five pounds, to the subscription founded for William Hone on 29 December 1817, after Hone had successfully defended himself against a charge of libel for publishing three parodies.94 Thus, I would suggest that, coupled with his keen interest in the current affairs of his time, Shelley's active interest in issues concerning the freedom of the press shows that he was likely to have been an aware observer of the political scene in England in 1819, and that an explanation of why he sent *The Mask of Anarchy* to Leigh Hunt, and Leigh Hunt did not publish it, needs to take into account Shelley's own attitudes as well as those of Leigh Hunt.

This point can be pursued further. It might be asked, if Shelley was knowledgeable about the press, and press prosecutions, why did he attempt to publish *The Mask of Anarchy* at all? In the view of some critics the exercise was futile, because of the nature of the situation at the time Shelley was publishing. Mary Shelley had written, it will be remembered, 'he had an idea of publishing a series of poems adapted expressly to commemorate [the people's] circumstances and wrongs - he wrote a few, but in those days of prosecution they could not be printed.' Similarly, Walter Edwin Peck had said that: 'freedom of the press was a dead letter as Hone's trials of 1817, and Carlile's in 1819 abundantly testify.'

I would wish to argue that these views of the position of the press in 1819 are incorrect, but first it has to be said that there are, superficially, reasons why Mary Shelley and Walter Edwin Peck have made their comments. The year 1819 was a dangerous one

---

92 ed. Jones, 2, p. 136. Scrivener notes that highly charged sexual imagery was a feature of the radical reaction to Peterloo, and Allen Davenport's poem *Saint Ethelstone's Day* contains the line, 'They hack'd off the breasts of the women'. See ed. Scrivener, p. 225.
for prosecutions. As W.H. Wickwar has commented, there was an increase in libel cases around the year 1819.\textsuperscript{95} The Government brought 120 cases between 1819 and 1821.\textsuperscript{96} Also, the Society for the Suppression of Vice, an organisation loosely affiliated to the government and established in 1802, stepped up its activities between 1819 and 1823.\textsuperscript{97} The year 1819 also saw the passing of the Six Acts in December. These included the Blasphemous and Seditious Libels Bill. The Bill aimed to curtail the activities of radical journalists, with equivocal results. Major elements of the Bill can be outlined. It stated that stamp duty was to be extended to all periodicals retailing items of political interest. Beforehand, stamp duty had only applied to what might today be understood as newspapers, not weekly political pamphlets which acted primarily as fora for political debate rather than sources of news. Because it avoided stamp duty, a paper like Cobbett's \emph{Political Register} retailed at 2d., and was often referred to by its detractors as 'twopenny trash'. To increase the price of such publications would limit the extent to which they could be read by a working-class readership. Pamphlets were also declared subject to Stamp Duty: previously they had been exempt. However, the authorities scored an own goal by stating that papers which measured 'less than twenty-one inches in length', 'seventeen inches in breadth' would be exempt from the Act. This simply meant that radical publishers began to issue their periodicals in smaller sizes. Additionally, publishers were required to publish the first number of a periodical on the first day of the month or within two days of that day, at a penalty of twenty pounds. This presumably was designed to stop publishers issuing pamphlets irregularly, as and when events arose, and thus stirring up sedition in response to events like the Peterloo Massacre, but could also encourage publishers to print more regularly.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{95} See the tables given in Wickwar, p. 315.
\textsuperscript{96} See Wickwar, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{98} The history of the passing of the Blasphemous and Seditious Libels Bill can be found in \textit{The Annual Register of a View of the History Politics and Literature for the Year 1819} (London, 1820), pp. 143 to 163. T.J. Wooler outlines the provisions of the Bill in \textit{Black Dwarf}, 5 January 1820, pp. 865-7.
T. J. Wooler reacted with proud defiance to such measures, stating that:

The principle on which your new Libel Bill proceeds, is simply this: - that the reformers do not know that three twopences make sixpence; nor that three persons can read one book! The restrictions you have imposed upon writers, are infamous severe - but the readers laugh at you, and the restraints you have imposed; but I dare say, without any intention to bring either, or any, or all of you into contempt!99

Wooler’s comments were prophetic: a glance at the British Library’s collection of political pamphlets published in 1820 shows how completely ineffective the Bill was at curtailing satirical comment on the establishment. For instance, Richard Carlile reported the ‘persecution’ of James Tucker for selling Hone’s works on 21 January 1820, and said that 20,000 copies of Hone’s parodies, the literature for which Hone was tried, had been sold after his trial and acquittal. The account by Hone of three trials on consecutive days in 1817, Carlile reported, had found 50,000 purchasers.100 Hone’s Political House that Jack Built was to become a bestseller in 1819.

Carlile had obviously learnt from Hone’s example, because he actively took measures to encourage the prosecution of his edition of Thomas Paine’s The Age of Reason. Carlile in his account of his trial in October 1819 gave an ironic narrative of the prosecution of the edition. He stated that it was first advertised, by means of a ‘rumour’, in November 1818. ‘The walls of the metropolis were well placarded’ on the work’s publication date, 16 December. On the 17th, the Solicitor of the Treasury visited Carlile’s shop, and was encouraged to take more copies than he requested. However, in spite of this, ‘the sale of the work went on very slow and the Publisher had begun to fear that it would not be prosecuted’. On 16 January Carlile was ‘agreeably disappointed’ by the Vice Society’s Information against him. 14 February saw his arrest, and having anticipated and welcomed this, he had published 3,000 copies additional to the first run of 1,000.101

99 Black Dwarf, 4, 12 January 1820, p. 5.
100 Republican, 1, 1819, p. xvi.
101 Carlile, 1822, p. III-IV.
Carlile deliberately courted controversy in the knowledge that it would increase the sales of his edition.

Carlile was not the only radical writer aware of the possible advantages of persecution. T.J. Wooler, who himself had been acquitted of libel in 1817, wrote about the prospect of Carlile's trial:

It is the mischief of all persecution, and it tends to show it in its proper colours, that it defeats itself. Once bring Mr. Carlile to trial, and what is deemed offensive, circulates with the rapidity of lightning, through the whole body politic. Every newspaper will teem with the passages selected for prosecution; which will be deemed those which are most objectionable; and they will go forth palpable, naked, and alone, without the comments that explain them, and the reasoning of which they form a part. Millions will read them in a newspaper, who would never have met with them through any other medium. Every corner of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales will re-echo with the sentiments; and as a matter of public discussion, every child will hear, and in some measure be compelled to think upon their propriety, or impropriety.102

Wooler predicted that the same events would follow upon Carlile's prosecution as that of Hone. He would become a cause célèbre, and his publications would be widely disseminated as a result.

The idea that radical works were proliferating in the face of prosecution was not simply a piece of radical propaganda. The Quarterly Review, a Tory periodical, complained about the increase in radical publications during 1819:

For some time past, a part of the public press had distinguished itself by an effrontery of licentiousness, without any former example. The stamp duty imposed a certain duty on newspapers and other publications containing news and political intelligence; but whether this description could be understood to comprise publications which, though appearing periodically, and wholly of a political character, affected rather to deal in discussion than to convey intelligence, was a point evidently admitting of much question. Availing themselves of this doubt, to avoid, if not to evade, the stamp-duty, a set of pestilent works were circulated at the lowest prices, and in fact swarmed in all parts of the country, threatening to devour every green thing. The Black Dwarf, Republican, and the Medusa, were, we believe, the most conspicuous of these performances; and the doctrines which they promulgated were such as might fully justify the assumption of titles like

102Black Dwarf, 3, 6 April 1819, p. 221.
the last. They wore, indeed, the 'saxificos vultus,' - a form and aspect that might congeal the beholder with horror. They spoke a language hitherto unknown to Englishmen....

The Quarterly highlights the fact that radical journalists, before the Six Acts, were able to exploit a loophole in the law relating to stamp duty. The Quarterly also paints a frightening picture for its Tory readers of a radical press devouring everything before it and unafraid of picturing itself in Gothic terms; the Gorgon was another name which appeared alongside those of the Black Dwarf and the Medusa. It is also worth noting that a number of periodicals were set up directly in response to political developments in 1819. The Republican's first issue began with Richard Carlile's paraphrasing of Thomas Paine, stating that there was a 'crisis' to which people had to respond. The Medusa, The Theological Comet, The White Hat and The Briton all began and ended in the year 1819.

Thus, it can be said that the period after the Peterloo Massacre, although dangerous in terms of the number of prosecutions which publishers faced, was also a period of unparalleled opportunity. As the cases of Hone and Carlile suggest, for those brave enough to take the risk of imprisonment, the rewards in terms of circulation figures could be immense. It can be said that the idea that 'freedom of the press was a dead letter' is false, and that in fact there was a thriving radical culture in 1819. Possible persecution may well have been a factor in the non-publication of The Mask of Anarchy, but it is not sufficient explanation in itself.

---

103 Quarterly Review, 22, 22 January 1820, p. 542.
Chapter 2 - Shelley and Publishers

Shelley and Self-Publishing

In this chapter I wish to deal at length with Paul Foot's assertion that Shelley had no one to turn to except Leigh Hunt. As I have argued already, Shelley was more aware of political events in England than critics have suggested. Here I wish to show that Shelley was also more aware of other publishing options available to him beyond his more usual practice of getting his poetry published in Leigh Hunt's periodicals and, in volume form, through the auspices of Charles Ollier. Besides showing that Shelley himself played a substantial part in the non-publication of The Mask of Anarchy, rather than being the victim of circumstances portrayed by Leigh Hunt and Mary Shelley, I hope to show also that an examination of the publishing options available to Shelley at the time leads to a re-evaluation of his radicalism. In this chapter of the thesis I emphasize the fact that both Hunt and Shelley were close to Iain McCalman's 'radical underworld' and that the decision not to publish was, whether explicitly or not, jointly taken.

In the first section of this chapter I explore one of the options which, I will argue, was open to Shelley, that of self-publishing without any outside agency. Here I will argue that self-publishing was more of a complex process than it might appear: the self-publishing poet or essayist was almost as reliant on other people as someone using more conventional methods. In order to provide a framework for my argument, I wish first to give an example of how a knowledge of Shelley's publishing practice can be useful in dispelling illusions about him and his poetry, and also to refer to Lord Byron's attempts to publish his politically controversial poem The Vision of Judgment, which can provide a possible blueprint for a course of action which Shelley may have wished to adopt in relation to The Mask of Anarchy.

An example of how a partial understanding of publishing in Shelley's time can be misleading is Newman Ivey White's account of the publishing history of The Mask of
Anarchy. White suggested that we should separate The Mask of Anarchy, intended for the Examiner, from six other short poems, intended to be published by Charles Ollier. I have already stated that this was a convenient means of reconciling the statements of Mary Shelley and Leigh Hunt.

Newman Ivey White's suggestion that The Mask of Anarchy was suppressed by Leigh Hunt using his own political judgment, and that the six other poems were suppressed by the Olliers because of fear of prosecution, implies that the two sets of publishers were acting independently of one another, and without Shelley's knowledge. Newman Ivey White has elsewhere given a picture of Shelley as relatively ignorant about the practice of publishing. As Michael Erkelenz has noted, for a long time it was believed that Shelley's 1820 political poem, the Ode to Naples, was, like The Mask of Anarchy, unpublished within the poet's lifetime, until Newman Ivey White reported its publication in the Military Register. Charles E. Robinson reported that it had also been published in the Morning Chronicle. As Erkelenz notes, White speculates that the poem's publication could not have been authorised by Shelley because four months later Shelley tried to get Ollier to include it in his Literary Miscellany. However, I would argue that this picture of Shelley as relatively ignorant is inaccurate. Erkelenz suggests that the second attempt to publish was a shrewd judgment in the light of political realities: it was a particularly opportune moment to publish.¹

Shelley had in his earlier career taken a close interest in his works at all stages in their production process, including the advertising. For his controversial prose pamphlet, The Necessity of Atheism, he had asked a friend to help him with the advertising, directing him in the marketing strategy which he wished to use. He wrote to Edward Fergus Graham on 14 February 1811: 'I send you a book. You must be particularly intent about

it. Cut out the title page and advertise it in 8 famous papers, & in the Globe advertise the
Advertisement [sic] in the 3rd page.\(^2\) Similarly, there is evidence that Shelley had a hand in
the advertising of an unpublished poem, *A Poem on the Existing State of Things*. It was
advertised in the *Oxford Herald*, the *Morning Chronicle* and *The Times* shortly after
Shelley's stay in Oxford in 1811, but was not published, which suggests that the agent
placing the advertisement was separate from the publisher. The person most likely to
have had an interest in placing the advertisement apart from the publisher was Shelley.\(^3\)

The poem *Ode to Naples* appeared in the *Military Register* and the *Morning
Chronicle*. The *Military Register* could be said to have the status of a 'local' paper for
Shelley at the time he was in Italy: on the back page of each number the newspaper states
that it is to 'be had ... of every Newsman or dealer in Books, throughout the Empire', and
states the postal charges to a number of foreign countries. The newspaper functioned as a
filter of events for expatriates abroad. Thus, it can be seen that the publishing practice for
the *Ode to Naples* and the *Poem on the Existing State of Things* is very similar. The *Ode
to Naples* was published in the kind of newspaper which Shelley may well have read,
aimed at the expatriate community in Europe, and the *Poem on the Existing State of
Things* was advertised in a newspaper with which Shelley, rather than his London
publishers Crosby and Co., would have been familiar. I would suggest that the history of
the *Ode to Naples* suggests that Shelley was in fact proactive in the publishing of his
poem, as he could no doubt have been, had he so wished, with *The Mask of Anarchy*.

To ask why Hunt did not publish, and why Shelley might have acquiesced in the
non-publication of the poem, is to ask a question about their politics as much as their
personal relationship. If Shelley had wished to publish *The Mask of Anarchy* without
Hunt's aid, a hypothetical trajectory can be seen in the history of Lord Byron's *Vision of
Judgment*, published by John and Leigh Hunt in 1821. Shelley for much of his career,
from 1816 onwards, when the *Hymn to Intellectual Beauty* first appeared in the *Examiner*,

\(^3\) See MacCarthy, p. 105.
used the liberal Charles Ollier as his regular publisher for volumes of his verse, and Leigh Hunt, aligned loosely to the radical cause as editor of the *Examiner*, to publicise individual poems via his periodical. Byron, like Shelley, settled into a regular relationship with a publisher for a large segment of his career. Byron used John Murray, who was the proprietor of the *Quarterly Review*, a highly respectable Tory periodical which discussed political and literary matters.

Byron's choice of Murray to publish *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* parts 1 and 2 in 1812 might seem odd, since Byron's views were in some respects sympathetic to radicalism, and he had already made his views public in his first speech to the House of Lords on 27 February 1812 which sympathised with the plight of the Luddite framebreakers. However, Murray became Byron's publisher as much through Byron's own inertia as through any conscious choice. On January 20 1808 Byron received 'an effusively flattering letter' from the Reverend Charles Dallas. Byron warned Dallas of his own reputation for 'licentiousness' and 'infidelity', but Dallas persisted in seeking his friendship, and helped him to put his poems through the press. In 1811 Byron showed *Childe Harold* to Dallas, and after consulting a minor author of poetry, Walter Wright, who assured him that the work would be a commercial success, Dallas contacted John Murray. Through Dallas' mediation, a number of alterations to the more controversial passages were agreed by Byron, and the publication of *Childe Harold* was the beginning of a profitable partnership between Byron and Murray.

Apart from the success of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*, Byron was also able to command advances in the £1000's, which would have been considered huge, for the Turkish Tales published by Murray before Byron's departure from England in 1816. However, as the increasingly less friendly reviews of Byron's work in the periodicals make clear, Murray's respectable readership faded away after the scandal which broke in 1816,

---

4 For the text of the speech, see Hampton, ed., *A Radical Reader*, pp. 391-395.
5 For an account of the beginning of the partnership between Byron and Murray, and the alterations which Byron made to his poem, see Leslie Marchand, *Byron: A Portrait* (London, 1971), pp. 49, 101, 102, 104 and 105.
when Byron was forced to leave England after accusations of unspecified sexual
abominations had been levelled at him by his wife.\(^6\) The publication history of Byron's
*Don Juan* charts the decline in the respectability of his readership: as contemporary critics
noted disparagingly, the first two cantos published in 1819 were sold at the price of £1 5s,
but in 1823, after Lord Chancellor Ellenborough's decision that Byron had no copyrights in
the work, because of its scurrilous nature, cantos 6 to 8 sold at the price of only 1
shilling.\(^7\) The first two cantos of *Don Juan* omitted John Murray's name on the title page,
but were published through his auspices, using a printer, Davison, whom Murray had used
in the past. The subsequent cantos were published by John Hunt, Leigh Hunt's brother,
who had shared his fate in the libel prosecution of 1812 concerning the *Examiner*'s
scurrilous comments about the Prince Regent.

In 1819 the Tory publisher Murray took steps to distance himself from his
partnership with the Tory periodical *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, which he had co­
published from its inception. *Blackwood's* had taken on an aggressively ideological
stance from 1817 onwards. *Blackwood's* had fired the opening salvo of its war against
radical journalism with the publication of the first in its series 'On the Cockney School of
Poetry' in November 1817, an attack on Leigh Hunt. In response to this newly aggressive
style of Tory journalism, the publishing firm Baldwin, Cradock and Joy withdrew their
name from the newspaper in November 1817.\(^8\) Murray was also uneasy. On 28
September 1818 he wrote about *Blackwood's*: 'how great is my own regret at finding the

---

\(^6\) See the numerous reviews of Byron in *The Romantics Reviewed Part B Byron and
Regency and Society Poets*, 5 volumes, edited by Donald H. Reiman (London and New
York, 1972). An example of the way that his reputation among respectable journalists
took a downward turn can be seen in the entries for *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*.
See *The Romantics Reviewed Part B*, 1, pp. 116-221.

\(^7\) An article in *John Bull*, 20 July 1823, commented disparagingly on the drop in price and
the relationship between Murray's 'finest wove paper' and 'beautiful type' and 'Mister
Davison's 'detachment of trash'. See *The Romantics Reviewed Part B*, 3, p. 1220.

\(^8\) Baldwin, Cradock and Joy were joint publishers of *Alastor*, with Carpenter and Son.
The poem's first favourable notice was in the *Examiner*, thus, they can be expected to have
been sympathetic to Hunt. They also founded the *London Magazine*, with John Scott as
the editor (he was also editor of the left-leaning *Champion*). See *British Literary
clamour against its own personality almost universal. You must naturally be aware that all
eyes are turned towards me ... I have undergone most severe remonstrances from my best
and most important friends.' In January 1819 John Murray withdrew his name from
Blackwood's, and Leigh Hunt in March 1819 was to report gleefully, no doubt reflecting
on his own part in the episode, that: 'Master Murrain, we find, has taken his name away
from the publication emphatically called Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.'

Murray, then, concerned about his reputation and his connections with influential
people, which had provoked him to sever his connection with Blackwood's, was even less
likely to involve himself in publishing Byron's scurrilous satire on Southey, the poet
laureate, and George III, the King's dead father, A Vision of Judgment, in 1821. Byron
sent the poem to him anyway, stating perhaps disingenuously that: 'It may happen that you
will be afraid to publish it'. Like Shelley, Byron sent a topical poem to his publisher.

However, rather than abandoning the project when Murray seemed to be
unenthusiastic, Byron wrote further, suggesting that if Murray would not publish the
Vision of Judgment: 'in that case find me a publisher - assuring him - that if he gets into a
scrape I will give up my name or person.' His first approach to the problem of an unco-
operative publisher was to ask Murray to find someone else. A parallel line of enquiry was
to ask Douglas Kinnaird if he could find someone. Neither Murray nor Kinnaird found

9 Murray's letter is quoted in F.D. Tredrey, The House of Blackwood 1804-1954,
(Edinburgh and London, 1954), p.34. An account of Baldwin, Cradock and Joy's
withdrawal from the periodical appears in Margaret Oliphant, Annals of A Publishing
himself can be found in: George Paston (Emily Morse Symonds), At John Murray's:
Records of a Literary Circle 1843-1892 (London, 1932); Samuel Smiles, A Publisher and
his friends, Memoir and Correspondence of the Late John Murray with an Account of the
10 Examiner, 584, 1819, p. 156. 'Murrain' was a scurrilous name for Murray used by both
Hunt and Shelley. See also Shelley's letters to Hunt in late August 1819 and to Byron on
11 Byron's Letters and Journals, edited by Leslie Marchand, 8, p. 232. Quoted in: Lord
Byron - The Complete Poetical Works, 7 vols, edited by Jerome J. McGann and Barry
12 Kinnaird was sympathetic to, and knowledgeable about, radical politics. In 1818 he
stood on a joint ticket for the two vacant seats in the Constituency of Westminster with Sir
anyone else. Byron is likely to have written the poem in September - October 1821, and by February 1822 no publisher had been found. By this time, Byron was writing to Kinnaird asking if he might be able to find a radical publisher unworried about the infamy the poem might bring, 'and if none such is to be found - print fifty copies (at my expence [sic]) distribute them amongst my acquaintances - and you will soon see that the booksellers will publish them - even if we opposed them. - That they are now afraid - is natural - but I do not see that I ought to give way on that account.' When such a plan was unsuccessful, Byron considered using Galignani, a Paris bookseller who relied heavily upon pirated editions, or 'with some other bookseller's name - or as a foreign edition - and in such a cheap form that the pirates cannot undersell you.' In the end, with Hunt's arrival in Italy in the summer of 1822, Byron offered the poem to him, and he accepted, writing to Bessy Kent, his wife's sister: 'Lord B. made me a present the other day of a satire on Southey, called the Vision of Judgment, which my brother has accordingly to get from the hands of Murray, and print for our mutual benefit; but I write to him by the present post to say that he had better put it in the first number of the Hesperides, if it be not already published by him.' The Hesperides was the initial name thought of for the periodical, The Liberal, in which it was planned Shelley, Byron and Hunt would collaborate. However, getting the manuscript from the hands of Murray was not as easy as it might have sounded. Hunt complained in a letter written in November 1822 that: 'Murray's conduct about the Preface, connected as it has been too with his servile - nay, abject shew of devotion to Lord B., is particularly bad; for he has kept back the corrected copy of the Vision, as well as the Preface itself, & given your father the corrected one, as

14 Hunt, 1862, Vol. 1, p.189.
if on purpose to get him into trouble with the very passages which his Lordship had altered.'  

Hunt's subsequent comments about the poem's trial smack of a personal sense of grievance against Murray. He states about the Old Bailey Barrister: 'the public would be led to suppose, by this lawyer's bravado, that the Gang had endeavoured in vain to reach the author, and that the latter had screened himself behind another man. The truth is, however, that MURRAY never made any demand for the author, but confined his attack entirely to the publisher; and that the Author (in the manly and fearless spirit which has marked his whole conduct) the moment he heard of the prosecution, expressed his anxiety to come and bear the brunt of it himself, and that he would long ago have been in England for the purpose, had not he been assured by the present Defendant, that the coming was entirely useless.'

Thus, it can be seen that Byron attempted a number of alternative strategies rather than using his regular publisher in attempting to publish the Vision of Judgment: publishing the poem at his own expense; hoping that one of the firms notorious for pirating works without possessing the copyright, Galignani, would take it up; and, the strategy which was ultimately successful, finding a radical publisher in the form of Leigh Hunt's brother John. Was Shelley, then, in a position to follow the same line of approach to the publication of The Mask of Anarchy?

The first of Byron's suggested solutions to the problem of his text's controversial nature was that Murray should 'print fifty copies (at my expence [sic]) distribute them amongst my acquaintances', i.e. that the Vision of Judgment should be self-published, because a text could be defined in this way if it lacked someone willing to put his or her name to the title-page and take on the responsibility for marketing. John Feather's comments on publishing history are useful to elucidate further different methods of distributing books. Feather writes about eighteenth-century imprints (his words also hold

16 Examiner, 833, 1824, p.34.
good for works printed during the Romantic period)\(^{17}\) that 'the variations all retain the essential information: the name of the distributor. In other words, the imprint, unless deliberately deceptive, is always concerned with marketing.'\(^ {18}\) So the information on the title page of a book, or the imprint, unless it was an illicit publication which sought to give misleading information, emphasized the name of the person responsible for its sale and distribution, i.e. a bookseller or publisher. The person responsible for physically producing, or printing, the book was of secondary importance.

An instance of a typical eighteenth century/early nineteenth century imprint, therefore, would be Shelley's first novel, *Zastrozzi*. The imprint reads 'Printed for G. Wilkie and J. Robinson'. It stresses the booksellers' names, Wilkie and Robinson, and does not mention the printers; the book's potential buyers were most interested in where they could obtain it. A more complicated example of an imprint would be Percy Bysshe and Elizabeth Shelley's *Original Poetry By Victor and Cazire*, 'Printed by C. and W. Phillips, for the Authors; And sold by J.J. Stockdale, 41 Pall-Mall, And all other Booksellers.' The imprint this time explicitly refers to the printers' names, the Phillipses, and tells us that the book was printed at the author's expense, 'for the Authors'. It also retains the same essential information as *Zastrozzi*'s imprint, the place where its potential readers could buy it, Stockdale's establishment in Pall Mall.

Feather gives examples of other imprints which do not follow this pattern, including Coleridge's *Moral and political lecture* of 1795. The imprint is as follows: 'Bristol: Printed by George Routh, in Corn-Street.' Feather comments: 'Such imprints say nothing of arrangements for distribution; there were none. The book was sold by the printer and author, often having been printed at the author's expense. These simple

\(^{17}\) Of course this is not to say that the book trade was static at the time. The roles of publisher/bookseller, printer and author were all changing, and the differences between them could sometimes be slight. Robin Myers comments that 'the trade was beginning to split into its modern components' at the end of the eighteenth century. *The British Book Trade* (London, 1973), p. 162. An account of the historical process of specialisation in the book trade appears in Marjorie Plant, *The English Book Trade* (London, 1974), pp. 59-67.

imprints indicate that a book could never have had more than a very restricted local
circulation.\textsuperscript{19} Byron's early comment about the \textit{Vision of Judgment} suggests that it was
to fit into this category of text: it was to be printed 'at my expence' and amongst his
acquaintances. There are a number of parallel examples in Shelley's publishing history.
\textit{Proposals for An Association} is 'Printed by I.Eton, Winetavern-Street'. \textit{Queen Mab} is
'Printed by P.B. Shelley. 23, Chapel Street, Grosvenor Square.' \textit{A Refutation of Deism} is
'Printed by Schulze and Dean, 13, Poland Street.' There are also a number of works
which, illegally, contained no printer's name at all\textsuperscript{20}: \textit{An Address, to the Irish People; A
Letter to Lord Ellenborough; The Devil's Walk; a Ballad; A Declaration of Rights; An
Address to the People on The Death of the Princess Charlotte}.\textsuperscript{21}

On this basis self-publishing, for Shelley, like Byron, might have seemed an
attractive option.\textsuperscript{22} Shelley twice in his letters compared himself and Thomas Paine, who
had self-published radical works. He wrote in connection with his self-published pamphlet,
\textit{An Address, to the Irish People}, in a letter to Miss Hitchener on 26 January 1812: 'I have
been busily engaged in an address to the Irish which will be printed as Paine's works were,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{19}Feather, 1985, p. 110.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} In the case of \textit{A Letter to Lord Ellenborough}, Shelley removed the printer's name from
copies after printing. Similarly, some copies of \textit{Queen Mab} have the author's name as
printer removed.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Readily available sources which, taken together, give a reasonably complete idea of
Prose; Dictionary of Literary Biography Volume 96: British Romantic Poets, 1789-1832,
p.308. Self-published works: title pages of the \textit{Necessity of Atheism, An Address, to the
Irish People}, the \textit{Proposals for an Association} and \textit{A Letter to Lord Ellenborough} are
reproduced in ed. Murray, 1, pp. 1, 7, 39 and 61. Murray consults the Huntington Library
copies of these: copies can also be found in the British Library (with the exception of the
Letter, where Murray has consulted the only copy that exists, in the Bodleian Library,
Oxford). Originals of the \textit{Declaration of Rights} and the \textit{Devil's Walk} exist in the Public
Records Office, London.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Jon Klancher has identified self-publishing as a strategy which became more prevalent
among radical writers from the 1790s onward, arguing that there was a shift from the
aristocratic, gentlemanly self-publisher to the radical self-publisher which reached its end in
the years 1816-17, by which time the practice had completely crossed over to the radical
\end{itemize}
and pasted on the walls of Dublin.\textsuperscript{23} Shelley also wrote in connection with the same pamphlet to Miss Hitchener on 7 January 1812, 'Thomas Paine died a natural death - his writings were far more violently in opposition to government than mine perhaps will ever be.'\textsuperscript{24} By comparing his mode of publication with that of Paine, Shelley placed himself within a radical tradition of self-publishing where the author kept himself aloof from the political pressures that might be brought to bear by his publishers. Paine financed the publication of a number of his writings himself; for instance, in his memorial, he wrote that he financed the printing of six thousand copies of \textit{Common Sense} himself,\textsuperscript{25} he also paid for the printing of \textit{The Crisis Extraordinary} in May 1780 himself\textsuperscript{26}. He also stated in a note to the second part of \textit{The Rights of Man} that he was offered £1000 for the copyright, probably for political reasons, and added:

\begin{quote}
I told the person who brought me this offer that I should not accept it, and wished it not to be renewed, giving him as my reason, that though I believed the printer to be an honest man, I would never put it in the power of any printer or publisher to suppress or alter a work of mine, by making him master of the copy, or give to him the right of selling it to any minister, or to any other person, or to treat as a mere matter of traffic, that which I intended should operate as a principle.\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

Paine made a point of taking on the expense and the marketing of his works himself for political reasons.

Jon Klancher has argued that self-publishing was a feature of radical culture in the early nineteenth century. He has suggested that the period between November 1816 and October 1817 (i.e. a period which falls between the publication of Shelley's early political writings and his writings of 1819) was 'significant' because it 'crystallised a tension between modes of reading prefigured in the 1790s'. This tension, for Klancher, is

\textsuperscript{24} ed. Jones, \textit{Shelley Letters}, 1, p. 221.
\textsuperscript{25} \textit{The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine}, edited by Philip S. Foner, (New York, 1945), pp. xxii-iii.
\textsuperscript{26} ed. Foner, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{27} ed. Foner, p. 456.
exemplified by Coleridge's feeling of despair about being able to self-publish at the time of
*Biographia Literaria*'s publication in July 1817. For Coleridge, 'the age of self-publishing
was now over' with his failure to secure a large readership for his periodicals the
*Watchman* and the *Friend*. Coleridge had been largely responsible for their dissemination
himself. Coleridge's failure contrasted with the phenomenal success of William Cobbett's
self-publishing venture, the *Political Register*, which was first issued at a reduced price of
twopence (the original price had been a shilling) in November 1816. Klancher suggests
that this marks a shift in the politics of self-publishing, and comments, 'the self-publishing
periodical essayist had become the self-publishing radical writer forming an artisan public';
for Klancher this change marks 'a shift in cultural practice from one social class to
another'.

This growth in self-publishing coincided with the growth of a culture of heroic
individualism among radical leaders. E.P. Thompson has written that, 'the years between
the Wars and the Reform Bill [i.e. between 1815 and 1832] were the age of the "self-
dependent politician". Every Radical was a political protestant; every leader avowed
himself to be an individualist, owing deference to no authority but that of his own
judgment and conscience.'

William Cobbett, whose influence on Shelley's circle has
already been noted, stated that 'from my very first outset in politics, I formed the
resolution of keeping myself independent. In adherence to this resolution, I rejected, in
America, many offers of great pecuniary advantage.' On his return to England in 1800,
having been a consistent supporter of the British government, although not in their pay, he
was offered one of their newspapers, *The True Briton*, by Tory supporters of the
government. He wrote that, 'They were their property, office, types, lease of houses and
all; and the former was offered me as a gift .... This was no trifling offer. The very types,

29 Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, p. 688. See also chapter 15,
'Demagogues and Martyrs, pp. 660-780, for a discussion of the way that radical leaders
promoted themselves as heroic individuals.
presses & c. were worth a considerable sum.\textsuperscript{31} However, he refused the offer, and wrote about the reason for this to Edward Thornton on 4 September 1800: 'for me to be able to do government any service, I must be able to say, that I am totally \textit{independent} of it, in my capacity of proprietor of a newspaper'.\textsuperscript{32} Cobbett, like Paine, presented himself as needing independence from booksellers if he were to retain any integrity in his political writings.

Shelley's early self-publishing ventures also can be seen as a statement of independence, given that they took place against a background of the suppression of his works by publishers. Shelley's earliest publication, a collection of poems published pseudonymously with his sister Elizabeth, \textit{Original Poetry by Victor and Cazire}, employed John Joseph Stockdale Junior. Stockdale wrote about his first encounter with Shelley:

\begin{quote}
With anxiety in his countenance, he requested me to extricate him from a pecuniary difficulty, in which he was involved, with a printer, whose name I cannot call to mind; but who resided at Horsham, near to which Timothy Shelley Esquire M.P. afterwards I believe, made a Baronet the father of our poet, had a seat, called Field Place. I am not quite certain how the difference between the poet, and the printer, was arranged; but, after I had looked over the account, I know that it was paid.\textsuperscript{33}
\end{quote}

The printer 'who resided at Horsham' is likely to have belonged to the firm of C. and W. Phillips, because Shelley mentions 'Philipps the Horsham printer' in a letter of 11 August 1810.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{Stockdale's Budget}, 1, 1826, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{34} Shelley to Edward Fergus Graham, 11 August 1810, in ed. Jones, \textit{Shelley Letters}, 1, p.13. James Phillips, who is likely to have been the sole proprietor of the firm, lived in Horsham. The business was carried out at 12 Warwick Street, Worthing, by his sons, Charles and William. There is anecdotal evidence that Shelley was closely involved in the printing of the work. See Samuel J. Looker, \textit{Shelley, Trelawny and Henley} (Worthing, 1950).
The story of Shelley's expulsion from Oxford and subsequent estrangement from his father as a result of the publication of the *Necessity of Atheism* is well known. John Joseph Stockdale gave an account of his involvement, writing that:

Shelley had informed me, either verbally, or by letter, or, not improbably, by both, of his having completed a Metaphysical Essay, in support of atheism, and which he intended to promulgate throughout the university. I represented that his expulsion, would be the inevitable consequence of so flagrant an insult to such a body, and keep down those talents, which would otherwise render him an ornament to society, and an honour to his family, and to his country. He, however, was unmoved, and I instantly wrote to his father.35

Stockdale was for Shelley a prospective publisher for the *Necessity of Atheism*, but Stockdale took steps to prevent the poem's publication. Other evidence suggests that John Joseph Stockdale may not have been the ideal man in whom to confide a delicate matter of this nature. Stockdale's business was based in Pall Mall: his father, John Stockdale, had a publishing business based in Picadilly, and was a respectable supporter of Pittite policies:36 during the late eighteenth century he was a keen defender of British policies in Ireland; in 1799 he wrote a poem called *Anglo-Hibernia*, praising the actions of the British army in putting down the Irish rebellion of 1798; and he was also one of the publishers of *The Orange Institution, A Slight Sketch*, which defended the Orange Order. His son, on the other hand, was responsible for *Stockdale's Budget*, a periodical devoted to scandal, and gained notoriety through publishing the *Memoirs of Harriet Wilson*.37 He also appears in the *Examiner's* pages in 1819, where an article accuses him of having

36 Dates given in the *DNB* for John Stockdale and John Joseph Stockdale are 1749 (?) - 1814 and 1770-1847. Information about the politics of the older Stockdale which centres on his acquaintance with a number of American presidents appears in Eric Stockdale's essay 'John Stockdale of Piccadilly: Publisher to John Adams and Thomas Jefferson', in *Author/Publisher Relations During the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, edited by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (Oxford, 1983), pp. 63-87.
37 This information can be found in *The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, 8 vols, ed. Roger Ingpen and Walter E. Peck (London, 1965), 8, p.lxi. It is also stated that John Stockdale Junior 'gained a reputation by issuing fiction at the author's expense'.

stolen £2,500 from Paddington Parish's church funds, and entertainingly illuminates vote-rigging practices in early nineteenth century England.38

The history of the poem called *A Poetical Essay on the Existing State of Things*, already mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, reinforces this impression that Shelley, during the early part of his career, would have been unwise to entrust too much confidence in a bookseller. It has been seen that it is probable that Shelley advertised the poem himself, or was a key factor in its advertisement; and he would have had good reason to expect Crosby and Co., the named publishers, to take part in an avowedly radical venture, to raise funds for the persecuted journalist Peter Finnerty.39 Crosby and Co. were responsible for publishing 'Report of the Proceedings on an information filed by his majesty's attorney-general against John Drakard, proprietor of the Stamford News, for publishing in that paper an article on military punishment. Stamford: printed and sold by J.Drakard; and sold by Crosby and Co., Stationers' Court, London.'40 John Drakard was tried in 1811, near the time of the *Poetical Essay's* reputed publication; Crosby must, then, have been sympathetic to the attempts of Drakard to champion the cause of free speech.

The link between Crosby and Co. and Drakard can also be seen in the fact that they were

---

38 *Examiner*, 590, 1819, p.255. Luther A. Brewer mentions an action being brought against Hunt, and subsequently withdrawn, by Stockdale in 1819. See *My Leigh Hunt Library*, edited by Luther A. Brewer (Iowa City, 1938), p.92.

39 Benjamin Crosby was active from 1784 to 1815. See Maxted, p.56. His history is also told in Montague Summers, *The Gothic Quest* (London, 1938), pp. 79-80. Summers refers to Crosby and Co. as a 'well-known house purveying Gothic romances'. Summers states that the firm who took over part of Crosby's business after he became ill were Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, co-publishers with Carpenter and Son of *Alastor* in 1816. Summers also states that at one point Crosby had been in the firm of Wilkie and Robinson, who published *Zastrozzi* in 1810. For the history of the various publishing Robinsons, see Charles Henry Timperley, *Encyclopaedia of literary and typographical anecdote*, (reprint of the 1842 edition), 2 vols, (New York and London, 1977), pp. 808, 843 and 852. William Godwin published both with Crosby and Co. and G.G. and J. Robinson (John Robinson was in partnership with George Wilkie from 1806-1814), using Crosby and Co. for *Caleb Williams* and G.G. and J. Robinson as joint publishers, with Joseph Johnson, for *Memoirs of the Author of a vindication of the Rights of Woman* in 1798 and also as sole publishers of three editions of *Political Justice* published in 1793, 1795 and 1797 (the last two editions with the dates 1796 and 1798 on the front cover), and *Thoughts occasioned by the perusal of Dr. Parr's Spital Sermon* in 1801.

40 See MacCarthy, p. 94.
extensive advertisers in Drakard's *Stamford News* during the period when Shelley was trying to publish with them. Advertisements appeared on 8 March, 15 March, 22 March, 10 May, 24 May, 31 May, 21 June, 26 July, 6 September, 27 September, 4 October and 25 October 1811 and 21 February 1812 for a number of titles. Examples include: *The Lady's Book* and *The Mirror of the Graces*; a series of books on gardening such as *The Gardener's Pocket Journal* and *Abercrombie's Treatise on the Garden Mushroom*; books on angling such as *A Concise Treatise on the Art of Angling* and *The Angler's Pocket Book*; educational books such as *The First Book for Children* and *The Universal Explanatory Spelling Book*; 'new novels' such as *The Welch Mountaineers* and *St. Bride's Manor*, and songbooks such as *Crosby's English Musical Repository*.

A number of the causes mentioned sympathetically by Drakard's newspaper were those which Shelley himself followed with interest. For instance, Shelley during the early part of his career was interested in the radical ideas of Sir Francis Burdett. The second of the *Original Poems of Victor and Cazire* refers to Burdett's 'plan' announced on 15 June 1809 and seconded by William Madocks MP:

> Then to politics turn, of Burdett's reformation,  
> One declares it would hurt, t'other better the nation,  
> Will ministers keep? sure they've acted quite wrong,  
> The burden this is of each morning call song.  
> (lines 9-12)

Shelley's production with Hogg in 1810, *The Wandering Jew*, was dedicated to Burdett. Later in his career, on 20 August 1812, the Town Clerk of Barnstaple wrote to Lord Sidmouth about Shelley that 'Mr Shelley has been regarded with a suspicious eye since he has been at Lynmouth, from the circumstance of his very extensive correspondence, and many of his packages and letters being addressed to Sir Frances Burdett.' The *Stamford News* was also sympathetic to Burdett. On 15 March 1811 it reported that a decision had

---

41 Kenneth Neill Cameron discusses the relationship between Shelley and the radicalism of the period 1811-1812 in *Young Shelley*, pp. 46-51.
been made on 20 February 1811 to raise a subscription for Peter Finnerty. Burdett was in the Chair, and Drakard was listed as amongst those collecting subscriptions. On 21 June and 28 June 1811 the newspaper reported a speech by Burdett.

The *Stamford News* also reported Leigh Hunt's prosecution for libel on 22 February 1811 (Shelley wrote a letter to Hunt concerning his prosecution on 2 March 1811 for reprinting an article on 'Military Flogging' which had originally appeared in the *Stamford News*). The *Stamford News* also shared a common interest with the Hunts in the plight of Peter Finnerty, the Irish journalist prosecuted for libel. In addition, it reported fully addresses from the MP for Boston, William Madocks, on 8 March 1811 and 15 March 1811, and gave their support for him in an editorial on 5 April 1811. Sympathetic accounts of Madocks' embankment-building scheme in Wales from the *Chester Chronicle* and the *North Wales Gazette* appeared on 9 August 1811, followed by the announcement on page 3 that 'Messrs. Madocks, and the Hon. D. Burrel, are now in Boston, renewing their canvas, preparatory to the general election which is universally considered as approaching.' In November 1812, Shelley went to live in Madocks' house at Tremadoc, Tan-yr-Allt, with the hope of helping him with his embankment scheme.43

So Shelley presented himself in 1812 as a radical reformer in Paine's mould, proudly independent and fearless of possible consequences to himself, and his early experiences with booksellers, however sympathetic to progressive politics, show that his desire to present himself as independent was born as much out of the harsh experience of rejection as of idealism. Why, then, did he not publish independently in similar circumstances in 1819? The answer to this question can be found by re-examining the publishing history of Shelley's pamphlets published in Dublin in 1812. A close re-

examination of their publication history suggests that he was not an independent figure at all, but was in fact dependent upon a network of acquaintances. As Hunt was a major player in the publication or otherwise of *The Mask of Anarchy*, the United Irishmen and their allies were key players in the publication of Shelley's Irish pamphlets.44

The imprints of the Dublin pamphlets fail to mention a publisher, and only the *Proposals for an Association* mentions a printer, 'I. Eton'. It will be remembered from John Feather's discussion of imprints in the period that this fact suggests that the pamphlets were an independent production by Shelley working in tandem with a small printing firm, with the aim of disseminating them to a limited readership. The firm 'I. Eton' is so small that it has not been traced in any directories by D.F. MacCarthy, and he does not feature in any of the standard reference works on Irish printers of the period which I have consulted.45 This is odd, given Shelley's wider acquaintanceship with the press in Dublin. For instance, David Lee Clark has noted the fact that Shelley wished at one point to write a work called 'Pieces of Irish History', and that a work of the same name was published by William James Mac Neven. 'That Shelley knew Mac Neven's *Pieces of Irish History* can hardly be doubted', notes Clark, 'for he was in contact with Mac Neven's closest friends - Lawless, Curran, Finnerty, Stockdale'.46 Mac Neven is described in the

44 Tom Garvin notes that 'underground political organization in pre-famine Ireland' has tended to be neglected, because of the emphasis on attempts at constitutional reform. Although Garvin's emphasis is on rural movements, it might also be said that the continuation of activities by those who had been United Irishmen in 1798 has similarly been neglected. See Tom Garvin, 'Defenders, Ribbonmen and Others: Underground Political Networks in Pre-Famine Ireland' in *Nationalism and Popular Protest in Ireland*, edited by C.H. Philpin (Cambridge, 1987), p. 219.

45 MacCarthy notes that there is no 'I. Eton' listed in any of the directories. See: MacCarthy, *Shelley's Early Life*, p. 260. Eton's name does not appear in the standard reference works on Irish printers of the period which I have consulted: *A Catalogue of the Bradshaw Collection of Irish Books in the University Library Cambridge*, edited by Charles E. Sayle (Cambridge, 1916); John S. North, *The Waterloo Directory of Irish Newspapers and Periodicals, 1800-1900*. Phase 2 (Ontario, 1986). Also, given the nature of Shelley's pamphlets, it is strange that the printer 'I. Eton', who was presumably sympathetic to his cause, does not appear as a signatory to the *Protestant Petition*. A 'Benjamin Eaton' appears on page 11, but he lived in Blackall Place, not in Winetavern Street.

46 See David Lee Clark, 'Shelley and "Pieces of Irish History"', *Modern Language Notes*, 
Dictionary of National Biography as 'one of the ablest members of the United Irish executive'. He was arrested and imprisoned in 1798, later to be released during the short lull in hostilities between France and England after the treaty of Amiens in 1802, and from 1805 onwards spent his time in the United States.

It has already been seen that Shelley took an interest in the fate of the Irish journalist Peter Finnerty, who was sentenced to 18 months in gaol for libel on 7 February 1811, deciding to dedicate the funds from A Poetical Essay on the Existing State of Things, if it were published, to Finnerty's subscription, which reached £2000. John Philpot Curran defended Peter Finnerty in an earlier libel action against him, for a piece in the United Irishmen's newspaper, The Press, on 26 October 1797. Curran was also associated with the Hon. Valentine Browne Lawless, another frequent contributor to The Press, being arrested in 1798 when found with him in connection with the disturbances in Ireland. Lawless attended one meeting of the United Irish Society, in October 1797. Both the names of Lawless and Stockdale appear in Shelley's correspondence regarding another of his unpublished works, a collection of early poems.

Stockdale was in fact the most likely person for Shelley to approach in connection with his political pamphlets. In February 1812 Shelley passed a manuscript to the Dublin printers Roger and John Stockdale. It is a matter of dispute whether this manuscript was identical with the Esdaile notebook, a group of early poems named after the owner of the manuscript. It is also unclear from the documentary evidence whether Shelley ever retrieved the manuscript. However, the vicissitudes of Shelley's attempts to publish the manuscript are known. Harriet Shelley wrote to Catherine Nugent on 4th August 1812: 'The case is this. His printer refuses to go on with his poems until he is paid. Now such a demand is seldom made, as printers are never paid till the profits arising from the sale of

53, 1938, pp. 522-5.
47 Biographical details are taken from the Dictionary of National Biography. See also Richard Robert Madden, The United Irishmen, Their Lives and Times, 4 vols (Dublin, 1859-1860).
the work come in, and Percy agreed with him to this effect, and as long as we staid in
Dublin he wore the mask which is now taken off. However, I am in great hope that Mr.
Lawless will get them from him. Harriet then writes to Catherine Nugent on October
12th, saying, 'Percy says he wishes you to go to Stockdale's, and get all his manuscript
poems and other pieces.' She writes again on 14th November: 'Have you been able to
get the poems from Stockdale?' Shelley writes to Hookham on a date which Frederick
Jones guesses as 17 December: 'I write hastily again today because I hear from Ireland of
my Mss.' These difficulties seem likely to have been because of John Stockdale's
precarious financial situation as much as any double-dealing. Stockdale was printer of the
Press, the United Irishmen's newspaper, in the 1790s and as a result he was imprisoned for
6 months and had his property destroyed. Later, in 1803, he was involved in the
insurrection of Robert Emmet in 1803, and received a two year imprisonment. Richard
Madden states, on the authority of Mr Flanagan, one of the printers of the Press, that 'he
came out of gaol a ruined man'. Roger and John Stockdale were also signatories to a
Protestant petition to Parliament requesting that Catholics should 'be admitted to the
Privileges and Franchises of the Constitution' in 1812. Madden states that John
Stockdale died on 11 January 1813.

Given the fact that Shelley knew John Stockdale and other people associated with
the United Irishmen, it is strange that no one has made a connection between Stockdale

53 Madden, United Irishmen, Fourth Series, p.650.
54 See Copy of the Protestant Petition to both Houses of Parliament, and the names of
the subscribers thereto, in the order in which they we[words illegible], (Dublin, 1812), pp.
5 and 18.
55 Richard Cargill Cole in Irish Booksellers and English Writers 1740-1800, (London,
However, given that Cole does not argue with Madden about the reliability of his source,
it seems more likely that John Stockdale the elder died in 1813 and that his son, also
named John Stockdale, took the business to Philadelphia. Robert Munter in A Dictionary
that John Stockdale Junior went into partnership with his father in 1802.
and Shelley's Irish pamphlets. A number of odd coincidences point to Stockdale's involvement in their publication. For instance, the use of spurious imprints was a tactic employed by Stockdale and his circle in attempting to avoid legal redress and/or to increase sales as well. There was an effort made to deflect prosecution of the United Irishmen's newspaper *The Press* away from its actual printers. The first supposed printer was Peter Finnerty, with the actual printer being a Mr. Whitworth. Then, after Finnerty's prosecution, Stockdale took over the actual printing of the newspaper, with Arthur O'Connor's name being used in the imprint; as a result, the circulation increased to 6,000, 'the utmost that could be printed in time by the presses in use at that period'. It would have been a clever ruse for the Irish pamphlets to use a name very similar to that of Daniel Isaac Eaton, who had recently been prosecuted in England, and was a popular figure in radical circles (when he was placed in the pillory, the crowd greeted him as a hero, not as a villain) with the hope of boosting sales. Also, the real 'proprieter' of the pamphlets, as the person financially responsible for them, was Shelley, an old Etonian, who was fond of using pseudonyms in his intrigues against his father. Shelley wrote in 1811 to Edward Fergus Graham suggesting that he should be addressed as the Revd. Charles Meyton, and to T.J. Hogg stating that his *nom de guerre* in his dispute with his father was to be Mr. Peyton. Perhaps the names are suggested by a conflation of the words 'Me-eton' and 'P[ercy]-eton', in which case the printer's name 'I.Eton' follows in logical succession in 1812.

---

57 Eaton, like Stockdale, was regularly accused of libel from the 1790s onwards. He was found not guilty of libel in 1794 for including a story about a gamecock 'meaning our lord the king' in his *Politics for the People, or a Salamagundy for Swine*. He was again tried in 1795 for *Pigot's Female Jockey Club*, and in 1796 was tried for *Pigot's Political Dictionary*. He then, in another parallel with Stockdale's family, lived in America for 3 and a half years, and returned to England to face 15 months imprisonment and the loss of £2,800 of his books. The last book bearing his imprint is *Ecco Homo* in 1813, but it has been suggested that this is the work of another printer (Source: *DNB*). There is also an entry for Daniel Isaac Eaton in the *Biographical Dictionary of British Modern Radicals*, edited by Joseph O. Baylen and Norbert J. Gossman (Hassocks, Sussex, 1979).
Additionally, Shelley's pamphlets and the texts published by Stockdale at the same time are physically similar. E.B. Murray suggests in his edition of Shelley's prose that it is probable that Shelley's *Proposals for an Association* and *An Address, to the Irish People* shared the same printer because both pamphlets use Gothic typeface for the word 'Dublin' and use open type elsewhere on the title page.\(^{59}\) An examination of three of Stockdale's publications from a roughly contemporaneous period, between 1811 and 1813, shows that they have a strikingly similar Gothic type for the word Dublin, and two out of three of them display a very similar open type used for the largest word in the title-page. An investigation into a selection of works printed by other printers in Dublin at the same time as Shelley's Irish pamphlets, in 1812, shows that this was not common practice. From a large sample of title pages examined, only one other besides those of Stockdale and 'Eton' displays the combination of highlighted words in open-face lettering and the word Dublin in the same-sized Gothic lettering. One caveat must be admitted: Stockdale's type-faces are not identical to those of the 'Eton' pamphlets, only extraordinarily similar.\(^{60}\)

Further evidence for Stockdale's involvement is a possible link between Stockdale's strained circumstances and the frugal manner in which the pamphlets were produced. Shelley, taking on the cost of publication himself, makes it explicit that *An Address, to the Irish People* is a cheap production, with a note on the title page to the effect that:

The lowest possible price is set on this publication, because it is the intention of the Author to awaken in the minds of the Irish poor, a knowledge of their real state, summarily pointing out the evils of that state, and suggesting rational means of remedy. - Catholic Emancipation, and a Repeal of the Union Act, (the latter, the most successful engine that England ever wielded over the misery of fallen Ireland,) being treated of in the following address, as grievances which unanimity and resolution may remove, and associations conducted with peaceable firmness, being earnestly recommended, as means for embodying that unanimity and firmness, which must finally be successful.\(^{61}\)

\(^{60}\) See Appendix C.
\(^{61}\) Percy Bysshe Shelley, *An Address, to the Irish People* (Dublin, 1812), title page.
The cost of the pamphlet was 5d. The awkwardness of the phrasing of this initial statement suggests that the pamphlet was rushed through the press, with little time for correction. The distribution of the pamphlets was also done in the cheapest way possible. Harriet wrote at the end of Shelley's letter to Miss Hitchener on 27th February 1812:

I'm sure you would laugh were you to see us give the pamphlets. We throw them out of window [sic] and give them to men that we pass in the streets; for myself I am ready to die of laughter when it is done and Percy looks so grave. Yesterday he put one into a woman's hood of a cloak. She knew nothing of it and we passed her. I could hardly get on my muscles were so irritated.62

Thus, a number of factors taken together point to Stockdale's collusion in the production of Shelley's pamphlets: there is good reason to suspect that 'I. Eton' was a spurious imprint, there is a physical resemblance between the productions of Shelley and Stockdale, and the shoestring nature of the pamphlets' financing is consistent with the use of a printer in a poor financial position. Shelley presented his self-publishing practice as a venture similar to that of Paine, and both men's comments lead the reader to believe that they were heroically independent, though I would suggest that Shelley's pamphlets existed in the context of a communications circuit of other men interested in the cause of Catholic emancipation.63 If, then, Shelley were to draw upon his own previous experience to attempt to find a publisher for *The Mask of Anarchy* other than Hunt, he would have to draw upon a network of friends or acquaintances in much the same way that he did in Dublin. The options open to Shelley should not be framed in terms of a heroic independence versus dependence on Hunt, a radical option versus the more timid approach

---

63 Robert Darnton has suggested that his model of the relationship between readers and publishers as a 'communications circuit' (see p. 12 of this thesis) is 'an organic view' in contradiction to a view of publishing as a process of 'diffusion', a filtering down of information from the elite to the masses. See Robert Darnton, *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (London, 1996), p. 182. Perhaps ironically, the heroic view of radical leaders held by Paine and Cobbett in their efforts to promote themselves supports an undemocratic 'diffusion' theory of publishers and readers: the radical leader operates on his own, and his ideas filter down to the masses. The whole question of self-publishing and politics can be seen to be fraught.
of Hunt. The choices open to Shelley were more complex and diverse than that, and to an extent the concept of radical independence, in Shelley's case at least, was a form of rhetoric rather than a political reality. In the following two chapters I wish to explore the means that Shelley might have used to publish within a network of radical acquaintances. An outline of this topic will throw interesting insights on to the relationship between Shelley's radicalism and that of Hunt.
Shelley and Literary Piracy

This section of the chapter aims to show that Shelley was both familiar with the practice of 'literary piracy', and that he would have been capable of exploiting this means of publishing. A number of examples of 'literary piracy' in the early nineteenth century will be explored. One instance of such piracy, of which Shelley was aware, was Robert Southey's *Wat Tyler*, initially written by Southey in 1794 without being published, and then published in 1817, Southey claiming that it was without his permission. The copyright of the work was in dispute. The history of Shelley's poem *Queen Mab* shows that Shelley would have been capable of exploiting piracy in 1819. The poem was initially privately published - it has features in common with Shelley's 'self-published' works in that it does not bear a publisher's imprint. But it was later to be published, without Shelley's apparent consent, for a wider audience by William Clark in 1821. Again, the publisher was not the copyright holder. Here I argue that, to some extent, Shelley was aware of the piracy of his poem and was willing to use it to his own advantage. I also explore in this chapter the publication by James Johnston of parodies of Byron and Wordsworth. Although these were original works, one written by John Agg, the other by an unknown author, the publisher contravened copyright law by publishing works in the name of well-known authors without having any legal right to do so. In this section of the chapter I will show that

---


65 For a general discussion of copyright law in the period, see Feather, *Publishing, Piracy and Politics*. Chapter 5, 'The Reform of the Law 1800-1842', pp. 122-148, discusses the involvement of Wordsworth and Southey in the passing of the Bill of 1837 and the Copyright Act of 1842. Chapter 6, 'Copyright in Britain and the World', pp. 149-172,
such piracy of well-known authors often did not work to the detriment of the authors themselves; they could be beneficiaries as much as victims. Thus, the pirates were people whom Shelley could have worked with. More generally, I hope to show that there was a blurred line between 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' texts in the Regency period. Copyright could be a double-edged sword. I will argue that this fact has important implications for a study of radicalism in the period, and for an understanding of the role of Shelley and Leigh Hunt vis a vis radicalism.

Openness, and hence the legitimacy of texts, was a key political issue among the publishers of the early nineteenth century. James Epstein, for instance, makes a distinction between 'aristocratic' modes of publishing and 'plebeian' modes, placing Shelley in the 'aristocratic' category. He writes that, 'whereas, for example, Shelley privately printed and circulated his more daring works, ripping out the title pages to avoid incrimination, the plebeian publishers Sherwin and Carlile forced the issue, seeking to remove all boundaries of permissible literary visibility.'

Epstein writes further about Paine: 'Paine linked directness and transparency of expression to the engendering of democratic politics. Aristocratic government, like aristocratic writing, depends on disguise, on elaborate conventions of deception, craft, and artifice; amid the show of monarchy truth is kept safely hidden from view, and government - which is essentially a simple thing - is thus rendered mysterious.' Epstein suggests that the mode of publishing a work, as much as its content, was important: how a work was published stamped it with legitimate radical status.

Leigh Hunt shared in the idea that radicalism was defined by being expressed in an independent and open manner, and in this sense his politics are close to those of William Cobbett, and of a more generally shared radical culture.

mentions Galignani's role in reprinting British books.

Epstein, _Radical Expression_, p.100.

Epstein, p.111.

Kevin Gilmartin argues that Cobbett and Hunt share a common culture during this period because of a 'sense of the common enemy that a radical or reform movement confronts', and explores the similarities in rhetoric between Cobbett, Hunt and Hazlitt in
Thompson commented on radicalism in the early nineteenth century that, 'every Radical was a political protestant; every leader avowed himself to be an individualist, owing deference to no authority but that of his own judgment and conscience.' Leigh Hunt can be shown to have a similarly Protestant sensibility. Hunt wrote in his Autobiography that 'the main objects of the Examiner were to assist in producing reform in parliament, liberality of opinion in general (especially freedom from superstition), and a fusion of literary taste into all subjects whatsoever'.

As Carl Woodring notes, Hunt's 'liberality of opinion' can be linked to 'liberal beliefs descending from Locke', one of which is described by Woodring as the 'responsibility of the individual to follow his own conscience in all spheres of life'.

Hunt himself referred to Locke's influence, writing that 'it was Locke, and such men as himself, who, in teaching us to give up our mental liberty to no man, taught us to give up our personal liberty to no man; but to prefer even the consciousness of independence to a slavery however worshipful. - To such a man as LOCKE, therefore, every Englishman owes love and reverence.'

In fact this division between 'aristocratic' and 'plebeian' modes of publishing is false. As it was seen that the independence granted by self-publishing was an illusion, so I wish to argue here that plebeian publishers, as much as aristocratic authors like Shelley, were implicated in an 'aristocratic' mode of subterfuge. There is not a clear line to be drawn between legitimate and illegitimate forms of publishing and/or radicalism in the period, and neither is there a clear division to be drawn between the way that 'gentlemen' like Byron and Shelley saw their works get into the marketplace, and the means that plebeian writers


and publishers used. Thus, I would suggest that radical modes of publishing were as open to Shelley as they were to anyone else, and that the nature of radical culture might lead us to suspect that the politics of an editor like Leigh Hunt cannot be so readily distinguished from those of the 'radical underworld' with its implications of illegality as might be thought. In the next section I shall present evidence which suggests that, whatever his statements in 1832, Leigh Hunt was implicated in that 'radical underworld' in the early nineteenth century. It is difficult, in the early nineteenth century at least, whatever Hunt's subsequent views, to distinguish either Leigh Hunt or Shelley as being more legitimately 'radical' than the other, and I would therefore suggest that the non-publication of *The Mask of Anarchy* was not due to political differences.

Before turning to the history of Robert Southey's *Wat Tyler* to illustrate my view of publishing in the period, the history of Byron's *Vision of Judgment* should be recollected. Byron had failed to self-publish the poem, because John Murray was unwilling to take on the task of production. I have argued that John Stockdale of Dublin suppressed his own name in publishing Shelley's Irish pamphlets, but Murray was not willing to undertake Byron's suggestion that his own name be suppressed and the work be aimed only at Byron's acquaintances. So Byron tried an alternative strategy, writing that it should be published, 'with some other bookseller's name - or as a foreign edition - and in such a cheap form that the pirates cannot undersell you.'  

Byron's reference to an edition which was to be either foreign or cheap showed that he meant to fight fire with fire. The 'pirates' were notorious for producing cheap editions which could undersell editions authorised by the writer, and the idea of a 'foreign' edition brings to mind the French publisher Galignani, himself a notorious pirate. In other words, Byron wished to publish the equivalent of a pirated edition of his work before the pirates could undersell him.

---

72 For more information on Byron and piracy, see Peter Manning, 'The Honey-ing of Byron's Corsair', in Peter Manning, *Reading Romantics: Texts and and Contexts*, (Oxford and New York, 1990), pp. 216-237, and also the references in appendix E which mention sources for James Johnston's piracies of Byron.
Giovanni Antonio Galignani was an influential figure among the English expatriate community on the continent. Scott and Byron both referred to him in their letters as 'the old pirate', and Thackeray chose to write about Galignani's newspaper in his portrait of the English expatriate community in Paris in his *Vanity Fair*. Giles Barber, mentioning these facts, describes *Galignani's Messenger* as 'the English language paper available in continental Europe'. This influence stretched to Shelley's circle: Shelley referred to having heard English news in 'some Paris papers' in the same letter of August 1819 to Peacock where he accused him of being 'well sheltered'. Mary Shelley also wrote about *Galignani's Messenger* in a letter to Marianne Hunt of 24 February 1820. She wrote a long letter about 'King Cant' and said, 'at present I have it double distilled through Galignani & even thus frittered way it makes one almost sick'. Byron, also part of the expatriate community in Italy, was an avid reader of *Galignani's Messenger*. His letters and journals are peppered with references to the newspaper and, like the Shelleys, he followed events in 1819 through its pages. Byron wrote to Douglas Kinnaird about Polidori's *The Vampire*, whose inspiration, like Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, came from the stay by Byron, Shelley and Polidori at the Villa Diodati in 1816. He wrote on 24 April 1819: 'Damn 'the Vampire' - what do I know of Vampires? it must be some bookselling imposture - contradict it in a solemn paragraph.' Byron had been named as the author in *Galignani's Messenger*, and wrote to its editor on 27 April denying authorship. He further wrote to Alexander Scott on 26 June deploring the lack of newspapers, including

---

73 Giles Barber, 'Galignani's and the Publication of English Books in France from 1800 to 1852, *Library*, Fifth Series, 16, 1961, p.276. Further notes on the history of the Galignani publishing firm can be found in James J. Barnes, 'Galignani and the Publication of English Books in France: A Postscript.' *Library*, 25, 1970, pp.294-313. Barnes notes that Charles Ollier, after Shelley's death, acted as an intermediary between Galignani and the firm Colburn and Bentley. This suggests that there may have been some kind of liaison before Shelley's death. Information on Ollier's later career in publishing with Bentley, after the winding-up of his own firm in 1823, can be found in: Royal A. Gettman, *A Victorian Publisher A Study of the Bentley Papers*, (Cambridge, 1960). Parts of the Bentley papers are on microfilm, other parts are only available in their original archives. See: *Index to the archives of Richard Bentley and Son*, compiled by Alison Ingram (Cambridge, 1977).

74 Barber, p.282.

75 ed. Bennett, 1, p.137.
Galigani's Messenger. On 30 July he wrote to John Cam Hobhouse stating that he sometimes got a glimpse of his speeches in the House of Commons in Galigani's Messenger. He wrote to John Murray on 9 August about some gossip he had read in the newspaper about Thomas Moore and on 12 September enclosed an advertisement from the newspaper. He referred to it again in letters to Douglas Kinnaird on 26 October and to Richard Belgrave Hoppner on 31 December.76

There is evidence that Percy and Mary Shelley actively liaised with Galignani in the hope of producing a foreign edition of The Cenci, and thereby boosting its sales beyond the legitimate readership of Charles Ollier's edition. Shelley suggested that the play had been pirated in a letter to Ollier of 30 April 1820: 'I observe that an edition of The Cenci is advertised as published in Paris by Galignani. This, though a piracy both on the author and the publisher, is a proof of expectation of a certain demand for sale that probably will soon exhaust the small edition I sent you.'77 Mary wrote to Maria Gisborne on 19th July 1820: 'That rascal Galignani gave you a pretty account of the sale of the Cenci - We know that Copies were sent for, and he sent word that none were to be had - it was only advertised once, so the matter is clear. It has been suppressed, doubtless, through the representations of our moral Country-men, who, as we have reason to know, hate Shelley with ardour (I hope they will include me in the Compliment), and this is why only four Copies were sold - ...'78 Her comments suggest that she and Shelley were encouraging Galignani to sell the play. Thus, Galignani engaged in the illicit practice of piracy, and should therefore in theory have been seen as a threat to Shelley and Byron's poetry, and the money they could make out of it. But, in fact, Shelley and Byron were keen to exploit the opportunities which Galignani presented.

Southey stated in his preface to Wat Tyler in his collected works that it 'appears just as it was written, in the course of three mornings, in 1794'.79 Southey had, in his

76 ed. Marchand, Byron's Letters and Journals, 6, pp. 114, 118-9, 166, 187, 205, 223, 231 and 262.
77 ed. Jones, Shelley Letters, 2, p. 188.
78 ed. Bennett, 1, pp. 155-156.
son's words, 'thrown off' the poem 'in a moment of fiery democracy'; it was a spontaneous production, about which Southey wrote to his publishers, Longman and Co., on 15th February 1817: 'It was the work, or rather the sport, of a week in the summer of 1794'. In 1821 Shelley was to write in a letter to the Examiner about Queen Mab, mentioning Wat Tyler as 'a poem, written, I believe, at the same age, and with the same unreflecting enthusiasm'.

It is difficult to ascertain exactly what happened during the negotiations surrounding the proposed publication of the poem because these events were a matter of dispute. Southey's son gives the following account of what occurred:

The MS. of this production was taken up to town by his brother-in-law, Mr. Lovel, and placed in a bookseller's hands, Ridgeway by name; and my father happening to go up to town shortly afterwards, called upon this person, then in Newgate, and he and a Mr. Symonds agreed to publish it anonymously. There was also present in Ridgeway's apartment a dissenting minister, by name Winterbottom.

All those involved who gave subsequent accounts seem to agree that Southey visited Ridgeway and Symonds, and that Winterbottom was also present. Their accounts conflict because there is no concrete evidence concerning Southey's intentions about who should have published Wat Tyler, and therefore who should have possessed the copyright. In a letter to the editor of the Courier on 17 March 1817, after the pirated publication of Wat Tyler, Southey wrote: 'Mr. Winterbottom, a dissenting minister, has sworn .... that Messrs. Ridgeway and Symonds having declined the publication, it was undertaken by himself and Daniel Isaac Eaton; that I gave them the copy as their own property, and gave them, moreover, a fraternal embrace, in gratitude for their gracious acceptance of it ...' He added,
'I never saw Daniel Isaac Eaton in my life; and as for the story of the embrace, every person who knows my disposition and manners, will at once perceive it to be an impudent falsehood. In Southey's account, it was Ridgeway and Symonds who were the agreed publishers, not anyone else. As a staunch supporter of the reactionary government of 1817, he would have felt that the reference to Eaton in Winterbottom's account was a hurtful jibe, since Eaton was notorious for having published some of Tom Paine's radical writings.

So ownership of *Wat Tyler* was disputed. This dispute over ownership was to prove a sticking point in the case at the High Court of Chancery on 18 and 19 March 1817 between Southey and Sherwood, Neely and Jones, which arose because Southey tried to bring an injunction against Sherwood, Neely and Jones for publishing the poem without his permission. Sherwood, Neely and Jones were the first firm to publish *Wat Tyler*. It may be, although this was denied by Sherwood, Neely and Jones themselves, that the manuscript had fortuitously come into their hands as a result of their taking over the business of Symonds, one of the publishers whom Southey had originally entrusted with the manuscript. The account of the case between Southey and Sherwood given by J.H. Southey, *Southev Letters*, pp.252-3.

An interesting coincidence occurs at this stage of the careers of Robert Southey and William Wordsworth. Wordsworth's activities in 1794 are to some extent shrouded in mystery: E.P. Thompson has suggested that Wordsworth was involved in the publication of Daniel Isaac Eaton's *Philanthropist*, and subsequently sought to suppress this fact. As Nicholas Roe points out, Wordsworth's reasons for treating his involvement with Eaton as a matter of scandal comparable with his affair with Annette Vallon remain obscure. Is it purely coincidental that in 1794 Southey was handing his manuscript to his publishers, who subsequently claimed Eaton's involvement? Is it possible that it was Wordsworth himself who handed the manuscript to Eaton, not Southey as has been suggested? This would explain Wordsworth's sensitivity about his relationship with Eaton. It would also cast an ironic light on a passage from Wordsworth's *Prelude*, which Thompson quotes because it relates to this period: 'Time may come/When some dramatic Story may afford/Shapes livelier to convey to thee, my Friend, /What then I learn'd, or think I learn'd, of truth,/And the errors into which I was betray'd ...' Was the 'dramatic Story' in fact a coded reference to *Wat Tyler*? See E.P. Thompson 'Wordsworth's Crisis', *London Review of Books*, 8 December 1988, pp. 3-6, and Nicholas Roe, *The Politics of Nature* (Basingstoke, 1992), pp. 101-107.

For further information about Sherwood, Neely and Jones, see also chapter 3 of this thesis, which refers to their involvement in the publication of *The Revolt of Islam*.
Merivale, a barrister of Lincoln's Inn, states that information from Ridgeway, another of the original intended publishers, formed part of the case. Merivale states:

This was accompanied by the affidavit of Ridgeway, that the poem had been published without the privity or consent of the deponent [Southey], who had no claim to the copyright, and by another affidavit, stating that the Defendants were the successors in business of Symonds deceased, and proving a letter, as charged by the bill, to be of the hand-writing of the Defendant Sherwood, which letter was addressed by him to Ridgeway, and was as follows: "Dear Sir, In reply to your note of yesterday, I cannot satisfy you how "Wat Tyler" found its way before the public. It is not our property. We sell it for another person; but this much I can assure you, that it was not found among Mr. Symonds's papers, nor do I believe that he ever had it in his possession, except on the occasion mentioned by Mr. Ridgeway."

The Lord Chancellor was to rule against Southey, who hoped to bring an injunction against future sales of Wat Tyler, saying that 'it appears to me that I cannot grant this Injunction until after Mr. Southey shall have established his right to the property by an action'. Thus, it can be seen that the whole question of literary property rights at this time was a vexed one. It was unclear where the property rights in Wat Tyler resided: Southey claimed that they belonged to him, Winterbottom claimed that they belonged to Southey's intended publishers, and Sherwood, Neely and Jones, who seem to have inherited the manuscript and therefore could be seen as the successors to Southey's original publishers, denied any form of ownership while still asserting their right to publish. The fact that Southey's action failed, and that the publishers were allowed to continue, left a loophole in the law. The implication of the Lord Chancellor's judgment was that the author of a potentially libellous work had no claim to ownership, unless he or she was willing to prove ownership in the courts, and therefore leave themself open to prosecution. This loophole was exploited by publishers like William Hone and Richard Carlile who republished the poem in 1817 and 1827.

---

87 J.H. Merivale, Reports of Cases Argued and Determined in the High Court of Chancery, from the Commencement of Michaelmas Term, 1815, to the end of the sittings after Michaelmas Term (London, 1817), 2, p. 436.
88 Merivale, p.440.
The publication history of *Queen Mab* demonstrates that Shelley would have been aware of such ambiguities in copyright law in 1819. *Queen Mab* is in important respects an instance of a 'self-published' text: Shelley sought to find a publisher for *Queen Mab* and was forced to publish it privately. He wrote to his friend Thomas Hookham, a publisher and son of another publisher, the elder Thomas Hookham, from Dublin in March 1813, after the death of Stockdale in January 1813, sending Hookham the poem and expecting that he would publish it. The letter is worth quoting at length, because it gives an idea of Shelley's attitude towards the poem at the time:

> I send you my Poem. To your remarks on its defects I shall listen & derive improvement. No duty on a friend is more imperious than an utter sincerity & unreservedness & criticism [sic]; none of which a candid mind can be the object with more inward complacency & satisfaction.- At the same time in spite of its various errors, I am determined to give it to the world.- I shall know at what a lo [words are cut out] ale my future literary worth [cut out] erase the memory of its deficiencies - If you do not dread the arm of the law, or any exasperation of public opinion against yourself, I wish that it should be printed & published immediately.89

Shelley subjects himself to self-criticism as early as 1813, but is 'determined to give it to the world'. He values the poem enough to believe that it is worthy of a wide readership, and hopes that Hookham will be bold enough to publish it, although he knows that his writings in the past have been subject to scrutiny by the authorities.90

As is the case with the Irish pamphlets, *Queen Mab* did not reach an audience solely through Shelley's own hard work. The poem's contents show that a central part of Shelley's publishing strategy was that the poem should reach a wider audience subsequent to its being privately printed. Like Byron, writing in his letters about the *Vision of Judgment*, a private publication was to be only the first stage in Shelley's dissemination of the ideas of the poem.

---

90An account of this incident appears in ed. Ingpen and Peck, *The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, 8, p.xxxiii-xxxiv. Ingpen and Peck cite Edward Hookham, the nephew of Thomas Hookham, who stated that *Queen Mab* was responsible for a deterioration in relations between Hookham and Shelley.
Shelley's letters about the poem support this viewpoint. Shelley wrote: 'I expect no success.- Let only 250 Copies be printed. A small neat Quarto, on fine paper & so as to catch the aristocrats: They will not read it, but their sons & daughters may.'\textsuperscript{91} *Queen Mab* presents itself in 1813 as a respectable poem fit for aristocratic readers, but contains subversive messages encoded in the notes and in the body of the poem itself in the hope that a younger generation of readers will respond to its revolutionary sentiments.

Shelley's first wife Harriet wrote to Mrs.Nugent, a friend of the Shelleys whom they had left behind in Dublin on 21 May 1813:

> Mr. Shelley continues perfectly well, and his Poem of 'Queen Mab' is begun, tho' it must not be published under pain of death, because it is too much against every existing establishment. It is to be privately distributed to his friends, and some copies sent over to America. Do you [know] any one that would wish for so dangerous a gift? If you do, tell me of them, and they shall not be forgotten.\textsuperscript{92}

Given that the copyright laws of Britain did not extend to America, it is perhaps not entirely fanciful to read into this letter a hint that a foreign edition would not have been frowned upon.\textsuperscript{93}

The strongest evidence that Shelley meant the poem to have a wider audience than the aristocratic readers of its first publication is contained in the periodical work the *Theological Inquirer*. Shelley liaised with its editor, George Cannon, in 1815, at the time it was beginning to be set up, \textsuperscript{94} and the periodical contains lengthy extracts from *Queen Mab*.

---


\textsuperscript{92}ed. Jones, *Shelley Letters*, 1, p.368.

\textsuperscript{93}*Queen Mab* did reach at least one American reader, because Charles Clairmont wrote to Shelley in 1816 about an American friend who had read the poem. We do not know how he received his copy. See Jones, ed., *Shelley Letters*, 1, p.515. William Benbow pirated an edition of *Queen Mab* which purported to be published in 'New York'.

\textsuperscript{94}As commentators have noted, this is one of the more shadowy parts of Shelley's career, because the only direct reference to Cannon appears in Mary Shelley's journal, written by Percy Shelley, at a time when Percy and Mary's marriage was in difficulties - a number of pages have been torn out. The diary entry for Tuesday 7 February reads: 'Cannon the most miserable wretch alive καταστρέφει τει υπνον εβδόμον ουν στα τον [translated by the editors as 'He shattered a most blissful sleep']. He stays the evening. vulgar brute - it is disgusting to hear such a beast speak of philosophy & republicanis. - Let refinement and benevolence convey these ideas.' ed. Feldman and Scott-Kilvert, 1, p. 63. Possible
and fulsome praise of the poem. But Shelley continued to take an interest in the poem after his involvement with the *Theological Inquirer* in 1815. On 22 November 1817 Shelley sent the poem to Mr. Waller, writing:

> it was a sincere overflowing of the heart & mind, & that at a period when they are most uncorrupted & pure. It is the Author's boast & it constitutes no small portion of his happiness that, after six years of added experience & reflection, the doctrines of equality & liberty & disinterestedness, & entire unbelief in religion of any sort, to which this Poem is devoted, have gained rather than lost that beauty & that grandeur which first determined him to devote his life to the investigation & inculcation of them.\(^{96}\)

An extract from the poem also reached the readers of *Sherwin's Weekly Political Register* in March 1818. An editorial 'To the Prince Regent' was headed by the following lines:

> Hearest thou not  
> The curses of the fatherless, the groans  
> Of those who have no friend?  
>  
> That man  
> Heeds not the shriek of penury - he smiles  
> At the deep curses which the destitute  
> Mutter in secret, and a sullen joy  
> Pervades his bloodless heart, when thousands groan  
> But for those morsels which his wantonness  
> Wastes in unjoyous revelry.  
> (Canto 3, lines 27-29, 33-39)\(^{97}\)

So Shelley continued to have an interest in the poem's progress after its private publication in 1813. His continuing interest is to some extent consistent with his highly explanations of how Shelley met Cannon are discussed in McCalman, *Radical Underworld*, p. 80.

\(^{95}\) Nicolas Walter suggests that *Queen Mab* found its way into the 'radical movement' 'possibly with Shelley's complicity'. See Nicolas Walter, *Blasphemy Ancient and Modern* (London, 1990), p. 38. Articles by Robert C. Fair, praising *Queen Mab* and quoting lengthy extracts from it, appear in the *Theological Inquirer*, March 1815, pp. 34-39, April 1815, pp. 105-110, May 1815, pp. 205-209 and July 1815, pp. 358-362. A letter from 'Eunomus Wilkins' (perhaps another pseudonym of Erasmus Perkins, or George Cannon) also quotes *Queen Mab* in the *Theological Inquirer*, May 1815, pp. 164-5.


\(^{97}\) *Sherwin's Weekly Political Register*, 7 March 1818, 2, p.235.
ambivalent attitude towards the poem when it was pirated in 1821 by William Clark,
because there are hints in Shelley's comments that he was flattered by the fact that there
was still a readership for the poem.98 Shelley wrote to Charles Ollier on 11 June 1821:

> I hear that a bookseller of the name of Clarke has published a poem which I
> wrote in early youth, called Queen Mab. I have not seen it for some years,
> but inasmuch as I recollect it is villainous trash; & I dare say much better
> fitted to injure than to serve the cause which it advocates.- In the name of
> poetry, & as you are a bookseller (you observe the strength of these
> conjurations) pray give all manner of publicity to my disapprobation of
> publication; in fact protest for me in an advertisement in the strongest
terms.- 99

Like Southey, Shelley was disavowing his own poem. In a letter printed in the *Examiner*
on 15 July 1821 and in the *Morning Chronicle* on 16 July 1821 he wrote in similar terms:

> I have not seen this production for several years; I doubt not but that it is
> perfectly worthless in point of literary composition; and that in all that
> concerns moral and political speculation, as well as in the subtler
discriminations of metaphysical and religious doctrine, it is still more crude
> and immature. I am a devoted enemy to religious, political, and domestic
> oppression; and I regret this publication, not so much from literary vanity,

---

98 William Clark is a somewhat shadowy figure in accounts of early nineteenth century
radicalism. The spelling of his name varies in contemporary sources. *The New Times* and
Shelley refer to him as 'Clarke', but I refer to him here as 'Clark' because it is the spelling
which Clark himself seems to have most often used: it appears in Clark's 1821 edition of
*Queen Mab*, and is also most often used in his advertisements in the *Morning Chronicle*.
David Worrall, in an unpublished article, refers to the fact that there were two William
Clarks, father and son, who were connected with Thomas Spence, but suggests that it is
unclear whether they were identified with the William Clark who published *Queen Mab*,
and notes that 'however many Clarks there were, they all express a common interest in
poetry, the press and radical politics'. See: David Worrall, *Mab* and *Mob: the Radical
Press Community in Regency England* (1997), pp. 18 - 20. From my reading of the
*Morning Chronicle*, I can add further information about the William Clark who published
*Queen Mab*. As well as publishing *Queen Mab* and a pamphlet opposing Shelley's view of
marriage in 1821, William Clark also advertised the following works for sale in 1821 from
his address at 201 Strand: *Defoe's True Born Englishman*: David Hume, *Essays on
Suicide, the Immortality of the Soul and Miracles*; Colonel Titus, *Killing No Murder*;
Lord Byron, *Waltz: an apostrophic Hymn*; Hugh Clark, *Hours of Contentment*; W. Clark,
*Mania of Emigrating to the United States of America*, John Cam Hobhouse, *Trifling
Chronicle*, 2 May 1821 and 2 August 1821. His publishing career appears to have been
shortlived.

as because I fear it is better fitted to injure than to serve the cause of freedom.\textsuperscript{100}

Like Southey deploring his \textit{Wat Tyler}, Shelley stresses the juvenile nature of the work; the poem is 'crude and immature', and is written 'in early youth'. He also denigrates the poem for its lack of literary merit; it is 'trash', and in both statements he claims that the poem is likely to harm the radical cause.

However, these statements need not be taken at their face value, and Frederick Jones suggests that they are a formality to evade responsibility for the poem.\textsuperscript{101} The timing of Shelley's letter to Ollier needs to be borne in mind - Shelley was writing in 1821, by which time his relationship with Ollier was not cordial - there had been a steady deterioration.\textsuperscript{102} Shelley explicitly referred to the difference between his private feelings and his public utterances in a letter to John Gisborne. He writes about the poem's publication in 1821: 'A droll circumstance has occurred' and 'You may imagine how much I am amused'. He writes that he is protesting 'for the sake of a dignified appearance' and 'because I wish to protest against all the bad poetry in it'.\textsuperscript{103} He also shows no desire to consign the poem to oblivion when he writes to Horace Smith on 14 September 1821: 'If you happen to have brought a copy of Clarke's edition of Queen Mab for me, I should like very well to see it.'\textsuperscript{104} Shelley further wrote to Leigh Hunt on 6 October 1821: 'If a letter arrives in time pray bring me a perfect copy of the Indicator & a copy of Clarke's Queen Mab.'\textsuperscript{105}

A further complicating factor in the marketing of \textit{Queen Mab} in 1821 is the fact that George Cannon, with whom Shelley seems to have actively colluded in promoting the poem in 1815, was to a greater or lesser extent involved in promoting the Clark edition of

\textsuperscript{100}ed. Jones, \textit{Shelley Letters}, 2, pp.304-305.
\textsuperscript{103}ed. Jones, \textit{Shelley Letters}, 2, pp. 300-301.
the poem. In his preface to the 'New York' edition of the poem, published by William Benbow under the imprint 'Baldwin and Co.', Cannon hinted that his own edition was complementary to, rather than in competition with, Clark's edition. Cannon wrote:

The object of the projectors of this edition, was cheapness and portability, in order that it might come into the hands of all classes of society; consequently it was thought that translations of those passages in the notes, quoted from Greek, Latin and French authors, would be acceptable. This has been done with the greatest fidelity; and the Editor pledges himself that there is no variation throughout this volume from the original, except four places in the notes, where the translation is substituted for the French and Greek, with a view to render the book less expensive.

Those gentlemen who may be in possession of 'The Revolt of Islam'; the tragedy of 'The Cenci'; the lyrical drama of 'Prometheus', and the various other poems of the same author, which are printed in the octavo shape, will find the English edition, before alluded to, more suitable to bind for their libraries, the present one being got up merely with a view to give extensive circulation to the principles contained both in the poem and the notes.  

The fact that Cannon took the trouble to advertise Clark's edition, and promoted his own edition as a complementary version of it, rather than a competitor in the same field, hints that he was not unfriendly towards Clark. This suspicion is heightened if we turn to articles in a contemporary newspaper, *The New Times*, which reported Clark's arrest and trial. Clark was first brought before the Court of King's Bench on 23 June 1821, and then on 29 June 1821 came before the court again, having submitted an affidavit to the effect that as he was no longer selling copies of *Queen Mab*, he should be permitted to go free. The newspaper reports that: 'However, the Solicitor for the prosecution informed his Lordship that the defendant had, in fact, given up his interest in this particular work to another individual, who handed it to the purchaser, on all occasions, but still the profits were given to CLARKE, the transaction took place in his house, and he was beyond all question the publisher'. Given Cannon's friendly attitude towards the Clark edition, it seems not unlikely that Cannon may have been the 'individual' concerned.  

---


107 See *The New Times*, 5 July 1821, No. 6270. An account of Clark's first appearance
not Shelley privately approved of Clark's edition of *Queen Mab*, the likelihood that his erstwhile collaborator George Cannon was involved in its promotion gives another twist to the history of its marketing; it is likely that *Queen Mab* was being sold in 1821 as a result of Shelley's liaison with an underground publisher years before.

I would argue that similarities between the content of Southey's *Wat Tyler*, pirated in 1817, and of Shelley's radical poems written in the early nineteenth century, suggest further that it was quite possible that, if Shelley had wanted to, he could have managed to get a poem like *The Mask of Anarchy* published through the auspices of the literary pirates. It has already been seen that *The Mask of Anarchy* shares features in common with other poems of 1819, which derive their rhetoric ultimately from the ideological battles of the 1790s. Similarly, there is a continuity between Southey's *Wat Tyler*, written in 1794, and the content of Shelley's poetry, not just in the similarities between the publishing history of *Queen Mab* and *Wat Tyler*.108

Shelley's rhetoric in *The Mask of Anarchy*, in the passages where he appeals for calm rather than revenge, is like that of Southey's John Ball, addressing the mob in Act 1 of his play:

_________

before the Court of King's Bench appears in *The New Times*, 25 June 1821, No. 6261, and an account of his trial, on 20 October 1822, when he was found guilty of libel, appears in *The New Times*, 22 October 1822, No. 6658. St Clair mentions the likelihood that Clarke, Cannon and Carlile were all co-operators, and the fact that the printer of Clark's edition of *Queen Mab* was Thomas Moses, who was linked to Carlile (see St Clair, pp. 515-516). This suggests Carlile as a possible candidate, but it seems strange that neither the magistrate nor *The New Times* mention Carlile in connection with *Queen Mab*, when he was a notorious figure who frequently appeared in *The New Times's* pages, and even in its editorials. The more shadowy figure of Cannon, who did not feature regularly in *The New Times*, sounds more likely.

108 Whether Shelley read *Wat Tyler* before its republication in 1817, and therefore was influenced by it in his writing of *Queen Mab*, must remain conjecture. Shelley did visit Southey at Keswick. Southey claimed that, having given the fair copy of the poem away, all he possessed afterwards was 'the original scrawl'. Robert Southey, *The Life and Correspondence of Robert Southey*, edited by The Reverend Charles Cuthbert Southey (London, 1850), 4, p.239. It is more likely that Shelley obtained a copy of the poem in 1817 when it was republished. If Kenneth Neill Cameron's suggestion that Shelley had a lingering hatred of Southey is correct, then he would have been keen to obtain it. See: Kenneth Neill Cameron, 'Shelley versus Southey: New Light on An Old Quarrel', *PMLA*, 57, 1942, pp.489-512.
Oh, then, remember mercy;
And though your proud oppressors spare not you,
Show you excel them in humanity.
They will use every art to disunite you;
To conquer separately, by stratagem,
Whom in a mass they fear; - but be ye firm;
Boldly demand your long-forgotten rights;
Your sacred, your inalienable freedom.
Be bold - be resolute - be merciful:
And while you spurn the hated name of slaves,
Show you are men.109

Like Southey's mob, Shelley's working people are asked to be 'resolute' in the face of the forces that would divide them:

Stand ye calm and resolute,
Like a forest close and mute,
With folded arms and looks which are Weapons of unvanquished war.
(stanza 79)

Shelley's Song to the Men of England, one of the unpublished poems of 1819, parallels a speech made by Wat Tyler to the mob. Wat Tyler addresses them as follows:

Think not, my countrymen, on private wrongs,
Remember what yourselves have long endured;
Think of the insults, wrongs, and contumelies,
Ye bear from your proud lords - that your hard toil Manures their fertile fields - you plough the earth,
You sow the corn, you reap the ripen'd harvest, - They riot on the produce! - that, like beasts,
They sell you with their land, claim all the fruits Which the kindly earth produces, as their own, The privilege, forsooth, of noble birth!
On, on to freedom; feel but your own strength, Be but resolv'd, and these destructive tyrants Shall shrink before your vengeance.110

109Southey, Poetical Works, p.94, Act 1, Scene 1.
110Southey, Poetical Works, p.93, Act 1, Scene 1.
Like Southey's play, Shelley's poem addresses his contemporaries, informing them that their labour does not profit themselves, but others. Stanza 5 of the *Song to the Men of England* echoes Wat Tyler's sentiments:

The seed ye sow, another reaps;
The wealth ye find, another keeps;
The robes ye weave, another wears;
The arms ye forge, another bears.

In *Wat Tyler*, John Ball is accused by the authorities of preaching equality and stirring up the mob, and replies:

That I told them
That all mankind are equal, is most true:
Ye came as helpless infants to the world;
Ye felt alike the infirmities of nature;
And at last moulder into common clay.
Why then these vain distinctions? - bears not the earth
Food in abundance? - must your granaries
O'erflow with plenty, while the poor man starves?
Sir Judge, why sit you there, clad in your furs;
Why are your cellars stored with choicest wines?
Your larders hung with dainties, while your vassal,
As virtuous, and as able too by nature,
Though by your selfish tyranny deprived
Of mind's improvement, shivers in his rags,
And starves amid the plenty he creates.
I have said this is wrong, and I repeat it -
And there will be a time when this great truth
Shall be confess'd - be felt by all mankind.
The electric truth shall run from man to man
And the blood-cemented pyramid of greatness
Shall fall before the flash.111

This passage compares the ugliness of reality with a utopian vision where 'the electric truth' shall demolish a 'blood-cemented pyramid'. This 'electric truth' is akin to other radical statements of the early nineteenth century, which try to induce optimism in their readers by suggesting that revolutionary change can happen as quickly as a lightning flash.

Carlile writes in his response to the Peterloo Massacre in *The Republican*: 'Let your voice come round them like the rolling thunder, and let your indignation flash on them, as the destructive fluid of the terrific lightning.' J.J. Brayfield's poem published in *The Republican, The Progress of Reason*, uses similar language. He states in the poem that: 'This truth, a voice of thunder make known,/And all its lightnings flash about the throne'.

Shelley's famous statement at the end of *A Defence of Poetry*, written in 1821, about the value of poetry, uses similar imagery: readers of poetry are to be startled by 'electric life', and the electricity of the poet's words is what ultimately makes him or her an 'unacknowledged legislator of the world':

It is impossible to read the compositions of the most celebrated writers of the present day without being startled with the electric life which burns within their words. They measure the circumference and sound the depths of human nature with a comprehensive and all-penetrating spirit, and they are themselves perhaps the most sincerely astonished at its manifestations, for it is less their spirit than the spirit of the age. Poets are the hierophants of an unapprehended inspiration, the mirrors of the gigantic shadows which futurity casts upon the present, the words which express what they understand not; the trumpets which sing to battle, and feel not what they inspire: the influence which is moved not, but moves. Poets are the unacknowledged legislators of the World.

Like Southey's play, and the writers in Carlile's *Republican*, Shelley's passage in the *Defence of Poetry* has a utopian vision of the future, because poets foreshadow 'an unapprehended inspiration'. Shelley's prose, however, in its measured crescendo to the final assertive sentence, comes close to poetry itself.

Thus, it could be said that Southey's poem *Wat Tyler*, seized upon by radical publishers without its author's consent, is in many ways allied to Shelley's writings of 1819 in its subject matter and rhetoric, in its attempt to depict a popular uprising, the Medieval

---

112 *Republican*, 1, 1819, p. 6.
113 *Republican*, 1, 1819, p. 208.
114 Herbert Lindenberger refers to this passage in his article, 'Shelley and Rossini in Italy - 1819', *Wordsworth Circle*, 1993, 24, p. 26. He compares it to a 'Rossini cabaletta' and suggests that Shelley's terms are taken from 'the discourse of the sublime'.
peasants' revolt, in a manner sympathetic to its contemporary readership, and in a manner which points out to them the injustices of their own situation. *Wat Tyler* in this way shows that the rhetoric in Shelley's poem could easily have been seized upon by opportunistic publishers. In the same way as the words of the poet laureate were appropriated for the radical cause, so could the words of the apparently 'aristocratic' Shelley be appropriated for that cause.

Two further examples of this complex interaction between literary piracy and the promotion of an author's work can be seen through the practice of the publisher of Shelley's *Oedipus Tyrannus*, James Johnston. On 22nd July 1816 Byron wrote to John Murray from the Villa Diodati, near Geneva in Switzerland, where Shelley was also residing at the time:

I enclose you an advertisement - which was copied by Dr. P[olidori] & which appears to be about the most impudent imposition that ever issued from Grub Street. - I need hardly say that I know nothing of all this trash - nor whence it may spring - 'Odes to St. Helena - Farewells to England - & c. & c.' - and if it can be disavowed - or is worth disavowing you have full authority to do so. - I never wrote nor conceived a line of any thing of the kind - any more than of two other things with which I was saddled - something about 'Gaul' and another about 'Mrs. La Valette' - and as to the 'Lily of France' I should as soon think of celebrating a turnip. - - On the 'morning of my Daughter's birth' i had other things to think of than verses - and should never have dreamed of such an invention - till Mr. Johnston and his pamphlets' advertisement broke in upon me with a new light on the Crafts & subtleties of the Demon of printing - or rather publishing.115

Byron was referring a volume of poems published by James Johnston, who was based in Cheapside, which was passed off as Byron's but which was actually written by one of Johnston's associates, John Agg: *Lord Byron's Farewell to England*. Agg was also to write another Johnston production, *Lord Byron's Pilgrimage to the Holy Land* in 1817.116

Johnston was to claim that Byron had received payment for the poems and Byron wrote to Murray on 9 December 1816, 'I never wrote such poems - never received the sum he mentions - nor any other in the same quarter - nor (as far as moral or mortal certainty can

---

116 For notes on the authorship of this book, see appendix E.
be sure) ever had directly or indirectly the slightest communication with Johnson in my life; not being aware that the person existed till this intelligence. Byron referred to Johnston in the same letter as 'this ingenious mountebank' and 'this poor creature'. Murray later brought out a successful injunction against the sale of these productions on 30 November 1816. Byron wrote to Douglas Kinnaird referring to the event on 12 January 1817.

This incident has a bearing on a view of Shelley's relationship with publishers because it is quite likely that Byron and Shelley would have discussed the matter, especially given Byron's strong feelings. Shelley may even have had a hand in suggesting Johnston's name to Horace Smith when he liaised with Johnston in the publication of *Oedipus Tyrannus* in 1820. What began as an imposture by a dishonest bookseller ended in an opportunity for Shelley to publish a politically sensitive work.

The possible beneficial effects of 'illegitimate' editions of poems for the authors of 'legitimate' works can be seen with reference to another of Johnston's piracies. Wordsworth's family, unlike Byron, welcomed Johnston's impostures and actively encouraged them. During 1819 parodies of Wordsworth became fashionable and actually benefited the sale of Wordsworth's own poems. John Hamilton Reynolds heard about Wordsworth's projected publication of his poem *Peter Bell* and published 'an anticipated parody' on 15 April. Sara Hutchinson wrote about this parody that 'I have no doubt that it has helped the sale of the true one - which has nearly all been sold in about a week'. Wordsworth's *Peter Bell* went into a second edition within two weeks. Shelley, also without seeing the original poem, wrote his *Peter Bell the Third*, which remained unpublished during his lifetime. Probably because of the success of *Peter Bell*, a direct result of Reynolds' mockery, the women in Wordsworth's household then asked him to publish his poem *Benjamin the Waggoner* 'just to give them another bone to pick'. This was followed by two parodies, *Benjamin the Waggoner, a Ryghte Merrie and Conceited*

Tale in Verse, A Fragment (possibly written by Reynolds) and The Battered Tar, a Poem with Sonnets, being a Companion to the Waggoner. By Wm. Wordsworth Esq, advertised by Johnston in The Morning Chronicle on 4 September 1819. Sara Hutchinson wrote to Thomas Monkhouse that, 'We are sorry that the false Benjamin, & the 'battered Tar' have not had the same agreeable effect upon the true Benjamin as the false Peter had upon the true - for there has been no call for a second Ed.' Sara Hutchinson implies here that the activity of a pirate like Johnston could have a salutary effect on a poet's sales, and that their activities were to be positively encouraged.121

More specifically, with reference to 1819, it has been seen that a clear-cut division between the respectable status of authors and the illicit status of the literary pirates is difficult to make. The publishing environment into which Shelley tried to bring The Mask of Anarchy was one where the interplay between the respectable and the illicit was a mutually profitable exercise. Thus, it would have been quite consistent with the general picture of Regency literary culture outlined here if Shelley had decided to use one of the literary pirates to publish. There was no insuperable bar to him doing so. From the same viewpoint, it can also be said that it is valid to examine the possibility that Shelley could have tried to contact radical publishers directly.

121 For the publication histories of Peter Bell and Benjamin the Waggoner see William Wordsworth, Peter Bell, edited by John E. Jordan (Ithaca and London, 1985), p. 17 and William Wordsworth, Benjamin the Waggoner, edited by Paul F. Betz (Ithaca and Brighton, 1981), p. 26. A parallel instance of Johnston helping someone to sell more copies of their own work is the example of Thinks-I-to-Myself. A Serio-Ludicro, Tragico-Comico Tale. Written by Thinks-I-to-Myself Who? published for Sherwood, Neely and Jones, J. Hatchard and J. Asperne. Johnston and another publisher, Chapple, produced their own imitation of this work, I Says, Says I (see Appendix E for details), and there followed claims and counter-claims about the works' authorship, with the Sherwood, Neely and Jones version of the book going into a ninth edition by July 1813, which included as an appendix notes on the other versions of the works, and the ensuing controversy (see The Morning Chronicle, 29 July 1813). Given the publicity which non-copyright works gave to the original book, it may have been in publishers' interests for copyright laws not to be enforced too strictly.
Shelley and the Direct Appeal to Radical Publishers

In answering Paul Foot's comment about Shelley having no one to turn to except Leigh Hunt, in this section of the chapter I wish to argue that there was very little difference between the political position of Leigh Hunt and other publishers who could more obviously be placed within a working class milieu. Hunt had an avowed interest in 'liberality of opinion' and 'freedom from superstition' and this made him popular among the freethinking radicals who formed part of the 'radical underworld'. It will be seen that the Examiner was not read only by the middle classes, but by an underground radical audience. There is a link between Hunt's Examiner and the publications of radical editors: William Cobbett's Political Register, George Cannon's Theological Inquirer and Robert Shorter's Theological Comet. The periodicals can be said to be part of a common radical culture. However, for Shelley to involve himself in the 'radical underworld' would have involved taking risks, and I also examine some of the risks involved by discussing the career of another publisher from the 'radical underworld', James Johnston.

If we wish to identify potential radical publishers for The Mask of Anarchy, then, it will be useful to take a jump forward to the publishing scene in the early 1820s, when it is possible to identify a plebeian market for Shelley's work, and to pinpoint a number of publishers. The Queen Caroline scandal of 1820 erupted when the Prince Regent attempted to divorce his wife Caroline on a charge of adultery. A constitutional crisis was threatened, and as a result radical publishers produced a vast array of pamphlets. Appendices B and E list the productions of William Benbow and James Johnston. These appendices are useful in illuminating Shelley's career because they give a possible context for the publishing of The Mask of Anarchy. Both publishers were active in publishing editions of Byron and Shelley, and were particularly active in the period immediately following Shelley's writing of The Mask of Anarchy, being keen to exploit the Queen Caroline scandal. Benbow began his career as pamphleteer in 1820, and Johnston, who specialized in ephemeral poems and prints related to topical issues, produced a number of pamphlets in response to it. Neither of these publishers can be identified as having taken
on some of Shelley's more controversial work because they were more radical than Hunt, but rather that they were more likely to operate at the margins of legality.

William Benbow can be seen as one possible option for Shelley because there is a link between his activities in 1821, when, as has been seen, he promoted *Queen Mab* under the imprint 'Baldwin and Co.', and the efforts to promote the poem in 1815 through the *Theological Inquirer* with the collusion of Shelley. A strong and enduring link between William Benbow and George Cannon, the editor of the *Theological Inquirer*, can be identified. William St Clair states that Percy Bysshe Shelley's notes in Mary Shelley's journal record meetings with Cannon on 29 January and on 7 February 1815. St Clair also notes that Godwin records in his journal a meeting with Cannon on 24 January 1815 and meetings with Benbow on 1, 16 and 21 February 1815. Both men were part of Godwin and Shelley's circle in 1815. They were also collaborators in the 'Baldwin' edition of *Queen Mab* in 1821 with Cannon as editor and Benbow as editor. In the 1820s and afterwards they collaborated in a series of pornographic and semi-pornographic works. The *Rambler's Magazine* in 1822 had Benbow as publisher and Cannon as contributor, and possibly editor. *The Amours of the Chevalier de Faublas* of 1823 was printed by Benbow and edited by 'G.C.', presumably George Cannon. A pirated version of Thomas Moore's *Melodies Irish and National* also appeared with a version of Cannon's pseudonym, Erasmus Perkins - Erasmo Perchino, in the imprint. It was William Benbow who appeared before the magistrate, charged with literary piracy. Cannon in the 1820s and beyond was also involved in printing pornographic works with a printer called John Sudbury, who was printing at the same address as William Benbow at the same time, and may therefore have been a 'front man' for Benbow and Cannon's activities.

Benbow might additionally be seen as a potential publisher of *The Mask of Anarchy* because Hunt's politics were not very far away from those of Benbow's

122 St Clair, pp. 512-513.
123 For further notes about Cannon's identifying mark, see St Clair, p. 514.
125 See Appendix D for a list of works which had Sudbury and Cannon's involvement.
collaborator George Cannon. Shelley would not have had to make a huge leap politically from Hunt to Benbow. Cannon himself seems to have been well disposed towards Leigh Hunt - in his preface to Clark's 1821 edition of *Queen Mab* he referred to the *Examiner* in complimentary fashion, calling it 'one of the best London Sunday newspapers'.

Cannon edited the *Theological Inquirer*, which, like the *Examiner*, was interested in disseminating the principles of freethought. The periodical was shortlived, only lasting for a few months in 1815. Cannon seems to have advocated a kind of radical freemasonry, since his preface to the first edition uses a number of freemasons' terms, and a letter to the *Political Register* also has a hint of freemasons' language.

A related periodical was the *Theological Comet*, published in 1819 by Robert Shorter. Like Cannon, Shorter was...

---

126 *Queen Mab* (London, 1821), p. 3.
127 In Cannon's introductory address to the *Theological Inquirer* he wrote: 'So long ... as you observe the line of rectitude, and act upon the square in your dealings with us, so long as you treat us to that civility which is requisite to preserve the harmony of society, we will give you the right hand of fellowship'. *The square* is a freemasonic term for rectitude, and the handshake is a well-known means of one freemason recognising another. *Theological Inquirer*, p. 2. In a letter to the *Political Register*, again writing under the pseudonym Erasmus Perkins, George Cannon refers to the universe's 'Grand Architect'. *Political Register*, 31 December 1814, 27, p. 858. As a lawyer, it would not be surprising if Cannon was a freemason. Shelley himself visualised the radical community as a form of freemasonry, and this may be one of the things that they shared in common. On first writing to Hunt on 2 March 1811 after his acquittal for libel, Shelley wrote: 'The ultimate intention of my aim is to induce a meeting of such enlightened unprejudiced members of the community, whose independent principles expose them to evils which might thus become alleviated, and to form a methodical society which should be organized so as to resist the coalition of the enemies of liberty which at present renders any expression on matters of policy dangerous to individuals. It has been for want of societies of this nature that corruption has attained the height at which we now behold it, nor can any of us bear in mind the very great influence, which some years since was gained by Illuminism without considering that a society of equal extent might establish rational liberty on as firm a basis as that which would have supported the visionary schemes of a completely-equalized community.' Jones, ed., *Shelley Letters*, 1, p. 54. The Illuminati were a mystical brotherhood founded along freemasonic lines. For Shelley's interest in freemasonry, see also James Rieger, *The Mutiny Within* (New York, 1967), 'The Freemasonic Synthesis: 'Rose Croix' and the Abbe Barruel', pp. 62-68.
128 Apart from the mutual admiration that their two editors had for Leigh Hunt, the journals were linked through the nature of their contributors. 'Varro', a contributor to the *Theological Inquirer*, also wrote a letter to the *Theological Comet*. See *Theological Comet*, 11 September 1819, 8, p. 64. 'R.W.', presumably Robert Wedderburn, an associate of Cannon's, was a contributor. See *Theological Comet*, 6 November 1819, 16,
an avowed admirer of Hunt's. Shorter's editorial of 18 September 1819 begins with a
reference to 'the editor of that truly and reasonably written paper, called THE
EXAMINER', and takes up a hint from Hunt that at a time of attempts to curtail freedom
of expression the account of the trial of William Penn ought to be republished.\textsuperscript{129}

There are also intriguing hints in the \textit{Theological Inquirer} that Cannon may have
been trying to appeal to Hunt's readership. One reader of the \textit{Theological Inquirer} seems
to have thought that Hunt had a direct involvement with Cannon's periodical, having
pencilled in the name 'Leigh Hunt' wherever the name of one of the contributors, 'Varro',
appears in one of the two British Library copies.\textsuperscript{130} Iain McCalman has researched the
identity of 'Varro' and suggests that he was a friend of Horne Tooke's, Timothy Brown.\textsuperscript{131}
I would agree that 'Varro' was not Hunt but, whatever his identity, the striking similarities
between the content of the 'Varro' articles and Hunt's writings demonstrate a closeness in
thinking between Hunt and the periodical's editor, George Cannon. 'Varro', like Cannon
himself, was additionally a contributor to Cobbett's \textit{Political Register}.\textsuperscript{132} The content of

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Theological Comet}, 18 September 1819, 9, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{130} The copy of the \textit{Theological Inquirer} where these notes appear has a BL shelf-mark of
C.58.f.9. One critic, apart from McCalman and Scrivener, who has looked at the
\textit{Theological Inquirer} in detail, is Bertram Dobell in his article 'Shelleyana', \textit{Athenaeum},
1885, 2993, p.313. He writes about the connection with Shelley and promises further
revelations about the periodical. These do not seem to have appeared, so perhaps these
are Dobell's notes: the identification of Hunt with 'Varro' does not seem to have been
published.
\textsuperscript{131} See McCalman, pp. 77 and 256.
\textsuperscript{132} 'Varro's letters in the \textit{Political Register} appear in the following issues: 17 December
88-92. Cannon wrote letters under the name 'Erasmus Perkins' on the subject of religious
persecution in the following numbers of the \textit{Political Register}: 3 December 1814, 23, pp.
730-736; 17 December 1814, 25, pp. 787-800, 31 December 1814, 17, pp. 854-858; 7
January 1815, 1, pp. 19-24; 21 January 1815, 3, pp. 92-96; 4 February 1815, 5, pp. 152-
158; 18 February 1815, 3, pp. 214-217; 25 February 1815, 8, pp. 250-256; 8 April 1815,
14, pp. 434-437. An additional link between the two periodicals is the fact that the
\textit{Political Register} contains a letter from 'F', who may well be the same 'F', Robert C. Fair,
his articles in the *Political Register* and the *Theological Inquirer* suggests that he may have been in fact Sir William Drummond, and he is obliquely identified as such in the *Political Register.* A correspondent, 'Justus', attacking Sir William Drummond’s work *Oedipus Judaicus*, suggests that in attempting to promote this work in his letters to the *Political Register* 'Varro' is using similar tactics to those employed by Drummond himself. He states that: 'Your correspondent tells you, that three anonymous writers have started up in defence of the OEDIPUS JUDAICUS, and have shown the ignorance and malice of the person who wrote against it. These three anonymous writers, it is pretty well known, are no other than Sir W.D. himself in disguise.' He adds further that 'your correspondent [i.e. 'Varro'] gives no very unfair specimen' of the 'mode of argument' of these writers.

However, the 'Varro' articles do demonstrate that the author was a keen reader of the *Examiner*. One of the articles is headed by the *Examiner's* motto, 'Party is madness of many for the gain of a few', and like Hunt wrongly attributes the motto to Swift rather than Pope. 'Varro' also put a number of brief anecdotes into the *Theological Inquirer* and asked the editor to put an indicator hand wherever the anecdotes appeared. Leigh Hunt used the indicator hand in a similar way in the *Examiner*. Also, it is interesting to note that both Cannon and Hunt were in the habit of using obscure marks at the ends of the articles in their periodicals to retain the author's anonymity while ensuring that the editor, and perhaps those close to him, knew who the author was: Cannon may have first started to use this technique in imitation of Hunt.

who wrote poetry for the *Theological Inquirer*. See the *Political Register*, 17 December 1814, 25, p. 790. Fair had an enduring friendship with Cannon and Benbow, because his name reappears in *The Rambler's Magazine* as a contributor of poetry. See *The Rambler's Magazine*, 1 January 1822, 1, p. 27 and 2 February 1822, 2, pp. 93-6.

Interestingly, Shelley himself took an interest in the work of Sir William Drummond, quoting his 1805 work *Academical Questions* in a footnote to *The Revolt of Islam*. Donald Reiman discusses the influence of Drummond and the 'British empirical school' on Shelley in *Percy Bysshe Shelley* (London, 1976), pp. 52-53.


*Theological Inquirer*, 1815, p.256.

See: *Theological Inquirer*, p. 444.
The 'Varro' articles also reflect Hunt's political concerns, the slave trade for instance: 'I propose in this communication to call the attention of your readers to the slave trade, as still shamefully carried on by nations of all denominations, and notwithstanding the snivelling cant set on foot by a set of oligarchical knaves and fools it will not be put a stop to by the means they are using'. The writer emphasises his use of the phrase 'knaves and fools' by a footnote stating: 'These may appear strong terms, but the subject will not allow a compromise'.\textsuperscript{137} Seven years earlier in a similar article Hunt had used the same terms, with an ironic gloss, in \textit{The Examiner}: 'The whole tribe of those West Indian Merchants, who are so furious against the abolition, must be divided into two classes, those who think the slave trade no violation of the rights of mankind, and those who think nothing of this violation in comparison with their own enjoyments. Now to speak with as little harshness as possible, the former class must be fools and the latter both fools and knaves'.\textsuperscript{138} The author of the 'Varro' pieces also showed an interest in suburban London. Writing in an article 'On The Observance of the Sabbath', he states that, 'in the metropolis, the scenes of attraction are the parks, the tea-gardens, to Richmond and Gravesend, where each act as if no biblical restraints were laid upon their conduct...'.\textsuperscript{139} Hunt was to become famous through the pages of \textit{Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine} as the leader of the 'Cockney School of Poetry' and wrote a number of articles eulogising Hampstead in his \textit{Examiner}. 'Varro' also referred, in the context of the debate about free speech, to 'two years imprisonment and a fine', which could have been a reference to Hunt's recent punishment.

Subtle differences from Hunt's writings should be noted, however. 'Varro' writes in the passage which includes the phrase quoted above: 'ENGLAND has given birth to a few characters, such as W. Shakespeare, J. Addison, Bishop Watson, Billy Pitt, Duke Wellington, the Prince Regent, and others, which it, perhaps, may be as well, for our own

\textsuperscript{137} \textit{Theological Inquirer}, p. 491.
\textsuperscript{138} Leigh Hunt, 'Meekness and Modesty of the Jamaica Planters', \textit{Examiner}, 1808, 2, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Theological Inquirer}, pp.32-33.
sakes, not to say as much as we know.- Two years imprisonment and a fine for more than the amount of our property, may, even under the present glorious and peaceful order of things, be refused, without subjecting us to the old-fashioned and threadbare cry of Jacobinism, or the ill-nature and suspicion of our neighbours.  

'Varro' further attacks Shakespeare: 'he employed his talents to inculcate and propagate the belief of astrology, walking-woods, ghosts, witches, and wizards, the usual attendants of superstition and ignorance, and which belief materially retards the mind from imbibing useful knowledge, liberal sentiments, and independence of conduct.'

Hunt was more subtle than 'Varro' in writing about Addison and Shakespeare, arguing that Shakespeare's passages about superstitious beliefs were included for artistic purposes, not as articles of faith:

Shakespeare may or may not have believed in destiny; I believe that he did, just about as much as he believed in the contrary. But whatever he might have thought of its use in a play or so, as connected with popular superstition, he knew that utility of some form or other, though not the mere mechanical idea of it, was the only test of truth within the limits of human understanding; and therefore he would extract from the idea of destiny all that was necessary for human charity or kindness, being certain that so far he was realizing something with it: but beyond that, he would anticipate the inevitable ignorance to which the rest of the question would lead him; and much more would he refuse to look at the question diseasedly; and because there is evil mixed with good, blaspheme the obvious beauty of nature, and have chimney-corner fears about 'a great Sphinx who will eat you up, if you do not discover her secret.'

Addison, like Shakespeare, was one of the writers Hunt most respected. In 1809 Hunt wrote about Steele, Addison and Swift that 'the periodical politics of these illustrious men
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140 *Theological Inquirer*, p. 96.
141 *Theological Inquirer*, p. 97.
exhibited a strain of virtue and a reference to dignified principle scarcely discernible in the present times.'

So Hunt can be seen to be implicated in the 'radical underworld' because he was admired by members of that underworld, and his rhetoric shares features with their writing. Another example, besides Cannon and Benbow, of a publisher whom Shelley might have contacted was James Johnston. Shelley contacted Oedipus Tyrannus's publisher through the auspices of his friend Horace Smith although, as has been seen, it is probable that Shelley himself was aware of Johnston's existence. Both Oedipus Tyrannus and Johnston have been relatively neglected in accounts of Shelley and his works. Marcus Wood has written that 'A close study of Shelley's only attempt to write an extended dramatic satire in relation to pro-Caroline propaganda is long overdue'.

There are sources which outline parts of James Johnston's career, but detailed discussion tends to be lacking.

One reason for the neglect of figures like Johnston in literary discussion can be found in Marilyn Butler's comments on satire. Although satiric traditions are central for discussion of seventeenth and eighteenth century writers like Pope and Dryden, she points out that 'satire is a mode with which we do not as a rule associate the Romantic period', and that the satiric tradition resists "Romantic" self-sufficiency' and 'the sympathetic portrait of the solitary artist'. As was seen in the introduction to this thesis, Romantic writers were keen to stress the idea that the author was an autonomous individual. Satire is not a Romantic project in the sense that it does not, as in a work like William Wordsworth's The Prelude, primarily concern itself with the author's own thoughts and feelings. Rather than exposing the sensibility of the author, and thus educating its readers

---

144 ed. Houtchens and Houtchens, pp.84-5.
about themselves, satire attempts to expose the state of society at the time of writing, and thus to educate its readers about society. The satire explicitly places itself within society, and thus lends itself to being seen in McGann's terms, as the 'social text'. A work of satire like Lord Byron's *Don Juan* demands to be understood in terms of the society which it inhabited, and hence the title of McGann's book about it, *Don Juan in Context*. The role of satire in the works of authors like Byron and Shelley, who in their day were either seen as liberal or dangerously radical, is additionally problematic if we grant satire a central place in their *oeuvre*, because in assessing their politics in relation to their poetry we come up against the problem that, as Claude Rawson states, 'satire is a conservative art and the example of Augustan England suggests that it flourishes most in an order-minded culture'.

Eirwen E.C. Nicholson comments on the difficulty of fitting the political print, a staple of Johnston's publishing practice, into a historical framework, mentioning its 'uncertain status as historical evidence'. Unlike the periodicals of Richard Carlile and T.J. Wooler, which were straightforwardly radical and addressed to a plebeian audience, such prints, Nicholson suggests, had an audience which is not easily identified. H.T. Dickinson also draws attention to this difficulty, stating that: 'Some historians have argued that the political prints reached a mass audience and could reach the illiterate sectors of the population more effectively than any other product of the public press. These claims are easily made, but rather difficult to verify'. Dickinson argues that the prints were not often prosecuted because they reached 'a more restricted market, both socially and geographically, than radical newspapers and pamphlets, and because the most effective caricaturists while often critical of government were not subversive'.
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A practical example of the ambiguity of the print's status can be seen in the first print which is listed as published by James Johnston in the *Catalogue of Satires*. In what appears to be a piece of cynical self-promotion by Johnston, an engraving of 12 March 1809 refers to scandal attached to the Duke of York and a Mrs. Clarke. A bill-poster is shown in the engraving with the following words: 'Johnstons Cheap Caricature Warehouse No 101 Cheapside A New Caricature on Mrs C--ke every Day Price One Shilling & Two each.' Johnston announces that his caricatures are to be sold to a popular audience with his use of the word 'cheap': however, the number of people able to buy a print at a 'shilling & two' every day in London in 1809 must have been limited, if we remember that Cobbett was retailing his *Political Register* at twopence a time. The audience which considered such prints 'cheap' was hardly working-class.

The ambiguity of the political print's status can be seen to be reflected in ambiguities in Johnston's status as radical publisher. Satire, as well as exposing genuinely corrupt practices, could be used itself as a corrupt tool, as a means of extortion. The editor of one of Johnston's publications, *The Scourge* (a mixture of satirical prints and writings), Hewson Clarke, wrote about the publisher of a satirical work, *The Ghost of the Royal Stripes*, M. Jones: 'It is asserted by the friends of the bookseller, that a confidential friend of the exalted personage intended to be ridiculed, not only bought up the whole impression of the original work, but paid one hundred pounds for its suppression.' The following statement to correspondents from the opening issue also suggests that instruments of personal satire like *The Scourge* could also all too easily become the instruments of extortion and blackmail:

We have received information from Lord Headfort, that a person pretending connection with the SCOURGE, has endeavoured to intimidate into compliance with certain pecuniary demands by threatening an attack on the subject of the late conspiracy. Should any similar machination be practised in any other quarter, we earnestly entreat that the persons
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aggrieved will enable us to punish the recreants, who thus attempt to make us and the editors of similar works, the instruments of extortion.155

Another example of the way that satire could easily become a tool of the extortionist, rather than an attempt to uncover the evils in society, can be found in the way that Johnston advertised a work called *Dublin Mail*. The text was first mentioned on 8 September 1821 when, in an advertisement in the *Morning Chronicle*, Johnston referred to 'Dublin Mail', 'STOPPED on a suspicious Person, offering them for Sale, who says he found them in Dublin, a PACKET OF LETTERS - several amorous, some political, and others of a serious cast, addressed to and from persons of the first distinction, which will be returned to the owner on producing proof, on application to Mr. Johnston, 98, Cheapside, London. If not claimed in a few days the different letters will be specified in this Paper.' Although there is no direct evidence that Johnston employed blackmail towards the writers of these letters, there seems to be little doubt that he could have done, had he so wished. On 15 September 1821 Johnston further reported in the *Morning Chronicle* that three of the letters had been retrieved by their owners, but that the rest would be published. Johnston further added on 18 September 1821 that 'it is expected an injunction will be applied for' and that his readers, 'Noblemen and Gentlemen', were 'requested to give immediate orders to their respective Booksellers'. On 28 September 1821 the finished work, put into verse, was advertised. Thus, whether or not Johnston actually practised blackmail himself, it can be seen that the publisher of satire aimed at individuals did have a course of extortion open to him.

Additionally, Johnston's status as radical publisher was equivocal because of his publication of a number of spurious texts purporting to be by radical authors. As has been seen, Johnston used the names of Byron and Wordsworth without their permission to turn a profit. He also published works of doubtful provenance purporting to be by radical writers such as *The Political A Apple Pie*, allegedly by William Hone and *The Kettle Scourge* 1, 1811.
Abusing the Pot and A Political Lecture on Heads, allegedly by T.J. Wooler. The Political A Apple Pie was first advertised in the Morning Chronicle on 21 January 1820. Soon afterwards, on 25 January 1820, Hone placed a notice in the newspaper stating that, in the light of a number of spurious imitations of his works, 'he has not suffered, or will he suffer, a line of his writing to pass into the hands of any other Bookseller'. The Kettle Abusing the Pot, a satire on King George and Queen Caroline, treated the two protagonists in the Queen Caroline affair even-handedly, which would be surprising if written by Wooler, who would no doubt have taken the Queen's side. A Political Lecture on Heads is, if anything, more harsh towards radicals than towards the establishment. Cobbett, who had recently brought Thomas Paine's bones back from America, was described as 'A Resurrection Man', 'void of all principle, honour, or feeling,/And places the trumps with himself in the dealing', and Johnston's 'Black Dwarf' (Wooler's pseudonym) apologises for treating government figures in a more agreeable light than their radical adversaries, saying about the radicals that 'when these Personages shall think proper to alter their principles, and amend their actions, - when they shall mutually exhibit regret for their present and past errors - when they shall mutually exhibit regret for their present and past errors - when they shall manifest some deference to reason, and hatred of inhumanity; in fine, when they shall become

' - the noblest work of God,'

that is - HONEST MEN, - then, and not then, will the Author exonerate them from the opinions he has expressed of their characters.156 Johnston was also capable of publishing texts openly antagonistic to the radical cause. In 1820 he collaborated on a number of projects of this nature, for instance, The Loyal Man in the Moon, a riposte to Hone's The Man in the Moon, and The True Political House that Jack Built, which corresponded to

156 Ironically, also, Johnston himself seems to have been the victim of piracy. In the advertisement at the back of one of these spurious works, Lord Byron's Farewell to England, Johnston states about his book, The Chronicles of the Ton, by Henry Mordaunt Esq., 'It is necessary to order this Work with the Publisher's Name, as there is a pirated edition.'
Hone's *The Political House that Jack Built*. He also published a caricature of Byron and *The Liberal* in 1823, in the print *A Noble Poet - Scratching up his ideas*.\(^{157}\)

Dorothy George has suggested that Johnston's opportunism may also have led him to become a government informer. Before considering her comments, it is useful to consider the role of informers in the Society for the Suppression of Vice, an organisation which can be linked to both Shelley and Johnston, since it helped to suppress Shelley's *Oedipus Tyrannus*, published by Johnston. In May and June 1817 a representative of the Society, George Prichard, was questioned about the prosecution of obscene prints and drawings by a member of the Police Committee of the House of Commons. The questioner noted on 15 May 1817 that: 'It seems strange that the Society should come to the knowledge of offences so little known to the police'\(^{158}\) and insinuated that this was impossible 'without employing a number of agents, whose practices are open to the same objections that attach to the common informer'.\(^{159}\) The respondent stated, that: 'The idea which has gone abroad, that the Society send among the public members of secret spies and informers, is utterly without foundation'.\(^{160}\) However, the long defence of the role of informers in bringing offenders to justice in the Society's initial *Address to the Public* suggests that this statement is disingenuous. The *Address* states:

> In a moral point of view, the much censured character of informer, is, on account of its utility, highly meritorious, when it is assumed from laudable motives. To drag guilt from its lurking holes, in order to bring it to condign punishment, is one of the greatest benefits that any man can confer on society; and when the performance of this disagreeable task is prompted by a regard for virtue, or a solicitude for the general welfare, the individual performing it acts a part, as honourable as it is useful. Those who are impelled to such a task by motives of personal interest, have no claim, indeed, to honour; but considering that, without the aid of such persons, the laws would often be a dead letter, their usefulness, nay, their absolute necessity, should, at least, shelter them from reproach. Their testimony, indeed, on account of the motives by which they are actuated, is generally
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\(^{158}\) *Society for the Suppression of Vice* (London, 1825), p.34.

\(^{159}\) *Society for the Suppression of Vice*, p. 35.

\(^{160}\) *Society for the Suppression of Vice*, p. 36.
admitted to stand in need of confirmation; but when it is properly confirmed, so as to enable the jury to pronounce a verdict of guilty, its effect is so valuable, that all, who take a comprehensive view of the subject, must surely rejoice that such means are to be found; to effectuate the most important object of civil government, - the administration of justice.\textsuperscript{161}

Such a lengthy defence of the role of informers in the Society's Address suggests that they played an important part in the Society's activities.

Dorothy George suggests that Johnston was an informer, mentioning the fact that between April 1819 and 1822 he was regularly paid for suppressing prints, and she also suggests that a reference to a story about 'Johnson the informer' in the newspaper \textit{The New Times} in a print dated 1825 is perhaps a reference to Johnston. \textit{The New Times} has a number of references to this 'Johnson', who seems to have been a notorious figure in early nineteenth century England. For example, he appeared at Bow Street on 26 September 1823, having accused a number of bakers in the Covent Garden area of selling their customers loaves of less than the regulation size at full price.\textsuperscript{162} He appeared again in the \textit{New Times} in 1825:

\begin{quote}
Johnson, the informer, again preferred complaints against several licensed victuallers for keeping open their houses at improper hours, and they were all fined in mitigated penalties, except one woman, named Tooke, the landlady of a public house who said her husband's affairs had gone completely to ruin.

Johnson said he was not aware of the poor woman's circumstances, or he would not have summoned her, and he should withdraw the information.\textsuperscript{163}
\end{quote}

This Johnson must have made a fair amount of money out of his busybodying activities, because another report describes his 'lucrative avocations'.\textsuperscript{164} Without identifying exactly who this 'Johnson' was, it is difficult to tell whether he is the same person as James Johnston. If the two do equate, the activities of 'Johnson, the informer' would be

\textsuperscript{161}Part the First, of an Address to the Public, from the Society for the Suppression of Vice, Instituted in London, 1802 (London, 1803), pp. 77-78.
\textsuperscript{162}New Times, 27 September 1823, 6950.
\textsuperscript{163}New Times, 17 November 1825, 8538.
\textsuperscript{164}New Times, 25 November 1825, 8545.
consistent with the possibility of Johnston being an informer for the Society for the
Suppression of Vice, since crackdowns on public houses would have been the kind of
activity that was part of their remit.

So Johnston's role in the suppression of radical texts in early nineteenth century is a
shadowy one: we know that, at the very least, he was being paid by the government on a
regular basis to suppress prints, and operated in a field - that of satire - where extortion
and blackmail seem to have been fairly common; he also seems to have attempted to cloud
the efforts of radical authors to communicate with their audience by producing bogus
texts by radical authors and by producing anti-radical texts.

I would suggest that a number of conclusions can be reached about Shelley's
relationships with radical publishers in the early nineteenth century as a result of this
survey. I began this examination by dividing Shelley's publishing practice into a number
of techniques which might have used in trying to get *The Mask of Anarchy* published: self-
publishing, piracy and the direct approach to radical publishers. A survey of these areas
shows that a common thread runs through Shelley's practice *vis a vis* his publishers: from
the early Irish pamphlets through to the satire published by Johnston, a number of Shelley's
works found themselves in a clandestine world of publishing where Paine or Cobbett's
ideas of openess or directness did not hold sway. The very nature of this strand of
radicalism lent itself to infiltration by informers, and to possible suppression of
controversial works by publishers.

What conclusions can so far be reached, then, about Shelley's relationship with
publishers and the reasons for the non-publication of *The Mask of Anarchy*? It has been
shown that the relationship between Hunt and Shelley was more a relationship of equals
than the sentimentalized protective relationship which Hunt portrayed, and that there were
alternatives to Hunt which Shelley would have been aware of, although using other
publishers would have been risky. It is also probable that political differences did not play
a part in Hunt's decision not to publish. Hunt, probably as much as Shelley did, had links
with the radical underground. In a later chapter I wish to explore how an understanding of this radical culture can be brought to bear on a reading of Shelley's poetry, but first I wish to re-examine the nature of the relationship between Shelley and Leigh Hunt. If Hunt has misrepresented it, what in fact did happen between himself and Shelley in 1819?
Hunt and Shelley

To recap, the reasons for *The Mask of Anarchy*’s non-publication are not those which previous critics have suggested: persecution by the authorities; Shelley's ignorance of other options; or the inevitability of press prosecutions. I have also suggested that another possibility, that there were political differences between Hunt and Shelley in 1819, is not viable because Shelley and Hunt were both implicated in the ‘radical underworld’ of the early nineteenth century. In this section of the chapter I wish to take the argument further, and to make a stronger case for Shelley as a player in his own destiny, by suggesting that the decision not to publish *The Mask of Anarchy* was tacitly shared by both Shelley and Hunt. I will explore the ramifications of the argument which I put earlier in this thesis, that Shelley's poem was dependent upon Hunt's political writing to a great extent. The implication can be drawn from the correspondence between Shelley and Hunt in 1819 that they were tacitly aware of a joint responsibility for the poem.

The preparation of *The Mask of Anarchy* for the press consisted, firstly, of Shelley's composition of the poem in his notebook which shows his drafting and redrafting of the text. The second stage in *The Mask of Anarchy*’s progress from Shelley's mind to Hunt's desk is shown by the notebook held by the Harvard College Library. The notebook, according to its editor, George Edward Woodberry, was 'plainly a copy-book and not intended for use in original composition'. A number of poems are listed in the index at the end: The Mask of Anarchy, To S-th and C-gh, E-d, An Ode, To - a sonnet, Men of England a song and To -. The notebook contained, then, *The Mask of Anarchy* plus the six other songs which Shelley tried to publish. Additionally there is a poem called 'An Ode', which Woodberry has speculated may have either been *To the Asserters of Liberty* or the *National Anthem*. The final stage in the poem's production was the
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manuscript copied by Mary Shelley and sent to Hunt, which is now held in the Library of Congress, and has been reproduced in facsimile by Donald Reiman. He has rightly commented that it is most important because it shows 'the care with which Mary W Shelley and Percy Bysshe Shelley prepared it for the press'. He has drawn attention to the facts that Mary Shelley ruled the sheets of paper, left spaces between the stanzas and numbered the columns and the individual stanzas. The manuscript, even in facsimile, is extremely easy to read. Shelley was obviously, whatever Hunt's assertion to the contrary, serious about intending the poem to be published. Mary A. Quinn has suggested that this process, from the first draft to the press-copy transcript, was carried out between 9 and 23 September 1819.

The correspondence between the Hunts and the Shelleys after the press-copy transcript had been sent also suggests that the Shelleys took the possibility of publication seriously. It is probable that Shelley, having received the news of the Manchester murders on or before 6 September 1819, sent The Mask of Anarchy to Hunt on 23 September 1819. Mary Shelley wrote in her journal on this day, 'S.'s poem goes to Hunt'. Evidence that this was The Mask of Anarchy can be found in Mary Shelley's letter on 24 November to Marianne Hunt, where she wrote: 'A few days before we left Leghorn which is now 2 months ago Shelley sent a poem called the mask of anarchy Hunt does not mention the reception of it - it was directed to York buildings - and he is anxious to know whether it has been received - ...'

Hunt also received a number of reminders that the Shelleys were concerned about the fate of The Mask of Anarchy. Mary Shelley wrote to him on 24 September mentioning Shelley's being busy: one of the reasons for this was 'his poem which you will have received'. Shelley wrote again in November:
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You do not tell me whether you have received my lines on the Manchester affair. They are of the exoteric species, and are meant not for the Indicator, but the Examiner ... I enclose you in this a piece for the Examiner; or let it share the fate, whatever that fate may be, of the 'Masque of Anarchy'.

Mary Shelley also wrote the letter quoted above on 24 November. She was anxious because the poem had been directed to York Buildings and Hunt had said he would be moving from that address - in fact this did not happen at this time, and cannot be given as a reason for Hunt's silence in response. Hunt, then, had received four reminders.

Hunt's response to the arrival of Shelley's poem in England from Italy was odd and contradictory. Hunt's first acknowledgment of the poem was on 2 December, in a letter already quoted. Hunt wrote: 'I will write more speedily, and tell you about your political songs and pamphlets, which we must publish without Ollier, as he gets more timid and pale every day'. Here, in contradiction to the facts as stated in his 1832 preface to The Mask of Anarchy, Hunt announces his intention to publish the poem. So why was he silent until this time, and why, in December 1819, did he change his mind and suddenly decide to announce his intention to publish?

Hunt's own explanation of his silence in this letter is consistent with his preface in that it suggests deliberate procrastination. He suggested that he may have seemed 'the most ungrateful person on earth' while Shelley was sending him his writings and that he had 'reposed'. This suggests that Hunt had not been a victim of the vagaries of the postal system, to which there are frequent references in the Hunts' and the Shelleys' letters. He was aware that he had been remiss in answering Shelley. He stated that:

I believe there are times when, at the very moment one's friend shows himself the most trusting of us, one does the least on that very account, out of a certain fulness[sic] and insolence of security. Have you ever felt it to be so on these occasions? I hope you have: - but you will understand and feel what I mean, if there be any truth in it.174

As in the preface, Hunt suggested that Shelley had complete faith in him, and it is this sense of Shelley's trust which, according to Hunt, had enabled him not to reply until a convenient moment.

Why also did Hunt suddenly promise to publish the poem? To have remained silent throughout would have been consistent with his preface. It could then be said that Hunt repressed the poem as a matter of policy. There is an answer to this question, but it raises more questions itself. Superficially, December might seem an odd time to have written to Shelley. It was at the very moment that the threat of prosecution, which writers have referred to as a motive in Hunt's failure to publish, was becoming more dangerous.

Parliament opened on 23 November 1819. This was the first opportunity it had to discuss the events of 16 August 1819 and their consequences. On 29 November 1819, three days before Hunt's letter, the Lord Chancellor proposed a bill to do away with the right of those accused of libel to 'imparle or traverse' (they had the right to be tried not more than a year after the date they were charged; in effect, this meant that at any point during their imprisonment they could request a trial, and have their wish granted). The publication history of Richard Carlile's edition of Paine's theological works, and its prosecution on 12 to 15 October 1819, shows that this piece of legislation was a direct response to Carlile's publishing strategy. Carlile, in his own account of the edition's history, states that it was first advertised, by means of a 'rumour', in November 1818. 'The walls of the metropolis were well placarded' on the work's publication date, 16 December. On the 17th, the Solicitor of the Treasury visited Carlile's shop, and was encouraged to take more copies than he requested. However, in spite of this, 'the sale of the work went on very slow and the Publisher had begun to fear that it would not be prosecuted'. On 16 January Carlile was 'agreeably disappointed' by the Vice Society's Information against him. 14 February saw his arrest, and having anticipated and welcomed this, he had published 3,000 copies additional to the first run of 1,000.\[175\] It was in Carlile's interest that the trial should follow as soon as possible upon his arrest so that he could capitalise on the current

\[175\] Carlile, The Mock Trials of Carlile, p.III-IV.
interest in his case, and make extra sales. Thus the practice of 'imparling or traversing' was calculatedly used by Carlile as part of his strategy against the establishment. 6 December saw the second reading of the bill for the prevention of blasphemous and seditious libels, which was moved by Lord Sidmouth. After various protests and suggested amendments, the bill was passed on 23 December.176

As has been seen, William Cobbett influenced many left-leaning intellectuals, and his explicit reactions to this legislation may throw some light on the reactions of other left-leaning figures like Hunt. Cobbett's first edition of the Political Register on his return to England was published on Saturday 4 December 1819. Cobbett commented on the current political scene by quoting the first three lines of Alexander Pope's Epilogue to the Satires Dialogue 2:

'Tis all a libel, Paxton, Sir, will say.
Not yet, my friend: to-morrow, faith it may;
And for that very cause, I print to day.177

Cobbett was stressing the necessity for people to publish as much as they could before more repressive measures were passed, and there is mention of these measures in articles in this issue of the Political Register. On 6 January 1820 Cobbett was expressing his fear of a Censorship of the Press: i.e. that all publications would have to be approved before publication. The onus was on the Government to prosecute after publication; therefore people were 'free' to publish what they wished to. Cobbett feared that this may not have been the case for very much longer, and wrote, 'Let us, therefore, be active while we can convey our thoughts to one another. Let us not lose a moment. If you do your part, I will

176 The history of the passing of the Blasphemous and Seditious Libels Bill can be found in: The Annual Register of a View of the History, Politics and Literature for the year 1819 (London, 1820), pp. 143-163.
177 Political Register, 35, 1819, p. 385. Cobbett's anxiety about prosecution was well-founded. A report to the Home Office from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, dated 2 December 1819, states that Cobbett's 'Twopenny Pamphlets' were 'certainly seditious', and that there was a plan of threatening Jackson, his publisher, with prosecution. This correspondent also had no great opinion of Cobbett's bravery: 'the mere threat of proceeding against him, would make him run away again to America'. H.O. 42/200/182-183.
do mine.\textsuperscript{178} Perhaps Hunt's initial promise to publish in December 1819 sprang from a similar political sense to that of Cobbett, that events closing in on publishers had made it more urgent to publish controversial texts like \textit{The Mask of Anarchy}.

Why, then, did Hunt not, having expressed his intention of doing so, publish after December 1819? One possibility which can be discounted is that it was timidity on his brother John's part. John Hunt had been involved in a prosecution faced also by Leigh Hunt in 1812 for publishing scurrilous remarks about the Prince Regent, and was to face prosecution for his publication of Byron's \textit{Vision of Judgment} in 1822. In Spring 1819 John Hunt had gone to Taunton, leaving the practical running of the paper to Leigh Hunt and John's son, Henry Leigh Hunt. Leigh Hunt later explained in a letter to Shelley in 1821 that the two brothers had decided to split the role of proprietor and editor between them, 'in order that the Government might not be able to imprison both of us at once. I consented at last with the less scruple, not only because my brother's name is obliged to be at the bottom of the paper as printer, and printers, though not editors, are indictable, like proprietors.'\textsuperscript{179}

So was it instead Charles Ollier who was to blame for holding things up? Hunt referred to Charles Ollier in his letter as becoming 'more timid and pale every day'. Ollier was becoming increasingly tied to the Tory \textit{Blackwood's Magazine} in late 1819. In December 1819, \textit{Blackwood's} reveals that 'Mr. Hunt, we understand, does not take in our Magazine, but he generally contrives to get a peep at it at our friend Ollier's or elsewhere, and whatever he may sometimes hint to the contrary in the Examiner, he knows very well that it is the very best Magazine he ever saw or can hope to see in the world.' Ollier is

\textsuperscript{178} \textit{Political Register}, 35, 1820, p.540.
\textsuperscript{179} ed. Hunt, 1862, p.162. There is a discussion of the role of Leigh and John Hunt in Ann Blainey, \textit{Immortal Boy A Portrait of Leigh Hunt} (London, 1985), p.114. She suggests that the decision whether to publish the poem was primarily John's responsibility and that probably 'Leigh Hunt did not insist that Shelley be published' while admitting that there are doubts about what actually happened. It is possibly erroneous to suggest that Leigh would have been the stronger of the two partners in pressing for the poem's publication: John, as Blainey points out, was, before and after, to shoulder press prosecutions.
played off against Hunt, leader of the 'Cockney School of Poetry' reviled in Blackwood's pages. The bookselling business of Charles and James Ollier is also praised: 'many interesting little works keep issuing from Messrs. Olliers' shop in Vere Street.' Charles Ollier can be seen also to have distanced himself from radicalism as a deliberate matter of policy: he placed a two-page advertisement dated 'December 1819' at the end of his 1820 edition of Barry Cornwall's *A Sicilian Story and Mirandola*. In this advertisement the forthcoming *Prometheus Unbound* is mistitled 'Prometheus, A Poem, by Percy Bysshe Shelley.' Ollier advertised his *Literary Miscellany* immediately below it, writing: 'As the above work will have no reference to politics or polemics, it may perhaps afford a channel for the communications of literary gentlemen who are unwilling to have their writings surrounded by the fever and bitterness of party dispute.' Perhaps there is a coded message here, that for Ollier *Prometheus Unbound* was far too full of 'party dispute.'

However, Ollier's unwillingness is not in itself a sufficient explanation for Hunt's procrastination. Both Hunt and Shelley refer to *The Mask of Anarchy* as to be published in the *Examiner* and, although no doubt they would have hoped for a subsequent publication by Ollier, Ollier's feelings in the matter would not necessarily have influenced the publication of the poem in the *Examiner*. As Hunt states, neither Hunt nor Shelley would have had scruples about publishing without Ollier.

Thus, there are important inconsistencies in Hunt's account, borne out by the fact that Shelley did not despair of publishing his other political writings of 1819. He had no

---

180 Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, 6, 1819, pp. 235 and 247.
181 Barry Cornwall, pseud. (Bryan Waller Procter), *A Sicilian Story and Mirandola*, edited by Donald H. Reiman (New York, 1977). Ollier was undergoing a period of commercial success during 1819. Ollier was at his most most successful at publicising Shelley's poems via Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, and Blackwood's even co-published at least one of Shelley's poems. See Charles E. Robinson, 'Percy Bysshe Shelley, Charles Ollier and Blackwood and Sons' in Everest, ed., *Shelley Revalued*.
182 In fact, from this time onward, Shelley's relationship with Charles Ollier steadily deteriorated. By February 1822 John Gisborne was writing to him: 'The Olliers, of course, are unwilling to relinquish your business, and their promises are fair, though I place your reliance upon them, and would merely wish you to go on gently with them till your business can be transferred into better hands.' ed. Jones, *Gisborne & Williams Letters*, p. 80.
consistent idea of Hunt's attitude. He wrote in a letter to Charles Ollier either on the 15 or
the 25 December 1819 about the *Philosophical View of Reform*:

I am preparing an octavo on reform - a commonplace kind of book - which, now that I see the passion of party will postpone the great struggle till another year, I shall not trouble myself to finish for this season. I intend it to be an instructive and readable book, appealing from the passions to the reason of men.\(^\text{183}\)

In fact, Shelley never finished it, and it exists only in draft form. Shelley was still writing to Leigh Hunt about political events at the end of the year, and wrote on 23 December: 'I send you a *Sonnet*. I do not expect you to publish it, but you may show it to whom you please.'\(^\text{184}\) Shelley did not expect Hunt to publish the sonnet *England in 1819*.

In April and May 1820 Shelley was still trying to involve Hunt in his schemes for publishing his works. In the following letter Shelley again does not seem the indifferent figure of Hunt's preface: 'I don't remember if I acknowledged the receipt of "Robin Hood" - no more did you of "Peter Bell". There's tit for tat!...Then Thornton's *esquisse de la legislation* ... Then on my side is the letter to Carlile, in which I must tell you I was considerably interested.'\(^\text{185}\) Shelley's letter to Carlile was addressed to the *Examiner*. His 'considerable interest' in the matter is again not consistent with an author who leaves his publisher to deal with his works as he sees fit. The letter is interesting in itself in expressing Shelley's own view of the freedom of the press. The letter is a powerful defence of free speech, hardly the work of a writer who would be indifferent to his editor's fear of prosecution. Besides involving itself in the issues raised by Carlile's prosecution, the letter mentioned the possibility of its own prosecution. Shelley asked the following rhetorical questions about why Carlile was prosecuted: 'For the impugning of the divinity

\(^{184}\) ed. Jones, *Shelley Letters*, 2, p.167. Shelley, Hunt and Keats had indulged in regular sonnet-writing competitions when Shelley and Keats were in England. Thus, the sonnet for these writers was a medium for the expression of a shared literary culture among friends, and perhaps Shelley intended that this sonnet should be regarded in the same way by Hunt, as a literary *jeu d'esprit*.
of Jesus Christ? I impugn it. For denying that the whole mass of antient Hebrew literature is of divine authority? I deny it.' He suggested that he was as guilty as Carlile himself:

I hope this is no blasphemy, & that I am not to be dragged home by the enmity of our political adversaries to be made a sacrifice to the superstitious fury of the ruling sect. But I am prepared both to do my duty & to abide by whatever consequences may be attached to its fulfilment.¹⁸⁶

He also stated here that he would have been willing to take the consequences of the letter's publication, which may have been the same that Carlile suffered, on himself. Again, Shelley does not sound as though he lacked judgment when thinking about the political circumstances in 1819.

Shelley's final attempt to publish was his letter of 26 May 1820 to Leigh Hunt about the *Philosophical View of Reform*. Shelley did not suggest that Hunt try to publish it in the *Examiner*, which would have made sense since, as Terence Hoagwood has suggested, Shelley's name would have been associated with reform by readers of the newspaper. Hoagwood has pointed out that Shelley's first poem to be published in the *Examiner*, in January 1817, the *Hymn to Intellectual Beauty*, appeared 'in the same column, on the same page' as an invitation to a meeting on reform.¹⁸⁷ Again, Shelley showed himself not to be ignorant of Hunt's scruples and the political circumstances in England in 1819. Shelley wrote: 'Do you know of any bookseller who wd publish for me an octavo volume entitled "A philosophical View of Reform".'¹⁸⁸

So what conclusions can we draw from the above account of the correspondence between Hunt and Shelley in 1819? A picture emerges which is consistent with what we have already learnt about Shelley's publishing history, that he was proactive in seeking the means of publication for his texts, and that he was careful to give Hunt every opportunity of publishing the poem. Hunt, on the other hand, procrastinated to the point of duplicity in the matter of *The Mask of Anarchy*'s publication. In many ways, Shelley would have been

well within his rights to find another publisher, and it has been seen within the course of this thesis that he could have done so. Ultimately, though, the answer to the question of why *The Mask of Anarchy* was not published can be seen to lie in the unusual nature of the relationship between Hunt and Shelley. Hunt was Shelley's editor, and represented only one of a number of publishing options open to Shelley. But he was also his friend, and, as has been seen, his political mentor. Although there is no point in the letters where Shelley states this point, the enduring friendship of Shelley and Hunt shows that Shelley did not feel antagonistic towards Hunt as a result of his actions. Thus, in the knowledge that Hunt's polemic in the *Examiner* was such an influence on the poem, the inference can be drawn that Shelley tacitly agreed with Hunt's decision: to find another publisher may well have been a betrayal of his friendship with Hunt. Thus, I would argue that the meaning of the poem and the poem's publication history are intimately interconnected. The poem's non-publication is evidence of the closeness of the politics of Hunt and Shelley in 1819, and also shows their shared commitment to the politics of the 'radical underworld'. In the following chapter I will provide a reading of the poem which shows how the content of the poem reflects its author's complicity with that underworld, and which shows how an understanding of that underworld can help to illuminate critical problems connected with the poem.
Chapter 3 - Readings of Shelley's Political Poems in the light of his Publishing History

Queen Mab

This chapter seeks to demonstrate that the publishing history of Shelley's poetry is intrinsic to its meaning. I suggest that a prior knowledge of the poems' publishing history leads to illuminating answers to a number of critical problems which are faced in reading Shelley's political poetry. I shall explore the relationship between a number of poems, which were all in danger of transgressing the law, and 'clandestine' traditions of radical publishing which, as has been seen, sought to evade the law through a variety of means: self-publishing, literary piracy, a direct assault on the legal process and through a relationship with the more respectable, liberal press. I will argue that both the publishing history and the content of the following poems are related to this 'clandestine' radicalism: Queen Mab (1813); The Revolt of Islam (1817); Oedipus Tyrannus (1820) and The Mask of Anarchy (1819). Thus, the critical problems, and apparent inconsistencies, faced in assessing the aesthetic worth of these poems can to some extent be resolved through an understanding of how their content is a reflection of Shelley's immersion in the radical publishing culture of the early nineteenth century. It will be seen that Queen Mab was very much bound up with the history of George Cannon, and thus the 'radical underworld', that The Revolt of Islam was also influenced by it, that Oedipus Tyrannus can be placed within the radicalism of 1820 both through its content and its publishing history, and that critical problems surrounding The Mask of Anarchy can be faced anew with a knowledge of its position vis à vis radical culture. I hope to show that the difficulty in pinning down Shelley's politics in his poetry does not show muddled thinking on his part, but shows instead that he fully understood the complexities of radical culture in the early nineteenth century. Shelley was aware of the various strategies by which radicals could put their thoughts into print: he was also aware of the political content which matched such strategies.
In earlier sections of the thesis I have explored an apparent discrepancy between a radicalism which espoused an ideology of openness, and that of those publishers who inhabited the 'radical underworld'. Both traditions of radicalism can be seen to fit Jon Klancher's definition of 'the radical text' as one which 'tries to locate itself outside the making and unmaking of signs'.

The self-publishing radicals, William Cobbett and Thomas Paine, but also Leigh Hunt, tried to evade absorption by the establishment by asserting their independence. Publishers and editors such as George Cannon, William Benbow, James Johnston and Shelley's Irish acquaintances located themselves outside conventional rhetoric and modes of publishing by either claiming that they owned texts which in reality they did not, or by using subterfuge to suggest that they were not really the publishers of their own texts. In other words, they were clandestine in their methods.

To elaborate, one of the most significant influences on Shelley was William Godwin. Godwin, like Paine and Cobbett, prized independence, stating that 'no truth can be more simple, at the same time that no truth has been more darkened by the glosses of interested individuals, than that one man can in no case be bound to yield obedience to any other man or set of men on earth'.

One of his statements on the necessity of sincerity was in connection with a hypothetical discussion of how a good citizen in a repressive state should express his views: 'Let us suppose that I communicate my sentiments, but with caution and reserve. This system involves with it an endless train of falsehood, duplicity and turgid. For Godwin, views ought to be expressed openly, with no falsehood.

Shelley himself shows that he was influenced by such notions of openness in his early pamphlets. In An Address, to the Irish People he wrote: 'Are you men of deep designs, whose deeds love darkness better than light; dare you not say what you think

---

2 I have mentioned Godwin's influence on Shelley in the introduction to this thesis.
before any man, can you not meet in the open face of day in conscious innocence?\textsuperscript{5} In \textit{Proposals for an Association of Philanthropists} he wrote: 'I propose not an Association of Secrecy. Let it open as the beam of day. Let it rival the sunbeam in its stainless purity, as in the extensiveness of its effulgence.'\textsuperscript{6} In \textit{A Letter to Lord Ellenborough} he wrote: 'Falsehood skulks in holes and corners ... except when it has power, and then, as it was a coward, it is a tyrant; but the eagle-eye of truth darts thro' the undazzling sunbeam of the immutable and just, gathering thence wherewith to vivify and illuminate a universe!'\textsuperscript{7}

Shelley shared other radicals' explicit commitment to a notion of openness. But there is ambiguity in Shelley's practice in that he subtitles his poem \textit{Queen Mab} a 'Philosophical Poem'. This title is open to a number of interpretations. David Duff suggests that as well as its literal meaning, that it concerns philosophy, the word 'philosophical' was also 'a calculated rhetorical signal', part of the jargon of the anti-Jacobins, 'a confident reassertion of the radical tradition of philosophical enquiry represented by [Erasmus] Darwin, [William] Godwin and [Sir William] Drummond'.\textsuperscript{8} The political philosophy of Paine could also be seen as part of this 'tradition of philosophical enquiry'. In the first section of this chapter, however, I would like to stress Shelley's indebtedness in \textit{Queen Mab} to the European Enlightenment, and to foreign interpretations of the word 'philosophy'. I will argue that through Shelley's association with George Cannon he was aware of a 'philosophical' culture which was allied to clandestine notions of publishing, in which \textit{Queen Mab} was implicated.

I would argue, then, that a knowledge of \textit{Queen Mab}'s publishing history helps us to understand more thoroughly the interrelationship between the poet's use of genre and the poem's radicalism, and therefore creates a more consistent account of Shelley's radicalism than is perhaps present in other critical accounts. The title of Shelley's poem,

\textsuperscript{5} ed. Murray, \textit{Shelley Prose}, p. 18
\textsuperscript{6} ed. Murray, \textit{Shelley Prose}, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{7} ed. Murray, \textit{Shelley Prose}, p. 64.
Queen Mab, refers to a legendary fairy mentioned in Shakespeare and other sources, and critics have often commented upon its similarity to a poem with a similar title, Spenser's Faerie Queene. Like Spenser's poem, Queen Mab might seem to exist in an aetherial allegorical world, for instance the following passage:

Behold the chariot of the Fairy Queen!
Celestial coursers paw the unyielding air;
Their filmy pennons at her word they furl,
And stop obedient to the reins of light:
These the Queen of Spells drew in,
She spread a charm around the spot,
And leaning graceful from the aethereal car,
Long did she gaze, and silently,
Upon the slumbering maid.

Oh! not the visioned poet in his dreams,
When silvery clouds float through the 'wilderied brain,
When every sight of lovely, wild and grand
Astonishes, enraptures, elevates,
When fancy at a glance combines
The wondrous and the beautiful,-
So bright, so fair so wild a shape
Hath ever yet beheld,
As that which reined the coursers of the air,
And poured the magic of her gaze
Upon the maiden's sleep.
(Canto 1, lines 59-78)

The Fairy Queen seems an insubstantial figure from an earlier poetic tradition of allegory; her horses are unreal because they tread air rather than earth, and have 'reins of light', her car is 'aetherial', and her 'shape' is more 'bright', 'fair' and 'wild' than any poet's imagining. Shelley's use of Spenser signals Queen Mab as a conventionally 'Romantic' piece of writing: Byron deliberately made use of the Spenserian stanza in Childe Harold's Pilgrimage, which begins as a mock-Medieval poem, and Keats uses the Spenserian stanza in a similar way in The Eve of St Agnes.

9 Comments of critics on Queen Mab and other poems have been compiled with the help of the following sources: Dunbar, A Bibliography of Shelley Studies: 1823-1950; Nancy Martinez, Joseph G.R. Martinez, Erland Anderson, Guide to Poetry Explication Volume 3 Restoration-Romantic (New York, 1993) and the Year's Work in English Studies.
Critics have identified other elements associated with 'Romantic' writing: an interest in the Gothic, a concern with organic evolution, and a preoccupation with other Romantic writers. John V. Murphy has discussed *Queen Mab* in terms of its Gothic elements; Stuart M. Sperry in terms of human relationships, writing that 'it is remarkable how much *Queen Mab* is dominated by the imagery of mother, father and child, and how many of the hopeful progressions it anticipates take as their model the metaphor of the child's development from infancy to maturity'; Donald Reiman has written about the poem as 'an irregular, unrhymed lyric verse derived from Southey's heroic poems', adding further that '*Queen Mab* illustrates an almost mechanical structure', and James Brazell has written about Shelley's Wordsworthian 'yearning for a principle of authority on which to ground human values'.

The derivation of Shelley's poem has received further comments from critics. Carlos Baker has placed the poem in the context of eighteenth century imitations of Spenser: *Queen Mab* is a somewhat belated example of the eighteenth-century moral allegory, a genre which had attained great popularity among the Augustan and post-

---

10 Writers on these topics have identified them all as resulting from a feeling of alienation from a natural state of being in the Romantic period. David Punter discusses the role of the Gothic within Romanticism in Chapter Four, pp. 99-129, *The Literature of Terror: A History of Gothic Fictions from 1765 to the present day* (London and New York, 1980). The role of nature is referred to on pp. 127-128. For the desire to return to a state of organicism as 'a means to cure the divided sensibility of modern man' (p. 10) see Inger Christensen, *The Shadow of the Dome. Organicism and Romantic Poetry* (Bergen, 1985), pp. 9 - 14. Harold Bloom has similarly argued that the concern which post-Enlightenment writers have felt to compare themselves with other writers has arisen from a sense of anxiety and insecurity. See Harold Bloom, *The anxiety of influence: a study of poetry* (New York and Oxford, 1973).


Augustan imitators of Spenser, and of which specimens were still appearing in Shelley's lifetime.\textsuperscript{15} Adel Salama makes the same point about the poem.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, a consistent description of the form and themes of Shelley's poem can be given. It might seem on the surface that Shelley's radicalism in the poem is equally consistent and easy to explain. For instance, critics have recently portrayed Shelley as a forward-looking poet with a profound knowledge of ecological issues. Timothy Morton has referred to Shelley's utopian vision of the future, where mankind has now converted to vegetarianism, as 'profoundly ecological', and suggests that 'Shelley's ecology belongs to the realm of futurism rather than nostalgia'.\textsuperscript{17} Similarly, Onno Oerlemans places Shelley's vegetarianism at the centre of his radicalism, suggesting that it is 'not a sign of the peculiarity or idiosyncrasy of his thought, but rather that he is aware of significant scientific arguments of the day, and that his defense of vegetarianism is part of a serious philosophical debate about reform'.\textsuperscript{18}

Shelley's radicalism in the poem would also seem to be consistent in its borrowings from William Godwin and Thomas Paine. Salama writes about the sections in Queen Mab from canto 3 to canto 7, that 'this part of the poem is almost a versification of the basic ideas in Godwin's Political Justice'.\textsuperscript{19} Michael Henry Scrivener writes that 'However much one modifies the statement, it remains true: Godwin, more than any other radical,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Timothy Morton, 'Shelley's Green Desert', Studies in Romanticism, 1996, 35, pp. 409 and 417.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Onno Oerlemans, 'Shelley's Ideal Body: Vegetarianism and Nature', Studies in Romanticism, 34, 1995, p. 533. For an earlier view of Shelley's vegetarianism as an integral part of his desire for a more equal society, see William E.A. Axon, Shelley's Vegetarianism (Manchester, 1891) and, in particular, p. 13.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Salama, Shelley's Major Poems, p. 30.
\end{itemize}
influenced Shelley's political philosophy. Scrivener also refers to a development in Shelley's philosophy, from an adherence to Godwin's principles initially, but then, after Godwin was disparaging about Shelley's attempts to radicalise the Irish population in 1812, Scrivener notes that 'Paine's works are being culled for useful quotations'. Scrivener traces this movement away from Godwin's ideas to the point where, with the writing of *Queen Mab*, 'he is no longer a "disciple" of Godwin, but a thinker and activist fully on his own'. J.R. Watson also comments on the influence of Paine and Godwin in canto 3 of the poem.

Thus, the poem has two elements which in themselves are consistent but taken together are contradictory: *Queen Mab* belongs to a genre which is of the past, Spenser's allegory, and espouses a radicalism which, although in some respects based upon a vision of an idealised, edenic past, looks to the future. In Carlos Baker's words: 'The ideology of *Queen Mab*, as distinct from the allegorical framework which encloses it, represents Shelley's first major attempt to clarify his antipathies and to synthesize in poetry his ethical, political and metaphysical views. The synthesis is hardly successful because at this date Shelley had not discovered an all-embracing formula under which his often mutually contradictory convictions could be arranged'. In a sense, Shelley's search for a 'formula' was a search for a credible framework for his poem: according to many critics, the poem lacks a unity of aesthetic purpose. Murphy notes also that 'there prevails a primary intellectual and didactic intention that, at best, remains secondary in most Gothic literature.'

---

22 Scrivener, *Radical Shelley*, p. 76.
25 Murphy, *The Dark Angel*, p. 55.
A specific example of the problems which critics have found in assessing the poem's aesthetic value and unity of purpose is found if the passage from *Queen Mab* quoted above is contrasted with an excerpt from Canto 3:

Whence, think'st thou, kings and parasites arose?
Whence that unnatural line of drones, who heap
Toil and unvanquishable penury
On those who build their palaces, and bring
Their daily bread? - From vice, black loathsome vice;
From rapine, madness, treachery, and wrong;
From all that 'genders misery, and makes
Of earth this thorny wilderness; from lust,
Revenge and murder.
(lines 117-126)

The Fairy Queen is the mouthpiece for this passage: unlike Spenser's fairy queen, she is knowledgeable about evils which exist beyond her idealised realm. The stridency of this passage, with its repetition of the word 'vice' and its inflammatory comments about the rulers' 'lust, revenge and murder' sit uneasily with the figure described at the beginning of the poem. It might appear, on a superficial reading, that the framework of Shelley's poem hinders his attempt to convey a radical message.

Additionally, Spenserian allegory is a genre which embeds hidden political meanings within an apparently innocuous fairy story. Thus, the whole purpose of the allegory is a form of subterfuge, where hidden meanings can be read into the poem by a circle of initiates. This esoteric form of writing is at odds with the advocacy of openness and plain-dealing by Shelley's two generally recognized radical sources, Paine and Godwin. However, if it is remembered that this 'openness' in the early nineteenth century was often compromised by what were in fact clandestine methods of avoiding the authorities, then Shelley's poetic method can be seen in fact as consistent with his radicalism.

I would argue that aspects of the eighteenth century European Enlightenment, which influenced Shelley in *Queen Mab*, shared features in common with this 'clandestine' radicalism. Carlos Baker has noted that *Queen Mab* derives from the most characteristic
modes of eighteenth-century thought and expression' and, among other sources, he notes Shelley's indebtedness to eighteenth century European culture: to the ideas of Spinoza and French philosophical thinkers such as Laplace, Bailly and Cuvier. The most notable link between *Queen Mab* and the European Enlightenment is, however, Volney's *Les Ruines*, a radical text in the Enlightenment tradition which was a key influence on radicalism in the 1790s. In one episode of *Les Ruines*, Volney describes how a mass of people rise up in a revolutionary movement, their rulers then try to seduce them into their former state of ignorance, and Volney uses the literal image of 'enlightenment' to describe the people's new-found consciousness. One of their leaders asks: 'If we went on with our eyes hoodwinked, our steps did not fail to be enlightened, why, now that the bandage is removed, should we conceive that we are involved in darkness? If we, who prescribe to mankind to exert their faculties, deceive and mislead them, what can be expected from those who desire only to keep them in blindness?'

As David Duff notes, *Les Ruines* was mentioned in connection with *Queen Mab* in George Cannon's *Theological Inquirer*, and thus, since Shelley was closely connected with the *Theological Inquirer*, the link is likely to have been intentional. Readers of Volney were also the intended readers of *Queen Mab*. A number of parallels between the two texts are mentioned by Daniel J. Macdonald and A.M.D. Hughes. Here, however, it is perhaps worth noting especially three features of *Les Ruines* which are pertinent to *Queen Mab*’s place in an account of Shelley’s radicalism. First, the narrator of *Les Ruines* is approached, like Ianthe, by a figure who can see the present, past and future, who is referred to as 'the Genius'. The narrator describes him as follows: 'I thought I saw, at my

28 Duff, *Romance and Revolution*, p. 82.
left, a pale apparition, enveloped in an immense drapery, similar to what spectres are painted [sic] when issuing out of the tombs. This 'pale apparition', who goes on to show the narrator a utopian and revolutionary view of the future, contrasts with Shelley's Fairy Queen in *Queen Mab* - there is nothing deathly about her - but is similar to figures who appear in similar contexts in Shelley's later poetry. For instance, there is the Shape in *The Mask of Anarchy* who rises like a spectre foretelling better things from the events of Peterloo, and Shelley's poem *England in 1819* refers to a 'glorious phantom' who 'may/Burst, to illumine our tempestuous day'. Volney's image of future glories only emerging from the tombs of past mistakes seems to have had a profound and lasting effect on Shelley.

Volney's *Ruins* also provides a link between Shelley's poem *Queen Mab* and other Enlightenment texts. There is an element of science fiction in the writings of Volney and Shelley. The Fairy and the Genius take the heroine and hero beyond the realm of the earth, in scenes which anticipate interplanetary space flight. Volney's narrator is liberated 'from the corporeal frame with which you are incumbered' and views the earth from space: 'Under my feet, floating in an empty space, a globe similar to that of the moon, but smaller and less luminous, presented to me one of its faces; and this face had the appearance of a disk variegated with spots, some of them white and nebulous, others brown, green and grey'. Similarly, Shelley describes Ianthe's view of the earth as she moves farther away from it in the Fairy's chariot: at first, 'earth/Appeared a vast and shadowy sphere' (Canto 1, lines 240-241), and then, 'Earth's distant orb appeared/The smallest light that twinkles in the heaven' (Canto 1, lines 250-251). Both writers use a science fiction device to introduce their view of a revolutionary future. This science fiction element links the two texts to a best-selling novel of eighteenth century France, called *L'An 2440*, referred to in Robert Darnton's study of such texts. In this novel, by Louis-Sébastien Mercier, a man had a dream, woke up in the year 2440, and returned to the eighteenth century at the end.

---

of the novel. The novel describes his experiences in 2440 in order to make a social
commentary on the mores of eighteenth century France. As Queen Mab and Les Ruines
anticipate interplanetary space flight, so Mercier's novel anticipates H.G. Wells' The Time
Machine. A fantastic vision of the future is used to cast a disparaging light on the present.

All three texts use notes for a radical purpose. Robert Darnton describes
Mercier's use of notes in the following way:

The notes to L'An 2440 are so extensive that they often overwhelm the
main body of the text, which is reduced on some pages to only a line or
two. The reader is meant to tack back and forth between the text at the top
of the page and the notes at the bottom. In doing so, he switches time
frames, because the text is set in the year 2440 and the notes in the
eighteenth century. The same narrative voice prevails in each - an
unidentified 'T' who clearly stands for the anonymous author. But the voice
changes register as it changes venue. In the main text, the narrator remains
stupefied and humbled by the marvels of the future. He listens raptly when
the guide lectures him on the superiority of French society in 2440. In the
notes, 'T' hurl's jeremiads directly at the reader, denouncing the abuses in the
reader's own world and defying all the authorities of the Old Regime.

A comparable parallel to Mercier's practice in L'An 2440 would be Shelley's
passage which describes a utopian future, where 'Here now the human being stands
adorning/This loveliest earth with taintless body and mind'; 'no longer now/He slays the
lamb that looks him in the face'; 'Disease and pleasure cease to mingle here,/Reason and
passion cease to combat there'; 'man... stands/An equal among equals', and lives in a
'Paradise of peace'. (Canto 8, lines 198-238) Shelley invites his readers, like Mercier's
narrator, to be 'stupefied and humbled by the marvels of the future'. Unlike the passage
from the poem where the ascent of the Fairy's car from earth is described, however,

32 The use of notes as an intrinsic part of a poem's overall effect was not unique to the
radical tradition in the Romantic period, of course, and Shelley's use of notes can in part be
credited to the influence of Robert Southey's Thalaba the Destroyer (1801), which is
another poem where the notes 'often overwhelm the main body of the text'. Southey's
notes have a different purpose from Shelley's, helping to reinforce the poem's sense of
exoticism: a stronger literary parallel with Southey's use of notes would be Lord Byron's
similarly exotic The Giaour.
33 Darnton, Forbidden Best-Sellers, p. 123.
Shelley attempts to dazzle his readers not with physical marvels but with a tale of moral excellence, of how the future could be if people put aside their more vicious passions. The passage has a Biblical flavour, with its reference to 'Paradise' and the 'lamb' who is no longer to be eaten by mankind, and, like the passage about the Fairy's car, is pervaded by a sense of unreality, of a sense of a return to an Edenic state before the Fall, a static world where 'reason' and 'passion and 'disease' and 'pleasure' are no longer at war with one another. Shelley's notes, however, like Mercier's, are an attempt to address the abuses of his own society in a practical manner. Darnton writes that in Mercier's text, 'in the notes, "I" hurls jeremiads directly at the reader, denouncing the abuses in the reader's own world and defying all the authorities of the Old Regime'. Shelley's notes refer to the line 'No longer now/He slays the lamb that looks him in the face'. Shelley states that 'I hold that the depravity of the physical and moral nature of man originated in his unnatural habits of life'. In other words, for Shelley, vegetarianism was a practical solution to the evils of his own society, and he adds further, 'The system of a simple diet promises no Utopian advantages. It is no mere reform of legislation, whilst the furious passions and evil propensities of the human heart, in which it had its origin, are still unassuaged. It strikes at the root of all evil'. Like Mercier, Shelley describes a fantastic state of affairs, and describes practical steps which in his opinion could bring that state of affairs about. Volney's *Les Ruines* also has extensive notes: in the 1795 edition there are 60 pages of notes to 387 pages of the text in total. All three authors signal to their readers that their texts are not entirely, or even primarily, designed for their readers' enjoyment, but have a didactic purpose in mind, that of removing the bandages from their readers' previously hoodwinked eyes.

So Shelley's radicalism in *Queen Mab* is derived from Paine and Godwin, but also additionally from the French Enlightenment. How, though, does this knowledge help us to resolve the problem of the difference between the form of Shelley's poem and its subject matter? This question can be answered by a return to the question of the word 'philosophical' and its use in Shelley's title-page. Not only did the word 'philosophical' have connotations within English eighteenth century radicalism, as Duff has pointed out, but it
had a particular meaning for the publishers of French enlightenment texts. There is some evidence that Shelley might have been aware of such a use of the term.

For example, Robert Darnton notes an incident in eighteenth century France: 'When the police interrogated one of their prisoners in the Bastille, a bookseller named Hubert Cazin who had been caught with all kinds of forbidden books and compromising papers in his shop in Reims, they asked him to explain a puzzling term that cropped up in his correspondence: "philosophical articles". Cazin defined it as a "conventional expression in the book trade to characterize anything that is forbidden".34

Interestingly, there is evidence to suggest that George Cannon, who was instrumental in attempting to promote Queen Mab after its first publication, would have been aware of this use of the word in a French context. Cannon was aware of the French book trade, since he and Benbow liaised in producing English versions of French pornographic literature, and he can be shown to be aware of the connotations of the word 'philosophique' because one of his works of fiction alludes to one of the eighteenth century French books which Darnton discusses in this context, a pornographic work entitled Thérèse Philosophique. In a story written by Cannon in Benbow's Rambler's Magazine, 'Adventures of Gregory Griffin' (1822), a woman attempts to seduce Gregory. The narrator tells us that 'After having given him this figurative invitation, she pulled from her bosom the second volume of "Theresa", and told him he might read it at his leisure'. Later on he states: 'Gregory ... sat calmly in bed, ... reading the "Philosophical Theresa"'.35

Knowledge of the subversive potentialities of the word 'philosophy', as a cloak for hiding views which could be either politically or sexually subversive, is again demonstrated in a book which Benbow published at a nearly contemporaneous time. The Philosophical Dictionary, which was originally published in 1786 under the pseudonym of Franz Xavier

34 Darnton, Forbidden Best-Sellers, pp. 6-7.
35 Rambler's Magazine, 6 June 1822, 1, 6, p. 393. The story can be identified as being by Cannon because a number of the episodes have the same mark which Cannon used for his preface to Benbow's edition of Queen Mab at the end of them. The slightly risqué content of the story also marks it as a Cannon production.
Swediauer, but compiled by Sir Francis Milman, was a collection of philosophical definitions by people who were genuine philosophers, often with a radical bias; authors quoted on the title page were: Locke, Hume, Helvetius, Adam Smith, Voltaire, Rousseau, David Williams, Bayle, D'Alembert, Diderot, Montesquieu, Condorcet, Filangiri, Beccaria, Priestley and Godwin. However, as well as demonstrating a genuine scholarly interest in philosophy, the work had room for radical disquisition on contemporary events. Consider, for example, the following entry under the word APOSTACY:

Apostate, a term of reproach. In religion, the changing from one form of religion to another. A man who has hitherto professed himself a Christian becomes a Mahometan - the Christian says he is an apostate - the Mahometans a convert. If he has changed from conviction that the Mahometan form of religion is better than the Christian form, he is a convert. Has he changed for a sum of money, for power, for privilege, in short, from interested motives, he is an apostate. Philosophers pretend that if he acts the part of an honest man, and never does to others that which he would not wish they should do unto him, it is of little consequence in which of the forms he continues.

Apostate in politics - a man, who having professed one set of political opinions, and supported one party, changes, or pretends to change his opinions, and gives his support to the opposite party: a Whig who becomes a Tory; a case of frequent occurrence, especially among the lawyers; and vice versa, a Tory who becomes a Whig, a case of very rare occurrence. Has he changed place from interested motives - from the gift or expectation of a place, a pension or a title? Verily, he is an apostate. Has he changed from conviction that his former opinions were wrong? he is not an apostate - he is a man who has made use of his reason, and who, thinking his former opinions erroneous, rejects them, and avows his change of sentiments.

When the author of Wat Tyler condescends to write in the Quarterly, to abuse like a true renegado, all those who retain the opinions he formerly professed, and to tell us that the only thing wanting to make us completely happy, is to double our taxes, we naturally are induced to inquire into the cause of such a change; and when we find that Robert Southey has been appointed Poet Laureate, with his butt of malmsey to inspire him, and sundry pensions besides, we set down the said Robert Southey as an apostate, a vile apostate, compared to whom Jack Ketch is a respectable gentleman. We have heard of a Mr. Goldsmith, who may safely be placed
Finally, a duodecimo volume printed on cheap paper entitled 'The Works of Aristotle The Famous Philosopher' also uses the word 'philosophy' to signal a less than respectable purpose. The Preface states: 'Though our Author applied himself to the investigation of the Secrets of Nature, yet he was pleased to bring into a fuller and more true light those secrets with respect to the Generation of Man. This he styled his MASTER PIECE; and in this he has made so thorough a search, that he has, as it were, turned Nature inside out.'

'Aristotle's Master Piece' turns out to be a mixture of descriptions of reproductive organs and old wives' tales of gynaecological interest. Thus, it can be said that to some extent British publishers were aware of the subversive uses of the word 'philosophy' in a similar way to their French counterparts and that the discrepancy between Shelley's allegorical mode of writing and the apparently Paineite nature of his radicalism in the poem can be reconciled if Shelley's poem is read not just in the context of the radicalism of Paine and Godwin, but also in the context of an earlier radical tradition. The poem is 'philosophical' in that it belongs to a tradition of clandestine literature which signals itself as such and revels in the use of philosophy as a subversive sign. Thus, Shelley incorporates Godwin's radical philosophy into the text as part of an overall strategy of subterfuge, which is as subversive of Godwin as it is of Spenser's *Faerie Queene* and emphasizes Shelley's role within an alternative Enlightenment tradition. The content of the poem reflects its publishing history. It has been seen that there is evidence to show that Shelley was not

---

38 *Sexual underworlds of the Enlightenment*, edited by G.S. Rousseau and Roy Porter (Manchester, 1987), refers to *Aristotle's Master Piece*, and the fact that it went through numerous editions from the eighteenth century onwards. See the note on page 21 for a list of articles which discuss the work's place in medical history.
39 Reading the poem in this way may also have implications for the poem's authorship: William St Clair has suggested that Cannon may well have been involved in the writing of the notes to *Queen Mab*, and the possibility that *Queen Mab* may well have been written with a knowledge of French clandestine literature adds to the evidence for such a conclusion. See St Clair, pp. 517-518.
unhappy that the poem was taken up by literary pirates, and that in fact he may have encouraged others to publicise it however they could. Shelley began by 'self-publishing' the poem, in having it privately printed, and thus echoed the practice of Thomas Paine. But later the poem was to find its way into the 'radical underworld'. The poem itself reflects both traditions of radicalism.
Shelley's *Revolt of Islam*, which he originally named *Laon and Cythna* before it underwent a series of revisions, can be seen as a rewriting in 1817 of his 1813 poem *Queen Mab*. Shelley himself described the new poem to Lord Byron on 24 September 1817: 'It is in the style & for the same object as *Queen Mab* but interwoven with a story of human passion & composed with more attention to the refinement & accuracy of language, & the connection of its parts'. Critics have agreed with Shelley in seeing similarities between the two poems. Donald Reiman compares *The Revolt of Islam* with *Queen Mab* and *Alastor*, saying that it 'was a continuation and a development of the ideas considered in the two earlier works'. Stuart Sperry has noted that *The Revolt of Islam* 'represents in many ways a return to the spirit of *Queen Mab* and *Alastor*'. James Lynn Ruff suggests that 'it marks a significant stage in Shelley's development, falling between *Queen Mab* and *Prometheus Unbound* and has compared the use of the palace in both poems: 'dedicated youths are taken to sky palaces for the purpose of learning revolutionary philosophy, the truth about the world'. John Murphy notes that, like *Queen Mab*, the poem has Gothic elements. Spenserian elements in the poem, written in the same metre as *The Faerie Queene*, have also been noted by critics. Lloyd Abbey refers to 'a Spenserian (or Coleridgean) hermit', and J.R. de J. Jackson compares Shelley's

---

40 Shelley and his Circle, 5, p. 291.
41 Shelley and his Circle, 5, p. 141.
42 Sperry, Shelley's Major Verse, p. 41.
43 James Lynn Ruff, Shelley's *The Revolt of Islam* (Salzburg, 1972), pp. 1 and 33.
44 Murphy, *The Dark Angel*, p. 111.
45 Lloyd Abbey, Destroyer and Preserver: Shelley's Poetic Skepticism (Lincoln and London, 1979), p. 42. The hermit first appears in Canto 3 stanza 29, line 1360. Laon leaves the hermit in Canto 4, stanza 32, line 1694. He has also been subject to biographical readings: Mary Shelley, in her Note to the poem, suggests that it is a depiction of a person Shelley had known early in life, Dr. Lind. The hermit was also identified as Godwin by a reviewer in the Quarterly. See Dawson, The Unacknowledged Legislator, p. 71.
Spenserianism in this poem with that of Lord Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*: 'Shelley is truer to the Spenserian spirit than Byron had been'.

Critics have also noted that Shelley was unsuccessful in his aim, stated in the Preface, of making the poem 'narrative, not didactic'. Carlos Baker states with reference to *The Revolt of Islam* that 'he was all his life a didactic poet'. Stuart Curran notes that 'The art of *The Revolt of Islam* is an art of propaganda'. Adel Salama also makes this point, saying that the poem 'lapses into blatant propagandism', and that 'in this respect some stanzas of *The Revolt of Islam* are hardly distinguishable in quality from some parts of *Queen Mab*'. An example, perhaps, of this propagandism in *The Revolt of Islam*, is the following stanza, where Laon recounts an episode from his youth:

The land in which I lived, by a fell bane
Was withered up. Tyrants dwelt side by side,
And stabled in our homes, - until the chain
Stifled the captive's cry, and to abide
That blasting curse men had no shame - all vied
In evil, slave and despot; fear with lust
Strange fellowship through mutual hate had tied,
Like two dark serpents tangled in the dust,
Which on the paths of men their mingling poison thrust.

(Canto 2, stanza 4)

This passage can be compared with a passage from Canto 3 of *Queen Mab*:

The King, the wearer of a gilded chain
That binds his soul to abjectness, the fool
Whom courtiers nickname monarch, whilst a slave
Even to the basest appetites - that man
Heeds not the shriek of penury; he smiles
At the deep curses which the destitute
Mutter in secret, and a sullen joy
Pervades his bloodless heart when thousands groan
But for those morsels which his wantonness
Wastes in unjoyous revelry, to save
All that they love from famine: when he hears

---

The tale of horror, to some ready-made face
Of hypocritical assent he turns,
Smothering the glow of shame, that, spite of him,
Flushes his bloated cheek.
(Canto 3, lines 30-44)

The 'tyrants' and their subjects and the 'King' are one-dimensional characters, who are inevitably drawn to evil.

On a more positive note, however, Stuart Sperry comments that 'The Revolt shares with Queen Mab a broadly prophetic character that draws on the poet's sense of his own place and time'\(^{50}\) and Ronald Tetreault notes that although the poem 'is the most rhetorically aggressive of all his works', 'instead of preaching, it tries to engage the reader in an imaginative experience'.\(^{51}\) Moreover, when discussing The Revolt of Islam, no critic has suggested that the poem's allegorical structure is at odds with its political message. This may seem strange at first, because the opening of The Revolt of Islam is in some respects as fantastic as that of Queen Mab. The narrator emphasizes the allegorical nature of the fight between the eagle and serpent at the beginning by calling it an 'unimaginable fight' (Canto 1, line 272). Shelley is emphasizing the fact that the opening scene is not a piece of natural history (elsewhere in his poetry, Shelley will meticulously describe natural effects to make his point - the clouds and water in the Ode to the West Wind are an example) but an emblematic struggle between two creatures who represent concepts of good and evil, although it has to be said that the description of the eagle and serpent has an energy which makes it interesting in itself, with the horror of the fight vividly imagined: for example, the 'bright scales did leap, Where'er the Eagle's talons made their way, Like sparks into the darkness' (Canto 1, lines 222-224), and the serpent is an equally tough and vividly imagined adversary:

Sometimes the Snake around his enemy's neck
Locked in stiff rings his adamantine coil,

---

\(^{50}\) Sperry, Shelley's Major Verse, p. 41.
Until the Eagle, faint with pain and toil,
Remitted his strong flight, and near the sea
Languidly fluttered, hopeless so to foil
His adversary, who then reared on high
His red and burning crest, radiant with victory.
(Canto 1, lines 228-234)

*The Revolt of Islam* echoes the fantastic quality of *Queen Mab* because, again, the opening of the poem depicts an unearthly, aetherial female figure. Like the Fairy in *Queen Mab* she has a conveyance which owes more to science fiction than nineteenth-century Britain (although Shelley's boat is also reminiscent of the equally unreal 'sunny pleasure-dome with caves of ice' which was a 'miracle of rare device' in Coleridge's recently published *Kubla Khan*, 1816):

A boat of rare device, which had no sail
But its own curved prow of thin moonstone,
Wrought like a web of texture fine and frail,
To catch those gentlest winds which are not known
To breathe, but by the steady speed alone
With which it cleaves the sparkling sea; and now
We are embarked - the mountains hang and frown
Over the starry deep that gleams below,
A vast and dim expanse, as o'er the waves we go.
(Canto 1, lines 325-333)52

Brian Wilkie suggests that such scenes have respectable antecedents in previous poetry: 'Shelley's decision to introduce the action proper with a supernatural scene has epic precedents in the celestial or Olympian scenes which precede the main action in the *Odyssey*, the *Aeneid*, *Jerusalem Delivered*, and the *Lusiad*: Shelley may have been thinking of this convention, just as Milton may have been when he called the Book of Job an epic'.53 Shelley's use of epic has also been commented upon in the context of the unfinished epic, *Ahrimanes*, written by his friend and associate Thomas Love Peacock in

---

1817. This, like Shelley's poem, drew upon elements in the Zoroastrian religion.\textsuperscript{54} Carlos Baker suggests that Milton's \textit{Paradise Lost} was in Shelley's mind when he wrote \textit{The Revolt of Islam} because of 'the development of the serpent and Lucifer symbols'.\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Paradise Lost} is, of course, like \textit{The Revolt of Islam}, an epic which dramatizes the struggle between good and evil through use of supernatural imagery, and the echoes of this poem in \textit{The Revolt of Islam} give Shelley's poem a respectable place within the radical tradition. \textit{The Revolt of Islam} also perhaps gains more credibility as a radical poem because of Shelley's avowed intention in his Preface that it should be a myth of revolution, and a corrective to an earlier generation of poets like Wordsworth and Southey who had become disillusioned with the original ideals of the French Revolution. Thus, the poem is not influenced directly by the European Enlightenment like \textit{Queen Mab}. Instead, as Richard Cronin suggests, it is a revival of the themes of the 1790s expressed in such poems as Robert Southey's \textit{Joan of Arc} and William Blake's \textit{The French Revolution} and \textit{America}.\textsuperscript{56} P.M.S. Dawson has also viewed the poem in terms of the debates of the 1790s, referring to 'Shelley's adherence to Godwin's gradualism rather than Paine's impatience'.\textsuperscript{57} The poem can be seen as a rewriting of the French Revolution in which the forces of good win out against a Manichean vision of evil.

Thus, \textit{The Revolt of Islam} has similarities with \textit{Queen Mab}, but it does not confront the reader with a possible conflict between its form and content, because the epic form had previously been used to convey radical ideas. Do we, then, read \textit{The Revolt of Islam} as an openly radical poem which is not complicated by the clandestine radicalism of \textit{Queen Mab}? Michael Henry Scriveren's view of the poem's readership perhaps concurs with this slant on the poem. Scriveren argues that:

\textsuperscript{55} Baker, \textit{Shelley's Major Poetry}, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{57} Dawson, \textit{The Unacknowledged Legislator}, p. 68.
Shelley was not writing *Laon and Cythna* for the followers of Cobbett and Wooler, but for the readers of the *Edinburgh Review*, the *Examiner*, the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Independent Whig*. If the leisure-class liberals would undergo a cultural revolution, adopting Shelleyan principles and carrying them into practice, then they could lead a new movement that would go beyond merely parliamentary reform. However remote the poem appears from the realities of 1817 politics, it actually is an attempt to arouse the leisure-class liberals to lead a radical social transformation.\(^{58}\)

Thus, we might from this viewpoint see Shelley as being more comfortable with his form in *The Revolt of Islam* because he is writing within a recognised liberal tradition, not the more subversive tradition of *Queen Mab*.

Stuart Sperry's comments about *The Revolt of Islam* also suggest that the poem's metaphor of revolution is one with which Shelley is more comfortable than that of *Queen Mab*. Sperry compares the fictional depiction of Shelley's two wives, Harriet and Mary, in *Queen Mab* and *The Revolt of Islam*. He notes that whereas Harriet is depicted in *Queen Mab* as a passive figure, 'the sleeping Iantie', awakened by the wisdom of the Fairy's words, Mary is depicted as Cythna, partner of the revolutionary Laon, a character with 'an active feminine intelligence equal and complementary to his own'.\(^{59}\) To expand upon Sperry's comments, a discussion of the syntax used in Shelley's dedications to the two women may be helpful. The dedication to Harriet runs as follows:

Whose is the love that gleaming through the world,
Wards off the poisonous arrow of its scorn?
Whose is the warm and partial praise,
Virtue's most sweet reward?
Beneath whose looks did my reviving soul
Riper in truth and virtuous daring grow?
Whose eyes have I gazed fondly on,
And loved mankind the more?
HARRIET! on thine: - thou wert my purer mind;
Thou wert the inspiration of my song;
Thine are these early wilding flowers,
Though garlanded by me.

---


Then press into thy breast this pledge of love;
And know, though time may change and years may roll,
Each floweret gathered in my heart
It consecrates to thine.
(lines 1-16)

The active verbs in this passage are interesting: Harriet's love 'wards off' poisonous scorn, but elsewhere Harriet is not seen as active at all. Shelley uses 'thou wert' a couple of times, but this construction is employed simply to state her equivalence to the poet's 'inspiration' and 'purer mind', that she cannot be separated from the poet. Shelley is seen as the person who is active: it is his soul which 'grows', his eyes which 'gaze', he who 'loves mankind' and 'garlands' the flowers which he asks Harriet to press to her breast. In the longer dedication to Mary at the beginning of *The Revolt of Islam* Shelley still concentrates largely on his own feelings - the pronoun 'I' regularly appears - but his vision of Mary is more egalitarian. Unlike Harriet, she is described as actively influencing him, rather than being simply equivalent or passive:

Thou Friend, whose presence on my wintry heart
Fell, like bright Spring upon some herbless plain;
How beautiful and calm and free thou wert
In thy young wisdom, when the mortal chain
Of Custom thou didst burst and rend in twain,
And walked as free as light the clouds among,
Which many an envious slave then breathed in vain
From his dim dungeon, and my spirit sprung
To meet thee from the woes which had begirt it long!
(lines 55-63)

Unlike Harriet, who is 'sweet', 'warm' and virtuous, Mary is seen as strong, able to actively 'burst' and 'rend' the chain of Custom. She is also seen as an active force which can free the poet from a similar 'dim dungeon' to that of the 'envious slave'. Also, at the end of the dedication, instead of granting Mary an equivalence to himself, he sees her as standing separately with him as an equal partner:

Truth's deathless voice pauses among mankind!
If there must be no response to my cry-
If men must rise and stamp with fury blind
On his pure name who loves them, - thou and I,
Sweet friend! can look from our tranquillity
Like lamps into the world's tempestuous night,-
Two tranquil stars, while clouds are passing by
Which wrap them from the foundering seaman's sight,
That burn from year to year with unextinguished light.
(lines 118-126)

Thus, the myths of revolution used in *Queen Mab* and *The Revolt of Islam* can be seen to differ. In the first poem, which had a subsequent history of being read by plebeian readers, a passive figure is awakened by the poet's words, but in the second poem the poet is seen in partnership in a process of revolution with an equal.60

Does, though, the publishing history of *The Revolt of Islam* reflect the difference between its myth of revolution and that of *Queen Mab*? A reasonably comprehensive account of the poem's publishing history appears in *Shelley and his Circle*, Volume 5, and can be summarised briefly.61 Donald Reiman notes that on 13 October 1817 Shelley sent sheets of the poem to an unidentified publisher. Reiman comments further that, 'there is strong evidence that Shelley submitted the poem to Taylor and Hessey, later Keats's publishers'. In the same month Charles and James Ollier were also advertising the poem. Shelley then approached Sherwood, Neely and Jones as possible co-publishers, and they did in fact appear on the title page of Shelley's first published version of the poem, *Laon and Cythna*. A complicating factor in Shelley's attempt to get the poem into print was the printer, Buchanan McMillan. Reiman notes that he took a more active role in the production of the poem than might usually have been the case: 'He was... fully established in his trade, whereas both Shelley and the Olliers were novices'.62 Shelley's relationship with McMillan was uneasy; he wrote to Ollier on 3 December 1817: 'That Mc Millan is an

---

60 Shelley's feminism in the poem also, perhaps, draws upon Romance convention. Catherine Addison refers to 'Cythna's knightly role' and notes that 'In Renaissance romance epics, such as *Orlando Furioso*, *Jerusalemme Liberata* and *The Faerie Queene*, the female knight-errant, always a figure of both beauty and power, was a literary commonplace.' Catherine Addison, 'Cythna as Hero in Shelley's *The Revolt of Islam* in *The Most Unfailing Herald*, edited by Alan M. Weinberg and Romaine Hill (Pretoria, 1996), p. 146.
61 See *Shelley and his Circle*, 5, pp. 141-189.
62 Reiman also mentions the fact that McMillan had royal connections. See also: Todd, p. 124. Todd states that McMillan was printer to the Prince of Wales, later becoming the Prince Regent and the King, from 1799-1800, in 1813 and in 1821.
obstinate old dog as troublesome as he is impudent. 'Tis a mercy as the old women say that I got him thro' the poem at all - Let him print the errata, & say at top if he likes, that it was all the Author's fault, & that he is as immaculate as the Lamb of God'. The printer later withdrew the poem on the grounds that it was blasphemous and that it depicted incest in a sympathetic light. After this, the poem evolved into the less controversial *Revolt of Islam* via a 'literary committee', in Thomas Love Peacock's words, comprised probably of Charles Ollier, Peacock, Mary and Percy Bysshe Shelley and Claire Clairmont.

Was the poem, then, as Scrivener has suggested, aimed at a 'liberal' audience, separate from the plebeian audience of *Queen Mab*? I have already suggested in connection with Leigh Hunt, and the links between his writings and those of William Cobbett and George Cannon, that such a distinction between radicalism and liberalism is not an easy one to make, and similar problems arise in assessing Shelley's attitude towards *The Revolt of Islam*. Shelley first chose Taylor and Hessey as publishers, but John Taylor's two biographers, Edmund Blunden and Tim Chilcott, have differed in their view of the firm's political character. Edmund Blunden has suggested that the firm's 'publications were not of an adventurous sort' at the beginning of their career, and that their output 'excelled in literary insight and permanence'; they published John Clare and the most important essayists of the 1820s in the *London Magazine*. Blunden hints that the firm was more interested in literary excellence than political infighting. He wrote about the attack by *Blackwood's Magazine* on Leigh Hunt and the 'Cockney School of Poetry' and, by implication, John Keats, one of Taylor and Hessey's authors, that the political implications made them 'uneasy'. Tim Chilcott, on the other hand, whilst mentioning the fact that Taylor conducted the *London Magazine* 'on principles of fairness, without any bias from party spirit', has suggested that Taylor's success as a publisher derived in part from his awareness of political trends: 'Taylor's role in his association with Keats was not restricted to the fostering of his talent, important though this was. A vital part of his

64 Blunden, *Keats's Publisher*, p. 180.
65 Blunden, *Keats's Publisher*, p. 49.
success as a publisher depended also upon his understanding of the wider pressures - moral, political, social, and economic - which affected the promulgation of literature.66

So Taylor's views are, perhaps deliberately, difficult to pin down. The firm of Sherwood, Neely and Jones plays a similarly equivocal part in the history of the relationship between publishers and politics in the early nineteenth century. Reiman writes that 'both the firm's history and its current publishing policies were favorable to the promotion of writings on the liberal side', and Frank Hoadley has emphasized their respectability, describing them as 'an establishment which usually dealt in nothing more sensational than travel literature or de luxe editions of Blackstone'.67 They also published the Investigator from 1822-4, which, like many other periodicals, found Byron's Don Juan and Byron and Hunt's periodical The Liberal too strong to stomach.68

Michael O'Neill describes Sherwood, Neely and Jones, equally accurately, as 'well-disposed towards radical literature'.69 For example, they were co-publishers with James Johnston of the following texts: The Adventures of Johnny Newcombe in the Navy (1818), Dr. Syntax in London (1819), Drakard's Emigrator's Pocket Book (1819) and The Aegis of Life (1819).70 They also had a radical reputation because they had pirated Robert Southey's Wat Tyler in 1817, and thereby had helped radicals in their fight against the establishment.

The equivocal status of The Revolt of Islam and its publishers can also be seen in its reception. As David Duff notes, 'the poem did eventually find a sympathetic readership, but not until after Shelley's death, and not among the people at whom it was aimed'. Duff quotes a correspondent writing to Carlile's Republican, who wrote in December 1826 that he could see no reason 'why The Revolt of Islam should not follow Queen Mab into the hands of the mechanic and labourer', and notes that, although it was not pirated, it was

---

66 Chilcott, A Publisher and his circle, pp. 131 and 58.
67 Frank Taliaferro Hoadley, 'The Controversy over Southey's Wat Tyler', Studies in Philology 1941, 38, p.81.
70 See Appendix E.
mentioned in the pages of The Republican, The Lion, The Newgate Magazine and the Poor Man's Guardian, as well as influencing Robert Owen's The New Moral World, Thomas Cooper's poem The Purgatory of Suicides and Benjamin Disraeli's The Revolutionary Epick.\footnote{Duff, Romance and Revolution, p. 214.}

Thus the publication history of The Revolt of Islam is not untouched by the underground world of the literary pirates. Clear-cut distinctions cannot be made in the following ways: between a radical tradition of openness and the radicalism of the literary pirates; or between radicalism and a middle-class readership. The overlap between these publishing methods is echoed in the content of the poems. Before placing the publishing history of The Mask of Anarchy in the context of the histories of Queen Mab and The Revolt of Islam, it will be useful to discuss Shelley's 1820 text Oedipus Tyrannus, which falls close to The Mask of Anarchy in terms of its publication date, and which will help to bring Shelley's radicalism into clearer focus.
In this section of the thesis I wish to focus on the relationship between the content of Shelley's poem *Oedipus Tyrannus* and its publishing history. It will be remembered that the poem was published by James Johnston, and in this section I shall compare the poem with other works published by James Johnston and those by William Benbow, who were both active in radical publishing in the year of *Oedipus Tyrannus*’s publication, 1820. In choosing to consider this work, and later in the chapter discussing its relevance to a reading of *The Mask of Anarchy*, I again emphasize Shelley's relationship with the 'radical underworld'.

*Oedipus Tyrannus*, or *Swellfoot the Tyrant*, is one of Shelley's most neglected poems, as recent critics have noted. Timothy Morton writes that, 'the play has never been given more than a humble place in the Shelley canon', and Ajoy Ranjan Biswas writes that 'it is customary not to take any serious notice of *Peter Bell the Third* and *Swellfoot the Tyrant*'.

Earlier critics have tended to dismiss the work on aesthetic grounds: as Ann Thompson notes, Kenneth Hopkins wrote in 1958 that the satiric element in Shelley comprises 'the least valuable, the least readable, of his work'; and Milton Wilson wrote in 1959 about the two poems mentioned by Biswas that 'both show a slight satiric gift, for the most part incompetently handled'.

However, there are perhaps more significant reasons for this neglect, and one suggestion has been that satire in the period had an ambivalent status. The publishing history of *Oedipus Tyrannus* suggests its satirical intent. The texts and prints sold by its publisher, James Johnston, consisted almost exclusively of contemporary political satire.

---


74 See pp. 122-123.
The date of the poem, 1820, places it within a vast body of literature which concerned itself with a highly topical subject, the Queen Caroline Affair of 1820. Thus, it can be said that the publication history of *Oedipus Tyrannus* is important to its meaning, and to an understanding of Shelley's political poems in general. The poem resists a reading which places it within a coherent and organic account of Shelley's political thought, tracing its relationship to other radical thinkers such as Paine and Godwin; so also, as we have seen, do the poems *Queen Mab* and *The Revolt of Islam*. They can be better understood with reference to a clandestine tradition of radicalism, and their involvement in this clandestine tradition is reflected in the publishers with whom Shelley chose to liaise in getting them published.75

The poem has also perhaps been neglected because it stands outside the mainstream of the concerns of Romantic period critics: such critics have been happy to discuss the Spenserian aspects of *Queen Mab* or the *Revolt of Islam* in the knowledge that there are numerous other examples of Romantic poems influenced by Spenserian form and imagery, but the generic source of *Oedipus Tyrannus* and its relationship to other canonical literature of the period are less easy to place. Michael Erkelenz suggests that its literary antecedents are most obviously Sophocles's cycle of tragedies concerning Oedipus, but that the poem also falls within the genre of Aristophanic comedy.76 So Shelley writes a poem which seems by its title to be a tragedy, but which turns out to be a comedy: it might also be said that, as he surprises his readers with the poetry of *Queen Mab*, putting contemporary radical ideas into an apparently outdated form, Shelley jars his readers' expectations by putting a thoroughly topical subject into an ancient framework, and a tragic subject into a comic form.

Another reason for the poem's neglect is perhaps its apparently ephemeral subject matter: the poem concerns itself with the Queen Caroline Affair of 1820, which might be

---

75 For examples of critical works on Shelley which place his poems within the traditions of particular thinkers, see Dawson, *The Unacknowledged Legislator*, which traces his debt to Paine, and Scrivener, *Radical Shelley*, which traces his debt to Godwin.
seen as a contemporary event that was entertainingly scandalous but which had no real significance for the development and history of radicalism in early nineteenth century Britain, and Erkelenz cites this as a possible barrier to explication of the poem.77 Erkelenz's comments bring to mind a poem like The Mask of Anarchy, which might fit more comfortably within a conventional account of Shelley's radicalism, being more evidently a serious poem about a serious subject.78

Why, then, should we take Oedipus Tyrannus seriously, and view it as having an important place in an account of Shelley's radicalism? One reason is suggested by Erkelenz. He argues that, 'the Caroline Affair was much more than a tawdry personal dispute outrageously publicized by a cynical opposition. It was, in fact, a lightning rod for the most powerful and universal expression of political dissent that nineteenth-century Britain had yet seen'. He also notes Iain McCalman's point that a 'Queen Caroline "aesthetic" grew up around the Affair.'79 As James Epstein notes, this 'aesthetic' was 'characterized by a coarse, subversive humor, dissolving of authority. There were strong elements of burlesque at work, a carnivalesque set of reversals: queen for king, counter-monarch for monarch. Radicals offered a satiric reversal of the standard trope of king and people, in which Caroline might assume the guise of the "Queen of Misrule".'80 The Queen Caroline affair was a significant political event, because, beyond its immediate constitutional significance, it provoked a huge response. Appendices B and E, which list the productions of the publishers Benbow and Johnston, show clearly how they attempted to exploit the Queen Caroline Affair. Benbow and Johnston were both prolific printers of caricatures by George and Isaac Robert Cruikshank as well as Lewis Marks.

77 See Erkelenz, 'Swellfoot the Tyrant', p. 509. He makes an exception for S.E. Jones's Shelley's Satire, which discusses the poem in pp. 125-6.
78 The subject has also perhaps been neglected because E.P. Thompson's influential The Making of the English Working Class does not discuss the Queen Caroline controversy in detail. By contrast, criticism of The Mask of Anarchy does obviously impinge upon a history of English radicalism, because Thompson stresses the importance of the Peterloo Massacre.
80 Epstein, Radical Expression, p. 110.
Johnston additionally published prints by C. Williams and Benbow published prints by William Elmes. Prints by these engravers also feature prominently in some of the books that they published. Shelley's work *Oedipus Tyrannus* resembles such caricatures in using contemporary characters, and then making them into grotesque figures by means of exaggeration. For instance, the poem opens with a grotesque image of Swellfoot the Tyrant, a representation of the Prince Regent, bowing down before the altar of the Goddess Famine, which resembles the exaggerated pictures of a fat prince which appeared in the prints of the time. Swellfoot describes himself in self-satisfied terms:

```
Thou supreme Goddess! by whose power divine
These graceful limbs are clothed in proud array
Of gold and purple, and this kingly paunch
Swells like a sail before a favouring breeze,
And these most sacred nether promontories
Lie satisfied with layers of fat; and these
Boeotian cheeks, like Egypt's pyramid,
(Not with less toil were their foundations laid),
Sustain the cone of my untroubled brain,
That point, the emblem of a pointless nothing!
```

(Act 1, lines 1-10)

Drawings of the Regent portray him as a similarly bloated figure, with the characteristics of an eastern tyrant, in Benbow's productions of 1820 *The Queen and the Mogul*, *Sultan Sham and his Seven Wives* and *Kouli Khan*.

Another part of the iconography of the literature of 1820 is the use of the notorious Green Bag, which was supposed to hold damning ministerial evidence against Caroline, and to prove her guilty of adultery. William Benbow published a one page broadside, *Green Bag Oddities*, and a print, *The Filth and Lies of the Green Bag Visiting Their Parents and Friends, or the Dandy of Sixty Severely Beat By His Wife*. Johnston published a Williams print entitled *A Peep into the Green Bag*. Shelley's play emphasizes perceptions of the poisonous nature of the Green Bag in the following extract from a speech by Mammon:

```
81 Dorothy George gives George Cruikshank's dates as 1792-1878 and Isaac Robert Cruikshank's dates as 1789-1856. Lists of the prints drawn by these artists during this period can be found in the 'index of artists' in her catalogue.
```
Behold this BAG! it is
The poison BAG of that Green Spider huge,
On which our spies skulked in ovation through
The streets of Thebes, when they were paved with dead:
A bane so much the deadlier fills it now
As calumny is worse than death, - for here
The Gadfly's venom, fifty times distilled,
Is mingled with the vomit of the Leech,
In due proportion, and black ratsbane, which
That very Rat, who, like the Pontic tyrant,
Nurtures himself on poison, dare not touch.82
(Act 1 Scene 1, lines 346-356)

The depiction of ministers and other political figures as animals was also common in the
caricatures, and a graphic use of the word 'leech' appears in Benbow's one-sheet broadside
called The Great Milan Leech, a parody on Justice Leach which depicts him as a giant
leech.

It can be said, then, that Oedipus Tyrannus appropriates images and motifs from
those works published by Benbow and Johnston in 1820 which were either caricatures or
poetry which included caricatures as part of their content. James Johnston also published
a large body of verse between 1811 and 1819 which did not contain caricatures and prints,
much of which falls into the category of Pindaric verse. This is 'Pindaric' verse not
because it falls into the ancient tradition of writing odes begun by Pindar, but because of
its relationship to the work of the radical John Wolcot, writing in the late eighteenth
century under the pseudonym 'Peter Pindar'. Johnston published the following titles,
which named 'Peter Pindar' as the author, between 1811 and 1819:

A Scourge for Stripes

82 For a discussion of the iconography of the Green Bag, see Biswas, pp. 173-4 and 177-9. Carl Woodring identifies the Leech as the Vice-Chancellor, Sir John Leach, who headed the Milan Commission into the Queen's affairs, and identifies the Gadfly and Rat mentioned in the above passage as performers in the same operation: 'Of those involved in the blunder of hiring Italian witnesses against the Queen, perhaps William Cooke, K.C., had not been previously called "the Gadfly", but John Allen Powell, who had earlier acted for Burdett, was in consequence of his defection already known to caricaturists as "the Rat". Carl Woodring, Politics in English Romantic Poetry (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1970), p. 271.
These Pindaric poems, rather than taking the form of a play, as Oedipus Tyrannus does, address the reader in the first person, the narrator taking the stance of an informed commentator on events. The following passage from The R—I Marriage is an instance where the narrator draws attention to himself:

Descend ye Nine, my good old chums,
Purveyors of my recreation!
Come scatter in my lap some crumbs
Of comfortable inspiration!

In all my toil and all my care
You have been good participators -
Let us a merry moment share,
And once, at least, be mirth-creators!

83 William Benbow's publications in 1820 based on the Queen Caroline Affair also occasionally take the forms of plays. See his works: The Queen and the Mogul; a Play and Lucretia and Runjumdildopunt; or, John Bull in search of the pathetic. A Serious Musical Farce, in Three Acts.
Aid me to sing, celestial Nine,
In strains most tuneful and most loyal,
Of loves, but not like yours and mine -
No gentle dames, wooings royal!

Bless me, ye nine celestial maids,
With visions from your holy mountains,
Visions of ideal Idalian shades,
Of liquorish loves and cooling fountains,

Come, smile upon the bard so pale, -
At his poor threshold check your wandering -
Lest the gay subject should get stale,
And die away while he sits pond'ring.
(stanzas 5-9)

The narrator adopts a jaunty tone, which mocks himself as much as those he is about to
satirise, and in this respect the Pindaric verse which Johnston published has as much in
common with Byron as any other writer, the tone of Don Juan being similar in its half-
mockery of the classical mode. Consider, for instance, this passage near the beginning of
the poem:

Most epic poets plunge 'in medias res'
(Horace makes this the heroic turnpike road),
And then your hero tells, whene'er you please,
What went before - by way of episode,
While seated after dinner at his ease,
Beside his mistress in some soft abode,
Palace, or garden, paradise, or cavern,
Which serves the happy couple for a tavern.

That is the usual method, but not mine -
My way is to begin with the beginning;
The regularity of my design
Forbids all wandering as the worst of sinning,
And therefore I shall open with a line
(Although it cost me half an hour in spinning)
Narrating somewhat of Don Juan's father,
And also of his mother, if you'd rather.
(Canto 1, stanzas 6 and 7)
Byron, like the author of the poem attributed to 'Peter Pindar', assumes a familiarity with classical literature between poet and reader alike, and uses the references to be self-deprecating and to emphasize that what he is writing is mock-heroic.

The jaunty tone of Byron's poem and the verse of 'Peter Pindar' contrasts with the seriousness of Shelley's *Mask of Anarchy* but there are, even so, echoes of the 'Peter Pindar' mode in the poem. For instance, the 1817 poem *Royalty Beset*, concerning an attack of stones on the Prince Regent's carriage, describes soldiers in a similar way to *The Mask of Anarchy*:

The day was dark, the dun grey fog
Spread round a muffling vapour;
The sun rode tho' the skies *incog*,
And look'd a languid taper.

The breezes whistled through the Park,
Damps on the green were lying;
Nor linnet, blackbird, thrush nor lark,
Amongst the trees were flying.

But scattered up and down,
Horsemen the turf were pressing;
To awe the grumblers of the town,
Or give the knaves a dressing.

And they were armed with plume and helm,
And tail that mock'd all measure;
And looked as if they thought the realm
Created for their pleasure.
(stanzas 1-4)

This passage can be compared with the following stanzas from the opening section of *The Mask of Anarchy*:

And a mighty troop around,
With their trampling shook the ground,
Waving each a bloody sword,
For the service of their Lord.

And with glorious triumph, they
Rode through England proud and gay,
Drunk as with intoxication
Of the wine of desolation.
(lines 38-49)
And Anarchy, the Skeleton,
Bowed and grinned to every one,
As well as if his education
Had cost ten millions to the nation.

For he knew the Palaces
Of our Kings were rightly his;
His the sceptre, crown, and globe,
And the gold-inwoven robe.
(lines 74-81)

Both poets stress the intoxicating effect of power without responsibility: for the
Pindaric poet, the soldiers 'thought the realm/Created for their pleasure', and both Shelley's
soldiers and Anarchy take their power for granted - the soldiers are 'Drunk as with
intoxication/Of the wine of desolation' and Anarchy knows that the 'Palaces' are 'rightly
his'. Both poets also emphasize the simplicity of the four line stanzas through their syntax,
using one short sentence per stanza. The four line stanza is characteristic of many of the
Pindaric poems, and Shelley's use of the AABB rhyme scheme can also be found in
Pindaric verse, as in another mock-classical opening of a Pindaric poem, The Fat Knight
and the Petition:

As Aristotle told his clan,-
'An imitative thing is Man,'
'Too apt,' still further on he sings,
'To mimic base and shameless things.'

Through life we find this still the case,
In ev'ry age, in ev'ry place;
Still from the garret to the kitchen,
We find this imitative itching.
(stanzas 1-2)

Thus, a distinction can be made between the poetry of Oedipus Tyrannus and The
Mask of Anarchy which directly relates to their date and place of publication. The Mask of
Anarchy can be found to have similarities with a form of verse which was already
beginning to die a death in 1819, and which Johnston stopped publishing after 1819,
poetry in imitation of the original 'Peter Pindar', John Wolcot, who died in 1821, and
whose imitators dry up at about the same time, whereas *Oedipus Tyrannus* has similarities with the caricatures and prints which were being produced in 1820.

So it can be seen, then, that *Oedipus Tyrannus* becomes a more rewarding poem if its publishing history is taken into account. Not only does the poem's content and style form part of a general 'Queen Caroline aesthetic', but it has been shown that this aesthetic is closely linked to the productions of particular publishers, one of whom Shelley used. His choice of publisher, as much as the style of the poem, tells us that Shelley was knowledgeable about the politics of early nineteenth century radicalism, and was careful to place it within the 'radical underworld'. Now the question can be asked, given what we know about its publishing history, can we view *The Mask of Anarchy* in a similar light?
If we interpreted *The Mask of Anarchy* as part of a clandestine 'radical underworld', this might seem at first to simplify answers to two crucial critical problems. The first is the problem of the poem's audience: who is Shelley addressing, and is the call at the end of the poem for people to 'Rise like lions after slumber' a genuinely radical call to working people, or a fictional construct? The second is the question of how seriously we are to take Shelley's politics in the poem: is his call to nonviolent political action the writing of a hopeless idealist out of touch with reality? It might be said that if we could pinpoint an audience and a coherent political strategy in line with the aims of radical publishers, in much the same way as it is possible to do with *Oedipus Tyrannus*, then convincing answers to these questions could be found. In fact, I wish to argue in this chapter that *The Mask of Anarchy* is equally valid as a manifestation of nineteenth century radical culture because it corresponds to the radicals' attempts to, in Klancher's words, locate themselves outside the making and unmaking of signs. The very complexity of the answers to such questions reflects the complexity of the radical culture which gave rise to Shelley's poem, which is also evidenced in the diverse means by which radical publishers sought to evade the pressures of the law.

The poem can, in a sense, be shown to continue the political project which Shelley first began when he wrote *Queen Mab*. Roland A. Duerksen argues, for example, that 'no event in history could have been tailored more exactly than was the Manchester Massacre to reinforce the thought and to rouse in Shelley again the spirit that had produced *Queen Mab* and *The Revolt of Islam*.' 84 Ronald Tetreault writes that 'The Masque of Anarchy reaches back to *Queen Mab* in its intentions.' 85 However, critics have seen *The Mask of Anarchy* as a more subtle treatment of the themes of *Queen Mab* and *The Revolt of Islam*. For instance, the sophisticated use of the Masque form has been commented upon by

critics. Stuart Curran has noted that Leigh Hunt's *Descent of Liberty. A Mask* and Shelley's *Mask of Anarchy* are a conscious rewriting of Beaumont and Fletcher: 'Together they stand openly against the main traditions of the masque formed in the early seventeenth century'.

Ronald Tetreault also notes Shelley's skilful use of the masque form, saying about his criticism of society in 1819: 'he ironically presents this criticism through the medium of a traditional courtly entertainment that had always been used to confirm the value of "God, and King, and Law."' It might be said that *The Mask of Anarchy*, like *Queen Mab*, is a re-use of Spenserian themes for a radical audience. The opening of the poem describes four allegorical figures, Murder, Fraud, Hypocrisy and Anarchy:

I met Murder on the way-
He had a mask like Castlereagh-
Very smooth he looked, yet grim;
Seven blood-hounds followed him:

All were fat; and well they might
Be in admirable plight,
For one by one, and two by two,
He tossed them human hearts to chew
Which from his wide cloak he drew.

Next came Fraud, and he had on,
Like Eldon, an ermined gown;
His big tears, for he wept well,
Turned to mill-stones as they fell.

And the little children, who
Round his feet played to and fro,
Thinking every tear a gem,
Had their brains knocked out by them.

Clothed with the Bible, as with light,
And the shadows of the night,
Like Sidmouth, next, Hypocrisy
On a crocodile rode by.

And many more Destructions played
In this ghastly masquerade,
All disguised, even to the eyes,

---

Like Bishops, lawyers, peers, or spies.

Last came Anarchy: he rode
On a white horse, splashed with blood;
He was pale even to the lips,
Like Death in the Apocalypse.

And he wore a kingly crown;
And in his grasp a sceptre shone;
On his brow this mark I saw -
'I AM GOD, AND KING, AND LAW!'
(Lines 5-37)

Shelley's description of Murder, Fraud, Hypocrisy and Anarchy parallels Spenser's description of the Seven Deadly Sins, who also form a pageant of figures on horseback. Like Shelley's figures, who are 'grim', 'ghastly' and 'pale like Death', Spenser's characters are grotesquely ugly both in their appearance and their morals. The following description of Gluttony perhaps comes closest to Shelley's vision of immorality, because for Shelley the vices of the powerful are always at the expense of the powerless. Like Eldon, whose Fraud causes defenceless children to suffer, the gluttony of rich people is seen to make the poor hungry in Spenser's poem:

And by his side rode loathsome Gluttony,
Deformed creature, on a filthie swyne,
His belly was vp-blowne with luxury,
And eke with fatnesse swollen were his eyne,
And like a Crane his necke was long and fyne,
With which he swallowd vp excessive feast,
For want whereof poore people oft did pyne,
And all the way, most like a brutish beast,
He spued vp his gorge, that all did him deteast.
(Book 1, Canto 4, stanza 21)\(^{88}\)

Shelley's skill in using popular forms of address has also been commented upon by critics. Shelley uses the popular ballad metre for his poem, and Carlos Baker notes that 'the vocabulary and syntax of the English Bible, suitably purged of the less familiar

archaisms, will come very close to representing the *lingua communis* which Shelley sought to use as an instrument of communication.89

So the poem can be seen as an authentic attempt to address ordinary people because of its use of echoes of the New Testament, one of the books they could have been guaranteed to be familiar with. Shelley alludes for example in lines 203-204, where he suggests that only the Englishman has no home, to the passage in the New Testament where it is said that the 'Son of Man' has no place to rest his head. He also suggests that Liberty is analogous to a state suggested by Christ in asking a rich man to give up his riches in order to enter heaven: 'the rich have kissed/Thy feet, and like him following Christ,/Give their substance to the free/And through the rough world follow thee' (lines 246-249). The vocabulary of the opening stanza of the poem can also be compared with that of, for example, *The Revolt of Islam*. *The Revolt of Islam* begins in the following way:

When the last hope of trampled France had failed
Like a brief dream of unremaining glory,
From visions of despair I rose, and scaled
The peak of an aereal promontory
Whose caverned base with the vexed surge was hoary;
And saw the golden dawn break forth, and waken
Each cloud, and every wave: - but transitory
The calm: for sudden, the firm earth was shaken,
As if by the last wreck its frame were overtaken.
(Canto 1, stanza 1, lines 127-135)

The latinate nature of such words as 'aereal', 'transitory' and 'promontory' are appropriate for a poem which follows in the footsteps of *Paradise Lost*, and the stance of the poet is also perhaps appropriate for the lengthy and ambitious nature of the poem: he stands eminent upon a promontory, in a distant land, and is implicitly linked to the eagle which is a central metaphor of the poem because of his 'aereal' position. He is thus removed from a common readership in his superiority and his distance from them. In *The Mask of Anarchy*, on the other hand, Shelley states that: 'As I lay asleep in Italy/There came a voice

from over the Sea./And with great power it forth led me/To walk in the visions of Poesy.'
(lines 1-4) The word 'poesy' jars slightly with the simple tone of the rest of the stanza, which is careful not to use three and four-syllable words. Shelley writes himself into the midst of the action of his poem, not standing aloof from it, stating in the next line, 'I met Murder on the way'. (line 5)

Such a reading of the poem, as consciously going out of its way to find a popular audience, is consistent with Michael Scrivener's reading of the poem's politics, where he writes that 'in The Mask of Anarchy [Shelley] encourages the poor to act. A poem, of course, is not a political essay, so that an imaginative "statement" is not the same as a prosaic one. A poetic reference to Peterloo can be more uncompromising and militant than a prosaic response because a poem exists in a realm of symbolic reference.'

For Scrivener, the poem is a genuine address to the poor which uses literary devices to facilitate a radical message.

A consistent case, along Scrivener's lines, for Shelley as a direct addresser of the populace in the poem can be made most clearly by referring to the stanza which appears at the end of the poem, as its final, and perhaps because of this, most important point. The stanza is also the only repeated one in the poem, and thus acts as a variant of the ballad form's use of a refrain; it could act as a chorus which sums up the message of the whole poem:

Rise like Lions after slumber
In unvanquishable number -
Shake your chains to earth like dew
Which in sleep had fallen on you -
Ye are many - they are few.

The second section of the poem also has the appearance of a direct address to ordinary people, with 'their own indignant Earth' (line 139) addressing poor people in the second person in provocative terms, for example when describing the slavery which the poetic persona believes the people labour under: 'ye can tell/That which slavery is, too well -'

---

90 Scrivener, Radical Shelley, p. 198.
(lines 156-7), "Tis to see your children weak' (line 168), "Tis to see the Tyrant's crew/Ride over your wives and you' (lines 190-1) and 'All things have a home but one -/Thou, Oh Englishman, hast none!' (lines 203-4). The final section of the poem also seems to be a direct address in the second person to people about what they ought to do to remedy such a situation. For example: 'Let a vast assembly be/And with great solemnity/Declare with measured words that ye/Are, as God has made ye, free -' (lines 295-298).

However, in the same way that critics have been uneasy about the relationship between Queen Mab's didactic message and its poetic form, they have also been uneasy about assigning an audience to The Mask of Anarchy. Richard Cronin argues against Richard Holmes' depiction of the poem as having 'triumphant solidarity with the underprivileged, oppressed, and unrepresented against the elite', saying that instead 'Shelley patronises the ballad'. There is, perhaps, a tension in the poem between the ballad's call to political action and Shelley's distancing of himself as poet from the narrative. The poet is careful not to address the working people himself, but puts the words of the second section of the poem into the mouth of 'their own indignant Earth': her words are not the poet's words, but an elemental expression of the sons of England's 'own' 'Earth' which spring from her organically, 'shuddering with a mother's throe' (line 142). Thus, the words can be read as a rendering of the unconscious will of the people themselves. It is possible also to read the final section of the poem, which is still voiced by the Earth, but which urges moderation (the people are asked to use 'strong and simple words', line 299, instead of swords, are asked to be 'calm and resolute', line 319, and to rely on 'the laws of your own land', line 327), as the authentic voice of the poet himself, a reading which Leigh Hunt himself suggested in his first edition of the poem in 1832, when he highlighted such passages in the text. A reading of the poem as a literary game would suggest, then, that Shelley was always at one remove from a radical audience; that he played with the forms and ideas of radical poetry but, in fact, was always anxious to guard

91 Cronin, Shelley's Poetic Thoughts, pp. 45 and 54.
his status as a literary author appealing to the middle-class audience of his intended readership for the poem, that of *The Examiner*.

In my opinion a detailed knowledge of Shelley's publishing history solves the problems which critics have in assigning the poem a putative audience. The audience of Leigh Hunt's *Examiner* and those of the radical publishers with whom Shelley fraternized at one level or another overlapped; there was no necessary conflict between the two audiences. It was quite consistent that Shelley should have sent Leigh Hunt the poem, expecting that it should be published, while also embedding elements in the poem which were consistent with the clandestine radical audience of a poem like *Queen Mab*. There was a large audience for the kind of satiric verse which Shelley was writing, and this audience was of the same kind as that which read *Queen Mab* and would have read *Oedipus Tyrannus*, had it not been suppressed after its original publication. Thus, it is wrong also to say that Shelley 'patronised' the popular ballad: the complex nature of his poem's address to the people of England is appropriate because his poem formed part of a rich and vibrant radical culture which was more complicated in its methods than a strict reading of radicalism in the tradition of Godwin, Paine and Cobbett would imply.

It can similarly be said that Shelley's treatment of nonviolent resistance is embedded within a detailed knowledge of contemporary culture. Michael Scrivener has emphasized the importance of this theme: 'The key to understanding the uniqueness of Shelley's poem is his proposal for massive nonviolent resistance.'92 Kenneth Neill Cameron has commented that Shelley 'rather naively' 'urges the people not to fight the military', and other critics have disagreed over how realistic Shelley's suggestion is.93 Some of this discussion has centred around the influence of Shelley's poem on Mahatma Gandhi and the struggle for Indian independence in the 1930s and 1940s. Meena Alexander notes that Gandhi quoted the following passages from *The Mask of Anarchy* in

---

a speech made in 1938 in order to explain to his audience of British missionaries 'the difficult spiritual discipline involved in the practice of nonviolence':

Stand ye calm and resolute,
Like a forest close and mute,
With folded arms and looks which are
Weapons of unvanquished war.
(lines 319-322)

And if then the tyrants dare
Let them ride among you there,
Slash, and stab, and maim, and hew,-
What they like, that let them do.
(lines 340-343)\(^4\)

Donald Beale criticises the poem in the light of the massacre of Amritsar, suggesting that its aims were unrealistic: 'Gandhi was much influenced by *The Mask of Anarchy*, but unarmed passivity here involved appalling carnage'.\(^5\) Art Young, however, cites the history of India to show how a strategy of nonviolence could be followed. For Young, the fact that 'it is estimated that ten thousand Indians were murdered during the struggle [for Indian independence] while not a single Britisher was killed' is a triumph for Shelley's viewpoint: people *are* capable of enduring enormous sufferings without retaliating.\(^6\)

As P.M.S. Dawson has argued, Shelley's advice was practical within the political context of the Peterloo Massacre:

Shelley has often been sneered at for inviting the Reformers to face cannon, bayonets, and sabres with folded arms and calm looks, but I am not sure that Shelley didn't have a better grasp of the situation. The army that beat Napoleon at Waterloo would have made short work of any *armed* resistance on the part of the Reformers. A completely peaceful resistance was more difficult to put down because no one was quite sure how the army would react if called upon to kill unarmed civilians.\(^7\)


\(^7\) Dawson, *The Unacknowledged Legislator*, p. 207.
I would argue that the evidence given in this thesis bears Dawson's point out: it has been seen that Shelley's poem, rather than being an idealistic portrayal of people's actions, was actually a more faithful depiction of their feelings and political motivation than perhaps critics have tended to concede. Also, his poem was not the work of an exile hopelessly out of touch with what was happening in England: Shelley did not publish the poem not because he was incapable of doing so, but because he realised his indebtedness to his friend Leigh Hunt. The poem is a practical expression of Shelley's desire to intervene in the events of 1819.

Thus, the poem can be seen to arise out of the events of 1819 and to inspire future generations to take up its politics, and it can be said that an understanding of this poem, and Shelley's other political poetry, cannot be reached without an understanding of the complexities of the radical culture which gave rise to it. Perhaps the most appropriate way of concluding a discussion of Shelley's poetry and its relationship with contemporary radical culture might be to quote one of his earliest and most appreciative critics, Robert Fair, writing in the *Theological Inquirer* in 1815, who himself was in the midst of that culture:

A Paine, a Voltaire, and a Volney, have written to teach man his dignity; they have conveyed the voice of Reason to the unprejudiced ear, and have secured monuments of fame in the gratitude of future ages, but it was reserved for the author of Queen Mab to show, that

"The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,"

might soar to other and to nobler objects than the domes of superstition, and the heaven of priestly invention, and to prove the justice of Milton's beautiful ejaculation;

"How charming is divine philosophy!  
Not harsh and crabbed as dull fools suppose,  
But musical as is Apollo's lute,  
And a perpetual feast of nectared sweets  
Where no crude surfeit reigns."98

---

98 *Theological Inquirer*, July 1815, p. 362.
Like Shelley's poetry, Fair's criticism is an example of how rich radical culture was in the early nineteenth century, and of how, to simply reduce the radical elements in Shelley's poetry to the ideas of a Paine, a Voltaire or a Volney, would not do justice to the challenge Shelley's interpretation of his own radical culture represents.
Conclusion

This thesis began by stating that there is an apparent dichotomy between Shelley's passionate and personal response to the Peterloo Massacre, *The Mask of Anarchy*, and its publishing history. To explore the implications of this apparent inconsistency, the thesis examined, and cast doubt upon, the best-known and most influential accounts of the circumstances of Shelley's failure to publish in 1819. Contrary to such narratives, it was suggested that Shelley had a number of options available to him, and these were outlined. Finally, Shelley's political poetry was re-evaluated in the light of knowledge gleaned about the poems' publishing history and its relationship with early nineteenth century radicalism.

This discussion led, firstly, to the conclusion that to describe Shelley as an 'ineffectual angel' is wildly inaccurate. To the contrary, he was very much aware of political developments in England, in spite of his self-imposed exile in Italy, and he was also aware of various publishing options which could have been open to him. Simply to see him as a victim of Hunt's intransigence and the repressive policies of the British government would be misguided. He was a significant player in the publication history of his own poetry, and was often resourceful in his resort to subterfuge. Knowledge of Hunt's politics, and his relationship with the radical underworld, as well as the important influence which his politics exerted over the writing of the *Mask of Anarchy*, in tandem with a reading of the correspondence of Shelley and Hunt, leads to the conclusion that there was a tacit agreement between the two men that the poem was not to be published.

Important new light has been shed upon the textual history of Shelley's poems. This history shows that Shelley was someone who was closer to the underground movements of his time than has been previously thought. For instance, it can be said with a fair amount of probability that John Stockdale of Dublin played a larger part in Shelley's publication of his texts in Ireland than has previously been suggested. Shelley's involvement with those people who still remained true to the cause of the United Irishmen in the early nineteenth century was closer than might have been thought, and an understanding of his politics when he was in Ireland is not complete without an
understanding of the way his poems got into print. The relationship between politics and publishing, in this case, is an important one. Another new discovery is that George Cannon is likely to have had a greater role in Shelley's attempts to publish his poems than might have been previously thought; he may well have played a part in the writing of *Queen Mab*. Authors writing on Shelley or the history of political satire have mentioned the publisher James Johnston in passing, but in my account he emerges as a more significant figure in the literary culture of early nineteenth century Britain.

Through this greater understanding of Shelley's textual history our knowledge of Shelley's radicalism has been enhanced. The thesis has taken into consideration the role of Paine and Godwin in shaping Shelley's thought, but has emphasized the influence of publishers who were in touch with the 'radical underworld' described by Iain McCalman, which overlapped with the thinking and contacts of a 'liberal' publisher like Leigh Hunt. A tentative generalisation can be made that the line between respectable and criminal dissent in early nineteenth century Britain was often so blurred as to be hardly meaningful.

It can be said further that Shelley's choice of publishers is revealing about his attitude to politics and society in general. The apparently diverse strategies which I have argued that Shelley could have used when publishing *The Mask of Anarchy* all have, when examined, a common thread - Shelley's willingness to involve himself with the radical underworld. Self-publishing radicals made great play of their independence, but in Shelley's case the practice meant employing a network of underground acquaintances; literary piracy was not entirely a threat to the apparently 'respectable' writer but was often an opportunity; the direct appeal to radical publishers was a possibility for Shelley; Leigh Hunt's role as editor of Shelley's work did not mean that Shelley was shying away from the more hard-nosed radicalism of a publisher like Richard Carlile, but was using an editor who himself was implicated in McCalman's 'radical underworld'.

The thesis makes an important contribution to the discipline of the 'history of the book', because in suggesting that Shelley's publishing history is very much bound up with his politics, I have argued for a sociological approach to bibliography. Like LeFebvre and Martin, I have argued that the way that a book translates itself from a thought in the poet's
mind to a physical object is a matter of sociological importance. The thesis also contributes to an understanding of the 'communications circuit' of Shelley's texts, because it offers a consistent reading of the way that Shelley got his texts into print which parallels studies by other writers of other aspects of nineteenth century texts, such as audience and authorship.

Shelley's *Mask of Anarchy* can be seen as an example of Stillinger's 'multiple authorship' because it draws extensively on Leigh Hunt's writings, and is part of a shared radical culture. The thesis is at pains not to decentre Shelley from a discussion of his political texts because I have argued for Shelley's own place in the non-publication of the poem. In this sense I would agree with Clifford Siskin, who argues that there is a place in a historical approach to Romantic texts for an 'organic' account. In other words, although it useful to place authors in terms of their historical setting, in terms of their audience and other influences upon them, as he states, 'to historicize Romantic discourse is to identify the self that produces it, and is produced by it, as something that must grow'.\(^1\) Although the function of this thesis is not to explore the growth of Shelley's political consciousness in a linear way, the thesis does explore Shelley's political texts in terms of Shelley's own thinking about the politics of publishing. In the sense that I delineate the history of the *Mask of Anarchy* in terms of Shelley's own ability to make conscious choices, I place the authorial self at the centre of the debate.

I have suggested ways in which Shelley's poetry might be read in the light of his publishing history. I have found consistency in Shelley's approach to publishing his poems, and have suggested that there is a parallel consistency in the content of his poems. Both publishing history and content demonstrate a deep understanding of the nineteenth century 'radical underworld'. *Queen Mab* derives from an eighteenth century enlightenment radical tradition which finds a nineteenth century advocate in George Cannon; *The Revolt of Islam* also engages with this tradition; *Oedipus Tyrannus* needs to be viewed in relation

to underworld figures such as the publisher James Johnston; and finally, *The Mask of Anarchy* echoes some of the complexities of radical culture in the early nineteenth century, much as I have argued that its publishing history embeds within itself not a narrative of failure, but a narrative of the possibilities open to radical-minded people in the early nineteenth century.

This work, then, represents part of what could be a wider re-examination of the role of politics and publishing in the Romantic period in general. It is clear, for example, from this thesis that there is much work still to be done on the interplay between Romantic authors and publishers. What was their role *vis à vis* one another? In discussing Shelley, I have highlighted examples from the publishing histories of the poets Wordsworth, Southey and Byron, and shown that the whole relationship between poet and publisher was a fluid one, where authorship was not perhaps the concrete entity which we would understand today, but instead an idea open to distortion and a wide variety of interpretations. The political implications of the means that such poets used to get their poems into print could also be examined. Is there a common theory which we can apply to the publishing practice in the period as a whole? Was Shelley unique in the way in which the materiality of his texts can be used to explore his politics? It is my belief that our understanding of many other writers of the Romantic period would benefit from an exploration of such questions. It is also clear from this thesis that there is much work to be done in uncovering bibliographical details of the publishers of the period - the bibliographies in the appendices are an example of what could be done; they also highlight the difficulties which are faced when uncovering textual details about publishers who were often enthusiastic to cover their tracks. I would argue that the work of uncovering such details is likely to uncover fascinating new insights about the society of the Romantic period, a society whose apparent disharmonies and contradictions are often perhaps part of a seamless garment.
DISPERAL OF THE REFORM-MEETING AT MANCHESTER BY A MILITARY FORCE.

This meeting, which has caused such universal anxiety and trepidation throughout the whole of the country, took place on Monday last at Manchester. The place appointed for the meeting was a large vacant piece of ground on the north side of St. Peter's Church, which is well known in Manchester by the name of St. Peter's-place. At half past 10 o'clock about 250 idle individuals might be collected within it. About half-past 11 the first body of Reformers arrived on the ground, bearing two banners, each of which was surmounted by a cap of liberty. The first bore upon a white ground the inscription of "Annual Parliaments, and Universal Suffrage," on the reverse side, "No Corn Laws." The other bore upon a blue ground the same inscription, with the addition of "Vote by Ballot." After these flags had been paraded over the field for some time, it was thought fit by the leaders of the party which had brought them, that they should remain stationary. A Post was accordingly assigned to the bearers of them, to which shortly afterwards a dung-cart was brought, into which the standard bearers were ordered to mount, and from which all the standards arriving afterwards were most appropriately displayed. Numerous large bodies of Reformers continued to arrive from this time to 1 o'clock, from the different towns in the neighbourhood of Manchester, all with flags, and many of them drawn up five deep, and in regular marching order. A club of female Reformers, amounting in number, according to our calculation, to 156, came from Oldham; and another, not quite so numerous, from Royton. The first bore a white silk banner by far the most elegant displayed during the day, inscribed "Major Cartwright's Bill, Annual Parliaments, Universal Suffrage, and Vote by Ballot." In one compartment of it was Justice, holding the scales in one hand, and a sword in the other; in another, a large eye, which we suppose was impiously intended to represent the eye of Providence. On the reverse of this flag was another inscription; but in the hurry of the day we found it impossible to decipher what it
was, and can only say that there were upon it two hands, both decorated in shirt ruffles, clasped in each other, and underneath them an inscription, "Oldham Union". The latter (i.e. the females of Royton) bore two red flags, the one inscribed, "Let us (i.e. women) die like men, and not be sold like slaves;" the other, "Annual Parliaments and Universal Suffrage." The Radicals of Saddleworth brought with them a black flag to the field, on one side of which was inscribed, "Taxation without representation is unjust and tyrannical; equal representation or death;" on the other side, "Union is strength. - Unite and be free. Saddleworth and Mosley Union." The Reformers from Rochdale and Middleton marched to the sound of the bugle, and in very regular time, closing and expanding their ranks, and marching in ordinary and double quick time, according as it pleased the fancy of their leaders to direct them. They had two green banners, between which they had hoisted on a red pole a cap of liberty, crowned with leaves of laurel, and bearing the inscription, "Hunt and Liberty." Another hand bore a banner, in which Britannia was represented with her trident, leaning on a shield, upon which was inscribed the motto borne by Sir William Wallace, "God armeth the Patriot."

In this manner the business of the day proceeded till 1 o'clock, by which time we should suppose that 80,000 people were assembled on the ground. During this period we found it impossible to approach the waggon, though very desirous to do so, as a young lad, not more than 17 or 18, was addressing the meeting with great vehemence of action and gesture, and with great effect, if we may judge from his audience, who were now beginning to be impatient for the arrival of Hunt, and the other orators who were to follow in his train, like the satellites which attend on some mighty planet.

The Reformers who had up to this time arrived in the field demeaned themselves becomingly, though a posse of 300 or 400 constables, with the Boroughreeeve at their head, had marched in a body into the field about 12 o'clock, unsupported by any military body to all outward appearance. Not the slightest insult was offered to them. The people did indeed rush to behold them; but this was probably occasioned by an idea that they were another body of Reformers. As soon as they saw who they were, they turned away from them with a smile; and, attracted by a crowd which was advancing from another corner of
the area, went to meet it, crying, "Let us keep peace and order, and go and welcome this body, which is one of ours."

As we stood counting the members of the Oldham Female Reform Club in their procession by us, and whilst we were internally pitying the delusion which had led them to a scene so ill-suited to their usual habits, a group of the women of Manchester, attracted by the crowd, came to the corner of the street where we had taken our post. They viewed these Female Reformers for some time with a look in which compassion and disgust were equally blended; and at last burst out into an indignant exclamation - "Go home to your families, and leave sike-like matters as these to your husbands and sons, who better understand them." The women who thus addressed them were of the lower order in life.

We had waited up to one o'clock on the field of action for the arrival of Mr. Hunt; but as he had not then made his appearance, we determined to go and meet the procession, which it was said was to attend the orator. We met it just by the Exchange, where the people were cheering most loudly, and Hunt and Johnson joining in the cheers. They were seated in an open landau, along with Carlisle, Knight, and others, and had moved in grand procession from Smedley-cottage, past New-cross, and Shude-hill, preceded by a large body of male, and followed by a scarcely less numerous body of female Manchester Reformers. Before them were carried two boards, on which were inscribed, "Order, order;" these were followed by two flags for annual Parliaments and universal suffrage, and also by Hunt's old flag and cap of liberty, of Westminster notoriety, "Hunt, and universal suffrage." This latter was held by a female Reformer, seated on the dicky of the landau, which had the honour of carrying the illustrious band of patriots whose name we have just mentioned. It was now to be exhibited in the last of its fields.

It was just opposite to the Exchange, as was before mentioned, that the individual who furnishes this report met the procession in full march: from the numbers whom he had already seen collected on the field, and those whom he then saw proceeding to increase them, he felt convinced of the impossibility of getting into any position in which he could hear the proceedings of the day, unless he received some personal accommodation from Mr. Hunt himself. He had never previously spoken to that individual, nor would he have
thought of addressing him upon this occasion, had he not known that every gentleman
connected with the London press had gladly availed himself of similar assistance at the
Smithfield meeting. As to espousing the political principles, or advocating the wild
doctrines of radical reform, supported by Mr. Hunt, it is the very last thing, if he knows
himself, that he should ever be induced to do; he holds them in as utter abhorrence as the
most loyal subject of his Majesty possibly can hold them, and will always be ready to
express that disgust in the warmest and most indignant terms. Mr. Hunt, on this
individual's asking to be admitted, if possible, on to the hustings, immediately acceded to
his request. He desired him to stand as close as possible to the landau in which he was
riding, and promised to take care that every accommodation in his power should be paid to
his convenience. He followed in the train of the Orator till he arrived in the field of action.

The enthusiasm excited among the crowd by the presence of the orator was
certainly beyond any thing which we ever before witnessed; and the cheers with which he
was hailed were loud and lasting. When he had taken his stand upon the hustings, which
were formed of two carts lashed together, and boards spread over them, he expressed
considerable disapprobation of the manner in which they were formed, and of the place in
which they were situated. This will not excite surprise, when we state, that it was so
arranged that the speaker had to talk against the wind; and also, that on Mr. Hunt's last
appearance at Manchester, the hustings were so slightly built as to yield to the pressure of
the superincumbent crowd, though fortunately no accident happened from their giving
way. After the different persons who intended to address the multitude had taken their
position upon them, and silence had been obtained, Johnson came forward, and proposed
that Henry Hunt be appointed their Chairman. Here a short pause ensued, as if Johnson
had expected that some person would have come forward to second his proposition. No
person, however, doing so, Johnson proceeded to call upon them to carry the question by
acclamation. The meeting did so, and Henry Hunt was declared Chairman, amid cheers of
3 times 3. The noise continuing longer than usual, Hunt found it requisite to entreat his
friends to preserve tranquillity. [sic] He commenced his address by calling the assembly
"gentlemen," but afterwards changed the term to "fellow countrymen". He had occasion,
he said, to entreat their indulgence. *(Noise continued.)* Every man wishing to hear, must himself keep silence. *(Laughter, but no silence.)* "Will you," said he, addressing himself to the mob, "be so obliging as not to call silence while the business of the day is proceeding?" *(Silence was then obtained.)* He hoped that they would now exercise the all-powerful right of the people; and if any person would not be quiet, that they would put him down and keep him quiet. *(We will.)* For the honour which they had just conferred upon him, he returned them his most sincere thanks: and for any services which he either had or might render them, all that he asked was, that they would indulge him with a calm and patient attention. It was impossible for him to think that with the utmost silence he could make himself heard by every member of the numerous and tremendous meeting which he saw assembled before him. If those, however, who were near him were not silent, how could it be expected that those who were at a distance could hear what he should say? A dead silence now pervaded the multitude. It was useless for him to recal to their recollection the proceedings of the last 10 days in their town; they were all of them acquainted with the cause of the late meeting being postponed; and it would be therefore superfluous in him to say anything about it, except, indeed, it were this - that those who had attempted to put them down by the most malignant exertions had occasioned them to meet that day in more than twofold numbers. *(Hear.)* *(Knight here whispered something into Mr. Hunt's ear, which caused him to turn round with some degree of asperity to Knight, and to say, "Sir, I will not be interrupted: when you speak yourself, you will not like to experience such interruption." They would have perceived, that since the old meeting had been put off, and the present one had been called - though their enemies flattered themselves with having obtained a victory, they showed by their conduct that they had sustained a defeat. *(Long and loud applause.)* In the interval between the two meetings, two placards had been circulated, to which the names of two obscure individuals were attached: the first was signed by Tom Long or Jack Short, a printer in the town whom nobody knew.*

At this stage of the business the Yeomanry Cavalry were seen advancing in a rapid trot to the area: their ranks were in disorder, and on arriving within it, they halted to
breathe their horses, and to recover their ranks. A panic seemed to strike the persons at the outskirts of the meeting, who immediately began to scamper in every direction. After a moment's pause, the cavalry drew their swords, and brandished them fiercely in the air: upon which Hunt and Johnson desired the multitude to give three cheers, to show the military that they were not to be daunted in the discharge of their duty by their unwelcome presence. This they did, upon which Mr. Hunt again proceeded. This was a mere trick to interrupt the proceedings of the meeting: but he trusted that they would all stand firm. He had scarcely said these words, before the Manchester Yeomanry cavalry rode into the mob, which gave way before them, and directed their course to the cart from which Hunt was speaking. Not a brickbat was thrown at them - not a pistol was fired during this period: all was quiet and orderly, as if the cavalry had been the friends of the multitude, and had marched as such into the midst of them. A bugle-man went at their head, then an officer, and then came the whole troop. They wheeled round the waggon till they came in front of them, the people drawing back in every direction on their approach. After they had surrounded them in such a manner as to prevent all escape, the officer who commanded the detachment went up to Mr. Hunt, and said, brandishing his sword, "Sir, I have a warrant against you, and arrest you as my prisoner." Hunt, after exhorting the people to tranquillity in a few words, turned round to the officer, and said, "I willingly surrender myself to any civil officer who will show me his warrant." Mr. Nadin, the chief police officer at Manchester, then came forward and said, "I will arrest you; I have got informations on oath against you," or something to that effect. The military officer then proceeded to say, that he had a warrant against Johnson. Johnson also asked for a civil-officer, upon which a Mr. Andrew came forward, and Hunt and Johnson then leaped from off the waggon, and surrendered themselves to the civil power. Search was then made for Moorhouse and Knight, against whom warrants had also been issued. In the hurry of this transaction, they had by some means or other contrived to make their escape. As soon as Hunt and Johnson had jumped from the waggon, a cry was made by the cavalry, "Have at their flags." In consequence, they immediately dashed not only at the flags which were in the waggon, but those which were posted among the crowd, cutting most indiscriminately
to the right and to the left in order to get at them. This set the people running in all
directions, and it was not till this act had been committed that any brick-bats were hurled
at the military. From that moment the Manchester Yeomanry Cavalry lost all command of
temper. A person of the name of Saxton, who is, we believe, the editor of the *Manchester
Observer*, was standing in the cart. Two privates rode up to him. "There," said one of
them, "is that villain, Saxton; do you run him through the body." "No," replied the other,
"I had rather not - I leave it to you." The man immediately made a lunge at Saxton, and it
was only by slipping aside that the blow missed his life. As it was, it cut his coat and
waistcoat, but fortunately did him no other injury. A man within five yards of us in
another direction had his nose completely taken off by a blow of a sabre; whilst another
was laid prostrate, but whether he was dead or had merely thrown himself down to obtain
protection we cannot say. Seeing all this hideous work going on, we felt an alarm which
any man may be forgiven for feeling in a similar situation: looking around us, we saw a
constable at no great distance, and thinking that our only chance of safety rested in placing
ourselves under his protection, we appealed to him for assistance. He immediately took us
into custody, and on our saying that we merely attended to report the proceedings of the
day, he replied, "Oh! oh! you then are one of their writers - you must go before the
Magistrates." To this we made no objection; in consequence he took us to the house
where they were sitting, and in our road thither, we saw a woman on the ground,
insensible, to all outward appearance, and with two large gouts of blood on her left breast.
Just as we came to the house, the constables were conducting Hunt into it, and were
treating him in a manner they were neither justified by law nor humanity, striking him with
their staves on the head. After he had been taken into the house, we were admitted also;
and it is only justice to the man who apprehended us to state, that he did every thing in his
power to protect us from all ill-usage, and showed us every civility consistent with his
duty. In the room into which we were put, we found the orator, Johnson, Saxton, and
some other individuals of minor note, among whom was another woman in a fainting
condition. Nadin the constable was also there. Hunt and Johnson both asked him to show
them the warrants on which they had been apprehended. This he refused to do, saying that
he had information upon oath against them, which was quite sufficient for him. Hunt then
called upon the persons present to mark Nadin's refusal. Shortly after this transaction, Mr.
Hay, the chairman of the magistrates, came into the apartment, and asked Hunt if he was
afraid to go down to the New Bailey; if he was, he himself would accompany him, and
look after his safety. Hunt, who we forgot to mention had received a slight sabre wound
on one of his hands, said, that he should have no objection to the Magistrate's company he
certainly did not like either a cut from a sabre or a blow from a staff, both of which had
been dealt out to him in no small quantity. Mr. Hay shortly afterwards went out, having
first made a reply to Mr. Hunt, which some riot out of doors prevented us from hearing.
On casting our eyes at the place where the immense multitude had lately been assembled,
we were surprised in the short space of ten minutes to see it cleared of all its former
occupiers, and filled by various troops of military, both horse and foot. Shortly after this
had occurred, a Magistrate came into the room, and bade the prisoners prepare to march
off to the New Bailey. Hunt was consigned to the custody of Col. l'Estrange, of the 31st
foot, and a detachment of the 15th Hussars; and under his care, he and all the other
prisoners, who were each placed between two constables, reached the New Bailey in
perfect safety. The staffs of two of Hunt's banners were carried in mock procession before
him.

After these individuals had been committed to the custody of the Governor, they
were turned into one common yard, where the events of the day formed the subject of
conversation. Knight and Morehouse, who had been taken a short time after them, were
afterwards added to their company. About 5 o'clock the Magistrates directed the
Governor of the prison to lock each of them up in a solitary cell, and to see that they had
no communication with each other. This was accordingly done.

The writer of this article was one of the parties thus imprisoned. Except that it was
imprisonment, he has no reason to complain of the treatment which he received. He was
in custody from 2 o'clock on Monday, till 12 o'clock on Tuesday. As soon as the
magistrates were acquainted with the circumstances under which his apprehension had
taken place, they immediately ordered his release, and expressed in very polite terms their
regret for the inconvenience to which he had been subjected. When we were once more allowed to enjoy that freedom of which we had been for a moment deprived, we took a walk through most of the principal streets of Manchester, and found that they were at that time (12 o'clock) completely under military disposal. Soldiers were posted at all the commanding positions of the town, and were to be seen extended at full length on the flags in various directions. At three o'clock, they had, however, all returned to their quarters, and the town was to all outward appearance once more in a state of tranquillity.

At seven o'clock, when we quitted Manchester, all was quiet in the town. A report had, however, reached it that there was a serious riot at Oldham, and in consequence some troops of the Chester Yeomanry were sent to quell it.

In our road to Stockport, our attention was forcibly struck by the numerous groups of idle men, who were congregated together along it. They appeared ready for any wicked or desperate purpose; and we have reason to believe that before the evening was concluded they were engaged in an attack upon the magistracy of Stockport. About a mile from that place some hundreds of them were assembled near a petty public house. A new hat, a tea-kettle, and some other articles of little value, were displayed at the window, as is customary to display the prizes given at wakes or feasts in this part of the country. This was to serve as a pretext for their meeting together; but that it was only a pretext we learned to a certainty during our stay at Macclesfield.

On our entry into that town about 10 at night, we were met by several women, who flung themselves in the way of our chaise, and entreated us for God's sake not to enter it, as murderous work was going on within it. This was not, to be sure, pleasing information; but on consulting with our driver, he said that there could be no harm in our proceeding on as far as the Royal Hotel, which lies nearly at the entrance of the town as you come from Manchester. On arriving there, our horses were seized by some special constables, and we were advised not to proceed further up the town, if we had any regard whatsoever for our lives. Of course we took their advice, and turned our horses into a yard, as they desired us. On inquiring into the cause of the anxiety which was depicted in all their faces, they informed us that the Reformers in their neighbourhood, irritated by the
defeat which they had sustained at Manchester the day before, had assembled in a body of 2 or 3,000 men, and had been committing the most abominable acts of violence in different quarters of the town. In the market-place they had broken every window which looked into it, and in various other places had done similar acts of atrocity. They were emboldened in their villany [sic] by the knowledge that there were only a few military men in the town, and that in the custody of these men, were 300 stand of arms, and several thousand rounds of ball cartridge. The circumstance of these arms being so loosely guarded, filled the minds of the peaceable inhabitants with the utmost dread, especially when they found, on going to the guard-house, that out of the six soldiers stationed in the town, two were dead drunk, and one of them the sergeant at the head of the detachment. They were all, however, persuaded to stand to their arms, and being aided by several respectable inhabitants of the town, assumed so formidable an appearance that the rioters thought it unwise to attack them. This disinclination on their part gave fresh courage to the friends of order and tranquillity; and in consequence they made an attack on the rioters, and took several of them prisoners. In the meanwhile, an express was sent off to Stockport, desiring that one of the three companies of the 31st, which had marched from their quarters at Macclesfield to Stockport, might be sent back to the former place, or else a company of the Cheshire Yeomanry Cavalry, many of whom are inhabitants of the place, might be dispatched to the assistance of their townsmen. Whilst this scene was transacting in Macclesfield, it was said that bonfires had been lighted on all the hills which surround it, and it was surmised that these served as signals to the disaffected. The first lighted was on Blakeney-hill; this was answered by similar fires on all the hills, from thence up to Northern Laney there it stopped; but at another signal, fire-rockets were thrown up from it. Whether there was any meaning in these fires or not we are unable to say; but shortly after they appeared, the rioters resumed their attacks, having first taken the precaution to extinguish all the gas-lights in the town. This was attended by twofold advantage inasmuch as it did not leave them so open to detection, and therefore gave them a better opportunity of continuing their devastations. Still, with all these advantages, they never durst meet the small but resolute band of special constables; who, under the command of
the Mayor, were everywhere ready to resist them. Some 8 or 9 gentlemen who had mounted themselves on horseback and armed themselves with swords, were of great utility in scouring the streets and bringing in prisoners, who were immediately placed in the custody of the soldiers of the 31st. We are happy to say, that in the struggles between the two parties, no serious personal injury was done to either of them. Some of the rioters got heavy blows from the staffs of the constables, and some of the constables awkward contusions from the brickbats hurled at them by their opponents; but no lives were either lost or endangered. When we left the town, which was at 4 o'clock in the morning, tranquillity was perfectly re-established; 30 or 40 rioters were in custody, and the gentleman who had gone with the express to Stockport had returned with the intelligence, that, though a battle between the military and the rioters was momentarily expected, a troop of infantry had started from Stockport, and were when he left them within an hour's march of Macclesfield. At Stockport the magistrates were assembled at the Warren Bulkeley Arms, before which the soldiery was drawn out, as that was the first point against which the rioters had declared their intention of making an attack. Similar riots were expected at other places; almost all the military being stationed at Manchester.
Appendix B - Contents of The Examiner, 22 August 1819, No. 608.

1. Leigh Hunt's editorial, 'Disturbances at Manchester'. Pages 529 to 531.

2. 'Somersetshire Politics - A New Protestant Champion'. An attack on an ex-MP, Sir Thomas Lethbridge, who had been described at a dinner as 'the champion of the Protestant ascendancy'. He had previously raised a motion against Sir Francis Burdett, so presumably was not sympathetic to the radical cause. Pages 531 to 532.

3. Foreign Intelligence. Page 532.

4. Provincial Intelligence. Pages 532 to 534.

This includes an account of the case of King v. Hynes for libel, stating that 'the defendant, an illiterate pedlar, was found guilty of selling a libel, entitled "Sherwin's signs of the People coming to their senses". The publication designated the clergy of the Church of England as a debauched and profligate set of men, and as abettors of abuse. The prisoner said he knew nothing of the contents of the publication: he was told it was a very good one. - He was sentenced to six months' imprisonment.'


5. From Saturday's London Gazette. 'Bankruptcies Enlarged' and 'Bankrupts'. Page 535.

6. Another editorial by Leigh Hunt, commenting on foreign news and further information from Manchester. Hunt was indignant that a verdict of 'accidental death', rather than murder, had been brought at the post-mortem into the killing of three men at St Peter's Fields. Page 535.

7. Further comments on items of news. This includes the petition from the framework knitters of Nottingham bemoaning their lot. Pages 535 to 536.

8. Report of the meeting at the Crown and Anchor where one of those present suggested 'we'll have blood for blood!' Page 536.

9. 'Court and Fashionables'. Pages 536 to 537.


11. 'Theatrical Examiner'. Reviews of plays, written by Leigh Hunt. Pages 537 to 538.

12. 'Sub-Pulpit Oratory. - No. 1. [Being the first of a Series of Critiques which we propose giving upon the principal Parish-Clerks of London, and within the Bills
of Mortality. After which will follow, Sketches of the Lives and Characters of some of the leading Organists, Church-wardens, and Pew-openers.] MR. MOSES MIMS, PARISH-CLERK OF ST. BRIDES, FLEET-STREET.
Pages 538 to 539.

13. 'Dispersal of the Reform Meeting at Manchester by a Military Force'. From _The Times_. Pages 539 to 541.

14. 'Letters from Manchester'. From _The Star_. Pages 541 to 543.

15. 'An address to Henry Hunt from the female reformers of Manchester.' Page 543.

16. 'Police.' Pages 543 to 544.

17. 'Accidents, Offences, & c.', 'Births', 'Marriages', 'Deaths'. Page 544.
Appendix C

A selection of works published in Dublin in 1812 (excepting Shelley's pamphlets) which appear in the British Library's Collections, highlighting typographical features. Listed in alphabetical order of printer (where known).


2. Anonymous (for John Cumming). *A Companion to the Altar; shewing the nature and necessity of a sacramental preparation, in order to our worthy receiving the holy communion, to which are added, prayers and meditations*. 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. 'Lord's Supper' in Gothic script.

3. Anonymous (for John Cumming). *The New Week's Preparation for a Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper, as recommended and appointed by the Church of England*. 'Dublin' in Gothic script. 'Church of England' in Gothic script. Other highlighted words in bold.


11. T. Courtenay. *The Apostolic and Papal Church of Rome Compared, or, The Church of Rome as she now is, compared with what she was, in the time of the apostles, and many years after*. 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. Highlighted words in bold.

1I have only included under 'Gothic script' those printers using a very similar script to that of Shelley's printer. Some printers have used a smaller version of Gothic script.

13. H. Fitzpatrick. *A Statement of the Penal Laws, which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland.* 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. Highlighting a mixture of bold, open-face type and Gothic lettering.


30. John Jones. *An Extract of Law's Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life; adapted to the state and condition of all orders of Christians*. 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. Highlighted words in bold and Gothic.


37. Robert Napper. *A charge delivered to the clergy of Lincoln*. 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. Highlighted words in open-type face. 'Printed by...' in Gothic.


41. R. Smith. *The New Week's Preparation for a Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper, as recommended and appointed by the Church of England.* 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. Highlighted words in bold and bold italics.


45. William Watson. *A Short and Plain Instruction for the better understanding of the Lord's Supper.* 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. Highlighted words in bold.


49. J. Watt. *The Eudoxologist; or an ethicographical survey of the western parts of Ireland.* 'Dublin' not in Gothic script. Highlighted words in bold and open-face.

A comparison of Shelley's works of 1812 and those published by John Stockdale between 1811 and 1813


Appendix D

A List of Texts published by William Benbow, in chronological order

1820

Print - *The Filth and Lies of the Green Bag Visiting Their Parents and Friends, or the Dandy of Sixty Severely Beat By His Wife.* Engraver: Marks. Published at 269 Strand.

Print - *The Song of Sid.* Engraver: Marks. Published at 269 Strand.

Print - *Doctors, Bishops, Judges, Generals and Statesmen at Hard Work, or a S[h]itting Committee.* Engraver: IR Cruikshank. Published at Corner of St Clements Church Yard, Strand.

Print - *A Kick up in a Great House.* Published at corner of St Clements Church Yard, Strand.

Print - *The Blanket Hornpipe by Signor Non Ricordo.* Engraver: W. Elmes. Published at corner of St Clements Church Yard, Strand.

Print - *K--g Cupid in the Corner - playing Bopeep.* Engraver: W. Elmes. Published at corner of St Clements Church Yard, Strand.


Print - *Persecution of the Saints - Anniversary. 22nd June 1820.* Engraver: George Cruikshank. Published at corner of St Clements Church Yard, Strand.

Print - *The Master Cook and his Black Scullion Composing a Royal Hash.* Engraver: I.R. Cruikshank. Published at corner of St Clements Church Yard, Strand.

Print - *Cuckold Cunning**m. Frightened at his W--f's caricature.* Engraver: J.L. Marks. Published at 269 Strand.

2 Reference sources used in compiling this list, in addition to the original texts themselves, are: Mary Dorothy George, *English Political Caricature 1793-1832. A Study of Opinion and Propaganda* (Oxford, 1959); George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, 10; St Clair, *The Godwins and the Shelleys*; Peter Mendes, *Clandestine Erotic Fiction in English 1800-1930* (Aldershot, 1993); and the British Library Catalogue. All references to prints are taken from George's *Catalogue*, whereas imprints of books are listed from the original texts. Additional information about Benbow's political career, and a list of further sources for his politics, can be found in ed. Baylen and Gossman, *Biographical Dictionary*, pp. 35-36. Texts are books, unless otherwise stated.

3 Benbow generally printed his own publications.
The Siege of Manchester, that was to be; a Satirical Poem. By S.T. Ragbotham. Published at 269 Strand. 4

The Reviewer Reviewed; being a Critical Reply to an Article entitled 'Restrictions on Foreign Commerce', contained in the Edinburgh Review for May, 1820. Published at 269 Strand. 5

An Answer to the Speech of the Attorney General. By William Cobbett. Published at 269 Strand.


Green Bag Oddities [a song - 1 page broadsheet]. Printed by W. Benbow, 269, Strand; and Published by J. Tyler, 49, Wych-street, Strand.

The Great Milan Leech. [1 sheet - caricature & text. Engraver: J.L. Marks]. Published at 269 Strand.

Woolwich Law! [broadsheet of text only] Published at 269 Strand.

1 page advertisement for The Queen’s Trial, Price Sixpence each number. Published at 269 Strand.

The Queen and the Mogul; a Play. Published at 269 Strand.


Sultan Sham, and his Seven Wives. Published at 269 Strand.

The Queen and Her Pawns Against the King and his Pieces; or, the Royal Check-Mate: A Poem. Published at 269 Strand.

Lucretia and Runjumdildopunt; or, John Bull in search of the pathetic. A Serious Musical Farce, in Three Acts. Published at 269 Strand.

The Trial of Arthur Thistlewood. Printed and published by Clement and Benbow, 269 Strand.

A Dispatch Extraordinary from the Court of Old Beelzebub, to the people of England. Published at 269 Strand.

4 Advertised in the Morning Chronicle, 14 July 1820. The Morning Chronicle, a Whig newspaper, carried extensive advertisements for publications. All dates for advertisements in these appendices are for those in the Morning Chronicle, unless otherwise stated.
5 17 July 1820
Cobbett's Parliamentary Register, containing a report of The Debates and other Proceedings in the First Parliament of King George the Fourth, begun and holden at Westminster, on the Twenty First Day of April, in the Year, 1820. Published at 269 Strand.

A Peep at the Peers. 4 editions of this. Published at 269 Strand.

The Spanish Constitution. Published at 269 Strand.

Fair Play, or who are the adulterers, slanderers and demoralizers? Published at 269 Strand.

A Peep into the Cottage at Windsor or, 'Love among the roses'. A Poem. By Roger Hunter. Published at 269 Strand.

Kouli Khan; or, the Progress of Error. Publisher: William Benbow. Printer: Coles or Soles, Thomas's Yard, Broadmead, Bristol.

Memoirs of the Celebrated Mrs. Q------. By Edward Eglantine, Esquire. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

The only authentic and correct Edition of the Trial of the Queen; containing the whole of the proceedings in the House of Lords, extracted from their Journals, on the Bill of Pains and Penalties, for depriving her Majesty of her Rights as Queen Consort, and effecting a Divorce from his Majesty George the Fourth. Published at 269 Strand.6

1821

Memoir of Mrs Dyott. By Mrs Dyott. Published at 269 Strand.7

The Political Works of Thomas Paine. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.8

Byron - Don Juan I-XVI. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

Queen Mab; A Philosophical Poem. By Percy Bysshe Shelley. New York: Printed by William Baldwin and Co. corner of Chatham Street. 1821. Edited by 'A Pantheist', i.e. George Cannon.

Don Juan. Cantos I to V. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

England's Worthies, under whom, all the Civill and Bloudy Wars, since Anno 1642, to anno 1647 are related. London: printed for J. Rothwell, at the Sun and Fountain in Paul's Church Yard, 1647. And re-printed by Benbow, 269, Strand.

---

6 21 September 1820
7 11 June 1821
8 30 October 1821
Waltz: an Apostrophic Hymn. By Horace Hornem, Esq. (The Author of Don Juan.) Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

A Full View of the British Commons. Published at 269 Strand.

A Peep at the Divan. By Tristram Pindar, Esq. F.R.S. Published at 269 Strand.

The Road to Ruin; or, An Historical Account of the Doleful Termination of Two Royal Visits to Ireland!!! Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.


A Lecture on various subjects. Published at 269 Strand.

1822

Lectures on Physiology, Zoology and the Natural History of Man, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons. By W. Lawrence, F.R.S. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.9

The Trial of William Benbow, and the Verdict of Acquittal, for publishing certain alleged licentious Libels in the 'Rambler's Magazine' and the 'Amours of the Chevalier Faublas;' with a full report of the eloquent and successful speech of Charles Phillips Esq., the celebrated Irish Barrister, against the Society for the Suppression of Vice. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.10

Hours of Idleness, a series of Poems, original and translated. By a noble author [i.e. Lord Byron]. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

Cain; a Mystery. By Lord Byron. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.


Franz Xavier Swediauer, The Philosophical Dictionary. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

The Rambler's Magazine; or, Fashionable Emporium of Polite Literature. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square. Numbers 1-5 bear the imprint of John Sudbury, 9 Castle-Street. From June onwards Benbow's name appears at the back of the issues.

---

9 18 April 1822
10 27 July 1822
The Amours of the Chevalier de Faublas. Newly and faithfully translated from the Paris edition of 1821. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square. Edited by G.C. 4 vols.11

1823

William Benbow, The Crimes of the Clergy. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

Critique from the Edinburgh Review, on Byron's Poems. Which occasioned 'English Bards and Scotch Reviewers'. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.12

English Bards and Scots Reviewers: A Satire. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

Byron, Heaven and Earth. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.

Thomas Moore, Melodies Irish and National. Erasmo Perchino: Pisa. [i.e. 'Erasmus Perkins' or George Cannon, Benbow's partner]13

A Bone to Pick for the Ranting Fanatical Irving. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square. 14

1824

Lord Byron, Cain. Published at 252 High Holborn.

The Citizen of Nature. Published at 252 High Holborn.

1825

A Scourge for the Laureate, in reply to his infamous letter of the 13th of December 1824, meanly abusive of the deceased Lord Byron, & c. & c. By W. Benbow. Published at 252 High Holborn.

Thomas Little [i.e. Thomas Moore], The Poetic Works of the Late Thomas Little. Printed for W. Benbow, 252, High Holborn: and Sold by J. Mann, Leeds; J. Wroe, Manchester; Jones and Smith, Liverpool; West and Co., Edinburgh; Stevenson, Aberdeen; J. Noble, Hull; and all other booksellers.

11 The British Library Catalogue suggests that this text was a spurious imprint, being in fact published in 1885. However, Benbow did publish a copy of this work in 1823, because he appeared before the Court of King's Bench accused of 'having published the obscene work of Chevalier Faublas' on 1 May 1823. See New Times, 2 May 1823, 6824.
12 There is no date given for this imprint. The British Library Catalogue suggests a date of 1823.
13 New Times, 19 May 1823, 6838, reports that Benbow appeared before magistrates accused of selling this work. William Dugdale had bought a copy of it in Castle-street.
14 13 August 1823
John Mitford, *A Description of the Crimes and Horrors in the interior of Warburton's Private Mad-House at Hoxton*. Published at Castle Street, Leicester Square.  

Lord Byron, *Miscellaneous Poems*. Published at 252 High Holborn.

*Confessions of Julia Johnstone, written by herself. In contradiction to the fables of Harriette Wilson*. Published at 252 High Holborn.  

1826


Percy Bysshe Shelley, *Poetical Works*. Published at 252 High Holborn.


1832


---

15 The British Library Catalogue gives a date of 1825 for this publication, but it would seem from the address, Castle Street, that it was published at an earlier date.

16 This text, which is undated, probably appeared in 1825, because this was the year that the *Memoirs of Harriette Wilson* were published by J.J. Stockdale (Junior).
Appendix E

A List of Texts published by John Sudbury, in chronological order

1822

Volume 1, Numbers 1-5, *The Rambler's Magazine*. Benbow was also named as printer of a number of issues of this periodical. See notes above.

1822-4

*Don Juan*. 252 High Holborn. 18

1823

Lord Byron. *Smaller Collections. The Beauties of Lord Byron*. 14 Gate Street.19


1824

17 Reference sources used in compiling this list, in addition to the original texts themselves, are: *A Directory of Printers and Others in Allied Trades, London and Vicinity 1800-1840*, compiled by William B. Todd (London, 1972); Mendes, *Clandestine Erotic Fiction*, Pisanus Fraxi, pseud. (Henry Spencer Ashbee), *The Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature* (New York, 1962). Mendes describes this catalogue as 'indispensable for any research into erotic book production in England in the 19th century' (see Mendes, p. xv) and his own list of erotic books derives partly from this encyclopedia. I have checked Mendes' sources against Ashbee's list where appropriate. I have also consulted the British Library catalogue. Because a number of these texts were destroyed by the trustees of the British Library, (an account of this destruction is in Mendes, pp. 466-467) I have not seen them. I have asterisked texts unseen by me which Mendes lists. It will be noted that there is a considerable overlap between the place and date of publication of Sudbury's texts and those of Benbow, suggesting that, as Mendes states, Sudbury was a 'front man' (see Mendes, p. 421). Sudbury seems suspiciously like a cipher for Benbow's activities if the date of his last publication is noted. 1841 is the date which Baylen and Gossman give for Benbow's death. See Baylen and Gossman, *Biographical Dictionary*, p. 35.

18 The British Library has a copy of the poem (shelf-mark 11646.aaa.73) published by Benbow, of which some parts are printed by Sudbury.

19 The British Library's copy of this work, like that of *Don Juan*, suggests that there was some overlap between editions printed by Benbow and Sudbury. The first title page states that Benbow was the printer and publisher, at the Castle Street address. However, another title page states that Sudbury printed and published it at Gate Street. The imprint 1823 is inconsistent with the contents of the volume, since the preface, by 'Thomas Parry Esq', mentions Byron's death in 1824. There is also a complaint in a notice 'To the Purchaser' that the work had been pirated by 'a certain unprincipled Publisher in Cheapside'. This almost certainly refers to Thomas Tegg's 1829 edition. The copy in the British Library seems to be a cobbling together of different editions.
The Modern Rake. Gate Street.*

1825

The Favourite of Venus. 252 High Holborn.*

c.1830

The Exhibition of the Female Flagellants. 252 High Holborn.

Venus School Mistress by R. Birch. As 'John Ludbury, No. 256, High Holborn'.*

? The Mysteries of Whoredom.*

The Virgin's Oath. Gate Street.*

1841

The Life of John Marsden, Bachelor. 252 High Holborn.*
Appendix F

A List of Texts which had the involvement of George Cannon, in chronological order

1810

_The Bed-Fellows._ Cannon was the publisher.*

1811-14

*Freethinking Christians' Magazine?*

1813

? Cannon involved in _The Political Censor.*

1814-15

Contributor to Cobbett's _Political Register._ Writes a number of letters in a series _On Religious Persecution_ as 'Erasmus Perkins'.

1815

Cannon edits the _Theological Inquirer._

1820

'Erasmus Perkins' the editor of _The Trial of the Rev Robert Wedderburn._

'Erasmus Perkins' the author of _A Few Hints relative to the Texture of Mind and the Manufacture of Conscience._ Published for the benefit of the Rev. R. Wedderburn, etc. T. Davison, London.

1821

Editor of Benbow's edition of _Queen Mab._

---

20 Reference sources used in compiling this list, in addition to the original texts themselves, are: Mendes, _Clandestine Erotic Fiction_; Fraxi, _The Encyclopedia of Erotic Literature_; St Clair, _The Godwins and the Shelleys_; McCalman, _Radical Underworld_. I have also consulted the British Library catalogue. Again, as with Sudbury, I have asterisked texts which I have not seen.

21 It has been suggested that Cannon was a contributor to this periodical, which appeared in four volumes between 1811 and 1814, but I have seen no sign of his involvement, except for possibly a poem written by 'Erasmus'. See _The Freethinking Christians' Magazine_, 4, 1814, p. 236.

22 This text is undated. The British Library Catalogue gives the probable date as 1820.
1822

Cannon the publisher? *The History of Tom Johnson.*

Contributor to Benbow's *Rambler's Magazine.*

1823

Thomas Moore, *Melodies Irish and National ... from the London edition of 1822.* Published by 'Erasmo Perchino: Pisa.' Advertised as forthcoming at the back of Queen Mab, Benbow's ed.*

1824


Cannon the publisher - *Vol IV. Simones Ludicri.*

1825

Cannon publishes *Amatory Tales and Histories.*

*The Favourite of Venus,* published by Cannon, using Sudbury's name.*

c1826

*The Birchen Bouquet.*

1827

*The Accomplished Whore,* by Mary Wilson.*

1828

*The Festival of the Passions, or Voluptuous Miscellany.* By an amateur. Constantinople. Printed and Published by Abdul Mustapha. 2 parts. 2nd part - author's name & place of publication 'philocunnus Glenfucket, foot of Bennavel.'*

1828?

*The Spirit of Flagellation.*

*Memoirs of Rosa Bellefille.*

*The Virgin's Oath.* Sudbury printer, Gate Street.*

c1830
Publisher of *The Adventures of Sir Henry Loveall.*

Publisher of *The Bagnio Miscellany.*

*Elements of Tuition.* Printer 'George Peacock'.

? *Evelina.*

*The Exhibition of the Female Flagellants.* London: Printed at the Expense of Theresa Berkley, for the benefit of Mary Wilson, by John Sudbury, 252 High Holborn.


1830

*The Crim Con Gazette*, Nos. III and V, gives an account of Cannon's prosecution on 10 December 1830 for the publication of *The Festival of the Passions.*

c1835

*The Amorous History and Adventures of Raymond de B----.* Printed by Jones.

c1838?

? *Virginities Vanquished.*

1840s

*Confessions of a Voluptuous Young Lady.*

1841

*The Life of John Marsden, Bachelor.* Printed by John Sudbury, 252 High Holborn, 1841. Edited by Mary Wilson, spinster.
Appendix G

Publications by James Johnston

1809

Print - *The Statue to be disposed of.* Published at 101 Cheapside.

1811

Print - *State Miners.* Engraver: George Cruikshank. Published at 87 Bishopsgate Street.

Print - *The Land of Promise!!!* Published at Bishopsgate Street and 101 Cheapside.

Print - *Paradise Regained!!!* Engraver: George Cruikshank. Published at 101 Cheapside.

Print - *Double Bass.* Engraver: George Cruikshank. Published at 101 Cheapside.


1812

*Extraordinary Interview.* Printer: Jones, 5 Newgate Street. Co-publishers, Wilson, Cornhill; Hughes, Ludgate Street.

---

23 Reference sources for the career of James Johnston are the following: Peter J. Manning, 'The Honeing of Byron's Corsair', in *Reading Romantics Texts and Contexts*, pp. 216-237; Howard Mumford Jones, 'The Author of Two Byron Apocrypha', *Modern Language Notes*, 2 February 1926, 41, 2, pp. 129-30; Graham Pollard, 'Pirated Collections of Byron', *The Times Literary Supplement*, 16 October 1937, p. 764; Philip A. H. Brown, *London Publishers and Printers, c. 1800-1870* (London, 1982); Mary Dorothy George, *English Political Caricature*, George, *Catalogue of Political and Personal Satires*, 9 and 10; Grzegorz Sinko, *John Wolcot and his School, A Chapter from the history of English Satire* (Wroclaw, 1962), particularly pp. 128 to 137, where Sinko attempts to assign authors to works written by 'Peter Pindar' during the period; ed. Marchand, *Byron's Letters and Journals*. I have also consulted the British Library Catalogue. In compiling this list, I have consulted original books where available from the British Library's collections, but prints are listed from Mary Dorothy George's catalogue. Original texts given as advertised in the *Morning Chronicle* may not have been consulted. Unless otherwise stated, all dates refer to advertisements in the *Morning Chronicle*. All texts, unless otherwise stated, are books, and, unless otherwise stated, texts are printed by Seyfang and Hamblin, Garlick Hill, and published from 98 Cheapside.

24 This periodical was still being advertised on 3 September 1816.

25 12 August 1812.
A singular letter (being the First of a Series) on the subject of the delicate investigation.
By John Agg. Co-publisher: 177 Fleet Street.\(^{26}\)

Print - Princely Agility or the Sprained Ancle. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - A Kick from Yarmouth to Wales. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - Polly and Lucy Taking [sic] Off the Restrictions. Engraver: George Cruikshank.


1813


Odes to the Pillory. Co-publisher J. Blacklock, Royal Exchange.\(^{29}\)

Print - The Merry Thought or, the Catholic Question Resolved. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - The Admiral in St. Petersburgh; Or, Poor Will Foil'd Again.

Print - Meditations Amongst the Tombs. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Rejected Odes. By Humphrey Hedgehog (John Agg).

R—I Quarrels, or Curtain Lectures at C—n H--e. By Peter Pindar. Co-publisher: J. Blacklock, Royal Exchange.\(^{30}\)

The R—I Mystery, or the Secrets of an illustrious family. A Poem, in three cantos. By Humphrey Hedgehog.

R—I Disaster; or, Dangers of a Q—n. By Peter Pindar.

1814

\(^{26}\) 11 December 1812. I have been unable to find the name of this publisher, who is not mentioned in either Todd or Brown.

\(^{27}\) This went into two editions, the second of which was advertised on 4 June 1812.

\(^{28}\) 6 November 1813

\(^{29}\) 15 April 1813.

\(^{30}\) There were at least two editions of this text.
Periodical - The Devil.\(^{31}\)

Print - The Mock Delivery of Joanna Southcott.\(^{32}\)

Physic and Delusion! or, Jezebel and the Doctors! By Peter Pindar.\(^{33}\)

Print - The Royal Sponcers A Peep in Belvoir Castle. Published at 101 Cheapside.

Print - The Ratification of Peace of the Military Mediator.

Print - The Ambassadors Return - or - a New Arrival from Congress.

Print - John Bull's Three Stages.

Print - Complements & Congees or Little Boney's Surrender to the Tars of Old England!!!

Print - Boney Crossing the Line.

The General-Post Bag. By Humphrey Hedgehog (John Agg).\(^{34}\)

The Regent and the King. By Peter Pindar.

Royalty Fog-Bound. By Peter Pindar.

Midnight Dreams; or Prophetic Visions of the Royal Brood. By Peter Pindar.

More Kings! A Poem. By Peter Pindar.\(^{35}\)


A Month in Town. By Peter Pindar.\(^{36}\)

1815

Chronicles of the Ton. By Henry Mordaunt.\(^{37}\)

An authentic Narrative of the Conspiracy against Louis the Eighteenth. By a gentleman just arrived from Paris.\(^{38}\)

---

\(^{31}\) 4 March 1814

\(^{32}\) 13 December 1814

\(^{33}\) The text is undated, but was advertised on 15 September 1814.

\(^{34}\) This went into three editions, the third edition being advertised on 15 September 1814.

\(^{35}\) There were two editions of this.

\(^{36}\) This went into three editions, the third edition being advertised on 30 October 1815.

\(^{37}\) First advertised as forthcoming in the **Morning Chronicle**, 7 December 1814.

\(^{38}\) 25 March 1815
The Evils of War' or England and its Public Charities. By James Bennett.39

The Royal Wanderer; or the Exile of England. By Algernon.40

Waterloo; an Heroic Poem, with Notes.41

Eighteen Hundred and Fifteen; A Satirical Novel. Humphrey Hedgehog (John Agg). Printer: W. Flint, Old Bailey.42

The German Sausages; or the Devil to Pay at Congress! A Poem. By Peter Pindar.

Fat Knight and the Petition, or Citizens in the Dumps! By Peter Pindar.

Love at Headquarters, or, a week at Brussels. A Poem. By Humphrey Hedgehog.

The Cork Rump, or Queen and Maids of Honour. By Peter Pindar.

1816

Dr. Syntax at his living. By Peter Porcupine, Jun.43

Periodical - The Busy Body.44


The Hour of Danger; or, Public Distress and Public Remedy. By a Commoner. Published at 98 Cheapside and 335 Oxford Street.46

The Secret Memoirs of a Prince. By John Agg. Published at 98 Cheapside and 335 Oxford Street.47

The Pavilion or a Month in Brighton. By John Agg.48

39 19 June 1815
40 6 July 1815. A third edition was advertised on 18 September 1815.
41 16 October 1815
42 The British Library's text is dated 1816, but this was first advertised on 9 October 1815.
43 The original Peter Porcupine was William Cobbett. Advertised on 30 January 1816.
44 12 April 1816
45 4 June 1816. The British Library's copy of this is dated 1819, and the work was frequently advertised by Johnston, the last advertisement appearing on 14 November 1821.
46 7 August 1816
47 14 September 1816.
48 20 December 1816.

Print - The Interview - or - Miss out of her Teens. Engraver: Williams.

Print - Noces Royales. Engraver: George Cruikshank.


Print - Economy. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - Preparing for the Match - or - May 2nd 1816 - Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - A How-Do-You-Do - or the Interview After Marriage. Engraver: Williams.

Print - The Wimbledon Hoax! Or Waterloo Review!!! Engraver: George Cruikshank.


Print - Progeny in Perspective or - A Royal Accouchement. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - The Modern Job! Or John Bull and his Comforts! Engraver: Marks.

Print - Paving the Way for a Modern Divorce. Engraver: Williams.

Print - The Ceremony of Kissing the Badge at the Installation of the Knights of the Bomb. Engraver: Williams.

Print - Improvement [sic] in the City of London. Engraver: Marks.

Print - Fare Thee Well. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - A Peep into the Blue Coat School !!!!!!!!!!!!! Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Print - A Bazaar. Engraver: George Cruikshank.

Two Royal Sinners Converted. By Dr Pendegrass. Printer: W. Flint, Old Bailey. Published at 335 Oxford Street and 98 Cheapside.

Royal Rantipoles; or the Humours of Brighton. By Peter Pindar. Printer: W. Flint, Old Bailey.

A Peep behind the Curtain. By Peter Pindar.

49 Arrowsmith and Shackell also printed this work, which was prosecuted for a libellous article. See New Times, 26 November 1821, 6393.

Lord Byron's Farewell to England; With Three Other Poems, viz. Ode to St. Helena, To My Daughter, on the Morning of Her Birth, and to the Lily of France. By John Agg. Published at 98 Cheapside and 335 Oxford Street.

The R—l Marriage, or Miss Lump and the Grenadier. By Peter Pindar. Published at 98 Cheapside and 335 Oxford Street.

Royalty Bewitched, or the Loves of William and Mary. By Peter Pindar. Printer: W. Flint, Old Bailey. Published at 98 Cheapside and 335 Oxford Street.


1817


Germanicus, a Tragedy. Published at 98 Cheapside and 335 Oxford Street.52

The Greeks Defended.53

Print - A Land Cruise on One of the Patent Hobby Horses. Engraver: Williams.

The Post Captain or Adventures of a True British Tar. By A Naval Officer. Printer: W. Lewis, 21, Finch Lane, Cornhill.


50 22 February 1817
51 17 April 1817
52 9 May 1817
53 22 August 1817


1818

Every Man His Own Blacking and Boot-Top Manufacturer.54

Periodical - The New Bon Ton Magazine.55


1819

Dr. Syntax in London. Co-publishers: Sherwood, Neely and Jones, Paternoster Row; Simkin and Marshall, Stationers' Court and W. Clarke, Royal Exchange.57

The Battered Tar. Attributed to William Wordsworth.58

54 16 January 1818
55 First advertised on 21 May 1818, and still being advertised on 2 September 1819.
56 Advertised on 26 August 1818 as appearing on 1 September 1818. The work was published serially, and advertised as 'now complete' on 19 December 1818. The British Library copy is dated 1819.
57 Published serially. The first advertisement appeared on 16 March 1819, and the advertisement for the eighth and final part appeared on 6 November 1819.
58 30 June 1819
Drakard's Emigrator's Pocket-Book; or Guide to the United States. Co-publishers: J. Drakard, Stamford; London - Baldwin and Co.; Sherwood and Co. and Simpkin and Co., Paternoster Row; Ridgway, Piccadilly; Richardson, Royal Exchange; Onwhyn, 4 Catherine Street, Strand.  


The Augustan Chief, a Poem. By Geoffrey Smellfungus.  

Johnston's Moveable Characters.  


1820

The True Political House that Jack Built. Co-publishers: Dean and Munday, Threadneedle Street; Simpkin and Marshall, Stationers' Court.

Narcissus and the Marchioness. By John Agg.  

Every Man his own stock-broker. By George Carey.  

Johnny Newcombe on the Peace Establishment; a Poem. By an Officer on the Staff.  


---

59 21 July 1819  
60 First advertised on 3 August 1819. The fifteenth edition was advertised on 10 January 1821, and Johnston's address was still appearing on advertisements on 18 July 1823.  
61 8 November 1819  
62 22 November 1819  
63 14 April 1820  
64 5 May 1820  
65 11 August 1820  
66 12 August 1820  
67 The copy in the British Library's collections is the third edition.  
68 18 September 1820
Print - *The Milan Garland or Revels Round the Vice Post*. Engraver: Williams.

Print - *The Ne-Plus-Ultra of Seamen Alias Ultra-Marine*.

*The Queen's Letter to the King*. Printer: W. Shackell, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street.


*The Kettle Abusing the Pot*. Attributed to T. J. Wooler. Printer: W. Flint, Angel Court, Skinner Street.

*A Political lecture on heads*. Attributed to T. J. Wooler. Printer: Hamblin, Garlick Hill.


*The Dorchester Guide; or a House that Jack Built*. Printed and published by Dean and Munday. Co-publishers: Wilson and Chappell, Royal Exchange; Johnston, Simpkin and Marshall, Stationers' Court; Rivington, Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; Knights, Sweeting's Alley.

1821

*The One-Eyed Coronation: a Satirical Poem*. 69

*The Cause of the Queen's Death Examined*. 71

*Dublin Mail*. By John Agg. 72

*Ross's Reply*. By George Ross. Co-publishers: W. Stockdale, 179 Piccadilly; J.M. Richardson, Royal Exchange. 73

*Upwards of Five Hundred New and Amusing Experiments for Young People*. By George Carey. 74

---

69 I have discussed in the text the likelihood of this text being published by Johnston. Addresses are not given for the publishers, and neither is the text dated. 1820 is the putative date given by the British Library.

70 18 July 1821

71 8 September 1821

72 8 September 1821

73 13 September 1821

74 28 November 1821
Print - *To Be, or not to Be!* Engraver: Marks.

Print - *Frontispiece to Last Moments of Queen Caroline.*


1822

*A Wife Wanted.*

*Defence of the Constitution.* By a Bedfordshire Freeholder.


Print - *How to Seymoure than we like - a cunning mystery.* Engraver: I.R. Cruikshank.


Print - *The Farmers Centenary - 1722 - and - 1822 - or the real cause of agricultural distress.*


*My Cousin in the Army; or Johnny Newcombe on the Peace Establishment a Poem.* By John Mitford. Printers: Shackell and Arrowsmith, Johnston's Court, Fleet Street.

*A Morning in Cork Street: or Raising the Wind.* Printer: C.F. Seyfang, 57 Fleet Market.


1823

Print - *A Noble Poet - Scratching up his ideas.* Engraver: Williams.


---

75 20 May 1822
76 24 August 1822
77 16 October 1822
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