

**F.I. DU ROVERAY, ILLUSTRATED-BOOK
PUBLISHER 1798-1806:
II: THE AMATEUR AND THE TRADE***

To enterprises like . . . [John Bell's] is Britain indebted for the extension of her literary fame: no small portion of which has been derived from the wide circulation of the British classics, promoted by the elegant & accurate manner in which they have been produced: – indeed we may date the revival of, if not the original taste for, fine painting & elegant book embellishments in England, to the enthusiasm & perseverance of Mr. Bell in that line of business – for the productions of the press may be said to have been in a barbarous state in this country, until he awakened public curiosity, & incited emulation by his beautiful editions . . . From the avidity with which those elegant publications were received, may be attributed the present spirited plans of Boydell & Macklin.¹

F.I. DU ROVERAY published a series of remarkably fine illustrated works between 1798 and 1806, but scarcely anything has been published about him as a man, and the quality of his publications has, I believe, hardly been remarked, much less studied. His work at least deserves rescue from oblivion.

Most publishers in the eighteenth century were primarily printers or booksellers; they had shops, employees, an institutional identity; indeed, the terms 'bookseller' and 'publisher' were in many ways synonymous. Aside from authors fostering their own works, such as Pope or Walpole or Blake, the entrepreneur without a shop who hired a printer and sold to the trade the books he had commissioned was quite uncommon. The only such entrepreneur known to me who published a distinguished series of literary classics is F.I. Du Roveray. So far as I know, he never had a bookshop, and he sold only through the trade.

Partly because of his institutional anonymity, Du Roveray is omitted not only from general reference works such as *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* and *The Dictionary of National Biography* but also from directories of the trade such as Ian Moxted's *The London Book Trades 1775-1800* (1977), William B. Todd's *A Directory of Printers and Others in Allied Trades in London and Vicinity 1800-1840* (1972), and *Stationers' Company Apprentices 1701-1800* (1978), edited by D.F. McKenzie.

The engraver Abraham Raimbach gives a verbal vignette of him:

Du Roveray was a merchant, a stockbroker, and by way of amusement, I suppose, occupied his leisure by publishing handsome editions of *Pope, Gray, &c.*, exceedingly well embellished, but by which it may be doubted whether he

*This is a monograph in four parts. Part I, in the preceding issue of *The Bibliographical Society of Australia and New Zealand Bulletin*, is 'The Life of a Huguenot Publisher and Connoisseur in London' by D.H. Weinglass. Part III, 'Du Roveray's Artists and Engravers and the Engravers' Strike' by G.E. Bentley, Jr, will appear in volume 12 number 3, and Part IV, 'A Bibliography of His Publications' by G.E. Bentley, Jr, will appear in volume 12 number 4 of the *Bulletin*.

obtained much profit, though he certainly proved himself possessed of some taste. He afterwards became a collector and dealer in drawings and pictures in a small way . . . He was an old bachelor, and of rather singular appearance, wearing his hair powdered and plaited in a long tail, doubled and fastened by a comb on the top of his head. He was a small man, and was accustomed to ride from the city to the west-end upon a large horse, of which he seemed somewhat proud.²

Du Roveray was a man of remarkable generosity and integrity. With the booksellers and printdealers who repeatedly failed him in honour and in obligation, Du Roveray was patient and forbearing. To Mr P,³ whom he suspected of having cheated him over a drawing of Berghem, he wrote on Wednesday [15 August 1804]: 'M^r Du Roveray . . . cannot . . . bring himself to believe that M^r P would *intentionally* deceive him, and would rather forego a part of his right than to have any dispute . . .'⁴ And again, on Thursday 16 August [1804] he wrote: 'I should be sorry you, or any one else, had it in their power to charge me with a proceeding which had the least appearance of being unhandsome.' Almost all his dealings with businessmen and friends recorded in the correspondence which has been traced seem to me handsome. (His dealings with engravers are a somewhat different matter.)

For a time at least, Du Roveray was a dealer in prints and drawings as well as a collector of them and a publisher, and these activities continued until 1810 (the last year of the correspondence I have seen), and perhaps until his death in 1849. On 5 March 1798 he invited Fuseli to his house to see 'a few drawings & prints', including some fine pieces of G.B. Cipriani,⁵ and he clearly wished to keep some of the book illustrations he commissioned for his own private collection. On 7 December 1804 the print collector Bryan Troughton Jr wrote from Coventry that he hoped next spring 'to avail myself of your kindness in viewing your collection of works of art'.⁶

The earliest record I have of Du Roveray as a dealer in drawings is in a curious contract of 27 December 1800 with Robert Bowyer, whose great folio edition of Hume's *History of England* (1793-1806) was one of the most ambitious illustrated-book ventures of the age:

F.J. DuRoveray engages to get from two to four Drawings made in the course of the next Year; — the Subjects to be taken from the History of England; of the dimensions of about 11½ inches by 8½ inches; and to lend them to R Bowyer, for the purpose of being Engraved; — who on receiving them shall pay to F.J.D. for each drawing the sum of Ten Guineas; engaging at the same time to return him the drawings as soon as they are engraved, without their being injured or to make good any damage they may have rec[eiv]ed — F.J.D. & M^r Bowyer mutually to agree upon the Subjects — F.J. DuRoveray engages not to have Engravings made from the drawings himself & if he should dispose of them, engages to procure an Undertaking from the purchasers of them, that no Engraving shall be taken, till at least 3 Years after M.^r Bowyers plates from them are published. — M.^r Bowyer engages to take the drawings on the terms above mentioned — R Bowyer

Presumably the advantages of the contract were that Bowyer kept down the cost of his designs and Du Roveray had a kind of subvention for the acquisition of drawings illustrating English history. The mode of action differs markedly from Bowyer's practice previously, when he commissioned huge oils, at hundreds of guineas each, which were hung in his Historic Gallery in Pall Mall until the engravers were ready to copy them. As is clear from the Farington Diary and elsewhere, Bowyer was in perilous financial difficulties in 1800, though he eventually completed his subscription publication, and this agreement with Du Roveray is one of the shifts by which he managed to complete it.

A year later, on 26 November 1801, Bowyer tentatively agreed with Du Roveray to make 'the exchange you mention' of copies of 'my new & beautiful work of the Egypt'⁷ for some of Du Roveray's own publications. This is my only clear evidence that Du Roveray was willing to deal in books besides his own. Plainly the attraction here was the engravings.

Occasionally Du Roveray sold drawings to the engravers who had copied them. On 12 April 1804 R.H. Cromek wrote that his (unnamed) friend would not pay the price Du Roveray asked for seven drawings but that he, Cromek, would like to buy the three [by Stothard] for *The Rape of the Lock* for £10.10.0 (see Part III, Plate 17):

I give you My *Word of Honour* I ask them *for myself*. If you will oblige me so far . . . I would endeavour to shew myself sensible for it [*the very great kindness*] by an increased exertion (if possible) in, the execution of such of your Works as may hereafter come under my Hand—

Du Roveray clearly agreed, for on 19 April Cromek sent a 'Gentleman . . . to call for the 3 Drawings', and it was only later, on 7 May, that he arranged payment, 'requesting you will stop 5 Guineas from y.^e next Plate I shall engrave for you (y.^e third) & y.^e like Sum from y.^e fourth'. On 16 December 1804 Cromek declined to purchase a Fuseli design, probably the one he engraved for *The Odyssey*, and on 30 December 1805 and 3 February 1806 William Bromley offered to buy Stothard's 'Diomed' (which he engraved for *The Iliad*) for 'a friend' for £6.6.0, the maximum he ever paid for 'things of this kind — Viz' pictures engr.^d from'.

Du Roveray regularly dealt in prints. E. Oxley, for example, arranged in letters from Hull of 23 September and 3 October 1801 for Du Roveray to supply the 'Captain of a Ship which has for many Years traded betwixt this Port & Dantzic' with '18 or 20£' worth of cheap plain or coloured prints of "*Naval Engagements*" of the *present war*; '*common Impressions* . . . not worth a Groat in my estimation, would just suit the clumsy taste of the Germans'. In an undated letter (of February? 1806), Jer. Dyson of Twickenham acknowledged receipt of a 'Parcel' with 'subjects from the Bible', apparently prints from the Macklin Bible (1791-1800), and ordered 'prints from Shakespeare', evidently the Boydell edition (1791-1805), and on 24 March 1806 he ordered more prints 'from Macklins Bible' and 'Prints from Heath's Shakespeare' (1802?). On Wednesday [15 August 1804] and Thursday 16 August [1804], Du Roveray wrote to Mr P about a parcel of seven drawings he had bought, including 'the Bergham', and asked about 'the Drawing-book of Rubens'. Mr [Thomas] Philipe, a print, book, and picture dealer of Golden Square, sent on 20

June 1808 'a note at Two months' payment, presumably for purchases from Du Roveray, and apologised for his inability to 'procure him any of the Drawings mentioned in his [Du Roveray's] Note'.

Du Roveray also sold prints and drawings made for his own publications. On Thomas Palser's letter of 28 May 1809 he made notes about fifteen 'Sets proofs' and eight 'Set[s] Etchings' for his Goldsmith, Gray, Homer, Milton, *Rape of the Lock*, and Thomson, plus '32 unf.^d proofs from Englehearts plates to Iliad', which he had sold at £20.15.0. to Palser, and on Palser's letter of 22 May 1810 he wrote:

£ 14	—————	Drawings &c	—————
£ 92. 8	—————	Pictures by Fuseli	
£ 6	—————	Books of my publishing	
£125.18.3	—————	Proofs & Etchings	
<u>£238. 6.3</u>		Sold P up to 29 May 1810	

I take it that all these drawings and engravings were commissioned by Du Roveray for his own books and that this is a record of his disposition of his stock as he was going out of the book-publishing business.

Du Roveray's surviving records of his relations with other publishers (1800-1810) are largely concerned with bad or, more often, postponed debts. Of course they are very fragmentary and give only intermittent glimpses of his activities as a publisher. They indicate how booksellers, engravers, printers, type-founders, and others in the trade were bound together in a web of exchanged acceptances or promissory notes which were often made out to one man and passed on by him to another. Most of Du Roveray's recorded troubles stem from acceptances given him by a bookseller which Du Roveray passed on to his printer, and, when the original bookseller failed to pay the note on the specified date, the printer came to Du Roveray for payment or at least for pressure upon the delinquent bookseller.

The debtor who appears most persistently in these records is Edmund Lloyd (fl.1799-1843), whose fashionable bookshop was on Harley Street. He was one of the booksellers named on the title-pages of Du Roveray's Thomson (1802), Milton (1802), Pope's *Works* (1804), *The Iliad* (1805), and *The Odyssey* (1806), and he doubtless owed money to Du Roveray for each of these, especially for Thomson, Glover, and Pope. On Tuesday 11 June 1805 Du Roveray's printer Thomas Bensley wrote to say that Lloyd's note to Du Roveray for £142.5.0d. is 'just returned to me, *dishonoured*'. On 12 June Bensley reported with 'satisfaction . . . that Lloyd has this afternoon sent the money for his Note', perhaps for a penalty or interest, but two years later, on Saturday 16 May 1807, he wrote: 'I am extremely sorry to inform you that Lloyd's Note was this day returned — £142.5s.0d. . . . which has left me nearly bankrupt at the Cashier's.' Du Roveray replied on Monday 18 May [1807] that he was

at a loss how to act towards him [Lloyd] . . . When the Bill was altered from 6 to 12 m[onths?], he gave me his word of honour that it would be regularly paid . . . Some Booksellers seem to consider it as *a matter of course* not to pay their engagements when it does not suit their convenience; but this is a System I never can acquiesce in.

And that same 'Monday Mornng.' he drafted a letter to Lloyd about the acceptance 'I had indorsed' to Mr Bensley saying he had urged Bensley not to take 'any further steps to get it paid, *till the end of the present week*'. At the end of that week, on Friday 22 May 1807, Du Roveray called on Bensley, missed him, and Bensley wrote to Du Roveray that, since he had not heard from Lloyd, he was 'under the disagreeable necessity of putting it into the hands of my Attorney.'

This produced some action, and on Tuesday the 26th Lloyd apparently paid a penalty of £83.7s.4d, but, as Bensley complained on Monday 1 June 1807, 'to my surprise . . . Lloyd has not sent the balance of his Bill (£58.7s.8d), nor have we heard any thing from him since last Tuesday'. Du Roveray therefore sat down that 'Monday Ev.^s 1 June' to draft a letter to Lloyd, saying that 'if the ballance in question be not paid into M^r B's hands *on or before Wednesday ev^s*, I shall not be able to prevent his taking legal measures to recover it, however contrary to my inclination.' On Wednesday 3 June 1807 Lloyd replied to Du Roveray:

I am very sorry to say that I really have not been able to get sufficient to send the Ballance of your Note to M.^r Bensley . . . but when you recollect the whole of my business is with the higher circles and the difficulty there is in bringing them to a settlement you will not wonder at my poverty . . . — pray do not suffer any additional expense to fall on me for I assure you it has been a very unprofitable concern to me. You will scarcely believe I have every *Book in the House* [—] not sold a single Copy . . .

The acceptance was, however, postponed a good deal longer, for on 12 July 1808 Bensley wrote to Du Roveray: 'M.^r Bensley is extremely sorry to inform M.^r Du Roveray that Lloyd's Acceptance for £142.5 — is this day returned. And he w.^d of course be obliged to him for the Cash.' On 13 July 1808 Lloyd told Du Roveray, 'I hope I shall be able to send you the Amount of your Bill in a very short time'. Doubtless Du Roveray hoped so too. My last record of this tedious business is Bensley's note to Du Roveray of 16 July 1808 that he had just written to Lloyd telling him 'that unless the money was sent in the course of this week, his Acceptance w.^d be placed in the hands of my Attorney.' Doubtless a great deal of Du Roveray's time was wasted in such struggles with men of little scruple.⁸

In his account of Goldsmith, Du Roveray remarked: 'there can be no doubt that if the lovers of English poetry were confined to a small selection of authors, his [*Goldsmith's*] name would find a distinguished place among the number' (p.xx). As a publisher, Du Roveray confined himself to illustrated editions of a small selection of distinguished English poets. Within the limits of his ambition, his success is very remarkable.

Du Roveray's first publication, in 1798, established the pattern he was to follow consistently in the rest of his books. It was a neat octavo of a popular and established English poet printed by the best printer, *ADORNED WITH PLATES* designed by some of the best book illustrators of the time and executed by the best engravers, and published at a modest price. In all he issued nine such works, steadily increasing in scope and ambition: Glover's *Leonidas* with seven plates (1798), Pope's *Rape of the Lock* with six plates (1798), Goldsmith's *Poems* with six plates (1800),

Gray's *Poems* with six plates (1800), Thomson's *Seasons* with seven plates (1802), Milton's *Paradise Lost* with thirteen plates (1802), Pope's *Poetical Works* with twenty plates (1804), Homer's *Iliad* in Pope's translation with twenty-five plates (1805), and his *Odyssey* translated by Pope with twenty-five plates (1806) — the last three works, a total of eighteen volumes, also considered as Pope's *Poetical Works*. In size and cost, they are not on the scale of Boydell's and Macklin's magnificent folio publications, but in their way they are worthy successors to them, in a size and style suited to a wide audience.

For each, Du Roveray as publisher evidently chose the poet, instructed the painters which passages to illustrate, commissioned the engravers, composed the preliminary matter, and read the proofs, as well as dealing with ordinary problems of printing and selling the works.

Du Roveray's commercial connections for his books were variable and unambitious. Before 1804 he never used the same set of booksellers for two publications, and half his booksellers he used for only one publication:

<i>Du Roveray's Co-Publishers</i>	<i>His Publications</i>
T[homas] Boosey	Glover (1798)
J[ohn] Wright	Glover (1798), <i>Rape</i> (1798), Gray (1800), Goldsmith (1800)
J[ohn] & A[rthur] Arch	<i>Rape</i> (1798), Pope, <i>Works</i> (1804), <i>Iliad</i> (1805), <i>Odyssey</i> (1806)
T[homas] Hurst	<i>Rape</i> (1798)
J[ames] Wallis	Gray (1800)
J. Bell	Milton (1802)
W[illiam] Miller	Thomson (1802)
R[obert] Dutton	Milton (1802), Thomson (1802)
B[enjamin] Crosby & Co.	Milton (1802), Thomson (1802)
E. Lloyd	Milton (1802), Thomson (1802), Pope, <i>Works</i> (1804), <i>Iliad</i> (1805), <i>Odyssey</i> (1806)

Even for works published in the same year, he used different groups of booksellers:

1798	1800
Glover: Boosey and Wright	Goldsmith: Wright and Wallis
<i>Rape</i> : Arch and Wright	Gray: Wright and Hurst

By 1804 Du Roveray's publishing arrangements had become firm, and his last eighteen volumes, of Pope's *Works*, *The Iliad*, and *The Odyssey*, were issued in 1804-1806 by the same combination of J. & A. Arch and E. Lloyd.

Many of these booksellers were notably new to the trade; William Miller's shop started in 1790, John & Arthur Arch's and Thomas Boosey's in 1792, John Wright's in 1797, and those of Thomas Hurst, James Wallis, Robert Dutton, and Edmund Lloyd in 1799.⁹ A few of these shops were not only recent but were short-lived, for James Wallis was declared bankrupt on 2 November 1801 (and again on 16 November 1805), and John Wright on 27 March 1802. Many of these booksellers

seem, then, to have been inexperienced when they undertook to sell Du Roveray's publications, and at least two of them, including Wright, with whom Du Roveray was repeatedly involved, seem to have been notably unsuccessful booksellers.

Du Roveray chose his printer far more carefully and successfully. Thomas Bensley (1760-1835) was one of the best printers of that or any age. Using the distinguished types of Vincent Figgins, he printed some of the most important illustrated editions of the 1790s, including Thomson's *Seasons* (1797), Macklin's Bible (1791-1800), and Hume's *History of England* (1793-1806), all of them in folio, as well as Blair's *Grave* in quarto (1808, 1813) with William Blake's designs. Presumably the uniform style of the title-pages, each 'A NEW EDITION./ = /ADORNED WITH PLATES./ =', was determined by Du Roveray (see Plate 1), but the care and effectiveness with which they are set out must be Bensley's. By 1798, Bensley had a good deal of experience with illustrated books, and this must have been one reason why Du Roveray chose him consistently from 1798 to 1806.

A good deal of fascinating information about Bensley's printing for Du Roveray survives in their correspondence. Bensley had cast off copy for *The Rape of the Lock* by 18 July 1798, and he wrote then to Du Roveray of his concern that the text seemed to come to only four and a half sheets (72 pages) and that, even with the preliminaries, the book was scarcely likely to amount to as much as five sheets. Du Roveray made notes on the letter about the preliminaries, which he calculated at '6 pages' for Parnell's Poem, six for the title and Pope's dedication, and eight for the Advertisement, which he called 'Observations', making one and a quarter sheets in all. As printed, they managed to swell the work to 110 pages, or eight sheets, but it was still a remarkably slim volume for 10s.6d, as some buyers observed.

A year later Du Roveray secured from Bensley an

		Estimate of Printing Gray in 8. ^{vo}		
N. ^o		p ^r Sheet		
		£	s	d
750 small & 200 large } 1000 small 250 large } 1250 small 250 large	Paper, Printing & Hotpressing, D. ^o — d. ^o — d. ^o D. ^o — d. ^o — d. ^o	9.	9.	0 — —
Advance upon the Paper —				
		10. [£]	p. ^r Cent. Disc. ¹ for ready [money].	
		5.	for 6 Mo. Credit.	

11 June 1799.

TB.

Evidently Du Roveray decided to have 1000 copies of the ordinary size and 250 large-paper copies (see below). Since there were twelve sheets of the Gray, the cost of printing the text must have been £151.4.0.

On 7 October 1800 Bensley wrote to Du Roveray:

Sir,

From a hasty Calculation — the Expense of Thomson in 8.^{vo} — 1000 Royal and 250 Copies on Imperial, Paper, Print^s and Hotpressing would be ab.^t — 300.^f I reckon for 16 Shts¹⁰ 24 lines to the page —

Since the Gray had cost only half as much, though three-quarters the length of Thomson, this price seemed surprisingly high, and Du Roveray made a series of notes on this estimate:

NB. Gray cost £12.12. p[er] sheet for the same number: Supposing the paper for Thomson of the same thickness, it ought to be (considering the advance of 20 pc[?]) ab.^t £14===, for Crown & Royal 8.^{vo} Sizes.

Royal & Imperial 8.^{vo} ought to make, according to my calculations, between $\frac{1}{3}$ & $\frac{1}{2}$ more in the price of paper. I suppose out of the price charged for Gray £8.8— for paper. Taking £4— therefore & adding it to the £14—, the sum would make together £18 p[er] Sheet

For 16 Sheets would be	£288—
Disc ^t [i.e., 5%]	<u>14—</u>
	<u>274</u>

233 lines by omitting the blanks, at 24 is 9 pages

say $\frac{1}{2}$ sheet

Suppose it printed with 26
lines the Same as
Dulau's Virgil

difference ab.^t — $\frac{1}{4}$
— $1\frac{3}{4}$

To add. for Title page, Bastard
title, & Contents not included $1\frac{1}{4}$
& advertisement at the end¹¹

$\frac{1}{2}$

Du Roveray asked for an estimate of the cost of printing Thomson in larger format, and on 10 October 1800 Bensley wrote:

T.B.'s Comp.^{sa} to M.^r Du Roveray — Calculates 'The Seasons' will make 5 Shts in Quarto (22 lines to a page) the Expense of which for 750 Royal & 250 Imperial, would be ab.^t — £15.5s.0d per Sht for Paper, Printing & Hotp^s — in all ab.^t 534, allow^s 10 p.^r Cent for Ready & £5. for 6 Mo. Credit.

Du Roveray therefore agreed for the octavo size, and on 11 June 1801 Bensley sent him

Specimens of large & Small Paper for Thomson's Seasons — As to the New Type, all I can extort from the Founder [*Vincent Figgins*] is a promise that you shall absolutely see a Specimen of it before the end of the present month — After which, it will then be cast, before we can begin. The Paper is arrived. For 50 additional Copies on the Large Paper, the Expence will be ab.^t 20 Guineas.

However, it was not until the next month that the types were finished, and on 14 July 1801 Bensley wrote: 'I enclose you the very first Sight of the Specimen, which of course will require Correcting before we can proceed any further —'. Du Roveray was minutely particular in the notes he made on the letter:

I don't like the *f*: I don't see why they might not be made nearly Straight; thus *f* — for the top part being thrown back so much has, I think, a very disagreeable appearance. The *S* are not all from the same mould . . . I don't much admire neither the bottom part of the *t*: why is there no *K*?

On 16 September 1801 the distinguished typesetter Vincent Figgins wrote to Bensley:

Dear Sir

I inclose a Specimen of the New small pica Capitals — the Lower Case is quite cast & nearly all dress'd — I shall finish the matrixes for the Cap.^s this Week — you may depend on my not loosing a moments time[.]

Bensley evidently forwarded this letter and specimen to Du Roveray, with whose papers the former is preserved, and Du Roveray in turn seems to have sent the specimen to his Hull customer E. Oxley, for on 3 October 1801 Oxley replied:

the Specimen of type is uncommonly fine the *t* excepted which will not wear well; the Size of the type will have another advantage in making the Volumes more sizeable; Gray & Goldsmith are full *thin* to bind alone.

Bensley apparently gave an estimate for the cost of printing a thousand sets of Pope's *Poetical Works* (1804), and, when Du Roveray asked for the cost of 750, Bensley wrote on 24 February 1803:

Dear Sir

The difference of Expense between 750 and 1000 (Paper, Print^s & Hotp^s will be, as nearly as I can ascertain, 40s/p.^r Sht —

If you determine upon 750, will thank you for a line in the morn^g. Should we *not* hear from you, the figures shall remain as they now stand — 1000 —

By December 1803 they were ready to begin printing — probably a thousand copies — but they were delayed by a series of mishaps concerning the delivery of paper detailed in Bensley's letters of 5 and 14 December 1803; when all was in order they hoped to proceed at an 'Average' . . . 'rate of 2 Shts p^r week'.

Bensley wrote on 1 November 1804 that he was 'ordering Paper for the continuation of Pope [i.e. *The Iliad*] . . . & I will [soon] be ready with some Specimens', and on the 12th he reported 'that, by contriving to the utmost, I have brought the expense of the papers (tho' all to be manufact^{ure}d by Whatmans) within the trifling addition of 40.^s upon the whole Bill' for 'the next 6 Vols. of Pope'. And on 12 January 1805 he asked permission 'to substitute a Ream of [*paper*] such as that we used before', because 'none of the Imperial is finished' for 'the Large Papers'. The text was finished long before the last plate was ready for publication, for five of the *Iliad* plates are dated 1 October 1806, though the title-page is dated 1805.

Du Roveray was extraordinarily successful in selling his editions of Glover's *Leonidas* (1798), Pope's *Rape of the Lock* (1798), Gray's *Poems* (1800), Goldsmith's *Poems* (1800), Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1802), and Thomson's *Seasons* (1802), and in his reply to James Norton's letter of 9 September 1807 he wrote: 'Of my former publications, even including the Milton, I have but one or two Copies left . . .'¹² No wonder he had been encouraged to go on to undertake publications so much larger than those of 1798-1802.

However, the sales of Pope's *Poetical Works* (1804) were discouraging, and judgments of its aesthetic success were mixed. On 28 November 1804 Bryan Troughton Jr wrote from Coventry of the '6 vols of Popes Poetical Works' which he had just received:

I am very sorry to see by your letter that your exertions have not been attended with that degree of success I am sure they must be entitled to . . . I left your proposals at the Library here & all the Booksellers shops . . . but without any success that I know of.

Not only were the works beautifully printed, but some copies were issued with all the refinements of collectors' editions. A list in Goldsmith (1800) of works '*lately printed, uniformly with this Edition*' reads: 'N.B. A few copies of the two last mentioned Works [Gray and Pope] remain, printed on large Paper, and containing Proof Impressions of the Plates; Price £1.1s. in Boards.' ('Proof Impressions' of the plates apparently differed from ordinary prints chiefly in the lack of title captions.) The list of works '*lately published, Uniform with the present Volume*' of Thomson (1802), reads that

A few copies [of Glover, *The Rape*, Gray, Goldsmith, Milton – and Thomson?] have been printed on large Paper, with Proof Impressions of the Plates. To accommodate the Purchasers of the above Editions, *decorated Portraits of Gray and Goldsmith* have been engraved, as frontispieces, and may be had separate, price 1s.6d. for the Proof Impressions.

The copies of Gray and Goldsmith which I have seen do not contain those optional extra frontispieces, which were evidently designed by Burney. Ordinary copies are about 19 x 11.5 cm. and large paper copies about 24 x 14.5 cm.

A few copies were printed on India paper, for Jer. Dyson wrote on a Sunday (March 1806) concerning 'the Thomson or Goldsmith printed on India paper' which he had ordered on 3 January 1806: 'the impression of the type on India Paper is very clear & beautiful'.

There were also copies of Pope's *Rape of the Lock* (1798), Gray's *Poems* (1800), and Goldsmith's *Poems* (1800) on vellum, for there are vellum copies of the Pope and Gray in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and in his draft reply to a letter of 9 September 1807 from the Bristol bookseller James Norton, Du Roveray offered

- 1 Gray on vellum (only 3 printed) — [£] 8. 8 —
- 2 Goldsmith d° (the only 2 printed) — 16.16.—

Norton bought them and complained in his letter of 25 September 1807:

The Gray is indeed on bad vellum Spotted on the Title &c — It will I fear never sell with me — and there is no portrait to that or the Goldsmith — if you have not the Portraits on Vell^m send me proofs the same size, on Paper . . . the plates to Gold^b is printed on Paper — which is a Pity: as the work cannot be said to be intirely Vellum[.]

In his letter of Sunday (March 1806), Jer. Dyson asked if there were 'any on Sattin or vellum of the Thomson'. So far as I know, there were not — but then, I have not seen a copy on India paper either.

Du Roveray also carefully elicited from his engravers twelve proofs of the etched version of each of the plates, at least for Pope's *Works* (1804) and *The Iliad* (1805),¹³ which he presumably added to a select number of large-paper copies at an enhanced price.

The prices were modest at first,¹⁴ with *The Rape of the Lock*, Goldsmith, and Gray, each in one volume with six plates, at 10s.6d. and Glover, in two volumes with seven plates, at 15s. in 1800. However, the Glover was raised to a guinea in the 1802 advertisement; the Milton was there offered in twelve parts at £1.16.0 or, 'for the large paper copies', £3.0.0; the large-paper sets of Pope's *Works* were £10.15.0;¹⁵ and *The Iliad* (and presumably *The Odyssey*) cost £9.9.0.¹⁵

Du Roveray clearly made a special effort to perfect the texts he was printing. In the first place, the proofs were corrected with extraordinary care. In an advertisement,¹⁶ Du Roveray wrote: 'After stating his belief that the RAPE OF THE LOCK is entirely free from typographical errors, the Editor thinks he may venture to promise that his Edition of GRAY shall be found equally correct.' The claim was repeated in the advertisement to his edition of Gray's *Poems* (1800):

Upon the merits of the embellishments annexed to this volume, it is not for us to decide: we shall only say that no expense has been spared (as the names of the artists employed will sufficiently evince) to render them worthy, not only of the poems they illustrate, but of the progress made by the national taste within these few years; and that every degree of attention has been bestowed on the correctness of the text (an object so important, yet so generally neglected), which we have reason to believe will be found entirely free from typographical errors. [Pp.v-vi]

And in an advertisement appended to the Bodley copy of Goldsmith's *Poems* (1800) he said:

There is reason to believe that the present Volume does not contain one typographical error. As the Editor proceeds, it will be his aim to render each succeeding Publication superior, if possible, to the preceding one. He has only to add, that *Thomson's Seasons* will be printed with the same degree of accuracy as *Gray* and *Goldsmith* . . .

These claims are repeated in the advertisement for Pope's *Poetical Works* (1804): 'the most scrupulous attention has been bestowed on the corrections of the text, and every exertion made to render the embellishments worthy of the poems they are intended to illustrate.' However, the claim is not repeated later. In his *Paradise Lost* (1802) there are at least a few typographical errors,¹⁷ and the advertisement for his edition of *The Iliad* stressed the editor's pains rather than his accuracy:

Upon the merit of the embellishments annexed to these volumes it is not for us to decide. We shall only say, that no pains or expense have been spared . . . In estimating our performance, it must, however, be remembered that the task we have undertaken is a very arduous one; so much so as perhaps to entitle us to a share of praise for the mere attempt.

Du Roveray's texts were chosen with care. The Gray '*carefully preserved every poem or fragment published by Mr. Gray's executor . . . The public may therefore look upon this as the only complete collection of Mr. Gray's poems that has appeared since the one edited by Mr. Mason.*' Du Roveray not only chose the best English classics, but he also tried to choose the best versions of them. He also took excellent advice in the editorial matter he added to these editions. As the correspondence quoted below indicates, he solicited assistance at least from the learned Henry Fuseli, and the prefatory matter of several editions contains passages from Fuseli's pen.

Du Roveray probably financed his new editions in part by selling to other publishers the rights in and copperplates for the editions he had already published. When he was embarking upon the twenty illustrations to Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1802) and Thomson's *Seasons* (1802), he sold his *Rape of the Lock* (1798) and Gray's *Poems* (1800) to John Wright. Wright commissioned the great printer William Bulmer to reprint them line-for-line in 1801, with title-pages closely modelled on Du Roveray's, even saying that they were 'PRINTED . . . FOR F.J. DU ROVERAY, GREAT ST. HELENS' (see Plate 2).

When Du Roveray saw Wright's new publications he was astonished and indignant. He was clearly proud of the standards associated with his name, and he fiercely resisted Wright's misuse of his name. He wrote indignantly to Bulmer about it, and Bulmer apparently replied on 3 September [1801?] that he had understood that Du Roveray had sold the rights and plates to Wright. Du Roveray wrote in rejoinder:

Observations on Bulmer's letter of the 3^d Sep.^r

M^r Bulmer asserts what is not true, when he says that the editions in question were printed *with my Knowledge & consent*. I knew nothing about the matter until I accidentally saw, a few days ago, one of the Copies of Gray in a bookseller's Shop. However, when I sold Wright the Plates belonging to the two works, I did not mean to prevent his printing a second edition: the question therefore is not concerning his right *in that respect*, but about the liberty that has been taken with my name, in stating on the titlepage of the books that they have been printed *by my orders, or for me*: this I conceive to be an unwarrantable liberty taken with my name, independent of that used by Wright, when in his catalogue he calls the books in question *Du Roveray's editions*. Why not to render the deception complete (for a deception has been clearly intended) state likewise that they were printed by Mr. Bensley? One falsehood is as easy to justify as another — and I conceive that I have as good ground for an action as M^r Bensley would have. If by giving up his employer, or by Wrights coming forward to take a false oath, Bulmer be sheltered, what is to prevent my proceeding in an action for damages against Wright? That I have Sustained damages would not, I believe, be a difficult matter to prove: for by means of those 2.^d editions, printed

THE
RAPE OF THE LOCK,

AN
HEROI-COMICAL POEM,

BY
A. POPE.

ADORNED WITH PLATES.

LONDON:

Printed by C. Bensley;

FOR F. J. DU ROVERAY, GREAT ST. HELENS;

AND SOLD BY J. AND A. ARCH, GRACECHURCH-
STREET; AND J. WRIGHT, PICCADILLY.

1798.

Plate 1

Title-page (reduced) of Pope's Rape of the Lock printed by Bensley for Du Roveray in 1798 (collection of G.E. Bentley, Jr).

THE
RAPE OF THE LOCK,
AN
HEROI-COMICAL POEM,

BY
A. POPE.

ADORNED WITH PLATES.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY W. BULMER AND CO.
FOR F. J. DU ROVERAY, GREAT ST. HELENS;
AND SOLD BY J. WRIGHT, PICCADILLY.

1801.

Plate 2

Title-page (reduced) of Pope's Rape of the Lock printed by Bulmer for John Wright in 1801, fraudulently using Du Roveray's name (collection of D.H.Weinglass)

on inferior paper, and with the Plates completely worn out: & afterwards passed off as my editions, and sold at reduced prices, my publications have been very much lowered in the estimation of the Booksellers; and I have thereby not only suffered a present injury, in regard to the copies I have on hand, but am likely to experience in future one to a greater extent, by several in the Trade (which has been the case already with Hurst & Crosby) refusing to subscribe to my editions of Thomson & Milton. Had the Books in question been published without my name, they would have appeared like any other edition, for which I could not be expected to be answerable: or had I myself printed 2.^d editions, I would have taken care that the paper & printing had been equal to the first, and that the Plates had been properly repaired. The inferiority in the editions, printed by Bulmer is evident; and the Public have been literally imposed upon, both by him & Wright, when those editions have been passed off as mine. I say nothing of the extreme correctness of my Books, which has not been attained without great difficulty, and which I cannot suppose to have been much considered in the 2.^d editions.

The difficulty must have been smoothed over to some extent, for Crosby, who apparently refused at first to handle Du Roveray's Thomson and Milton, allowed his name to appear on the title-pages of both works, though Hurst did not. John Wright was declared a bankrupt about six months later.

Du Roveray was not deterred by his unfortunate experiences with Wright and Bulmer, and he sold the rights to other editions as well. When he was undertaking the enormous expenses of his edition of Pope's poetry in eighteen volumes (including his translations of *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*), he needed to have a great deal of ready cash to pay his designers and engravers. It was probably for this reason that he sold the rights and plates to his editions of Glover's *Leonidas* (1798), Thomson's *Seasons* (1802), and probably Goldsmith's *Poems* (1800). But this time he made sure that his name should not be misused in the imprints of the new works.

On 23 February 1803 E. Lloyd signed the following agreement:

M^r Lloyd undertakes not to republish M^r Du Roveray's edition of Thomson's *Seasons* before a Twelve-month hence; nor to print M^r Du Roveray's name on the Titlepage of that work, or of the *Leonidas*, without the latter's consent —

M^r Lloyd also engages to erase M^r D's name from the Plates of both works, if he should desire it —

The price may have been the £142.5.0. (or about £11 for each of the thirteen plates) which Du Roveray tried vainly from 1805 to 1808 to collect from Lloyd.

As a consequence, as soon as possible, Lloyd published Du Roveray's plates in
 LEONIDAS: | APOEM. | BY | RICHARD GLOVER. | ADORNED WITH
 PLATES. | = | VOL.I[-II]. | = | THE SEVENTH EDITION. | = |
 LONDON: | PRINTED BY C. WHITTINGHAM, | *Dean Street, Fetter Lane;*
 | FOR CADELL AND DAVIES; LONGMAN AND REES; LEIGH AND
 SOTHEYBY; | OTRIDGE AND SON; CUTHELL AND MARTIN; VERNOR
 AND HOOD; J. | WALKER; J. HARRIS; R. LEA; J. DEIGHTON;
 LACKINGTON, ALLEN, | AND CO.; L. LLOYD; J. ASPERNE; J. AND A.

ARCH; WYNNE AND | SCHOLEY; AND SCATCHERD AND
LETTERMAN. | = | 1804.

Notice how closely the wording follows the Du Roveray edition.

At the same time Du Roveray may have sold the plates for Goldsmith's *Poems* (1800) to Cadell & Davies. At any rate, Cadell & Davies published in 1805 an edition of Goldsmith's *Poetical Works*, 'With an Account of his Life and Writings [as in Du Roveray's edition] and A Critical Dissertation on his Poetry by J. Aikin', printed by Whittingham with an engraved portrait and six plates after Wheatley and Hamilton (apparently those in Du Roveray's edition — I have not seen the book itself).

Later Du Roveray may have sold the plates for his edition of Pope's *Poetical Works* (1804) to Lloyd, as well as those for Glover and Thomson, for on 14 September 1804 Lloyd's agent Edmund Haines sent 'M^r DuRoveray £84 for the plates sent', and on 8 May 1805 Lloyd enquired about 'the [*promissory*] Note I gave you for the Pope'.

When the fire at Bensley's warehouse in 1807 destroyed the sheets of his Milton (1802), Du Roveray evidently sold the copperplates for it to Joseph Johnson, who had published his own (unillustrated) edition of *Paradise Lost* in 1802. Johnson published another edition in 1808 with Du Roveray's plates.

Du Roveray's fragmentary accounts with his printer Bensley and others make it possible to estimate roughly and by analogy the number of copies Bensley printed and their costs. (See Table 1.)

If we accept for the moment the plausibility of these rough estimates, and if we assume that all subscription monies came to Du Roveray, we can see that he would have almost cleared his expenses for *The Rape of the Lock* (£352.8.0) with the sale to subscribers of 360 ordinary copies (£189) and 140 large-paper copies (£147). In fact, Du Roveray told Joseph Farington on 16 December 1798, about the time the work was published, that already 'He had 500 subscribers to it [*The Rape of the Lock*], which will clear His expences'. The rest of the copies of *The Rape of the Lock* he presumably sold through booksellers, whose normal allowance seems to have been one sixth of the selling price;²² for *The Rape of the Lock*, Du Roveray would have received 8s.9d. for ordinary copies and 17s.6d. for large-paper copies from the booksellers. For the 640 ordinary copies (£280) and 110 large-paper copies he had to sell through the trade (£96.5.0), he should have received a profit²³ of about £360. The break-even point must have been higher and the profit margin proportionately smaller on his later and bulkier publications.

It seems likely that Du Roveray tried to clear his expenses for all his works through subscription sales, as he did with *The Rape of the Lock*, and to make his profits through the trade, but the only other publications of his for which I have evidence of subscription sales are Glover, Milton, and Pope's *Works*.

The stocks of *The Rape of the Lock* and Gray were presumably almost exhausted by 1801, when Du Roveray sold the plates of them, and, at the rates above, these should have realized between them about £667 in profits for Du Roveray. His expenses in publishing his later works were very high, particularly for Milton (1802), Pope's *Works* (1804), *The Iliad* (1805), and *The Odyssey* (1806), and it is unlikely that

	Glover (1798)	<i>Rape</i> (1798)	Goldsmith (1800)	Gray (1800)	Milton (1802)	Thomson (1802)	Pope, <i>Works</i> (1804)	<i>Iliad</i> (1805)	<i>Odyssey</i> (1806)	TOTALS
SHEETS	25	8	12 4/8	12	33	18	77 5/8	82 1/8	74 4/8	342 6/8
Ordinary	1000?	1000?	1000?	1000	1000?	1000	1000	1000?	1000?	9000?
Large Paper	250?	250?	250?	250	250?	250	250	250?	250?	2250?
Cost* of Paper, Printing, Hotpressing	£315. 0. 0	£88. 4. 0	£132. 6. 0	£151. 4. 0	£594. 0. 0	£324. 0. 0	£1397. 8. 1	£1461. 4. 10	£1341. 6. 1	£5804.13. 0
Number of plates	7	6	6	6	13	7	20	25	25	115
Cost* of Designs ¹⁸	£35.14. 0	£61.19. 0	£105. 1. 0	£142.10. 0	£265.10. 0	£137.14. 0	£229.13. 0	£409. 0. 0	£194. 0. 0	£1581. 1. 0
Cost* of Engraving ¹⁹	£132. 6. 0	£113. 8. 0	£113. 8. 0	£113. 8. 0	£245.14. 0	£132. 6. 0	£378. 0. 0	£472.10. 0	£472.10. 0	£2173.10. 0
Cost* of Printing Plates ²⁰	£103.15. 0	£88.17. 0	£ 88.17. 0	£88.17. 0	£192.12. 0	£103.15. 0	£291.16. 6	£380. 8. 6	£380. 8. 6	£1719. 6. 6
Total ²¹ Cost*	£586.15. 0	£352. 8. 0	£439.12. 0	£495.19. 0	£1297.16. 0	£697.15. 0	£2296.17. 7	£2723. 3. 4	£2388. 4. 7	£11278.10. 6
Cost per Vol. or Set	£0. 9. 4	£0. 5. 8	£0. 7. 0	£0. 7.11	£1. 0. 9	£0.11. 2	£1.16. 9	£2. 3. 6	£1.18. 2	
Sale Price* per Vol. or Set	£0.15. 0	£0.10. 6	£0.10. 6	£0.10. 6	£1.16. 0		£2. 0. 0			
Large Paper	£1.10. 6	£1. 1. 0		£1.10. 0	£3. 0. 0		£10.15. 0	£9. 9. 0	£9. 9. 0	

*Estimated

Table 1: Costs of Bensley's Books for Du Roveray

he sold enough subscriptions to pay his enormous printing bills on time. He may have sold the plates of the Glover and Thomson, in February 1803, in order to raise money for the huge expenses of Pope's *Works* (1804). With these massive and mounting expenses, it is remarkable that his surviving correspondence does not reveal occasions on which he had to ask to have his credit extended. Du Roveray's reliability and credit must have been very good.

Notice that the plates form a very substantial proportion of these estimated costs; in the cases of *The Rape of the Lock*, Goldsmith, Gray, and Milton, they form half or more of the expenses. The most attractive, as well as the most expensive, feature of these works was their illustrations. Du Roveray certainly sold separate copies of the prints, and perhaps he had printed extra sets so that he could do so. He may therefore have printed more than the 250 sets of proofs and 1000 sets of finished (that is, lettered) prints allowed for in the calculations above.

By 1807, when the last *Odyssey* design was published, Du Roveray had become depressed about book-publishing, and even before his *Odyssey* was completed he wished to give up his work as a publisher. On Monday 18 May [1807] he wrote to Bensley: 'As to *publishing*, every thing is now so advanced in price, that there must soon be a stop to it, and so the evil will cure itself. For my own part, I only long to have entirely done with it.' He had about this time sold to other publishers the copperplates for his Glover, Thomson, Milton and, perhaps, *The Rape of the Lock*, and his editions of Pope's *Poetical Works*, *The Iliad*, and *The Odyssey* were selling slowly. Probably the coup de grace to Du Roveray's career as a publisher was the fire at Bensley's warehouse on 5 November 1807.²⁴ Bensley presumably had stored there the remaining sheets of all Du Roveray's editions, and it seems likely that most copies of Pope's *Works* (1804), *The Iliad* (1805), and *The Odyssey* (1806) were destroyed in the conflagration. Apparently Du Roveray's most ambitious works never reached a wide public. The fire must have meant his ruin as a publisher.

Fortunately, his prints seem to have been stored elsewhere, and, to save something from the wreck, Du Roveray sold some of them to Joseph Johnson. In 1809 Johnson had published an edition of William Cowper's translation of *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey*, and in 1810 his firm used Du Roveray's plates for Pope's translation in his re-issue of Cowper's translation²⁵ and in a separate portfolio.²⁶ A note in Bent's *Monthly Literary Advertiser* for 10 June 1810 explains that proofs of the prints were available for Cowper's Homer because the large-paper copies of [Du Roveray's] Pope's Homer, for which they were made, had been destroyed by fire. A somewhat inaccurate label for the edition reads:

The Engravings which decorate this Copy of COWPER'S HOMER, were originally designed for a Splendid Edition of POPE'S TRANSLATION, lately published. But a limited number of PROOF IMPRESSIONS being taken from the Plates, in the state they came from the hands of the Engravers, and *even prior to the names of the Artists being affixed to their performances*, or if affixed, to their Autograph being changed by the writing Engraver; it has been thought proper to appropriate them to the Illustrations of a select number of LARGE PAPER Copies of COWPER'S VERSION, to which, as the quotations have not been added, they are equally applicable as to the Translation of Pope.

March 25, 1810.

Clearly Du Roveray had reserved 'Proof' copies and etchings for his large paper issue, and these were issued in the Johnson edition. This label indicates that it was prints, not just copperplates, which survived the fire at Bensley's warehouse.

As a consequence of the 'stagnation of Trade in general' in 1807, of his discouragement with the high prices a publisher had to pay and ask, and of his losses in Bensley's fire, Du Roveray apparently began to wind up his business. He evidently sold copies of the prints for the 1806 *Odyssey* to William Suttaby as well as to Joseph Johnson (see above), for a letter to Du Roveray from Thomas Palser of 4 November 1808 asks 'on what average the agreement was with M^r Suttaby respecting the impressions'. He also seems to have sold Suttaby 'portions of the Letterpress' for £256, according to letters from Bensley to Du Roveray of 23 December 1809 and 1 March 1810. These 'portions of the Letterpress' were evidently incomplete sets which had been delivered by Bensley before the fire in his warehouse in 1807. Some sets must have been defective, for new title-pages (dated 1813 and still bearing Du Roveray's name) and text were printed and combined with text printed earlier. Presumably Suttaby kept Du Roveray's name on the title-page because most of the text had been printed for him. I have no other evidence that Du Roveray was active as a publisher as late as 1813.

In 1810 he sold to Thomas Palser £238.6.3 worth of drawings, including 'Pictures by Fuseli' and 'Books of my publishing', and about the same time he sold 'Letterpress' probably for the 1813 *Odyssey* to William Suttaby for £256 and the prints from his editions of *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* to the firm of Joseph Johnson. Probably it took several years for him to recover all his credits, but by 1809 he had evidently largely ceased to act as a publisher.

Du Roveray's struggles with his debtors and engravers were a severe harassment to him, but the publications which such struggles produced seem, in the eyes of posterity, well worth the struggle. But then, the struggle was his, while most of the pleasure is ours.

G.E. Bentley, Jr,
University of Toronto.

NOTES

1. Quoted by Shelley M. Bennett, *Thomas Stothard: The Mechanisms of Art Patronage in England circa 1800* (1988), p.9, from an unidentified clipping of ca.1790 among the Victoria & Albert Museum volume of 'Press Cuttings from English Newspapers on Matters of Artistic Interest 1686-1835', p.586.
2. *Memoirs and Recollections of the Late Abraham Raimbach*, ed. M.T.S. Raimbach (1843), pp.107-108fn.
3. Perhaps the picture-dealer Thomas Philipe, with whom he corresponded about buying pictures at least in 1808.
4. Quoted from the MS in the Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
Du Roveray's correspondence below is quoted from (a) The Free Library of Philadelphia for all engravers (save Testolini, 1794-1810, in the Huntington) and (b) the Huntington Library for all others (plus Testolini), unless (c) another source is given. (An asterisk indicates that I have seen the letter only in reproduction.) The largest other collection of Du Roveray letters is that of D.H. Weinglass and M. Carbonell, consisting of about sixty letters of 1794-1810 from booksellers, print customers, and business friends, which was generously shown me in reproduction. Du Roveray's own letters are chiefly known

known through the draft replies he made on the backs of letters to him. Du Roveray carefully docketed the letters he received with the name of the sender, the date of writing, a number indicating the date of receipt, and, occasionally, the day of reply, e.g., 'R 3/4'.

5. A *copy is in the Greater London Record Office: Q WIL/ 215.
6. Du Roveray later acquired Fuseli's oil of 'Satan's first Address to Eve' (sold in 1850).
In Du Roveray's sale at Christie's of 22-28 February 1850, lots 103-108, 183 included 149 proofs for his editions of Gray, Thomson, Pope's *Poetical Works*, and *The Odyssey*, and lots 97-98 were Fuseli drawings for Homer (2, £2.2.0) and 'poetical subjects' (£7). According to Anna Eliza Bray, *The Life of Thomas Stothard* (1851), p.237, 'the late Mr. Du Roveray sold, I believe, the principal part of his collection of Drawings to Mr. [B.G.] Windus some years ago.'
7. Sir Robert Ainslie, *Views in Egypt*, a prospectus for which is with the Huntington Du Roveray papers. Du Roveray may have bought the remainder of *Il Paradiso Perduto*, tr. Felice Mariottini (Londra: G. Polidori e Co, 1796), fifteen copies of which appeared in Du Roveray's sale at Christie's, 22-28 February 1850, lot 37.
8. Du Roveray experienced similar difficulties with John Wright (1770?-1844), bookseller, who went bankrupt on 27 March 1802 (letter from Bensley to Du Roveray of 14 July 1801); with John Ginger (fl.1797-1806), a bookseller who went bankrupt on 22 June 1805 (letters from Bensley to Du Roveray of 11 and 12 June 1805); with William Earle (fl.1789-1823), bookseller and owner of a circulating library (letter from Bensley to Du Roveray of 29 February 1808); with Gaetano Testolini (fl.1760-1822), engraver and printseller (letters from Testolini and his wife of 18, 19, 20 and 23 June 1808); and with William Suttaby (1773?-1838), bookseller (*MS in the Collection of D.H. Weinglass and M. Carbonell).
9. Boosey (fl.1792-1832) was noted as a French bookseller; Wright's shop was a resort of Pitt's supporters, and *The Anti-Jacobin* was edited from his address in 1797-98; and the Arches were known as Quakers.
10. In fact, there were eighteen sheets.
11. N.B. There is no twenty-page 'advertisement at the end' or anywhere else.
12. This and all other letters to and from James Norton are quoted from the *MS in the Collection of D.H. Weinglass and M. Carbonell.
13. See letters from William Bromley of 16 June 1804, 29 May, 16 September, 30 November 1805, and from R.H. Cromek of 14 October 1803 with references to 'taking off 12 Etchings from each plate'.
14. However, in March 1806 Jer. Dyson wrote of India-paper copies of Goldsmith and Thomson with proof plates: 'These publications are very expensive & once in a way for a curiosity is very well'.
15. At least these were the sums enclosed for them in Bryan Troughton Jr's letters of 28 November 1804 and 22 July 1807.
16. This advertisement, on slightly smaller paper than the rest of the book, is tipped in to the Michigan copy of *The Rape of the Lock* (1798). It also announces that Glover's *Leonidas* uniform with *The Rape* was 'Lately . . . published' at 15s and that Gray's *Poems* with plates 'From pictures and Drawings' by Fuseli and Hamilton 'speedily will be published'. The plates from *The Rape* (1798) are dated 1 November 1798, and those from Gray (1800) are dated 1 January 1800, suggesting a date of 1799 for this advertisement.
17. Vol.I, p.239, 1.4 from the bottom: 'less that' for 'less than'; Vol.II, p.52, 1.5 from the bottom: 'God answer'd not, displeas'd' for 'God answer'd, not displeas'd'.
18. Estimated at £2.2.0 per design for Burney, £31 for Fuseli (his only known price was £31.10.0), £18.18.0 for Hamilton, £3.3.0 for Stothard (the price Du Roveray paid for his *Rape* designs), £35 for Westall, £17.10.0 for Wheatley, and £3 for Howard, Singleton, Smirke, and Thurston (about whom I have no separate information).
According to Du Roveray's letter to George Baker of 22 January 1806 (British Library Egerton MSS 2679, f.13, kindly pointed out to me by Professor Patricia Crown), Du Roveray had paid £18.18.0 for Burney's watercolour portrait frontispieces for Glover, Gray, Goldsmith, Thomson, Milton, Pope's *Poetical Works*, *The Iliad*, and *The Odyssey* (but Du Roveray was willing to let all eight go for £10.10.0), £47.5.0 for one by Westall for *The Iliad*, £26.5.0 each for Westall's last two for *The Odyssey*, and he offered Hamilton's six large designs for *Paradise Lost* at £105, the six by Hamilton and Wheatley for Goldsmith at £94.10.0, five frames of drawings for Bell's *Poets* (including two frames for Chaucer with eight designs by Stothard and Mortimer at £8.8.0), five [sic] for Thomson and one for Gray by Hamilton for £15, the two by Hamilton for Gray's 'Ode to Spring' and 'The Birth of Shakespeare' for £42, and several for Bell's *British Theatre* including one by Smirke, not engraved, and one by Westall (no price mentioned). Since Du Roveray sold some of the drawings at approximately the price for which he bought them, I assume that the sale price above is also roughly the price he paid.
19. At £18.18.0.

20. Calculated at 6s per hundred, the cost of printing Flaxman's outline plates to *The Iliad* (see *Blake Books* [1977], p.561), not adding extra for large-paper proofs, and assuming paper at £4.5.0 per ream (as in Flaxman) with 480 prints per ream. The cost of printing the etchings (probably at 3d each) is ignored here; doubtless it was more than recovered in the price (unknown) of special copies with which they were sold.
21. Omitting the costs of stitching, labels, and covers (2s. 2d each for Flaxman), warehousing, cartage, advertising, and general overheads.
22. James Edwards wrote on 4 February 1796 to William Roscoe, for whom he was publishing Roscoe's *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici* (printed at Roscoe's expense): 'The allowance I must make to other Booksellers [on two volumes at £1.16.0] cannot be less than 3/ p[er] Volume' (MS in Liverpool Public Library). This suggests that a bookseller expected to keep one sixth of the selling price per volume (3s of 18s).

In a draft reply to James Norton's letter of 13 August 1807 (*MS Collection D.H. Weinglass and M. Carbonell), Du Roveray gave the following prices for the eighteen-volume Pope:

	Trade Price	Selling Price
Imperial Octavo	£28. 7.0	£37.16.0
Royal Octavo	£14. 8.0	£18.18.0
Crown Octavo	£ 7. 4.0	£ 9. 9.0

The relation of Trade Price to Selling is slightly variable but is about as three is to four.

23. Omitting stitching, &c., as above. I ignore here the fact that Du Roveray retained the copperplates, which were vendible assets; he seems to have sold the plates for Glover, Thomson, Milton and *The Rape of the Lock*.
24. Letters from Bensley to Du Roveray of 29 February 1808 and 23 December 1809 say that he has 'No tidings yet from the Union' or 'the Fire office'.
25. *THE | ILIAD [ODYSSEY] OF HOMER, TRANSLATED INTO | ENGLISH BLANK VERSE, | BY | WILLIAM COWPER, ESQ. | WITH A PREFACE BY HIS KINSMAN, | J. JOHNSON, L.L.B. | AND ILLUSTRATED WITH ENGRAVINGS, | FROM THE | PAINTINGS AND DESIGNS | OF FUSELI, HOWARD, SMIRKE, | STOTHARD, WESTALL, &c. &c. | MEMBERS OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY. | - | [1-line Greek quotation.] | - | VOL.I[-II]. | = | LONDON. PUBLISHED BY J. JOHNSON and C^o S^t Paul's Church Yard, | and SHARPE and HAILES, Piccadilly. Printed by S. Hamilton, Weybridge. | = | 1810.*

(Sharpe & Hailes had not appeared on the 1809 titlepages.)

The extra-illustrated Princeton set includes both finished versions of the plates and the unfinished etchings, indicating that Du Roveray had not sold even the twelve sets of etchings for Homer before Bensley's fire in 1807.

26. Norma Russell, *A Bibliography of William Cowper to 1837* (1963), pp.170-173. She gives the cover-title of the portfolio as *COWPER'S | HOMER. | 4 VOLS. | LARGE PAPER, EARLY PROOFS | £7.4s. boards. . | - | ILLUSTRATED WITH | 50 PLATES, FROM DESIGNS | BY | FUSELI, STOTHARD, | HOWARD, WESTALL, | SMIRKE, &c. &c. | - | VOL.I[-IV].*

Copyright of Full Text rests with the original copyright owner and, except as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, copying this copyright material is prohibited without the permission of the owner or its exclusive licensee or agent or by way of a license from Copyright Agency Limited. For information about such licences contact Copyright Agency Limited on (02) 93947600 (ph) or (02) 93947601 (fax)