An Edition of the Selected Letters of Samuel Rogers

Charlotte Frances May, BA (Hons), MA.

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 2017

Abstract

This thesis offers an edition of the selected letters of the poet Samuel Rogers (1763-1855). Rogers was a member of extensive social networks in the late eighteenth and early to mid- nineteenth centuries.

The Introduction looks at how the study of correspondence reveals the author to be an individual actively engaged in sociability. The content of a letter, its intended recipient, and the format of the letter itself, reveals the intricacies of the cultivation of sociability. The letter fulfils four crucial functions: to inform the recipient, thank them, ask a request of them, and create future opportunities for sociability, demonstrating the multi-faceted role of correspondence.

Chapter One, 'Rogers's Reputation', examines the history of Rogers's critical reputation, which is particularly pertinent in this project which seeks to reinstate Rogers in current conversations on eighteenth and nineteenth century poets. Chapter Two, 'Rogers and his Correspondents', follows on from this by demonstrating how Rogers's correspondence sheds light on professional, political and literary identities for both men and women in society.

These chapters which recover Rogers's reputation and highlight his role in the professional development of his acquaintances, are followed by the edition of the selected letters of Samuel Rogers, including the editorial methodology for the transcriptions, the footnoted letters themselves, and concludes with summative biographies of the correspondents included in this edition. A list of all of the letters written by Rogers which have come to light during this project, are included as the appendix.

Acknowledgments

This thesis is dedicated to all those whose passion for literature and history, particularly Romantic poetry, has inspired me to pursue my own research. Two key figures in this are my PhD supervisors Professor Lynda Pratt, under whose tutelage I have thrived for eight years, and Dr Adam Rounce, who very kindly took me under his wing and has helped me find a sense of humour in Samuel Rogers. A huge thank you is owed to Lynda for taking on the colossal task of nurturing my love for Lord Byron into a productive and critical approach to literature, as well as for all the coffees, catch-ups about cats, and genuine friendship when times were difficult during this PhD process.

I am also indebted to Professor Brean Hammond: to close-read *The Pleasures of Memory* with Brean was truly a privilege. Furthermore, the School of English at the University of Nottingham has provided a supportive and passionate environment for me to undertake this research. Too many members of staff to mention in the School of English have made my eight and a half years at Nottingham the most important and enjoyable years of my life. This PhD was partly funded by an incredible twelve months as a Postgraduate Teaching Fellow, and many manuscript and archive trips were also made possible by generous bursaries. Similarly, the willingness of archivists and librarians to help me as much as possible, and provide me with material with as little cost as possible, has been truly incredible.

I would not be where I am without the inspirational teaching of Marcello Giovanelli and Maureen Chadwick. And over the last few years, maintenance of my sanity has been provided by the important friendships of Fiona Lewin, Sally Utton and her family, and the Careers and Employability

Service at the University of Nottingham. Thank you all for checking in on and me and providing parental care when necessary! Thanks are also owed to the Newstead Abbey Byron Society, particularly Ken Purslow and the late Peter Cochran, for allowing me to cathartically share my love of Byron since 2008.

Finally, this thesis would not have been possible without the positivity, emotional, and financial support of my family, especially my dad, Chris, and my incredible mum, Mandy.

Contents

Abbreviations vii

Chronology ix

Introduction 17
- I.i The role of correspondence 17
- I.ii Rogers's correspondence 23
- I.iii Thesis structure 28

Chapter One: Rogers's Reputation 30
- 1.1 Reviews of Rogers's poetic works, 1780 to 1830 30
- 1.2 Articles and commentaries on Rogers, 1795 to 1855 38
- 1.3 Rogers's inclusion in anthologies 61
- 1.4 Literary works dedicated to Rogers 72
- 1.5 Rogers's posthumous poetic reputation 75

Chapter Two: Rogers and his Correspondents 90
- 2.1 Politicians 94
- 2.2 Writers 121
- 2.3 The publishing world 139
- 2.4 The art world 140
- 2.5 Scientists, antiquaries and theologians 150
- 2.6 Conclusion 154

The Letters of Samuel Rogers: A Selected Edition 156
- a) Editorial Methodology 157
- b) Chronological Letters 160
- c) Undated Letters 358

Biographies of Correspondents 367

Appendix: Archival Locations of Samuel Rogers's Letters 381

Bibliography 392

List of Abbreviations

BLJ	Byron, Lord, George Gordon, *Byron's Letters and Journals: The complete and unexpurgated text of all the letters available in manuscript and the full printed version of all others*, 13 vols., ed. Leslie A. Marchand (London: John Murray, 1973-94).
Blocksidge	Martin Blocksidge, *The Banker Poet: The Rise and Fall of Samuel Rogers, 1763-1855* (Brighton, Chicago, Toronto: Sussex Academic Press, 2013).
Clayden 1887	Peter William Clayden, *The Early Life of Samuel Rogers* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1887).
Clayden 1889	Peter William Clayden, *Rogers and his Contemporaries*, 2 vols. (London: Smith, Elder, & co., 1889).
Wordsworth Letters, III	William and Dorothy Wordsworth, *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, III. The Middle Years. Part II. 1812-1820, 2nd edn. rev. Mary Moorman and Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).
Wordsworth Letters, IV	William and Dorothy Wordsworth, *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, V. The Later Years. Part I. 1821-1828, 2nd edn. rev. Alan G. Hill (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978).
ODNB	*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <http://www.oxforddnb.com/>
Ilchester	Earl of Ilchester, *Chronicles of Holland House* (London: Murray, 1937).
Roberts	Ellis Roberts, *Samuel Rogers and His Circle* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1910).
Sale Catalogue	*Catalogue of the library of the late Samuel Rogers, Esq.; which will be sold by auction by Messrs. Christie and Manson* (London, 1856).
St Clair	St Clair, William*, The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Table Talk	Samuel Rogers, *Recollections of the table-talk of Samuel Rogers, with a memory,* ed. Alexander Dyce (London: Edward Moxon, 1856).
The Pleasures	Samuel Rogers, *The Pleasures of Memory; a Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell, 1792).

Samuel Rogers, 1763-1855:
A Selective Chronology

1763 30 July: Born in Newington Green, London; the third of eight children born to Thomas Rogers and Mary Rogers (née Radford). Family are close friends of Richard Price who lives next door.

1776 Attends schools in Hackney and then Stoke Newington.

1781 Contributes several short essays to the *Gentleman's Magazine.*

1784 19 April: Becomes a partner in his father's bank alongside his older brother Thomas.
Begins writing *An Ode to Superstition* in the evenings.

1785 Finishes writing *An Ode to Superstition* and begins to write *The Pleasures of Memory.*

1786 Pays Cadell £30 to publish *An Ode to Superstition, with some other poems*, sold for eighteen pence. Favourably reviewed by Enfield in the *Monthly Review*.

1788 Thomas Rogers dies.

1789 Visits Scotland, where he meets Adam Smith, Henry Mackenzie, Walter Scott and William Robertson the historian.

1790 Becomes a trustee of the Newington Presbyterian Meeting House.

10 December: Attends Joshua Reynolds's last lecture at the Royal Academy.

1791 18 January – end of February: Visits France, where he sees the art collections in the Palais Royal.
21 April: Meets Robert Merry, the Della Cruscan poet, who publishes Rogers's poem 'On a Tear' in *The Poetry of the World*.
Spends a month in Wales for his health.

1792 June: Visits Salisbury Cathedral (21st) and Stonehenge (22nd).
Meets William Gilpin and Richard Sharp.
Anonymously publishes 250 copies of *The Pleasures of Memory*.

1793 June: Rogers's father dies. Rogers's eldest brother, Daniel, is disinherited due to his marrying someone his father disapproved of. Rogers therefore inherits the family share in the bank, giving him an income of £5000 a year.

1794 17 – 26 November: Attends Horne Tooke's treason trial.
Sixth and seventh editions of *The Pleasures of Memory* published, at 1000 copies each.

1795 Rogers's brother Henry becomes a partner in the bank and takes over its management.
Writes an epilogue for Sarah Siddons.

1796 January: Rogers is required as a witness in the trial of William Stone for high treason. Stone had previously

introduced Rogers to Fox and Thomas Paine. Stone is later acquitted.
Ninth edition of *The Pleasures of Memory* published.
Becomes a fellow of the Royal Society but is blackballed by the Literary Club.

1798 Meets Charles James Fox.
Publishes *An Epistle to a Friend; with other poems*, written as a reply to [Sutton] Sharpe.

1799 Tenth and eleventh editions of *The Pleasures of Memory* published.

1800 Assists in bringing the Orléans gallery to England.

1801 100 large paper copies of *The Pleasures of Memory* published.

1802 Visits Paris during the peace of Amiens.
Thirteenth edition of *The Pleasures of Memory* published at 1500 copies.

1803 Fourteenth edition of *The Pleasures of Memory* published at 2000 copies.

1804 Tours Scotland with his sister Sarah.
Meets Wordsworth and Coleridge for the first time; Coleridge instantly dislikes him.

1805 Meets and befriends Thomas Moore.

1806 August: Arranges bail for Francis Jeffrey and Moore to be released from Bow Street prison after their duel is interrupted by the police. Reconciles Moore and Jeffrey.
Fifteenth edition of *The Pleasures of Memory* published at 2000 copies.

1808 Fragmentary epic *Columbus* printed privately.

1810 Publishes *The Voyage of Columbus* with his name on the title page.
250 large paper copies of *The Pleasures of Memory* published.

1811 11 November: Gives a dinner party attended by Lord Byron, Thomas Moore and Thomas Campbell. Resolves a duel between Byron and Moore.
November: Introduces Francis Hodgson to Campbell and Moore.
December: Spends last two weeks of the year at Lord Robert Spencer's.

1812 20 January: Accompanied by Byron, attends Coleridge's lecture on Milton.
September: Visits Moore and then the Scottish Highlands.

1813 25 March: Byron asks Rogers to help with the (ultimately failed) sale of Newstead Abbey.
Byron dedicates *The Giaour* to Rogers.
Procures Wordsworth his position as distributor of stamps.

1814 Visits France during the Peace, but trip is cut short due to Napoleon's escape from Elba.
Publishes *Jacqueline* alongside Byron's *Lara*

1815 Visits Italy and then goes on to France in September and October.
Advises Byron to suppress the fifth edition of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*.

1816 20 January: Rogers advises Byron to give the money that he had turned down for copyrights from his publisher John Murray to William Godwin.
16 May: Gifts £150 to Sheridan to help with debts.
December: Robert Southey asks Rogers to help fund Herbert Knowles's university education.
Rogers sympathises with and supports Byron during his divorce.

1818 Byron writes 'Verses on Sam Rogers, in Question and Answer', which call Rogers a 'ghoul' and 'vampire'. Not published until 1833, but sent to John Murray and 'a few Admiralty friends' in 1820.

1819 Moore leaves England due to debts and entrusts his literary and financial affairs to Rogers.
Helps Crabbe publish *Tales of the Hall*, encouraging John Murray to offer and Crabbe to accept £3000 for this and his other books.
Publishes *Human Life*. It meets with more criticism than *The Pleasures of Memory*.

1821 Rogers goes abroad with his sister and niece. They part in Switzerland and Rogers visits Italy for the winter.
29 October: Meets Byron in Bologna for the first time in six years and they travel to Florence.

1822 Rogers visits Italy again and arrives in Pisa on 20 April.
Italy, a poem. Part the first published anonymously.

1823 Murray publishes third edition of *Italy*.

1825 Rogers takes two shares in the founding of a company to start London University, at £66 a share.
Involves himself in negotiations between Wordsworth and Murray regarding the publication of a collected edition of Wordsworth's poems.

1828 Second part of *Italy* is published, not anonymously as the first. Sells badly and Rogers destroys the unsold copies.

1830 Publishes a revised edition of *Italy* to include illustrations by Turner and Stothard. By December, 3959 copies out of the 4252 printed are sold.
July: Rogers provides Moxon with the financial support to publish Charles Lamb's *Album Verses*, Moxon's first publication.

1831 Rogers sends Campbell £500 to buy a share in the *Metropolitan Magazine*.
17 July: Sends a 'tribute' letter to Goethe from 'Fifteen English Friends'.

1834 Publishes major edition of his *Poems*, illustrated by Turner and Stothard, costing £7000 which he recovers quickly through its successful sale.
Rogers is elected a Trustee of the National Gallery.

1836 Meets Thomas Carlyle, who initially likes him.

1837 Autumn: Visits Thomas Moore.
Regularly meets with Henry Crabb Robinson.

1839 February: Initiates the Public Library project with Carlyle, which is supported by *The Times* and *The Examiner*.
September: Meets Charles Dickens in Broadstairs.

1840 August: Dickens dedicates *Master Humphrey's Clock*, including *The Old Curiousity Shop* and *Barnaby Rudge,* to Rogers.

1841 Rogers financially sets up the poet and novelist Thomas Miller as a London bookseller.

1842 Frequently dines with Dickens, Crabb Robinson, Carlyle and Longfellow.
Contributes to Mary Macarthur's poetry collection *The Necropolis: an Elegy. And Other Poems*.

1843 Rogers lends Wordsworth his court suit when he is appointed Poet Laureate.
Rogers's bank is robbed: £40000 in notes and £1000 in gold are stolen from a safe. The money is later recovered after two years, but Lord Ashburne, Lord Lansdowne, Sydney Smith and Lady Grey financially assist Rogers.

1845 Featured as 'Mr Rhymer' in Lady Blessington's novel *Strathern: Or, Life at home and abroad.*

1846 Visits Broadstairs where he sees Dickens. Relationships with Dickens and the Carlyles begin to decline.

1847 20 November: Collaborates with Crabb Robinson to help him organise an exhibition of Flaxman's works.

1848 Frequently dines with Crabb Robinson.

1849 31 March: Meets Elizabeth Gaskell at Dickens's dinner party.

1850 May: Rogers declines the Poet Laureateship after the death of Wordsworth, and advises that Tennyson receive it. He offers Tennyson a suit to wear on accepting the Laureateship (as he had done for Wordsworth).
June: Rogers is knocked down by a passing carriage and fractures his thigh bone, making it difficult for him to move around.
September: Takes up residence in Brighton with his sister.

1855 18 December: Rogers dies at 22 St James's Place, London.

I. Introduction
Letter Writing and Samuel Rogers

'I take great shame to myself – but I am a sorry correspondent, & pray, pray come to me, not write to me when you want an answer.'[1]

Samuel Rogers's most recent biographer, Martin Blocksidge, describes Rogers as an 'unenthusiastic correspondent'.[2] However, the survival of more than 700 manuscript letters written by Samuel Rogers suggests that this was not the case. These letters demonstrate not only that Rogers was one of the best-connected individuals in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but also that the letters themselves often preceded social meetings, evaluated them, or discussed potential future ones; therefore, correspondence was pivotal in sculpting the social life of Samuel Rogers.

I.i The role of correspondence

Correspondence is a crucial avenue through which to demonstrate the interconnectivity of literary and political individuals during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Correspondence links both social and spatial places: a study of correspondence produces a map of communication, demonstrating that the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were times when social networks were a key part of professional and domestic identity, and that such networks were not necessarily divided by gender or class. Furthermore, the correspondence of Rogers suggests that Romantic counter-

[1] See letter 59. For a calendar of Rogers's letters, see Appendix.
[2] From 'Notes on Texts and Editions', *Blocksidge*.

culture does not exist as an antithesis to the culture of the establishment. For example, there is no evidence that Rogers ever met William Blake, but they had friends in common, such as George Cumberland, John Flaxman and Isaac D'Israeli. This connection of different social demographics demonstrates the crucial role of correspondence in enabling historians to revaluate social structures: for women particularly, Barker-Benfield explains how 'Reading and writing letters were embedded in the economic prosperity signified by literacy, privacy, and the invention of the penny post in 1680'.[3] Space in the domestic home, particularly for the middle-classes, was often reserved for letter writing.

The writing, sending and receiving of letters was a priority in the lives of Rogers and his acquaintances, and letter writing in itself was an important part of an individual's livelihood. In his 1831 essay 'The Letter-Bell', William Hazlitt laments the replacement of the post-boy with the depersonalised and utilitarian function of the mail coach, implying that letter writing was beginning to take on a more business-like and less sentimental function.[4] Similarly, De Quincey's 1849 essay 'The English Mail-Coach' highlights the importance of the mail-coach in every day society: 'the modern modes of travelling cannot compare with the mail-coach system in grandeur and power', depicting the mail-coach as a social oddity and object of interest due to the protection it was granted by law.[5]

---

[3] G. J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-century Britain* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), p.162.
[4] William Hazlitt, 'The Letter Bell', *Athenaeum,* April 1831, pp.191-194.
[5] Thomas De Quincey, 'The English Mail-Coach', *Confessions of an English Opium Eater and Other Writings*, ed. Grevel Lindop (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p.193.

The less sentimental and more business-like function of the letter does not, however, diminish its importance or disempower correspondence as a vehicle for the voiceless (such as those who lived away from busy social spaces, and those politically disenfranchised). Favret refers to the era of the mail-coach as 'post-epistolary […] where one reads the movements of the mail coach, not the vagaries of epistolary sentiment, and where one begs the postman, not the lover, for correspondence'.[6] This indeed echoes Hazlitt's dependence on the mail-coach for his communication and professional dealings, and although it may de-romanticise and functionalise correspondence, the technological innovations within the postal industry increased the speed at which letters were received, and consequently the speed at which it was necessary to write. Rogers's short letters are an example of this.

Many of Rogers's letters contained within this thesis are invitations, cancellations and thank-you notes. These letters are like a calling card: they mark a date, time and place of visitation as well as an intent to visit. They demonstrate the interconnectivity of individuals and networks, and show that spheres such as the 'political' and the 'literary' simply do not exist in isolation. An informative way to look at this fluidity of spheres is through Tuite's theory of Romantic sociability (although as Rogers both preceded and succeeded the Romantic period, it is best to be cautious about using concepts of Romanticism as the best lens through which to view his life and work). Nonetheless, Tuite's definition of Romantic sociability articulates the fluidity of the social spheres that Rogers inhabited: 'our own definition of "Romantic sociability" is not to focus solely on the sociability of literary circles but to

---

[6] Mary A. Favret, *Romantic Correspondence: Women, Politics and the Fiction of Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p.196.

recognize its fluid interplay with other modes of sociability within British society as a whole'.[7] Consequently, evaluating Romanticism in these terms regards it as not just a literary movement but as one heavily influenced by the politics and sciences of its day.

A useful discussion of what constitutes a letter is highlighted in Anderson, Daghlian and Ehrenpreis's discussion on the correspondence of the earlier eighteenth century:

> A letter has an address and a date; it is written for a certain recipient, and may often be concerned with matters of a particular time. If it is one of a series of letters to the same correspondent, it may be affected by a sort of momentum given by their previous interchange. Its style is conditioned by these facts, and also by many other considerations present in the mind of the writer as he begins to write.[8]

This 'momentum' is particularly applicable to Rogers, who often continues correspondence with individuals through decades. It can also make it difficult to trace discussion and chart the development of correspondence between recipients, as inevitably a complete collection of correspondence is a rarity.

To work on personal letters is a privilege for the researcher. Letters are not merely communications but possessions, handled by generations and kept or edited in commonplace books and autograph albums in many instances. As such they not only contain the residue of the generations

---

[7] Gillian Russell and Clara Tuite (eds.), *Romantic Sociability: Social Networks and Literary Culture in Britain, 1770-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.19.

[8] Howard Anderson, Philip B. Daghlien, Irvin Ehrenpreis (eds.), *The Familiar Letter in the Eighteenth Century* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1966), p.2.

post-Rogers who kept and used the letters, but frequently preserve the situational context of the letter-writer and letter-reader (who is not always the recipient).

With this functionality of letter writing in mind, it is important to consider the voice in the letters, particularly when regarding authenticity. Vulliamy's 1945 *English Letter Writers* claims that a letter shows 'the writer without his guard or defences, uncovers all his thoughts and feelings […] Of all documents these are the most essentially human'.[9] Although Vulliamy exempts the eighteenth-century open letter from this definition, the idea of the letter-confessional is indeed a pervasive one in cultural memory. As Lovelace states in the epistolary novel *Clarissa,* 'I love to write to the *moment*'.[10] Lovelace's 'moment' suggests that a confessional reflection of an individual's current situation is a more authentic representation of the self, as opposed to a retrospective representation. However, the very construction of character suggests that this representation is indeed performative, and it is this notion of the represented self in correspondence as performative, that can be seen in Rogers's letters.

Bushell views old-fashioned authorial intention as an 'outmoded conception of the author as controlling presence and of writing as an expressive act by a unique individual'.[11] There are other challenges to the view of the in-the-moment writer: it may be more or less reflective of some individuals, but Rogers's writing regime when it came to both correspondence and poetry was certainly not spontaneous. His writing is methodical, each line taking up the breadth of the page and any words that

---

[9] C. E. Vulliamy, *English Letter Writers* (London: Collins, 1945), p.7.
[10] Samuel Richardson, *Clarissa: Or, the History of a Young Lady*, Vol. 4 (London: Samuel Richardson, 1751), p.163.
[11] Sally Bushell, *Text as process: creative composition in Tennyson Wordsworth and Dickinson* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009), p.47.

did not fit on one line hyphenated instead of squeezed into a small amount of space. Similarly, there is no evidence of cross-hatching in his letters. This is reflective of an individual who had both the time and money to fill extensive space in letters.

This thesis attempts to recover Rogers's significance by providing an edition of selections from his surviving letters. It provides a wealth of information about those to whom the individual was connected as well as Rogers himself. Although current research on Rogers as an individual is limited, the historical investigations of similar projects on other individuals have acknowledged Rogers as an active participant in socially and spatially wide-reaching networks. These include the online editions of the *Collected Letters of Robert Southey*, edited by Lynda Pratt, Tim Fulford and Ian Packer (published by Romantic Circles), and *The Henry Crabb Robinson Project*, edited by Timothy Whelan and James Vigus (Queen Mary University of London). In print, the *Letters of Thomas Moore* (Jeffery Vail, 2013) and *Byron's Letters and Journals* (Leslie Marchand, 1973-1994) provide critical precedents for an edition of correspondence that sheds light on canonical literary and political networks, and indeed proves that the success of sociability is dependent on the diversity of networked participants, and not the dominance of a particular person.

These studies have, however, framed Rogers from perspectives not cultivated by the man himself. The narrative of authenticity surrounding studies such as these is further complicated: Rogers himself is not a truthful correspondent. Rogers's identity as a correspondent is an inescapably performative one. Rogers's letters demonstrate that even responding to friends was a type of business arrangement, and this function can be seen through the relationships with correspondents that I analyse in Chapter Two.

I.ii Rogers's Correspondence

As well as the business function of the letter reducing its length and content, the practicalities of letter writing became more difficult as Rogers's age increased, which undoubtedly impacted the quantity of correspondence that Rogers could physically write. It is in the latter half of his life that Rogers's pleasure in letter writing ceases, as the process became time-consuming and difficult for an individual who enjoyed inviting people into his home, and whose illnesses meant that letters were often cancellations of engagements and genuinely difficult to write.

Rogers's own geographical positioning meant that he was not as dependent upon the reliability of the mail coach as many of those in more remote locations may have been. From 1805 onwards, Rogers resided at 22 St James's Place, London, enabling the hand delivery of letters and escaping the delays of the postal system. The correspondence from Rogers to Holland House, for example, demonstrates how the hand delivery of letters meant that a letter could be brief because the very distance that the Hollands or Rogers would travel to meet was very short in itself. The longer letter was not required when the opportunity to meet was so frequent and easy due to the location of the correspondents, and also due to the very fact that Rogers could afford to have letters hand delivered within a reasonable distance.

Despite this utilitarian function of letters, Rogers still used them as a vehicle for dialogue. Rogers's carefully chosen words, his topics of discussion, the correspondents of the letters themselves, as well as Rogers's attitude to letter writing as a mode of communication, reveal the complexities of sociability in

the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. There is also a situational context that can be derived from the physical letters themselves. For example, Rogers's handwriting is generally a consistent and readable one for the correspondent as well as the subsequent intended (and unintended) audiences, but there are instances (footnoted in this thesis) where this handwriting is different, often related to Rogers's health or a change in place from where Rogers is writing.

Despite the inevitable revelations of the situational context of Rogers as letter writer, I would argue strongly that the narrative in Rogers's letters is a distinctly performative one. One such example is Rogers's opening in a letter to Lord Holland: 'As I threatened you with a letter, write I will, though I can do nothing but give you the dramatis personae'.[12] Rogers dramatically introduces the letter as a 'threat', implying that the letter may be time consuming, and by referring to the individuals mentioned as 'dramatis personae', Rogers accurately reflects how his letters often read like a theatrical play-bill, due to the lists of names mentioned throughout. Through his letters we can construct a carefully built network, with individuals through whose acquaintance Rogers could either benefit or bestow favours. Moreover, through the physical examination of these letters, we can see that Rogers is careful in his writing, and that his even, consistent hand suggests a professional writer. As Rogers's first biographer Clayden emphasised, Rogers often destroyed drafts or publications (such as the 1822 first edition of *Italy*) that did not live up to the public's- and his own- stringent expectations; we can understand Rogers as a self-conscious writer, who by destroying drafts of his own work attempted to hand-pick his material historical presence. Consequently, the letters in this

[12] See letter 42.

thesis can be seen as an edited collection of Rogers's already self-edited correspondence, and although there are undoubtedly moments of sincere thought and feeling present in them, Rogers's self-conscious practices cultivated his particular letter-writing persona, representing himself in a particular way to particular audiences. This, alongside his lateness in responding, may also account for why he called himself a 'sorry correspondent', as his letters took time and thought (and potential drafting) so could be delivered late or delayed; furthermore, as an individual keen on telling the stories of the notable people he had met and exhibiting his art collection, as well as inviting people to his breakfast table, Rogers was an individual whose sociability was in the form of his physical presence as well as writing.

Many letters written by Rogers were incorporated into the biographies completed by Clayden. Although Clayden was given access to the family papers by the descendants of Rogers's sister, and used them extensively and thoroughly, he did not take this aspect of performativity into account. Clayden's first major work on Rogers was *The Early Life of Samuel Rogers* (1887), which finishes at the point that Rogers moves into 22 St James's Place in 1805. This volume presents Rogers's earliest and longest letters, with perhaps the level of performativity we see in his later letters less prevalent. This first biography leaves Rogers when he is in his early forties, and covers his education at Newington Green, his early connections such as Dr Richard Price, Joseph Priestley, Anna Letitia Barbauld and her family, and Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin. Clayden followed this publication with the two volume *Rogers and his Contemporaries* in 1889, which features hundreds of letters to and from Rogers. This not only charts the life of Rogers, but critically puts him at the centre of an

evolving and important series of generational and positional networks, through which nearly every canonical literary and political figure of the early to mid-nineteenth century is presented. Clayden states that 'for fifty years Rogers was a prominent- for a long time the most prominent- figure in London life', and these biographies demonstrate the interconnectivity of figures in society.[13]

Although Rogers is often referred to as a 'banker-poet', this is an unfair dismissal of the many dimensions to his public persona, and Clayden not only demonstrated at the end of *The Early Life* that Rogers ceased active participation in the family business of banking in 1795, but also that his poetic pursuits were paralleled by his (although not overtly) political interests and commercial enterprises. If we are to acknowledge Rogers as a 'banker-poet', we would have to amend this title accordingly to 'banker-poet-collector-philanthropist-patron-commercialist', and not necessarily in that order. Clayden acknowledges the multi-dimensional character of Rogers through his biographies.

Conscious of the sensitivity of publishing letters of the previous generation, Clayden admitted that when he could not trace the heirs of particular letters that he wished to publish, he only printed those letters 'where the interest was entirely of a public character and no private matters were involved'.[14] This can be seen as a microcosm of the way in which Clayden treats Rogers: he represents Rogers as a generous individual, both in terms of his literary output and his attitude to others, such as through his patronage. These omissions become apparent by comparison with Blocksidge's biography, which used many of

[13] *Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, p.vi.
[14] *Clayden 1889,* Vol. 1, xiii.

the same family papers as Clayden, in order to reveal another side to Rogers.

An important aspect of Clayden's selective use of Rogers's family papers is his use of Rogers's commonplace book, which contains some copied letters of Rogers's, some drafts, and many fragments of Rogers's opinions on philosophy and politics. Clayden saw this and stated in his biography that in it 'are accounts of many of these choice things, but to quote them would be tedious'.[15] It is this very same commonplace book in which Blocksidge transcribed a letter that Rogers had written out in his own hand from an unknown lady, referring to 'your poor daughter [...] – your poor unhappy girl'.[16] Although Blocksidge has noted several instances of sexual scandal in Rogers's life, this demonstrates that evidence of this particular incident- that a lady who believed her daughter was Rogers's, and that this daughter had fallen on hard times- had been in Clayden's hands in the commonplace book. As such, Blocksidge's investigation into Rogers's behaviours that were documented by the press at the time (and included allegations that Rogers had molested young girls), demonstrates that knowledge of scandal surrounding Rogers might not have been unknown and was purposely left out of Clayden's works on Rogers. Indeed, recently published letters between Lord Byron and Thomas Moore refer to the way that Rogers had spoken of the 'soft flesh' of Moore's young daughter, with the shared knowledge between the two men implying that it was known that Rogers had a predilection towards indecent behaviour.[17] These letters, along with Blocksidge's investigations into

---

[15] *Clayden 1889,* Vol. 1, p.297.
[16] *Blocksidge*, p.125.
[17] Peter Cochran, 'The correspondence between Byron and Thomas Moore, 1811-1824' (June 2012) <https://petercochran.files.wordpress.com/2010/03/byron-and-moore-1811-18244.pdf> [Accessed 1/04/2016].

allegations that women had made against Rogers, suggest that there must have been a degree of public knowledge surrounding Rogers's dubious character, but that his prominence as a public figure made it difficult for scandal to tarnish his reputation. The genre of biography in the late nineteenth century would not have been an appropriate platform to publish and discuss such details.

Clayden's biographies stand as demonstrative works on the sociability of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. By comparing the manuscripts of letters with the transcriptions published by Clayden, the editions demonstrate that Clayden did use Rogers's original manuscript material. However, due to the nature of the late nineteenth century biography and the editorial censorship inevitably present (such as the absence of negative criticism of Rogers's character), Clayden's works cannot be seen as wholly comprehensive. The letters included by Clayden are often lengthy instead of proffered excerpts, and also dated where possible to fit within the chronological narrative.

I.iii Thesis structure

This thesis begins by analysing Rogers's reputation. Chapter One discusses his presence in criticism from his own day to the present, as well as his inclusion in anthologies and satires. Chapter Two offers an analysis of the correspondence itself, and demonstrates the impact and influence that Rogers had on his contemporary society. Rogers's correspondence allows a revision of the biographies of his correspondents to take place, shedding more light on the world in which Rogers lived as well as the people involved.

Chapter Three describes the editorial methodology that underpins my selection and editing of Rogers's letters. It is followed by an edition of 132 letters written by Rogers between 1804 and 1855. A list of currently archived and catalogued letters by Rogers forms the Appendix to this thesis.

Chapter One:
Rogers's Reputation

This chapter offers an evaluation of Rogers's reputation from his own lifetime to the present day. Rogers occupied many different spaces in the public sphere, and although this was acknowledged during his own lifetime, the only role he is now known for is as a banker-poet, with 'banker' included to juxtapose a modern reader's expectations of an eighteenth and nineteenth century poet. To analyse the trajectory of the public's perception of Rogers, I have divided this chapter into different categories: the reviews of his works from the 1780s to the 1830s; the non-review material published in magazines and periodicals as well as later entries on Rogers in literary encyclopaedias, anthological biographies and miscellanies; dedications; and Rogers's recent critical reputation.

1.1 Reviews of Rogers's poetic works, 1780 to 1830

The reaction of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century review culture to Rogers's works was not reflective of their public appeal. This section will look at how periodicals saw Rogers's works, and suggests that review culture was at a distance from the commercial bookselling market. In eight articles that appeared under the pseudonym of 'The Scribbler' in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1781, Rogers humorously referenced the anxiety of an author to appease his public: 'no one can conceive very sanguine expectations of entertainment from the Scribbler', and implied that his readers should not

expect much from him.[1] The inability to fulfil his reader's expectations was a risk that 'The Scribbler' was prepared to take for 'the satisfaction he will feel at seeing himself in print'.[2] Yet where his own writings were concerned, Rogers was a perfectionist. *The Pleasures of Memory*, for example, took him seven years to write.

Both in Rogers's contemporary critical world and the modern one there has been difficulty in assigning a consistent poetic identity to poets across the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A useful way to look at changes in poetry is not to segregate it into distinct movements or periods, such as 'Augustan' and 'Romantic', but instead to view poetry as 'organic', as proposed by Fairer.[3] This organicism does not divide literary history into distinct time-categories, but instead accounts for similarities and differences in poetry and poets from the eighteenth to nineteenth centuries. Similarly, in the case of Romanticism, Roe reverts to 'readings of poetry in empirical historical research, in the belief that this remains an effective base from which to return the criticism of Romantic poetry to 'a human form''.[4] This empirical approach takes into account the complex contexts of individuals writing, selling and buying poetry during this period, and therefore rejects the division between the supposed older 'Augustan' style and the newer 'Romantic' one.

The reviews discussed in this section largely propose that poetry should offer something more than that which has gone before it, and that a poet should be progressive and

---

[1] 'The Scribbler, No.I', *The Gentleman's Magazine*, February 1781, p.68. Although there are eight articles, the last two of the series are both numbered as 'No.VII'.
[2] *Ibid*.
[3] David Fairer, *Organising Poetry: The Coleridge Circle: 1790-1798* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
[4] Nicholas Roe, *The Politics of Nature: William Wordsworth and Some Contemporaries* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002), p.8

experimental, even if this is at the risk of public popularity. Through charting reviews, it is clear to see that this concern arose from the beginning of the nineteenth century.

As well as reviews constituting public responses to *The Pleasures*, tributes to and commentaries on the poem between its publication in 1792 and the early 1810s were frequently published, which I will discuss in the second section of this chapter. Notably, critical interest in *The Pleasures* during its key bestselling years waned, despite its ubiquity on the bookshelves of consumers.

The reviews of *The Pleasures* in 1792 suggest reasons for the longevity of the poem's appeal. The *Monthly Review* commented on the representation of memory as 'a copious and fertile theme which has yet, by no means, been exhausted'. It also celebrated Rogers's sentimental style: 'Correctness of thought, delicacy of sentiment, variety of imagery, and harmony of versification, are the characters which distinguish this beautiful poem in a degree that cannot fail to ensure its success'.[5] The words 'correctness', 'delicacy' and 'harmony' were used to explain his popular appeal in 1792, but would later be used to demonstrate how Rogers's poetry was not innovative enough to satisfy critical opinion. Similarly, the *European Magazine* praised the poem's sentimentalism, reinforcing the notion that sentimentality 'will afford the highest delight to every reader of taste', and that the reader's 'judgement will be improved by the correctness of thought and uniformity of design with which the work abounds'.[6] The concept of reading as promoting 'correctness of thought' is an important part of the pedagogy of sentimentalism, and the

[5] *Monthly Review*, June 1792, pp.121-22.
[6] *European Magazine*, October 1792, p.515.

European Magazine uses this concept to promote *The Pleasures* to its readers.

Compared to the other reviews published in 1792, the *Critical Review* noted that Rogers's *Ode to Superstition* (1786), not *The Pleasures of Memory,* 'demanded our applause', but they would also 'not withhold [it] from the present poem', despite conceding that 'a few passages [were] not so carefully written as they might have been'.[7] This review is notable for accusing *The Pleasures* of being 'more argumentative and metaphysical' than *Ode to Superstition*; for this reviewer, merit in *The Pleasures* did not lie in its intellectual discussion of memory, but rather in its sentimentalism.

The *Quarterly Review* published an extensive review in 1813 of Rogers's *The Pleasures* when it was reissued to include some of his shorter poems. The review, written by Lord John William Ward, suggested that Rogers may not be of high merit but nonetheless remained a popular and enjoyable author.[8] For example, Ward states that the circulation of *The Pleasures* is not 'confined to the highly educated and critical part of the public, but […] of that far more numerous class, who, without attempting to judge by accurate and philosophical rules, read only for the pleasure it affords them'. Ward separates an *elite* way of reading from the public- and increasingly popular-definition of reading as something undertaken primarily for pleasure. However, this success of *The Pleasures* is juxtaposed with the reviewer's belief that it is not Rogers's ability as a poet that has attracted such a 'class' of readers, but rather that 'it was published at a moment of great poetical dearth'. Ward's negative review may also have been a reaction to Rogers's politics: Rogers, a Whig, had rejected John Murray's offer of

---

[7] *Critical Review*, April 1792, p.398.
[8] *Quarterly Review*, July 1813, pp.207-218

joining the Tory *Quarterly Review* in 1809, and Ward was in the process of carving out a political career as a part of the Tory establishment.

Another individual whose personal politics played a part in his review of *The Pleasures* was Thomas Moore. As a friend of Rogers and an individual whose lyrical poetry was aimed at engaging the public's sensibilities, Moore's review of the same edition of *The Pleasures* in the *Edinburgh Review* was not as critical of Rogers's sentimentalism, but nonetheless he did comment that Rogers's work 'resembles the rhymes of the eighteenth century'.[9] Although Moore did not believe (like Ward) that popular literature was unrepresentative of the highest literary calibre, both Ward and Moore situated Rogers's style firmly in the late eighteenth century. The popularity of Rogers's poetry did, however, transcend the audience of that time: by 1816 *The Pleasures of Memory* had reached its nineteenth edition of 2,000 copies.[10]

Rogers used this gain in momentum to publish with another bestselling poet, Lord Byron. In 1814 the *Courier* reviewed the collaborative publication of Rogers's *Jacqueline* with Byron's anonymous *Lara*. Byron himself referred to *Jacqueline* as 'all grace and softness and poetry' in the same letter that he asked Rogers to help him 'make it up' with Lord Carlisle, demonstrating the role that Rogers played in both the poetic and the political.[11] Byron had indeed flattered Rogers in order to gain this political favour, but this suggestion of Rogers's rather effeminate writing style was an indication that this style was out of fashion with reviewers. The *Courier* juxtaposed the two poems by referring to the 'tragic grandeur'

---

[9] *Edinburgh Review*, October 1813, pp.32-50
[10] *Clayden* 1887, p.216.
[11] Byron to Rogers, 19 June 1814, *BLJ*, Vol. 4, pp.133-134.

of *Lara*,[12] which Byron noted as an offensive and 'savage' attack on Rogers.[13]

Byron predicted that Rogers's next large work of 1819, *Human Life*, would not sit well with reviewers. Byron stated in a letter to his friend Douglas Kinnaird that 'I am sorry for his failure (if it be failure) and that's more than he would be for mine'.[14] However, the reviews for *Human Life* were generally positive. The *Edinburgh Monthly Review* referred to 'passages of beauty' in *Human Life* despite the negative recollections of Rogers's attempted imitation of Byron in *Jacqueline*.[15] The *Gentleman's Magazine* believed that *Human Life* provided evidence that Rogers was worthy of his stature as an eminent poet,[16] as did the review in *Blackwood's* which proclaimed that 'perhaps no other poem ever accomplished so much with so little ostentatious labour', which although a positive remark is not without criticism.[17] The reviews in this magazine and the *New British Lady's Magazine* still held up *The Pleasures of Memory* as the pinnacle of Rogers's accomplishments, but did not believe that there was inconsistency in Rogers's popularity despite the twenty seven years that had elapsed since the first publication of *The Pleasures*.[18]

Rogers was also a keen traveller and travel writer, and his next work *Italy*, initially published in 1822, was based on his travels in the country from 1815 onwards. The sales of the first part were extremely disappointing: Rogers was out of the

---

[12] 'Samuel Rogers', Richard Garnett, rev. Paul Baines, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23997?docPos=2], accessed 01/04/2013.
[13] Byron to Lady Melbourne, 18 February 1814, *BLJ*, Vol. 4, p.65.
[14] Byron to Douglas Kinnaird, 7 April 1819, *BLJ*, Vol.6, p.109.
[15] *Edinburgh Monthly Review*, February 1819, pp.427-433.
[16] *Gentleman's Magazine*, February 1819, p.157.
[17] *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine,* February 1819, pp.553-558
[18] *New British Lady's Magazine,* April 1819, pp.166-169.

country for its publication and ensured that it was published anonymously, later burning those copies that did not sell. Rogers revised *Italy* and a second part was published in 1828. It was positively reviewed in The *Athenaeum* but referred to as inferior to *The Pleasures of Memory*.[19] The review of *Italy* in the *Literary Chronicle* was similarly positive, and referred to Rogers as the 'Nestor of English poetry', a venerable poet whose other rivals had passed away (as in the Greek myth of Nestor, the King of Pylos).[20] It was, however, with *Italy* that Rogers made one of his most innovative decisions: he published an edition in 1830 which included engravings from illustrations by J. M. W. Turner and Thomas Stothard.[21] Stothard had partially illustrated *The Pleasures of Memory* and was a close friend of Rogers (he even helped in the design of Rogers's house), but it was Turner's illustrations of Italian landscapes that made *Italy* a great success. Turner's vignettes are now considered alongside his other works for their 'strikingly classical character', according to Holcomb.[22] This integration of visual and literary art redeemed the initial failure of the first part of *Italy* in 1822.

Rogers's successful way of increasing the attraction of his works through aesthetics was positively received. A review of *Fifty-six engravings, illustrative of the Pleasures of Memory, and other poems,* published in the *Literary Gazette* in December 1833, was focused mainly on the engravings instead of Rogers's poetry.[23] This demonstrated how Rogers's fame and influence extended to the illustrators of his work and also the

---

[19] *Atheneaum,* January 1828, pp.547-548.
[20] *Literary Chronicle*, June 1828, pp.40-41.
[21] Samuel Rogers, *Italy* (London: T. Cadell and E. Moxon, 1830).
[22] Adele M. Holcomb, 'A neglected classical phase of Turner's art: his vignettes to Rogers's *Italy*', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes,* Vol. 32 (1969), p.405.
[23] *Literary Gazette,* December 1833, pp.794-795.

changes in taste amongst the poetry-buying public. Furthermore, the improvements in printing technology as well as 'productivity improvements' such as changes in the cost of paper and tax rates diversified the available formats of publications.[24] As explored by St Clair, the price of copyrighted works did actually continue to rise during the Romantic period, which put added pressure on authors, publishers and printers to make their publications investable for buyers.[25]

Rogers's last major publication was his collection of *Poems,* initially published in 1834. The reviews were extremely positive, but perhaps more so because of the illustrations by Turner and Stothard as opposed to the poetry. The *Monthly Magazine* referred to 'the magnificence of this illustrated work' as 'above all praise',[26] with the *Metropolitan* commenting that it 'contains some exquisite pieces of art'.[27] Again, the merit of Rogers's work was defined by its aesthetics: Rogers had marketed his poetry as a commercial item, and its success with both reviewers and the public was down to this. The illustrations appealed to the sector of society that St Clair terms 'the non-reading nation'.[28] Although subsequent editions of Rogers's works were published, the 1834 *Poems* was the final original publication of Rogers's poetic career.

Review culture demonstrates that Rogers's poetic career was defined by *The Pleasures of Memory*, but the commercial success of his poetry was not dependent on these reviews. Instead, Rogers catered to the public's poetic appetite for a familiar, eighteenth-century style, with poetry that although not critically innovative, was enjoyed and easily read by the

---

[24] *St Clair,* p.20.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] *Monthly Magazine*, September 1835, p.315.
[27] *Metropolitan Magazine*, November 1835, p.80.
[28] *St Clair*, p.14.

emerging mass book-buying public. Furthermore, Rogers skilfully negotiated the public's demand for poetry as an aesthetic commodity by introducing illustrations alongside his verse. The reviewers, however, were not critical of this business venture, which is evidence of a review culture that was adapting to changes in the commercial bookselling market.

1.2 Articles and commentaries on Rogers, 1795 to 1855

Tributes, short biographies, and summaries were published in periodicals and newspapers: literary discussion was not restricted to reviews and literary critics but instead open to the public. Periodicals such as the *Gentleman's Magazine* did not just feature reviews, but instead created a link between poetry and popular culture, and demonstrated how 'the expansion of the literary marketplace fostered both a professional culture of literary celebrities and a democratization of reading and writing'.[29] There was increasing space in periodicals to feature tributes and criticisms that did not undertake the form of the review. This democratization of literary media and the creation of the poet as celebrity expanded the influence of the poet over public opinion, but also caused inevitable resistance to the changing concept of literary quality.[30] This section will explore how non-review contributions in periodicals and newspapers demonstrated the celebrity status of Rogers in the late eighteenth and early to mid-nineteenth century, but also created resistance within the literary community.

---

[29] George Justice, 'Poetry, Popular Culture, and the Literary Marketplace', *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*, ed. Christine Gerrard (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), p.97.
[30] As discussed in David Higgins*, Romantic Genius and the Literary Magazine: Biography, Celebrity, Politics* (London: Routledge, 2005), p.38.

In 1795 the anonymous publication of the parody 'To Samuel Rogers ... on his ordering a short Great Coat called a Spenser' in the *European Magazine,* used the fashionable Spencer jacket to allude to how Rogers's poetry was stylistically of the Spenserian school. This is more than just a commentary on Rogers's poetry as imitation, but rather a wider comment on contemporary poets, who had an 'ever-deepening impression of Spenser's unique adaptability within England's formidable poetic tradition'.[31] In 1795 Rogers had not yet begun his epic *The Voyage of Columbus* (published 1810), but this commentary predicts Rogers's interest in the epic genre which included Spenser's *The Faerie Queene.* Rogers's texts align with contemporary interests in poetic tradition: as such, this commentary refers to him as having similar aspirations to other poets, inferring a lack of originality but also Rogers's ambition to reach the vaunted position of Spenser.

The image of Rogers as an imitator was prevalent in the 1790s, as demonstrated in a sonnet published 'To the Author of the Pleasures of Memory' in the *Universal Magazine* in 1796, which extols, 'Sweet Bard of Memory! […] Nor from thy genuine theme in error stray, / With gloomy Dante, or with plaintive Gray'.[32] The author argues that Rogers needs to avoid the melancholy of the poets his work acknowledges, and write poetry with a lighter and more cheerful tone.

Another aspect of the popularity of poetry raised by these tributes in periodicals is Rogers's engagement with Europe. As the success of Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1812) and 'Oriental Tales' (1810s) would later demonstrate, poetry could not just offer access to imaginary worlds and stories, but also

---

[31] Greg Kucich, *Keats, Shelley, and Romantic Spenserianism* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), p.11.
[32] 'To the Author of the Pleasures of Memory', Anonymous, *Universal Magazine*, August 1796, p.129.

to different places across the world. This idea is articulated in a 1794 poetic tribute to *The Pleasures* in the *European Magazine* as 'Roving with Fancy in Arcadian Bowers', with Arcadia referring to the pastoral genre evoked in Rogers's works, as well as Rogers's indebtedness to classical and neo-classical traditions.[33]

Rogers's poetry offers escapism for the reader by evoking this sense of the pastoral. As the poet Robert Merry described in a letter to Rogers of 1794, Rogers's writings 'allure me from a boisterous sea of Politics to the mild abode of Poetry and Peace'.[34] As the founder of the Della Cruscans who redefined poetry as a collaborative international (although mainly European) movement, Merry was influenced by Rogers's use of memory to create pastoral escapism, and published his own poem based on *The Pleasures*, *The Pains of Memory* (1796).[35] Rogers published his poem 'On a Tear' in *The Poetry of the World*, the magazine of the Della Cruscans, in 1791. The popularity and increasing ease with which people were able to travel the world (punctuated by the Napoelonic wars) increased the interest in European culture, as well as the already long-standing availability of classical education to some (chiefly male) sectors of society in public schools, and also the availability of classical literature in bookshops and libraries.

An important moment in the acknowledgement of Rogers as a significant contributor to the literary landscape of the late eighteenth century was a chapter in David Rivers's *Literary Memoirs of Living Authors* (1798). Rivers opens this with a

---

[33] J.B., 'On Mr. R-'s Poem, entitled The Pleasures of Memory', J.B., *European Magazine*, July 1794, pp.62-63. The eighteenth century pastoral is also from an imitative tradition, as explored by Nigel Leask, *Robert Burns and Pastoral: poetry and improvement in late eighteenth century Scotland* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p.56.
[34] Robert Merry, to Samuel Rogers, January 1794, in *Clayden 1887,* p.284.
[35] Robert Merry, *The Pains of Memory* (London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1796).

description of Rogers as 'a partner in the Banking-house of Messrs. Welch and Co., and a poet of very considerable distinction'.[36] This is indicative of the identity of the late eighteenth century poet: for a poet to earn by his pen was a rarity. Instead, poets had professional careers alongside their writing, and this did not damage public opinion of their poetry.

However, despite such acknowledgements, critiques of Rogers did continue. In *The British Parnassus, at the Close of the Eighteenth Century* (1801), Alexander Thomson suggested that Rogers was popular despite his lack of simplicity:

> To the merit of ROGERS I cannot be blind,
> Who Science Didactic with Pathos has join'd,
> And told why the PLEASURES OF MEMORY please,
> In a Song, which wants no other beauty but Ease;
> For, however delighted, one tires of a style,
> Whose Pomp is ne'er cheer'd by Simplicity's smile.[37]

This 1801 reference to Rogers and Parnassus was not the first. Mathias's *The Pursuits of Literature,* which was first published in 1794 and within seven years reached its eleventh edition, included Rogers. Mathias commented that 'Mr. Rogers dreams on Parnassus; and, if I am rightly informed, there is a great demand among his brethren for *the Pleasures of Memory*'.[38] Linking authors to Parnassus, the mythological home of the muses, was a pervasive concept in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, representing the expectation of a

---

[36] David Rivers, *Literary Memoirs of Living Authors*, Vol. 2 (London: R. Faulder, 1798), p.219.
[37] Alexander Thomson, *The British Parnassus, at the Close of the Eighteenth Century: A Poem, in Four Cantos* (London: Mundell & Son, 1801), p.60.
[38] Thomas James Mathias, *The Pursuits of Literature*: *a satirical poem in four dialogues, with notes* (London: T. Becket, 1801 [11th edtn.]), p.359.

poet to be knowledgeable in classical literature as well as to influence and inspire future generations.

As early as 1799, Southey wrote to his wife that Rogers was due to write an epic, again echoing the expectations of a poet who was knowledgeable in classical literature.[39] This epic would later take the form of *The Voyage of Columbus* (1810). Meanwhile, *The Pleasures of Memory* was still selling consistently well and was now into its tenth and eleventh editions. This popularity was reflected by tributes in magazines and periodicals. In the *Morning Post and Gazetteer* an anonymous tribute was paid 'To Samuel Rogers, Author of the Pleasures of Memory', referring to Rogers as the 'Sweet Bard of Memory' and 'Great master of the sentimental strain'.[40] By referring to Rogers as a 'sentimental' poet and a 'Sweet Bard', the author was conjuring the reputation of the eighteenth-century sentimental poet, who could both 'overtly stimulate' but also 'manipulate the reader's emotions'.[41]

Whilst Rogers indulged his artistic interests abroad in 1802, 1,500 copies of a thirteenth edition of *The Pleasures of Memory* were produced, and Rogers's position as a bestselling poet in America was established by his inclusion in *Longworth's Selected Modern Poets* (1802). This edition also included Merry's *The Pains of Memory*, which was placed in the text after Rogers's *The Pleasures of Memory,* making a connection between them. Ultimately, this publication suggests that Rogers's success could not be reduced to the preferences of a

---

[39] Robert Southey to Edith Southey, 9 May 1799, 'The Collected Letters of Robert Southey', ed. Ian Packer and Lynda Pratt, Romantic Circles, <http://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/southey_letters/Part_Two/HTML/letterEEd.26.405.html> [Accessed 01/04/2013]

[40] Anonymous, 'To Samuel Rogers, Author of the Pleasures of Memory', *Morning Post and Gazetteer*, January 1799.

[41] Jennifer Keith, 'Poetry, Sentiment, and Sensibility', *A Companion to Eighteenth Century Poetry*, ed. Christine Gerrard (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), p.127.

particular gender or even a nation, as Rogers's poetry was combined with Merry's Della Cruscan European nostalgia for classicism and published for an American audience. Even though sentimental poetry often drew on the familiarity of the British landscape (such as in the opening of *The Pleasures*) at a time when America was resisting Britain's influence and colonization, European imports constituted a large part of the bookselling market as the American republic was at an early stage in its development. Consequently, the attraction of the reading public to Rogers's work is far more complicated, and reveals that individuals were not reading poetry that sought to progress their own concept of nationhood. Concepts of nationhood and nationality were not just influenced by indigenous sources.

This wide appeal of Rogers's poetry cemented his reputation in the early nineteenth century. In 1809, Rogers was one of the few contemporary poets to escape Byron's criticism in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. Although Byron had written the poem as a reaction to the negative reviews of his earlier works, it also featured criticisms of many writers unrelated to these reviews, and Rogers was one of the few whom Byron featured positively:

> And thou, melodious ROGERS! rise at last,
> Recall the pleasing memory of the past;
> Arise! let blest remembrance still inspire,
> And strike to wonted tones thy hallowed lyre;
> Restore Apollo to his vacant throne,
> Assert thy country's honour and thine own.[42]

[42] Lord Byron, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (London: James Cawthorn), 1809, p.43.

As well as referring to poetry as instrumental in 'assert[ing] thy country's honour', further exposing the complexity of national identity, Byron's *English Bards* includes Rogers in the canon of contemporary established poets, and indeed it was this celebrity that kept Rogers at the centre of London literary society. In 1813, before Southey accepted the Poet Laureateship, Francis Hodgson published *Leaves of Laurel; or New Probationary Odes, for the Vacant Laureateship*, and in his verse on 'The Pleasures of Poetry, by S.R.', he considered Rogers a candidate for the title.[43]

In 1813, tributes to Rogers continued to be published in periodicals, such as Thurlow's 'Lines, on the beautiful and perfect Poem, An Epistle to a Friend, written by Mr. Rogers' in the *Morning Post*, which claimed that before *An Epistle to a Friend*, 'So poor in wit was all we wrote, / So void of philosophic thought, / So inharmoniously we wrought'.[44] This implies that there was more to Rogers's popularity than his ability to evoke the public's taste for poetry: Thurlow is suggesting that Rogers's 1798 poem engaged anew with philosophical discourse and also featured a style not merely sentimental. The irony in Thurlow's poem is of course that Rogers's *Epistle* was based on the eighteenth-century recovery of the poetic epistle, used by Pope in imitation of the classical poet Horace.

The public's taste for Rogers's poetry included both men and women. The increasing accessibility of female education and disposable income in the eighteenth century inevitably increased the numbers of women reading, and spending money

---

[43] Francis Hodgson, 'The Pleasures of Poetry. By S.R.', *Leaves of Laurel; or New Probationary Odes, for the Vacant Laureateship* (London: T. Becket and J. Porter, 1813), pp.5-6.
[44] 'Lines, on the beautiful and perfect Poem, An Epistle to a Friend, written by Mr. Rogers', *Morning Post,* March 1813, p.3.

on, poetry.[45] Critical resistance to sentimentalism arose from a belief that poetry could emotionally manipulate its readers, and this resistance was articulated by Thomas Barnes in 1814, as he saw this manipulation to be one aimed at the female readership. Barnes directly contrasts Rogers with Byron's modern subjects in an article in the *Champion*. Both Rogers and Byron had large female readerships, although it is difficult to say whether female readers comprised a majority of the purchasers of Rogers or Byron's poetry.

Barnes's article speaks of poetry, particularly of the sentimental genre, as 'enfeebling' women:

> … women, instead of being regarded as beings of the same capacities as men, have been supposed to be condemned to the most limited quantity of intelligence […] Poetry has not been unconcerned in this cruel combination, but has employed much of its pleasing influence to relax and enfeeble the female mind[46]

Barnes puts the blame of this influence chiefly on one individual:

> For many years Mr. Rogers remained contented with the reputation which this amiable poem [*The Pleasures*] conferred upon him. And he had reason: for he was the idol of all young ladies. He had the honor to lie bound in the richest morocco on every toilet, and was shut up in the same cabinet with the rouge and the French essence.

---

[45] G. J. Barker-Benfield, *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), p.163.
[46] Thomas Barnes, 'Portraits of Authors. Mr Rogers', *Champion*, 14 June 1814, p.198.

> He was (I mean his book was) a perfect perfumed bean, and was perhaps even more pleasant to the nose than he was to the understanding.[47]

This characterisation of Rogers as a 'perfumed bean' marks a transition from opinions on Rogers expressed at the end of the eighteenth century, when a veneer of sentimentality was applauded and expected in poetry, to one where Rogers's sentimental style is blamed for the suppression of women to the status of children, albeit in an extreme example of criticism. Barnes refers to the lack of progression and innovation in Rogers's poetry that adds to the suppression of female identity.

When Byron and Rogers published together in a rare venture for either author in 1814, the *Monthly Review*'s review of *Jacqueline and Lara* referred to *Jacqueline* as 'a pretty trifle', suggesting that Rogers was not taken as seriously as Byron, despite Byron's developing animosity towards the taste of the reading public.[48] Byron used his mock epic *Don Juan* in 1819 to parody those readers who literally bought into the idea of the Byronic hero, with a particular emphasis on female readers.[49]

Despite this contrast between Rogers and Byron, they became known for their public affiliation after the publication of Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1812), due to Byron residing in London and participating in social events. 'A parody of the friendship between Rogers, Byron and Moore' was published in the *Sun* on 19 April 1816, referring to Byron leaving the country in the wake of his divorce:

---

[47] Thomas Barnes, 'Portraits of Authors. Mr Rogers', *Champion*, 14 June 1814, p.198.
[48] 'Samuel Rogers', *ODNB*.
[49] See Charlotte May, 'Don Juan the Anti-Byronic Hero', *Aspects of Byron's Don Juan*, ed. Peter Cochran (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), pp.255-264.

We three, Rhymers be,
That deal in doggrel Po-e-try,
To tickle men of high degree,
—Alas! that we should sever'd be![50]

In the early 1810s Rogers was often in the company of Byron and Thomas Moore, as demonstrated in the letters and diaries of all three, and that this inclusion was noted enough to be satirised demonstrates that Rogers was certainly not detached from new generations of poets, however out of fashion his poetry was often perceived to be by critics. Rogers was experimenting with marketability by publishing his poetry alongside Byron's and including illustrations to attract readerships to further editions of his older works (namely *The Pleasures of Memory*). The concept of the professional poet was developing during this period: for example, Burke discusses Southey's 'efforts to be taken seriously as a literary professional, rather than simply as a prodigious producer of literature'.[51] Rogers struggled with a similar issue, insomuch that he was a producer of bestsellers. However, there is no evidence that Rogers actually strove towards consideration as a professional poet in the same way Southey did, although he certainly never refuted the title.

Rogers was recognised as a banker by the poet and satirist John Hamilton Reynolds, when Reynolds published an article in *The Champion* in April 1816 representing Rogers

[50] 'We Three, Poor Mariners Be, the Words by Sam. R – rs, Esq. assisted by Lord B – n, and harmonized by Anacreontic M – re, Esq.', *Sun*, 19 April 1816.
[51] Tim Burke, 'Southey's anti-professional fantasy: writing for pleasure and the uneducated poet', *Romanticism*, Vol. 17, No.1 (2011), p.63.

> with a glass in his hand, which, from the cypher engraved thereon, had evidently once belonged to Oliver Goldsmith. He caught but a few drops, and these he meant to make the most of, by mingling them with common water.[52]

The suggestion that Rogers was not just imitating Goldsmith but by imitating him was 'diluting' Goldsmith's literary merit, implied that Rogers was an imitator, reflecting a common criticism of Rogers throughout his literary career. The *Biographical Dictionary* and Reynolds's article created the argument that Rogers's poetic efforts were considered as extensions of the late eighteenth century and that his positions as a banker and philanthropist were more of a priority (and arguably profession) than that of a poet. The concept of Rogers 'diluting' the poetry of Goldsmith is further complicated in 1827, when the pseudonymous 'V.A.' published 'Samuel Rogers, a Biographical and Literary Sketch' in *Living Poets of England: Specimens of the Living British Poets*, declaring that 'Rogers is the Goldsmith of the nineteenth century'.[53] Despite these conflicting sentiments, the very affiliation of Rogers to Goldsmith highlights how Rogers was famed for his knowledge and literary indebtedness to eighteenth century poets.

As Rogers started writing poetry at a point in literary history when it was developing as a professional craft, the reliance upon networks to further a career was extremely important. [54] An example of this is Rogers's connection to

---

[52] John Hamilton, 'The Pilgrimage of living Poets to the Stream of Castaly', *Champion*, 7 Aril 1816, p.110.
[53] 'Samuel Rogers, a Biographical and Literary Sketch', *Living Poets of England: Specimens of the Living British Poets*, Vol. 1 (Paris: Baudry, 1827), pp.59-62.
[54] As discussed by Brian Goldberg, *The Lake Poets and Professional Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Holland House, the residents and guests of which demonstrated that literary interest, because of its cultural and commercial value, was not defined by political orientations.[55] Although a bastion of Whig politicians, it also served a larger role to the literary public, and the extensive library with a particular focus on South America and Spain due to the interests of Lord Holland, was even used by arch-Tories such as Robert Southey.

This made Holland House a unique place to visit; with its resources of books and knowledgeable visitors, it became an attraction for writers. In a poem published in the *New Monthly Magazine* in 1820, Henry Luttrell described a visit to Holland House which he hoped would inspire him, but which instead led to frustration at being unable to write:

> So I rise, since the Muses continue to frown,
> No more of a poet, than when I sat down;
> While ROGERS, on whom they look kindly, can strike
> Their lyre, in all times, and all places alike.[56]

Here Luttrell describes Rogers as a poet who was blessed by the Muses and can consequently write with ease, adding to his reputation as someone who could consistently publish and write, even though in reality his writing process could take years. This was written the same year as Luttrell's 'Lines Written at Ampthill Park in the Autumn of 1818' dedicated to Lord Holland, which suggest not necessarily political appreciation, but an appreciation of the place of poetic composition.

---

[55] The relationship between Rogers and Lord and Lady Holland will be examined further in Chapter Two.
[56] Henry Luttrell, 'Lines in an Alcove in Holland House', *New Monthly Magazine*, May 1820, pp.592-593.

Despite Luttrell's yearning to be as poetically inspired as Rogers, in the same year, Byron wrote 'Verses on Sam Rogers, in Question and Answer', which although not published until January 1833, suggests that Rogers's personal character was becoming more infamous than his poetic one. This depiction demonstrates the general pattern that relationships with Rogers would form. As I will demonstrate through Rogers's later acquaintances with other poets, generally the first decade of their friendship would be one of great civility, friendship and literary dialogues, but there was normally a turning point at which the other would realise that Rogers could become nasty, besmirch their reputation and also inhibit their friendships with others due to his tight control and influence over networks. Byron describes this second stage of the friendship in these quotations from the 'Question' proposed by his poem:

> Mouth which marks the envious scorner,
> With a scorpion in each corner,
> Turning its quick tail to sting you
> In the place that most may wring you;
> Eyes of lead-like hue, and gummy;
> Carcass pick'd out from some mummy;
> Bowels (but they were forgotten,
> Save the liver, and that's rotten);
> Skin all sallow, flesh all sodden, —
> Form the devil would frighten God in.
> Is't a corpse stuck up for show,
> Galvanised at times to go?
> With the Scripture in connexion,
> New proof of the resurrection?
> Vampyre, ghost, or goul, what is it?

I would walk ten miles to miss it.[57]

The 'Answer' to this poem is of course Rogers, and Byron went to great lengths to explain the poisonous parts of his character. He particularly focused on 'All which life presents of evil / Makes for him a constant revel', and described Rogers's abuse of his 'friends':

You're his foe — for that he fears you,
And in absence blasts and sears you:
You're his friend — for that he hates you,
First caresses, and then baits you —
Darting on the opportunity
When to do it with impunity:

[…]

He's the cancer of his species, And
will eat himself to pieces,— Plague
personified, and famine,— Devil,
whose sole delight is damning.

For his merits, would you know 'em?
Once he wrote a pretty Poem.[58]

Byron's poem is a personal attack on Rogers. Although a bestselling poet, the literary merit of Rogers's poetry was questioned, and the bad ways in which many of his friendships ended with authors (such as Byron) have besmirched his

[57] 'Lord Byron's Verses on Sam Rogers, in Question and Answer', *Fraser's Magazine,* January 1833, pp.82-84.
[58] *Ibid*.

historical reputation. However, whilst beginning to realise that this part of Rogers's character existed, Byron also held him up alongside Crabbe as the 'fathers of present Poesy'.[59] For Byron, Rogers conceptualised a problem with the position of a bestselling author; what the public had bought into and encouraged in a poet like Rogers, had not been a reflection of his personal character or the actual literary merit of his endeavours.

As Byron's attack was published posthumously, it did not influence public opinion in 1820, though it can be seen as an example of the deterioration of Rogers's reputation in private circles. To the reading public, however, Rogers's personal life was presented as untarnished. For example, in Carey's *The Mansion of the Poets: Beauties of the Modern Poets* (1820), Rogers is described as singing 'the joys arising from the pleasurable recollections of a blameless life'.[60] The tension between Rogers the private person and the public poet had reached new heights by 1820.

This tension was enhanced by Rogers's position as a bestselling poet who had written a variety of works, not just one 'pretty poem', as Byron had suggested. In a reflection on 'The Augustan Age in England' published in 1822, the author suggests that 'we think his [Rogers's] Epistle to a Friend the best of his compositions. It represents the perfection of '"lettered ease"'.[61] The author then finishes the article on Rogers by complimenting *The Voyage of Columbus* instead of the highly acclaimed *The Pleasures of Memory*: 'The Fragments of the Voyage of Columbus shew flashes of power which Mr.

---

[59] Byron to Thomas Moore, 2 February 1818, *BLJ*, Vol. 6, p.10.
[60] David Carey, *The Mansion of the Poets: Beauties of the Modern Poets* (London: Wright, 1820), p.xxi.
[61] 'The Augustan Age in England', *The Album*, Vol. 1 (London: J. Andrews, 1822), pp.221-222.

Rogers has nowhere else evinced. […] If Mr. Rogers had written more in this style, he would stand far higher than he now does.'[62] This suggestion that Rogers's newer works represented his greatest achievements in poetic style stands alone in the opinions on Rogers during the Romantic period. To look at this in context, in the same year James Harley published in *The Press, or Literary Chit-Chat: A Satire*, that Rogers's 'verse / Hath lately grown less musical and terse'.[63] Rogers was still considered by many to have already reached his poetic Parnassus with *The Pleasures of Memory*. The popularity of Rogers's new works was partly due to the enduring popularity of one of his very first.

Rogers's reputation remained as consistent as ever throughout the 1820s, with Charles Burton's poem *The Bardiad* recognising that Rogers remained in a class 'in which, in the main, the elegance of taste predominates over the sublimity of genius'.[64] Again, Rogers's recognition lay not in his literary merit or innovation, but in the simplicity and popularity of the style in which he wrote. This lack of literary 'depth' in Rogers's work was articulated by William Hazlitt in 1824. Rogers was omitted as a separate article in Hazlitt's *The Spirit of the Age*, but referenced in the entry on Thomas Campbell, who had based his *The Pleasures of Hope* on *The Pleasures of Memory*:

> The author of the *Pleasures of Memory* polishes his lines till they sparkle with the most exquisite finish; he attenuates them into the utmost degree of trembling softness: but we may complain, in spite of the delicacy

---

[62] Ibid.
[63] James Harley, *The Press, or Literary Chit-Chat, A Satire* (London: Lupton Relfe, 1822), p.70.
[64] Charles Burton, *The Bardiad; a Poem* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1823), p.23, pp.142-143.

> and brilliancy of the execution, of a want of strength and solidity.[65]

Hazlitt described Campbell's *Pleasures of Hope* as an improvement upon the unpromising 'strength and solidity' of Rogers, as he has a 'richer and deeper vein of thought and imagination'.[66] Hazlitt's exclusion of Rogers from the essays in *The Spirit of the Age* demonstrates how Hazlitt did not believe Rogers to encompass the Romantic spirit, shown in the differences he ascribes between Rogers and Campbell. Here Hazlitt alludes to the aesthetics of sentimental poetry, and suggests that despite the stylistic 'execution' of Rogers's poetry, it is not 'strong' enough to compete with other modern poets.

Hazlitt's opinion echoes that of the literary establishment more than it does that of the reading public. For example, another tribute that year came from Mary Ann Browne (the sister of the popular poet Felicia Hemans), who published 'Lines written in a Blank Leaf of Rogers' Pleasures of Memory' in the *Morning Post* on the 6 November 1829, demonstrating the sentimentality of Rogers's works:

> It may be pleasure unto thee
> To look on days and years well spent,
> To cast a glance behind, and see
> A path of virtue and content.
>
> But is it pleasure for a heart
> Like mine to look on years of woe,

---

[65] William Hazlitt, *The Spirit of the Age* (London: Henry Colburn), 1825, p.355.
[66] *Ibid.*

> And o'er again see joys depart—
> Buds that had never time to blow?[67]

Browne confuses Rogers with his narrator, and close friends of Rogers would have indeed known that his past was not 'a path of virtue and content'.[68] However, Browne does not critique Rogers's sentimentalism to suggest that there are better ways in which to frame dialogues on memory, but instead indulges the sentimental tradition by suggesting that memory is not an idyllic escapism for all people, but instead one that is full of 'years of woe' and the regrets of missed opportunity ('buds that had never time to blow'). Although she warns of the effects of sentimentalism upon the reader, Browne does demonstrate that Rogers's poetry carries an emotive strain, and one that provokes the thoughts and feelings of the reader, which is the very aim of the sentimental. Although Browne by no means speaks for the general female readership of Rogers's poetry, the notion of memory striking a chord with the reader (albeit a tragic one) demonstrates that Rogers's poetry still had an appeal.[69]

Rogers was cannily able to navigate the commercial bookselling market, and although sentimentalism may have not coincided with Hazlitt's 'Spirit of the Age' but instead with a public who still read sentimental poetry, Rogers was innovative when publishing editions of his work. By publishing *Italy* with

---

[67] Mary Ann Browne, 'Lines written in a Blank Leaf of Rogers' Pleasures of Memory', *Morning Post*, 6 November 1829.
[68] Such as the evidence discussed by Jeffrey W. Vail, 'Samuel Rogers: A Passion for Little Girls', *The Wordsworth Circle* 42, no. 3 (Summer 2011), pp.217-25.
[69] Rogers's use of memory to refer almost solely to the positive has been noted by modern critics. See J R Watson, 'Samuel Rogers: The Last Augustan', *Augustan Worlds: New Essays in Eighteenth-Century Literature*, ed. J. C. Hilson, M. B. Jones, J. R. Watson, Richard Hoggart (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1978), p.287.

illustrations, Rogers was compensating for the lack of 'intellectual merit' which previous editions of his works had been criticised for and turning his works into collectable consumer items. In the American publication *Studies in Poetry* (1830), George Barrell Cheever commented that 'Rogers has displayed a chaste refinement and pensive delicacy of thought very nearly allied to that of Goldsmith; though his versification and style are far inferior […] his genius is not vivid or powerful'.[70] Nonetheless, the opinions on Rogers's innovation (or lack of) aside, both the British and American public were still enjoying his poetry and he continued to be a bestselling poet. The appeal of his poetry continued to be articulated through tributes in periodicals, such as C.H.'s 'Sonnet, on reading the Voyage of Columbus' in the *Morning Post* in January 1830, which demonstrated that the public were still enjoying Rogers's more recent works.[71]

This public taste for Rogers was articulated by Allan Cunningham in his 1833 'Biographical and Critical History of the Literature of the last Fifty Years' in the *Athenaeum*:

> Rogers selects topics of a pure and poetic order; he refuses to unlatch the door of the lazar-house; he delights in contemplating whatever is fair and beautiful; and has no wish to describe Eden for the sake of showing the Evil Spirit crawling among the trees, and lying like a toad at the ear of beauty and innocence to inspire mischief.[72]

---

[70] George Barrell Cheever (ed.), *Studies in Poetry… A copious Collection of Elegant Extracts* (Boston: Carter and Hendee, 1830), p.261.
[71] C. H., 'Sonnet, on reading the Voyage of Columbus', *Morning Post*, 21 January 1830.
[72] Allan Cunningham, 'Biographical and Critical History of the Literature of the last Fifty Years', *Athenæum*, October 1833, p.716.

Cunningham refers to Satan in Milton's *Paradise Lost* to depict Rogers writing in a naïve, pure fantasy Eden. It is also particularly pertinent that Cunningham's description of Rogers's poetic style is, for example, antithetical to the aims of Wordsworth, who defended the experimental *Lyrical Ballads* in 1798 by stating in the introduction that any readers of the collection might 'struggle with feelings of strangeness and awkwardness' as readers are 'accustomed to the gaudiness and inane phraseology of many modern writers'.[73] As Hazlitt referred to Rogers's lack of meaning in 1825, Wordsworth argued as early as 1798 a similar concern about modern poetry. However, as Cunningham's opinion on Rogers demonstrates, public opinion had not yet turned to embrace this new form of poetry.

Rogers had been embraced by the book-buying public, whether the critics agreed or not, as a bestselling author. He was continuously referenced in encyclopaedia entries on poets and poetry, such as S. C. Hall's *The Book of Gems: The Modern Poets and Artists of Great Britain* (1838).[74] This entry marked an important part of Rogers's reputation as it referred to the 1830 *Italy* and the 1834 *Poems* as 'the most exquisite examples of embellished books which our age, so fertile in achievements, has yet produced'.[75] Rogers's reputation was consolidated in the 1830s not through his own literary merit but that of his illustrators, although Hall did concede that *Italy* was amongst the greatest of Rogers's works. Rogers was still frequently discussed in publications in America as well as Britain, with a 'Memoir of Samuel Rogers' published

---

[73] Michael Schmidt (ed.), Advertisement to *Lyrical Ballads* (London: Penguin Books Limited, 2006).
[74] S. C. Hall (ed.), *The Book of Gems. The Modern Poets and Artists of Great Britain* (London: Whittaker and Co., 1838), p.174.
[75] Ibid.

anonymously in *The Poems of Pleasure*.[76] This commentary referred to how Rogers had poetically prospered despite the 'adverse circumstances' of his inherited wealth, and that he was 'one of the most amiable and accomplished gentlemen living' as 'he envies the reputation of no one'.[77] These critiques highlight two major obstacles that Rogers was clearly seen to have overcome by his critics and readers. Firstly, the public were not tired of the republications of his works, as the illustrations and inclusion of new poems kept those who enjoyed Rogers's work engaged. Secondly, by 1850, attitudes towards the idea of poetry as a profession had changed. A poet could be someone who earned an income from his work, and indeed poets like Scott and Rogers proved this, more so than poets like Wordsworth. That being in a profession such as banking should be seen as an inhibiting factor towards Rogers's poetic output harkens back to the notion of the impoverished literary genius. However, there is also the suggestion that Rogers *wanted* to write poetry despite the fact he had no financial need to. As discussed, Rogers did indeed make clever financial decisions, and these were mainly in publishing, not in banking.

Another example of Rogers's financial acumen is the publication of an eighteen-pence edition of *The Pleasures of Memory* in 1839. This lower price coincided with Rogers's work with Thomas Carlyle to engage the public with literature by making it more widely available, particularly with the increase in the prices of copyrighted works.[78] The reviewer of this cheap edition in the *Monthly Magazine* commented that 'this is a popular edition for Eighteen-Pence, and is a superior specimen of typography', suggesting that even for a cheaper edition its

---

[76] Anonymous, 'Memoir of Samuel Rogers' (1838), *The Poems of the Pleasures* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1841), pp.125-32.
[77] Ibid.
[78] *St Clair*, p.20.

presentation and format were still of a certain quality.[79] By 1840, it is possible to see that the presentation and price of Rogers's poetry contributed to its popularity, and that there was a demand for a cheaper version shows that Rogers still had a thriving, and potentially new, readership. From 1801 to 1816, 22,350 copies of *The Pleasures* alone had been printed, and when it was reissued by Moxon in 1838, 1,500 copies of this one edition alone were printed.[80] These numbers of copies in a print run were similar to those of the bestseller Walter Scott.

These figures for publications demonstrate how Rogers was continuously and favourably thought of in the media, despite public knowledge of accusations of indecent conduct made towards him by women.[81] This does seem to have been largely ignored. In Robert Chambers's *Cyclopaedia of English Literature* of 1844, Rogers was cited as 'an accomplished traveller, a lover of the fair and good, and a worshipper of the classic glories of the past', with a life 'as calm and felicitous as his poetry'. But as with many critiques of Rogers throughout his life, Chambers referred to 'no forcible or original invention, no deep pathos that thrills the soul, and no kindling energy that fires the imagination'.[82] Instead, he writes that Rogers 'verge[s] on the sublime', but as a poet is unable to attain it. [83] As with many descriptions of Rogers, Chambers highlights his reputation as a traveller and an antiquarian before his poetry. His reputation was ingrained into the cultural memory of the nineteenth century, making him an indomitable figure, so that even scandal could not tarnish his reputation. This is also reflected in *Homes and Haunts of the Most Eminent British*

---

[79] *Monthly Magazine*, November 1839, p.607.
[80] *St Clair*, p.632.
[81] *Blocksidge*, p.124.
[82] Robert Chambers, *Cyclopædia of English literature*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: W. and R. Chambers, 1844), p.316.
[83] *Ibid*.

Poets (1847), in which William Howitt referred to Rogers as a 'teacher of the past' and 'patriarch of the present', calling him 'the master'.[84] His poetry had, by this point, cemented his reputation.

This representation of Rogers also suggests that he was becoming an object of antiquity. He was not an active poet but was rather the gatekeeper to an extensive network, to knowledge and to collections. Eventually, Rogers's reputation as a social commentator eclipsed the reputation of his own poetry through the posthumous publication of his *Table Talk* in 1856, which fed a public demand for celebrity culture. This neglect that would befall Rogers was prophesised by the poet and editor David Macbeth Moir in *Sketches of the Poetical Literature of the Past Half–Century*, in 1851:

> Among great or original minds Rogers scarcely claims a place — nay, his genius may not seldom be said to glow with something of a reflected light; but, in this age of slovenly prolixity, where elaboration is held at a discount, and volume after volume, sparkling with something good, is poured forth in its crudity, only to be sighed over and forgotten, I look upon his example of elegance and correctness as quite invaluable.[85]

After Rogers's death on 18 December 1855, the writer Harriet Martineau, a long standing friend, published his obituary in the *Daily News*:

---

[84] 'Samuel Rogers', *Homes and Haunts of the Most Eminent British Poets*, Vol. 2, William Howitt (London: George Routledge & Co., 1847), pp.368-89.
[85] David Macbeth Moir, *The Poetical Literature of the Past Half-Century* (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons, 1851), pp.48-54.

> He was, in the course of his long life, both client and patron; and for a great part of it he was both at once. His purse was open to the poor author, and his influence with the great publishers was at his service, while he himself sat at great men's tables as a poet and a wit, more even than as a connoisseur in Art; and certainly much more than as a rich banker. The last character he kept out of sight as much as possible.[86]

Martineau's opinion of Rogers examines the many facets of Rogers's character. By the end of his life, I would argue that his purse and his collection were more in demand than his poetry, but it was due to the number of his works on the shelves of readers that he became an important part of the networks of many eminent people. Rogers's poetry from the turn of the nineteenth century onwards did not retain the popular critical opinion that had been suggested by the *Monthly Review* upon its publication in 1792, but nonetheless the longevity of Rogers's popularity demonstrates that there is a difference between public and critical opinion.

1.3 Rogers's inclusion in anthologies

The inclusion of Rogers's poetry in anthologies places Rogers alongside other poets and directs particular parts of his poetry to particular audiences. St Clair argues that these commercial productions enabled the diffusion of texts as well as the comparison of authors, and consequently are interesting vessels through which to study the representation of Rogers as a poet and his poetry in the context of the other authors and

---

[86] Harriet Martineau, *Biographical Sketches* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1869), pp.51-59.

texts they were printed alongside.[87] The problematic areas of the anthology arise from the ethical decisions made by publishers and editors to use and often re-use material that they did not have the copyright permissions for. However, this issue aside, the analysis of anthologies does demonstrate that the priority for the publishing industry was to attract the book-buyer. An analysis of library collections during the late eighteenth century by Lethbridge reveals that poetry did not often even constitute a separate section, and that 'the inference is that people tended to buy rather than borrow poetry', with reasons for this including the possibility that 'they valued poetry as cultural possession or status symbol on their shelves'.[88] With this in mind, it is safe to assume that Rogers's presentation in anthologies, and consequently the inclusion of his poetry (or not), was a decision made to increase the marketability of an anthology as a commercial item.

The selected anthologies I have analysed are contained in Shattock's *Bibliography of English Literature*, *1800 to 1900*. Although a crucial indicative bibliography, the nature of the anthology as ephemeral and often a miscellaneous collection, means that Shattock's list of publications cannot be considered comprehensive. Consequently, this section is an analysis of the complexities of anthological representation, and explores a facet of Rogers's currently understudied works.

The inclusion of Rogers's poetry in anthologies shows not just the popularity of *The Pleasures of Memory*, but also the practicality of including shorter poems in anthologies, both for the sake of economy and also to reinforce the idea of an

---

[87] *St Clair*, p.66.

[88] Stefanie Lethbridge, 'Anthological reading habits in the eighteenth century: the case of Thomson's *Seasons*', eds. Barbara Korte, Ralf Schneider and Stefanie Lethbridge, *Anthologies of British Poetry: Critical Perspectives from Literary and Cultural Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000), p.94.

anthology as a volume from which the reader could select the particular material by the poet they wished to read. It is arguable that readers were already using longer poetry in this manner.[89] Another complicating factor in Rogers's inclusion in anthologies (and a major theme of this project), is Rogers's longevity. As his lifetime and major publications were in both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, his identity is complicated as he does not conform to a particular category or literary movement, which has displaced him from anthologies that take literary movements or centuries as their subject.

An important indicator of Rogers's popularity is Thomas Baker's *The Royal Engagement Pocket Atlas*, published annually from 1779 to 1826. Baker's *Atlas* was 'expensive and ephemeral', functioning as both 'a diary and almanac' for its readers. As stated by Jung, 'the annual pocket atlas was an index of taste in reading and literary popularity', consequently marking the texts included within the anthology as those that were reading in wider society.[90] Rogers's *The Pleasures* first appeared in this publication in 1794, accompanied by an illustration by Stothard.

As well as being included in such an anthology which could measure public opinion, Rogers was also included in four anthologies which referred to poetic 'beauties': *The Beauties of Poetry*, edited by Alexander Campbell, 1804; *Beauties of the Modern Poets*, edited by David Carey, 1820; *Beauties of Classical English Poetry*, edited by Boniface and Stone, 1824; and *The Beauties of the British Poets*, edited by George Croly,

---

[89] Stefanie Lethbridge, 'Anthological reading habits in the eighteenth century: the case of Thomson's *Seasons*', eds. Barbara Korte, Ralf Schneider and Stefanie Lethbridge, *Anthologies of British Poetry: Critical Perspectives from Literary and Cultural Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000), p.90.
[90] Sandro Jung, *James Thomson's The Seasons, Print Culture, and Visual Interpretation, 1730–1842* (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press), 2015, p.158, 159.

1828. The early 1804 date of Campbell's *Beauties of Poetry* means that *The Pleasures* is inevitably the only text included by Rogers, but Carey's and Boniface and Stone's later publications include the short poems 'A Wish', 'The Patriot' and 'The Alps at Day Break'. This selection of shorter poems over the longer reinforces the function of the anthology as a work which is not read comprehensively by the reader but instead can be read in selections. In editions of 1845 and 1852 *The Beauties of Modern British Poetry,* edited by David Grant, included ten selected excerpts from Rogers's works *The Pleasures*, *Human Life* and *Italy*.[91] This anthology was one of the last to include Rogers alongside other 'beauties', suggesting that tastes in poetry, as well as Rogers's popularity, were changing.

Another crucial aspect of the anthology is the timeline of poets it wishes to include: although excluded from Hogg's 1816 *The Poetic Mirror: or the Living Bards of Britain*, Rogers is included in Galignani's unofficial *The Living Poets of England* in 1827, and in 1829 Galignani reproduced an even greater range of Rogers's poetry in the unauthorised *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb, and Kirke White.* Rogers's exclusion from Hogg's edition does appear to be an anomaly: it would seem likely that Rogers, as a popular contemporary poet (evidenced by the sales figures of his works), would be included, however this exclusion demonstrates the subjective nature of the anthology, and the control over poetic representation that the editor enforced, whether intentional or not.

Categories in contemporary or historical identity were often presented alongside categories of national identity in

---

[91] David Grant (ed.), *Beauties of Modern British Poetry* (Aberdeen: G. and R. King, 1845; London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co., 1852), pp.13, 58, 71, 110, 120, 294, 304, 324-328, 333, 338-320.

anthologies. This can be seen in Rogers's inclusion in Aikin's 1820, 1831 and 1838 *Select Works of the British Poets*, Fitz Greene's 1845 *Selections from the British Poets*, and Toovey's 1848 *Biographical and Critical Notices of the British Poets of the Present Century*.

The categorisation of a poet by historical age or nation was not, however, a limiting factor in the representation of poets in anthologies. In fact, the commercialism of anthologies increased in the 1850s, as evidenced by the inclusion of Rogers in anthologies which aimed to appeal more to the everyday routine of the book-buying individual. For example, Kirkland's 1852 *Garden Walks with the Poets* (published in London in 1858) includes Rogers's short and sweet poem 'To the Butterfly', Bartlett's 1858 *Familiar Quotations* includes excerpts from *Human Life*, *Jacqueline*, and the poems 'On a Tear' and 'A Wish', and Dana's 1858 *The Household Book of Poetry* includes Rogers alongside authors from Shakespeare to Tennyson. These anthologies are more miscellaneous, and appeal to the general knowledge that individuals were expected to have of poetry and poets, reinforcing Rogers as an important individual in public cultural memory.

An important measure of the tension between the popular and the elite was Palgrave's *The Golden Treasury*. This publication which both sculpted the public appeal of poetry as well as reflecting it, included Rogers's 'The Sleeping Beauty' and 'A Wish' in the original 1861 edition, fitting Palgrave's intention to include lyric poetry.[92] However, from 1916 onwards Rogers is absent from all subsequent editions of *The Golden Treasury*, indicating Rogers's decline in popularity from

[92] Francis Turner Palgrave (ed.), *The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical poems in the English Language* (Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1861).

the turn of the twentieth century. This was a crucial moment for Rogers's representation, as I will go on to explore.

Rogers had died in 1855, and his poetry was still published in anthologies from the 1860s (such as *The Golden Treasury*, which only included deceased poets in the first edition*)*. As well as excerpts of *The Pleasures* and *Human Life* alongside shorter poems appearing in anthologies such as *Gleanings from the English Poets* (1862), there is also a shift to Rogers's inclusion in anthologies with more religious and profoundly literary themes. For example, excerpts from *The Pleasures* were included in both the 1862 and 1865 editions of *Lyra Sacra: Being a Collection of Hymns Ancient and Modern, Odes and Fragments of Sacred Poetry* edited by Savile, and Rogers's shorter poems appeared in both the 1867 and 1891 editions of *Lyra Elegantiarum: A Collection of Some of the Best Social and Occasional Verse by Deceased English Authors*. The Latin words for 'sacred lyrics' and 'elegant lyrics' bestow Rogers's poetry with a sense of the classical, affiliating him with elite culture. This is arguably a similar theme in the 1865 and
1869 editions of *Leaves from the Poets' Laurels* edited by Wood, which uses a crown of laurels to associate the nineteenth century poet with literary prestige. Again this is seen in Watts's 1867 *The Laurel and Lyre: Fugitive Poetry of the Nineteenth Century*, which includes the 'Ginevra' section from Rogers's *Italy*. This section is particularly interesting as 'Ginevra' features a story of 'old Romance', and harkens back to both an ancient and an early modern Italy. Rogers's poetry deliberately invokes the classical to unite the interests of the early nineteenth century audience (and indeed the education of many literate people) with his own artistic interests and a sense of literary prestige. *The Laurel and Lyre* arguably uses Rogers's 'Ginevra' in the same way that Rogers used *Italy*.

The focus on the lyric and short forms of poetry is an important aspect of the anthology, allowing the reader to dip in and out of the volume. Thornbury's 1867 publication of *Two Centuries of Song* included Rogers's 'To ---', 'A Wish', 'On --- asleep', and 'An Italian Song', all of which are shorter lyrical pieces. In 1868 this function of the anthology is united by Robert Bell in a successful combination of *Art and Song: A series of Original Highly Finished Steel Engravings from Masterpieces of Art of the Nineteenth Century Accompanied by a Selection of the Choicest Poems in the English Language*. This attempted to unite literature with art and suggested that illustrations are a part of poetic readings, and also that poetry can be valued for its aesthetics as well as its content. This was a marketing strategy utilised by Rogers from the 1790s onwards, and the acknowledgement of this in the form of an anthology demonstrates its success. Due to the changes in technology, it was both cheaper and quicker to produce books in this format than ever before.

Publishing a range of sections from longer narrative poems such as *Italy*- particularly 'Ginevra'- became a necessarily common practice in further publications, such as Adams's 1869 *The Household Treasury of English Song: Specimens of the English Poets,* with the title of 'The Household Treasury' suggesting that these were standard poems suggested to be of interest to those within a household, both men and women, and potentially children too, and the mention of 'treasury' clearly capitalising on the popularity of Palgrave's anthology. This wide appeal of Rogers's poetry also resulted in his inclusion in Adams's 1873 *The Students' Treasury of English Song,* reflecting the function of poetry collections as educational tools and textbooks. Crucially, different excerpts of poetry are used in this edition, with the excerpts including

'Memory' from *The Pleasures*, 'The New World' from *The Voyage of Columbus*, an excerpt from *Human Life*, 'The Brides of Venice' from *Italy* and the shorter poem 'To the Butterfly'. These poems are demonstrative of the extent of Rogers's writing career, as they cover poems from the 1790s to the 1820s.

Proof of Rogers's continuing appeal in the late nineteenth century was his continued inclusion in anthologies. Anthologies covered popular poets and those texts which were expected to be known by well educated people, and Rogers was included in the American edition of Fields and Whipple's *The Family Library of British Poetry* (1878), Ward's *The English Poets* (1880), Kellogg's *A Text-Book of English Literature* (1884), and Garnett's *The Universal Anthology* (1899). It is in the early twentieth century, after the death of Queen Victoria in 1901, that anthologies analysing the historical period that had preceded their publication began to categorise the Victorian from the Romantic, and it is from this sharp contrast, defined by monarchical reigns rather than literary change, that Rogers's displacement begins.

In 1902, Rogers's 'The Sasso de Dante' was included in Duff's *The Victorian Anthology*. This is a problematic inclusion: whilst acknowledging Rogers as a poet who was popular during the Victorian period, and alive for eighteen years of Victoria's reign, he did not write new poetry during it, and publications of his poetry were reprintings of his 1834 *Poems* and previous publications. The 1912 *Oxford Book of Victorian Verse* also included Rogers, although only 'A Wish'. However, Rogers was not included in the first edition of the *Oxford Book of English Verse* in 1900 and subsequent editions until 1939, when it was revised to include other poems pre-1901 as well as some early twentieth century poetry. With the longer poems not occupying

more than a few pages, Rogers's short 'A Wish' was included in this revised edition. This sudden reappearance of Rogers in 1939 does seem to be an odd editorial choice, considering the decline of his literary reputation, but is a similar editorial choice to that undertaken by Palgrave. This suggests that *The Golden Treasury* impacted the contents of other anthologies, and that the short sentimental poem 'A Wish' encapsulated Rogers's literary legacy in the eyes of the editor.

Leonard's 1909 *The Pageant of English Poetry* contains some of the most extensive excerpts from Rogers's poetry, such as 'Melancholy', 'Mine be a cot beside the hill', 'Nature's gift' (from *Italy*), 'Venice' (from *Italy*), and 'The Robin's Grave'. Furthermore, it is also only six years before the publication of Saintsbury's 1915 *Lesser Poets, 1790-1837: Rogers, Campbell, Moore and others*. This categorisation of Rogers as a 'lesser poet' is a very interesting one, especially since Rogers, Campbell and Moore named in the title were three of the bestselling poets of the Romantic period, and certainly sold more than poets such as Wordsworth, Coleridge and Keats. The 'Lesser' here refers to the intangible concept of poetic quality. The section on these 'Lesser Poets, 1790-1837' in the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (1915), the dates of which are a clear indication of the Romantic period, claims that 'at the present time, it is probably a very exceptional thing to find anyone who, save in a vague traditional way, thinks of the author of *The Pleasures of Memory* as a poet at all; and, even where that tradition survives, it is questionable whether it is often supported by actual reading'.[93] The cause of Rogers's popularity 'at one time' is that 'he had the very great advantage of beginning at a dead season […] and of writing in a

[93] 'Lesser Poets', *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916), p.96.

style which, while thoroughly acceptable to established and conventional criticism, had certain attractions for the tastes, as yet undeveloped, which were to bring about new things'.[94] Indeed, neither of these statements about the apparent dearth of poetry during the 1790s or the audience who read Rogers's poetry were novel ones about Rogers by 1915, but these statements misrepresent a dynamic commercial market. Tastes were indeed changing, as were literacy rates and the accessibility through the dissemination of different, new and- crucially- cheaper formats of publications. It is, however, this view of Rogers that is still attached to his reputation today.

Categorisations of poetry and poets in anthologies have displaced Rogers. For example, Rogers was not included in the Oxford edition of *The Book of Regency Verse* from 1928; it expands the Regency period to incorporate 1798 to 1837, and whilst this is historically inaccurate (as George IV was Prince Regent from 1811 to George III's death in 1820), it does instead highlight poetry which would now be identified within a categorisation of Romantic.

This anomaly of the acknowledgement of a literary Regency period (albeit an extended one) aside, anthologies in the 1930s were beginning to divide literary history into the periods that are studied today. Edith Sitwell's 1932 *The Pleasures of Poetry: A Critical Anthology* uses a title that is indeed born from a tradition in which Rogers's *The Pleasures of Memory* participates, but Sitwell discards him completely. The publication is divided into sections on 'Milton', 'The Augustan Age' and 'The Romantic Revival', none of which Rogers fits into.

However, as with criticism and scholarship, Sitwell's categorisations were not universal. In 1935 *The Oxford Book of English Romantic Verse*, edited by Milford, included Rogers's

[94] *Ibid*.

'Fond Youth' from *Human Life* and 'Bologna and Byron' from *Italy*. Here 'Romantic Verse' is used to describe poetry written from the late eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, and included poetry by Crabbe and Browning.

Another example of Rogers being anthologised in the 1930s was in *The Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse* (1936). Oxford chose to republish the same section of *Italy*, 'Byron and Bologna', that had been published the previous year. The eighteenth century and the Romantic have been conflated in this example, by the same publisher. This is an indication of the complexity of literary categorisation: although Rogers can easily fall between the gaps of the eighteenth century, the Romantic period and the Victorian era, he can also be seen as all three, as *The Pleasures of Memory*- his bestselling work- was published in 1792, he was actively writing during most fluid definitions of the Romantic era, and he lived eighteen years into the Victorian period.

The argument that Rogers could have been included in many categorisations due to his literary timeline was unfortunately one that was not represented in anthologies, and has consequently continued to shape the decline of his reputation, though of course, editors may have had many reasons for not including poets. The 1938 *Treasury of Unfamiliar Lyrics* included his 'An Italian Song' and 'An Epitaph on Robin Redbreast', the very title itself proclaiming that these would not be poems familiar to the reader, despite the inclusion of these two specific poems in previous anthologies. This work seemingly forecasts crucial decades of Rogers's exclusion from anthologies, such as Bull's *Regency Poets*, 1941 (despite his inclusion in a previous collection of *Regency Verse*); Grigson's *The Romantics* (1942), and *The Victorians* (1950); Evans's *Anthology of Victorian Verse* (1949); Noyes's American edition

of *English Romantic Poetry* (1956); Frost's *Romantic and Victorian Poets* (1961); and Francis Camilla's *The Romantics and Victorians* (1961). This list clearly illustrates Rogers's exclusion from separate Romantic and Victorian anthologies, as well as those anthologies which cover both the Romantic and the Victorian.

Although problematic when considering Rogers, this division of literary history into distinct categories can be seen as a pragmatic one for literary studies. Many modern anthologies which have become the defining texts of curricula across the world, particularly in the UK and America, do not include Samuel Rogers, including *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* which was first published in 1962 and most recently revised in 2012 and has not featured any of Rogers's poetry.

1.4 Literary works dedicated to Rogers

Rogers frequently had literary works dedicated to him. The literary dedication serves the function of an open letter: it publically acknowledges an individual author's patronage and influence, and complicates the notion of the lone writer, instead implying that an author works within particular social networks and is also indebted, be it intellectually or financially, to other individuals. Furthermore, it is also a feature of commercialism, which increases the appeal of one publication by suggesting it has links to other successful works and authors.

Two important dedications to Rogers were from Byron and Dickens. Rogers had been a bestselling author twenty years before Byron and forty years before Dickens. Byron's *The Giaour* was addressed to Rogers 'as a slight, but most sincere token of admiration for his genius, respect for his character,

and gratitude for his friendship'.[95] Although this opinion of Rogers was not one consistently held by Byron throughout his life, it represents a snapshot in time, and depicts Rogers as an individual who was not just intellectually influential for Byron but also one who was economically helpful in domestic and practical book publishing matters.

In 1840 Dickens dedicated his weekly serial *Master Humphrey's Clock* to Rogers, which included the novels *The Old Curiosity Shop* and *Barnaby Rudge*. Dickens did seek Rogers's permission for this dedication before publishing it, in a gesture which suggests that Dickens was aware of Rogers's own strict adherence to controlling publications of his own work in Britain, but also a gesture which suggests that publically proclaiming Rogers as a literary ally was beneficial for an actively publishing author.[96]

As well as serving the purpose of the proclamation of a literary allegiance and indebtedness, the dedication also maps literary networks, which is certainly the case with Thomas Campbell, whose poem *The Pleasures of Hope* (an unofficial companion to Rogers's *The Pleasures of Memory*) was published in 1799. Five years after Campbell died in 1844, his biographer William Beattie dedicated the *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell* to Rogers.[97] His tribute outlined the role that Rogers played in the life of Campbell:

> In your experience of the world, in the maturity of your fame, he found a faithful and enlightened monitor; in your approbation, strong motives for exertion; in your

[95] Lord Byron, *The Giaour* (London: T. Davison, 1813), 'Dedication'.
[96] Charles Dickens to Samuel Rogers, 13 August 1840, in Madeline House and Graham Storey (eds.), *The Letters of Charles Dickens*, Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p.114.
[97] William Beattie (ed.), *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, Vol. 1 (London: Edward Moxon, 1849), p.vi.

> sympathy, a "brotherly kindness" that soothed him in affliction, supported him in difficulties, and sweetened the intercourse of private life.[98]

This portrayal of an altruistic 'brotherly' Rogers did not match the motivations that drove Rogers to invest in popular authors, but Campbell's position was slightly different as his work was a deliberate response to Rogers's *The Pleasures of Memory*. Arguably, Campbell used Rogers's position and reputation to sell his *Pleasures of Hope*, more than Rogers used Campbell.[99] However, Campbell himself did not dedicate *The Pleasures of Hope* to Rogers, but instead to his friend Dr Robert Anderson, using the dedication in a personal capacity.

The dedication cultivates these literary circles and categorisations. Thomas Moore's *Lalla Rookh*, first published in 1817, was also dedicated to Rogers. Moore took advice from Byron on the writing of *Lalla Rookh*, and to dedicate the publication to Rogers puts the latter in this circle of second generation Romantic writers. He may be out of place here as *The Pleasures* was first published twenty five years earlier, and Rogers himself was twenty five years older than Moore, but in the literary landscape of Britain in the nineteenth century, Byron, Moore and Rogers were professional colleagues and friends. To displace Rogers from this network, as modern readings and definitions of Romanticism arguably have done, does not accurately depict the politics and friendships that were crucial to the creation of literature during this period.

These dedications demonstrate Rogers's intergenerational appeal in both commercial and social ways, although they are by no means exhaustive (for example, the playwright James

---

[98] *Ibid.*
[99] *St Clair*, p.632.

Sheridan Knowles also dedicated works to Rogers). To be included in dedications from individuals born decades apart shows Rogers to be a consistently present social character as well as a poet in the late eighteenth and early to mid-nineteenth century literary landscape. In the same way that correspondence demonstrates the networks and connections between individuals, literary dedications serve a similar purpose through their public acknowledgements.

1.5 Rogers's posthumous poetic reputation

From the turn of the nineteenth century onwards, the social character of Rogers became increasingly hard to divorce from the literary, so famed was he for his connections and storytelling alongside his writing. This section focuses on Rogers's critical reputation, and how this developed during and after 1855, the year in which he died.

Inevitably, Rogers's longevity is a key subject in his obituaries, which present him as an author who lived through important historical and literary moments. Due to his support of other poets and artists alongside his position as a bestseller, the *Athenaeum* dubbed him 'the Patriarch of English poets, wits, and patrons of Art', and commented that his 'poetical creations' were few, far between, and finished so highly, that the best thoughts and lines in them will not readily perish from among the pleasures of memory'.[100] Similarly, the *Literary Gazette* referred to Rogers as 'The last of the bright constellations of poets conspicuous at the beginning of this century'. Furthermore, they predicted that 'the name of Rogers will remain among the classical poets of England, we have little

[100] *Athenaeum*, 22 December 1855, pp.1498-1499.

doubt'.[101] Prophesising the legacy and memorability of an individual is characteristic of an obituary, but in the case of Rogers it certainly did not prove to be true. The *Literary Gazette* embellished further:

> He is a remarkable instance of what industry and taste will effect for poetic reputation even with feeble genius. Elegance alone can never suffice for popularity, and correctness of diction alone will not give classic rank without energy of thought or felicity of invention […] If the name of Rogers lives when those of greater natural genius are forgotten, it will be because he has striven to satisfy the taste as well as to excite the passion of his readers, and has used to the utmost every assistance of literary art. His poems rarely surprise by brilliance of fancy, or strike by originality of thought, yet they please by their genial spirit and their refined taste. So smooth, so polished, so elegant is their diction, that he almost deserves to be styled "The Addison of Verse".[102]

Linking Rogers to the prose of Addison and other eighteenth century poets such as Gray was not unusual, but by 1855 these links were criticised to demonstrate how Rogers's style was somewhat old fashioned, and not how he was a master of verse.

Rogers's reputation as a patriarch of poetry continued: in a chapter *of A Book of Memories: Great Men and Women of the* Age in 1871*,* Hall references Rogers as a 'veteran of literature'

---

[101] *Literary Gazette*, 22 December 1855, pp.1814-1815.
[102] *Literary Gazette*, 22 December 1855, pp.1814-1815.

and that Rogers 'belongs to a remote generation'.[103] Hall questions Rogers's status as a generous patron, suggesting that Rogers was concerned with receiving money back from his investments, and that he paid Turner £5 instead of a previously suggested £50 for his illustrations to *Italy* (although I have yet to find evidence to support this).[104] Hall further critiques Rogers's writing process, suggesting that he did not "sweat the brain" in his writing endeavours.

Rogers's death provided critics with an opportunity to both refute and cultivate myths about him. Harriet Martineau, who knew Rogers, uses her chapter on Rogers in *Biographical Sketches* to refute some well-known myths about him and instead suggest, in a similar way to Hall, that Rogers was not as kind-hearted as people thought. Martineau suggests that Rogers's success was due to his 'function [which] was a remarkable one- that of representing the bridge over which Literature has passed from the old condition of patronage to the new one of independence'.[105] As stated in the obituaries, Martineau focuses on Rogers's ability to navigate the changes that occurred in society and the bookselling market during his time, particularly by including images by popular artists in his works. Also present in Martineau's critique is the common comment on Rogers's poetry as polished yet not innovative: 'The elegance and correctness of his verse are beyond question; but the higher and more substantial qualities of true poetry will hardly be recognized there'.[106] A similar point is

---

[103] S. C, Hall, 'A Memory of Samuel Rogers', *A Book of Memories of Great Men and Women of the Age, from Personal Acquaintance* (London: Virtue & Co., 1871), p.426.
[104] *Ibid*.
[105] Harriet Martineau, *Biographical Sketches* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1869).
[106] *Ibid*, p.58.

made in Devey's critique of Rogers in *A Comparative View of Modern English Poets* (1873):

> That there is no poet of the nineteenth century whom criticism should delight to honour more than Rogers […] a princely Maecenas of letters […] But, I fear, the amiability of the man had largely to do with his defects as a poet. He could not feel, and, therefore, could not awaken, passion in others. […] Nor was he possessed of that frowning imagination which delights in the contemplation of the grand and the terrible […] He lived too constantly in the creations of others to flourish very much in his own. Hence he struck out no new line for himself.[107]

Similarly, the *University Magazine* in 1878 features a section on reminiscences, and notes that Rogers was a 'polisher' of his work, inferring that this 'polishing' went beyond the writing and editing of poetry, but also included Rogers's presentation and marketing of his poetry.[108]

The ways in which Rogers adapted to the changes in technology, the accessibility of literature and the expectations of the book-buying public, such as including illustrations in his works, is again mentioned in Henry Taylor's *The English Poets*, which included a critical introduction on Rogers. Taylor identifies *The Pleasures of Memory* as a work 'well worthy to attract attention at the time when it appeared', and goes on to explain how Rogers's critical reception changed:

---

[107] Joseph Devey, 'Classical School. Rogers', *A Comparative View of Modern English Poets* (London: E. Moxon, Son, and Co., 1873), p.145.
[108] *University Magazine*, July 1867, pp. 64-65.

> In 1793 very different days were approaching — days in which poetry was to break its chains, and formality to be thrown to the winds. The didactic dullness of the eighteenth century was presently to be supplanted by the romantic spirit and easy animation of Scott, the amorous appeals of Moore, and the passion of Byron; whilst mere tenderness, thoughtfulness and grace were to share its fate, and be trampled in the dust.[109]

In the 1880s P. W. Clayden published some of the most important works on Rogers's life yet written: *The Early Life* (1887) and the two volumes of *Samuel Rogers and His Contemporaries*, which begins with Rogers's move into 22 St James's Place in 1805 (1889). These volumes contain hundreds of letters written by Rogers, chiefly to his sister Sarah, but also include letters from correspondents such as Wordsworth, Peel and Prince Albert. Clayden tracks Rogers's writing career and publications, but crucially also the development of his social circles, and demonstrates how important Rogers's networks were to the cultivation of his public persona and consequent reputation.

Quotations from Clayden's volumes were used as evidence for Dennis's article in the *Leisure Hour* (1889). Yet again, Dennis states that 'if Rogers's poems still engage attention, it is for the sake of their delightful illustrations', and that Rogers's works contain 'good taste' and 'right feeling', but not 'high imagination', 'rare fancy' or an 'exquisitely felicitous use of language'.[110] The same year, undoubtedly inspired by Clayden's volumes, the essay 'A-propos of Samuel Rogers' was

---

[109] Henry Taylor 'Samuel Rogers', in Thomas Humphry Ward (ed.), *The English Poets: Selections with Critical Introductions*, Vol. 4 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1880), p.90.
[110] John Dennis, *Leisure Hour*, June 1989, p.386.

published in the periodical *Temple Bar*. This essay directly comments on the decline of Rogers's reputation, suggesting that

> It is just possible that the verdict of the present day, which places him now above […] Shelley, Keats, Crabbe, Southey, and Moore, may be set aside in part at some later period. It is possible but unlikely, for the claims of Rogers as a poet do not rest upon the originality of his muse, so much as on the polish of his verse, on his fine taste, his cultivated mind, and, lastly, upon the splendid manner in which his poems were offered to the reader.

The author suggests that 'it cannot be said that English literature would materially suffer' if all of Rogers's works were lost. [111] Furthermore, the author also critiques Rogers's letters:

> Rogers did not write very good letters. Indeed, if those given in Mr. Clayden's two volumes are average specimens, his letters have nothing to distinguish them from those of any ordinary person. That he did not write good letters is, to our thinking, a corroborative proof that he wanted original genius. The freshness and the originality which accompany genius make themselves everywhere felt, and relieve the most commonplace things of their commonplace character. We see this in Byron's letters, we saw it the other day in the delightful ones which Thackeray penned to Mrs. Bloomfield. The

[111] G. B., 'A-propos of Samuel Rogers', *Temple bar: with which is incorporated Bentley's miscellany*, August 1889, pp.482-495, 485.

> individuality of Dickens is stamped on all his letters, and every characteristic of Wordsworth is found in his.[112]

This quotation demonstrates that public interest in individuals such as Rogers was not necessarily in their poetry, and that there was a market for the private papers and letters of eminent people. Clayden's volumes satisfied a public appetite for the published and edited papers of eminent individuals such as politicians, such as the edition of *The Croker Papers* (1885), based on the correspondence and ephemera of the Tory politician and secretary to the Admiralty John Wilson Croker (who also knew Rogers). Publications of papers such as these and Clayden's volumes demonstrated to the public that the professional and personal spheres were not separate, and that papers and letters are of interest because they show extensive and diverse social networks by focusing on the connections and undertakings of an individual.

The continuation of interest in Rogers's social networks and not his poetry continued into the twentieth century, and suggests that his poetry had declined in popularity, but that cultural memory still preserved him as an individual of interest. As predicted by many critics and biographers, Rogers's legacy was characterised by these extensive social networks and not his works. This can be seen in Parsons's 'Rogers's Breakfasts' (1904) and Roberts's *Samuel Rogers and His Circle* (1910).

Despite Dennis' denunciation of the importance and consequent interest of Rogers's letters, there has been a revived interest in Rogers's correspondence from the mid-twentieth century, such as Firebaugh's 'Samuel Rogers and American Men of Letters' (1942), Barbier's *Samuel Rogers and William Gilpin: Their Friendship and Correspondence* (1959)

---

[112] *Ibid*, p.493.

and Johnson's 'Letters of Blanco White to J. H. Wiffen and Samuel Rogers' (1968), as well as the extensive use that Clayden made of his letters to construct the *Early Life* and the later two volume biography of his life (1889).

Correspondence aside, the number and volume of Rogers's publications articulate his importance and popularity. For Rogers, publication is the key to understanding his relationship with the reading public, and consequently how he shaped the literary landscape within which he published; this can be measured in terms of editions, the copies of editions, the way in which work was edited and re-formatted between editions, and ultimately the success of the publications of each edition. Although it may be difficult to ascertain particular numbers for each edition sold, the very fact that Rogers's works were constantly published demonstrates much about the reading public's positive reaction to his poetry.

Although Rogers does indeed implement, for example, Hartleian philosophical discourses in his poetry, such as that of association in *The Pleasures of Memory,* his references to eighteenth century philosophy and the use of classical forms, such as the epic, do not disassociate him from his fellow poets who we now distinguish as Romantic. Indeed, when Southey in the 1790s noted that Rogers was to write an epic, it was an admission from a poet who was currently writing epics that Rogers was to continue writing a popular yet classical form of poetry, which was undergoing a particular revival in the 1790s.[113] Rogers's poetic endeavours were not, therefore, identifiably different from those of the poets we now class as Romantic. Rogers's epic *The Voyage of Columbus* and his travel

[113] Robert Southey to Edith Southey, 9 May 1799, 'The Collected Letters of Robert Southey', ed. Ian Packer and Lynda Pratt, Romantic Circles, <http://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/southey_letters/Part_Two/HTML/letterEEd.26.405.html> [Accessed 01/04/2013]

poem *Italy* were read by both the poets and the readers of the age in which Rogers lived, and ultimately Rogers's exclusion from Romanticism due to his position as a 'pleasant anachronism' whose earlier style was sentimentalist in nature, does not accurately reflect either the writers or readers of the period 1780 to 1830.

Reviews and criticisms of Rogers, both during his age and posthumously, contribute to what Gaskins articulates as Rogers's representation as a 'museum piece'.[114] This anachronistic representation of an individual who is out of touch with a particular time suggests that his popularity may have been due to a resistance to the modernisation of poetry. However, resistance is also very much a feature of Romanticism. For example, Byron uses Pope's *Dunciad* as a model for his 1809 *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, in which he critiques not just the *Edinburgh Review* which instigated the satire but rather the contemporary review and literary culture of the time. The difference between the reaction of Rogers and Byron to the eighteenth century is highlighted here; Byron uses eighteenth century poetry to inspire a commentary on his current age, whereas *The Pleasures of Memory* indulges the sentimental and elegiac style of Gray. An important consequence of these approaches is that Rogers's endeavour is a commercial success; Byron's endeavour is instead a political jibe, and also creates tension within his own circles, such as Holland House (the relations between which Rogers was instrumental in smoothing over). Consequently, there is not a division between the neo-classical literature of the eighteenth century and the critically dubbed 'Romantic' literature of the nineteenth. Byron's poetry is particularly

---

[114] Avery F. Gaskins, 'Samuel Rogers: A Revaluation', *The Wordsworth Circle* (16:3), (Summer 1985), p.147.

grounded by his love of the ancient world and classics, as well as by Pope, who he held in higher esteem than any of his contemporaries. Byron wrote to his publisher John Murray about the contemporary poetic landscape:

> I am convinced […] we are upon a wrong revolutionary poetical system - or systems - not worth a damn in itself - & from which none but Rogers and Crabbe are free. […] & Rogers the Grandfather of living Poetry - is retired upon half-pay, (I don't mean as a Banker)[115]

Here Byron is questioning the 'worth' of poetry and the 'systems' through which poetry is composed. Although not an admission of Romanticism by any means, this awareness of 'difference' is key to McGann's modern definition of Romanticism.[116] This letter to Murray, a publisher of many other poets including the bestselling Sir Walter Scott, contains an acute observation about how Rogers really did stand apart from his contemporaries. That Rogers is 'free' from a 'revolutionary poetical system' suggests that his style does not digress from the standard which was set before Byron's generation began writing. This is indeed true, and echoes Byron's own love and appreciation for the writing of the eighteenth century, and his dislike for many Romantic writers, such as members of the lake school. For Byron, the movement that we now categorise as Romanticism was certainly not a positive thing, and as demonstrated in his mock-epic *Don Juan*, was a fashionable trend in which he believes that the public

---

[115] Lord Byron to John Murray, 15 September 1817, *BLJ* Vol. 5, pp.265-266
[116] Jerome J. McGann, *Romantic Ideology: A Critical Investigation* (London: University of Chicago Press), 1983, p.2.

have been almost gullible to buy into (if they did buy into it at all).

The attraction of the reading public to Rogers's poetry from the 1780s to the mid-nineteenth century further demonstrates the inaccuracy of categorising Rogers's poetry as belonging to particular poetic movements. As articulated by Watson (1978),

> Although Rogers was in his heyday in the Romantic period, his work seems to by-pass it: it is polished, urbane, classical in tone and temper, with a certain authoritative restraint and severity; yet it is also intimate, tender and sentimental, with a fondness for a good story.[117]

As Rogers is excluded from studies of Romanticism due to his sentimental style, yet also excluded from studies of eighteenth century poetry due to his success during what is seen as the Romantic period, the categorisation of literary history has made Rogers a problematic figure.

This historical accuracy upon which I am focused is not simply an investigation of the position of the poet, but rather an investigation that has revealed how the restrictive title of poet does not do justice to the intricate and complex roles that writers had to undertake in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. One of the reasons that Rogers has been neglected is because he was a capitalist, investing in art abroad as well as setting up enterprises in Britain (such as Edward Moxon's publishing company), and although he intervened little

---

[117] J R Watson, 'Samuel Rogers: The Last Augustan', *Augustan Worlds: New Essays in Eighteenth-Century Literature*, ed. J. C. Hilson, M. B. Jones, J. R. Watson, Richard Hoggart (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1978), p.201.

in his family's bank which he managed, he was still a banker, and known as such to acquaintances. Giddey comments that when it comes to Rogers, 'Scholars apparently are interested in the reactions of the man and disdainfully discard the feelings and beliefs of the poet',[118] and Skarda articulates this as being the result of the perception that 'Samuel Rogers had considerably more taste than poetic talent, more friends than favourable reviews'.[119] Rogers's location in London was an important part of this sociability, but does not limit it. During the Victorian era, Robinson notes that 'the salient feature of London was *mobility* […] It was a fluid environment whose consumer culture promised unprecedented possibilities of social mobility and gender performativity amid rapidly changing fashions and lifestyles'.[120] As demonstrated in the reviews of Rogers's poetry that I have discussed, literary 'fashion' was a complex arena composed of many different voices, and even those reviews and tributes which were favourable towards Rogers particularly revered his poetry for its nostalgia and sentimentalism. Again, this popularity perhaps shows resistance that the consumers of the bookselling market had towards an urban landscape that was undergoing economic and technological changes at a rate faster than ever before, and perhaps a yearning for a familiar and anachronistic form of reading.

This makes it somewhat inevitable that scholars have been interested in Rogers due to his reaction to his changing surroundings. He is not given the label of madman that

---

[118] Ernest Giddey, 'Byron and Samuel Rogers', *Byron Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (1979), p.4.
[119] Patricia Skarda, 'Samuel Rogers', *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 93: British Romantic Poets, 789-1832,* ed. John Greenfield (London: Gale Research, 1990), p.224.
[120] Alan Robinson, *Imagining London, 1770-1900* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p.45.

Lockhart's review of Keats's *Endymion* suggests that the experimentalism of Keats's style embodies,[121] but instead is indeed the 'museum piece' amid a rapidly changing society.[122] However, when discussing Rogers, the concept of the 'museum piece' is an extremely loaded one; his house was nothing short of a museum, as the sale catalogue at the time of his death demonstrated.[123] There were not just rare books and exclusive copies of new books signed by authors in his library, but he had paintings from Rubens and Titian as well as Turner and Stothard, which suggests that the nineteenth century library was more than a space in which books were housed, but rather an exhibition space that could potentially become a public one.

When placing Rogers in a *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, Patricia Skarda suggests that he is mediocre: 'Although the quality of Rogers's life cannot compensate for the mediocrity of his poetry or even for the occasional sharpness of his tongue, his hospitality and refined taste made him a legend in his own time and earn him a place among his more powerful contemporaries'.[124] This notion of 'powerful contemporaries' is an interesting one, and refers to the influence of an individual, not necessarily the sales of their works. The political would outweigh the literary here, with the Duke of Wellington, Earl Grey, Robert Peel, and Lord and Lady Holland arguably becoming Rogers's 'powerful contemporaries'. Rogers was indeed a living literary legend, which made him a much sought-after figure for younger poets and a colleague for bestselling

---

[121] John Gibson Lockhart, Review of Endymion, *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine,* August 1818, pp.519-524.
[122] Avery F. Gaskins, 'Samuel Rogers: A Revaluation', *The Wordsworth Circle,* Vol. 16, No. 3 (Summer 1985), p.147.
[123] *Sale Catalogue.*
[124] Patricia Skarda, 'Samuel Rogers', in John Greenfield (ed.), *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 93: British Romantic Poets, 789-1832* (London: Gale Research, 1990), p.235.

writers such as Walter Scott. There is a comparison here to Samuel Johnson: according to Dyce's account in Rogers's *Table Talk,* Rogers once tried to meet Johnson but ran out of courage on his doorstep, dwarfed by Johnson's literary stature.[125] That the author's residence could become a place for the literary tourist and pilgrim of art demonstrated that Rogers was continuing the model of the sociable living legend who had different roles to different generations.

It is my priority to delve into this historical context of Rogers's representation through his letters. The self-representation in correspondence, often in the form of critiques or updates on an individual's situation, is ultimately a fictional one, but the letter does not exist in isolation, instead functions as a part of a thriving dialogue of sociability that was the main form of communication during Rogers's lifetime. It was living in London and in such close and increasing accessibility to people all over the country (and, indeed, world), that made Rogers prioritise the visit of the individual over their letter. This can be seen in his letters, such as in his letter to George Cumberland, in which he asks the artist to visit, not write, in response.[126] Gaskins argues that it is through a close reading of Rogers that we can revaluate and recover his reputation and importance to literary history, but he was so much more than a bestselling author, and the study of his letters demonstrates this.[127]

In conclusion, the reasons for the decline of Rogers's reputation are complex, but partly due to the specialisation of literary studies. The categorisation and periodisation of literary history, although a necessity for curriculums, has left the extensive life of Samuel Rogers to fall through a gap in the way

---

[125] *Table Talk*, p.9.
[126] See letter 59.
[127] Avery F. Gaskins, 'Samuel Rogers: A Revaluation', *The Wordsworth Circle* (16:3), (Summer 1985), p.147.

that we consider the role of the poet, and the public's expectations of the poet, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Poetry was not an isolationist activity or experience, but played an important part in the active sociability in the age during which Rogers lived. This will be explored further in my analysis of the relationships between Rogers and his correspondents in Chapter Two.

Chapter Two:
Rogers and his Correspondents

> 'I always distrust the accounts of eminent men by their *contemporaries.* None of us has any reason to slander Homer or Julius Cæsar; but we find it very difficult to divest ourselves of prejudices when we are writing about persons with whom we have been acquainted'[1]

> '[Lady Beaumont's] kind letter I shall answer forthwith - but writing to me is worse than arsenic or hellebore & the unanswered Epistles that undraw my curtain at midnight & murder my sleep, are as numerous as the leaves that strew the brooks &c.'[2]

This chapter explores Rogers's correspondence in order to reveal more about the lives of his correspondents, and the roles played by correspondence itself in sustaining sociability in the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Favret argues that 'traditionally the letter has not been read as having a "public" voice', yet the pivotal function of the letter in cultivating sociability proves that it was a public voice with the potential of multiple audiences.[3] The mode of the letter could consequently be both public and private, enabling correspondence to enact different functions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This multiplicity of correspondence is a key concern of constructing literary biography. St Clair, for example, uses the concept of 'the biographer as archaeologist'

---

[1] *Table Talk*, p.103.
[2] See letter 47.
[3] Mary A. Favret, Romantic Correspondence (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p.19.

to discuss how there is an instability in literary biography when more evidence is available: the variation of forms of evidence, from letters and ephemera to literary works, provides conflicting perspectives of an individual's life.[4] During this chapter, correspondence is used to chart relationships. The reliability of correspondence is debatable: correspondence and opinions expressed therein are not necessarily authentic. The more evidence which has arisen about Rogers through this project has, indeed, not clarified Rogers's stance but complicated it by suggesting that there is a strong performative identity running through his sociability. Consequently this chapter aims not to produce a biographical account of Rogers as seen through his letters, but instead to review the relationships between Rogers and others. In doing so it hopes to demonstrate that individuals existed in multiples, their motivations and functions changing depending on the date they are corresponding on and the person they are corresponding with.

[4] William St Clair, 'The Biographer as Archaeologist', *Mapping Lives: The Uses of Biography,* ed. Peter France and William St Clair (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), p.222.



‘Samuel Rogers at his Breakfast Table’, John Doyle, engraved by Charles Mottram, c.1823 (Tate Gallery, T04907).

The image of ‘Samuel Rogers at his Breakfast Table’ is a crucial articulation of the myth of sociability, as it is not an image of an actual gathering, but rather an imagined one: all the individuals represented did visit Rogers, but never at the same time. Those arranged around the table include Lord Byron, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, John Flaxman, Francis Jeffrey, John Philip Kemble, Thomas Lawrence, James Mackintosh, Walter Scott, Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Robert Southey, Thomas Stothard, J.M.W Turner, and William Wordsworth (to name a few). These individuals demonstrate the interconnectivity of sociability: professions include sculptors, poets, artists, members of the theatre, and critics. Their actions are expressive, and foregrounded is Rogers in the middle, with large white spaces bringing the viewer’s attention to both the tablecloth and Byron’s waistcoat. This imagined scene does

however tell only a partial story. It excludes those from the scientific and religious professions whom Rogers associated with frequently, as well as women. Rogers's female correspondents included Mary Shelley and Mary Somerville, and the novelist Elizabeth Gaskell met Rogers at Dickens's house. Literary salons (even impromptu ones such as Dickens's residence as well as established ones such as Holland House) 'insisted on mixed-gender sociability'.[5]

Although the literary salon may seem a static place, depicted in Mottram's image as a moment in time, it was in fact 'maintained through' activity, including 'travel and epistolary communication'.[6] Travel- both to travel to the salon as destination, and also travel as a mutual interest of attendees- and correspondence, provided a movement to sociability, changing and adapting how sociability was performed to match the interests of individuals within networks. Another intriguing aspect of Mottram's engraving is his assertion of Rogers's private space as a literary salon: frequently, and accurately, Rogers is indexed as a prominent figure in the literary salon of Holland House.[7]

This chapter looks at Rogers's relationship with politicians, poets, novelists, artists, editors, publishers, scientists, antiquaries and theologians through his correspondence with them. It also reflects on the function of correspondence as discussed in the introduction to this thesis, and the very place that it held in Rogers's daily routine.

---

[5] Amy Prendergast, *Literary Salons Across Britain and Ireland in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p.3.
[6] *Ibid,* p.1.
[7] See Linda Kelly, *Holland House* (London: I.B. Tauris & Co., Ltd, 2013), and chapters dedicated to this discussion in *Blocksidge* and Susanne Schmid, *British Literary Salons of the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp.71-113.

2.1 Politicians

Rogers corresponded with many eminent figures in public life, including Prime Ministers such as Earl Grey, Benjamin Disraeli and William Gladstone. His letters dealt with matters of current political importance (such as the Great Reform Act of 1832) but also with social and domestic life. Moreover, his correspondence was passed on and read by others, including the wives and families of politicians, who thus became the indirect recipient of Rogers's letters.

One of the largest surviving groups of letters that I have located are those exchanged between Rogers and Lord and Lady Holland from 1811-43, now in the British Library (Add.MS. 51646-51647). Although this collection does not contain every letter sent from Rogers to the Hollands, those that are present demonstrate that not only was Lady Holland as politically involved in affairs of state as her husband, but that Holland House itself served as a political, artistic and literary centre that connected Whigs with the Tory establishment. For example, the Tory Poet Laureate Robert Southey made use of the collection of books on Spain and Spanish culture in Holland House's library and exchanged ideas and information with his fellow Hispanophile Lord Holland. Literary concerns therefore existed alongside political ones but were not defined by political alliances; as Linda Kelly states, 'wit, talent and learning, far more than social status, were the keys to entry into Holland House'.[8] It is difficult to know when Rogers was first introduced into Holland House due to his mutual acquaintances who were already in the Holland House circles. It has been claimed that both Charles James Fox and Richard Sharp introduced Rogers initially to the Holland House circle, but Rogers's mutual

[8] Linda Kelly, *Holland House* (London: I.B. Tauris & Co., Ltd, 2013), p.73.

contacts with the circle means that this is difficult to determine. Although there had been an initial meeting between Rogers and the Hollands, Rogers would probably have already known their frequent guests such as Sharp and Sydney Smith.[9]

Lady Holland's relationship with Rogers was complicated. His wit was a good match for her own at social occasions, but he also had the tendency to irritate her, and there is evidence that the Hollands' children avoided his company. In a letter to her son Henry Vassall Fox in 1822, Lady Holland noted that 'Rogers seems to let his affections slip into new channels, & has given us up […] He is a strange man, & will throw off many friends with whom he might have gone through life comfortably'.[10] Here Lady Holland alludes to Rogers's social priorities, and although the Whig cause of reform was popular, the Catholic Emancipation debates that the Hollands supported were not, and Rogers was always keen to network with the most influential people of his day even if they did not share his political concerns.

Although her eldest legitimate son Henry Fox disliked Rogers immensely, Lady Holland vacillated between a dislike of Rogers's social politics and an occasional affection for his company, as expressed in a letter of 1824:

> You are too hard upon Rogers, as you only dwell upon the notorious blemishes, without accepting the qualifications of sound sense & generous upright principle & real benevolence of heart. His tongue is viperish to be sure:

---

[9] *Ibid*.

[10] Elizabeth Vassall Fox to Henry Fox, 9 November 1822, in Earl of Ilchester (ed.), *Lady Holland to Her Son, 1821-1845* (London: John Murray, 1946), p.14.

> but many times it is darted without intended mischief, & inflicts perhaps pain upon those who are too sensitive.[11]

Whereas Lady Holland's letters to others reveal her ambivalence towards Rogers, his letters to her are often affectionate and familiar, exchanging information and gossip.[12] The Holland House letters demonstrate one of Rogers's distinct habits as a correspondent: they often open with 'Many, many thanks'. This may be to thank for a letter, a meeting, information, enquiries into his health, or even for the sending of periodicals and books.

Rogers has been dubbed the 'Oracle of Holland House' by Kelly and Blocksidge. The latter described Rogers's necessity of cultivating this 'oracular character' as a 'means of making himself noticed', such as through 'sharp, pithy, statements'. Blocksidge contrasts this with Rogers's 'emollient' conduct at his own dinners and breakfasts. Rogers's position in the Holland House circle was not simply as a competitive social entertainer.[13] The letters to the members of Holland House from Rogers suggest that the relationship was mutually beneficial and also record Rogers's changing position in society- not just in relation to Holland House- over the years.

As demonstrated in many letters, the style of Rogers's correspondence changes from a travel narrative, to a log of social activities, to a personal diary, and also fulfils the function of accepting invitations and excusing absences.[14] Furthermore,

---

[11] Elizabeth Vassall Fox to Henry Fox, 6 June 1824, in Earl of Ilchester (ed.), *Lady Holland to Her Son, 1821-1845* (London: John Murray, 1946), p.33.
[12] For examples, see letters 7, 9 and 12.
[13] *Blocksidge*, p.157.
[14] Examples of these are Rogers's letters to William Gilpin in Carl Paul Barbier's *Samuel Rogers and William Gilpin: Their Friendship and Correspondence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959); and the letters to his sister Sarah Rogers, published in *Clayden 1889* (both volumes).

it also contains poetic language, fulfilling the expectations that a political and literary establishment like Holland House would have of a poet:

> I set out in rain, but it is now all sun-shine & I wish you could take a drive with me along the sea-side to-day, for the sea is as smooth as glass & a fleet of merchant-men in full sail <are coming> around the North-foreland, as large as the life[15]

Rogers's correspondence demonstrates that he is a keen travel writer. A letter sent to Lord Holland, dated 23 October 1814, declares: 'To-day in my gondola I made a vow that I wanted to write to you'.[16] For Rogers, writing was a duty, and occasionally a burden, and even thinking about writing- let alone undertaking the task of writing- formed a part of his travel experience. He writes to Lord and Lady Holland from Paris, Dropmore, and Geneva during the 1820s, but also importantly mentions English country houses and tourist destinations, such as when Rogers visits Petworth with Lord Egremont, Lord Brougham, and Charles Wyndham.[17] These narratives in Rogers's correspondence are, therefore, not just travels abroad (as was the vogue at the time), but also detail social minutiae and social networks. Where Rogers travels to, and who he travels with, are demonstrative of his sociability, status within political and literary circles, and also his wealth. That Europe was as accessible to Rogers as the rest of Britain demonstrates his flexibility in terms of time and the very fact that he could

---

[15] Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 22 September 1836, British Library Add.MSS.51647, ff.99-100.
[16] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], 23 October 1814, British Library Add.MSS.51646, ff.44-45.
[17] See letter 28.

afford to travel at such short notice and, as he notes in a letter, on a 'whim'. An example of this is a letter to Lady Holland dated 6 August 1827, when Rogers declares that 'You may be very sure that I shall not fail at Ampthill, unless some whim takes me over the water, of which I see no likelihood at present'.[18]

Rogers is undoubtedly aware of how his travel writing sounds to correspondents. In a letter to Lady Holland in 1821 he writes 'I don't know where to begin my life & adventures' before detailing his travels from Fontainbleu to Napiers.[19] In reality, although Rogers had made many exciting trips abroad, these places certainly were not new to Lord and Lady Holland, who had both travelled extensively through Europe from the 1790s onwards. For Rogers, these places were not a privilege to travel to but are recorded with a sense of familiarity, as they would have also been familiar to the recipients of the letters. In a letter of around 1826, Rogers breaks his traditional pattern, and writes in the form of a travel log, detailing journeys alongside the meeting of acquaintances. For Rogers, more space in letters is given to the description of mutual acquaintances of Holland House and their activities, than space is given to the descriptions of places. Exchanging information about mutual acquaintances was a way of maintaining social networks, a priority of Rogers's correspondence, and also reflecting the Hollands' interests and priorities.

Although Rogers undertook extensive travels, a constant complaint in his letters is the very fact that he has nothing to write: 'If I have not written sooner, it was really because I had little or nothing to say'; 'You will say this is all very trifling & so it is. But you tell me to write & I have nothing else'; and in

[18] See letter 46.
[19] See letter 29.

November 1841, after detailing meeting acquaintances, Rogers writes that 'all this amounts to nothing'.[20] For Rogers, having nothing to write about does not necessarily mean that he has not been busy. It rather implies that Rogers does not feel that he has information of any relevance to impart, or that he is immodestly claiming that spending time with influential individuals at important places is such a normal occurrence that he does not need to make note of it. Consequently, the nature of his correspondence (particularly to Lady Holland) echoes the 'backbiting' and gossipy character that he had cultivated at Holland House.

Rogers did not just share mutual acquaintances with Lord and Lady Holland. He was also a contributor to artistic and literary life at Holland House. For example, in 1811 he responded to an invitation to stay: 'I shall have very great pleasure in finding myself under the old roof that has sheltered so many foreign statesmen - from Sully to Calonne - & so many foreign artists from Van dyke to Canova'.[21] For Rogers, staying at Holland House was not just about the present eminent owners. The furnishing of a house with these artistic objects and histories was an attraction to the visitor, especially one like Rogers, who had his own renowned art collection. Rogers particularly remarked to Lady Holland in 1838 about the art collection of Lord Cowley, the youngest brother of the Duke of Wellington:

> There are some old Spanish Portraits, whole lengths, brought from Spain by Lord Cowley – but almost every bed-

[20] See letter 84; Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 1838, British Library Add.MSS.51647, ff.133-134; Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], November 1841, Add.MSS.51647, ff.158-159.
[21] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 24 April 1811, British Library Add.MSS. 51646, f.4

> chamber & passage-room has its walls covered with prints, french & english – For instance I counted 121 in my room of every size and as brilliant as just out of a portfolio.[22]

This passage would have been of particular interest to Lady Holland given her own house's vast library on Spanish history (which Southey found so appealing) and extensive art collection.

To the Holland House circle, Rogers was both a famous and bestselling poet with an extensive knowledge of the publishing industry and someone at the centre of contemporary literary life. Rogers kept Lady Holland up to date with the latest publications from Fanny Burney and William Godwin, Joanna Baillie, Madame de Stael, and sent her gossip about Lord Byron's affairs. He also intervened in an important political decision regarding the suppressed publication of the fifth edition of Byron's *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*. Byron's satire had presented an unflattering portrait of the Holland House set,

> Thy HOLLAND'S banquets shall each toil repay!
> While grateful Britain yields the praise she owes
> To HOLLAND'S hirelings and to Learning's foes.
>
> […]
>
> Illustrious HOLLAND! hard would be his lot,
> His hirelings mentioned, and himself forgot!
> HOLLAND, with HENRY PETTY at his back,
> The whipper-in and huntsman of the pack.

[22] Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 1838, British Library Add.MSS.15647, ff.126-127.

> Blest be the banquets spread at Holland House,
> Where Scotchmen feed, and Critics may carouse!
> Long, long beneath that hospitable roof
> Shall Grub-street dine, while duns are kept aloof.[23]

Byron attacked Holland House's reputation as a shelter for writers and those Byron considered as degrading to literature (hence the reference to 'grub street'). Although Byron's Whig politics placed him in this circle of individuals, he criticises the familial association of Holland with his relation Lord Lansdown (Henry Petty) and the way in which Holland House is used by authors to keep bailiffs away through their association with wealthy individuals ('while duns are kept aloof').

In retrospect, the decision to attack so many eminent individuals was a political mistake, written as a response to *The Edinburgh Review's* critique of Byron's 1807 collection of poems *Hours of Idleness*. As a Whig and prominent poet who had taken up his position, albeit briefly, in the House of Lords in February 1812, Byron could not socially or politically afford to make enemies of the Hollands and their circle. It was at this point that Rogers interceded, and urged Byron to suppress any further editions of *English Bards*. Rogers wrote to Lady Holland to assure her that the fifth edition would not appear:

> Tell Lord H. that Lord B. has behaved nobly. A New Edition of the Satire is just printed, & waiting only for an advertisement to take flight. At the very first word, he declared his resolution to extinguish the whole & never more to publish a single Copy. He only expressed his

[23] Lord Byron, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers; A Satire* (London: James Cawthorn, 1809), p.43, ll.521-529.

> regret that it had not occurred to <u>him</u> before & when we parted at your door, he set off to the Publisher's.[24]

This is an example of Rogers using his network to change a crucial publishing decision. It also smoothed the relationship between Byron and his fellow Whigs, demonstrating Rogers's usefulness as both a literary and political acquaintance. However, what Rogers didn't consider was that this decision would actually increase the popularity of *English Bards*, and that second hand copies consequently went up in price.[25]

Rogers kept the Hollands up to date with the latest news in the literary world, including information on his meetings with Sheridan, Byron and Moore, the health of Madame de Stael, and theatre performances and plays by Kemble and others.[26] Rogers used his letters to arrange social occasions that might enhance existing or develop new networks. In 1812, for example, he reassured Lady Holland that 'I will this instant set to <u>unearth</u> Mrs. Inchbald, if possible' to invite her to a dinner.[27]

Rogers's relationship with Lord Holland, however, was slightly different. Holland used Rogers as a sounding board for his own writings. Holland sent Rogers manuscripts of his own works, mainly poems, and asked Rogers to comment on them. In October 1813 Rogers offered the first of many critiques of verses that Holland had sent him, and 'in return' sent him his own verses on Garrick.[28] What can be understood from this, is that- as I will later explore in the relationship between Rogers

---

[24] See letter 9.
[25] *St Clair*, p.163.
[26] Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], October 1812, British Library Add.MSS.51646, ff.22-23; see letter 12; Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], January 1817, British Library Add.MSS.51646, ff.73-74.
[27] Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 13 April 1812, British Library Add.MSS.51646, ff.18-19.
[28] See letter 13.

and Richard Wellesley- the poet and the politician did not exist as two separate professions.

This exchange of poetry also demonstrates Rogers and Holland's shared knowledge- the result of education and continuing interest- in literary history. This can be seen in a response that Rogers gives Lord Holland on poetry that he submits to him: 'Many, many thanks for the MS: I am delighted with it; & so would Addison have been, I am very sure'.[29] The correspondence evidences that Holland sent the verses to Rogers as he had extensive knowledge of Milton and Gray: 'Many thanks for your prose & your verse, both of which are always most welcome. Your conclusion with regard to Milton is very ingenuous & worthy of yourself & that passage'.[30] Rogers expresses that he both enjoyed receiving Holland's poetry and responding to his queries about poetry. The latter included providing Holland with a text of Fitzpatrick's verses written in response to Gray's 'Thyrsis', after Holland had 'lost or misplaced' his copy.[31] When writing to Lord Holland about Lady Holland's spirits, Rogers asks to be remembered to her as 'she used to flatter me sometimes by asking me to point to her some little thing to read - may I venture to recommend to her a letter of Gray's'.[32] Not only does this suggest that Rogers was recommending reading to the Hollands, but it also demonstrates similarities and affinities in their collections of books.

Although the letters show that Rogers was revising Holland's verse, Holland also undertook the same task for Rogers. On Christmas Day 1830, Rogers confessed that 'I like

---

[29] See letter 15.
[30] See letter 58.
[31] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], 21 August 1833, British Library Add.MSS.51647 ff.70-71.
[32] See letter 79.

much your four alterations. They are all improvements'.[33] Although Rogers's own writing habits demonstrate that he was meticulous about his works, for example through his republications of his poem *Italy*, poetry had a place in his sociability practices as well as in his publishing life. The exchanging of verse and poetic discourses were ways of reinforcing his political as well as literary and social networks.

Rogers entered the Holland House circle as a bestselling poet, and this status, along with his Whig allegiances, helped him to retain his connections there. Moreover, he benefitted from his position as a friend of the Hollands. This is shown clearly by their mutual acquaintances, individuals repeatedly referred to in the letters. For example, on 18 October 1813, Rogers writes to Lady Holland from Bowood, the seat of the Marquis of Lansdowne, that 'the Persons of the Drama here just now, are very soon numbered the Abercrombies, Jekyll, Eden, & a M^{r} Newnham, a cottage-friend of Lord L's.'[34] 'The Persons of the Drama' reads as though there is an expected script to be played out at social gatherings, and that the participants in it are characters that Lady Holland would recognise. This is reinforced by the use of abbreviations such as 'Lord L.', which imply mutual familiarity and understanding.

As well as the benefits in sharing networks for both the Hollands and Rogers, the latter's propensity for gossip and for sharing private news did land him in trouble with others. For example, in 1822 Rogers wrote to Lady Holland reprimanding her for repeating what he had told her in confidence: 'I am told that what has dropped from me by your fire-side has been repeated at Edinburgh & to those who think proper to resent it

---

[33] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], 25 December 1830, British Library Add.MSS.51647, f.31.
[34] See letter 14.

[…] But I fear I am too old to mend, & before you & Lord H who have treated me with such indulgence, I cannot restrain myself'.[35] Rogers became as famous for this type of behaviour as for his poetry with his close acquaintances. When Byron met Rogers in Bologna in 1821, he wrote to Murray that 'we slashed away to right and left- cutting up all our acquaintances, - and indeed - every body else […] *You* were not spared by any means - but as nobody else was - you were in very good company - I don't think that I heard & uttered so much slander for these last seven years.'[36] Even twenty five years later in 1846, Thomas Carlyle described Rogers as a 'most sorrowful distressing distracted old phenomenon; hovering over the rim of deep Eternities with nothing but light babble, fatuity, vanity, and the frostiest London with [sic] in his mouth! Sometimes I felt as if I could throttle him, the poor old wretch'.[37] The use of 'wretch' and the implication that Rogers participated in ghost-like 'hovering' was, as discussed in Chapter One, akin to that found in other descriptions of Rogers. Rogers's tendency to disclose other people's private confidences only supported this negative portrayal.

However, Rogers was an indispensable political connection, and passed on information to Holland House as soon as he heard of it: 'I send you my Times of yesterday in which M^{r} Fox is described as a factious leader - the author of all Evil – I conclude it by the Impertinent Thief D'Israeli'.[38] In this case, Rogers had sent an article about her husband's uncle and

---

[35] See letter 32.
[36] Lord Byron to John Murray, November 1821, *BlJ,* Vol. 9, p.53.
[37] Thomas Carlyle to John A. Carlyle, 8 November 1846, 'The Carlyle Letters Online', Duke University press, [http://carlyleletters.dukeupress.edu/content/vol21/#lt-18461108-TC-JAC-01], accessed 7/12/16.
[38] Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 1837, British Library Add.MSS.51647, ff.120-121.

leader of the Whig opposition from 1784-88, Charles James Fox, to Lady Holland as soon as he had known of it.[39] This is also a notable demonstration of how Rogers wrote his letters for a specific audience: Rogers was friends with Benjamin Disraeli's father, Isaac D'Israeli, at this time, and did meet Benjamin Disraeli on cordial terms. Expressing opinions like this about a Tory politician consecrated Rogers's allegiance to his Whig audience, despite his personal connection to Disraeli.

Although correspondence served the purpose of reinforcing an individual's particular politics to a particular audience, Rogers was aware that the Whig bastion of Holland House could not exist in isolation from the Tory establishment. When Peel bestowed a literary pension on the poet and hymn-writer James Montgomery, a radical pamphleteer in his youth and a newspaper proprietor, Rogers defended Montgomery's acceptance of the honour to Lord Holland: 'If Dryden or Johnson were now alive & pouring forth Toryism or bigotry, would not I service them if I could?'[40] Rogers is aware here that literary merits cannot be overlooked because of political opinions.

Rogers's letters to the Hollands form a large part of this edition of his correspondence due to their surviving numbers. Another eminent member of the Whig establishment whom Rogers met and corresponded with was Lord Brougham. Whilst allied in their Whiggism, they also shared a love of literature. Brougham had been one of the co-founders of the Whig *Edinburgh Review* in 1802. In *Rogers and His Contemporaries*, Clayden printed fourteen 'remarkable' letters from Brougham to Rogers, which 'were written with the object of keeping the

---

[39] Probably the *Times*, 2 Oct 1837, p.2; Charles James Fox is referred to in this article as a 'factious leader'.
[40] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], 25 December 1838, 51647 ff.122-123.

sequestered poet and politician fully informed of the public events in which he and his friends felt close personal interest'.[41] The letters I have included in this thesis demonstrate the interconnectivity of the political and poetic world.

Rogers expresses a great deal of gratitude to Brougham in his letters, in an overly sentimental style. Examples include Rogers's referral to his own 'Unworthiness' in comparison to Brougham: 'I ever more sensible of my Unworthiness than when I read what you have written concerning me',[42] and 'Much have I admired & envied you from the day you were born'.[43] Rogers places Brougham letters at the top of a social hierarchy, referring to how 'for among the friends I have known from the beginning there are none whom I can think, with more pride & pleasure',[44] and again in tones verging on the sentimental, writes that 'if I had the wings of a swallow instead of directing my flight to Egypt, I should be with you to morrow […] but alas my wings have been clypt'.[45]

One of the reasons for this sentimental, ever-grateful tone in Rogers's letters may be due to the claim Rogers made on Brougham's political and social influence through requesting favours for family and friends. In November 1830, Rogers asked Brougham to help his nephew Thomas Rogers, 'who with six children & with no preferment <u>whatsoever</u>, is struggling on with less than three hundred a year,' enclosing a reference from his employer to bear further witness to his merit. [46]

---

[41] *Clayden 1889*, Vol. 2, p.356.
[42] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter Brougham], National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 14,879.
[43] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter Brougham], 7 August 1852, National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 21,647.
[44] *Ibid.*
[45] *Ibid.*
[46] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter Brougham], 26 November 1830, National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 21,238.

Another favour that Rogers asked Brougham for was to recommend Mr Ottley 'the Office now in the British Museum'.[47]

One of the joint endeavours that Brougham and Rogers embarked on was founding London University (now University College London). In 1825 a mutual acquaintance, the poet Thomas Campbell, published an open letter to Brougham in *The Times*, suggesting that a secular university in London be established.[48] In a letter dated 16 August 1825, Rogers asked Brougham: 'As for our University […] What have you done? What have others done? Am I to make my fortune by it? I fear, like Sir Francis Wronghead.[49] At all events, you may depend upon me for a Subscriber – small as my means are'.[50] Rogers describes himself as a dependable subscriber to the University but ultimately not a very active one; by enquiring as to whether he is to make 'fortune by it', Rogers mocks the prestigious intellectual and secular values that the university was founded on and instead asks what he can expect back. Rogers's investment as a subscriber is also echoed in a comment he makes in a letter to Brougham about being 'bullied into a Subscription to Drury Lane Theatre […] but of principal & interest I have not yet received the shadow of a sixpence'.[51] Although Rogers is clearly supportive of Brougham's causes, as an individual who was often asked for financial favours and careful with his money, Rogers was also looking for sound financial investments.

---

[47] *Ibid*. The Mr Ottley mentioned is presumably a relation of William Young Ottley (1771-1836), art critic and collector, but upon enquiry the British Museum has no record of an individual by this name.
[48] The record of the first meeting concerning this was published as 'The London College', the *Times*, 6 June 1825, p.4. It includes details regarding the meeting which was chaired by Campbell and attended by Brougham.
[49] Belligerent character from Colley Cibber's 1792 play *The Provok'd Husband*, part written by Vanbrugh in 1728.
[50] See letter 38.
[51] See letter 39.

In a way not too dissimilar from Rogers and Lord Holland swapping poetry, Rogers wrote to Brougham suggesting that Brougham has changed Rogers's reading tastes: 'for I have long ceased to be much of a novel-reader. But I soon came to higher things – to such as make us wiser & better; & I cannot tell you how much I shall value the Volumes as long as I live'.[52] Although it is difficult to know what volumes are specifically alluded to, Rogers is acknowledging that social networks can change an individual's reading habits. In 1845, Rogers also thanked Brougham for sharing one of the latter's political speeches, which he 'had read […] before with the greatest pleasure in a less authentic shape; & I need not say, I am sure, how glad I am to receive it as it came from your lips'.[53] That Rogers had read the speech before it was delivered is indeed not surprising; Rogers had also contributed to drafting Byron's maiden speech in the House of Lords on the Luddites in February 1812. It is likely that Brougham would have outlined or possibly recited a speech to Rogers whilst drafting it, demonstrating the function of sociability in political apostrophe. What can clearly be seen from the letters, however, is that there is a direct transfer of political and literary information.

The political ideas exchanged also demonstrate that although there was a strong political divide between Whigs and Tories, some party members did share similar values with regards to the role of the politician, as demonstrated in Rogers's discussion of the Duke of Wellington: 'How nobly did the Duke of Wellington act the other day! but when does he not do himself honour?' [54] As a staunch Tory and a one-time Prime

---

[52] See letter 107.
[53] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Brougham], 5 March 1845, National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 23,138
[54] Samuel Rogers to [Henry Brougham], 13 August 1850, National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 21,645.

Minister (albeit only for a short time and quite unsuccessfully), Wellington's comments held political weight for both Tories and Whigs. Rogers is suggesting that the notions of 'nobility' and 'honour' surpass political exclusivity, and that even an individual who worked against the political notions that Rogers spent his life agreeing with, could be an individual worthy of admiration.

The relationship between Rogers and Brougham in Rogers's letters encapsulates a notion of literary and political sociability in which correspondents swap knowledge. A key function of social networks was for them to be dialogic, and to ensure that individuals could develop ideas with other people. This is particularly prevalent in the correspondence between Rogers and Brougham and Rogers and Lord Holland.

Another notable Whig with whom Rogers shared discursive political correspondence was Earl Grey. Rogers's letters to Grey demonstrate that he shared Grey's political pursuit of the Great Reform Act of 1832, as well as sharing interests in art, particularly the National Gallery. Rogers corresponds with Grey about the National Gallery at the same time that huge political changes were developing in the lead up to and the wake of the Great Reform Act. Rogers corresponded with Grey in one of the most politically important years of his career. Although Rogers apologised for speaking of the National Gallery at such an important time, Rogers recognised that the removal of the Gallery was an issue of national importance.

The National Gallery had been housed at 100 Pall Mall until 1831, when Parliament agreed to build a new Gallery at the 'Charing Mews' (now Trafalgar Square). In 1832 the government were still in the early stages of planning for the new building (which opened in 1838). Rogers is concerned with the physical appearance of the National Gallery, as he wants

confirmation from Grey that he is not supporting certain plans, as 'whoever consents to let the front of a Stable be the front of the National Gallery of a great Empire […] will furnish subject enough for epigrams & caricatures without number'.[55]

As well as writing to Grey in relation to the National Gallery, and ensuring that Grey is not supporting an idea that would be satirised by the press, Rogers also used Grey to recommend friends for available political positions. For example, in a letter dated 15 April 1834, during a time of political restructure for the Whigs, Rogers stated that 'I ventured the other morning to recommend to your notice M^{r} James Millingen; & I really believe that there is not one, among them all, who has so strong a claim to your bounty', and uses the letter as a written reference .[56] Even in 1845, when Grey had been out of power for over a decade, Rogers sent him a very flattering letter, with reference to Grey's political career: 'How wise, how noble has been your Conduct & how much are we indebted to you! […] By the little word <u>we</u> I mean the Human Race for who can say what might not have followed?'[57]

Alongside this close friendship with Earl Grey, Rogers was also well acquainted with Lady Grey. On 16 August 1847 Rogers declined an invitation to visit the Greys, probably due to the fact that he was to visit the Devonshires in Derbyshire in September 1847, and states that 'glad indeed should I be to come to you wherever you were - & above all to be with you where I have passed so many happy days'.[58] This letter is also interesting as Rogers opens it with 'what can I say to you both', suggesting that letters were shared between families and in

---

[55] See letter 66.
[56] See letter 76.
[57] Samuel Rogers to [Charles Grey], 28 December 1845, University of Durham, GRE/B/121/11A/13.
[58] See letter 113.

social circles. This complicates the notion of the individual recipient in this period: authors of letters were aware that they could be shared, read aloud and could also be kept and even copied by the recipient, making letter reading (as well as letter writing) a social activity for a particular audience. Consequently, letters which contained personally or politically sensitive information were at risk of being shared, which is why William Godwin asked Rogers to burn his letters requesting money once they had been received (as I will later discuss).

In the same way that Rogers used letter-writing to cultivate literary and political acquaintanceships within his own political group, the political sphere of an individual was not limited to those of his own party, and Rogers shared similar relationships with Tories as he did with Whigs. An example of this is evident in the correspondence between Rogers and Richard Wellesley, the older brother of the Duke of Wellington. Like Lord Holland, Wellesley sent Rogers verses, with Rogers responding that 'I need not say, I am sure, with what delight I read the Verses […] They are beautiful, & well worthy of a better age.'[59] Wellesley privately published his collection of poems in Latin and English *Primitiae et Reliquaie* in 1840, and had sought Rogers's opinion on them.[60]The other notable subject of the letters from Rogers to Wellesley is a tree, reportedly planted by Pope at his villa in Twickenham, and mentioned by Wellesley in his poetry. Rogers states: 'May [the verses] bring again into favour a Tree which on its arrival here was hailed universally, but has, I think, most unaccountably been neglected of late. You mention it as flourishing on the banks of the Thames. Was it not first planted there by one of

[59] See letter 91.
[60] Richard Colley Wellesley, *Primitiae et Reliquaie* (Londini: Gulielmi Nicol, 1841).

our poets? I mean Mr. Pope'.[61] In another letter, Rogers adds that 'Surely no tree was ever before so honoured; &, if she continues to weep after this, she must indeed be fond of grief'.[62] Rogers's knowledge of London, history and poetry made him an important critic for Wellesley's poems and source for his enquiries.

As with prominent Whigs, Rogers takes the opportunity of writing to Wellesley about his poetry to flatter the man himself:

> I cannot tell you with what impatience I opened the Volume or with what delight I read it. - If such has been the fruit of your boy-hood & of your leisure hours in after-life, may you long continue to exercise your talent - to demonstrate to the World, that He who for the benefit of so many millions had in turn held two Sovereignties in regions so remote from each other, could preserve to the last his love for classical literature & his excellence in every branch of it.[63]

This opinion offered by Rogers is of *Primitiae et Reliquaie.* It focuses on Wellesley's achievement of balancing his poetical work with his political positions in Ireland and India, instead of on the work itself. Rogers blurs the poetic and the personal to cultivate his friendship with Wellesley, demonstrating how Rogers used his position as a bestselling poet to gain the friendship of important political figures.

A different example of Rogers's use of politically important acquaintances is demonstrated in his letter to Benjamin Disraeli:

---

[61] See letter 91.
[62] See letter 92.
[63] See letter 94.

> Being an ardent admirer of your character as a Statesman as well as your elegant works, and having obtained the Autographs of some of our most eminent men, I am particularly desirous to add yours to the number and would feel deeply indebted by your transmitting it to me in the accompanying envelope.[64]

Autograph collecting was a popular nineteenth century hobby, emerging from the popularity of domestic commonplace books as sources of information and, indeed, literary and political inspiration. Rogers's own autograph was in demand by collectors and found its way into numerous nineteenth century collections alongside those of monarchs, politicians and authors of his age.[65] The tone of this letter does, however, suggest that Disraeli and Rogers did not share a familiar relationship, despite the long standing friendship between Rogers and Disraeli's father Isaac. A reason for this could be the friendship between Rogers and Gladstone, which had begun in the 1830s, and the political animosity between Disraeli and Gladstone which became personal as well as professional during Victoria's reign.

Rogers's relationship with Gladstone was a politically charged one, which saw a young Gladstone at the beginning of his career asking Rogers for advice and feedback on his political writings. In response to Gladstone sending him a copy of his writings, Rogers acknowledged the difference in their political opinions:

---

[64] Samuel Rogers to [Benjamin] Disraeli, Bodleian Library, Dep.Hughenden 245/2, f.80.

[65] An example of this is at the Bodleian Library MSS.Autogr.c.24, which contains autographs from Tudor monarchs to mid nineteenth century authors and includes Rogers.

> Many, many thanks for your Volume! I cannot say how much I admire it in every line & how far I am inclined to go with you - but when I tell you that I am descended on my mother's side from One, who, though a favourite scholar of Busby, became a stout nonconformist, & that my father, when he married, was presented to my mother's house, you will not wonder if I am not so zealous in the good causes as I ought to be. Still I feel the pull of your arguments; & perhaps on a second perusal I shall confess myself a Convert; but whatever I may be in that respect, of this I am very sure that I shall always love & admire you as much as ever.[66]

The work that Rogers refers to is Gladstone's *The State in its Relations with the Church* (1838), which emphasised that one of the difficulties with Whiggism as a dominant political ideology was that it did not support the affiliation of state and church as many of its supporters were non-conformists. As a dissenter, Rogers would have been interested in Gladstone's thesis.

One of the other interesting points articulated in this letter is that Rogers feels that this nonconformist background prevents him from being 'so zealous in the good causes as I ought to be'. However, the ending of this letter ('I shall always love & admire you as much as ever') as well as the beginning ('Many, many thanks') suggests that Rogers is using correspondence to placate potential political allies whilst not necessarily agreeing with them.

Gladstone's papers and diaries reflect the relationship between Rogers and Gladstone as one composed of similar literary interests, and not necessarily shared politics. Not only do Gladstone's diaries show that he was reading *The Pleasures*

[66] See letter 88.

of Memory in 1834, forty two years after its initial publication, but that he also met Rogers in the company of Wordsworth and was a regular attendee at Rogers's breakfasts and dinner parties from 1836 onwards.[67] Furthermore, Gladstone kept detailed notes of his meetings with Rogers, who could report on the political histories of figures like Lord Lansdowne,[68] and also on Wordsworth and Southey's communications.[69] It is in these notes that Gladstone reports an important conversation with Rogers about the integration of authorship and politics:

> [Rogers] spoke unfavourably of Bulwer: well of Milnes's verses: said his father wished them not to be published: because such authorship and its repute would clash with the parliamentary career of his son. Mr. Rogers thought a great author would undoubtedly stand better in Parliament from being such: but that otherwise the additament of authorship, unless on germane subjects, would be an hindrance.[70]

This was in 1838. In a letter of 1844, at a time when Gladstone was a Minister in Peel's cabinet, authorship and translation form the main subject of the correspondence:

> Many, many thanks for your excellent criticisms! It is a strange thing to say - but, if we may judge from experience, perhaps the best vehicle on our language for a translation of verse is prose. He who doubts it has only to open his Bible. At least, right or wrong, such was always my opinion; & who could wish the stories of

---

[67] William Ewart Gladstone, M. R. D. Foot (ed.), *The Gladstone Diaries*, Vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), p.92.
[68] John Brooke and Mary Sorenson, *W. E. Gladstone* (London: H. M. S. O., 1971), p.72.
[69] *Ibid,* p.91.
[70] *Ibid*, p.101.

> Joseph & of Ruth to be otherwise than they are? & who would but rejoice if the Iliad & the Odyssey were so translated?[71]

This letter raises Rogers's interest in literary form, particularly the advantages of translating classical epics into English prose. Not only does the ability to translate Latin into English and poetry into prose demonstrate a high level of classical learning and education, shared by both Rogers and Gladstone, but it is demonstrative of Rogers's interest in the accessibility of the classics and the benefits of adaptations. In a letter to Rogers of 1833, Charles Lamb, whose *Tales From Shakespeare* (1807) reworked Shakespeare's plays into prose for children, articulated this shared interest:

> What injury (short of the theatres) did not Boydell's "Shakespeare Gallery" do me with Shakespeare?—to have Opie's Shakespeare, Northcote's Shakespeare, light-headed Fuseli's Shakespeare, heavy-headed Romney's Shakespeare, woodenheaded West's Shakespeare (though he did the best in "Lear"), deaf-headed Reynolds's Shakespeare, instead of my, and everybody's Shakespeare. To be tied down to an authentic face of Juliet! To have Imogen's portrait! To confine the illimitable![72]

Lamb's rejection of 'confining the illimitable' in terms of restricting editions and publications of Shakespeare was encouraging the accessibility of canonical works to a wider public, and a view that does seem to have chimed with Gladstone's own works. In *Studies on Homer and the Homeric*

---

[71] See letter 102.
[72] *Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, p.85.

Age (1858), Gladstone states that 'The more they [the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*] are searched and tested, the more does it appear they have to say, and the better does their testimony hang together'.[73] This idea of textual interrogation and publication as increasing literary creativity and not necessarily limiting it, is a concept that is discussed in Lamb's correspondence to Rogers as well as Rogers's correspondence to Gladstone.

The availability of classical texts to the public through new translations was seen as a positive movement in the expansion of the bookselling market by Gladstone and Rogers. Despite their religious and political differences, Rogers's role as a bestselling and experienced poet made him an important acquaintance for Gladstone.

Rogers's friendship with Gladstone and his wife, Catherine, was very much cemented by the similar social circles that they moved in. As with Lord and Lady Holland, Rogers corresponded with both husband and wife separately, as well as implying in letters that information provided in correspondence could be shared in the family unit. This is partly due to familial connections. For example, Rogers writes to Catherine Gladstone to invite herself and Lady Lyttleton for dinner.[74] The connection between the two women was that Lady Lyttleton's eldest son married Catherine's sister, uniting two important political families. The changing identity of the Whig party did not isolate Rogers from these circles, but instead his correspondence suggests that Rogers maintained and cultivated strong relationships with those in opposing political parties. That Rogers did not hold a political position in the government

[73] William Ewart Gladstone, *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* (Oxford: University Press, 1858), p.3.
[74] See letter 95.

undoubtedly strengthened his ability to cultivate networks of friends that crossed political spheres.

It was through Catherine Gladstone that Rogers was able to send invitations to not just Catherine but her husband and family too. He accepted invitations to dine, asked to be remembered to Gladstone, and also addresses letters to her as 'My Dear Friend'.[75] For Rogers, to correspond with Catherine Gladstone was not just to correspond with the wife of a politician, but to correspond with an individual who was knowledgeable about social and political matters, and one who- by her own family and interests- was connected to other important figures. In this way, women were important connections in their own right, as they had their own set of family and friends independent from the social circles created by their marriage.

Furthermore, the correspondence to Catherine Gladstone demonstrates that Rogers was closely connected to progressive women such as Angela Burdett-Coutts, referred to as an 'Angel' by Rogers because of her philanthropic and charitable activities.[76] Burdett-Coutts had other interests in common with Rogers: she too was a collector of paintings by Old Masters, and at the auction held after Rogers's death, she purchased six items, three of which were works by Flaxman.[77] For Rogers, these women were politically important, and shared philanthropic interests and artistic expertise. They were not important just because of their marital connections, although this certainly did contribute to the networks surrounding Rogers.

---

[75] Samuel Rogers to [Catherine] Gladstone, British Library, Add.MSS.46227, f.13, f.59 and f.60.
[76] See letter 121.
[77] *Sale Catalogue*.

Another family with which Rogers shared more than political interests were the Wilberforces. In the letters I have transcribed, there is evidence that Rogers made requests of Samuel Wilberforce and arranged to meet.[78] It was Samuel Wilberforce's political power as the Bishop of Oxford, not necessarily as the son of a politician, which made him an important correspondent for Rogers. As with William Wilberforce, however, there are similar requests and engagements made of Wilberforce, including an invitation to meet Miss Coutts.[79] Burdett-Coutts's appearance in this correspondence again suggests that she, like Rogers, had a wide network featuring people of differing political agendas.

The correspondence from Rogers to individuals of political standing, whether Members of Parliament, Prime Ministers or women who shaped political opinion but could not hold professional roles in the establishment, demonstrates that sociability was not confined to those of similar political opinions. Furthermore, correspondence to these individuals suggests that a priority of correspondence was to arrange meetings and visits in person, and not necessarily to use the form of the letter to communicate political views. The literary content in these letters reflects the multifaceted role of the professional man and woman: an individual who was well educated and participating in political agendas was also an individual who was actively engaged in the writing, reading and dissemination of important literary ideas.

[78] See letter 16.
[79] See letter 108.

2.2 Writers

Although sought out by many poets for his status as a bestselling author, Rogers's positions in extensive networks made him a valuable acquaintance. It may be argued that a public figure is as famous as he is *useful* for particular people and particular causes. This section demonstrates that whilst Rogers was supportive of and frequently engaged in the literary activities of his contemporaries, he was supporting them in a variety of different ways. This reflects the complexities of defining an individual merely by their position as a poet. It was not being a poet that made Rogers a useful connection for both politicians and other poets, but rather that he could bestow patronage, had wide-ranging knowledge of the publishing industry, and with his extensive networks, could enact the role of an intermediary when poets needed financial and political support.

As with Rogers's relationship with politicians, one of the ways that he both used other poets and was used by them in turn, was to carry out commissions and favours. When Walter Scott asked Rogers for a commission, Rogers replied that the very request 'flattered [his] vanity',[80] but did not hesitate to ask favours of Scott too, such as to send an engraver's apprentice to Scott's doorstep:

> The bearer of this Letter is a very worthy ingenious man, an Engraver of this City, - He is setting out for Edinburgh & all that he requests of me is that I would give him a line to some Man of Genius once there, mainly that it may be said of him that he is no Adventurer, & that he means honourably to fulfill the Contract he is making with

[80] See letter 54.

> the public. I cannot therefore do better than address a line to you on the subject & I know you will have the good nature to excuse it.[81]

This request is not without its flattery; Rogers refers to Scott indirectly as a 'Man of Genius', but notably also recognises the importance of the profession of the engraver in the publishing process. Rogers sent the individual to become a part of the busy publishing landscape of Edinburgh.

Rogers was very interested in the economics of publishing, as demonstrated when he published *Jacqueline* alongside Byron's *Lara,* which was an experiment for both poets. Rogers also considered publishing *Columbus* alongside Scott's work: 'I can assure you I shall have very good pleasure in seeing my name united with yours on any occasion', but noted that he was already working on 'a new coalition'.[82]

Rogers played a key role in negotiating the publishing politics of other authors. In the same way that Scott had set up a publishing house with the Ballantynes in 1809, Rogers was later a major financial benefactor in establishing Edward Moxon's business. Rogers also acted as a mediator between authors and publishers, particularly when authors needed to make crucial decisions about which publishing house to approach.

Rogers took on the role of a mediator between author and publisher for both Dorothy and William Wordsworth. William had asked Rogers to investigate the possibility of publishing Dorothy's journals that documented her travels in

---

[81] See letter 124.
[82] Samuel Rogers to [Walter] Scott, 22 September 1809, National Library of Scotland, MS.3878, f.147.

Italy, but Dorothy decided against their publication.[83] The letters from Rogers include his insight and knowledge of the publishing marketplace, including the prices for which Campbell, Byron, Scott, and Irving had sold their works.[84] This intricate knowledge of the publication landscape made Rogers an important ally when negotiating publications. Furthermore, Rogers's championing of Dorothy's journals suggests that he did believe their publication would prove financially fruitful.

As with Dorothy Wordsworth, when advising William on publications, Rogers firstly suggested heading to John Murray's publishing house. A particularly important part of the negotiations of Wordsworth's publications was that he could control how they would appear; for example, Rogers assures Wordsworth that Murray 'consents that they shall be published in the order & form you propose & that the advertisements shall be regulated by you as well as himself'.[85] Furthermore, Wordsworth's details of what he wanted were very specific, including that his works should appear in 'six volumes. The 5 first to consist of ~~400~~ <340> - the sixth of 450 pages. But how many lines in a page'.[86] The letter that contains this detail affirms that Rogers was negotiating on Wordsworth's behalf with Murray, even though Wordsworth did not choose to publish with Murray.

Another way in which Rogers made himself of use to Wordsworth was to provide him with gifts, such as the brushes that he sent to Keswick for Southey and Wordsworth.[87] When writing to Wordsworth, Rogers adopts a very grateful tone:

---

[83] See letter 33.
[84] See letter 37.
[85] See letter 37.
[86] See letter 39.
[87] See letter 43.

> Many & many a time have I resolved to write to you & to thank you for the five precious Volumes. They are full of Virtues, full of Piety, full of Wisdom, the Wisdom of the heart, & must console you under any circumstances, whenever you lay your head upon your pillow. Of the genius I need say nothing. While you were in the process, I was so too - but on a <very> small scale - I should have troubled you on the subject, if it had been any thing new. Being too old & lazy, to correct the proofs as I wished, I promised a reward for every error - & one of my nieces performed her part to miracles. Her eye sight was wonderfully quickened - nothing escaped detection.[88]

Rogers compares his own writing process as inferior to the 'genius' of Wordsworth. Rogers's first publishing failure had occurred with the first part of *Italy* (1822). In the excerpt from this letter, Rogers is flattering Wordsworth but not hesitating to mention that Rogers himself is continuing to write, although he humbly suggests that it is on a 'small scale' and not 'any thing new' as well as full of errors (the second part of *Italy,* which was published in 1828). Rogers is mitigating future failure whilst presenting himself as a continuing active and professional author.

As well as the prevalence of Rogers's self-representation of poetic identity in correspondence, he portrays himself as a professional traveller. The letters from Rogers contain lengthy prose descriptions and are a form of travel writing, an important genre in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, as travel became increasingly quicker, more comfortable and less expensive. For example, in a letter to Scott, Rogers recounted meeting Byron in Italy after 1821: I

[88] See letter 45.

saw Lord Byron twice. We crossed the Apennines together & I afterwards passed a day or two with him under his roof at Pisa'.[89] The casual mention of 'crossing the Appenines together' undermines the difficulty in travel and, indeed, does not detail the mechanics of travel, such as how Rogers and Byron were able to cross the mountains. The mention of familiar contacts takes precedence in this letter instead.

Rogers was an eager traveller, and as well as travelling to France to purchase art, he travelled with his sister Sarah and his larger family. Rogers wanted Walter Scott to travel with him too, and in a letter to Scott after 1821 expressed that he was 'sorry to learn that you have given up your intention of coming to us this year - & of taking a ramble through the forests of Germany'.[90] Rogers proposed a similar scheme to Wordsworth also, who had advised Rogers on where to visit in Germany as he had visited in the 1790s. Rogers's *Italy* was a publication inspired by his own visits to the country, with the poem itself divided into episodes and places, the format providing a somewhat unoriginal list of famous tourist sites.

One element of travel writing that is missing from both Rogers's letters and poems is political perspective. Although clearly not apolitical in his choice of correspondents, Rogers's writings demonstrate that his political subjectivity was replaced by his interest in influential people. On 22 September 1809, Scott wrote to Rogers about the Tory Minister (and later Prime Minister) George Canning, as Scott had received information on Canning's health from the Conservative literary editor William Gifford.[91] This emphasis on influence and connections is much more important to Rogers than his interest in taking political

[89] See letter 54.
[90] See letter 54.
[91] See letter 5.

sides and consequently refining his acquaintanceships to only those with whom he politically aligned himself. An example of social politics and Rogers's practical use of his networks was demonstrated by his introduction of Robert Southey to the poet George Crabbe, 'whom'- Rogers writes to Southey- 'I believe, you have never seen'.[92] For Southey, being a part of Rogers's network bridged the gap between the works he had read and the authors he had yet to meet. Networks and sociability were crucial aspects that Rogers used to define the poetic identity of himself and his peers.

Rogers's relationship with poets was perhaps more instructive with regard to the publishing industry than with writing poetry itself. In Rogers's letters to politicians, particularly Lord Holland and Richard Wellesley, poetry was sent back and forth as they asked Rogers for his opinion. But with poets, Rogers offered an insight into the mechanics of publishing. As well as founding publishers such as Edward Moxon, Rogers's own re-editing and republishing of his works demonstrated that he was an individual who could offer works that were attractive to the book buying public, and it was this that made his network an important one for actively writing and, more importantly, publishing, poets to be a part of.

Although not a novelist himself, Rogers's knowledge of the publishing industry extended to novels. Some of the earliest and longest letters transcribed in this thesis are between Rogers and the novelist Henry Mackenzie. Rogers's habits as a correspondent inevitably changed throughout his life, and as such these letters give an insight into a younger Rogers, who was a popular and active poet. The letters were later transcribed by an unknown copyist, evidence of the importance

[92] See letter 52.

of archiving letters for their content and not the author's autograph.

The letters to Mackenzie unite the concerns of Edinburgh and London literary circles. Rogers first travelled to Edinburgh in the 1790s, meeting individuals such as Mackenzie and Adam Smith, key figures in the influential intellectual networks that had been developing in the eighteenth century. Business interests ensured that sociability was not contained, and that individuals needed networks to provide themselves with the best opportunities with regards to publication. In 1804, the printer James Ballantyne was printing Southey's *Madoc* and Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel,* both of which were published by Longman and Ballantyne. That Ballantyne was printing from Edinburgh was not an inhibition to his working on commissions and with business partners from across Britain. Scott particularly had an interest in the expansion of Ballantyne's work. He was a school-fellow of Ballantyne's and had a share in his printing business. Rogers does not mention Ballantyne by name to Mackenzie, but instead refers to a printer 'who is perfectly intoxicated with happiness, & who stops his friends to enquire whether any more was so distinguished before. He is at once employed on Madoc & on the Lay of the Last Minstrel; so we may expect great amusement this winter'.[93] The mention of Southey, Scott, Sidney Smith and William Roscoe in this particular letter suggests the interconnectivity of individuals based on location, shared intellectual pursuits, but also- more importantly for Rogers- commercial enterprises.

The sending of correspondence also opened up the opportunity for Mackenzie to receive verses from Rogers, although these are not to critique or inform (as we see when Rogers receives poetry from Lord Holland and Wellesley), but

[93] See letter 2.

rather to pass on to a Mr Thompson.[94] This passing on of material in letters destroys the fiction of the letter's recipient as the sole correspondent: material was intended to be passed on, and letters were, to an extent, intended to be shared material.

Although from this it may be seen that the idea of poetical critique is not necessarily present in the letters from Rogers to Mackenzie, their longevity as correspondents does enable Rogers to share his own self-critiques, including how he sees himself in social circles. One of these interesting critiques includes Rogers's search for older, potentially more experienced intellectuals as a younger writer:

> I don't know how it is but there is something so soothing & delightful in such a character, when the big-day & bustle of life is over, that I have almost always, even when a young man, been led to cultivate the friendship of people much older than myself.[95]

Rogers's networks were extensive but not necessarily exclusive, and his exclusion of an individual or his unwillingness to acquaint himself with them would not be due to age or personal character, but rather to their profession, station in life and general influence. However, Rogers's correspondence with Mackenzie reveals an individual who was very aware of the link between a poet's ability to engage with his audience and the year in which he was born:

> I have pitched Human Life too high - It is a fault committed <too>, I think, by Cicero in his treatise, popular as it has always been; & perhaps not the less popular on that

[94] See letter 3.
[95] See letter 3.

> account, for we like to look upon sunny objects. His ideas are all patrician & so indeed are his characters; & half the consolations in Old Age he derives from the memory of splendid Achievements. - To tell you the truth I had passed thro' the Childhood & the Manhood with tolerable ease […] but when I approached the decline of life I was at a loss how to give it interest or dignity without more precious exertion, & the poem for a long time lay unfinished.[96]

Not only is this opinion somewhat reminiscent of critical reviewers who had negatively commented on Rogers's dated style, it is also a reaction to Byronism, and the marketability of a younger, more enigmatic poetic self to the reading public. These letters to Mackenzie, then, delve into a more personal critique of Rogers that he does not acknowledge in correspondence with other people, and particularly comments on the very theme that made him famous, that of the pleasures of memory.

A letter from Rogers to William Beckford in 1818 contains another interesting reference as to how he was reacting to the phenomenon of Byronism. He states that 'Lord Byron has just written another poem after the manner of *Beppo*. He calls it *Don Juan*, & dedicates it in no very flattering verse to Southey. Is *Don Juan* another portrait of the same personage who lurks in *Child. Harold*, in *Manfred*, in *Lara*, &. &c.?'[97] This seems to be a particular reference to Byron's works, in which prefaces and bibliographic information that Byron provided highlighted how the individual in the poem was not himself at all, despite references in the work that would inevitably link the narrator to the author in the mind of the reader. It also highlights how

[96] See letter 27.
[97] See letter 26.

readers were aware that these different characters were in fact similar in many ways, and that the character of Byron himself predominates. Much like Mackenzie and Rogers, Beckford's fame was one born in the eighteenth century, and he shared a cultivated interest in buying and collecting art. This letter is particularly interesting because it demonstrates that there was an awareness that the nineteenth century- particularly the 1810s- were heralding a new era of authorial identity, and that it was one closely tied to public perception and expectation.

Another author who had achieved notoriety in the eighteenth century and was well known to Rogers, particularly from their proximity in London, was William Godwin. The correspondence with Godwin highlights a very important reason why some individuals self-archived and censored their own letters during their lifetime: Rogers claims to have destroyed Godwin's letter that asks for money. However, the survival of Rogers's response to this suggests that Godwin did not share the same modest and somewhat embarrassed attitude to requesting money (particularly as he asked others, such as Percy Shelley, repeatedly), as Godwin kept the letter that Rogers sent back after he requested money from him.

> I lament exceedingly that it is not in my power to do what, I can truly assure you, would give me a very great pleasure, &, if it will be any satisfaction to you, I will frankly explain the peculiar circumstances in which I am placed, when next I have the good fortune to see you – But if so trifling a sum as Fifty Pounds for two months can be of any immediate use, I know my Brother will be equally happy with myself in discounting your Note to that amount […] I have burnt

> your letter & you may depend upon the strictest secrecy.[98]

Here Rogers has not confided his own financial situation in writing, but offers to 'explain the peculiar circumstances' at a later date, whereas Godwin has clearly already stated his personal financial details in writing. The etiquette of burning such a personal and potentially embarrassing letter demonstrates a handling of financial situations that Rogers, as a banker, would be used to.

Although Rogers was by no means the only individual Godwin approached for money, it did leave Rogers in a position where he could ask Godwin for favours in return. Rogers's extensive social circles left him in a position where he could be approached and, in turn, approach others. An example of this is Rogers's introduction of Emile de Bonnechose, the King's librarian at the Palace of St Cloud from 1830 to 1848. This letter is dated 4 August 1834, the year of de Bonnechose's popular *Histoire de France*, and a year after the publication of his poem *La mort de Bailly* for which he received a prize from the French Academy. That all de Bonnechose 'wishes is to see you & shake you by the hand' is followed by Rogers's acclamation that Godwin must not 'refuse to pay the tax which all men of Genius must pay'.[99] Rogers's tactful handling of this request is not made by proving that Godwin owes him any favours, but rather by flattering Godwin's vanity, and suggesting that famous intellectuals have a duty to meet and encourage others.

This flattery that is evident in much of Rogers's correspondence, from the regular occurrence of the opening

---

[98] See letter 4.
[99] See letter 77.

phrase of 'many, many thanks' to his apologetic and humbling letters which turn down or cancel social engagements, is continued in the correspondence to Godwin's daughter, Mary Shelley. Not only does this correspondence show Rogers's social presence and influence crossing generations of writers, but also that he played a crucial role in Shelley's publication of her late husband's work.

Rogers's replies during which he admits to not having responded frequently or early enough, or that imply he has cancelled engagements, flatter Shelley as a correspondent and are self-deprecating on Rogers's part:

> You were no sooner <gone> than I came to myself - & you may conceive from your own feelings what were mine. – Again & again did I take up my pen – but what could I say – no, I could not write – for what could I say – how could I account for forgetfulness so strange – so unaccountable – […] & I can only say – Come, if you can, if you will, on Sunday morning – at 10 ½ - M^{rs} Norton comes & the Gordons come & by your silence shew that all is forgiven. […] Don't write but come if you can.[100]

Another important aspect of this particular section is Rogers's insistence on Shelley not replying in writing, but attending the engagement instead. This letter, dated 1844, demonstrates the work and time that went into writing letters. Those to Shelley from this period are often short, and fulfil the function of arranging visitations or accepting gifts, instead of including issues of social or literary interest. In 1844, Rogers accepted the receipt of two volumes of Shelley's work, probably *Rambles*

[100] See letter 104.

in Germany and Italy, in 1840, 1842, and 1843, Mary Shelley's last work published by Edward Moxon in 1844.[101] As Rogers had helped to set Moxon up financially as a publisher, this gift articulates the complex relationship between patron, publisher and the subsequently published author. Undoubtedly Rogers's relationship with Moxon aided the business partnership between Moxon and Shelley, who also commissioned Moxon to publish the posthumous works of Percy Bysshe Shelley in 1839.[102]

In 1838, when Mary Shelley was undertaking the process of editing and writing the prefaces for Percy's posthumous edition, Rogers wrote to Mary about his personal esteem for biography. Her depiction of Percy in the works of 1839 includes a biography at the beginning, which crucially recovers him as a politicised author. Rogers states that, 'the thing in the world I love best in literature is biography – is a life & the life of a man of letters. Johnson's lives were published when I was a school-boy – with a school-boy's pence I bought them & the very volumes are to this hour as dear to me as any thing in my house'.[103] Mary Shelley was undoubtedly aware of the public taste for biography, and her preface to the 1839 edition proclaims her intention of 'giving the productions of a sublime genius to the world' by detailing Percy's process of poetic production (although she does notably refrain from revealing details of his personal life).[104]

As well as Rogers's encouragement of the importance of biography in recovering the literary and political reputation of

---

[101] See letter 105.
[102] This is also indicated in a short letter indicating Rogers's conciliatory function between Moxon and Shelley: Samuel Rogers to [Mary Shelley], Bodleian Library, MS Abinger C.50, f.15.
[103] See letter 87.
[104] Mary Shelley (ed.), *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley* (London: Edward Moxon), 1839, p.vii.

an individual, Shelley also tried to draw on his network to further her son's career. For example, Rogers apologises that he is unable to introduce anyone at Brookes's, but that he would try to enquire for the young Percy Shelley to become a member of the Athenaeum.[105] Another way in which Mary Shelley participates in Rogers' networks is as a part of his deliberate cultivation of important female intellectuals. As much as Samuel Johnson was famous for his support of bluestockings, Rogers's companions and visitors were often female. An example of this is his invitation for Shelley to meet with himself, Mary Robinson, Caroline Norton, and Thomas Moore.[106]

For Mary Shelley, Rogers was an important figure. Not only had he grown up with her parents and provided a generational link, and indeed attended the same Unitarian church in Newington Green as her mother Mary Wollstonecraft, but he was also able to give her advice on the publishing industry, as well as use his network to enable her requests for her son's career progression. Shelley's presence in Rogers's networks show that there was a mutual benefit for both individuals; Shelley could draw on Rogers's knowledge and experience, and Rogers could count on Shelley amongst his networks of important female intellectuals.

Another two bestselling female writers who featured in Rogers's social circles were Frances D'Arblay (née Burney) and Joanna Baillie. Rogers facilitates the connection between these women and other influential literary men, such as his invitation for D'Arblay to meet Walter Scott, who 'is very desirous to see

---

[105] Samuel Rogers to [Mary] Shelley, 13 November [1833], Bodleian Library, MS Abinger C.49, ff.82-83.
[106] See letter 86.

you'.[107] Although women did not have equal political rights to men, there is evidence in Rogers's circle that they could wield a substantial amount of political influence.

Like D'Arblay, Baillie was of a similar generation to Rogers, and had begun her professional career in the eighteenth century, with her first collection of poems published two years before *The Pleasures of Memory*. When using correspondence to discuss business matters and authorial control over publication, Baillie notes this similarity between their careers:

> I am ~~also~~ of the same age – the same year, if we are right in our calculation, had the honour & glory of producing us both; & why should we not be our own executors as far as we can? I am at this moment as busy as I can be in correcting the Press, determined to leave as little as possible for other people to do.[108]

The letters from Rogers to Baillie disclose a relationship that was similar in terms of this approach to authorial identity, as well as their political opinions. Rogers's tone and style reflect an individual who was used to sharing quips about the contemporary political atmosphere: 'What events have happened since the first swallow came among us! A Dey of Algiers smoking his pipe at Naples; a King of France once more on his travels & taking out a license to shoot on a manor in Dorsetshire; a Jack Tar on the throne of England'.[109] This informal and conversational manner of writing shows that Baillie was indeed one of Rogers's close acquaintances, but she

---

[107] See letter 51.
[108] See letter 93.
[109] See letter 57.

also consulted him on matters of business. When Baillie requests advice on publishing poems by an acquaintance, Rogers responds much in the way he does to Wordsworth, when Wordsworth considered publishing his collected works with Murray:

> The poems you point out are beautiful as are also some of the stanzas elsewhere. But how to proceed on what plans to propose; it is difficult to say. The booksellers would give nothing for any poetry with an unknown name in their age - & I would rather advance […] the money than ask any body for a Guinea at any time. If a small sum would relieve her in her present necessity, she shall have it, & may I beg the favour of you to leave a little about it, that she may do nothing in a hurry. Twenty or thirty Pounds I will advance immediately - & she may refund when it suits her, or not at all for you have really given me a great interest in her - & she must be most distressed, not receiving the salary due to her.[110]

Rogers trusts Baillie's opinion on poetry and the esteem she has for other poets, and consequently offers to invest in the poet Baillie asks him to support, Mary Ann Hedge. He is sympathetic towards the plight of unknown poets, and clearly interested in being an important contact for the next popular poet. He is also notably cautious about the attitude of booksellers towards 'poetry with an unknown name', and aware of the expenses that need to be taken into consideration when an individual intends to begin a poetic career. Furthermore, Rogers does not demonstrate a bias towards male writers, but

[110] See letter 99.

instead recognises the professional careers women were undertaking in the literary sphere.

This trust and genuine investment in women writers and their professional careers is demonstrated by Rogers's critical judgement on poetry that Baillie recommends to him. When Baillie's brother leaves a volume (presumably of poetry) for Rogers, Rogers remarks to Baillie that the volume 'is beautiful within & without […] I have done nothing but read it ever since. It has a simplicity, a sincerity, a directness as from the heart about it, that puts all fine writing to the blush'.[111] Although it is unclear to which volume in particular Rogers is referring, his appreciation for literary work as a marketable item, as well as for intellectual quality, suggests that both he and Baillie appreciated such qualities in modern works of literature.

For Rogers, his connections to Joanna Baillie also included her brother Matthew and sister-in-law Sophia. This integration of family networks into Rogers's circles was common. Indeed, Rogers himself often travelled and visited with his sister Sarah Rogers, as well as his nieces and nephews, the Sharpes. Dorothy and William Wordsworth writing and living together was by no means an exceptional situation, and social networks crucially created and expanded families, such as John Gibson Lockhart marrying the daughter of his icon Walter Scott. Rogers's letter to Sophia Baillie highlights this connection, by thanking Matthew Baillie, and also informing Sophia that Rogers 'took Miss Coutts with me to Hampstead & as she wished to see your Aunts I took her there'.[112]

As with the correspondence from Rogers to poets, correspondence often served very specific functions for Rogers,

---

[111] Samuel Rogers to [Joanna] Baillie, 21 November 1840, Royal College of Surgeons of England, MS0014/7, Hunter-Baillie Letters, Volume 4.1, 1704-1923, Letter 167.
[112] See letter 119.

chiefly as a means to create engagements and invite individuals to events, as well as to discuss important business matters and offer instructive literary advice. Very little space in his letters is taken up by Rogers's 'literary' opinion. However, as Rogers lived so long and was famous relatively early in his career, his long-standing relationships in the literary world are reflected by the occasional informality or references to previous discussion on political or societal subjects.

2.3 The publishing world

The mechanics of the publishing world are an important concern in the correspondence of Samuel Rogers, as demonstrated in my discussions of the letters between Rogers, poets and novelists; those individuals who were actively writing and publishing in Rogers's lifetime. Rogers himself was innovative when it came to the publishing industry and its creation and manipulation of the reading and book-buying publics.

John Gibson Lockhart was an important correspondent for Rogers: his Tory politics may not have been of Rogers's persuasion, but as Walter Scott's son-in-law (and future biographer) and an editor for the *Quarterly Review*, he was well placed in the literary sphere. An important letter from Rogers to Lockhart was sent on the receipt of the news of Walter Scott's death. Dated 25 September 1832, four days after the event, Rogers laments: 'Then all is over and we have now only to reflect on his great & good qualities. Had he been of a less noble nature, he would have suspected more & trusted less – but then he would not have been the man he was, & who could

wish him otherwise'.[113] Rogers's personal regard for Scott made him an important contact for Lockhart who published a biography of Scott in 7 volumes in 1837. Rogers was also acquainted with Lockhart's sister, in a similar manner to the relationship he shared with the Baillies and Wordsworths. The correspondence between Rogers and Miss Lockhart does not say much as to the relationship between them, but fulfils the function of correspondence as an invitation.[114]

For Rogers, one of the most crucial businesses in the publishing world was Cadell and Davies. Thomas Cadell had published Rogers's first official collection of poems, *An Ode to Superstition With Some Other Poems* in 1786 at a cost to Rogers of £30. Cadell also published Rogers's bestselling work *The Pleasures of Memory* in 1792. A letter to the publishing house of Cadell and Davies from Rogers is a crucial piece of information that demonstrates how Rogers conducted his business with publishing houses. Rogers requested that 'fifty copies of Jacqueline to be leaved stitched in brown covers (like the Quarterly Review) with titles at the back, & sent to him in St James's Place'.[115] These would undoubtedly have been presentation copies.

Another important publisher for Rogers was Edward Moxon, who had started work at Longman's publishing house, but had left in 1821 with support from Rogers and Charles Lamb. Moxon had borrowed £500 from Rogers in 1830, and from this was able to set up his own publishing house, with an edition of Lamb's poems as his first publication.[116] Rogers had consequently been instrumental in Moxon's very existence as

---

[113] See letter 68.
[114] Samuel Rogers to [Violet] Lockhart, National Library of Scotland, MS.929, f.56.
[115] See letter 17.
[116] Hans Osrom, 'Edward Moxon', *ODNB.*

an independent publisher. Moxon published Rogers's 1834 *Poems*, a major collection of Rogers's poetry. Similarly to the letter to Cadell and Davies, the letter to Moxon is in the form of an order, asking if Moxon could provide copies of Rogers's *Poems* to an unnamed individual: 'Pray deliver to the bearer Six Copies of my "Poems"'.[117] Again, this is a request for presentation copies, where Rogers is gifting copies of his works to friends in his networks.

From Rogers's relationship with editors and publishing houses, it is clear to see that Rogers was interested in the mechanics of the publishing industry. It would be interesting, if any such correspondence comes to light in future, to compare the relationship of Rogers with editors such as Lockhart with other editors, such as William Gifford. What is clear is that Lockhart was an important connection to Rogers not just because of his role as editor, but also because of his family ties. These letters show a different and very business-like side to Rogers's correspondence. Rogers was a successful businessman and very much in control of his publications in terms of how many were printed and how they were presented, and this certainly becomes clear in his letters.

2.4 The Art World

The individuals with whom Rogers corresponded in the art world, including artists and collectors alike, were incredibly important to him. Not only was art an intellectual pursuit and a medium of great interest to Rogers, but it was also a financial one. In 1851 Mary Hervey remarked that she was to visit Rogers to 'have breakfast and see his pictures', demonstrating

[117] See letter 80.

the appeal of an individual who could offer access to an extensive private art collection.[118]

In the sale catalogue of Rogers's belongings after his death, a portfolio of drawings by Sir Thomas Lawrence was auctioned, dating from 1841.[119] Lawrence died deeply in debt without his works gaining the reputation for which he had hoped, but Rogers clearly recognised his talent, and was one of the few people to attend his funeral.[120] Rogers trusted Lawrence's opinion on not just the quality and integrity of art, but on the art market. Rogers enquired as to whether he may call on Lawrence at the studio of the artist Richard Westall, to enquire on 'a picture of the St Peter Martyr, by Giorgione – Pray look at it & let me know your opinion confidentially – Carr wants it, but I have the refusal'.[121] Rogers's interest in this particular work of the Renaissance painter Giorgione was in its worth, not necessarily in its attractiveness. Another example of this is a letter dating from around 1825, when Rogers lists a 'final agreement' with Lawrence:

> Then the final Agreement, if I apprehend it rightly, is as follows, that you deliver to Lord Dudley Raphael's Pictures of The Graces, & also a bond or promissory note for the Sum of Two Thousand Pounds, bearing interest from the 23^{d} dec^{r}. 1825 & to be discharged on or before the 23^{d} dec^{r} 1827. That Lord Dudley may choose from among the rest of your pictures any that he thinks fit, accounting to you for them at the prime cost, this privilege to be exercised or not, as he may determine -

---

[118] James Hamilton, *A Strange Business: Making art and money in nineteenth-century Britain* (London: Atlantic Books, 2014), p.21.
[119] *Sale Catalogue*, item 1602, p.66.
[120] *Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, pp.424-426.
[121] See letter 64.

> &, that after the payment of the two thousand pounds, you have the privilege of redeeming the Raphael before mentioned; at the price of one thousand pounds, the price at which it is now rated.[122]

This letter is reminiscent of those discussing the mechanics of the publishing industry written to Scott and the Wordsworths. Art was a business interest for Rogers. Not only could he afford to amass a collection of old masters such as the Raphael mentioned here, but he also invested in contemporary artists, and showed an interest in the work of others which he thought- quite rightly in the case of Turner and David Wilkie- would be worth money in the future.

As well as trusting Lawrence's judgement on the worth of particular pieces of art, Rogers also consulted him on the social politics of clubs to which they both belonged.[123] Lawrence's presence in these clubs and social circles demonstrates the integration of artistic and literary circles, with both sharing the common concerns of attracting the buying public whilst also maintaining authorial and artistic integrity, as well as investing in art with the expectation of making money.

As well as these shared business interests, Rogers was also a friend to Lawrence. Rogers invited Lawrence to accompany him on a voyage down the Thames to Richmond, during which 'You will find in my vessel the following items – A Roast fowl – a bottle of claret & Crabbe

---

[122] See letter 40.
[123] See letter 49.

the Poet'.[124] Artists and authors alike were important individuals in Rogers's circle, in many cases requiring Rogers's influence to help them during their career, as well as being of interest to Rogers himself.

The portraitist Thomas Phillips was another example of this. He had been commissioned to paint the portraits of many literary individuals, including Lord Byron, and was also commissioned by John Murray to paint a series of portraits of the poets whose works Murray published. The role of Phillips as a painter of poets is reflected in Rogers's correspondence:

> I had a very great pleasure indeed in introducing M[r]. Moore to you the other day, as I knew I was complying with his wishes as well as yours. With regard to my portrait I am at a loss what to say about it. My Publisher, I am very sure, were he consulted on the subject would protest loudly against all further proceedings, & perhaps with reason. I have heard of some Poet who prefixed his ugly unmeaning face to his book, & it instantly stopped the sale. Nobody took any farther interest in his tuneful complainings.[125]

Rogers purposely abstained from including portraits of himself in his publications, perhaps because he was aware that his appearance did not add to the marketability of his poetry. Nonetheless, Phillips's 1817 portrait of Rogers softened his features, making him appear amiable and learned with his hand between the pages of a book and, as with Thomas's portrait of William Blake, particular attention is drawn to Rogers's

---

[124] Samuel Rogers to Thomas Lawrence, Royal Academy, Lawrence Papers, LAW/3/171.
[125] See letter 131.

forehead, deliberately lit to suggest that he was an individual with great mental and intellectual powers.[126]



Samuel Rogers by Thomas Phillips, 1817 (The National Portrait Gallery)

The correspondence from Rogers to Phillips involves the mechanics of publication, with Rogers again taking an interest in the aesthetic appearance of works, such as the crucial decision whether to include a portrait or not as a frontispiece, a common practice at the time. With the changing expectations of the reading public and expansion of technology which enabled books to be printed with images alongside them at a cheaper cost, the art and literary worlds could simply not afford to exist independently. Murray's commissioning of portraits, for

[126] Annette Peach, 'Thomas Phillips', *ODNB.*

example, reflects a culture of celebrity where visitors to his publishing house could gaze upon the faces of individuals he published, in the same way that providing an image of the author in a publication creates a personal link between the reader and the author. The visual aspect of authorial representation was becoming of increasing interest to the reading public.

As with Phillips and Lawrence, Rogers's correspondence with the artist David Wilkie contains further negotiations for the inclusion of works in Rogers's art collection:

> Mr Stothard mentioned to me the other day that he had some conversation with you on the subject of your picture of The death of the Red Deer. My Brother wishes much to have it, &, if you are still not disinclined to part with it, will think himself much obliged to you, if you can favour him with it. The price, I think, was Thirty Five Guineas.[127]

As well as this letter demonstrating the function of correspondence as a business transaction, it also highlights how Rogers was using his connections, in this case the artist Thomas Stothard, to scout for paintings for his family's collections and not just his own. Rogers clearly had an interest in Wilkie's work, and can be seen in the image below inspecting Wilkie's portrait of Queen Victoria before it was exhibited.

[127] See letter 30.



'Sir David Wilkie, Samuel Rogers and Sir James William Colville inspecting a portrait' by Jemima Blackburn (née Wedderburn), c.1840 (National Galleries of Scotland)

This illustration depicts Rogers as an individual who was actively visiting the studios of artists and taking interest in their career progression. A letter to the artist George Cumberland, however, reveals an aspect of Rogers as a correspondent that was becoming increasingly common as he became older: 'I am a sorry correspondent, & pray, pray come to me, not write to me when you want an answer'.[128] Correspondence was genuinely time-consuming and took up a large part of the day for Rogers, who was involved in many different aspects of businesses. In this letter, Rogers refers to his investment in 'young Poets', and corresponds with Cumberland not just

[128] See letter 59.

because of a mutual interest in art, but also because Cumberland was very interested in literature himself:

> As to young Poets, if you knew by how many & their Patrons I am beset, you would pity me; & I have resolved, that I may die in peace, to read no more. Let them read Milton & Dryden, & then see how they like their own verses.
>
> Mr Eagles's Poem strikes me so very Shakesperean – as far as I have had time to run thro' it; & I heartily wish it the success it deserves. When I say so, I hope I return the right Poem, for it lies among fifty others by many much better & abler men than myself. Arguably to your desire, I beg your acceptance of ~~me~~ a Volume, to which Stothard & Turner have given a great Value.[129]

Cumberland bought and supported William Blake's poetry, and in 1827 Blake designed Cumberland's calling card, which Rogers might have seen. Rogers's attitude in this section of the letter reflects an individual who feels that the more poems he reads by other people, the less he thinks of his own, and suggests that younger poets would benefit by this realisation with regard to their own works. He does, however, give an edition of his *Italy* to Cumberland, and states that value has been given to it through its illustrations by Turner and Stothard. Rogers's admission that he has been given volumes by many poets to read and presumably pass judgement on suggests that Rogers's poetry could be seen as a standard against which others measured themselves. Furthermore, it would have been beneficial for younger, unknown poets to

[129] See letter 59.

connect with Rogers, due to his reputation, social standing and networks.

Further evidence of the value Rogers placed in the aesthetics of his publications is demonstrated by his commissioning of the engraver William Miller in 1831. Rogers wrote to him to commission vignettes, asking him to

> Pray do me the favour to engrave the The old House & The Garden. It is yet uncertain whether the other viz the Dame's School & the Rialto are to be engraved – but pray begin in the first instance with the old House; & I will afterwards determine concerning the rest. I have many others ready for you & will send them, when required.[130]

Rogers is asking Miller to engrave Turner's image of 'The Old House', the watercolour of which is now held by the Tate gallery and described as an example of some of Turner's finest work for inclusion in literature.[131] The final engraving of this was indeed undertaken by Miller and used at the beginning of Rogers's poem *Human Life* in his 1834 collection, with Rogers crediting the illustration to Turner and the engraving to Miller beneath the vignette.[132] This letter provides an important part of Rogers's commissioning for his publications, as it shows that Turner had already been commissioned and had completed 'The Old House', and that Miller was now to engrave it. The result of this completed transaction can still be seen in the editions of Rogers's *Poems*, and articulates an important part in the

---

[130] See letter 62.
[131] Meredith Gamer, Matthew Imms, 'Watercolours Related to Samuel Rogers's Poems c.1830-2', *Tate* <http://www.tate.org.uk/art/research-publications/jmw-turner/watercolours-related-to-samuel-rogerss-poems-r1133334#entry-main> [accessed 01/11/16].
[132] Samuel Rogers, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1834), p.63

mechanics of the publication process that is often taken for granted.

As well as artists like Lawrence, Phillips, Wilkie and Cumberland featuring in Rogers's correspondence as individuals involved in both the literary world as well as the artistic, the families of artists became crucially involved in Rogers's circles. For example, a letter written by Rogers was reproduced by Maria Denman, the sister-in-law and housekeeper of the sculptor John Flaxman, in a letter to someone else.[133] After Flaxman's death in 1826, Denman had a crucial role in handling Flaxman's estate, including the sale of his works. Her management of these sales was facilitated by Henry Crabb Robinson, the diarist and journalist, who was a close friend of Rogers and shared his artistic and literary interests. The letter refers to a 'bas relief, which […] is now in your house; & can truly say that I should be happy on all occasions to execute any commission of [Crabb Robinson's] or yours, that I could under - take with propriety, but I am very sure, if I could explain the matter to him, that he would say I was right in declining altogether to take any part in that very unpleasant business - it is no concern of mine'.[134] This letter is indicative of complications over ownership that had arisen over articles in Flaxman's estate, demonstrating the important role Rogers played as both a collector of Flaxman's art, and as an individual who was often involved with the legalities and mechanisms of the art world.

Nonetheless, this did not prevent Rogers making the most of his art collection by using it to increase his social circles. The painter John James Masquerier, famous for bringing his paintings of Napoleon from Paris to London, wrote to Rogers

[133] See letter 82.
[134] See letter 82.

to express his wife's interest in seeing Rogers's paintings, to which Rogers responded with: 'M^rs Masquerier & any of her friends will be most welcome to see the pictures, if they will do him the Honour to call in St James's Place to-morrow between two & three o clock'.[135] Again, Rogers's collection of art attracted individuals to his home, and presented him to his visitors as an individual of both intellectual as well as financial affluence.

Rogers undeniably had a passion for art, as demonstrated by his correspondence. But he also had a passion for the mechanics and legalities behind the art world, which was swiftly turning into an industry, with the development of travel, and many private galleries opening up to the public to make art more accessible. Furthermore, Rogers's circle was formed of individuals both active in the art sphere in terms of their career and profession but also those interested in art from their own intellectual pursuits.

2.5 Scientists, antiquaries and theologians

The well-travelled and educated individuals in Rogers's circles had a variety of interests outside of their professions. There was not a separation between the artistic, literary worlds and the scientific, but instead these spheres were united by mutual interests in intellectual pursuits and business ventures.

As discussed in the section on Rogers's relationships with politicians, Rogers's correspondence does not suggest that he shared a close relationship with Benjamin Disraeli, but the correspondence does show that he was good friends with Disraeli's father, Isaac D'Israeli, who was an established historian and literary critic. The opening of Rogers's letters

[135] See letter 10.

defer to this reputation: 'Pray express my grateful Acknowledgements',[136] and 'Pray accept my acknowledgements for a Work which I have read more than once'.[137] Not only does this demonstrate Rogers's gratitude towards D'Israeli, but it also suggests the swapping and exchanging of literature. This form of sociability was very important. Much like the swapping of verses, the swapping of volumes ensured that networks remained connected by mutual knowledge. Although the volume that D'Israeli gives to Rogers is unnamed, Rogers writes that 'The manner in which the preface is conceived promises much for the poem & I am very sure that I shall not be disappointed'.[138]

Another antiquarian with whom Rogers shared a similar relationship was Francis Douce, who was also a close friend of Isaac D'Israeli. Douce was a renowned collector whose motivation, according to Hurst, was 'to assemble material which pictured the activities of humanity down the centuries'.[139] Rogers must have contributed to this collection himself, as Douce sought to repay Rogers by giving him a book: 'Accept my best thanks for your very handsome present – You have more than repaid me & I am very proud & happy to have been the means, in any way, of rendering such a Collection <as yours> more complete'.[140] Other letters from Rogers to Douce reflect the organising (and cancelling) of engagements, and general evidence of how Rogers and Douce, two avid collectors, were supporting each other's intellectual pursuits.

With respect to Rogers's acquaintanceship with other intellectuals, his collection was incredibly important in

---

[136] See letter 75.
[137] See letter 50.
[138] See letter 75.
[139] C. Hurst, 'Francis Douce', *ODNB.*
[140] See letter 127.

demonstrating his own wealth and influence. Rogers wrote to the naturalist Adam White in 1846, inviting him to visit: 'You & yours will be welcome to see the Pictures any day after two o'clock & may I beg you to come & breakfast with me on Sunday the 11th July at 10 o'clock'.[141] White himself was compiling lists of the specimens at the British Museum, and consequently, in a similar way to Rogers, was an individual adept at listing and working with collections.

This crossing over of interests from science to literature and art demonstrates how professional spheres were not distinctive, but rather co-dependent. Another example of an individual who existed in both spheres was the mathematician and astronomer John Herschel. The letters from Rogers to Herschel demonstrate that Herschel was actively reading and possibly even writing poetry, as Rogers clearly responds to his letter by acknowledging that 'the Verses are arrived & accept my best thanks for your ready compliance with any request. To possess them has long been my wish & with religious care shall they be preserved in testimony of your kindness & of my regard for them'.[142] Again, this letter is a receipt of literary exchanges, and suggests that by 'preserving' the verses sent to him, Rogers was adding to his collection. To own paintings and poetry bequeathed by important people was undoubtedly important to Rogers, with the items of the collection themselves resulting from Rogers's networks.

Rogers also gave books to Herschel, in a letter of 1850 explaining how he was giving him a book to 'express in return my veneration & my affection for Him who has instructed & delighted me for so many years & who has now presented me with a Volume so far above me that I can only read it & admire

[141] See letter 110.
[142] See letter 100.

it in silence?'[143] A letter of 1842 goes even further, referring to Herschel's father the astronomer, who had discovered the planet Uranus in 1781, linking poetry and science:

> Many, many thanks for a beautiful Poem which I have read again & again; & I need not say how highly on every account I shall value it – for its own sake & the Writer's. Schiller must already have visited you in your dreams to thank you […] The Generous must not wonder if those to whom they give, ask for more; & may I venture to solicit for a Song that was once sung, I believe, by some "faery elves" in the tube of a Telescope which had revealed to your Father what for ages had remained unknown to ~~the great of~~ Mankind?[144]

This link between poetry and science reveals the common motivation and interests of the work of both Rogers and Herschel. The idea of inspiration, the "faery elves" who had revealed knowledge to Herschel's father through his telescope, is linked to the philosopher and dramatist Friedrich Schiller. Well-educated men were knowledgeable about art, literature, science and mathematics. Another of Rogers's correspondents was the scientist Peter Roget. Despite Roget's removal from Rogers's area of expertise by the former's work on physiology, the very fact that he was an author in the process of writing and publishing made Rogers an important connection for him.[145] Rogers could not just offer advice on those publishing poetry and novels, but he was genuinely interested in the marketability of books.

---

[143] See letter 117.
[144] See letter 98.
[145] Peter Mark Roget to [Samuel] Rogers, 6 December 1828, University of Edinburgh Library, La.II.646/214.

Rogers's correspondence with scientists and theologians demonstrates the integration of intellectual networks. Rogers had had a similar education to these men, and to be an intellectual required knowledge of the arts and literature as well as the sciences. Furthermore, another uniting aspect of pursuing these interests was the practicality of publication. Rogers was interested in the marketing of books in general, not just poetry.

2.6 Conclusion

Rogers's correspondence crucially highlights the interconnectivity of genders, generations, and professions. Literary interests were not isolated to a distinct community or sphere, but instead it was an expectation that men and women of varying social positions had an interest in literature, particularly poetry. Furthermore, 'readerly autonomy' in an age where texts were becoming increasingly accessible enabled individuals to cultivate interests outside of their professions.[146] This interest was not just an intellectual or leisurely pursuit but, as Rogers's letters show, a business one. There was money to be made in discussions of marketability, and also status, influence and money to be generated from the swapping of poetic verses.

The political and the scientific were not confined to individual professions, or those whose masculinity enabled them to undertake eminent positions in the establishment. For example, Rogers's networks provided a space for women to pursue their intellectual interests, and also demonstrated the active role that women played in society, such as Lady Holland

[146] *St Clair*, p.5.

in the Whig Holland House circle and Mary Shelley in the commercialism of literature.

Extensive networks enabled Rogers to ask for favours and commissions, and in turn gave others the opportunity to consult Rogers for his advice. Asking Rogers for advice, be it intellectual or financial, was not necessarily an imposition: it empowered Rogers's position as others relied on his opinion and capacity to help.

The Letters of Samuel Rogers:
A Selected Edition

Editorial Methodology

The editorial methodology of this selected edition of the letters of Samuel Rogers is a 'plain text methodology', based on the edition of the Robert Southey letters published online by Romantic Circles and edited by Lynda Pratt, Ian Packer and Tim Fulford. This methodology ensures that the letters are clear for the reader and preserve the meaning inherent within the original text

For this selective edition, the letters are presented in chronological order. Letters to which it has not been possible to assign a date are presented in an undated section at the end of the edition.

All of my transcriptions have been taken from manuscripts, chiefly those in Rogers's own hand, although those that are not in Rogers's hand (such as letters to Henry Mackenzie and Maria Denman) are footnoted to inform the reader of this accordingly. Where a letter, or part of a letter, has been previously published, this has been recorded in a footnote.

I have followed a 'plain text' methodology to ensure that the letters are clear for the reader and preserve the meaning inherent within the original text. For example, a word that was originally divided by a hyphen as Rogers could not fit it on one line, has been transcribed as a whole word. Similarly, the format of the transcriptions has not preserved the lineage of the original manuscripts. However, deletions have been preserved, with the word(s)- where determinable- struck through. I have not noted the heaviness of deletions.

Individual illegible characters are indicated by 'x'. I have used […] to indicate an uncertain reading or a word or phrase, including illegible characters and words. If a word or phrase has been missed and Rogers inserts it above or below the line, <>

indicates the insertion. Generally, Rogers inserts words above the written line, and not below. I have retained Rogers's use of underlining, italicisation and superscript (e.g. 'M^{rs}' and in his signature at the end of a letter, 'Sam^{l} Rogers').

Rogers's grammar and spellings have been preserved. Rogers generally indicates the end of one paragraph and the beginning of a new one in two ways: either by leaving a gap roughly the width of a written line between sections in a letter, or by leaving a gap between two sentences on the same written line. To indicate this clearly to the reader, I have started the paragraph on a new line and indented. Balancing the conflicting editorial priorities of accessibility and reliability has meant that letters presented in the edition are paragraphed in such a way that they do not always reflect Rogers's own usage, and should not be relied on in this respect.

Each letter in my edition has an editorial headnote. This provides information about the author, the addressee, and the letter's date, and if these details are not explicit within the content of the letter, they are surrounded by […]. For headnotes, the name of the individual is given in full but does not include their title (for example, 3rd Baron Holland is presented as Henry Richard Fox), to ensure consistency in the presentation of individuals. However, individuals are referred to by their title in the footnotes (Henry Richard Vassall Fox is footnoted as Lord Holland). This ensures that the headnote clearly identifies the exact individual and that the footnotes use the names that Rogers identified people by, to shed further light on the content and context of the letters. More information about titles and positions is given in the 'Biographies of Correspondents' section. The letter's current archival location and any further relevant information (such as envelopes and postmarks) are included in the initial footnote to each letter.

The footnotes to individual letters contain information about individuals, events and other matters mentioned in the letter text. If biographical information has already been footnoted in a previous letter, the individual's name in consequent letters will be followed by 'q.v.' and the letter number that the biographical information is contained in. The footnotes also contain translations of any material in a foreign language (with the exception of book titles). Biographies of correspondents can be found in the 'Biographies of Correspondents' section following the edition.

For the purpose of this PhD thesis, not all of the letters I have transcribed are present here. Those that have been selected have been done so due to the following factors: to demonstrate Rogers's knowledge on a variety of themes; to demonstrate how poetry and the poet in the eighteenth and nineteenth century were integrated into social and professional networks; and to demonstrate the range of individuals with whom Rogers corresponded. As such, this is not a complete edition, but is the basis for a future and complete edition of Rogers's letters. The Appendix supplements my critical edition by listing all the archives containing letters by Rogers that I have located.

Chronological Letters

1. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Mackenzie], 6 May 1804[1]

May
6th 1804

My dear Sir

I should indeed be ungrateful if I did not seize the earliest opportunity to thank you for your very kind letter, & for the beautiful verses enclosed in it.[2] I had resolved in my heart to make you many reproaches & particularly for not letting me into a secret which I did not discover till it was too late.[3] I hope I need not say what pleasure it would have given my sister to have waited upon your fellow-traveller & to have shown her every attention in her power.[4] When you come back we flatter ourselves you will make ample atonement.

As to the verses written by Queen Mab* (for I suspect the writer to be no less a personage),[5] they are really wonderful & possess all that charming abstraction from common life which so remarkably characterises the poetry of young people.[6]

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.648, ff.23-25. MS in another hand. Follows title 'Letters from Samuel Rogers to Henry Mackenzie'. In the margin at the end of the MS is written: 'insert here extract from Collins regarding Henry Mackenzie's death, 1831'.
[2] Unidentified.
[3] In 1804 Mackenzie was elected to the office of comptroller of the taxes for Scotland.
[4] Sarah Rogers (1772-1855), Rogers's sister and confidante; 'fellow-traveller' is probably Mackenzie's wife, Penuel Mackenzie (1750-1835).
[5] By the left hand side of the MS here is written the corresponding asterisk: '*!'.
[6] Clayden states that Mackenzie sent Rogers 'a brilliant forgery on Burns, and a fancy drama by a girl of eleven', who is probably the 'Queen Mab' referenced here (*Clayden 1889*, Vol. I, p.14).

Grasshopper's soup is worthy of Ariel himself.[7] The affecting lines which accompany them, might well deceive better eyes than mine, & Burns might have been proud to own them.[8] The pernicious reptile alluded to sits smiling at this moment in the shade of his verandah, not ineffectual I believe are his endeavours.[9]

For save his secret soul from nightly fears
From Scotia's curse, from Scotia's tears.[10]

In return I have nothing to send you but a stanza or two upon a girl asleep. Do you think they would be of any use to Mr Thomson?[11] They are quite at his service. Eccolé![12]

Sleep on & dream of heaven awhile
Though shut so close thy laughing eyes
Thy rosy lips still wear a smile,
And more & breathe delicious sighs!

Ah, now soft blushes tinge her cheeks
And mantle to her neck of snow!
Ah now she murmurs, now she speaks
What most I wish yet fear to know.

Sleep on serene above controul,

---

[7] A reference to the Burns forgery; Ariel is a character from Shakespeare's *The Tempest*.
[8] This is 'the brilliant forgery on Burns' previously mentioned.
[9] Unidentified.
[10] Adapted from Thomas Gray's 'The Bard, A Pindaric Ode': 'To save thy secret soul from nightly fears / From Cambria's curse, from Cambria's tears!'
[11] George Thomson (1757-1851), music collector and publisher. Thomson was setting Rogers's poem 'The Sleeping Beauty', featured in this letter, to music.
[12] Translates to 'here they are'.

Thy Thoughts belong to Heaven & thee.
And may the secret of thy soul
Still rest within its sanctuary,
Forever undisturbed by me!

Columbus returns his best acknowledgements for your obliging inquiries. He has crossed the Atlantic & will be happy to make the voyage with you, whenever you are at leisure. How are your nerves, for the new world is full of "black spirits & white, blue spirits & grey".[13]

I rejoice to hear your son bore the journey so well. The bitter East has at last retired into his cave, & the air here today is as mild as in summer. Let us hope he will revive with all nature, in that delightful season

"When May flowers blow, & green is every grove
And the young linnet sings I love! I love!"[14]

How charming are those lines of Tasso here so faintly imitated,

Odi quallo usignölo
Che va di ramo in ramo
Cantando, Io amo, Io amo[15]

---

[13] Rogers was working on his epic *The Voyage of Columbus* (published 1810) during the 1800s. 'Red' is changed to 'blue' in the quotation from Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (Act 4, Scene 1, ll.44-5): 'Black spirits and white, red spirits and gray; / mingle, mingle, mingle, that you mingle may'. The colour could be a political reference: blue may refer to the blue of the Tory party, or the blue and buff of the Whig party.
[14] These lines do not appear in Rogers's works.
[15] Lines are an adaptation of Tasso's *Aminta* (1573), Act 1 Scene 1, translated in P. B. Du-Bois, *Tasso's Aminta, A Pastoral Comedy in Italian and English* (Oxford, 1726), pp. 9 and 11, as: 'hear that Nightingale, which hops from Bough to Bough singing, I love, I love'.

I wish I had any news to send you, for what a pleasant confusion we are at present! How will it end?

The new coalition is now closely cementing, & hostilities will recommence immediately if no surrender takes place.[16]

Adieu, my dear Sir. I accept very thankfully your very friendly offer, though I fear you will find in me an unworthy correspondent. You are now, I picture to myself, revisiting the wild scenes of Boslin & Hawthornden.[17] If you can command there at will such society as you have peopled my dreams with, you are wise indeed in shunning the bustle & impertinence of what is vulgarly called good company.

I am very dear Sir

Yours most sincerely & affect^{y}

Sam^{l} Rogers[18]

[16] The Third Coalition was formed from 1803 of the United Kingdom, Russia, Naples, Sicily, Sweden and nations under the governance of the Habsburgs, against the threat of the French Empire.
[17] Castles in Scotland.
[18] Cross-written in the left hand margin is: 'Insert here- extract from letter regarding henry Mackenzie's death. 1831'.

2. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Mackenzie], 5 November 1804[1]

London

Nov^r^ 5 1804

My dear Sir,

Pray don't flatter yourself that you are forgotten because you have been so long without a letter. Quite otherwise. I have not failed to think of you at least three times a day. When yours arrived here, I was from home & I returned full of cold & fever & a thousand fancies, which last have hung about me ever since, & have rendered me absolutely ~~eff~~ fit for nothing.

But I am now beginning to breathe again, & hope by means of two great doctors, not Galen and Hippocrates but a horse & a cow, to become a miracle of health & strength.[2]

You say nothing of your son. Let me conclude he is now secure from all apprehension & as full of life & courage as I mean to be.[3]

So the star [~~x~~] which first discovered itself in your sky is soon to be visible in ours.[4] Mrs Siddons from a discreet regard ~~for~~ to her amplitude of person, begs leave to decline a comparison with this actor from Lilliput, but we are all on tiptoe

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.648, ff.26-28. MS in another hand. Part published in Clayden, Vol. 1, pp.16-17. At the end of MS is written: 'In above letter is stamped "Brighton"'.

[2] Galen (c.130-c.210), physician and philosopher; Hippocrates (460-370 BC), physician. Rogers had returned from visiting the countryside for his health.

[3] Mackenzie had three sons, and this could possibly be a reference to the youngest one Holt Mackenzie (1787-1876) who served in the East India Company.

[4] William Henry West Betty (1791-1874), a child actor. Clayden notes that Betty had debuted at Covent Garden in December 1804 (*Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, p.18*).*

& prepared to die in the crowd.[5] Pray present my <best> compliments to Mr Thompson, when you see him. His criticism I believe to be perfectly just.[6] It is my practice in such cases to administer a very short & effectual remedy, but here unluckily, if I burn the offending stanza, there is nothing left.

I will therefore beg leave to withdraw the last line, which I suppose to be most in fault, & the song will conclude thus,

"And may be secret of thy soul,
Repose within its sanctuary"[7]

But the last word is I fear, the very worst in the world, for a composer to finish with. It is indeed altogether worthy of Mr T's notice & he will do well to think no more of it.[8]

There is a printer, I understand in our town, who is perfectly intoxicated with happiness, & who stops his friends to enquire whether any man was so distinguished before. He is at once employed on Madoc [⁎] & on the Lay of the Last Minstrel; so we may expect great amusement this winter.[9] With the last, I suppose you are already well acquainted. Pray give my compliments to the author. I lament that I have scarcely seen him. S^{r} Smith is now very happy & very busy in preparing, as

---

[5] Sarah Siddons (1755-1831), actress and sister of the actor John Philip Kemble.
[6] George Thomson, q.v. letter 1.
[7] These lines are the final couplet of Rogers's 'The Sleeping Beauty', which Thomson set to music. Rogers did not include it in his *Poems* (1834), but it was published in collections by Palgrave (1861), and in Germany in 1863 in *British Diamonds: A Standard Selection from the Modern English poets, Chiefly Living*, ed. Henrich Jolowicz (Dresden: Attenburg).
[8] George Thomson, q.v. letter 1.
[9] Robert Southey's *Madoc* (1805) and Walter Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel* (1805) were both published by Longman, Hurst, Rees, and Orme, and both printed by James Ballantyne of Edinburgh. See 'Biographies of Correspondents'.

he says, his moral philosophy for the ladies.[10] I met him not long ago in the fields, lost in thought & full of his subject. Roscoe's Leo Xth. is nearly printed which reminds me of a book I have just read with great delight.[11] Alas! There are not above six copies of it existing, but I will not rest till it is reprinted. I mean Ten hove's Memoirs of the House of Medici.[12] It is if I may say so, all kernel & no shell & as interesting as a French memoir. If histories were written as histories should be, boys & girls would cry to read them.

Farewell my dear sir & believe me to be

Ever yours
Sam^{l} Rogers[13]

[10] Sir Sydney Smith (1771-1845), clergyman and one of the founders of the Whig *Edinburgh Review*. In November 1804 Smith gave two lectures on moral philosophy at the Royal Institution in Albemarle Street.
[11] William Roscoe (1753-1831), historian, who published books on Lorenzo de Medici (1795) and Pope Leo X (1805). Rogers owned copies of both of these books at the time of his death according to the Sale Catalogue of his possessions.
[12] Nicholaas Ten Hove, *Memoirs of the House de Medici* (originally published in Dutch in 1770).
[13] Below this is written: 'The above letter is stamped "Brighton" [59]'.

3. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Mackenzie], 24 March 1805[1]

March 24th 1805

My dear Sir

I have at last seen the boy who has enchanted old & young, & till then I had resolved to deny myself the pleasure of writing to you. I will not say I was surprised, for I went with great expectation, but he certainly came up to the idea you had led me so long ago to form of him. Through many passages he hurried without feeling; & his countenance wanted the changes which time only can give it, but he is a prodigy & with careful culture will delight, if he lives, the rising generation.[2] His acting may now be compared to painting in water-colours – by & by it will acquire more force & body. Mrs Siddons has retired to Hampstead for her health, & what is odd enough, though she has seen a play, she has not seen him, nor does she disguise her scepticism on the subject. I heard her read the trial scene in the Merchant of Venice the other night with great effect.[3]

Our public speakers are divided. Mr Grey can see no merit in him & Mr Wyndham sees but little, while Mr Pitt has become a play-goer & Mr Fox, with whom I saw him in Hamlet, thought his acting during the Play better than Garricks.[4] – I ought to make many apologies to Mr Thompson for my unpardonable delay. He wants another stanza Eccola![5]

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.648, ff.30-31. MS in another hand. Part published in *Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, pp.18-20.
[2] William Henry West Betty, q.v. letter 2.
[3] Sarah Siddons q.v. letter 2,
[4] The Whig politician Charles Grey (1764-1845), Whig William Windham (1750-1810), Tory William Pitt (1759-1806) and Whig Charles James Fox (1749-1806); and the actor David Garrick (1717-1779).
[5] George Thomson, q.v. letter 1.

She starts she trembles & she weeps
Her fair hands folded on her breast: -
And now how like a saint she sleeps –
A seraph in the realms of rest.

Sleep on secure above controul
Thy thoughts belong to Heaven & thee, -
And may the secret of thy soul
Be held in reverence by me![6]

I will not say I am satisfied, & Mr T. I am sure, will not.[7] However he will take it, I hope, as a proof of good intention. I have done what I could. I have lately visited other times with Mr Scott & have returned with great regret to the present.[8] Mr Fox expressed a wish to make the same enterprise & I found him busily engaged yesterday in reading my copy.[9]

We have received, as you may have heard, some very interesting letters from Mackintosh.[10] He thirsts for European society like an Arab in the desert, & looks forward with impatience to the distant day of his return. He gives audience every day to grotesque figures from strange countries, but such novelties have already ceased to amaze him.

Don't you rejoice in our friend Smith's success? His lecture on wit yesterday deserved the praise it met with.[11]

Let me hope you have weathered this winter well, with all its changes. What a restless life does the Quicksilver lead in such a climate as ours. Since you wrote I have suffered a great

---

[6] Rogers's poem 'The Sleeping Beauty'.
[7] George Thomson, q.v. letter 1.
[8] Walter Scott (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').
[9] This is possibly a copy of Rogers's poem 'The Sleeping Beauty'.
[10] Sir James Mackintosh (1765–1832), political writer and politician. Mackintosh had moved to India as a judge in Bombay in 1804.
[11] Probably Sydney Smith, q.v. letter 2. Smith gave a lecture on 'Humour and Wit' at the Royal Institution, London, in the spring of 1804.

loss in Mr Townley.[12] You may remember to have seen him lying on a couch among his marbles last spring. A kinder heart & a more elegant mind were never found together. I don't know how it is but there is something so soothing & delightful in such a character, when the hey-day & bustle of life is over, that I have almost always, even when a young man, been led to cultivate the friendship of people much older than myself.

Pray follow a better example, than I have set you, & write soon to say that you intend us a visit this Spring.

Be assured, my dear sir, that it cannot give greater pleasure to every body.

Yours with very great sincerity
Saml Rodgers

[12] Charles Townley (1737-1805), collector.

4. Samuel Rogers to [William Godwin], 18 November [1806][1]

Tunbridge Wells, Nov^{r} 18[2]

My dear Sir

I lament exceedingly that it is not in my power to do what, I can truly assure you, would give me a very great pleasure, &, if it will be any satisfaction to you, I will frankly explain the peculiar circumstances in which I am placed, when next I have the good fortune to see you – But if so trifling a sum as Fifty Pounds for two months can be of any immediate use, I know my brother will be equally happy with myself in discounting your Note to that amount.[3]

Yours, dear Sir
With the greatest Esteem
Yours very sincerely
Sam^{l} Rogers

I have burnt your letter & you may depend upon the strictest secrecy.

---

[1] Bodleian Library, MS. Abinger c.10, ff.17-18. F.18v postmarked 1806, addressed: 'William Godwin Esq^{r} / N^{o} 29, Polygon; / Somers Town / near / London'.
[2] Royal Tunbridge Wells, a town in Kent equidistant between London and Brighton.
[3] Probably Rogers's older brother Daniel (1760-1829).

5. Samuel Rogers to [Walter] Scott, 22 September [1809][1]

My dear Scott

I can assure you I shall have very good pleasure in seeing my name united with yours on any occasion – Unfortunately I have already made some progress in a new edition, which will contain all my unpublished scraps –[2] but I don't know why this circumstance should be any obstacle; &, if you think it more, & think the inclosed worthy of Mr B's acceptance, it is very much at his service -[3] It is, if I may venture an opinion, at least as unexceptionable as any I have to offer, & in size I believe the most considerable. The subject is the death of M^{rs} Duff & ~~at~~ it is addressed to her sister, the Duchess of St. Albans.[4] – I believe I once repeated it to you – You may deal with it just as you please.

When I received your very welcome letter, I was wandering about the Isle of Wight, & admiring, morning, noon, & night, the sea & the shipping from its woody shores, but, alas, I lived under my umbrella! A rainbow or two, & three or four brilliant flashes of lightning was almost the only agrémens I can recollect to have had in my journey.[5] May you have been

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.3878, f.147. This letter is probably a response to Scott's, dated 18 August 1809, published in *Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, pp.58-59.
[2] John Ballantyne (1774-1821), literary agent and publisher, the brother of James Ballantyne and friend of Scott. They had set up a publishing house in 1809. Scott had asked Rogers to contribute poems to a miscellany put together by John Ballantyne, and Rogers offered his verses on Mrs Duff for publication.
[3]In his reply, Scott described Rogers's enclosed verses as 'a delightful though a melancholy tribute to the fate of poor Mrs. Duff'. Mrs Duff had been bitten by a dog and died of an infection (Scott to Rogers, 4 October 1809, *Rogers and his Contemporaries*, p.61).
[4] Maria Janetta Beauclerk (1779-1822), Duchess of St Albans.
[5] Rogers was visiting the Isle of Wight at the end of 1809.

more fortunate! <notwithstanding the melancholy monument at your door->[6]

What a singular occurrence has taken place. I have just seen Gifford, who has been sitting this morning by Canning's bedside. C. is in good spirits & without fever. He is lying on his side & conversing with great composure. Having <never> before appeased in that character, he <u>fronted</u> Lord C. & perhaps to that fortune owes his life.[7] Adieu, my dear Scott, & believe <me> to be

Ever yours
Saml Rogers

London, Sept. 22.

George Ellis is expected in town to-morrow[8]

---

[6] Scott wrote to Rogers that 'the lightning splintered an oak here before my door last week' (*Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, p.59).

[7] George Canning (1770-1827), Foreign Secretary and later Prime Minister (1827), was admired by Scott who wrote that 'I don't see how the present ministry can stand without him' (Scott to Rogers, 4 October 1809, *Clayden 1889,* Vol. 1, p.61). On 21 September 1809, Canning and Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh (1769-1922, the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, whom Rogers refers to as 'Lord C.') fought a duel which resulted in Castlereagh shooting Canning in the thigh. Castlereagh had redeployed troops to the Netherlands which Canning had promised would be sent to Portugal in 1809, starting a series of political disputes between the two which had resulted in Castlereagh's challenge. As a friend and fellow Tory, William Gifford had spent much time by his bedside whilst Canning was recovering.

[8] George Ellis (1753-1815), antiquarian and editor of *Specimens of Early English Poets* (1790). He was a close friend of Walter Scott.

6. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [1810-1811] [1]

Pray accept my very sincere thanks. It was indeed a very great affliction - not as much on accounts of the poor boy himself – his sufferings were soon over – but your heart would melt if you saw those he has left behind.[2]

His poor mother has not spoken since – nor has she shed a tear, I believe, but once. Time, however, will, I hope, bring her back to herself again.

Pray remember me very particularly to Lady Holland. I was very sure she would feel for me when she heard of it.

Ever yours, most gratefully,

Sam[l] Rogers

When I come to town, I will not fail to call & thank you both.

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.11-12. Dated by British Library. Rogers asks to be remembered to Lady Holland, so this letter is probably addressed to Lord Holland. F.12v features pencil sketches of doves and an old man.
[2] Unidentified, not one of Rogers's nephews.

7. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [25 November 1811][1]

Dear Lady Holland,

Last night I was very sorry (I hope Frere has said how sorry I was) to be obliged to sleep in the fog, & to breakfast not with you in the sun, this morning.[2]

Today I am very sorry to lose another pleasure – that of seeing Lord H & the Duke of Inf. next Thursday, as there is no meeting of the Royal Society this week, in consequence of an Election of the Officers for the next year.[3]

As Lord Holland has the gift of tongues, perhaps he will explain this circumstance to the Duke, & in the mean time I shall confine myself to sending him a Card for Thursday 5th, December (the Thursday in next week) requesting the Honor of his Company to meet Lord H. at a quarter before 5 o'clock.[4] Sir Josh Banks in the evening will I am sure, receive them in his best manner – in

"His reddest ribbon & his brightest star"[5]

If any other Thursday should be more convenient to Lord H., I shall be happy to change the day to any other he will name.

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.7-8. Dated by British Library.
[2] John Hookham Frere (1769-1846), translator, poet and diplomat. As a Tory, Frere was a close friend of William Gifford and the Prime Minister George Canning (q.v. letter 5), but he also corresponded frequently with Lord Holland.
[3] Possibly Pedro Alcántara de Toledo y Salm-Salm, 13th Duke of Infantado (1768-1841), a Spanish politician. He does not appear in any records of the Royal Society, but was in England at the time.
[4] Here, Rogers is trying to organise an occasion to meet Lord Holland and the Duke, as he has missed them due to the rescheduling of the Royal Society meeting.
[5] Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1820), English naturalist and President of the Royal Society from 1778 to his death. The red sash and star are indicative of the Order of the Bath, a reference to the knighthood Banks received in July 1795.

Ever & ever yours most truly

Sam[l] Rogers

Monday, 6 o’clock

8. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [December 1811][1]

I am very sorry I cannot have the pleasure of dining with you next Sunday, nor indeed for some little time to come. Independent of some little engagements which I have, my house & my house-hold are just now at sixes and sevens, & I dare not stir; but your kindness is not thrown away upon me & I hope to call & tell you so very soon. If Charles is gone without my seeing him, I shall be very unhappy indeed.[2]

Ever yours,
Sam[l] Rogers

I have forwarded the note to Anacreon[3]

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.11-12. Dated by British Library.
[2] Charles Richard Fox (1796-1873), the eldest son of the Hollands. However, as he was born before their marriage, he could not be the heir to the Baronetcy. Charles served in the navy from 1809 to 1813.
[3] Thomas Moore (1779-1852), poet. Moore was famed for his *Odes of Anacreon* (1800).

9. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [10 May 1812][1]

I am afraid my Name will be erased for ever from the list of your Corps Diplomatique but I was in the act of calling upon Lord B. when he was, I believe, comfortably sitting by your fire-side –[2] But I hope the circumstances I am just now in – will in some degree plead for my apparent ~~diligene~~ dilatoriness – Happy indeed should I be to wait upon you on Tuesday, but by & by I shall be worthier of you. –

Pray tell Lord H. that Lord B. has behaved nobly. A New Edition of the Satire is just printed, & waiting only for an advertisement to take its flight. At the very first word, he declared his resolution to extinguish the whole & never more to publish a single Copy. He only expressed his regret that it had not occurred to <u>him</u> before & when we parted at your door, he set off to the Publisher's.[3]

Ever yours obliged
S. R.

Sunday.

When I return to town, as I shall in a day or two, I am sure I shall hear that the whole has been cancelled -

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.20-21. Dated by British Library. F.21v is addressed: 'The Lady Holland', and includes a black seal.
[2] Lord George Gordon Byron (1788-1824), poet.
[3] At Rogers's suggestion, Byron suppressed the fifth edition of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, which had originally been published in 1809, to prevent it offending Lord and Lady Holland. In *English Bards*, Byron criticised the role the Hollands played in the culture of reviews and in literary society: 'Illustrious Holland! hard would be his lot / His hirelings mentioned, and himself forgot'. The publisher was James Cawthorn.

10. Samuel Rogers to [John James Masquerier], [after 1812][1]

Dear Sir

M^rs^ Masquerier & any of her friends will be most welcome to see the pictures, if they will do him the Honour to call in St James's Place to-morrow between two & three o clock.[2]

Yours very truly
Sam^l^ Rogers

Wednesday

[1] Dr Williams's Library, the Masquerier Album. Recipient has been identified by Dr Williams's Library. Letter dated to after 1812, as this was when James Masquerier married.
[2] James Masquerier married Rachel Scott (d.1850) in 1812. Rogers is responding to a request for Rachel to visit his collection.

11. Samuel Rogers to [William Wordsworth], 9 January 1813[1]

St James's Place, London

My dear Sir

Upon my return from the North Pole yesterday,[2] I found your Letter lying upon my table to welcome me; & happy, I can truly say, I shall be to execute any Commission you may favor me with. You say the Work is in process[3] - &, so far I read - but unfortunately being called off in the middle of the letter, short as it was, when I returned, I found that my Sister by some unlucky mistake had burnt it.[4] If you have not entrusted it to another, pray send it to me that I <may> begin my negotiations.[5] I hope it is that which relates to your own Lakes & mountains.

As for myself I have been idling away my life in the Highlands among erse-songs & tartain-plaids & when the time came, I left Scotland with great regret.[6] Had I found Mary & her little court in Holy Rood - had I supped now & then with her & Rizzio in that little chamber there (any night, if you please, but one) I could not have heard sweeter music, nor could I have

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, MSS WLMS A /Rogers, Samuel / 1. Wordsworth replied to this letter on 12 January 1813, expressing thanks for Rogers's offer of assistance with the 'Publication' but, explaining that due to the death of his son Thomas, he would defer thoughts of publication (*Wordsworth Letters*, *III*, pp.69-70).
[2] Rogers visited the north of England (including the Lake District) and Scotland from August 1812 to January 1813.
[3] Possibly *The Excursion*, published in 1814.
[4] Sarah Rogers, q.v. letter 1.
[5] Rogers was willing to negotiate with publishers on behalf of Wordsworth's publication (probably *The Excursion*).
[6] Rogers's 'Written in the Highlands of Scotland', composed in September 1812, was an imitation of one of these 'erse-songs'.

liked it half as well.[7] Sharp is now out of parliament, but hopes to be soon in again.[8] W Scott's Rokeby is to be out in ~~Yorkshire~~ a day or two.[9] The scene is laid in Yorkshire. He has written it lately, I hear, at the rate of a hundred lines a day. Pray remember me very kindly to your Ladies, & to one & all, little & large, & believe me to be as ever

Yours very truly
Saml Rogers

Janr^{y}. 9th 1813
My Sister desires her kind Remembrance

[7] Mary, Queen of Scots, who resided at Holyrood Palace from 1561 to 1567. David Rizzio (c.1533-1566), an Italian musician and member of Mary's court. The night Rogers would not have wanted to have supped with them was 9 March 1566 when Rizzio was murdered in Mary's presence.
[8] Richard 'Conversation' Sharp (1759-1835), renowned wit and politician. Sharp represented the Whig party as a Member of Parliament for Castle Rising from 1806 to 1812.
[9] Walter Scott's *Rokeby; A poem* (1813).

12. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [8 August 1813] [1]

My dear Lady Holland,

I hope the pain is fled & you are comfortably established in your pavilions on the sea-shore. If it does not interfere with your Arrangements, I will be with you to-dinner on Tuesday next. But pray answer me, indeed I know you will, frankly.

M^me^ de Staël is in great affliction. She was to have dined with me to-day & I with her yesterday, when the news of the duel came.[2] I have just received a line from Lord Aberdeen.[3] He sets off to-morrow.

Sheridan writes me word that he is very busy & very happy in his new house at Fetcham.[4] I should like to look at him, by the good offices of the Diablo Boiteux.[5] Lord Webb. Seymour is in town & looks very ill.[6]

The Duke of Northumberland is again in the gout, & may be kept as long in town, as he was at Alnwick.[7] He talks of removing to Tunbridge.[8] This last intelligence will interest you very much & you will smile at it, but as I had it first from Lord J

---

[1] British Library, Department of Manuscripts, Add.MSS.51646, ff.24-25. Dated by the British Library.
[2] Germaine de Staël (1766-1817), author and playwright. De Staël's son Albert was killed in a duel whilst serving in the Swedish army in 1813.
[3] George Hamilton-Gordon, 4th Earl of Aberdeen (1784–1860), Tory and scholar. He was later Prime Minister (1852-55).
[4] Richard Brinsley Sheridan (1751-1816), playwright, bought the large Polesdon Lacey house in Fetcham, Surrey, in 1804.
[5] *Diablo Boiteux* is a novel by Alain-René Lesage, published in 1707, in which the devil transports the protagonist to different houses to observe what happens within them.
[6] Lord Webb John Seymour, 10th Duke of Somerset (1777 –1819), a Fellow of the Royal Society and scholar.
[7] Hugh Percy, 2nd Duke of Northumberland (1742-1817). The ducal seat is at Alnwick Castle.
[8] Tunbridge Wells in Kent where Rogers frequently travelled. As well as being a spa town, Tunbridge Wells was equidistant between London and Brighton, which Rogers and the Hollands also visited.

Murray just now, I thought it would give you an idea of the trifles we subsist upon here.[9]

I called in at Brookes's yesterday & found only Blue & Hat Vaughan.[10] Ward gives a supper to-night.[11] It was to have been at Nugent's.[12]

Ever & ever yours
Sam[l] Rogers

Pray let me hear from you, or about you.

[9] Possibly Sir John Archibald Murray, Lord Murray (1778?–1859), Whig politician and judge.
[10] Possibly Sir Charles Richard Vaughan (1774–1849), diplomat.
[11] John William Ward, 1st Earl of Dudley (1781–1833), initially a Whig, by 1812 he had joined Canning's Tory party.
[12] Probably the house of George Nugent Grenville, 2nd Baron Nugent of Carlanstown (1788-1850), politician and writer.

13. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [after 20 October 1812] [1]

The French is admirable, & your translation, though you will not allow it, is very good. I shall now answer your queries.

1.st I do indeed think that the thought, even in prose, would be an improvement on the Brighton Sketch, but, are they incompatible?

2.dly I should prefer verse, I confess; but prose will do nearly as well, & perhaps will be altogether more suitable to the subject & the hero. I think the Genl. would have voted for prose.[2]

3dly. I think the turn in your two last lines not only tolerable, but excellent. I would only propose to alter the last word for something, which, being opposed in the lines to gratitude, should represent the causes of it. Generosity would not do, but I think there is a word that would do, "Worth" – It has cost me some trouble to find a rhyme to it, & perhaps after <all> it did not deserve it. But as you have intrusted me with some lines of yours, enjoining secrecy - I think the best security I can give you for my good conduct will be some doggerel-stanzas in return. Pray throw them into the element that has caused you all the embarrassment you allude to.

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646 ff.28-29. British Library, Add.MSS.51646 ff.28-29. Dated to 1812 as it references the opening address at the Drury Lane Theatre, which was given by Byron on 20 October 1812. The recipient of the letter is Lord Holland. This letter is concerned with the opening address for the opening night of the rebuilt Drury Lane Theatre, which had burnt down in 1809 when Sheridan was Theatre Manager. Holland was a member of the Drury Lane Committee which rejected all entries received for a competition to write the opening Address of the new Drury Lane Theatre when it was reopened in 1812. This letter shows that Holland was writing an address himself which applauded the politician Sir Samuel Whitbread's (1764-1815) chairing of the committee to restore the theatre. After asking Byron to write the address, Byron accepted and Holland gave Byron comments on drafts that he sent. The address was performed on 20 October 1812.

[2] Unidentified.

Here on this classic spot, when Ruin came,
Where Garrick's self the words of Shakespeare spoke,[3]
When the majestic pile dissolved in flame
And on its ashes Morning broke

One man restored it.[4] He & he alone
Stranger, gave all that here delights thee birth;

And to all eyes may this enduring stone
Record our gratitude & Whitbreads worth.[5]

Or to attempt your medium

When on this spot so dear to Fame,
(Where oft & long a Garrick spoke)
The gorgeous pile ~~was swept~~ <dissolved> in flames,
And on its ashes morning broke;

One Man restored it. He alone
Gave all that here enchants us birth;
And here would we record in stone
Our Gratitude & Whitbread's Worth.[6]

I really think you have begun well, & at all events the verse will melt down into something better than Sherry's prose.[7] Dont you think Garrick gives that spot such an advantage over every other theatre as not to be omitted. You

[3] David Garrick, q.v. letter 3.
[4] Benjamin Dean Wyatt (1775-1855), architect.
[5] Samuel Whitbread (1764-1815), politician. Whitbread chaired the committee to organise the rebuilding of the Drury lane Theatre in 1809.
[6] This poem was never published.
[7] Probably Richard Brinsley Sheridan, q.v. letter 12.

may object to "restored it (the house that was burnt) – but would it not be admitted in bold language – The temple was consumed by fire – but he came & it stood there again!

Pray remember me very affectionately to Lady H. I have received a delightful letter from her & will answer it to-morrow.

Ever yours
SR.

Sunday
Bowood[8]

[8] Bowood House was the Wiltshire house of Lord Lansdowne. Poets such as Rogers and Thomas Moore (q.v. letter 8) were frequently invited to stay.

14. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [18 October 1813][1]

Monday, Bowood[2]

Many thanks for your very entertaining Letter – I wish I could send you such a packet of news; but, alas, I have none. The Persons of the Drama here just now, are very soon numbered the Abercrombies, Jekyll, Eden, & a M^r^ Newnham, a College-friend of Lord L's.[3] Jekyll leaves us to-morrow; but many, I believe are on the road to succeed him. Dumont is hourly expected.[4] M^me^ de Stael comes on Sunday notwithstanding that interposition of Heaven which you allude to; & the Romillys are said to be on the Road.[5] Seventy miles of the journey I performed alone in a Bath Coach, but at night-fall M^r^ Horace Twiss descended from the roof & revived me with many quotations.[6] The house here is very sumptuously furnished. M^r^ Tatham, your friend, has just quitted the field, & has left his foot-steps in every room.[7] The ascent from the hall

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.30-31. Date and recipient identified by the British Library.
[2] Bowood House in Wiltshire, the seat of the Marquess of Lansdowne.
[3] James Abercromby, 1st Baron Dunfermline (1776-1858), and his wife Mary, Abercromby was a Whig Politician who became Speaker of the House of Commons in 1835; Joseph Jekyll (1754–1837), lawyer and politician; Morton Eden, 1st Baron Henley (1752–1830), diplomat; Possibly William Newnham (1790–1865), medical doctor and author; Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice, 3rd Marquess of Lansdowne (1780–1863), Whig politician and cousin of Lord Holland.
[4] Pierre-Étienne-Louis Dumont (1759–1829), editor, who lived in the household of Lord Lansdowne.
[5] Germaine de Staël , q.v. letter 12. De Staël's son Albert (b.1792) died in October 1813. Sir Samuel Romilly (1757–1818), lawyer and politician, and his wife Anne.
[6] Horace Twiss (1787–1849), lawyer, politician and poet.
[7] Possibly Charles Heathcote Tatham (1772–1842), architect.

to the drawing room is very pretty indeed & reflects great honour on M^r^ Smirke.[8]

Poor M^me^ Moreau![9] Were the Pére the guardian of M^r^ Kinloch's pulse, he would probably make the same observation.[10] L^d^ Lansdowne & the two members dine to-day with the electors of Calne –[11] I have written to L^d^ B, tho' I believe I can anticipate his answer -[12] W's conversing is indeed a miracle beyond that of Ianuarius, & requires such evidence, as I fear, will never be furnished.[13]

I breakfasted this morning with Bowles in his rectory.[14] In a letter to Howley he predicted his exaltation to <the sees of> London 20^yrs^ ago, & well he might.[15]

Ever yours most aff^y^

Saml^l^ Rogers

---

[8] Robert Smirke (1780-1867), architect, who worked on Bowood House in the early nineteenth century.
[9] Eugénie Hulot Moreau (1781-1821), wife of Napoleon's political rival Jean Victor Marie Moreau (b.1763), who died on 2 September 1813.
[10] George Kinloch (1775-1833), politician. Unidentified subject.
[11] Calne, a town in Wiltshire. The two MPs at this time were Joseph Jekyll and James Abercromby. As Lansdowne was the sole patron of Calne, he selected individuals who were political allies to stand as MPs.
[12] Lord Byron q.v letter 9. Response is unidentified, and the topic is probably Byron's address at the Drury Lane Theatre, performed on 20 October 1813.
[13] Possibly William Wordsworth (see 'Biographies of Correspondents).
[14] William Lisle Bowles (1762–1850), clergyman and poet.
[15] William Howley (1766–1848), clergyman and later Archbishop of Canterbury. This reference is to Howley's consecration as Bishop of London in October 1813.

15. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], 1813[1]

1813

Tuesday morning

Many, many thanks for the MS.[2] I am delighted with it; & so would Addison have been, I am very sure, if he could have read it. It is just the thing to his taste.[3] – The idea of an old king so gifted is in itself very striking to the imagination, & is rendered still more so by being in some degree, if I may say so, founded on historical truth, for the person alluded to certainly thinks he possesses the power ascribed to him.[4]

The groupe he has assembled, indeed does him honor, & is highly picturesque including the dresses & manners from Henry 8th to Queen Anne.[5] The ensemble, as we have the portraits, would make an admirable picture. – Nothing too can be better imagined as a vehicle to convey ideas that by some

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.90-91. At the top of the letter, the date is clearly written as 1813, but when this letter has been foliated by the British Library, the date has been pencilled in as '1818?', probably due to the publication of *A Dream* in 1818. However, Holland had been writing this from at least May 1813, so the date of 1813 is correct. The correspondent is Lord Holland due to the references to *A Dream*.

[2] MS is probably that of Lord Holland's *A Dream* (1818). The published edition begins with 'Dear R.', possibly Rogers, and ends with the date of May 1813.

[3] Joseph Addison (1672–1719), writer and politician.

[4] *A Dream* features a king who appears to be George III (1738-1820), who from 1809 to his death in 1820 was deemed unfit to rule, and his son Prince George (1762-1830) ruled in his stead.

[5] The 'groupe assembled' in *A Dream* refers to the historical figures the dreamer meets: Sir Thomas More (1478-1535), politician and theologian executed by Henry VIII; Reginald Pole (1500-1558), Cardinal and archbishop of Canterbury; William Cecil, 1st Baron Burghley (1520/21-1598), royal minister; Francis Bacon, Viscount St Alban (1561-1626), politician and philosopher; Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon (1661-1723), politician and historian; John Milton (1608-1674), poet; Abraham Cowley (1618-1667), poet; Sir William Temple (1628-1699), diplomat and author; Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713), philosopher and author; John Locke (1632-1704), philosopher; John Somers, 1st Baron Somers (1651-1716), lawyer and politician; George Berkeley (1685-1753), Church of Ireland Bishop and philosopher; and Joseph Addison.

may be thought romantic than a dream. Not that these are all of that class. I wish most fervently that the experiments might be made, one & all – & I think, with a few touches here & there, & perhaps now & then a little compression (an operation I am too fond of) the composition would be excellent. It reminded me at one time, I dont know why, of Cowley's discourse concerning Cromwell, & you must once or twice have had Hurd's dialogues in your mind.[6]

Perhaps the persons of the Drama might be rendered a little more alive by describing them before you named them, after the manner of Addison in his Palace of Fame, Tatler, 81.[7] – But you have begun so well. You have only to consult the Good Genius who inspired you.[8] Pray remember me very affectionately to Lady H. & believe me to be

Ever yours

Sam[l] Rogers

There is one allusion (at least so I understand it) to a departed Contemporary, which is very delicate & elegant.[9] You see I confine myself to the ornamental parts – of the rest when we meet. One of your schemes hit my fancy excessively, being a little in my own way – to establish a fund for enabling young authors to retain their copyrights.[10] – I hope this will find you with one foot on the step of the carriage. -

---

[6] The poet Abraham Cowley wrote a discourse on Oliver Cromwell, *The visions and prophecies concerning England, Scotland, and Ireland* (1660); Richard Hurd (1720-1808), Bishop of Worcester's *Moral and Political Dialogues* (1760).
[7] Joseph Addison (1672-1719), poet and critic. The article Rogers references is from Addison's *Tatler* (No.81., 15 October 1709).
[8] *A Dream* is addressed to 'Mr R.', so could possibly be Rogers himself.
[9] Unidentified.
[10] There is no evidence that this was carried forward by Rogers. In 1814 copyright legislation was extended to cover an unconditional twenty eight

years or the life of an author, so Rogers's 'scheme' may not have been necessary.

16. Samuel Rogers to [William Wilberforce], 23 February 1814[1]

My dear Sir

I am very sorry indeed for the Cause which will deprive me of the Honor & Pleasure of your Company to dinner on Tuesday next; & can truly say that if Public Business & your other Engagements will allow of it, I shall think myself greatly obliged to you, if you can look in upon us in the course of the Evening. I ought, I am very conscious, to make you many Apologies for having ventured to trouble you with a Request which, I fear, I had no right to make; but I am very sure you will have the Goodness to ascribe it to the true motive.

I remain with very great Respect
Dear Sir, yours most sincerely

Sam[l] Rogers

Feb[y] 23.[d] 1814

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Wilberforce D.14, f.166.

17. Samuel Rogers to [Cadell and Davies], [c.1814][1]

M[r] Rogers will esteem it a favour if Mess.[rs] Cadell & Davies will order fifty copies of Jacqueline to be ~~leaved~~ stitched in brown covers (like the Quarterly Review) with titles at the back, & sent to him in St James's Place.

Saturday

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Montague d.5 f.184. Dated c.1814 as Cadell and Davies published Rogers's *Jacqueline* alongside Byron's anonymous *Lara* that year.

18. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [c.17 October 1815][1]

Paris

I made a vow I would not trouble you with a line from Paris, when I found I must go without seeing you (I slept but one night in town) & write I will, tho' I have but little to say. I spent 14th at sea, & I wish you could have seen Fredk North in his banyan & attended by his Athenian, distributing his lavender water among some Irish ladies in the cabin.[2]

My journey lay thro' Arcadia; the first day was Sunday, & the church-bells came over the hills from every quarter; & before almost every post-house there were children dancing & singing in the road for the chance of a sous; nor did I see a soldier or a tent till I came to Amiens, where the English officers were preparing a fete for the Ladies. Here, alas, Soldiers are every where, & guns planted by the Prussians on the bridges - & the match kept always burning. It was ever so when the King passed by to open the chambers.[3] They say the French show no feeling; but the melancholy groups assemble in the Place de Carrousel to gaze at the Venetian horses for some days before they were taken down by our Engineers, & those now assembled round the column with the same sad presentiment would affect you not a little.[4] "They won't rob us

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.47-48. Dated by the British Library. The political and geographical information in this letter indicates that it dates from after the Battle of Waterloo. There is a similar letter published from Rogers to his sister Sarah, which includes the same content and references and is dated 14 October 1815 (Clayden 1889, Vol. 1, pp.202-207).
[2] Frederick North, 5th Earl of Guilford from 1817 (1766–1827), politician.
[3] Louis XVIII (1755-1824), King of France from 7 July 1815 to 16 September 1824.
[4] Rogers is describing the political and social upheaval in France after Napoleon had been defeated at the Battle of Waterloo in June 1815. The

of every thing," said an old Gentleman to me in the crowd "they would take away the City of Paris if they could." The horses went along under my window, each like a dead horse uncovered in a cart, all the people standing at their doors to see them – the pictures go on the heads of the Hungarian Soldiers. Canova was in a great agony for some days[5] - "I have spent two hours at a time in Metternich's antichamber – that Metternich est une chose terrible –[6] I have heard him laugh thro' the door - &, if the servants had not given me a crust of bread, I must have fainted – I am advised to take some moulding clay in my fingers the next time I go to sit there" – but you will hear his ~~xxxx~~ story from his <own> lips – He has carried his point - the pictures are gone, the marbles going & the galleries resemble an auction room after a sale.[7] A scene of still greater confusion is the Austrian barrack in which the Venus, the Apollo, the Transfiguration, the St. Peter Martyr, & a thousand precious things are all huddled together.[8] Denon is very angry with us, & the Duke's vindication of himself (it is said to be written entirely by himself & who would envy him the honor of such a composition) will not increase some

---

Place du Carrousel is a public square by the Louvre and Tuileries Palace in Paris. Military demonstrations including horses took place here.

[5] Antonio Canova (1757-1822), sculptor.

[6] Translated from French as: 'is a terrible thing'.

[7] This is in reference to the works in the galleries of the Louvre (named Musée Napoléon from 1803 to Napoleon's abdication in 1815) which were being moved and reallocated as many had been taken by Napoleon during his campaigns**.** named Musée Napoléon from 1803 to Napoleon's abdication in 1815. The Austrian Foreign Minister was Klemens von Metternich (1773-1859) who resided in Paris during this time.

[8] Dominique Vivant Denon (1747-1825), Director of the Louvre (then named the Musée Napoléon) from November 1802 to 1814. The Venus is not the Venus de Milo (this was discovered in 1820), but could be a painting by Raphael. Apollo is probably the Apollo Belvedere, which Napoleon had taken from Italy in 1796 and which was returned to the Vatican after his final defeat in 1815. Raphael's *Transfiguration* was similarly taken from Italy in 1797 and returned to the Vatican. 'The Pale Martyr' is Titian's *The Death of St Peter Martyr,* which Napoleon had taken from Venice.

popularity.[9] The other night he & his aid-de-camps were shewn by mistake, as they say, into the King's box at the Opera, & the displeasure of the audience soon [~~Xxxxxx xxxx xxxxxxxx~~] <set them to flight>,[10] nor have the public prints suffered them yet to forget it. There is a caricature of him with moustaches, [~~a~~] <in circulation,> inscribed M. Blucher.[11]

The Smiths left us yesterday.[12] Caroline looks well & cheerful; but I think they travel too fast. Bobus dined with Talleyrand & was at the opening of the Parliament.[13] Jeffrey is here & is very amusing.[14] We lodge on the same floor. Glasserton Stewart is here.[15] He saw the last of poor Eustace & was at Genoa when Lady Jane Died.[16] The Dss returns immediately, but all this you know.[17] I hope to see you in a fortnight.

Yours ever

S. Rogers

---

[9] Denon's anger is probably a result of the handling and dispersion of collections that Napoleon had acquired for the museum, which led to his resignation as Director. Gebhard Lebrecht von Blücher (1742-1819), General of the Prussian Army, had demanded that Denon return the works that had been taken by the French during the German campaign, and when Denon had not done so, Blücher ordered troops to take the works back. 'Duke' is the Duke of Wellington (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').

[10] Three words have been struck through before being replaced by the insertion, but due to this they are difficult to discern.

[11] Rogers mentions this in a letter to his sister. The caricature features Wellington dressed as the Prussian General Blucher.

[12] Robert Percy 'Bobus' Smith (1770-1845), judge and conversationalist, and his wife Caroline Maria.

[13] Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (1754-1838), French politician.

[14] Francis Jeffrey (1773-1850), judge and critic.

[15] George Stewart, 8th Earl of Galloway (1768-1834), Admiral and politician. He lived in Glasserton in Wigtownshire, Scotland.

[16] John Chestwode Eustace (1761-1815), travel writer and Catholic priest; possibly Lady Jane Montagu (1794-1815), eldest daughter of William Montagu, 5th Duke of Manchester (1771-1843), politician.

[17] Possibly the mother of Lady Jane Montagu, Lady Susan Montagu (d.1828), Duchess of Manchester. Lady Susan would have been returning from Jamaica, where her husband was the colonial administrator.

19. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [October 1815][1]

I have just seen the Overseer at the Printing Office, & he promises to proceed with all possible expedition, & to put two sheets at a time to press that you may meet with no interruption.[2] He says a sheet lay ten days at Ridgeways before you received it,[3] & we have determined that for the future the sheets shall be sent directly to you at Holland House by the post; & you may return these in the same manner, addressed to

Mr Davison
Printer
Lombard Street
Whitefriars[4]

He may give publicity to others; but for himself he has chosen the most obscure retreat I ever saw. After a long search I was directed thro' Plantagenet Court & up King Edward Street to "The Ruins" & there in a troisieme I discovered him –[5]

Pray tell Lady Holland how much sorrow I feel at not being able to wait upon her before Wednesday on which day, if I hear nothing from you to prevent me, I will not fail.

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.49-50. Dated by the British Library and recipient is identified as Lord Holland as Rogers asks after Lady Holland.
[2] This is probably Holland's re-edition of Joseph Townsend's *Dissertation on the Poor Laws* (London: Ridgeways, 1817).
[3] Ridgeway or Ridgeway and Sons, owned by James Ridgeway (1755-1838), bookseller and printer based in Piccadilly, London.
[4] Thomas Davison (1766-1831), printer and publisher.
[5] Davison had traded at 6 Lombard Street, Whitefriars. 'Troisieme' could possibly refer to a storey of a three-storey building.

Poor Murat! – [6] What should I meet yesterday but Ward's Apparition, in St. James's Street?[7]

S.R

[6] Joachim-Napoleon Murat (1767-1815), Napoleonic Marshal and Admiral. Murat died in October 2015 after fleeing to Corsica in the wake of Napoleon's defeat.
[7] Unidentified.

20. Samuel Rogers to [Walter] Scott, [July 1816][1]

My dear Scott

Many, many thanks for your introduction to Robert Burns, & to the Magician who has revised his [significant] life.[2] To speak seriously, the Portrait is admirable, tho' I confess it wold have affected my mind still more, if he had sat for it. The Artist too struck me exceedingly.[3] Such simplicity of manners I never saw; & he has great genius! That sketch of the sick man in his bonnet-de-nuit; & its companion the old Lady, are above all praise.[4]

The event you allude to, was to me quite unexpected. In the summer & autumn I observed no alteration tho', I believe, they were then unhappy.[5] After the separation I saw him every day, & he is as on all occasions anxious to do her justice. Wherever the wrong lies, he used to say, it does not lie with her, she is perfect in thought, word & deed, & whenever a syllable dropped from another that seemed to reflect upon her, he instantly checked it.[6] It is, as you say, a sad calamity, &

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.3887, ff.100-101. The date of this is probably July 1816, as Rogers has returned from Richard Brinsley Sheridan's (q.v. letter 12) funeral, which was held in July 1816.
[2] *A New edition of the Life and Works of Robert Burns, as originally edited by James Currie*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Macredie, Skelly and Muckersy, 1815).
[3] The portrait features Burns in a frame with his name in laurels. The illustrator is identified as 'A. Nasmyth' (Alexander Nasmyth, 1758-1840, artist) and the engraver is identified as 'Ja^{s} Stewart' (James Stewart, 1791-1863, Scottish engraver).
[4] Nasmyth's illustrations.
[5] The collapse of Lord Byron's (q.v. letter 9) marriage, which resulted in his wife Annabella (1792-1860) returning to her parents' estate with their daughter Ada, and Byron travelling to Europe.
[6] Rogers is referring to Byron's vehement comment regarding his honourable conduct towards his wife (and his prevention of others saying negative things), written in a letter to Rogers on 23 March 1816:
'Will you have the goodness to say to me at once - whether you ever heard me speak of her with disrespect - with unkindness- or defending myself at *her* expence by any *serious* imputation of any description against *her*? Did

another triumph for mediocrity over genius. He is just now on the lake of Geneva. Venice is a City he has long wished to see; &, after a rapid journey <thro' Italy>, he talks of paying another visit to his old friend in Albania.[7] But on this & a thousand other subjects, my dear Scott, I think I could pour out my mind to you, were you & I together by the same fire-side; & I am very sorry we meet so seldom. Coleridge is now at Highgate & in better health than usual. He is printing some letters to his friend Wordsworth on his theory of Poetry, a theory certainly very assailable;[8] & also a Play written last year for the Drury Lane Stage.[9] – Poor Sheridan! I sat very often by his bed-side.[10] Just before he took finally to his bed, & a day or two before Lord Byron left England, S. prepared a little supper for us, & looked with pleasure to the meeting; but, alas, I went alone and carried an excuse from Lord Byron.[11] Sharp is now at the foot of the Alps;[12] which, whenever I saw them, struck me, always as if I was looking at them for the first time.

In a fortnight I shall set off for the North; whether I shall get so far as the Tweed, I dare not say – But, if I do, I shall not forget to inquire for you. Pray remember me very tenderly to

---

you never hear me say "that when there was a right or a wrong, she had the *right*?"' (BLJ V, p.55).

[7] Possibly Eustathius Georgiou, a close male friend of Byron's when he first visited Albania in 1809.

[8] Probably *Biographia Literaria* by the poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772-1834), published in 1817. It set out the ways in which Coleridge's ideas on poetry agreed with and dissented from those expressed by his erstwhile collaborator Wordsworth in the various versions of the 'Preface' to *Lyrical Ballads* (1800 and subsequent editions) and in the 'Essay Supplementary to the Preface' (1815).

[9] Possibly Coleridge's *Zapolya: A Christmas Tale*, written in December 1815 and January 1816.

[10] Richard Brinsley Sheridan, q.v. letter 12.

[11] On 18 April 1816 Byron wrote to Rogers to apologise for being unable to meet Sheridan, as Byron's sister Augusta Leigh was leaving town and Byron was concerned that he would not see her for a while (BLJ Supplementary Volume XIII, p.44).

[12] Possibly Richard 'Conversation' Sharp. It could also be Rogers's nephews William Sharp, Roger Sharp or Sutton Sharp, although Scott would be less likely to know them.

M^rs^ Scott, & to Miss Scott.[13] I should be happy to walk with her in another Abbey. There perhaps she would indulge me, with a song of other times.[14] Farewell & believe me

to be ever

Your affectionate Friend

Sam^l^ Rogers

I am glad to hear you are so busy, but hope your talents, as a Builder, are not confined to stone & mortar.[15]

I am just returned from Sheridan's funeral. Such a catalogue of Mourners. And yet he was suffered to die in the hands of the Sherriff.[16]

In a letter written to me from his bed – the last I believe that he ever wrote, I can just decipher these words – "I am absolutely undone & broken hearted. They are going to put the Carpets out of the Window & break into M^rs^ S's Room - & take me." - -

When you see H. Mackenzie, pray remember me to him.[17] I hope he received my letter in the Spr.

---

[13] Anne Scott (1803-1833), Scott's youngest daughter.
[14] Unidentified.
[15] Referring to Scott as a 'builder' of literary works as well as possible building work being carried out at Scott's home, Abbotsford.
[16] Sheridan was in a large amount of debt and bailiffs were waiting in his house at the time of his death (ODNB).
[17] Henry Mackenzie (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').

21. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [ca. 12 August 1816][1]

Many thanks for thinking of me! Tomorrow I am off, but fear I shall not overtake you, tho' I will do my best. Poor little Mary! – but travelling was never her forte.[2] Whishaw is determined to sink or swim in a Dutch Inundation & sets sail in a few days.[3] Our friends at Spa have it all to themselves. Frere says he shall look foolish, if you find him where you left him – but I think you will – in a small back-room in Jermyn Street that would be light but for a dead wall, & square but for the chimney. He has translated an entire play – The Frogs - & has set the lyrical part to music![4] (don't mention it for it is a secret) & he inquires for D^{r} Crotch to arrange it properly.[5] So we shall soon know something of a Greek chorus & see the Ambassador in an organ-loft & in a doctor's gown, all scarlet & white, flourishing a scroll about, & directing a band with many gesticulations.[6] Fred^{k} North is smoking his pipe here with great composure; & waits for you till 15th Nov^{r}. when he goes post to Nice, <where he writes & afterwards> in a portantina to Genoa & Pisa & proceeds (after visiting Rome & Naples)- to Amiens, Corfu & Athens.[7] He, Erskine & Jekyll dine with Coutts to-day.[8]

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.59-60. Dated by the British Library. Correspondent could be either Lord or Lady Holland due to the mutual acquaintances and shared knowledge in the letter.
[2] Mary Elizabeth Fox (1806-1891), the daughter of Lord and Lady Holland.
[3] Probably John Whishaw (1764/5-1840), lawyer, writer, and member of the Whig Holland House circle.
[4] John Hookham Frere, q.v. letter 7. *The Frogs* was an ancient Greek comedy written by Aristophanes, translated by Frere and published privately in 1837 alongside his translations of *The Cloud, Plutus,* and *The Birds.*
[5] Dr William Crotch (1775-1847), composer.
[6] 'Ambassador' is a reference to Frere.
[7] Frederick North, q.v. letter 18. North had an interest in Ancient Greece. He had known Byron since 1810, and was visiting him at Villa Diodati in 1816.
[8] Probably David Erskine, 11th Earl of Buchan (1742-1829), writer and antiquary; Joseph Jeykll, q.v. letter 14; Thomas Coutts (1735-1822), banker.

E. sends you his tome & an Epigram – He says you are the keeper of his nonsense.[9] He attends the Reviews in Sept[r] at Cambray.[10] He says he is one of W's aide de camps –[11] There was a breakfast at Roehampton last Friday. Miss Rawdon spends all the earnings she can spare from her mother – with this Pss. Charlotte, who writes "Dearest Bessy".[12] Her green veil is exhibited, & is as sad a sight as Thisbe's, having received 3 or 4 slugs thro' it.[13] She goes directly to the North, their finances running low, but returns in the Spring. She is delighted with [Hennyce's] letter.[14] Lord Cawdor was in town last week well-pleased with the match, but still more with the thoughts of his Hebe.[15] Sharp is among the Swiss lakes & bound to Milan.[16] The first act of the Foresters has been found.[17] I hope the weather has not annoyed you much. - It is an universal topic, as you will see by what follows.[18]

---

[9] A reference to Erskine's *The Anonymous and Fugitive Essays of the Earl of Buchan* (1816).
[10] Probably a reference to the town of Cambrai in France, one of the main centres for the Army of Occupation led by the Duke of Wellington. 'Reviews' could be military reviews or parades.
[11] Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').
[12] Miss Rawdon (dates unknown) was a niece of Lady Aylesbury and an attendant of Princess Charlotte, 1796-1817 (according to Cornelia Knight, *Autobiography of Miss Cornelia Knight, Lady Companion to the Princess Charlotte of Wales,* Vol. 1 (London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1861), pp.186-191.
[13] Possibly a reference to Miss Rawdon's dress and veil. Thisbe is a character from the story of Pyramus and Thisbe in Ovid's *Metamorphoses,* who presumes that her lover has died and when fleeing accidentally leaves her veil behind, upon the discovery of which he kills himself, believing her to be dead.
[14] Unidentified.
[15] Possibly John Pryse Campbell, 1st Baron Cawdor of Castlemartin (1755–1821), politician and army officer; his son John Campbell, 1st Earl Cawdor (1790-1860) married in 1816; Hebe is the Greek goddess of youth.
[16] Richard 'Conversation' Sharp, q.v. letter 11.
[17] Possibly a reference to work carried out by the Commissioners of Woods, Forests and Land Revenues, established in 1810.
[18] 'What follows' is a section copied by Rogers from Byron's letter to Rogers, 29 July 1816 (*BLJ*, Vol. 5, pp.85-87).

Diodati n^{r} Geneva –[19] July 29th

I came here by the Netherlands - & the Rhine Route & Basle – Berne - Morat & Lausanne.[20] – I have circumnavigated the lake - & shall go to Chamonix with the first fair weather -[21] but really we have had such stupid mists, fogs, rains & perpetual density that one would think Castelreagh had the foreign affairs of the Kingdom of Heaven also – upon his hands – I do not think of Italy before Sept. - - - [22]

I have read "Glenarvon".[23]

From furious Sappho scarce a milder fate
by her love – or libelled by her hate.[24]

& have also seen Ben Constant's Adolphe - & his preface denying the real people.[25] It is a work which leaves an unpleasant impression – but very consistent with the consequences of not being in love which is perhaps as disagreeable as any thing - except being so — -

There is a third Canto of Chid Har^{d}. finished & some smaller things – among them a story on "the Chateau de Chillon" - I only wait a good opportunity to transmit them to the Grand Murray – who – I hope – flourishes. -[26]

---

[19] The Villa Diodati, which Byron rented in Geneva, Switzerland, from June to November 1816.
[20] Byron is describing the route he took here in Switzerland, Germany and France.
[21] Chamonix is a town near the borders of France, Switzerland and Italy
[22] Robert Stewart, Viscount Castlereagh, q.v. letter 5, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs from 1812 to his death in 1822.
[23] *Glenarvon* was a novel published by Lady Caroline Lamb (1785-1828), intended as a critique of her ex-lover Lord Byron among others.
[24] *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated* (1733), by the poet Alexander Pope (1688-1744).
[25] *Adolphe* was a novel published in French by the writer Benjamin Constant (1767-1830) in 1816. Constant denied claims that the characters were based on himself and his acquaintances, particularly Madame de Staël (q.v. letter 12), a friend of Byron and Rogers.
[26] Byron worked on the third canto of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* and *The Prisoner of Chillon* in 1816.

All are well at Copet – excepting Rocca – who - I am sorry to say looks very ill –[27] the Duchess seems grown taller – but – as yet – no rounder since her marriage –[28] Schlegel is in high force - & Madame as brilliant as ever.[29]

~~My prayers~~ Remembrance to all – particularly to "Lord & Lady Holland -"[30]

I hope fishing prospers - & grouse-shooting, if begun – Farewell – pray remember me to one & all & believe me to be as ever

Yours very affectionately
S. R.

London

So the Pss Mary walks the streets - the envy of every Pss in Europe –[31] Sir Rob[t] Wilson <is in good spirits> – He is very desirous to go back to Howick but thinks he had better delay his visit, lest it should be commented upon - [32]

---

[27] Coppet, a region of Switzerland. Albert Jean-Michael Rocca (1788-1818), soldier who married Madame de Staël in 1816.
[28] Albertine de Staël (1797-1838), daughter of Madame de Staël who married Victor de Broglie, Duke of Broglie (1785-1870), in 1816. Byron speculates as to whether Albertine is 'rounder' with pregnancy.
[29] Karl Wilhelm Frederick Schlegel (1772-1829), writer and philosopher; Madame de Staël.
[30] Byron's excerpt finishes here.
[31] Princess Mary, Duchess of Gloucester and Edinburgh (1776-1857), daughter of George III. She was – or possibly was not – the 'envy' of other Princesses because on 22 July 1816 she had married her cousin Prince William Frederick, Duke of Gloucester and Edinburgh.
[32] Sir Robert Thomas Wilson (1777–1849), army officer and politician. Howick is the seat of the Earls Grey.

22. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [13 November 1816][1]

Many thanks for the thousandth time! Alas, I am very unfortunate, for concluding you were gone or going, I have plunged myself up to the chin in Engagements – but I will not fail to look in upon you at breakfast-time or soon afterwards in a day or two.

I am glad to hear so well of Lord H.[2] C'est le premier pas – So Mr Beckett marries Lady Anne Lowther -[3] & Lord Byron & Kinnaird are out of the theatre, & Wilson balloted into it.[4] I am very sorry to hear that the Duke of Bedford is far from well – tho' shooting every day.[5]

Yours most affectionately
Sam[l] Rogers

Wednesday

Kemble dines with me to-day. I found him on the top-rung of his ladder, when I called.[6]

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.61-63. Dated by the British Library. F.62v is addressed to: 'The right Hon[ble] / Lady Holland / Holland House / Kensington'.
[2] Lord Holland.
[3] Sir John Beckett, 2[nd] Baronet (1775-1847) married Lady Anne Lowther in January 1817.
[4] Byron was a member of the subcommittee of the Theatre Royal on Drury Lane from June 1815 until he left the country in April 1816. Byron's friend Douglas Kinnaird (1788-1830), politician, had joined the subcommittee in May 1815. Sir Robert Wilson, q.v. letter 21.
[5] John Russell, 6[th] Duke of Bedford (1766-2839), who lived at Woburn Abbey when Rogers visited.
[6] John Philip Kemble (1757-1823), actor at Drury Lane Theatre.

23. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [14 November 1816][1]

Many, many thanks for your two kind letters which punctually arrived – the first on horse back, the last on foot. The old song you sing delightfully.

Come unto these yellows sands &c.[2] though, if I remember right, your sands are shingles - I am rejoiced at your account, & hope & trust the crutches will be thrown into the sea. –

On Sunday next I will meet you & yours in the hall at Petworth, so pray, pray don't fail me - & pray tell me if you don't make your triumphal entry on that day for I shall be governed by you entirely. Pray, if you write to Petworth, say I am coming – I really think his Lordship, has been often enough at my door to remember it – I will write & announce myself, relying on you –[3]

Ever yours very affec^{ty}
Sam^{l} Rogers

Thursday –

Fre^{k} North stands for the academical chair at Athens to-morrow –[4] What do you think my Lord Elgin is doing at this moment? Negotiating with the Turk there for the rest of the Spoil. [5]

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.64-65. Dated by the British Library. F.65v is addressed to: 'The / Lady Holland'.
[2] *The Tempest*, Act 1, Scene 2, l.376.
[3] Petworth House in West Sussex, the home of the politician and art collector George Wyndham, 3rd Earl of Egremont (1751-1837).
[4] Frederick North, q.v. letter 18. This is possibly a reference to North's election to the position of President of the Philomousos Society of Athens in 1814, established as an educational society for the Greeks.

[5] This is a reference to the collection that would become known as the Elgin Marbles (also known as the Parthenon Marbles, as they were taken from the historical site of the Parthenon). Elgin bought them from the Ottoman Empire and sold them to the British Museum in 1816 at a loss.

24. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [9 August 1817][1]

Your tidings have given great delight – least of all indeed to me as a little vexation is mingled with it. We were to have left this place, the busiest, the idlest yet discovered, last Friday, but M. had consented to stay till Tuesday – Whether he will give me a glimpse of you I cannot say, but I shall do my best.[2]

You rejoice in your escape from the low countries – so do we – So many voyages on so many seas in so many ships - & without the loss of an individual – Capt^{n} Cook could have done no better –[3] but we shall hope for a quarto from Henry next winter - & he will not forget to give us a genuine receipt for Water Semolina.[4] The Theatre here is just now in eclipse, Talma & Mars being away –but Fleury & Duchesnois perform; & Brunet & Potier - & the ballets are admirable, tho' Gosselin has withdrawn - in a decline.[5] The St Helena MS. is still a subject of discussion.[6] Sebastiani swears it is <u>his</u> –Caulincourt says he hears his voice when he reads it – Denon says he has heard him talk the first forty pages verbatim all his friends say it is his – all his enemies deny it, &, as Stuart says, it is a <u>… party</u>

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.79-80. Dated bby the British Library. F.80r is addressed: 'The Lady Holland / Poste Restarte / a Senlis'.
[2] 'M.' is probably Thomas Moore (q.v. letter 8), who frequently met with Rogers in 1817.
[3] Captain James Cook (1728-1779), explorer.
[4] Henry Edward Fox (1802-1859), second eldest and eldest legitimate son of the Hollands. 'Quarto' possibly a reference to correspondence. 'Water Semolina' reference unidentified.
[5] François Joseph Talma (1763-1826), actor; Mademoiselle Mars, Anne Françoise Hyppolyte Boutet Salvetat (177-1847), actress; Fleury was the stage name of Abraham Joseph Bénard (1750-1822), comedian; Catherine-Joséphine Duchesnois (1777-1835), actress; Jean-Joseph Brunet (1766-1853), comedian; Charles-Gabriel Potier (1774-1838), comedian; Geneviève Gosselin (1791-1818), ballet dancer.
[6] *Manuscript transmitted from St. Helena by an Unknown Channel* (London: John Murray, 1817). This was supposedly a memoir written by Napoleon, but the real author was Frédéric Lullin de Châteauvieux.

question.[7] We shall soon know what he himself thinks of it. The King is seen abroad every day. If he does not mount his horse, he lives in Paris, & that is so much in his favour.[8]

All your friends have been very kind to me. Me de Sousa Me D. Coigny – Gallois –[9] Could Me de Stael's character in the Chronicle be written by McKintosh? <Constant has written two but neither of them are much admired.> <The funeral was at Coppet whilst the Lonsdales were passing through it!>[10] Stuart's dinners are very good – so are Pozzo's & Baring's – Boddington is indefatigable in your service, & will I think do more as your Diplomat than Sir Charles with all his practice.[11]

Pray remember me very kindly to Lord H. & Henry & Allen & S.&c.[12] At Calais I passed a very gay evening with Lady Oxford.[13] The English <& Irish> here are innumerable, & English is to be heard at the corner of every street, but those you will wish to meet are soon numbered.

---

[7] Probably Horace François Bastien Sébastiani de La Porta (1771-1851), French soldier and politician; Armand-Augustin-Louis de Caulaincourt (1773-1827), diplomat; Dominique Vivant Denon, q.v. letter 18; Charles Stuart, Baron Stuart de Rothesay (1779-1845), British Ambassador to France; 'party question' unidentified.

[8] King Louis XVIII (1755-1824), King of France from 1814 to 1824 (interrupted by Napoleon's 100 Days in 1815).

[9] Adelaide Filleul, Marquise de Souza-Botelho (1761-1836), author; Anne-Françoise-Aimée de Franquetot de Coigny, Duchess of Fleury (1769-1830), literary salon hostess; Jean Antoine Gauvin Gallois (1761-1828), French liberal politician and writer.

[10] Madame de Stael (q.v. letter 12) died in July 1817, and this is a reference to her obituary in the *Chronicle*, with the author conjectured James Mackintosh q.v. letter 3; Henri-Benjamin Constant de Rebecque, known as Benjamin Constant (1767-1830), writer and friend of de Staël; de Staël's funeral was held at her family château in Coppet, near Geneva; William Lowther (see 'Biographies of Correspondents') and his wife Augusta Lowther (1761-1838).

[11] Charles Stuart, Baron Stuart de Rothesay; Count Carlo Andrea Pozzo di Borgo (1764-1842), politician; probably Alexander Baring, 1st Baron Ashburton (1773-1848), banker; Possibly Samuel Boddington (1766-1843), merchant and slave owner; possibly Sir Charles Napier (1782-1853), Army Officer.

[12] Lord Holland (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'); Henry Edward Fox; John Allen (1771-1843), physician and writer; possibly Dr Samuel Parr (1747-1825), schoolmaster and book collector.

[13] Jane Elizabeth Harley, Countess of Oxford and Countess of Mortimer (1774-1824), an advocate of reform.

Luttrell is come for a month.[14] The Jerseys talk of going on Monday sennight - & S^{r} H. D Hamilton sets out for Scotland – Lady Elizth Vernon is sadly changed - her Sisters are very pretty, & ^{Me} D. Coigny as lively as ever.[15] M^{e} De Sousa seems to be out of spirits, & goes out no where.[16] Sebastiani leaves Paris to-morrow.[17] He gave the Jerseys & myself a dinner yesterday at Very's in the Palais Royal.[18] – Very's in the Thuilleries Gardens is pulling down.[19] The exhibition of modern Pictures is just over. There is now a fountain in the Palais Royal, the very prettiest I ever saw. Those at Versailles play on the first
Sunday in the month – there at St Cloud on the first & third – Many, many thanks for wishing me to stay – but M. talks in that case of setting out without me -[20] & to see you for a moment, would be only tantalization – I am at a loss what to say – but I will do my utmost, for I cannot bear the thought of leaving the barriers as you are entering at the other side, like a retreating enemy.

Ever, ever yours
Sam^{l} Rogers

Saturday
Paris

---

[14] Henry Luttrell (1768-1851), poet.
[15] George Bussy Child-Villiers, 5th Earl of Jersey (1773-1859) and Sarah Sophia Child-Villiers (1785-1867); Hamilton unidentified; Lady Elizabeth Vernon (c.1763?-1829); The sisters Henrietta Greville, Countess of Warwick (née Vernon, 1760-1838) and Caroline Maria Smith (nee Vernon, d.1833 A), who married Robert Percy 'Bobus' Smith (q.v.); Anne-Françoise-Aimée de Franquetot de Coigny (1769-1820), political hostess.
[16] Adelaide Filleul, Marquise de Souza-Botelho (1761-1836), author.
[17] Probably Horace François Bastien Sébastiani de La Porta (1771-1851), French soldier and politician.
[18] Restaurant.
[19] Café. Tuileries, gardens by the Louvre in Paris.
[20] Probably Thomas Moore (q.v. letter 8).

25. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [1817] [1]

Many thanks – I have resolved every morning when I come to myself to visit you in your sunshine – but, alas, the fetters we wear in this sad town! You were wise to leave it –

I dined with Frere after many attempts yesterday – a service of Plates - inscribed with the Erroll Arms![2] Foscolo is in bed - & in great tribulations –[3]

On Monday next <or Tuesday>, I shall be happy to wait upon you – Moore is not yet returned from Arcadia.[4]

Ever yours
Sam[l] Rogers

Fred[k] North has written to desire that his house may be let no more. -[5]

---

[1] British Library, Department of Manuscripts, Add.MSS.51646, f.83. Dated by the British Library. F.83 is addressed to 'The Lady Holland'
[2] John Hookham Frere, q.v. letter 7.
[3] Ugo Foscolo (1778-1827), Italian poet. Foscolo could be in 'great tribulations' due to the death of his mother Diamantina Spatis (b.1747), who died in 1817.
[4] Thomas Moore, q.v. letter 8.
[5] Frederick North, q.v. letter 18.

26. Samuel Rogers to [William Beckford], [23 October 1818][1]

Friday

My dear Sir

Many, many thanks. I should have great pleasure indeed in waiting upon you on Tuesday, & would gladly have changed the day for that purpose – if I had not very unfortunately just received a letter from town which obliges me, however reluctantly, to set off for that pandemonium to-morrow morning.

I cannot say what a disappointment it is to me, but I hope to indemnify myself on some future day.

Yours ever most truly

Sam[l] Rogers

Lord Byron has just written another poem after the manner of *Beppo*. He calls it *Don Juan*, & dedicates it in no very flattering verse to Southey.[2]

Is *Don Juan* another portrait of the same personage who lurks in *Child. Harold*, in *Manfred*, in *Lara*, &. &c.?[3]

---

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Beckford c.34, ff.124-125. Recipient identified by the Bodleian Library and dated 23 October 1818. On f.121v is written in pencil 'Rogers'.

[2] Canto I and II of *Don Juan* were published anonymously in July 1819. Although suppressed at the time, the 'Dedication' included critiques of poets such as Wordsworth and Southey, as well as politicians, and its content was known in social circles. *Beppo* was published in 1817, and was the first of Byron's works in ottava rima, which is the 'manner' that Rogers refers to.

[3] Rogers picks up on Byron's insistence he is not to be identified with his characters here. For example, in the preface for the second edition of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage,* Byron insisted that Harold 'is the child of imagination'. *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (London: John Murray; Edinburgh, William Blackwood, J. Ballantyne and Co.; Dublin: J. Cumming, 1812), p.vi. *Manfred*

was published in 1817, and *Lara* was originally published alongside Rogers's *Jacqueline* in 1814.

27. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Mackenzie], 2 March 1819[1]

My dear Sir

Many thanks! I hope you will believe me when I say that you are often in my thoughts - It is unnecessary to tell you (for you know it by the best of all evidence) that your volumes are often open before me;[2] you gave me delight of the highest kind as soon as I was old enough to feel it; & when you cease to give it me, I shall then think it high time to retire. – What then must have been my feelings, when I received your Letter? If I was a vain man before, I shall now be in danger of becoming a proud one.

What you say is ~~ag~~ true. I have pitched human life too high -[3] It is a fault committed <too>, I think, by Cicero in his treatise, popular as it has always been; & perhaps not the less popular on that account, for we like to look upon sunny objects.[4] His ideas are all patrician & so indeed are his characters; & half the consolations in Old Age he derives from the memory of splendid Atchievements. -[5] To tell you the truth I had passed thro' the Childhood & the Manhood with tolerable ease - I had given a good education (<u>that</u> you would not object to) & had resolved to observe the golden mean "neither poverty nor riches";[6] - but when I approached the decline of life

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.6362, ff.146-147. MS not in Rogers's hand.
[2] Although Mackenzie did publish *The Miscellaneous Works of H. Mackenzie,* 3 vols. in 1819 , he had previously published *The Works of Henry Mackenzie*, 8 vols. in 1807.
[3] Rogers's *Human Life* (1819). *Human Life* was one of the first works by Rogers that did not become an instant bestseller.
[4] Cicero's *Treatise on the Laws*.
[5] Achievements.
[6] *Proverbs* 30:8.

I was at a loss how to give it interest or dignity without more precious exertion, & the poem for a long time lay unfinished.[7]

At last I resolved, not by means or birth or fortune, but by weight of character alone, to force him out of a private station into something like public life, (still however ~~passing~~ regarding him as one of the people); & his imprisonment & trial afforded me an opportunity of assembling his family round him – of giving him a wife, a daughter, & a friend with some of the lineaments of Lady Rachael, Cavendish, & Margaret Roper.[8] An allusion to such persons may give an idea of higher rank that I meant to give; but to be in Parliament, to be in the tower, & to be tried for high treason has fallen in <u>our</u> day to the loss of ~~persons~~ men in middle life, if not below it.[9]

I am talking however to little purpose – let me reason as I will, you are still in the right - & the impression, I fear, will be always such as you have described it to be.

Pray remember me very particularly to all your family. I lament very much that I saw so little of Miss Mackenzie <last spring>, & so does my Sister where long & dangerous illness cut us off from society about that time.[10] Believe me to be

My dear Sir,

---

[7] *Human Life* had taken Rogers about twelve years to complete, as he had started it in 1807.

[8] Individuals who supported family or friends executed for high treason: Lady Rachel Russell (c. 1637-1723), who campaigned for the reprieve of her husband the Whig martyr William Russell (1639-1683); William Cavendish (1641-1707, later 1st Duke of Devonshire), a friend and supporter of William Russell; Margaret Roper (1505-1544), the daughter of Sir Thomas More (1478-1535) who stood by her father, after his fall from political favour. This links to Rogers's previous comment on Cicero, who was executed for his opposition to Marc Antony.

[9] Whereas in the past aristocrats were tried for treasonable activity, Rogers is commenting on how individuals from lower walks of life were now being held accountable. Rogers knew individuals who had been involved in William Pitt's 1794 Treason Trials, which included prosecuting the authors and political activists John Thelwall (1764-1834) and John Horne Tooke (1736-1812).

[10] Presumably Mackenzie's daughter; Sarah Rogers, q.v. letter 1.

Ever yours most affect^{y}

Sam^{l} Rogers

London,

March 2, 1819.

28. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [25 January 1820][1]

It is a great disappointment to me that I cannot avail myself of your kind Invitation, having just heard of the arrival of some relations in town whom I see but seldom. Lord Egremont seemed much surprized & concerned at your leaving Brighton so soon.[2] I wish I had any news to send you. Lord Charles Spencer's marriage with Miss Hamlet is not to take place, the Lady has broken off all negotiation.[3] I have heard what I believe to be the truth of what passed between W^{m} Ponsonby & Lord Shaftesbury – Lord S. appears to have acted just as I should have thought he would - & Ld P. comes off with flying colours.[4]

I presume you have written Brougham a letter of condolence on the death of his dear friend at Sidmouth.[5] The Ossulstons are at Woolbeding & the Blandfords come to-day –[6] Lord Henry Seymour & the Sextons next week.[7]

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.94-96. F.96v is addressed to 'Lady Holland'. Dated by the British Library, confirmed by the letter's reference to the death of Prince Edward.
[2] George O'Brien Wyndham, 3rd Earl of Egremont (1751-1837), patron of the arts and philanthropist.
[3] Probably John Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl Spencer (1782-1845), Whig politician.
[4] William Francis Ponsonby (1787-1855), Whig politician; Cropley Ashley-Cooper, 6th Earl of Shaftesbury (1768-1851), Tory politician and Ponsonby's father-in-law. Incident could possibly be in relation to the question of Ponsonby replacing his brother in the general election of 1820.
[5] Henry Brougham, 1st Baron Brougham and Vaux (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'); 'friend' is Prince Edward (b.1767) who died at Sidmouth 23 January 1820.
[6] Ossultons are Charles Augustus Bennet (1776-1859), later 5th Earl of Tankerville, and his wife Sophie (d.1865). Woolbeding House is an estate in Chichester, West Sussex. It was owned at this time by Lord William Robert Spencer (1770-1834), poet. George Spencer-Churchill, later 6th Duke of Marlborough (1793-1857, known as Marquess of Blandford until 1840) and his wife Lady Jane St Spencer-Churchill.
[7] Lord Henry Seymour (1746-1830), politician; Sextons unidentified.

Lord Egremont seems to have renewed his youth. Charles Wyndham is limping in the gout.[8] In two or three days I shall endeavour to find you at home. I hope you arrived there without an adventure, tho' it was on a Friday, & found Mary as well as you expected.[9]

Yours very truly
Sam[l] Rogers

Tuesday
Petworth[10]

Mr Grenville's dinner seems to me a much more extraordinary event than the death of a Prince or a rebellion in the Peninsula –[11]

Lord E. will not believe in the morning excursions at Brighton.[12] He thinks the Prince's passion of too harmless a nature to require such long & continual absences.[13] His approbation of Ivanhoe is confined to the Jewess. I rather think he would have tried the influence of his [Leeching?] to traverse the Templar.[14]

---

[8] Probably Lord Egremont's illegitimate son Charles Wyndham (1796-1866).
[9] Mary Elizabeth Fox (1806-1891), daughter of Lord and Lady Holland.
[10] Petworth House, Sussex, home of the Earls of Egremont.
[11]Thomas Grenville (1755-1846), politician and collector. Prince Edward (1767-1820) died at Sidmouth on 23 January 1820. The Liberal Revolution took place in Portugal in August 1820, with political tensions starting earlier that year.
[12] Lord Egremont.
[13] Prince Regent, later George IV (1762-1830). George III died on 29 January 1820, so this letter is in the last few days of the Regency.
[14] Walter Scott, *Ivanhoe* (1820). The 'Jewess' is the character Rebecca, and the Knights Templar feature in the novel.

29. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 13 September 1821[1]

I don't know where to begin my life & adventures, so I shall say I slept at Fontainbleau, where a bungler of an Artist is restoring Primaticcio's Paintings.[2] Whoever wishes to see them as they were must make haste. From Lyons we went down the Rhone, a nervous thing; but we survived it – Thought Vaucluse very pretty, the Pont-du-Gard sublime, & the Maison Carrée more beautiful than any thing left at Rome.[3] I went & slept a night at the Grand Chartreuse, which I had long wished to do, nor was I disappointed.[4] I found 20 fathers, 40 friars, & heard their matins from my bed, a very snug & comfortable one. The country between Grenoble & Chambéry – how beautiful it is! At Genoa Dumont was of course very kind & attentive to us.[5]

Just missed the Bessboroughs, & Lord Minto, as I had before the Belgraves.[6] Mont Blanc was very gracious. He wore his rose-colour at sunset; & threw his shadow half across the lake, a thing to be believed only by those who have seen it. At Lausanne we drank tea & breakfasted with Kemble.[7] He is a

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.98-99. 'Lady Holland' is written upside down on the bottom of f.99 not in Rogers's hand. Lady Holland is the addressee as Rogers enquires after Lord Holland's health at the end of the letter.

[2] From 1540, the artist Francesco Primaticcio (1504-1570) worked at the castle of Fontainbleau in France.

[3] Vaucluse is a region in southeast France, the Pont du Gard is a Roman aqueduct, and the Maison Carrée is a Roman temple in Nimes, in the south of France.

[4] The Grande Chartreuse is a monastery in southeast France. Visitors were allowed to briefly stay there in the nineteenth century (such as Matthew Arnold in 1850).

[5] Pierre-Étienne-Louis Dumont (1759–1829), editor, lived in Italy.

[6] Frederick Ponsonby, 3rd Earl of Bessborough (1758-1844), Whig Politician, and his wife Henrietta Spencer (1761-1821); Gilbert Elliot Murray, 2nd Earl of Minto (1782-1859), Whig politician; Richard Grosvenor, 2nd Marquess of Westminster, styled Viscount Belgrave from 1802 to 1831 (1795-1869), and his wife Elizabeth Mary Leveson-Gower (1797-1891).

[7] John Philip Kemble (1757-1823), actor. Kemble spent time in Lausanne between 1820 and his death in 1823.

dandy in every respect, wearing long skirts & long spurs – riding every day & looking as well & as radiant as in his best days. M^rs^ Siddons was with him –[8] His house is an excellent one, looking full on the lake - & I sat out with him on his terrace by moonlight without my hat [~~xxxx~~] for half an hour, catching no cold.

At Lausanne who should we see driving in but Sharp –[9] He has ~~us~~ persuaded us to make a little journey with him into Swisserland –[10] We arrived here last Sunday - & here I have remained 5 days nursing a cold – Sharp is gone again into the Mountains - but I expect him back to-morrow –May he have better luck than a poor young man <a professor>, who was buried here yesterday, having lost his life on Grindelwald –[11] To-morrow we shall set out again for Lausanne, where I shall part with my fellow-travellers with much regret. My sister & the Siddons's have a little project of returning to England together; & I hope they will accomplish it.[12] My present intention is to pursue my journey southward, wintering at Rome, & returning in time to catch you & your Nightingales soon after Easter. I suppose Charlie has left you – Pray give my love to Henry, if he is with you.[13]

Report says that Lord Byron has written to hire a house at Geneva - Lausanne makes much of Kemble, & Geneva is said to be very jealous – He desires one to say every thing to you for him that can be said.[14] He speaks much of his sufferings in

---

[8] Sarah Siddons (1755-1831), actress and sister of John Philip Kemble.
[9] Richard 'Conversation' Sharp (1759-1835), Whig politician.
[10] Switzerland.
[11] Grindelwald in Switzerland, a village in the Alps. Victim was possibly Reverend Jean Aime Mouron (d.22 August 1821).
[12] Rogers and his sister Sarah (q.v. letter 1) often travelled together. The Siddons are probably Sarah Siddons and her daughter-in-law Harriet (1783-1844)
[13] Charles Fox, q.v. letter 8.
[14] Lord George Gordon Byron (1788-1824), poet. Byron was making plans to leave his accommodation at Ravenna near the Countess Guiccioli, and at the

London last winter, nor will he return very soon, if I guess right. He has taken his house for 5 years. Surely if every thing is as cheap as medical advice, a many may live here for nothing. My Physician here, (& I think I should consult him in London, I like him so much) is very well-pleased with a frank & a half a visit. You will not agree with me but I begin to fancy the Swiss – Remember the Genevois are not Swiss.[15] I saw Sismondi in his Chateau.[16] The Miss Allens remain thro' the winter with Mrs S.[17] Pray remember me very affectionately to Lord Holland & believe to be.

Ever yours
Sam[l] Rogers

Thurs, 13 September, 1821

In the South, at Avignon & [Nimes] particularly, I suffered much from the heat, nor am I yet quite recovered from it. I hope this will find you at Ampthill.[18]

---

end of October left Ravenna with Percy Bysshe Shelley, to join Shelley's family in Pisa. John Philip Kemble, q.v. letter 29.
[15] Physician unidentified; 'Genwois' is a reference to 'Genevans'.
[16] Jean-Charles Léonard de Sismondi (1773-1842), writer.
[17] Sismondi married Jessica Allen in 1819; the Miss Allens are probably her relatives.
[18] Ampthill Park, inherited by Lord Holland on the death of Lord Upper Ossory in 1818.

30. Samuel Rogers to [David Wilkie], [after 1821][1]

My dear Sir,

Mr Stothard mentioned to me the other day that he had some conversation with you on the subject of your picture of The death of the Red Deer.[2] My Brother wishes much to have it, &, if you are still not disinclined to part with it, will think himself much obliged to you, if you can favour him with it. The price, I think, was Thirty Five Guineas.

Yours very truly,
Saml Rogers

22, St James's Place

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.9836. Date and correspondent identified by the National Library of Scotland.
[2] Wilkie's 1821 painting 'The Death of the Red Deer, with McIntyre and McGregor, Stalker and Piper to the Duke of Atholl'; Thomas Stothard (1755-1834), painter.

31. Samuel Rogers to [William] Wordsworth, September 1822[1]

Cirencester, Sept 1822

My dear Wordsworth,[2]

Many thanks for your kind Letter & your Commission, which I shall have great pleasure in executing, tho' I must beg leave to enter my protest against one part of it.[3] I never knew a single instance of the sale of a Copyright by a young writer or a writer before unknown, where reasons for repentance did not, follow. Campbell sold his first poem for £60 -[4] & was many years afterwards asked a thousand for it, when he wished to recover it.[5] Irving sold his Sketch-book the other day for £200 -[6] & his second work of less value for £1200- Lord Byron sold his two first cantos of Child Harold for 600 & his fourth for 2,500.[7] Now it may <be> said that success is uncertain - Still I keep to my opinion - & I know that Scott a great authority in these matters - agrees with me. Irving on the first occasion sold against his advice - L^{d} B against mine - & whenever there is <u>real merit</u> in a work, & you know my opinion of your Sister's,[8] I think <u>where it can be done</u>, it is best to enter

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 2.
[2] This letter is a reply to Wordsworth's letter to Rogers of 16 September 1822 (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* pp.152-153.).
[3] Wordsworth had asked for Rogers's advice in the publication of Dorothy Wordsworth's 'Recollections of her Scotch Tour' (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.152).
[4] *The Pleasures of Hope*, Thomas Campbell (London: Mundell & Son; and for Longman & Rees, and J. Wright, 1799).
[5] Thomas Campbell, *The Pleasures of Hope* (1799).
[6] Geoffrey Crayon [Washington Irving], *The Sketch Book* (1819).
[7] John Murray had published Canto One and Two of Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* in 1812, and Three and Four in 1818. Although Byron had not previously accepted money for his coprights, he did charge Murray for the final cantos in 1818.
[8] According to Wordsworth's letter of 16 September 1822, it was Rogers who had initially thought of the idea of publishing the journals and offered

the Lottery oneself & not sell the ticket for little or nothing to the bookseller. After all, she must judge for herself - The bookseller I should go to myself in such a case would be Murray -[9] He will consult Gifford, who will certainly be charmed with a talent such as hers - his own life makes me feel sure that he will. [10] I am delighted to hear she has some thoughts of Italy - I am very sure she will inscribe her little book to you & it will do it a service - by letting the world know at once who the Author is & who was her fellow traveller. Perhaps Murray or Longman would advance enough for the present purpose upon it.[11] At all events, I am very sure it would be better to raise what was wanted any other way <than the way you propose>. However give me your orders & I will do my best.

I am here on something like classic ground - where Pope & Addison & Swift & Prior have been more than once -[12] I am just now turning over some mss letters of Pope to L[d] Bathurst - that send me back to those times - & in the woods there is a seat of his that furnishes the same contrast as his grotto, opening behind into a dark wood & in front [⁎] commanding a bright & cheerful view.[13] I need not say how much pleasure I have received from you lately - particularly from your memorials, tho' perhaps the other Volume is of a yet higher

---

'to assist in disposing of it to a Publisher for her advantage' (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.152).

[9] As Murray had offered a position on the editorial board of the *Quarterly Review* that Rogers had declined in 1809 due to his political differences. Nonetheless, Rogers remained a great advocate of John Murray.

[10] William Gifford (1756-1823), editor, critic and satirist. Gifford edited the *Quarterly Review*, which Murray published, and became renowned for his strong Tory views and critical opinions of anti-establishment authors like William Hazlitt and Robert Merry.

[11] John Murray's publishing house; Longman's publishing house, founded in 1724.

[12] The poets Alexander Pope (1688-1744), Joseph Addison (1672-1719), Jonathan Swift (1667-1745) and Matthew Prior (1664-1721).

[13] Henry Bathurst, 3rd Earl Bathurst (1762-1834) lived at Cirencester Park where the Bathurst Estate was based. In his gardens there is a folly called Pope's Seat, in honour of Pope's many visits. Bathurst was friends with many poets.

order.[14] As to my journey - & all my Munchausen adventures in strange countries, I don't know where to begin -[15] Pray come & let us see you as soon as you can & I will bore you to death on the subject - Next year I shall certainly be with you, if you are at home & Pray remember me to every body under your roof & believe me to be

Yours ever

Sam[l] Rogers

I go home tomorrow.

[14] William Wordsworth, *Memorials of a Tour on the Continent* (London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1820), see letter 33.
[15] Baron Münchhausen (1720–1797), known for his tall stories of his adventures and travels. They were published in English as *Gulliver revived or the singular travels, campaigns, voyages, and* adventures of Baron *Munikhouson, commonly called Munchausen* (1786).

32. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [1822][1]

I am very unwilling to trouble you about so foolish a business - & yet I must, lest you should ascribe my conduct to the wrong motive. I am told that what has dropped from me by your fire-side has been repeated at Edinburgh & to those who think proper to resent it.[2]

Now you know how unguarded I am, when with you. I say whatever comes uppermost – much to your annoyance no doubt – sometimes – oftener to my own vexation – But I fear I am too old to mend, & before you & Lord H who have treated me with such indulgence, I cannot restrain myself –[3] I know I am much to blame - You perhaps a little, who have spoilt me – but in those hours, think aloud I must.

Pray therefore ascribe it to the right motive, & no other, if I am unwilling to run into danger any more than I can help. – At your table, whenever you will let me, I shall not fail to be found – but in a Country house I may get into scrapes –

Ever & ever yours
Sam[l] Rogers

I have here alluded to a circumstance, which you may think exists only in my own brain, but I know it to be true.

---

[1] British Library, Department of Manuscripts, Add.MSS.51646, ff.104-105. The addressee of this letter is probably Lady Holland: the letter is included in the Holland House folios, and Rogers refers to Lord Holland at the beginning of this letter.
[2] The repeated subject has not been mentioned, possibly because letters were shared and read by multiple persons. Edinburgh refers to shared acquaintances residing there, such as Walter Scott (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').
[3] Lord Holland (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').

I have just received your very kind letter which has followed me here. As I have just arrived & have been so long in coming, I cannot stir for a day or two – but, notwithstanding what I have said to the contrary, I will certainly come, if you really wish it & are not going away immediately. Pray write & let me know how long you mean to stay & let me find it in town.

Dropmore[4]

[4] Dropmore Park, the home of William Wyndham Grenville, Baron Grenville (1759-1834), Whig politician.

33. Samuel Rogers to [Dorothy] Wordsworth, [1822][1]

Dear Miss Wordsworth,

I should make you many apologies for my great & unaccountable delay - but I have been idling & christmassing in Northamptonshire & have but just set myself down again to sober business. Sorry indeed was I to hear of the cause of yours - May I hope it is entirely removed & that we shall soon see William under [good] auspices strong & well & prepared to review the long journey which, I trust, is before him.

With regard to the Volume in question,[2] I think you had better perhaps send it up & I will, with your approbation, lay it before the great M[r] Murray - he will lay it before the great M[r] Gifford,[3] & we must await the verdict.[4] If that is not entirely satisfactory, we must go elsewhere - Of the Longmans, I confess, I have no good opinion - but your Brother knows them better than I do.[5] [~~Xxxx~~] I believe them to be narrow, unenterprizing & penny-wise –

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 3. Dated by the Wordsworth Trust. A part of this letter is transcribed by Duncan Wu in *Wordsworth's Reading, 1800-1815*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1995), p.262. Dorothy's reply is dated 3 January 1823, and ends the discussions of publishing her journals: 'I find it next to impossible to make up my mind to sacrifice my privacy for a certainty less than two hundred pounds' (*Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, pp.346-348).

[2] Dorothy Wordsworth's MS journals.

[3] William Gifford (1756-1826), poet, critic and editor. He worked for Murray as an intermediary, advising and editing poets such as Byron on Murray's behalf, often without their consent.

[4] 'Volume' is Dorothy Wordsworth's MS journals; William Gifford (1756-1826), poet, critic and editor. He worked for Murray as an intermediary, advising and editing poets such as Byron on Murray's behalf, often without their consent.

[5] The Longman publishing house, founded 1724. Longman purchased the copyright of Wordsworth's *Lyrical Ballads* in 1800.

When it is printed, the sheets must be sent down to you, when you will look at yourself with new eyes, & be a much better judge of yourself, than the best of us.

I confess it is still my opinion, confirmed by long observation, that a bookseller never buys, but with a sure & certain loss to a young Author, ✕ where there is a grain of merit. I read your Brother with great delight & entirely agree with him tho' I cannot give up a line of the Ode. As to his Memorials I take them with me wherever I go -[6] & I cannot tell you what pleasure I felt when I came to the lines on Aloys Reding.[7] I was wandering alone in the wood, when I stumbled upon the stone & the inscription & I can never forget my feelings at the moment. When at Schwytz in 1802, we had paid him a visit, & at the gate were surprized by a little girl coming from school, who first took my hand & then my Sister's, leading her up stairs & supporting her by the elbow, into a large old fashioned room where we found him drinking coffee with his family, after dinner, the clock striking two. There was a noble simplicity in his manners, & a courtesy, a cordiality in the reception they <all> gave us that sent us away enchanted. - I have lately met with a remarkable instance of your Brother's sagacity - He had always maintained that Gray's line "And leave us leisure to be good" was not his own - [8] It is in Oldham. "I have not yet the leisure to be good".[9] He is said to have been scrupulous in quoting, but he never did so, but when he wanted an authority. "Slow tolls the village-clock the drowsy hour - is

---

[6] William Wordsworth, *Memorials of a Tour on the Continent* (London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1820).
[7] Aloys Reding (1765-1818) was a Swiss patriot. Wordsworth wrote that he 'reached a votive stone that bears the name of Aloys Reding' in his poem 'Memorial, on the Outlet of the Lake of Thun', published in *Memorials of a Tour on the Continent*, p.15.
[8] Thomas Gray's 'Hymn to Adversity', *Poems* (London: J. Dodsley, 1768), p.31.
[9] Quotation is by John Oldham (1653-1683), *The Satyr Against Vertue. Pindarique Ode* (London, 1710), p.63, l.119.

in Hy V.th.[10] The clocks do toll, & the third hour of drowsy morning came." Pray remember[11]

[10] Quotation is from James Beattie's *Minstrel* (London: Edward and Charles Dilly and A. Kincaid and W. Creech; Edinburgh: J. Bell, 1771), p.21, st. XLI.
[11] Remainder of MS missing.

34. Samuel Rogers to [unknown], [after 1823][1]

Pray accept the Inclosed – I wish it was more; but small as it is, I fear it will become less – for I have great claims upon me.

Beautiful as your verses are, how much more so would they be, if you would remember Horace's precept & not write so fast, blotting more & condensing more.[2]

The immortal rays of Genius are shed
Such a line is not musical to my ears.

Heart ~~an~~ to heart & mind to mind
Within those sad words – Fare thee well I should like better than as it is –

But I will say no more -

Pray, pray never again publish in the heat of the moment. Not that I would advise you to do as I have done; for in my 60th year I had written less than you have; though I laboured night & day.

Yours as ever
S. Rogers

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.966, f.299. Unidentified recipient. As Rogers references his sixtieth year, the date is after 1823.
[2] A reference to Horace's *Art of Poetry (Ars Poetica)*, which offers maxims and advice for writing poetry.

35. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [10 November 1824][1]

Many thanks for your two kind letters & also for what your good nature led you to say concerning a thing that, I am very sure, can give you little pleasure. Here I am established for 3 or 4 days, &, after passing as many more at Panshanger, I shall hope to find you quite recovered on the old Steyne.[2]

I came here yesterday; &, the night before, who should enter the box at Covent garden, while the overture was playing (I have heard it at last) but Mr Grenville?[3] So here I am without him, but we do pretty well, as Charles W$^{ms's}$ better half & her two daughters are here, & there is no want of talking.[4] As for Lord G. he is as amiable as ever & I think as well, tho' <still> more abstemious; [~~xxxx xx xxxx~~], confining himself at dinner to the wing of a chicken; & literally, for he eats nothing else.[5] He & I have just been taking an hour's walk together; &, except in slippery places, where he took my arm, he walked as well as ever. His greatest effort is in rising from his chair, even after he has sat there but for a moment. He has just finished Fouche's Memoirs, which he read with great interest.[6] Last winter Lady Grenville read aloud to him Johnes's Froissart, & he says he was very sorry when they came to the conclusion.[7] Just now they are very busy in building a new cottage, & in thinning a

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51646, ff.112-113. Dated by the British Library. F.113v is addressed 'To Lady Holland, Holland House'.
[2] Panshanger was a country house near Hertford, owned by the Earls Cowper; Old Steine was in Brighton.
[3] Thomas Grenville (q.v. letter 28).
[4] Possibly Charles Watkin Williams-Wynn (1775-1850), politician, and his wife Mary (1785/6–1838).
[5] William Grenville (q.v. letter 42), Whig politician and Prime Minister from 1806 to 1807.
[6] *Authentic memoirs of the public life of M. Fouché* (1818).
[7] Lady Anne Grenville (1772-1864), political hostess and wife of Lord Grenville. The book referenced is *Sir John Froissart's chronicles of England, France, Spain, and the adjoining countries* (1805).

wood. As these great operations are in the same quarter, he visits them every day & is at a loss to say which gives him most pleasure. A little conversation & a little ombre conclude the evening, which is not long, as we dine at 6, & all is over by 11.[8]

Mr G. is now visiting the Spencers –[9] On Friday he goes to the Staffords for a day or two, &, then after a night or two in town, returns to this place.[10] Lord Clifden's is just now full of people coming & going.[11] Lord Lansdowne was to go home to-day & not to Paris, tho', as he says, his appearance just now in town looked very suspicious.[12] But these things you know better than I do. Yesterday & the day before, you must have spent upon the pier.

To-day we are warm & showery.

Lady C. Lamb is in a great flurry & is with Murray every day. She says she shall publish L^{d} B's last letter to her, to show that he was in love with her, whatever Capt.^{an} M. may make him say to the contrary, & she has actually printed it I am told – But I suppose she will proceed no farther.[13]

Ever yours

Sam^{l} Rogers

---

[8] Ombre is 'A trick-taking card game for three people using forty cards' (OED).
[9] John Charles Spencer (q.v. letter 28).
[10] Possibly George William Stafford-Jerningham, 8th Baron Stafford (1771-1851).
[11] Possibly Henry Welbore Ellis, 2nd Viscount Clifden (1761-1836), Irish politician.
[12] Henry Petty-Fitzmaurice, 3rd Marquess of Lansdowne (1780-1863), Whig politician.
[13] Lady Caroline Lamb, q.v. letter 21. After Byron's death in 1824, Lamb wanted Byron's ex-publisher Murray to publish Byron's letters to her. Murray had published Lamb's novel *Ada Reis* in 1823, by which point Byron had decided against publishing with Murray again. Byron's friend Thomas Medwin (1788-1869), who is referred to as Captain M in the letter (although it is unknown whether he was a Captain or Lieutenant), had published *Conversations of Lord Byron* in 1824, and did not want Lamb's letters from Byron to be published.

Dropmore
Nov^{r} 10. 1824.

The dinner in Brook St. was very pleasant & I lament I could not be there. At the Deepdene we had a sun without a cloud; & he has really made the house very picturesque & striking on the out-side, what with loggie & old Italian towers, I wish it was as likeable within.[14]

[14] Deepdene was a country house in Surrey, which had been owned by the Dukes of Norfolk. Changes were made to the architecture when it was bought and lived in by the banker Thomas Hope (1769-1831) from 1807. It may be Thomas Hope to whom Rogers refers here.

36. Samuel Rogers to [Mary Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound], 19 April 1825[1]

Apr. 19 1825

Dear Lady Minto

May I beg your acceptance of the little Volume here inclosed - When I think of the subject, I own I feel some diffidence in sending it to the Daughter of One who, in my mind, has written the most delightful book of travels in any language – But you have already done me so many acts of Kindness that I am sure you will not refuse to do me another.[2]

Yours ever most truly
Sam[l] Rogers -

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.11906, f.32.
[2] Minto's father was Patrick Brydone (1736-1818), traveller and author, known *for A Tour through Sicily and Malta: in a series of letters to William Beckford* (London: W. Strahan, and T. Cadell, 1773), a bestselling work which reached multiple editions. Volume enclosed is unidentified, probably a work of travel literature.

37. Samuel Rogers to [William] Wordsworth, 22 April 1825[1]

My dear Wordsworth,

I have seen Murray several times & he agrees to all you wish, or rather, I should say, to all I wish.[2] He listened to parts of your letter & consents that they shall be published in the order & form you propose & that the advertisements shall be regulated by you as well as himself.[3] He says that when the advertisements come to a great deal & the profit to a very little, that little in many cases would not otherwise have been gained at all. You say six volumes. The 5 first to consist of ~~400~~ <340> - the sixth of 450 pages. But how many lines in a page. Till then he cannot guess at the expences - nor can he very exactly till all the copy is before him - He proposes to publish 750 - & consents that you shall have two thirds & himself only one third~~s~~ of the profit.[4]

Those were always my terms with Cadell - & Murray, & are so still, I running two thirds of the risk, & standing responsible for two thirds of the losses.[5] I am well pleased with my terms & think them as good as Walter Scott's - but my single vols are small matters - Perhaps you will not decide till an accurate estimate has been made of the Cost.

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 4.
[2] Rogers had acted as intermediary in negotiating a publishing deal between Murray and Wordsworth, regarding an edition of Wordsworth's complete works.
[3] As an editor and publisher, Murray liked to have great control over the works issued, which clashed with Wordsworth's particularity over the way his works were published.
[4] This alludes to the financial terms Murray was offering Wordsworth: splitting the profits, with two thirds to Wordsworth and one third to Murray, although eventually the proposed edition appeared with Longman as *The poetical works of William Wordsworth*, 5 vols. (London: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1827).
[5] Publishing house, founded by Robert Cadell (1788-1849).

Ever yours
Saml Rogers

My Brother & Sister desire to be very kindly remembered to all.[6]

Ap 22, 1825

I conclude that the work cannot be very great where the cautious, I may say, timid Longman & Co are willing to take it upon themselves. -

[6] Henry Rogers (1774-1832) and Sarah Rogers, q.v. letter 1.

38. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter] Brougham, 16 August 1825[1]

My dear Brougham

Many, many thanks for the Inaugural Discourse, which shall be preserved & delivered down to my latest posterity, not thrown on the dung-hill now collecting for the Bp's fulminations.[2] I embarked on <the> Wye the other day, but was soon burnt out of the water & have ever since been cooling myself under large trees, wherever I could find them –

Are you alive after the fever-heat & have you escaped those other agrémens of a hot climate, lion, tyger or Boa Constrictor?[3]

As for our University, I want much to confer ~~you~~ with you. What have you done? What have others done? Am I to make my fortune by it? I fear, like Sir Francis Wronghead. At all events, you may depend upon me for a Subscriber – small as my means are –[4]

Ever yours

Sam[l] Rogers

Aug. 16. 1825 -

---

[1] The National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 21,236.

[2] *Inaugural Discourse of Henry Brougham, Esq, M.P., on being installed Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, Wednesday, April 6, 1825* (1825)*;* 'Bp' is probably William Howley (1766-1848), Bishop of London.

[3] Unidentified.

[4] Alongside the poet Thomas Campbell (1777-1844), Brougham was pivotal in the establishment of London University, in which Rogers also played a part. Sir Francis Wronghead is a character from *The Provoked Husband,* begun by John Vanbrugh in 1728, and reworked by Colley Cibber, and performed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

39. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter] Brougham, 24 August 1825[1]

My dear Brougham

Many thanks for thinking of me in these matters. I am as poor as a church-mouse, & it was my intention to assist you only with a silent Ejaculation or two.[2] But I cannot resist so bright an Example as yours, & must therefore beg you to put me down for <u>One</u> share. If I can dispose of others I will let you know. A hundred years ago I was bothered & bullied into a Subscription to Drury Lane Theatre (& I would as soon have subscribed for a pedestal to D^{r} Eady) but of principal & interest I have not yet received the shadow of a sixpence – Lord Holland was the most active in that Canvas – I fear not so in this – But this is quite another matter & I wish it success with my whole soul.[3]

Yours ever
Sam^{l} Rogers

London, 24.th Aug.st
1825

I would do more if I could & wish my income was larger – half as large as yours -

---

[1] The National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 21,237.
[2] Probably a reference to a financial gift made by Rogers.
[3] Dr Samuel Phillips Eady was a 'quack' doctor who was noted for his promises to cure sexual diseases and his questionable character; Rogers was also involved in the rebuilding of the Drury Lane Theatre in 1812; Lord Holland (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'); reference to the establishment of London University in 1826, which was also supported by a mutual acquaintance of Rogers and Brougham, the poet Thomas Campbell (q.v. letter 38).

40. Samuel Rogers to [Thomas] Lawrence, [December, 1825][1]

My dear Lawrence

Then the final Agreement, if I apprehend it rightly, is as follows,

That you deliver to Lord Dudley Raphael's Pictures of The Graces, & also a bond or promissory note for the Sum of Two Thousand Pounds, bearing interest from the 23^{d} dec^{r}. 1825 & to be discharged on or before the 23^{d} dec^{r} 1827.[2]

That Lord Dudley may choose from among the rest of your pictures any that he thinks fit, accounting to you for them at the prime cost, this privilege to be exercised or not, as he may determine - &, that after the payment of the two thousand pounds, you have the privilege of redeeming the Raphael before mentioned; at the price of one thousand pounds, the price at which it is now rated.[3]

Yours ever

Sam^{l} Rogers

---

[1] Royal Academy, Lawrence Papers, LAW/4/394. The content indicates that it dates from December 1825.
[2] John William Ward, q.v. letter 12.
[3] *The Three Graces* by Raphael, painted around 1505. The painting is currently housed in the Musée Condé, Chantilly, France. The *British and Foreign Review* (1842) states that Dudley did indeed purchase *The Three Graces* from Lawrence (p.253). Lawrence asked Rogers for a loan in December 1825, and as Rogers could not come up with the total sum, Dudley agreed to help by buying the Raphael (*Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, pp.423-424).

41. Samuel Rogers to [William] Wordsworth, [1825][1]

My dear Wordsworth,

I have no such excuses to make. Your first letter was most faithfully delivered. It came as I was getting into the carriage to leave town & I took it with me to enjoy & reflect upon at leisure. When I returned, I applied instantly to Murray,[2]
& for above a month have been expecting his answer - I have called & called about it at least a dozen times, & whenever I get access to him, he promises me a letter in a day or two. When he shakes his head, & expresses his desire to serve you & talks of his respect, his admiration, I inform him that we come to ask no favour and he concludes with saying that he is cogitating about your mutual interest.[3] To tell you the truth, I had of myself prepared to him such a scheme of publication as you hint at - The volumes to be six - two of <the more> popular poems, if I may call them so - (for you have so many chords to your lyre) - two of a more lofty strain, such at least as the great vulgar affect to think so - & two containing the excursion -[4]

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 6. Dated by The Wordsworth Trust but due to the letter's content, I have placed this chronologically before WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 5.
[2] Wordsworth had given Rogers permission to negotiate with the publisher John Murray about publishing a complete edition of Wordsworth's poetry.
[3] Murray's hesitance about publishing Wordsworth was a financial one, as can be deduced from Rogers's comments about Walter Scott's publishing arrangements, and then about the publisher Longman's. Rogers had mentioned Longman as a potential publisher to Wordsworth in a letter of 1822, and Wordsworth did publish his complete works with Longman in 1827. Murray also wanted to have greater control over the format of Wordsworth's publications, but Wordsworth did not want to cede this control to him (see letter from Rogers to Wordsworth of April 22 1825). Wordsworth had actually been considering printing his complete works with Hurst and Robinson (see letter from Rogers to Wordsworth of 1825).
[4] Wordsworth's *The Excursion: Being a Portion of The Recluse, A Poem* (1814).

The plan I once mentioned to you as Walter Scott's, I fear is not for us - It is only practicable when many thousands are disposed of at once;[5] & my plan is to take two thirds of profit & expenses upon myself - you, I see take <only> half- Longman says "We take the expenses on ourselves & divide the profits".[6] This may be liberal, where there is risk - but where the sale, tho' slow, is sure, is neither more nor less - than follows - you & Mr Longman in your morning-walk discover a MS. on the high-road & agree to publish it for your joint profit, share & share alike - with this advantage on the part of Mr L. that he may charge you what he pleases for Advertisement - & advertise other books at your expense.

I have proposed my plan to Murray - He demurs - & perhaps you may demur to it - as you will then share the risk - I confess I should not demur - as your profit is much greater than before - & your risk, I should think, in a course of years, as the past shows, nothing at all - He could assail us however in the article of advertisements, & then I think, we might prescribe some limit. Scott, by his plan, escapes from that iniquitous charge - Otherwise my plan of 2/3rds is as good as his - After all, a little delay signifies nothing; & if you, as I hope you are, are coming this way,

[5] Probably a reference to the lower prices of later editions of Scott's works which could be sold for less as they were published in high quantities. For example, *Lay of the Last Minstrel* was sold for 9 shillings a copy for the 1825 'new edition', as 2,000 were printed (St Clair, p.364).
[6] Longman's usual arrangement was to pay the costs involved in publication and halve any profits with the author.

42. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [before 9 May 1826][1]

As I threatened you with a letter, write I will, though I can do nothing but give you the dramatis personae.

Thursday – Tierney & M^rs^ T & Madge & George.[2]
B King; & Sr. John Newport from Althorpe[3]

Friday - The same, with the addition of the Devonshires from Hatfield & the Fords from town.[4] Morn. The J^s^ are altering or repairing in Brook St.[5]
The house is full of workmen. At Hatfield they played every night for the amusement of the Dss of Gloster at Snip snap snorum, another name for my sow's pigged.[6]

Saturday - The Devonshires went away & in their place came L^y^ De Rous & her 2^d^ daughter from Panshanger.[7][~~X~~]
L^y^ Caroline was at the ball there, & very quiet.[8]

Sunday - 5 o' clock. Nothing has yet occurred.

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.1-2. The recipient of this letter is probably Lady Holland, as Lord Holland is referred to. The date of 'before 9 May 1826' been pencilled on f.1r.
[2] George Tierney (1761-1830), Whig politician, and his wife Anna Maria Miller. 'George' is probably Tierney's son George Tierney (1800-1883) and Madge one of his three daughters.
[3] John Newport, 1st Baronet (1756-1843), Whig politician; 'B King' is possibly Walker King (1751-1827), Bishop of Rochester from 1809.
[4] Possibly William George Spencer Cavendish, 6th Duke of Devonshire (see 'Biographies of Correspondents') and his father's second wife, the Dowager Duchess Elizabeth Christiana Cavendish (1757-1824); Hatfield Hall is the seat of the Earls of Salisbury in Hertfordshire; Richard Ford (1796-1858), art critic, and his wife Harriet (1807-1837).
[5] Possibly George Child-Villiers and his wife Sarah Sophia Child-Villiers, Countess of Jersey (q.v. letter 42). Brook Street in the affluent suburb of Mayfair, London.
[6] Possibly Princess Mary, q.v. letter 21. Snip snap snorum is a card game.
[7] Probably Charlotte Maria Rous, Countess of Stradbroke (1769-1856) and her second daughter Charlotte Marianne Harriet Rous (d.1824). Panshanger, Hertfordshire, a country house owned by the Earls Cowper.
[8] Probably Caroline Lamb, q.v. letter 21.

> Sery. Vaughan called yesterday to tell us that Canning had sent in his resignation, but did not meet with much credit.[9]

We have Ecarté of course all night long, & much about Ireland from Sir John & much about Cobbett, & Lady Westmeath from M^r^ King.[10] There was a ball at the Parsonage at Watford on Friday night, but nobody went from this House. Miss Capell, the Parson's eldest daughter is about to be married to a M^r^ Clark.[11] She is a pretty girl. M^rs^ Ford has dined only once with us, but seems much as normal.[12]

But Tierney has just told me that he is writing to you & I am half inclined to burn what will now only give you trouble. I hope you have made some use of the fine weather & have sent again <to St James's Place> for the Mess you have honoured so much?[13] Indeed if you have not, I shall for the first time in my life doubt your sincerity. If you have not erred in that instance, you do daily & hourly in another – at least if the knowing know any thing – for I can assure you, & I will never <u>disguise the truth to you</u>, Halford says wherever he goes, that there is nothing seriously the matter with you & that you will

---

[9] Charles Richard Vaughan (q.v. letter 12), who held secretarial positions; George Canning (q.v. letter 5), Whig Prime Minister in 1827. The resignation mentioned is probably Canning's resignation from the cabinet in 1809, due to political differences over the war with France and public disputes with other politicians.

[10] Ecarté is a French card game; Sir John Newport, q.v. letter 42;the political writer William Cobbett (1763-1835); Elizabeth Emily Moore, Countess of Westmeath (1771-1841), who was involved in a protracted legal case to obtain a legal separation from her husband. Walker King, q.v. letter 42.

[11] Probably the sister of Harriet Ford ('M^rs^ Ford'); the 'Parson' mentioned is probably Reverend William Capel (dates unknown), a relation of the Earls of Essex; 'Clark' unidentified.

[12] Harriet Ford.

[13] Unidentified.

soon be as well as ever; & so says Holland & so says Moore.[14] With all my respect for the profession, I am determined, after what I have seen, never to be cast down by their evil predictions; but it will be strange indeed if so many favourable ones are wrong.[15] Lord Essex is for ever wishing to get you here, & I need not say, I am sure, that there are others here who wish for you too.[16]

The Gardener has just come in & he says there will be snow. I hope it will not fall before Wednesday, when I flatter myself we shall be moving again. Till then farewell –

Ever yours
Sam[l] Rogers

I hope the Gout is better, at least going on with good humour. Arthur Capel is expected here to-morrow. He has been to visit a sister married in Ireland, &, strange to say, is just now <u>out of love</u>.[17]

Sunday Evg
Cassiobury[18]

Lord Essex & Tierney are just now smoking in the grass-plot. Little alarming – but at the lodge, where new rooms & garden are making – I mean the lodge you enter at from town.

---

[14] Sir Henry Halford, 1st Baronet (1766-1844), physician; Lord Holland (see 'Biographies of Correspondents); Thomas Moore, q.v. letter 8.
[15] 'Profession' of physician.
[16] George Capell-Coningsby, 5th Earl of Essex (1757-1839), Whig politician.
[17] Arthur Algernon Capell, 6th Earl of Essex (1803-1892).
[18] Cassiobury House, the seat of the Earls of Essex in Hertfordshire.

43. Samuel Rogers to [William] Wordsworth, 2 February 1827[1]

My dear Wordsworth,

You may at all times command my vote, & my little influence too, such as it is.[2] On the present occasion, I will not forget your friend - I cannot say what pleasure your account of the forthcoming Edition gives me.[3] I began to think it would never come –

I am much vexed about the brushes, I sent three to Keswick - one for Southey & two for you - Have they not arrived - Let me know how to send them to you, & you shall receive two directly.[4] I have not seen Sir George B since we parted at Mulgrave.[5] I hope he had the good fortune to find your Sister, when he got back, & that she staid at Cole Orton till M^{rs} Siddons arrived there.[6] You say nothing of coming this way, but Sharp tells me you still think of Italy & we are in the way.[7] He is once again absorbed in Politics & Parliament. The Muses, alas, I hope they are under your roof - They hate <u>us</u> for our smoke & bustle, & no wonder - I am sorry to hear your account of D - but hope she is by this time as she ought to be - If not, send her or rather come with her to the only Place,

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 7.
[2] On 10 March 1827, Wordsworth replied to this letter and spoke of his friend Mr Johnson, who had 'got a notion that, through your influence, one might be procured for his own church' (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.159).
[3] The edition of Wordsworth's poetry was published by Longman in 1827.
[4] Despite sending gifts of brushes to Southey and Wordsworth, neither party acknowledged that they had received them.
[5] Sir George Beaumont (1753-1827), friend and patron of Wordsworth; Mulgrave Castle, Yorkshire, home of Henry Phipps, 1st Earl of Mulgrave (1755-1831).
[6] Dorothy Wordsworth (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'); Coleorton Hall in Leicestershire, home of the Beaumonts; Sarah Siddons q.v.
[7] Richard 'Conversation' Sharp (1759-1835), Whig politician, dissenter and close friend of Rogers.

where we have no time or leisure to think of our maladies.[8] Poor Lydia White was to give a large dinner on the day she died.[9] My love to all,

Ever yours very affectionately,
Sam[l] Rogers

Feb 2, 1827 -

[8] Wordsworth's daughter Dora (1804-47). On 10 March 1827 Wordsworth replied that 'Dora is improved in health, but the severe weather confines her to her room' (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.159).
[9] Lydia Rogers White (1760-1827), society hostess. It is possible that Rogers had proposed marriage to her and been rejected.

44. Samuel Rogers to [unknown], 6 April 1827[1]

My dear Sir

Many, many thanks for a Volume which I am reading with equal profit & pleasure. It is on a subject from which I have for some years withdrawn my mind, but I return to it with my old ardour & find it as fascinating as ever.[2]

I have shown the Work to our old friend Stothard, & it shall be at his service whenever he is in a reading humour. Perhaps you dont know that he is in a writing one, having been for some time, for some years I may say, employed in preparing a new Dictionary of the Painter.[3]

As usual, he began a Picture for the Exhibition last Saturday, tho' the Pictures are to be sent in next Tuesday – The Canvas is larger than that of S^{r} Joshua's Puck, & I like neither the subject nor the way of treating it.[4]

I had a letter from Collins some little time ago, to introduce M^{r} Cotton, a Painter to me. He speaks of his cottage, his garden-terrace, & the many sails that he sees from it. When he left town last spring he had set his heart upon a visit to you.[5]

Things, I believe, are yet afloat; but the opinion was yesterday very current that Canning was to be Minister & Robinson foreign secretary. It was generally believed in the H. of Lords.[6]

---

[1] Liverpool Central Library, Hornby Autographs, ref. 97-B5.
[2] Unidentified volume.
[3] Thomas Stothard (q.v. letter 30), painter. Stothard had been writing a 'Dictionary of the Lives of Painters' from 1812. It was never published.
[4] *The Puck*, painted in 1789 by Sir Joshua Reynolds (1723-1792).
[5] Possibly Richard Collins (1755-1831), painter; possibly John Cotton (1802-1849), pastoralist.
[6] After Robert Banks Jenkinson, 2nd Earl of Liverpool (1770-1828) suffered a stroke on 27 February 1827, changes were made in the Cabinet, and George

Ever yours very truly

Sam[l] Rogers

Ap. 6. 1827

St James's Place

Canning (q.v. letter 5) became Prime Minister from 10 April 1827 until his death on 8 August 1827. Frederick John Robinson, 1st Earl of Ripon (1782-1828) succeeded him as Prime Minister.

45. Samuel Rogers to [William] Wordsworth, 14 July 1827[1]

Dropmore, July 14
1827

My dear Wordsworth,

Many & many a time have I resolved to write to you & to thank you for the five precious Volumes.[2] They are full of Virtue, full of Piety, full of Wisdom, the Wisdom of the heart, & must console you under any circumstances, whenever you lay your head upon your pillow. Of the genius I need say nothing. While you were in the process, I was so too - but on a <very> small scale - I should have troubled you on the subject, if it had been any thing new.[3] Being too old & lazy, to correct the proofs as I wished, I promised a reward for every error - & one of my nieces performed her part to a miracle. Her eye-sight was wonderfully quickened - nothing escaped detection.

Have you any foreign schemes? My Brother & Sister think of Italy; & if they go, I cannot answer for myself - But nothing is settled.[4] What would not I give to find myself with you in the Eternal City! My Italian Journey on paper is not yet brought to a conclusion - & I dread the moment, as I shall never [mount] my hobby again - When I have recourse to the Infernals (the

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 8. This letter is a reply to Wordsworth's letter of 10 March 1827 (*Wordsworth Letters, IV*, pp.518-519).
[2] In 1825 Rogers had tried to negotiate a publishing contract between Murray and Wordsworth to publish Wordsworth's complete works, but Wordsworth chose to publish with Longman instead (see letter 43).
[3] The second part of Rogers's poem *Italy*, published in 1828. The first part had been published anonymously in 1822 and had been Rogers's first failure as a poet.
[4] Henry Rogers (q.v. letter 32) and Sarah Rogers (q.v. letter 1).

Printers I mean, not the Critics) I shall call upon you for your friendly advice -[5]

Lady Beaumont was very much as usual, when in town. She had recovered her cheerfulness, tho' she saw but few people & seldom went out.[6] At Cole-Orton, I fear, she will miss him much. Solitude, when you look for the return of a friend to criticize your labours & listen to your narratives, is very different from the Solitude she will now find there.

Pray remember me very affectionately to all your Family & believe me to be

Yours ever
Sam[l] Rogers

St James's Place
July 14, 1827

Alas, I have no influence in the British Institution.[7] I <have> represented our case again & again there & they express a great desire to give us an Altar-Piece. The applications are very numerous from the New Churches.

---

[5] Rogers was asking Wordsworth for his advice before the publication of the second part of *Italy*.

[6] Sir George Beaumont had died on 2 February 1827 (q.v. letter 43), leaving his wife Lady Margaret Beaumont (c.1766-1829) to reside at their house in Coleorton, Leicestershire, alone. The Beaumonts were friends and patrons of Wordsworth.

[7] On 10 March 1827 Wordsworth had written that his friend Johnson, the Minister of St Clement's Church in East Cheap, was inquiring as to 'certain pictures, and a fund for the purchase of pictures, exist at the disposal of the British Institution for the decoration of churches, he has got a notion that, through your influence, one might be procured for his own church' (*Wordsworth Letters, IV*, pp.518-519). The 'British Institution' was the British Institution for Promoting the Fine Arts, founded in 1805 and disbanded in 1867.

46. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 6 August 1827[1]

You may be very sure that I shall not fail at Ampthill, unless some whim takes me over the water, of which I see no likelihood at present, I am very impatient to be <u>there</u> <at Ampthill>, & am very sorry that you put it off so long.[2] I came here from Cassiobury last thursday, & the instant I return to town, which, I hope, will be on wednesday or thursday, I shall venture to come down to you, unless I find a line at home to prevent ~~you~~ me.[3]

As you have Lord Essex to-day, I need say nothing about Cassiobury.[4] Lord Ashburnham, in a day or two, was as well as ever.[5] I left him on the wing for Ashburnham, but he had just received an intimation from Windsor, that might delay him.[6] Lord Grenville is I think, growing weaker, but is very cheerful, & sometimes as conversible as ever.[7] M[r] Grenville was much obliged to you for your Letter.[8] His visit to the Isle of Wight has been delayed to the D. of Clarence but he sets off in two or three days.[9] I hope Lord Holland is better. Many thanks for the good-natured things you say about my rhymes.[10]

Yours ever!

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.9-10. F.10v is addressed to 'The Lady Holland'.
[2] Ampthill is a town in Bedfordshire and the seat of the Barons Holland.
[3] Cassiobury House in Hertfordshire, seat of the Earls of Essex.
[4] Lord Essex, q.v. letter 42.
[5] George Ashburnham, 3rd Earl of Ashburnham (1760-1830), lord of the bedchamber to the Prince of Wales from 1784 to 1795.
[6] Unidentified.
[7] William Wyndham Grenville (q.v. letter 32), Whig politician and Prime Minister.
[8] Thomas Grenville (1.v. letter 28), younger brother of William Grenville.
[9] William IV (1765-1837), who was styled Duke of Clarence until he ascended the throne in 1830.
[10] Possibly Rogers's *Italy*.

Sam^{l} Rogers

Dropmore

Aug$^{st.}$ 6. 1827.

47. Samuel Rogers to [William] Wordsworth, 5 November 1827[1]

My dear Wordsworth,

If I have not written to you, I have often thought of you - no excuse, you will say, perhaps an exaggeration - but as I knew nothing of the Work in question, I thought it best to wait till I had learnt something about it. I am now told that it is a good thing & a great bargain, but it is not much in my way.[2]

When you do come to town - pray let me know - you have set me all agog — When you go into Leicestershire, pray remember me very affectionately to Lady Beaumont.[3] Her kind letter I shall answer forthwith - but writing to me is worse than arsenic or hellebore & the unanswered Epistles that undraw my curtain at midnight & murder my sleep, are as numerous as the leaves that strew the brooks &c.[4]

Pray thank your Sister for the M.S. tho' I believe I am obliged to you for it - I shall never, never be on the best terms with her till she gives us her travels.[5] They are worth all the Ennuyées & Invalids that ever were or will be written.[6] By the by, next year I hope to go up the Rhine by steam from Cologne

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 9.
[2] On 20 September 1827, Wordsworth wrote to Rogers to ask for his opinion on prints that were being sold at the Stafford Gallery for 'one third of the original price' (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.543). Wordsworth asked about the quality of the impressions and whether they were worth the price.
[3] The friend and patron of Wordsworth, Lady Beaumont (q.v. letter 45), lived alone at her home of Coleorton Hall in Leicestershire after her husband Sir George Beaumont (q.v. letter 43) had died on 2 February 1827.
[4] 'Murder my sleep' is a reference to Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, Act 2, Scene 2; 'Leaves that strew the brook' is a reference to Milton's *Paradise Lost*, Book 1, ll.302-202.
[5] Rogers was trying to convince Dorothy Wordsworth to publish her travel journals. Wordsworth did ask for Rogers's advice in the matter, but Dorothy eventually declined, as she believed the profits would be small and not worthwhile.
[6] The travelogues *The Diary of an Ennuyée* by Anna Bronwell Jameson (1826) and *The Diary of an Invalid* by Henry Matthews (1820).

to Basil & again visit Hesperia, if health & strength be mine - <remember I have waited for you>[7] So pray propose, one & all, let us swim together in a Gondola & muse in the temples of Pasteum & in the streets of Pompeii together.

My Sister set out last summer with my Brother & niece; but, alas, the youngest of the party fell ill - they proceeded no farther than Spa & are once again in England, tho' I have not yet seen them. Your walk on the Lowther & through the Elysian fields I should have enjoyed much with you - though not a little saddened by the absence of a third.[8] - Do you wish me to buy the Stafford Gallery by Tomkins?[9] Had not you better wait till you come, if come you do? - Pray remember me to Southey, if ever you see him, & believe me to be

Ever yours
Sam^{l} Rogers

As you say nothing of brushes, much of prints, I conclude you want none of the former.[10]

St James's Place
Novr 5th, 1827.

---

[7] Rogers was trying to persuade Wordsworth to go travelling to Italy with him but failed in his endeavours.
[8] Rogers is referring to a walk Wordsworth undertook with William Lowther (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'), with the unusual wording of 'on the Lowther' possibly referring to Lowther's estate; the absence is Sir George Beaumont who had died in February 1827 (q.v. letter 43).
[9] Peltro William Tomkins (1759–1840), engraver. In 1818 he illustrated *Engravings of the Marquis of Stafford's Collection of Pictures*, with additional text written by William Young Ottley.
[10] Rogers had sent brushes to the Lake District for Southey and Wordsworth. 'Prints' were available to buy at the Gallery.

And Stafford has first given to the National Gallery his large Rubens. It is the best picture he had to give, the others being settled on his second son.[11]

[11] George William Stafford-Jerningham, q.v. letter 35. Stafford donated Rubens's 'War and Peace' to the National Gallery in 1828.

48. Samuel Rogers to [William] Wordsworth, [5 December 1827][1]

My dear Wordsworth,

Your anxiety must indeed be very great in the settlement of a Son. I know it from experience for my Brother & myself had the same difficulties to contend with in the settlement of five orphan nephews, thrown entirely upon us & without inheritance - You may believe me when I say that nothing could give me greater pleasure than to reflect that I had been of the best service in so very important a business.[2]

I am sorry indeed to hear such an account of Miss W's health.[3] The separation is a cruel one - Pray mention me very affectionately to Lady Beaumont.[4] She is now reaping the fruits of a long life well spent - for if ever a human being lived for others, she has done so, & with her means in so noble a service, she is still an object of Envy.

What think you of Navarino?[5] Thucydides <in the fourth book> describes the scene of action very accurately. He must

---

[1] The Wordsworth Trust, WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 10. Date is consistent with the content of the letter. This is a reply to a letter that Wordsworth wrote to Rogers on [c.30 November 1827] from Coleorton Hall (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* pp.554-336).

[2] Wordsworth's son John was having difficulty deciding on a career. He did not want to go to university, but was instead 'bent upon being a beggar either in the honourable character and profession of a Soldier or of a Farmer'. Wordsworth asked Rogers about 'what to do with this infatuated youth' (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.556).

[3] Wordsworth wrote to Rogers that Dorothy (see 'Biographies of Correspondents') was suffering from 'an affection of the throat' (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.555).

[4] Sir George Beaumont died 7 February 1827. Wordsworth wrote that Lady Beaumont (q.v. letter 45) had been ill but was recovering (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.55).

[5] The Battle of Navarino 20 October 1827: British, French and Russian ships destroyed an Ottoman Armada in the defence of Greek Independence.

have been there.[6] Mitford has given a pretty full account & his book is, I know, in the library at Coleorton.[7] How splendid must be the Winter garden there <just now>! I dont know that I was ever more agreeably surprized than when I first looked down upon it from above. It is a thing unique in its kind.

My sister is returned from her unfortunate expedition. I think I told you that she set out for Italy with my Brother & a Niece, & had approached the [~~xxxx~~] <Rhine>, when the poor Girl fell ill.[8] I am sorry to hear you so desponding as to Italy.[9] Let me ascribe it to a misty morning. In revenge for the qualm it gave me, let one inflict upon you my first sheet - Pray criticize it without mercy.[10] You need not return it. My love to M^rs^ & Miss W.

Ever yours
Saml Rogers

London, Dec 5
1827

I saw Page the other day in the street & he told me about it.[11] He was delighted with your reception of him & is well

---

[6] Rogers is making a joke about the Greek historian Thucydides (c.460 – c. 395 BC) and his description of the battle of the Syracusan and Locrian ships in the fourth book of *The History of The Pelopennesian War*, comparing it to the battle of Navarino as Navarino falls within the ancient territory of Pelopennesia.
[7] William Mitford, *The History of Greece* (London: J. Murray; and J. Robson, 1784). Coleorton Hall, Leicestershire, Beaumont family seat.
[8] Illness of Rogers's niece Caroline.
[9] Wordsworth told Rogers that to him Italy was 'ignis fatuus' [OED- 'A phosphorescent light seen hovering or flitting over marshy ground'] and that he could not consider visiting until he had 'disposed' of his son with a suitable career (*Wordsworth Letters*, *IV,* p.556).
[10] A draft of the second part of Rogers's Italy, published in 1828.
[11] Unidentified 'Mr Page'. On 20 September 1827, Wordsworth wrote to Rogers that he had been forwarded an advertisement about the prints at the Stafford Gallery, with the postscript added for the catalogue: 'The Stafford

worthy of it. As to the Work, I should not buy it myself, tho' as things go, it is cheap~~er~~.[12] The cheapest thing now is the Scotch Encyclopaedia. In consequence of Constables failure, it is now at half-price.[13]

Gallery complete in four volumes, folios, half bound, uncut, 12l. 12s. 0d., published at 35l. 14s. 0d., sold by Samuel Leigh, 18 Strand' (*Clayden 1889, Vol.* 1, pp.449-451).

[12] Referring to a work at the Stafford Gallery.

[13] Archibald Constable (1774-1827), founder of the publishing house Constable & Co in 1795. He had died on 21 July 1827. In 1812 he purchased the copyright for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, but Constable over-speculated and the publishing house crashed in 1826.

49. Samuel Rogers to [Thomas] Lawrence, [1827][1]

My dear Lawrence

I am very sorry indeed but must, however reluctantly, release you from your Engagement to-day. Brougham's answer was thought very cool & proper.[2] He only observed that M^r^ R. had chosen rather a singular time & place for his [~~xxx~~] address to him.[3] Sir Rob^t^ Wilson delivered [~~xxx~~] a message from B. to R. in the evening, & R is said to have received it at Lady Glengall's –[4]

Lady G came last night to Lady Holland's last night, but nothing passed on the subject.[5] Lady Jersey was there & of course there was <not> much cordiality. B is bound to keep the peace & I believe Raikes.[6] The Club are summoned to meet, I suppose, on the question of Expulsion.[7]

Yours very truly

Sam^l^ Rogers

---

[1] Royal Academy, Lawrence Papers, LAW/5/128.
[2] The politician and diarist Thomas Creevey (1768-1838) details how on 5 March 1827, Thomas 'Dandy' Raikes (1777-1848) entered Brooks's club and insulted Henry Peter Brougham (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'), to which Brougham replied 'You have chosen a strange place and occasion for offering your insult' (*The Creevey Papers,* Vol. 1, ed. Herbert Maxwell (London: John Murray, 1903) p.106).
[3] 'M^r^ R' is Thomas Raikes.
[4] 'B' is Lord Henry Brougham, and 'R' Thomas Raikes- Brougham had asked Robert Wilson to carry a message to Raikes challenging him to a duel. Upon the day of issuing the challenge, Brougham was taken into custody at Bow Street, as duelling was illegal and another member of Brooks's who had been there at the time (Thomas Spring Rice, 1^st^ Baron Monteagle, 1790–1866, politician) had informed the police.
[5] Creevey believed that Lord and Lady Glengall (Richard Butler, 2^nd^ Earl of Glengall, 1794-1858, politician, and his wife Margaret Lauretta, d.1864) had encouraged Raikes to insult Brougham (*The Creevey* Papers, Vol. 1, ed. Herbert Maxwell (London John Murray, 1903), p.106).
[6] Sarah Villiers, Countess of Jersey (1785-1867), society hostess.
[7] Brooks's Club, St James Street, London.

St James's Place
Tuesday –

M^r^ Cowper, a barrister, was 50 yrs ago, assailed on the western circuit <in a similar manner> at Dorchester by an [~~xxx~~] Irishman, who broke into his bed-room, before he was up. Do you mean to murder me in my bed? No, by God, says the other – I wont touch a hair of your head, while you are there. Then, replied the other, I wont stir out of it while you remain in Dorchester -[8]

[8] Unidentified.

50. Samuel Rogers to [Isaac] D'israeli, 6 May 1828[1]

My dear Sir

Pray accept my acknowledgements for a Work which I have read more than once, though not, alas, at Athens; & which I shall always value most highly.[2]

Ever yours very truly
Sam[l] Rogers

St James's Place
May 6, 1828.

---

[1] University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dep. Hughenden 245/2, f.82. F.82v is addressed: 'I. D.'Israeli Esqr / Bloomsbury Square'. D'Israeli lived at No. 6 Bloomsbury Square from 1817 to 1829.

[2] The work mentioned is likely to be D'Israeli's *The Literary Character: Or the History of Men of Genius*, which was republished in 1828 and dedicated to Robert Southey. In the dedication, D'Israeli notes that an early copy of *The Literary Character* 'accidentally fell into my hands which had formerly belonged to the great poetical genius of our times, and the singular fact that it had been more than once read by him, and twice in two subsequent years at Athens, in 1810 and 1811, instantly convinced me that the volume deserved my examination' (*The Literary Character: Or the History of Men of Men and Genius*, 1828, p.xvii). As Byron was in Greece and Turkey for these years, it is possible that D'Israeli in this preface, and Rogers in the letter, are referring to Byron here.

51. Samuel Rogers to [Frances] D'Arblay, 26 May 1828[1]

Dear Madame D'Arblay

Sir Walter Scott leaves town to-day & is very desirous to see you before he goes. May we venture to call upon you at so early an hour as one o'Clock. I am very sure you will admit us if you can. Perhaps M[r] D'Arblay will be there, if not otherwise engaged; as S[r] Walter would be very glad to make his acquaintance.[2]

Yours very sincerely
Sam[l] Rogers

St James's Place
Monday, May 26.
1828.

Pray send back a verbal answer. He hopes to return soon.

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Eng. Lett. E. 116, ff.164-165. F.165v is addressed to: 'To Madame D'Arblay / Burton Street'.
[2] Walter Scott (see 'Biographies of Correspondents). 'Mr D'Arblay' is probably D'Arblay's son, Alexander (1794-1837), as her husband had died in 1818.

52. Samuel Rogers to [Robert Southey], 29 June 1828[1]

I am delighted to think you are abroad again! If you have nothing better to do, will you breakfast with me next Wednesday to meet Crabbe, whom, I believe, you have never seen.[2]

Yours very sincerely
Sam[l] Rogers

St James's Place
June 29.[th]

[1] Harry Ransom Center, Robert Southey Collection, Container 2.6. This letter has been bound with an ALS from William Browne to Southey.
[2] George Crabbe (1754-1832), poet and clergyman. He met Rogers at Bowood House in London in 1817.

53. [Samuel Rogers] to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [1828][1]

Were not 18,000 persons & upwards transported from the Morea to Egypt after the battle of Navarino?[2]

Was not there a considerable number of Greeks among them, non-combatants? And were they not sold as slaves at Alexandria?

Was not such a project long known to our Government before its execution & were not orders sent out to prevent the measure?

Was not the blockade withdrawn after the battle of Navarino, & did not corn-ships & others enter freely for the accommodation of Ibrahim & his army, by which means he assembled that fleet?[3]

Is there any blockade now existing, & may not that fleet bring back men & stores for the reinforcement of Ibrahim's Army?[4]

How is our navy now employed in those seas? Is not the Commander still at Malta?

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.17-18. The recipient of this fragment is likely to be Lord Holland due to its subject matter. Dated by the British Library, and the content of the letter is consistent with this.

[2] The Battle of Navarino took place on 20 October 1827 as a part of the Greek War of Independence, and was fought between the Ottoman Empire and the allied English, French and Russian navies. The allies sunk the Ottoman's fleet. Morea was the Peloponnese peninsula in the south of Greece.

[3] The Commander in Chief of the Royal Navy campaign at Navarino was Vice Admiral Edward Codrington (1770-1851). Generally, the government did not approve of Codrington's actions at the Battle of Navarino, and the battle did not resolve the Ottomon Empire's domination of Greece.

[4] The army of the Ottoman Empire, under the command of Ibrahim Pasha (1789-1848).

54. Samuel Rogers to [Walter] Scott, [c.1828][1]

My dear Scott

Many many thanks for your two letters. They assured me that you had not forgotten & they flattered my vanity by giving me a little commission or two, which I need not say I felt a great pleasure in executing – in the last instance particularly – when all I saw served to confirm the prepossessions I had conceived in his favour.[2] Of his talents I had no doubt & I hope & trust he will not let them sleep but remember your maxim that labour is its own reward.

When I was in Italy the last time, I saw Lord Byron twice. We crossed the Apennines together & I afterwards passed a day or two with him under his roof at Pisa. He had just received a letter from you, & spoke of you with great warmth & affection.[3]

I am very sorry to learn that you have given up your intention of coming to us this year - & of taking a ramble through the forests of Germany.[4] If you will not come to us, we must come to you, & you may depend upon it that I shall not forget your kind Invitation.[5] Whether it will be this summer or not, I dare not say, but come I shall, if I live.

Yours most affectionately

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.869, f.208, Dated by the NLS as after 1821, but correspondence from Scott regarding their travels to Germany dates this letter to possibly about 1828 (H. J. C. Grierson, *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, Vol. 10 (London: Constable & Co., 1932-37), p.420.
[2] Possibly on asking Wordsworth (see 'Biographies of Correspondents') to join Scott and Rogers on their travels.
[3] Rogers met Byron and travelled with him into Florence on 29 and 30 October 1821.
[4] Despite asking many times, Scott did not eventually undertake any travels with Rogers to Italy or Germany.
[5] Probably Rogers and his sister Sarah Rogers, q.v. letter 1.

Sam[l] Rogers

I know you will be glad to hear that Crabbe is much better than when you saw him.[6]

[6] George Crabbe, q.v. letter 52. From 1820 Crabbe suffered from neuralgia.

55. Samuel Rogers to [Isaac D'israeli], 26 May [1829][1]

My dear Sir

Many, many thanks for your kind & entertaining Letter; which I should have acknowledged long ago, if I had not promised myself the pleasure of calling upon you.

Just now I am going out of town for a few days, but when I return, I shall be most happy to avail myself of your obliging permission to see the Drawings.[2]

Yours very sincerely
Sam^{l} Rogers

St James's Place
May 26 -

[1] Bodleian Library, Dep. Hughenden 245/2, ff.84-85. Dated by the Bodleian Library and consistent with the content of the letter. F.85v is addressed to: 'I. D.'Israeli Esq^{r} / Bloomsbury Sq-'.
[2] Probably relating to a request from Rogers to view D'Israeli's collections.

56. Samuel Rogers to [Mary Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound], 8 July 1829[1]

My dear Lady Minto

What can I say to you in return for what you have sent me? The chain I shall value on every account - for its own sake & the Giver's - & wear it wherever I go – at home & abroad – in my lonely walks - & in the crowded street. In the last it will have much to do, & I shall trust to it as to a Good Angel. You have infused into it your own spirit, & it will not forget the trust. Not that you are the most trusty of human beings, for you have given me again & again false hopes. When will they be realized, for when shall we meet again?

Yours ever
Sam^{l} Rogers

July 8. 1829.

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.11906, f.41.

57. Samuel Rogers to Joanna [Baillie], 24 October 1830[1]

My dear M^rs^ Joanna

I will not fail to do my utmost for your Protegée.[2] I have not ventured to a Public dinner these twenty years; but I will lose no opportunity of urging your suit; though I have not quite forgiven you or your Sister, for not breakfasting with me last Summer –[3] I console myself however with thinking that it is only a pleasure deferred & that you would have kept your word if you could.

What events have happened since the first swallow came among us! A Dey of Algiers smoking his pipe at Naples;[4] a King of France once more on his travels & taking out a license to shoot on a manor in Dorsetshire;[5] a Jack Tar on the throne of England & La Fayette once again commanding with his tricolor cockade![6] Surely those Invisibles, who are the scene-shifters here below, must have been very busy of late.

Ever yours most truly
Sam^l^ Rogers

---

[1] The Royal College of Surgeons of England, MS0014/7, Hunter-Baillie Letters, Volume 4.1, 1704-1923, Letter 218.
[2] Mary Anne Hedge (dates unknown), poet, from the Royal Literary Fund, who Baillie had asked Rogers to financially aid (Judith Bailey Slagle, *Joanna Baillie, a Literary Life* (London: Associated University Presses, 2002), pp.216-217).
[3] Agnes Baillie (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').
[4] Hussein Dey (1765-1838), the last ruler of the Regency of Algiers. When the French invaded Algiers in July 1830, Dey surrendered to the French and was exiled to Naples, a colony of the Austrian Empire.
[5] Louis Phillipe I (1773-1850), King of the French 1830-1848.
[6] 'Jack Tar': King William IV (q.v. letter 46), who ascended to the British throne in June 1830. He had previously served in the Royal Navy. 'La Fayette' is Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, who fought in the French July revolution of 1830, which resulted in the ascension of Phillipe I to the French throne. Rogers is commenting on the revolutionary cockade that Lafeyette was still wearing.

Holkham, Oct^{r} 24

1830

58. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [29 November or 6 December 1830][1]

Dear Lord Holland

Many thanks for your prose & your verse, both of which are always most welcome. Your conclusion with regard to Milton is very ingenuous & worthy of yourself & that passage.[2]

The sweets that lie enclosed in folds of smoothest Poetry, very poetical & beautiful.

The Foreign Office was very warlike yesterday, I hope without reason.

As to Alfred Stothard, he is a very ingenious & very deserving young man - & a very excellent artist. He has, I believe, been very unfairly dealt with, & as I understand, supplanted by one much his inferior - This, I learn from his father who is as deaf as Johnson - but I will see the young man himself.[3]

The Spencers are in great trouble, & what makes it still more afflicting, the news comes only thro' a merchant's house in the City - Sir Thomas Hardy, who called yesterday, says the official news in all probability will not come to the Admiralty for three or four days.[4] After their former affair, when he came to life again, their minds cannot but cling to something like hope. I rejoice in your bright weather & wish myself with you – but

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.29-30. Dated by the British Library and consistent with the content of the letter.
[2] Unidentified.
[3] 'Afred Stothard' is probably a relation of Thomas Stothard, q.v. letter 30, but all three of Stothard's sons had died by 1830; 'Deaf as Johnson' is a reference to Samuel Johnson (1709-1784), author and lexicographer, who had been going deaf in his old age.
[4] Possibly George Spencer, 2nd Earl Spencer (1758-1834), and his wife Lavinia. The trouble referred to could be the death of their son Captain Robert Cavendish Spencer on 4 November 1830. Sir Thomas Hardy (1769-1839), Vice Admiral in the Royal Navy.

my imprisonment has left me so susceptible of cold, that want courage for such a journey –

Ever yours truly
Sam^{l} Rogers

Monday

I will forward the letter –

A confirmation is arrived <He died at Alexandria>, He returned from a walk ashore, & complained of illness, retiring to his cabin. His Surgeon blooded him, but next day he was worse - & when the Surgeon came, bringing him L^{d} Clare's Physician, he was dead as is believed of a spasm - He was buried at Malta.[5]

[5] Sir Robert Cavendish Spencer (1791-1830), naval Captain. He died near Alexandria and was buried at Malta. 'Lord Clare' is probably John FitzGibbon, 2nd Earl of Clare (1792-1851).

59. Samuel Rogers to [George Cumberland], 2 December 1830[1]

My dear Sir

I take great shame to myself – but I am a sorry correspondent, & pray, pray come to me, not write to me when you want an answer. As to young Poets, if you knew by how many & their Patrons I am beset, you would pity me; & I have resolved, that I may die in peace, to read no more.[2] Let them read Milton & Dryden, & then see how they like their own verses.[3]

M[r] Eagles's Poem strikes me so very Shakesperean – as far as I have had time to run thro' it; & I heartily wish it the success it deserves.[4] When I say so, I hope I return the right Poem, for it lies among fifty others by many much better & abler men than myself. Arguablyy to your desire, I beg your acceptance of [~~xxx~~] a Volume, to which Stothard & Turner have given a great Value.[5]

Yours truly
Sam[l] Rogers

Dec[r] 2, 1830

---

[1] Liverpool Record Office, in Synge Collection (no further reference). F.2v is addressed to: 'George Cumberland Esq'.
[2] Rogers was often sent requests for money by aspirant poets and their patrons.
[3] The poets John Milton (1608-1674) and John Dryden (1631-1700).
[4] John Eagles (1783-1855), poet and art critic. The work referenced is probably Eagles's *Felix Farley, Rhymes, Latin and English, by Themaninthemoon* (Bristol: J. M. Gutch, 1826).
[5] An edition of Rogers's *Italy* (1830), containing engravings by Turner and Stothard.

60. Samuel Rogers to [Benjamin] Disraeli, 3 December 1830[1]

Monaghan
3 Dec^{r} 1830

Sir

Being an ardent admirer of your character as a Statesman as well as your elegant works, and having obtained the Autographs of some of our most eminent men, I am particularly desirous to add yours to the number and would feel deeply indebted by your transmitting it to me in the accompanying envelope.

I am Sir
Your obed^{t} servant
S. Rogers

[1] Bodleian Library, Dep. Hughenden 141/2, f.151. The handwriting is of a very different style to other samples of Rogers's hand, possibly due to the formality of his request. F.152v is dated in a different hand '1850 Dec^{r}', with an indiscernible scrawled note beneath it. F.152r is addressed: 'B. Disraeli Esq'.

61. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [1830][1]

I wish I could dine with you to-morrow, but I have so often left this House sooner than I ought, that I dare not go to-morrow; & on Saturday I am very unfortunately engaged to Lady Stafford.[2] I will endeavour to see you however on Saturday sooner or later.

The Duke says this is the coldest place in the Island & the thermometer has been down at 11, but the party has only lost a day's shooting & are out to-day.[3] The Dramatis Personae are the Aberdeens, Jerseys, Vernons, D. of Manchester, L^{d} Fitzroy Somerset, F. Russell, L^{d} Roslin & Alva –[4] On the first day, Monday, the Duke sprained his right shoulder by an unfortunate twist to shoot a hare which however he killed – But he was obliged to return home immediately & has worn his arm in a sling ever since with considerable pain. The D. of W. is detained at Winchester & could not come.[5]

I am sure it will give M^{r} Allen pleasure to know that L^{y} A read his article on Clarendon to L^{d} A, on Sunday Ev^{g}, the day but one before he died & that he listened to it with great

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.44-45. F.45v is addressed: 'The Lady Holland'. Dated by the British Library and consistent with the content of the letter.
[2] Frances Henrietta Stafford-Jerningham, Baroness Stafford (d.1832).
[3] Probably John Russell, 6th Duke of Bedford (q.v. letter 22).
[4] George Hamilton-Gordon, 4th Earl of Aberdeen (1784-1860), Tory Prime Minister from 1852 to 1855, and his wife Harriet (1792-1833); George Child-Villiers, 5th Earl of Jersey (1773–1859), Whig politician, and his wife Sarah Sophia Child-Villiers, Countess of Jersey (1785–1867), political hostess; Probably George Charles Venables-Vernon, 4th Baron Vernon (1779-1835), and his wife Frances Maria (d.1837); William Montagu, 5th Duke of Manchester (1771-1843), politician; Fitzroy James Henry Somerset, 1st Baron Raglan (1788-1855), army officer; Possibly Lieutenant Colonel Francis Russell (1793-1832), army officer; James St Clair Erskine, 2nd Earl of Rosslyn (1762-1837), Whig politician and army officer. Alva was the title of Rosslyn's father: Lieutenant-General Sir Henry Erskine of Alva, 5th Baronet (bap. 1710-d. 1765).
[5] Possibly the Duke of Wellington (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').

interest & pleasure.[6] She told me so herself the day before I left town.

Ever yours
Sam[l] Rogers

Woburn Abbey[7]
Wednesday

He used to speak very often of your kindness to him.

[6] John Allen, q.v. letter 24. Allen's 'article' is a review in the *Edinburgh Review* of Lord Ashburnham's (q.v. letter 46) publication on his ancestor, John Ashburnham (1602/3-1671), to reinstate Ashburnham's reputation from suggestions by the politician Edward Hyde, 1st Earl of Clarendon (1609-1674) that John Ashburnham had contributed to the downfall of King Charles I (1600-1649). The publication was entitled *A Narrative of John Ashburnham of His Attendance on King Charles the First* (London: Payne and Foss, 1830). 'Lady A' is Lady Charlotte Ashburnham (1776-1862), who was reading Allen's review to her husband.
[7] Woburn Abbey, Bedfordshire, seat of the Dukes of Bedford.

62. Samuel Rogers to [William Miller], 30 June 1831[1]

My dear Sir

When you are at leisure to begin with the Vignettes, pray do me the favour to engrave The old House - & The Garden. It is yet uncertain whether the others viz the Dame's School & the Rialto are to be engraved – but pray begin in the first instance with the old House; & I will afterwards determine concerning the rest. I have many others ready for you & will send them, when required.[2]

I am very sorry that I had not the pleasure to see you in London, & hope you will do me the favor to call upon me when you come again into these parts.

Yours very truly
Sam[l] Rogers

St James's Place
June 30, 1831

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.582, ff.109-110. F.110v is addressed to: 'M[r] William Miller / 4, Hope Park / Edinburgh'.
[2] Miller engraved Turner's paintings for Rogers's *Collected Poems* (1834). The vignette of 'The Old House' was reproduced in the published edition. The titles referred to are engravings for *Poems*.

63. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [16 September 1831][1]

I can assure you, if I was not really so, I should be much the better for your kind Remembrance. But I really am better & I believe a dull life & a spare diet are good things sometimes.

My Sister desires me to say every thing for her to you in return for your Inquiries.[2] We walk & drive & sit in the sun & now & then I mount a pony as sober as L^{d} Holland's.

We have taken the best House in the place for a month – It is very ruinous – but we had no alternative. Sometimes we go to Ramsgate & this morning we were at Margate, but I have not seen a face I ever saw before.

The Warwicks come here to-day for a month.[3] I have not exchanged a word with them since L^{d} H & I dined with them in the Crescent at Brighton. Poor Calcraft– I have long thought him very desponding.[4] The batch of Poems is a very good one with the exception of two or three Scamps – But I want another & a larger.[5] I am reading Marianne again & am delighted to find that my heart has not grown old, for I cry over it as much as ever.[6]

Ever yours
Sam^{l} Rogers

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.50-51. F.51v is inscribed 'Lady Holland'. Dated by the British Library and consistent with the death of Calcraft, mentioned in the letter.
[2] Sarah Rogers, q.v. letter 1.
[3] Henry Richard Greville, 3rd Earl of Warwick (1779-1853), Tory politician, and his wife Sarah Elizabeth (1786-1851).
[4] John Calcraft (1765-1831), Whig politician. He committed suicide at Whitehall palace on 11 September 1831.
[5] Probably a reference to Rogers's 1834 collection *Poems*, which he was working on at this time.
[6] Possibly *La Vie de Marianne*, an unfinished novel by Pierre de Marivaux. A 1782 English translation of this was in Rogers's *Sale Catalogue*.

I wish I could send you a little of our blue Ether – I am sure it would revive you.

64. Samuel Rogers to [Thomas] Lawrence, [before 1832][1]

My dear Lawrence

May I beg the favour of you to call at Westall's.[2] There is in his painting-room (& you can see it, whether he is at home or not) a picture of the St Peter Martyr, by Giorgione – Pray look at it & let me know your opinion confidentially – Carr wants it, but I have the refusal – I know you will forgive me for the trouble I here give you – it is much injured.[3]

Ever yours
Sam[l] Rogers

It will remain there till Wednesday afternoon certainly

[1] Royal Academy, Lawrence Papers, LAW/2/198.
[2] Richard Westall (1765-1836), painter. Westall lived in Fitzroy Square, London.
[3] The picture in question is probably 'St Peter Martyr' by Giorgio Schiavone, which was acquired by the National Gallery, London, in 1860. Probably Sir John Carr (1772-1832), travel writer, and Westall's friend.

65. Samuel Rogers to [William George Spencer Cavendish], 20 January 1832[1]

My dear Lord

Pray accept a thousand thanks for the great Favor you have done me. The Fac-simile I shall value most highly on every account – for your sake & its own.[2]

Ever sincerely yours
Saml Rogers

Jany 20
1832

[1] Chatsworth House, Devonshire Mss., Chatsworth, CS6/245/0. Recipient identified by Chatsworth House.
[2] Above 'Fac-simile', in a different hand, is written 'Inigo Jones Sketch Book'.

66. Samuel Rogers to [Charles] Grey, 22 April 1832[1]

My dear Lord Grey

Who it is I dont know – I am sure it cannot be You - &, after all, the rumour may be a false one – But whoever consents to let the front of a Stable be the front of the National Gallery of a great Empire — & at the very same time lets so noble a portico be given away to any who asks for it, will furnish subject enough for epigrams & caricatures without number.[2]

The portico seems to be a God's-send for such a purpose. It must have cost many thousands; & as for the Stable, it was conceived when our Taste was at the lowest.[3]

Ever yours most sincerely
Sam[l] Rogers

St James's Place
April 22, 1832

[1] University of Durham, Grey Family Papers, GRE/B50A/1/13/1.
[2] Rogers was concerned with the appearance of the National Gallery when it was moved to its current location in Trafalgar Square.
[3] This is a reference to the demolition of Carlton House which occurred after George IV moved to Buckingham Palace in 1820. Parts of the building were re-used in different architectural designs, with the portico used as the new front of the National Gallery.

67. Samuel Rogers to [Charles Grey], 24 April 1832[1]

Private

April 24, 1832

My dear Lord

Having assailed you, foolishly enough, with an Enigma, I am bound to solve it as soon as I can.

The Stable-front, alluded to, is that in the Mews at Charing-Cross. The Portico is the Portico of Carlton House.[2]

In a Conversation I had the other day with The Woods & Forests,[3] he mentioned (entre nous) that that there was a great desire – in the K. among others -[4] to employ the first for the National Gallery,[5] if the Pictures were to be removed to that spot - - & at the same time expressed a strong inclination on his own part to give the portico to Beazeley the Architect, who had applied for it.[6]

Imagining that some of these things might escape your notice among the greater cares that beset you, I ventured to write as I did, & pray forget & forgive it.

---

[1] University of Durham, Earl Grey Family Papers, GRE/B50A/1/14.
[2] See letter 66. The 'Enigma' in question is the construction of the new building for the National Gallery (completed in 1834).
[3] This is a reference to the Commissioners of Woods, Forests and Land Revenues, established originally in 1810. The 'he' referred to is probably the Whig politician Viscount Duncannon (1781-1847), who was the First Commissioner between 1831 and 1834.
[4] 'K' is King William IV, q.v. letter 46.
[5] This is a reference to the demolition of Carlton House which occurred after George IV moved to Buckingham Palace in 1820. Parts of the building were re-used in different architectural designs, with the portico used as the new front of the National Gallery.
[6] Samuel Beazley (1786-1851), architect. Beazley redesigned and modified theatres in London in the 1820s and 1830s, including the Royal Lyceum and Drury Lane theatres.

yours very truly

Sam[l] Rogers

I am setting out for Ampthill or should very gladly avail myself of your kind Invitation.[7]

[7] After the death of Lord Upper Ossory in 1818, Lord Holland inherited Ampthill House, which became a notable destination for his Whig acquaintances.

68. Samuel Rogers to [John Gibson] Lockhart, 25 September 1832[1]

Dear M[r] Lockhart

Many thanks for thinking of me at such a time! I am sure I need not say how much you have all been in my thoughts for a long while –

Then all is over and we have now only to reflect on his great & good qualities. Had he been of a less noble nature, he would have suspected more & trusted less – but then he would not have been the Man he was, & who could wish him otherwise?[2] Pray remember me very particularly to one & all who are with you. Much as I feel for them, I envy them more at this moment for the glory of having had such a father, than I pity them for the loss of him. – May He who alone knows what is best for us, who gives & who takes away, support & bless them under their great Afflictions!

Ever yours most sincerely
Sam[l] Rogers

Sept 25
1832

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.929, no.57.
[2] The novelist, poet and Lockhart's father-in-law Sir Walter Scott died on 21 September 1832.

69. Samuel Rogers to [Charles] Grey, [1832][1]

My dear Lord Grey

Those Ultras – their annoyance is insufferable. They think there is a divided Cabinet; & well they may, accustomed as they have been, to ~~a~~ serve under a man who never hesitated – who had it all his own way – & who, if I may believe them, could & would have carried this measure instanter, if he had thought it a fit & proper one.[2]

Nor are the moderate, as they affect to a regard themselves, less provoking. "If he requires pledges – if our assurances are not enough for him, let him make his votes & take the consequences." I repeat their very words, for such I have heard from them.

And yet who, when so much is at stake, would confide in the confidence of others, however honourable they may be? The men who make these assurances are not so very wise, & may be over-confident.

But admitting all they assent, admitting that the Bill is sure to pass, what chance has a Whig Administration of carrying a single measure afterwards in such a Chamber? And how is it to be reformed but in the way proposed? ~~Its~~ Corruption has been the work of years. Is its reformation to be brought about by as slow a process? The balance is now destroyed, & the opportunity of restoring it may be lost for ever!

---

[1] University of Durham, Earl Grey Family Papers, GRE/B50A/1/1511. Dated by the University of Durham. On f.2v is written in a different hand: '1812, Mr Rogers'. However, due to the content of this letter, the date is likely to be 1832, the date of the Reform Bill.

[2] Possibly a comment on Robert Peel's (see 'Biographies of Correspondents') leadership of the Tory opposition, who had been pushing for the Reform Act.

Alas, while I write, the minutes are running fast away. On all great occasions, as Talleyrand was observing the other night, it is of the utmost importance to ascertain "si le temps est pour nous, ou contre nous".[3] The undecided always flatter themselves that it is for them; & how often are they mistaken!

But I use you very ill. I am once again making you the victim of my spleen against others. If I err, pray forgive me, & ascribe it to the kindness with which you have always treated me.

Ever yours most sincerely
Sam[l] Rogers

The Tories (God bless them) have changed altogether their plan of defence. The K's determination has filled them with dismay, & they are now endeavouring by every means in their power –[4] by soft words & by big words – to prevent a restoration of the balance. Nor are they alone against this addiction to the Peerage. Many among yourselves are, I fear, very averse to it. But can the Peerage lose in character or in influence by your admitting among you those who have most character & most influence among the Commoners of Great Britain? If a Crisis were to come, could you repent of having done it? –

But these things are better known to you than to me; & you alone know the thousand obstacles you have to contend with at every step. –

---

[3] Translation: 'If the time is for us or against us'. Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord q.v.

[4] 'K' is King William IV (q.v. letter 46). Grey had persuaded William IV to create additional Whig peers in the House of Lords, in order to pass the Reform Act which the Tories did not agree with. However, Tory peers abstained from the vote, which prevented more Whig peers from being needed (and consequently created) to pass the Bill.

May your own noble spirit sustain you in this Warfare!

70. Samuel Rogers to [William Brockedon], 6 April 1833[1]

Dear Sir

I am sure I need not say how much flattered I feel by the Honor of such an Invitation or how happy I shall be to avail myself of it.

Yours very truly
Sam^{l}. Rogers

St James's Place
April 6, 1833

[1] National Portrait Gallery, Heinz Library and Archive, Registered Packet 2515 (1-104), Brockedon Albums. Verso addressed to 'W^{m} Brockedon Esq^{r} / Devonshire St / Queen Square'.

71. Samuel Rogers to [Alfred] Tennyson, [after June 1833][1]

My dear Tennyson

Pray, pray come & meet Wordsworth at dinner to-morrow at 6 ½ o'clock & if you are engaged, come in the Evening, but pray dine.

Yours ever
S. Rogers

Friday
St. James's Place

R.S.V.P.

[1] Lincoln Central Library, Tennyson Research Centre, 5050. The earliest record of Rogers and Tennyson meeting is in June or July 1833, so this would have been after then (F. B. Pinion, *A Tennyson Chronology* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1990), p.19).

72. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 2 December 1833[1]

Monday,
Dec^{r} 2. 1833

Your budget of Brighton-news was most welcome & I wish I could see you any in return. L^{d} Grey liked his visit to Woburn, tho' he did not draw a trigger & I am happy to think that none of the ministers were slain by each other.[2] He is not a little annoyed by the attacks of the press. ~~Touch~~ Those Gentlemen feel as one man. Touch one of them & it is resented thro' all Europe. Poor Funchal.[3] I am sorry to lose any body who always shewed me kindness & with whom my eyes have been familiar for so many years. I fear I write worse than usual – but L^{d} Stuart is writing by my side & he shakes the table most cruelly –[4] "Where can you be?" You will say. In a Coffee house near Wesm^{r} Hall with a multitude of witnesses, all waiting to be questioned – L^{d} Brownlow – L^{d} Mahon, Rose, D^{r} Chambers, Smythe &c.[5]

---

[1] British Library, Department of Manuscripts, Add.MSS.51647, ff.74-75. Lady Holland is the possible recipient of this letter.
[2] Charles Grey (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'). Woburn Abbey is the ancestral home of the Dukes of Bedford located in Bedfordshire. John Russell, 6th Duke of Bedford (q.v. letter 22), a Whig politician. Rogers's comments on the disagreements between politicians reflects the divisions that were developing in the Whig party in the 1820s and 1830s. According to the ODNB, Russell was 'opposed to the government's line on lay approbation' in 1833.
[3] De Sousa Coutinho, Conde de Funchal (c.1760-1833), Portuguese diplomat, who had just died in London.
[4] Charles Stuart, q.v. letter 24.
[5] John Cust, 1st Earl Brownlow (1779-1853), Tory politician; Philip Henry Stanhope, 5th Earl Stanhope (1805-1875), known as Viscount Mahon 1816-1855, historical writer, politician and member of Peel's Cabinet; Possibly George Henry Rose (1770-1855), diplomat; Possibly John Chambers (1780-1839), writer and antiquary; Probably Percy Clinton Sydney Smythe, 6th Viscount Strangford (1780-1855), diplomat.

I am very sorry I cannot come down to-morrow as I intended – but on Thursday sooner or later you shall be invaded – tho’ not to dinner.

Ever yours
Saml Rogers

73. Samuel Rogers to [Mary Shelley], 13 November [1833][1]

Many, many thanks to you both for thinking of me![2]

How delighted I should be to come & see you – But, alas, I am just now a prisoner, being confined to my room with a very bad cold which came I dont know how & is to go I dont know when – Not that I brought it from foreign parts – It is purely native and born, I think, of a good old English November fog. I rejoice to think you are both well –

Yours ever truly
S. Rogers

Nov^{r} 13.

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Abinger C.48 ff.121-122. Dated by postmarked envelope. The envelope is addressed to: 'M^{rs} Shelley / Layton House / Putney'.
[2] 'you … both' probably includes Shelley's son Percy Florence (1819-1889), as well as herself.

74. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [1833?][1]

I am really at a loss what to say – It is a great hardship that you cannot open your doors to an Author, but his Wife writes to borrow money.[2] I have already lent him that very sum, & if I was not just now very poor, I would readily advance the money through you to him; for though I have no hope for myself I am very sure they will repay you - I will try what I can do - & let you know in a day or two -. Delay will do no harm -

You can only say that you waited to see what your man of affairs could do for you -.

Yours ever
Sam[l] Rogers

I consider that I have brought this upon you & must do what I can -

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.76-77. The recipient could be either Lord or Lady Holland. Dated by British Library.
[2] Unidentified.

75. Samuel Rogers to [Isaac] D'Israeli, 30 March 1834[1]

March 30, 1834

Dear Sir

Pray express my grateful Acknowledgements to M[r] D'Israeli for a very splendid Volume which I have found this morning upon my table. The manner in which the preface is conceived promises much for the poem & I am very sure that I shall not be disappointed.[2]

Yours very truly
Sam[l] Rogers

I am but just returned to town

[1] Bodleian Library, Dep. Hughenden 245/2, f.86. Dated by the Bodleian Library.
[2] This is probably Benjamin D'Israeli's *The Revolutionary Epick* (1834), published by Edward Moxon.

76. Samuel Rogers to [Charles] Grey, 15 April 1834[1]

St James's Place
Ap. 15, 1834

My dear Lord Grey

I ventured the other morning to recommend to your notice M[r] James Millingen; & I really believe that there is not one, among them all, who has so strong a claim to your bounty.[2]

In very many respects – more especially in all that relates to Greek & Roman Antiquities, he is confessedly one of the most learned men in Europe – Not only here, but in the cities of Paris, Rome & Vienna, he is regarded as the very highest authority; & his papers in all the foreign transactions have done us the greatest honor.[3]

But I cannot do better than refer you to the inclosed extract from a letter which I received from M[r] Hamilton, our former consul at Naples, a man well-qualified to give an opinion of his character & talents.[4] Lord Holland & Lord Lansdowne will also, I am very sure, confirm all I have said on the subject.[5]

Yours ever
Sam[l] Rogers

---

[1] University of Durham, Earl Grey Family Papers, GRE/B43/23/31.
[2] James Millingen (1774-1845), archaeologist. Millingen assisted Rogers with purchasing historical artefacts during his tours to Italy.
[3] Millingen was noted for his expertise on historical coins and currency.
[4] This is likely to be William Richard Hamilton (1777-1859), Minister and Envoy Plenipotentiary at the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies (which included Naples) from 1822 to 1825. He was also interested in collecting and antiquaries, and monitored the French removal of antiquities as well as organising the removal of the Elgin marbles with Lord Elgin.
[5] Both Holland and Lansdowne were interested in collecting historical artefacts

By the loss of his pension from the Royal Society of Literature he is reduced to very straitened circumstances & his means of being useful <are> much impaired, as he cannot now continue his researches - [6]

[6] Millingen was an honorary member of the Royal Society of Literature, and he had a civil-list pension of £100 a year. This pension could have been granted due to the loss of his pension from the Royal Society of Literature, as he had formerly been an Associate.

77. Samuel Rogers to [William Godwin], [4 August 1834][1]

My dear Sir

Pray forgive me if I venture to introduce to you Mons[r] de Bonnechose the King's Librarian at the Palace of St Cloud.[2] All he wishes is to see you & shake you by the hand.

Pray dont refuse to pay the tax which all men of Genius must pay.

Yours very truly

Sam[l] Rogers

[1] University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Abinger c.14, f.36. F.36v also includes notes, names and dates in Godwin's hand, from which the Bodleian library have dated the MS.

[2] François Paul Émile Boisnormand de Bonnechose (1801–1875), French poet, historian, and, from 1830-1838, the King's Librarian in the Palace of St Cloud.

78. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 25 September [1834][1]

Dunmore,[2] Sept 25.
1824.[3]

Many thanks for a letter that flatly contradicted your description of it. Here I am still, but I go in a day or two; & my next resting place will be Howick.[4] I was very sorry indeed to receive such an account of yourself & Lord Holland. I hope & trust that by this time he is up & about again.

I am rather better in my foot & well enough in other respects. You must have been very sorry for Leach's death.[5] When he came to Staffa, it was in a pouring rain & nobody else left the Steam-boat.[6] He insisted on going, against all their entreaties & there in the open boat he caught his cold. From that hour he become feverish & irritable, declaring, according to the account of his poor niece that he would return to town directly for advice. An Erysipelas came on & at Glasgow he saw D^{r} Burns – Still he would proceed – [7] At Edinburgh he saw D^{r} Abercrombie who called in D^{r} Thomson – but then it was too late.[8]

The Harrowbys came here yesterday from Scone, Dunrobin, Haddo &c.[9] At Dunrobin they had two days of

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.84-86. Content of letter identifies date as 1834, Rogers possibly misdates.
[2] Probably the village Dunmore in Stirlingshire, Scotland, the seat of the Earls of Dunmore.
[3] Misdated by Rogers.
[4] Howick Hall, Northumberland, seat of the Earls Grey.
[5] Possibly Sir John Leach (1760-1834), Whig politician.
[6] Staffa, an island in the Inner Hebrides.
[7] Erysipelas is a type of skin infection; Dr John Burns (1774-1850), surgeon.
[8] John Abercrombie (1780-1844), physician; Anthony Todd Thomson (1778-1849), physician.
[9] Dudley Ryder, 1st Earl of Harrowby (1762-1847), Tory politician, and his wife Lady Susan.

Brougham, who made a great sensation in the church there.[10] When pointed out to ~~a~~ <an old> Highlander, he shook his head, & said – "That's no Chancellor – The Chancellor's a Christian & no Christian would wear such a Coat as that on a Sunday." – The Harrowbys go to-morrow, & go to L^d^ Roseberry's, Dalkeith, L^d^ Melville's, Chillingham, Howick, Chatsworth &c &c.[11] I had a letter from L^d^ Essex the other day, who stays at Leamington till the end of Oct^r^. so I fear he is not right yet.[12]

Did I give you an account of my day here? Before breakfast we meet in the Garden, when the pheasants are fed. At 12. L^d^ D. mounts a grey poney & crawls about for an hour – then I mount it & do the same.[13] At 2 we go out in a poney chaise drawn by two little Norwegians, Lady D. our driver, or rather theirs - & dine at 6.[14]

I wish I could take you to my bed-chamber window at this moment. That water glittering through the trees & along which a white sail is gliding so smoothly, is the Forth, & that little town on the opposite shore with its large cathedral-like church is Alloa.[15] It has sent two ships to China this year & a third, an India-man, is on the stocks. But you must now have had enough of me.

Yours ever

---

[10] Dunrobin Castle, in the Scottish Highlands, seat of the Earls of Sutherland; Henry Peter Brougham, 1st Baron Brougham and Vaux (1778-1868), Whig politician. Brougham was Lord Chancellor from 22 November 1830 to 9 July 1834.

[11] Archibald John Primrose, 4th Earl of Rosebery (1783–1868), Whig politician; Dalkeith, Scotland, possibly a reference to Dalkeith Palace, the seat of the Dukes of Buccleuch; Melville Castle, the seat of the Viscounts Melville; Chillingham Castle, Northumberland, owned by the Earls Grey; Howick Hall, Northumberland, the seat of the Earls Grey; Chatsworth Hall, Derbyshire, the seat of the Dukes of Devonshire.

[12] Lord Essex, q.v. 42.

[13] Probaby George Murray, 5th Earl of Dunmore (1762-1836), politician.

[14] Probably Susan Murray, Countess of Dunmore (1774–1846).

[15] Alloa is a town in Clackmannshire, Scotland.

S. R.

On Saturday I shall go to Jeffrey's for a day or two, & perhaps to Chillingham for a night –[16]

[16] Francis Jeffrey, q.v. letter 18.

79. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [1836][1]

Wednesday

Many thanks for your two kind & very welcome notes, which I have but just received – in consequence of the Post Office having missent them ~~all~~ into Suffolk - & to Stow Market of all places in the world.

You give me great comfort & particularly in what you say of Lady Holland – tho' I felt always very sure about Her – Whatever she might think of the event when she sees it at a distance (& her presentiments from the beginning were, alas but too just) we might be very sure that her strong & excellent mind would bear up against it & would instantly suggest to her that she had other duties to discharge & other things to live for –[2]

Pray remember me most affectionately to Her – She used to flatter me sometimes by asking me to point out to her some ~~thing to read~~ little thing to read – May I venture to recommend to her a Letter of Gray's – Vol. 4 p.43. It is on such a subject as this, & I have always liked it for the good sense it contained –[3]

You say nothing of your healths – Let me hope you are both tolerably well - & that your Winter Visitor will forget you this time – You mention your walks in the garden – & I shall

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.88-89. Recipient is probably Lord Holland. Dated by the BL as 'after 16 February 1835', but dates from 1836, after the death of Lady Holland's son.

[2] Lady Holland's son from her first marriage, Godfrey Vassall Webster (b.1789), died in 1836.

[3] Thomas Gray, *The Poems of Mr. Gray*, 4 vols., ed. William Mason (London: J. Todd; York: J. Dodsley, 1778). This is a letter from 'Mr. Gray to Dr. Wharton' dated 'Sunday, April 9, 1758', in which Gray offers consolation to Wharton 'occasioned by the death of his eldest (and at the time his only) son' (vol. 4, p.43). The letter is a philosophical discourse on the ineffectiveness of consolation in times of grief.

look for you there when I call – which I should have done some days ago - but for a feverish cold which I cannot shake off – but I shall escape from my confinement as soon as I can – I trust early next week – By that time however you will have every body you wish to see. - - Lord Morpeth I hope –[4]

Yours ever
Sam[l] Rogers

Pray remember me very kindly to Allen & give my best love to Henry, if he is with you –[5] Poor Charley will be sadly overcome –[6] Whatever may be his versatilities (& who is without a failing) there is not a warmer or a more generous heart than his - & I think I have seen him in his most undisguised moments –

I am reading Crabbe regularly through, & am entirely a convert to your Opinion – I am surprized at myself for never having thought so before -[7]

Wassell Grove
Stourbridge —[8]

[4] George William Frederick Howard, 7th Earl of Carlisle (1802-1864), Whig politician, styled Viscount Morpeth from 1825 to 1848.
[5] John Allen, q.v. letter 24; Henry Edward Fox, q.v. letter 24.
[6] Charles Richard Fox, q.v. letter 8.
[7] George Crabbe, q.v. letter 52.
[8] Stourbridge, a large town in Dudley, West Midlands.

80. Samuel Rogers to [Edward Moxon], 18 February 1835[1]

My dear Sir

Pray deliver to the bearer Six Copies of my "Poems"[2]

Sam[l] Rogers

St James's Place
Feb[y] 18, 1835. –

"The Poems"

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Montagu D.18, ff.72-73. F.73v is addressed 'To M[r] E. Moxon'.
[2] This is a reference to Rogers's *Poems*, initially published by Moxon in 1834. From the content of the letter, it is clear that Rogers has sent someone to Moxon's publishing house with this note to collect the copies, but the bearer of the note is not specified.

81. Samuel Rogers to [unknown], 31 March 1835[1]

Dear Sir,

I am sure you will believe me when I say how much I wish you success in your very honourable Enterprize. Your Zeal in favor of so much talent deserves it & the beauty of the Volume must I think attract the notice of the Public. I hope you will forgive me for not being very sanguine — but you must observe that Moore & Campbell have both relinquished Verse for Prose; & as for Southey & Wordsworth, I believe, that really their profit is less than nothing. At least so they have assured me; but the World is always ready to adopt a new favourite & at all events there is no such a preparation for Prose as Verse.

Yours very truly
Sam^{l} Rogers

Mch 31, 1835

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.966, f.298. Recipient unidentified but letter could be to a publisher due to suggestion of an 'Enterprize' and discussions of literary style. A newspaper obituary of Rogers is affixed to this later, dated 'Dec^{r} 18th 1855'.

82. Samuel Rogers to [Maria] Denman, [28 July 1836][1]

Dear Miss Denman, -

I have just received a letter from Mr. Robinson,[2] concerning a bas relief, which, he says, is now in your house;[3] & can truly say that I should be happy on all occasions to execute any commission of his or yours, that I could under- take with propriety, but I am very sure, if I could explain the matter to him, that he would say I was right in declining altogether to take any part in that very unpleasant business - it is no concern of mine.[4] If the Duke applies to me,[5] which is very unlikely (for since his last attack of paralysis which happened two years ago, I have never seen him when I called) I should beg leave to decline giving any opinion on the subject - Mr. Robinson asks me if the Chancellor of the Exchequer has declared any thing of his intention concerning Mr. Flaxman's works -[6] Alas, a sick man in his bed knows nothing - when he leaves it, he will call in Norton St.[7]

Yours very truly-

---

[1] British Library, Add.MS.39783, f.29. A copy of Rogers's letter by Maria Denman and included by her in a letter to 'Mr. H. Howard Esquire' (Henry Howard, 1769-1847, painter) dated 28 July 1836. Before the transcribed letter, she writes: 'But before I lay down my pen I must call upon the patience of my ever kind friend to a communication I have received from another quarter - I mean Mr. Rogers - nor can I do it better than by copying his Letter - which I received the very day of your departure from London'.
[2] Henry Crabb Robinson (1775-1867). Robinson facilitated Maria Denman's sale of Flaxman's sculptures to University College London in 1847 as well as negotiations over Flaxman's estate. Rogers helped Crabb Robinson to create the Flaxman Gallery.
[3] Possibly the sale of a relief of Flaxman's organised by Denman.
[4] Unidentified.
[5] Unidentified.
[6] Whig politician Thomas Spring Rice (1790-1866), Chancellor of the Exchequer, April 1835 to August 1839. He had a keen interest in art and was a trustee of the National Portrait Gallery.
[7] Norton Street, home of the Flaxmans and Maria Denman (Flaxman's sister-in-law)

S. Rogers.[8]

[8] After the copied letter, Denman has added: 'I have not seen Mr. R. yet but as Mr. Collett has seen the Bas-relief this morning, I shall call upon him in a few days and have his opinion on the subject'.

83. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Fox], 9 October 1836[1]

Broadstairs,[2] 9 Oct[r]
1836

I need not say how welcome your letter was, though I wish it had told me better news of yourself. I have been vegetating here since I came & looking upon what Homer so justly calls the melancholy deep; but I thought it was for my good, & so perhaps in the article of health I have found it.[3]

Margate & Ramsgate have seen me alternately & except a short colloquy with the Duchess of Kent & the Princess on Ramsgate pier I have nothing to record in my history.[4]

I rejoice to hear that Luttrell is again abroad.[5] Moore's visit, I conclude, was to Paternoster Row.[6]

My Sister is delighted with her Journey & must by this time be at Marseilles, from which she wishes much to make a digression to Genoa the Superb, if the cholera & the cordon will let her. In that case she will not be in Paris before November.[7]

To-day I start for Dover & if the winds & the waves are amiable, shall cross to-morrow. So pray give me your good wishes. I have found a compagnon de voyage in Lord Webb,

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.101-102.
[2] Broadstairs, a seaside resort in Kent.
[3] Homer's 'deep' refers to the sea (Homer's *Odyssey*, Book I, l.65: 'the wonders of the deep expanded lie'), but the phrase 'melancholy deep' is more likely to be Rogers's memory of the poet James Beattie's (1735-1803) reference to 'a dark and melancholy deep' in *The Minstrel* (1771/2), etc.
[4] The Duchess of Kent (1786-1861) and her daughter Princess (and later Queen) Victoria (1819-1901).
[5] Henry Luttrell, q.v. letter 24.
[6] Thomas Moore, q.v. letter 8. Many publisher and booksellers were based in Paternoster Row, including Longman & Co.
[7] Sarah Rogers (q.v. letter 1) was travelling in Europe.

whom I picked up on the beach & with whom I travelled from Paris in 1802.[8]

Yours ever
S Rogers

[8] Unidentified.

84. Samuel Rogers to [Elizabeth Vassall Fox], 4 September 1837[1]

Broadstairs
Sept[r] 4, 1837

If I have not written sooner, it was really because I had little or nothing to say. On our way to the sea we tracked you every where & were shewn with no less pride than pleasure where you slept & where you dined. Here we were over-taken by Wordsworth & as he proposes to breakfast with you (I believe on Wednesday morning), he will tell you of our goings on.[2] He is now with the Archb[p] of Canterbury near Croydon.[3] He & I made a pilgrimage to Dover & to the top of Shakespeare's Cliff. On the beach we met with the Winchilseas & had the satisfaction of welcoming the Poodle as he stept ashore from the packet.[4]

M[r] Travers was here for three or four days last week & was a great acquisition to us.[5] I hope you are better than when you left us, in spight of all the thunder & lightening. As for us, we have <done> nothing but lounge along the shore, as idle as the idlest — now to Margate — & now to Ramsgate, where of course we assisted the disembarkation of a King & queen.[6] In a few days we shall return as slowly as we came – perhaps by Maidstone & Tunbridge - &, if you are where we left you – in

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.113-114. Recipient possibly Lady Holland, as Rogers mentions that his sister wishes to be remembered to her.
[2] William Wordsworth (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').
[3] William Howley (1766-1848), Archbishop of Canterbury from 1828.
[4] George William Finch-Hatton, 10th Earl of Winchilsea, 5th Earl of Nottingham (1791-1858), politician, and his wife Emily Georgiana (d.1848). Frederick Gerald Finch Byng (1784-1871), known as 'Poodle Byng', wit and politician.
[5] Possibly Benjamin Travers (1783-1858), surgeon.
[6] Possibly Ernest Augustus, King of Hanover (1771-1851) and his wife Queen Frederica (1778-1841), who ruled Hanover from 20 June 1837.

the old mansion – we shall not fail to inquire after you. My Sister desires to be remembered very kindly to you.[7]

Yours ever
S Rogers

I have looked again at Macaulay & with fresh admiration; - but if Bacon sinned against Essex, Macaulay has done him the honour to follow his example; — for with what an energy, with what a zeal has he argued against <u>one of his greatest Benefactors</u>![8]

[7] Ramsgate, coastal town in Kent; Maidstone, Tonbridge and Royal Tunbridge Wells are equidistant between London and Ramsgate. Rogers's sister, Sarah.
[8] Thomas Babington Macaulay, Baron Macaulay (1800–1859), historian, essayist, and poet. Macaulay's 'great benefactor' with whom he has argued is possible Lord Lansdowne (1780-1863), his political patron. The comparison is with Francis Bacon (1765-1626) who helped prosecute his former patron Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex (1565-1601) for high treason.
Rogers admired Macaulay's *The Life and Writings of Francis Bacon* (1837).

85. Samuel Rogers to James Clark, [after 1837][1]

My dear Sir James Clark

Any afternoon you & yours will be most welcome, when it suits you best.

Yours very sincerely
Saml Rogers

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.3218, f.67. James Clark was created Baronet in 1837, so the MS dates from after this time.

86. Samuel Rogers to [Mary] Shelley, [30 June 1838][1]

My dear M[rs] Shelley

Pray, pray let me have the great pleasure of seeing you & Miss Robinson at 10 ½ o'clock to meet M[rs] Norton & Moore.[2] If I hear nothing from you to the contrary, I shall venture to expect you.

Yours ever
S. Rogers

St James's Place
Monday.

---

[1] University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Abinger C.49 ff.84-85. Dated by a possible corresponding event in Shelley's journals on 30 June 1838: 'Rosa & I breakfasted with Rogers today', although there is no mention of Norton or Moore (*The Journals of Mary Shelley,* ed. Paula R. Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), p.552).

[2] Possibly Rosa Robinson (d.1878) who lived with Shelley from 1838; Caroline Norton (1808-1877), author and social reformer; Thomas Moore, q.v. letter 8.

87. Samuel Rogers to [Mary] Shelley, 6 August 1838[1]

Aug.st 6, 1838

Dear Mrs Shelley

A thousand thanks for what I am very sure will give me so much pleasure.[2]

The thing in the world I love best in literature is biography – is a life & the life of a man of letters. Johnson's lives were published when I was a school-boy – with a school-boy's pence I bought them & the very volumes are to this hour as dear to me as any thing in my house.[3]

I shall be delighted to see you – But may I mention Thursday instead of to-morrow? If I have nothing to the contrary, I shall venture to expect you on Thursday. The gate will fly open to the words. I have been out of town & am going again – but only for a day or two.

Till then farewell.

Yours very truly

S Rogers

---

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Abinger C.49 ff.120-122. The envelope (f.122r) is addressed to: 'Mrs Shelley'.
[2] The editor Dionysus Lardner's *Lives of the Most Eminent Literature and Scientific Men*, which Shelley contributed a majority of essays to in the 1830s. Shelley may have given copies to Rogers.
[3] Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* (written from 1779–81).

88. Samuel Rogers to [William Ewart] Gladstone, 14 December 1838[1]

My dear Gladstone,

Many, many thanks for your Volume![2] I cannot say how much I admire it in every line & how far I am inclined to go with you - but when I tell you that I am descended on my mother's side from One, who, though a favourite scholar of Busby, became a stout nonconformist, & that my father, when he married, was presented to my mother's house, you will not wonder if I am not so zealous in the good causes as I ought to be.[3] Still I feel the pull of your arguments; & perhaps on a second perusal I shall confess myself a Convert; but whatever I may be in that respect, of this I am very sure that I shall always love & admire you as much as ever.[4]

S. Rogers

St. James's Place
Decr 14, 1838

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.44356, f.145. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.
[2] In 1838, Gladstone published *The state in its relations with the Church*. In this, Gladstone emphasised how Whiggism (as many of its supporters were non-conformists) did not believe in the connection between the state and the Church of England. He wanted to give the Church of England more power in political affairs. As a dissenter, Rogers disagreed with Gladstone's religious politics but was a supporter of many of his other political positions.
[3] A reference to the phrase 'a Busby amongst schoolboys': Richard Busby (1606-1695), a schoolmaster and Royalist, drove opponents to resign. Rogers's mother was related to the clergyman and author Philip Henry (1631-1696), who was a biographer of Busby. One of these 'good causes' is the belief that the church has a place within state politics.
[4] Rogers is not arguing solely about religious conversion here, but rather that the Church of England could play a greater role in British politics.

89. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], 25 December 1838[1]

Xmas Day, 1838

My dear Lord Holland

The more I reflect upon it, the more I am convinced it could not be – for a gentler, meeker spirit does not exist than Cary's. He may write with warmth under a wrong impression – he may turn ⚹, when he thinks himself trodden upon – but, if ever I know a man, & I have seen him in all weathers, he cannot be what you say he was thought to be.[2]

His case is a very cruel one. He laboured long in a subordinate place; &, when a vacancy occurred, an under-servant was put over him. The measure was perhaps a just one - I cannot say it was not so – but the reason could not be explained to him, though it was a reason to create an interest for him in every generous mind — & he gave in his resignation.[3]

Well, there he was – a man of great merit, great learning & genius, & in his old age without bread. Such indeed was his merit, such his learning & genius, & such the cruelty of his case, that the Trustees went out of their way, opposite as most of them were to him in political sentiments, & recommended

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.122-123. MS has been published in *Clayden 1889*, Vol. 1, pp.173-174.
[2] Henry Francis Cary (1772-1844), translator.
[3] In June 1837 the British Museum chose Antonio Panizzi for the position of keeper of printed books, despite Cary's position as assistant keeper from 1826. Rogers had written to the Trustees to support Cary's candidacy for the post.

him as a proper object of bounty to the Government — And yet nothing has been done.[4]

Was the pension-list Committee averse to such pensions? Quite otherwise, if I may believe Lord John.[5]

But he has written a Sonnet: What had not Montgomery done, when Peel gave him what he did?[6] If Dryden or Johnson were now alive & pouring fourth Toryism or bigotry, would not I serve them if I could?[7]

Cary has now quarrelled with me, as much as such a spirit can quarrel – he thinks I have been his enemy; but that shall not make me less anxious to render him any service in my power – but power I have none.

Yours ever

S. Rogers

He is now slaving for the Booksellers.[8]

---

[4] Cary resigned his post as assistant keeper of printed books in October 1837. The Trustees of the museum recommended him for a pension, and Rogers wrote to Lord Melbourne in August 1838 (the Prime Minister) to further plead Cary's case.

[5] Lord John Russell, 1st Earl Russell (1792-1878), Home Secretary from 1835 to 1839.

[6] James Montgomery (1771-1854), poet. In 1835 Robert Peel had recommended that the government provide Montgomery an annual pension of £150, which was granted,

[7] John Dryden (1631-1700), poet, and Samuel Johnson (1709-1784), author and lexicographer. It was alleged that the Trustees of the British Museum had not promoted Cary due to his political opinions.

[8] Cary was working on a translation of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, which was eventually published in 1844. He was also writing articles for periodicals such as the *London Magazine*.

90. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox], [4 February 1839][1]

Dear Lord Holland

I am very sorry indeed to find that I have given you so much trouble & uneasiness. – The Volume contains autograph letters of Thurlow, Burke, Scott &c also a diary of Crabbe's in his own hand & knowing the Value his sons set upon it & being conscious that it was intrusted to me with no leave to let it out of my hands, my conscience flew in my face when I found it among other things loose on the table.[2] I reproached myself (not you) for I then reflected that I had not properly apprized you of these circumstances. M^{r} Allen, in whose hands it is, will tell you rest.[3]

Yours very truly
Sam^{l} Rogers

Hastings
Monday Night

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, ff.135-136. Dated by the British Library. F.136v is inscribed to 'The Right Hon^{ble} Lord Holland, D. Burlington, London'.
[2] An unidentified autograph album. Edward Hovell-Thurlow, 2nd Baron Thurlow (1781-1829, poet; Edmund Burke (1729/30-1797), politician and author; Walter Scott (see 'Biographies of Correspondents'); George Crabbe, q.v. letter 52.
[3] John Allen, q.v. letter 24.

91. Samuel Rogers to [Richard Colley Wellesley], 12 November 1839[1]

My dear Lord,

Many, many thanks! I discovered your letter among others on my table when I returned home last night from the Continent; & I need not say, I am sure, with what delight I read the Verses.[2] They are beautiful, & well worthy of a better age. May they bring again into favour a Tree which on its arrival here was hailed universally, but has, I think, most unaccountably been neglected of late.[3]

You mention it as flourishing on the banks of the Thames. Was it not first planted there by one of our poets? I mean Mr. Pope. Lord Oxford, if I am not much mistaken, says so.[4]

Yours ever sincerely
S. Rogers

St. James's Place
Novr 12, 1839

---

[1] British Library, Add.MS.37312, f.180. This letter has been previously published in *The Wellesley Papers*, Vol. 2, ed H. Jenkins (London: Herbert Jenkins Ltd, 1914), p.351. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.
[2] Wellesley had just completed his edition of Latin poems, which was privately published in Latin in 1840 and 1841: *Primitiae et Reliquiae*, Richard Colley Wellesley (London: Privately printed, 1840).
[3] This is a reference to the poet Alexander Pope's (1688-1744) Willow Tree, which he reputedly planted in the garden of his riverside villa on the Thames. There is debate as to whether it was the first Weeping Willow planted in the country. Wellesley was an admirer of Pope's works and bought Apsley house in London in 1807 from the 3rd Earl Bathurst, whose ancestral home Cirencester Park had been frequented by Pope.
[4] Edward Harley, 2nd Earl of Oxford and Mortimer (1689-1741), patron of the arts and friend of Pope.

92. Samuel Rogers to [Richard Colley Wellesley], 27 December 1839[1]

St James's Place
Decr 27, 1839

My dear Lord,

Again must I break in upon you to thank you - But you have perplexed me beyond measure; for I am really at a loss to say which I admire most - the Latin or the English Poem.[2]

Surely no tree was ever before so honoured; &, if she continues to weep after this, she must indeed be fond of grief.[3]

As to the Laurel, she must be dying of jealousy, & would most certainly desert your brows, if she could.[4]

Yours very sincerely
S. Rogers

---

[1] British Library, Add.MS.37312, f.203. MS previously published in *The Wellesley Papers*, Vol. 2, ed H. Jenkins (London: Herbert Jenkins Ltd, 1914), p.358. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.
[2] Wellesley had just completed his edition of Latin poems, see letter 91.
[3] This is a reference to the weeping willow tree which the poet Alexander Pope had supposedly planted at his villa in Twickenham, and about which Wellesley had written.
[4] The Laurel (bays) is traditionally used to crown poets.

93. Samuel Rogers to Joanna [Baillie], 1839[1]

My dear M^rs^ Joanna

I need not say how happy I shall be to dine with you & your Sister next week & on Wednesday next at 5 o clock, as you give me the choice of the day & the hour.

I shall be delighted also to render you any service I can in so important a matter – but why leave it to another when you can act for yourself?

I am ~~also~~ of the same age – the same year, if we are right in our calculation, had the honour & glory of producing us both; & why should we not be our own executors as far as we can?

I am at this moment as busy as I can be in correcting the Press, determined to leave as little as possible for other people to do.[2]

Yours ever
S. Rogers

St James's Place
Wednesday, the 14th, 1839.

[1] The Royal College of Surgeons of England, MS0014/7, Hunter-Baillie Letters, Volume 4.1, 1704-1923, Letter 232. The recipient has been identified by the Royal College of Surgeons.
[2] This could be a reference to a new edition of Rogers's *Poems* published in 1839 by Edward Moxon (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').

94. Samuel Rogers to [Richard Colley Wellesley], 21 March 1840[1]

St James's Place
Mch 21, 1840

My dear Lord,

I cannot tell you with what impatience I opened the Volume or with what delight I read it. - If such has been the fruit of your boy-hood & of your leisure hours in after-life, may you long continue to exercise your talent - to demonstrate to the World, that He who for the benefit of so many millions had in turn held two Sovereignties in regions so remote from each other, could preserve to the last his love for classical literature & his excellence in every branch of it.[2]

I remain
Your obliged
& faithful servt
S. Rogers

[1] British Library, Add.MS.37312, f.279. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.
[2] Wellesley's collection of Latin poems *Primitiae et Reliquiae* (1840), see letters 91 and 92.

95. Samuel Rogers to [Catherine] Gladstone, 4 June [1841][1]

My dear Mrs. Gladstone,

How surprized you must have been last night to receive my note which crossed yours on the road - but, having had no favourable tidings from Lady Lyttleton, I resolved to try for you again.[2] - And now after all, having been disappointed of some I wished you to meet & thinking I can arrange more to your mind, let me release you from your promise & request you to come & dine with me on Friday or Saturday in next week instead of to-morrow.

I have written with the same request to your sister & I hope & trust with success — but <what> must you both think of me? -

If things are cross next week, come you must in the week that follows, for I will not, cannot let you off altogether & in the mean time you must console me by breakfasting with me as in old times, I cannot say in happier. Pray settle with her!

Yours ever,

S. Rogers

St. James's Place
Friday, June 4

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.46227, f.11. Dated by the British Library, and is consistent with the chronology of Rogers's acquaintanceship with the Gladstones. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.

[2]Catherine's sister Mary (1813-1857), wife of George William Lyttelton, 4th Lord Lyttelton (1817-1876).

96. Samuel Rogers to Robert Peel, 22 October 1841[1]

Paris, Oct^{r} 22, 1841.

My dear Sir

Pray accept my best Acknowledgements for the Honour you do me. Unworthy as I am, I cannot decline the offer.

Yours ever most truly
Sam^{l} Rogers

To the Right Hon^{ble} Sir Robert Peel. Bar^{t}.

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.40492, f.99. This is a response to Peel's request of 14 October 1841, foliated alongside this letter: 'Will you permit me to submit your honoured name to the Queen to be a member of the Royal Commission which it is intending to institute for the purpose of considering whether the Construction of the new Houses of Parliament can be made, by means of their internal Decoration, conducive to the Promotion of British Art?' (Add. MSS, 40492, f.98).

97. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Crabb Robinson], [29 October 1842][1]

Pray, pray come & meet my nephew Sam[l] Sharpe at breakfast to-morrow morning, if you are disengaged.[2]

Yours sincerely

Sam[l] Rogers

Saturday.

I wish you joy on the pension. –[3]

Send me answer.

---

[1] Dr Williams's Library, Henry Crabb Robinson Collection, I.ii.13. Letter is addressed to: 'H. C. Robinson Esq / Russell Square'. Exact date is indicated by postmark. Attached is a one penny stamp.

[2] Samuel Sharpe (1799-1881), Rogers's nephew and Egyptologist, encouraged in his scholarly pursuits by Rogers.

[3] Crabb Robinson did not receive a civil-list pension until 1862, this pension mentioned is unidentified.

98. Samuel Rogers to John Herschel, 29 December 1842[1]

My dear Sir John Herschel

Many, many thanks for a beautiful Poem which I have read again & again; & I need not say how highly on every account I shall value it – for its own sake & the Writer's.[2]

Schiller must already have visited you in your dreams to thank you.[3]

Yours ever
S. Rogers

St James's Place
Dec^{r} 29, 1842

The Generous must not wonder if those to whom they give, ask for more; & may I venture to solicit for a Song that was once sung, I believe, by some "faery elves" in the tube of a Telescope which had revealed to your Father what for ages had remained unknown to ~~the great of~~ Mankind?[4]

---

[1] Royal Society, Royal Society Library, HS14.418.
[2] Alongside his work on astronomy, Herschel also wrote poetry, but it was not until 1866 that he published a translation of Homer's *Iliad*.
[3] Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805), poet and philosopher.
[4] This is a reference to the forty-foot long telescope through which Herschel's father, William Herschel (1738-1822), discovered the planet Uranus.

99. Samuel Rogers to [Joanna Baillie], [1842][1]

My dear Friend

I am entirely of your mind. The poems you point out are beautiful as are also some of the stanzas elsewhere. But how to proceed or what plans to propose; it is difficult to say. The booksellers would give nothing for any poetry with an unknown name in this age - & I would rather advance ~~not the advance~~ the money than ask any body for a Guinea at any time.[2] If a small sum would relieve her in her present necessity, she shall have it, & may I beg the favour of you to leave a little about it, that she may do nothing in a hurry. Twenty or thirty Pounds I will advance immediately - & she may refund when it suits her, or not at all for you have really given me a great interest in her - & she must be much distressed, not receiving the salary due to her.[3]

Pray remember me to M^iss^ Agnes & believe me to be[4]

Yours ever

Sam^l^ Rogers

21 Marine Parade

---

[1] The Royal College of Surgeons of England, MS0014/7, Hunter-Baillie Letters, Volume 4.1, 1704-1923, Letter 162. I have dated this to reflect Baillie's correspondence regarding Dorothea Primrose Campbell (see footnote 3).

[2] Rogers paid his publishers up front for the editions of his poems, so the cost to the publishers was not dependent on the success of the sales of poetry.

[3] Possibly Dorothea Primrose Campbell (1792-1863), poet and novelist. In 1842, the banker and philanthropist Angela Burdett-Coutts, Baroness Burdett-Coutts (1814-1906) wrote to Baillie to solicit financial aid for Campbell (22 March [?1842], *Further Letters of Joanna Baillie,* ed. Thomas McLean (Madison, Teaneck: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2010), p.216).

[4] Agnes Baillie (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').

Brighton

I am just now here with my Sister, who desires me to say every thing for her to you both.[5] – So also my Niece. In a week I shall return & try to see you – Just now I have a bad Cold – but the sun shines on sea & land.

[5] Rogers's sister Sarah (q.v. letter 1) also knew the Baillies.

100. Samuel Rogers to [John Herschel], 6 January 1843[1]

Janʸ 6, 1843.

My dear Sir

The Verses are arrived & pray accept my best thanks for your ready compliance with myy request. To possess them has long been my wish & with religious care shall they be preserved in testimony of your kindness & of my regard for them.[2]

I am ashamed to think of my remissness concerning the books & thought they had <gone> long ago. Lady Herschel does me great honour in thinkᵍ of them. Pray remember me very particularly to Her & believe me to be[3]

Yours most sincerely
S. Rogers

My Sister desires me to say every thing for her to you both. She says how glad she should <be> if you were once more her Neighbours.[4]

---

[1] Royal Society, Royal Society Library, HS14.419.
[2] Unidentified.
[3] Margaret Herschel (1810–1884), John Herschel's wife; books unidentified.
[4] Sarah Rogers q.v. letter 1.

101. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Richard Vassall Fox or Elizabeth Vassall Fox], [c.1843][1]

I need not say how welcome your letter was, when so full of news. As you say nothing of your health, let me hope you are better. We set out the day after I was in South St. slept at Rochester & came on to Canterbury where we slept two nights very comfortably.[2] At Broadstairs I found Dickens on the wing – but we passed two Evenings together[3]. I made no allusion to the coming Work, nor did he – but he talked with much distaste of the Americans in general.[4] The Bishop is still in very delicate health. I found him with two or three young men like chaplains & a charming lady about 30 – perhaps a Sister.[5]

My only acquaintance at Ramsgate is a very lively one, Lord Strangford; he is there with a sick daughter.[6]

Lady Essex is at Dover & returns to town, I believe, this week.[7]

I have twice heard from my Sister at Wiesbaden. There is nobody she knows there, but she seems to like it. Her niece dines at the table d'hote & brings many a quiet little conversation from it. The D^{ss} of Hamilton & Lady Powerscourt are in the Hotel.[8] L^{y} Grenville is travelling about with Miss

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.51647, f.163. Dated by BL. Fragment of MS.
[2] Canterbury, Kent.
[3] Broadstairs, Kent, where the novelist Charles Dickens (see 'Biographies of Correspondents') spent time writing.
[4] Dickens visited America in 1842. Dickens was working on *Martin Chuzzlewit* (published 1843), in which the protagonist travels to America.
[5] Possibly Connop Thirlwall (1796-1875), Bishop of St David's, who visited Ramsgate for his health and was an acquaintance of Rogers.
[6] Percy Clinton Sydney Smythe, q.v. letter 72.
[7] Catherine Capel-Coningsby, Countess of Essex (1794-1882), actress.
[8] Probably Susan Euphemia Douglas-Hamilton, Duchess of Hamilton (1786-1859); probably Elizabeth Frances Charlotte Jocelyn, Countess Powerscourt (1813-1844), known as Countess Powerscourt from 1836 to 1846, when she became Marchioness of Londonderry.

Phillimore & is delighted.[9] Dr Skey is [~~xxxx~~] <with> my Sister. He came from Paris to join her.[10]

The moment I decide when to return, I will write & I can say truly I shall[11]

[9] Anne Grenville, Baroness Grenvillle (1772-1864), wife of the Whig Prime Minister William Wyndham Grenville, q.v. letter 32. 'Miss Phillimore' unidentified.
[10] Frederic Carpenter Skey (1798–1872), surgeon.
[11] MS finishes here.

102. Samuel Rogers to [William Ewart] Gladstone, 20 April 1844[1]

St. James's Place
April 20, 1844

My dear Mr Gladstone,

Many, many thanks for your excellent criticisms![2] It is a strange thing to say - but, if we may judge from experience, perhaps the best vehicle on our language for a translation of verse is prose. He who doubts it has only to open his Bible. At least, right or wrong, such was always my opinion; & who could wish the stories of Joseph & of Ruth to be otherwise than they are? or who would be rejoice if the Iliad & the Odyssey were so translated? I once asked Porson to attempt it & he seemed to like the idea, but said that it would be a labour of ten or twelve years.[3] Bobus Smith said once to me, "Let us, each of us, take a passage for an exercise," but we proceeded no further.[4]

Yours ever
Samuel Rogers

The second best vehicle surely is blank verse. Those in Rhyme (Dryden's excepted) I cannot read. What would be the story of Joseph in Mr. Pope's couplets?[5] But I have already said a line on the subject in the Edinburgh Review. It is in an article

---

[1] British Library, Department of Manuscripts, Add.MSS.44361, f.104. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.
[2] Unidentified.
[3] Richard Porson (1759-1808), classical scholar.
[4] Robert Percy ('Bobus') Smith (1770-1845), writer and judge, friend of Lord Holland and George Canning (q.v. letter 5).
[5] John Dryden (1631-1700), poet; Alexander Pope q.v.

on Dante, compounded of Mackintosh & myself - I forget in what year, not having read it since it appeared.[6]

[6] Possibly a review of Shee's *Elements of Art* published in the *Quarterly Review*, Vol. 3, No.6, in 1810. John Hoppner and Rogers have been identified as possible authors, *Quarterly Review Archive*, ed. Jonathan Cutmore <https://www.rc.umd.edu/reference/qr/index/06.html> [accessed 10/01/2016]

103. Samuel Rogers to [Robert Peel], 19 June 1844[1]

My dear Sir

A pension being at the disposal of the Government in consequence of the death of my Friend Campbell, may I venture, if not too late, to recommend M^{r} Tytler the Historian.[2] His merits cannot be unknown to you, nor are they, I believe, unknown to Her Majesty; & I hope you will excuse me – indeed I am sure you will, if I presume to give my humble testimony in his favour.[3]

Sincerely yours
Sam^{l} Rogers

St James's Place
June 19th, 1844

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.40547, f.92. Peel responded on 20 June 1844, foliated alongside this letter, stating: 'The death of Mr Campbell does not give the Crown any increased favour of granting a Pension', and suggests that Rogers wait until the 'amount appropriated' for pensions is renewed the following year (BL Add.MSS.40457 f.95).
[2] Patrick Fraser Tytler (1791-1849), historian.
[3] Queen Victoria (1819-1901), Queen from 20 June 1837 to 22 January 1901.

104. Samuel Rogers to [Mary Shelley], 7 July 1844[1]

St James's Place

You were no sooner <gone> than I came to myself - & you may conceive from your own feelings what were mine. — Again & again did I take up my pen – but what could I say – ho, I could not write – for what could I say – how could I account for forgetfulness so strange – so unaccountable – I can only say Forgive me – I would come to you & say so but my spirit fails me – & I can only say – Come, if you can, if you will, on Sunday morning – at 10 ½ - M^{rs} Norton comes & the Gordons come & by your silence shew that all is forgiven.[2]

Yours ever
S. R.

Don't write but come if you can.

July 7. 1844

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Abinger C.50 ff.41-42. Recipient identified by the Bodleian Library.
[2] Caroline Norton, q.v. letter 86; 'Gordons' unidentified.

105. Samuel Rogers to [Mary Shelley], 30 July 1844[1]

What can I say to you in return for the honour you have done me – an honour so undeserved? – If some feelings make us eloquent, it is not so with others - & I can only thank you from the bottom of my heart & assure you how highly I shall value & how carefully I shall preserve the two precious Volumes on every account – for your sake & for their own.[2]

Ever yours most sincerely
S. Rogers

St James's Place
July 30, 1844

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Abinger C.50 ff.43-44. Recipient identified by Bodleian Library.
[2] Probably Mary Shelley's *Rambles in Germany and Italy, in 1840, 1842, and 1843* (London: Edward Moxon, 1844).

106. Samuel Rogers to [Arthur Wellesley], 30 September [1844][1]

My dear Lord

May I avail myself of your kindness & come on Wednesday or Thursday to pass a day or two at Walmer?[2] If it interferes with any of your Arrangements I shall console myself with the hope of being more fortunate another time.

Ever most sincerely yours
Sam[l] Rogers

Monday, Sept 30
Albion Hotel, Broadstairs

[1] University of Southampton, Wellington Papers 2/123/132, f.117. In a different hand (possibly Wellington's) is written on the back of the letter: '1844 Septr 30 / From S. Rogers / Proposing a visit to Walmer Castle'.
[2] Wellington was Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports and his official residence was Walmer Castle in Kent.

107. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter Brougham], 5 March 1845[1]

Pray accept my grateful Acknowledgements for the Honour you have done me, an Honour so undeserved. When I began to read what you have written, I expected only to be amused, to be interested, & to be led on through uncounted hours from one incident to another as I was formerly in my youth; for I have long ceased to be much of a novel-reader. But I soon came to higher things – to such as make us wiser & better; & I cannot tell you how much I shall value the Volumes as long as I live.[2]

I should have <written> long ago to thank you, as I do from my heart, if I had known to whom I was addressing myself; but I can now wait no longer - & write I must, though I can do my feelings no justice.

Yours very sincerely
Samuel Rogers

St James's Place
March 5, 1845

---

[1] The National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 21,754.
[2] Although it does not mention Rogers, probably Brougham's *Lives of Men of Letters & Science, Who Flourished in the Time of George III* (London: Charles Knight, 1845).

108. Samuel Rogers to [Samuel Wilberforce], [after 1845][1]

My dear Bishop of Oxford

Can you do me the great favour to come & meet Miss Coutts at breakfast tomorrow at 10 o'clock?[2]

Yours sincerely
S. Rogers

Wednesday

[1] University of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Dep. C. 372, ff.22-23. Wilberforce was Bishop of Oxford from 1845 to his death in 1857.
[2] Angela Burdett-Coutts, q.v. letter 99.

109. Samuel Rogers to [Samuel Wilberforce], 31 July 1845[1]

My dear Sir

I need not say, I am sure, how delighted I should be to make one of such a break-fast party under your Roof on Saturday next & very sorry I am that a promise to remain here a day or two longer will deprive me of so great a pleasure.

Sincerely yours
S. Rogers

Nuneham[2]
July 31, 1845

[1] Bodleian Library, MS. Wilberforce c.8, ff.18-19. Recipient identified by the Bodleian Library.
[2] Nuneham Courtenay, a village near Oxford.

110. Samuel Rogers to [Adam] White, 7 July 1846[1]

Dear Mr White

You & yours will be welcome to see the Pictures any day after two o'clock & may I beg you to come & breakfast with me on Sunday the 11th July at 10 o'clock.[2] I change the day as I am going out of town.

Yours truly
S. Rogers

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.10306, f.112. Another hand has written at the top of f.112r 'Note from S Rogers Esq'. This letter has been transcribed by another person, possibly White.
[2] Probably a request to view items in Rogers's extensive art collection.

111. Samuel Rogers to Robert Peel, 3 October 1846[1]

My dear Sir Robert Peel

I need not say, I am sure, how happy I should be to wait upon Lady Peel & yourself at any time; & on Wednesday next I will not fail to come & to arrive in good time.[2]

Yours ever most sincerely
Samuel Rogers

St. James's Place
Oct^{r} 3, 1846

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.40547, f.182.
[2] Julia Peel (1795-1859), Robert Peel's wife.

112. Samuel Rogers to [Maria] Grey, [1846?][1]

My dear Lady Grey

How can I thank you as I would for your glad tidings? May they be as happy as they deserve to be & we cannot wish them more. Pray, pray remember me very affectionately to them. The only draw-back upon our happiness is that we shall lose them both so soon & that the Atlantick will be so soon between us.[2]

I am delighted to think that you are coming! Pray remember me to L^{d} G. & your dear Sister -[3] & pray believe me to be

yours as ever
S. Rogers

St James's Place

The Statue is still as much envelloped as ever.[4] Your Autumn must be very beautiful. How often in my day-dreams I lose myself in your glens![5]

---

[1] University of Durham, Papers of Maria, 3rd Countess Grey, GRE/C/220/1. MS dated by University of Durham. Envelope to the letter reads: 'The Countess Grey / Belgrave Sq'.
[2] Unidentified individuals.
[3] Henry Grey, 3rd Earl Grey (1802-1894), politician; unidentified sister.
[4] Unidentified.
[5] Howick Hall, Northumberland, ancestral seat of the Earls Grey, had extensive grounds.

113. Samuel Rogers to [Maria] Grey, 16 August 1847[1]

My dear Lady Grey,

What can I say to you both – How can I thank you for your great kindness!

Glad indeed should I be to come to you wherever you were - & above all to be with you where I have passed so many happy days.[2]

Unfortunately – to my great vexation I am under a necessity to be far away in September – But I shall often think of you & often wish myself ~~wish myself~~ with you in the Glen & on the Seashore & in a Garden so full of flowers.

Pray remember me very affectionately to Lord Grey & to the L G's when you see them. & believe me to be[3]

yours <u>ever</u>

S. Rogers

Nuneham
Augst. 16, 1847.

[1] University of Durham, Papers of Maria, 3rd Countess Grey, GRE/C/220/7. MS dated by University of Durham.
[2] Probably Howick Hall, Northumberland, seat of the Earls Grey.
[3] The Greys had no children, so possibly other family members.

114. Samuel Rogers to [William George Spencer Cavendish], 15 September 1847[1]

My dear Lord Duke,

If in your kindness you wish me to pay you, a little visit at Chatsworth, I can say & say truly that I shall be delighted to find myself there; & if I hear nothing from you to the contrary I shall make way to endeavour to be with you on Monday the 27th of Septr.[2]

Many, many thanks for thinking of me & so kindly!

Yours most sincerely
S. Rogers

St James's Place
Septr 15. 1847

[1] Chatsworth House, Devonshire Mss., Chatsworth, CS2/245/0. Addressee clearly identified by references to Chatsworth and folio.
[2] Chatsworth House, Derbyshire, the seat of the Dukes of Devonshire.

115. Samuel Rogers to [Catherine] Dickens, 21 September 1848[1]

My dear Mrs Dickens

I am very sorry to leave you & yours so soon & so abruptly. Pray remember me very affect^{y} to Carlo Trio & to your Sister.[2]

Yours sincerely
Sam^{l} Rogers

Sept 21
1848

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.581, f.7.
[2] Possibly a nickname for Charles Dickens (see 'Biography of Correspondents'); Georgina Hogarth (1827-1917), the sister of Catherine Dickens, who lived with the Dickens family from 1842.

116. Samuel Rogers to [Peter] Cunningham, 7 July 1849[1]

My dear Mr Cunningham,

Many, many thanks for the delightful & most interesting Volumes which I have just received.[2]

I need not say, I am sure, <how> highly, while I live, I shall value them on every account — for your sake & for their own. Pray do me the great favour to come & breakfast with me to-morrow or Monday, or Tuesday next.

Yours very sincerely,
Samuel Rogers

22 St James's Place
Sat^{y}. July 7
1849

[1] University of Edinburgh Library, La.II.646/214.
[2] Peter Cunningham, *Handbook of London*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1849). It included quotations and anecdotes from Rogers about famous people of London, such as Sheridan and Byron.

117. Samuel Rogers to [John Herschel], 13 April 1850[1]

Saturday, April 13,
1850

May I venture to express in return my veneration & my affection for Him who has instructed & delighted me for so many years & who has now presented me with a Volume so far above me that I can only read it & admire it in silence?[2]

Pray accept them from me, my dear Friend; & pray remember me, most affectionately, to Lady Herschel & to Miss Herschel & to one & all of your dear Family.[3]

When chance brings them to London & they have a thought & a minute to spare, perhaps, if he is still here, they will think of one who can never forget them & & who would be so happy to see them once more.

Yours ever & ever
Samuel Rogers

22, St James's Place
London.

I see now & then our old friends near the heath at Hampstead & you are not forgotten when we meet.[4]

---

[1] Royal Society, Royal Society Library, HS14.420.
[2] Unidentified.
[3] John and Margaret Herschel (1810-1884) had nine daughters and three sons, although the youngest daughter had not been born by this date.
[4] Individuals such as James Henry Leigh Hunt (1784-1859), who lived near Hampstead Heath.

118. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter Brougham], 9 September 1850[1]

22 St James's Place
Sep. 9th. 1850

My dear Friend

How I envy you & yours at this moment and if I had the wings of a swallow instead of directing my flight to Egypt, I should be with you to morrow at your night-hospital board, but alas my wings have been clypt – though much better I must content myself with a flight to Brighton; - yes, Luttrell is married and his wedding cake is now on my table, an excellent lady who for some-time as kept a boys school in Brompton Square and has deserted his leisure hours to him is now his wife. I like her much for I have passed much time with them both during his illness.[2]

I have often said to her that I should like to succeed him when she was released from the engagement, Pray remember me most affectionately to the Ladies you mention and believe me to be yours ever

S. R.

How right Metternich is in his judgement[3]

---

[1] The National Archives, Brougham Papers, 21,646.
[2] Henry Luttrell, q.v. letter 24.
[3] Klemens von Metternich, q.v. letter 18. After his resignation from his position in 1848, Metternich moved to England. By 1851 he had returned to Vienna.

119. Samuel Rogers to [Sophia Baillie], 25 February 1851[1]

22 St James's Place

My dear Friend

What can I say to you & Mr Baillie for your great great kindness? I can only thank you both in the fullness of my heart & only express my wish that you may always meet with so much consolation as I have received from you.[2]

On Saturday I took Miss Coutts with me to Hampstead & as she wished to see your Aunts I took her there desiring her to conceal from them that I was come least they might catch cold from a desire to do what they have done more than once in their kindness.[3]

Her words were these, I was so glad that you took me for how sorry I should have been not to have seen her again. Her last words were when I left her "I look forward to the time that I shall be released with more pleasure than to anything else". & I thought to myself may I look as peacefull & happy as you do at this moment.

Fare well my dear friend. & believe me to remain most gratefuly & affectionately

ever yours

Samuel Rogers

Feby. 25. 1851.

---

[1] The Royal College of Surgeons of England, MS0014/6, Hunter-Baillie Letters, Volume 4.1, 1704-1923, Letter 117. F.118r is addressed: 'To / Mrs. Baillie'

[2] This letter was written in the aftermath of the death of Joanna Baillie (q.v.) on 23 February 1851.

[3] Angela Burdett-Coutts, q.v. letter 99.

My love to your Aunt Agnes when you see her.[4]

[4] Agnes Baillie (see 'Biographies of Correspondents').

120. Samuel Rogers to [Agnes Baillie], 26 February 1851[1]

My dear friend

Pray forgive me if I break in upon you at such a moment but write I must to tell how much you are in my thoughts & how much I grieve – not for her who is at rest – but for you who have lost her.[2] May He who alone knows what is best for us – who gives & who takes away, support & bless you under this great affliction!

Yours most affectionately
Samuel Rogers

February 26. 1851.
22 St James's Place

[1] The Royal College of Surgeons of England, MS0014/6, Hunter-Baillie Letters, Volume 4.1, 1704-1923, unnumbered letter. The likely recipient of this letter is Joanna's sister Agnes. At the bottom of this page in pencil is written: 'M^{rs} A Baillie, death of Joanna Baillie'.
[2] Joanna Baillie (see 'Biographies of Correspondents') died on 23 February 1851.

121. Samuel Rogers to [Catherine Gladstone], 27 October 1851[1]

My Dear Friend,

Pray allow me to thank you in the fullness of my heart for your kind & beautiful letter.

Happy should I be to contribute my mite & follow you in any little influence I may have elsewhere. There is a good Angel* among us whose heart & hand are always open but she is now alas at Vienna & if she has not already contributed I will not fail to send her an extract from your letter to me.[2]

Pray give my love to one & all under your roof, not forgetting Mr Gladstone & a little lady I can never forget.[3]

Yours most affectionately
Samuel Rogers

*Miss Coutts

Harewood House
Brighton
Oct 27 1851

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.46227, f.59. Recipient identified by the British Library. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.
[2] The 'angel', as identified by the asterisk, is Angela Burdett-Coutts, q.v. letter 99. She was a close acquaintance of both Catherine Gladstone and Rogers.
[3] William Ewart Gladstone (see 'Biographies of Correspondents) and possibly his daughter Agnes (1842-1931), Mary (1847-1927) or Helen (1849-1925).

122. Samuel Rogers to [Catherine Gladstone], 19 December 1851[1]

Decemb 19 1851

My dear friend,

Pray forgive me if for a moment when you have so many duties to perform, I break in upon you with my subscription such as it is, for your charity.[2]

Pray remember me affectionately to Mr. Gladstone & assure him how much he is now in my thoughts & how much I honour him for his noble conduct the Neapolitan business, may his volume live for ever, a monument of their disgrace & his virtue![3]

Yours very affectionately
Samuel Rogers

Harewood House
Brighton

---

[1] British Library, Add.MSS.46227, f.60. Recipient identified by the British Library. It has not been possible to carry out a final check on the transcription of this letter.

[2] Possibly the House of Charity in Soho, which was founded in 1846. The House supported families when the financial provider was in the workhouse. William Ewart Gladstone was one of the first members.

[3] This is a reference to William Ewart Gladstone's *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen, on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government* (London: John Murray, 1851). These letters were written as a reaction to Gladstone's visit to the Vicaria prison in Naples and addressed to George Hamilton-Gordon, 4th Earl of Aberdeen (1784-1860), who became Conservative Prime Minister in 1852.

123. Samuel Rogers to [Henry Peter Brougham], 13 March 1855[1]

March 13, 1855

My dear Lord

M^r^ Ottley having informed me that he is a Candidate for the Office now vacant in the British Museum, I beg leave to recommend him to your notice, & to say – that, according to the opinion of much better Judges than myself, (many of whom are dead & gone) he is, in all that related to the Arts, the most learned man in this or perhaps any other Country, & that the Appointment would give Credit to the Institution at Paris, & Rome & Vienna; so highly is he esteemed in those Cities.[2]

Yours very truly
Sam^l^ Rogers

Agreeably to your desire I inclose a letter which I have received from M^r^ Sams.[3]

I remember a very interesting collection of Egyptian Antiquities some years ago at Paris, for which the King of Prussia by Humboldt's advice gave afterwards, if I was rightly informed, Five Hundred Pounds.[4] This now offered to you is

---

[1] The National Archives, The Brougham Papers, 44,825. Letter from Joseph Sams (1784-1860), bookseller and collector of antiquities, enclosed.
[2] Unidentified by the British Museum as there is not an individual on the Lists of the Establishment for 1854-1857 under the name Ottley, but could possibly be a relation of William Young Ottley (1771-1836), art historian and keeper of prints and drawings at the British Museum from 1833.
[3] Joseph Sams.
[4] Frederick William IV (1795-1861), King of Prussia from 7 June 1840 to 2 January 1861;
Alexander von Humboldt (1769-1859), Prussian geographer, naturalist, traveller and scientist.

much more ample & curious, but certainly in its marketable value, I should think, much over-rated by its Possessor.

Undated Letters

124. Samuel Rogers to [Walter Scott][1]

My dear Sir

The bearer of this Letter is a very worthy ingenious man, an Engraver of this City, - He is setting out for Edinburgh & all that he requests of me is that I would give him a line to some Man of Eminence once there, mainly that it may be said of him that he is no Adventurer, & that he means honourably to fulfill the Contract he is making with the public.[2] I cannot therefore do better than address a line to you on the subject & I know you will have the good nature to excuse it. I should instantly have refused it, if I had any idea, that it would give you a moments trouble. He never ate [⁎] of my bread, nor do I mean that he should come with any claim [⁎] <upon> your Hospitality. It is only that, you may say, if referred to, what I have written.

I lament exceedingly that I saw no more of you when you were in town – I had much to say - & I had besides a little account to settle with you, which I presume I may now adjust with Murray the bookseller.[3]

Ever yours most sincerely,
Sam^{l} Rogers

London
June 4th

---

[1] National Library of Scotland, MS.3876, f.73.
[2] Unidentified.
[3] The publisher John Murray (1778-1843).

125. Samuel Rogers to [Mary] Somerville[1]

My dear Mrs Somerville

Can you & Dr Somerville & the young Ladies do me the great favour to breakfast with me on Thursday next the 18.th at 10 oclock?[2] I need not say how delighted I shall be to see you, it is so long since you have done my threshold the honour to cross it.

Yours very sincerely
Samuel Rogers

22 St James's Place
Tuesday

[1] Bodleian Library, Dep. C. 372, ff.22-23.
[2] Mary Somerville's husband, William (1771-1860), and their daughters.

126. Samuel Rogers to [Thomas] Lawrence[1]

My dear Lawrence

Many, many thanks for your kind Enquiries & good Wishes. I am better, tho' still in captivity; but hope soon to be free & shall be happy to visit Venice with you next Monday. Alas, my Interest with the managers is so small as with the Ministers; but Shylock must take his turn on the stage & his turn is come.[2]

Ever yours very affectionat^{y}
Sam^{l} Rogers

Monday Morn^{g}

[1] Royal Academy, Lawrence Papers, LAW/3/110. The delivery postmark is for London, 16th July. It is also features an unreadable mileage postmark. F.294v is addressed to: 'Sir Tho^{s} Lawrence / Russell Square'.
[2] 'Managers' could be theatre managers: Rogers and Lawrence possibly went on a theatre trip to see *The Merchant of Venice*.

127. Samuel Rogers to [Francis Douce][1]

My dear Sir

Accept my best thanks for your very handsome present – You have more than repaid me & I am very proud & happy to have been the means, in any way, of rendering such a Collection <as yours> more complete.[2]

Yours very sincerely
Sam[l] Rogers

Sunday Morn[g]

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Douce D.31, f.87. Francis Douce has been identified as the recipient by the Bodleian Library.
[2] Douce was a renowned collector and antiquary. According to the *ODNB*, 'The motive behind Douce's various collections was to illustrate the manners, customs, and beliefs (especially those of the common people) of all ages'.

128. Samuel Rogers to [Francis Douce][1]

Dear Sir

I am going to take a liberty with you, but I know that when I assign the reason, you will forgive it. Tomorrow is the Apposition Day at St Paul's School & I have long promised a friend of mine to be present at the first performance of his Son.[2] I will therefore with your leave postpone our visit to M^{r} Hope's till Saturday, when, if I hear nothing to the contrary, I shall take it for granted, that all will proceed as before <appointed>.[3] I have seen M^{r} [Coomber] on the subject & he will call upon you on Saturday morn^{g}.[4]

Yours very truly
Sam^{l} Rogers

Wednesday Morn^{g}
St James's Place

---

[1] Bodleian Library, MS Douce D.31, ff.83. Francis Douce identified as the recipient by the Bodleian Library. The names Hope and Coomber in brackets have been difficult to identify as they were close to the foliated margin of the letter.
[2] St Paul's School, London. The Apposition tradition was introduced as a way to assess the quality of the teaching staff at the School, particularly with regards to religious views and intellectual learning.
[3] Probably one of the art collectors and brothers Henry Hope (1774-1839) or Thomas Hope (1769-1831).
[4] Unidentified.

129. Samuel Rogers to [Charles] Dickens[1]

My dear Mr Dickens

A pleasure in prospect is not amiss, but a present pleasure is not to be despised; & I have heard so much in favour of a bird in the hand, that I never let him go, when I can help it. In this instance however, I must content myself with what I can get.

May I venture to trouble you with the gigantic parcel for Ramsgate?[2]

By the way, I am going myself at two o clock – Cannot you or your parcel & also mine bear me Company?

Don't trouble yourself to write if I receive nothing from you, I shall conclude you will take your own course.

Yours very truly
S. Rogers

Friday.

[1] Wisbech Museum, WISFM : 2003.35.282.
[2] Rogers and Dickens spent time at Ramsgate together. The parcel could possibly be volumes or manuscripts of works, as Dickens spent time writing his novels at Ramsgate.

130. Samuel Rogers to [William Lowther], [after 1827][1]

My dear Lord

If it will not interfere with any of your Engagements or those of Lady Lonsdale I shall be very happy indeed to visit upon you on Thursday next for a few days & I am commissioned by M[r] Wordsworth & his Son, the Clergyman, who is now on a visit at Rydal, <to say> that they will, if encouraged by you, accompany me.[2]

If we receive no answer, we shall venture to come.

Yours very truly
Sam[l] Rogers

Low Wood[3]
Tuesday

---

[1] Cumbria Archives, D/LONS/L1/2/60/44.Recipient identified by Cumbria Archives.
[2] William Wordsworth and his son John Wordsworth (1803-1875), who became an Anglican clergyman in 1827; Rydal Mount in Kendal, Cumbria, the home of William Wordsworth from 1813 to 1850.
[3] Low Wood, Windermere, Cumbria.

131. Samuel Rogers to [Thomas Phillips][1]

My dear Sir

Many, many thanks! I had a very great pleasure indeed in introducing M^{r}. Moore to you the other day, as I knew I was complying with his wishes as well as yours.

With regard to my portrait I am at a loss what to say about it.[2] My Publisher, I am very sure, were he consulted on the subject, would protest loudly against all further proceedings; & perhaps with reason. I have heard of some Poet who prefixed his ugly unmeaning face to his book, & it instantly stopped the sale. Nobody took any farther interest in his tuneful complainings.

Yours very truly
Sam^{l} Rogers

I have been out of town, or I should certainly have answered your kind note sooner. —

---

[1] National Portrait Gallery, Heinz Library and Archive, MS 96.. On the manuscript is written: 'Presented by G. S. 19th April 1872', and in a different hand is added '(no date & no direction)'. Recipient identified by the National Portrait Gallery.

[2] The National Portrait Gallery dates Thomas Phillips's portrait of Samuel Rogers as c.1817. However, in a transcript of a catalogue of the works of Thomas Phillips held by the NPG (MS96) this painting is not accounted for. The date and commissions for Phillips's portraits of Byron, Wordsworth, Southey and Blake (among many others whom Rogers knew) are detailed in full, but there are not any references for the portrait of Rogers, possibly due to Rogers's aversion to having his likeness reproduced, hence this letter remains undated.

Biographies of Correspondents

Baillie, Agnes (1760–1861)

The older sister of Joanna Baillie (q.v.) Agnes knew Rogers and his sister Sarah.

Baillie, Joanna (1762-1851)

Playwright and poet. Rogers was on close terms with Baillie, sharing advice on writing and moving in similar social and literary circles.

Baillie, Sophia (1771-1845)

Sophia married Dr Matthew Baillie in 1791 and Joanna became a close friend of his sisters Agnes (q.v.) and Joanna (q.v.).

Beckford, William (1760-1844)

Novelist, builder and art collector. Beckford's major works include *Vathek: An Arabian Tale* (1781). Rogers and Beckford were acquaintances with shared interests in art and literature, and both travelled.

Brockedon, William (1787-1854)

Painter and inventor. Brockedon published *Illustrations of the Passes of the Alps by which Italy Communicates with France* 'issued in twelve parts between 1827 and 1829, and published in two well-received volumes in 1828 and 1829' (ODNB). Brockedon wrote a commentary on Rogers in *Finden's Illustrations of the Life and Works of Lord Byron* (1834).

Brougham, Henry Peter, 1st Baron Brougham and Vaux (1778-1868)

Whig politician, founding member and leading light of the *Edinburgh Review* (1802), and Lord Chancellor from 1830 to 1834 in Earl Grey's administration. Brougham and Rogers shared political as well as literary circles, including Holland House.

Cadell and Davies (publishing house)

Thomas Cadell (1742-1802), bookseller and publisher, whose business was based at 141 Strand, London. Cadell published Edward Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1788), Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling* (1771), the poetry of Robert Burns, and, in 1792, Rogers' *The Pleasures of Memory*. Thomas Cadell retired in 1793 and the business was taken over by his son Thomas Cadell the younger (1773-1836) and his associate William Davies (d.1820). Rogers continued to publish with them and by 1816, when the 19th edition of *The Pleasures* appeared, over 22,000 copies of it had been sold. Cadell and Davies also published Rogers' *Jacqueline* with Byron's anonymous *Lara* (1814), *Human Life* (1819), *Italy* (1822, 1828 and 1830). Davies died in 1820, and Cadell alone published Rogers's last original collection, *Poems*, in 1834. Rogers had a great deal of control over his published writings: he commissioned the numbers of copies for each print run, and chose the format of the published volume including illustrations. Although Rogers's personal reason for this is unclear, it may have been due to his own financial intelligence and also his favouring of authorial autonomy.

Cavendish, William George Spencer, 6th Duke of Devonshire (1790-1858)

Whig politician and patron of the arts. Rogers had known Cavendish's father, the 5th Duke of Devonshire (1748-1811) and the 6th Duke's first wife Georgiana Cavendish (1757-1806) as they moved in Whig circles. Rogers visited Cavendish at Chatsworth House in Derbyshire and also at Devonshire House in London. From their correspondence, it is clear that their acquaintance was a formal one, and Rogers's opinion of the 6th Duke's refurbishments of Chatsworth House was not an esteemed one, as he wrote to his sister Sarah in 1826: 'Chatsworth is really little worth seeing, though full of Canova (Clayden, Vol. 1, p.431).

Clark, Sir James (1788-1870)

Physician. He was made a baronet and physician-in-ordinary to the Royal family after Queen Victoria's accession in 1837. There is little record of their relationship, although it is likely the Clark was one of Rogers's physicians during Rogers's later life in London.

Cumberland, George (1754-1848)

Art critic, painter. Cumberland gave his support to a range of artists, including Sir Thomas Lawrence (1769-1830), President of the Royal Academy, and William Blake (1757-1827). Cumberland and Rogers moved in the same artistic and social circles.

Cunningham, Peter (1816-1869)

Literary critic and author whose works included the *Handbook of London* (1849). Cunningham and Rogers

were both Trustees of the National Gallery and served on the Board at the same time.

D'Arblay, Frances (1752-1840; née Burney)

Author, whose novels included *Evelina* (1778), *Cecilia* (1782) and *Camilla* (1796). Rogers knew her father, the musician and author Dr Charles Burney (1726-1814), and shared similar literary circles. Rogers and D'Arblay were good friends and D'Arblay regularly dined at his house at St James's Place alongside other female authors such as Letitia Barbauld.

D'Israeli, Isaac (1766-1848)

Writer and literary critic. His works include *An Essay on the Manners and Genius of the Literary Character* (1795), and *Miscellanies, or, Literary Recreations* (1796). Rogers and D'Israeli had shared interests in literature and antiquarianism and many mutual acquaintances, including Francis Douce (q.v.). Rogers also knew D'Israeli's son, the Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli (q.v.).

Denman, Maria (1808-1861)

Artist and lithographer. Denman was the sister-in-law, adopted daughter and executor of the estate of the sculptor John Flaxman (1755-1826). Denman gave many of Flaxman's works to University College, London, where they could be publically displayed, and was involved in the sale, distribution and public presentation of his works. Rogers was involved in the sale and distribution of these works as he had been a patron of University College, London.

Dickens, Catherine (1815-1879)

Wife of the novelist Charles Dickens (1812-1870) (q.v.) and author of the cookery book *What Shall we have for Dinner*? (1851). Catherine Dickens dined with Rogers both with and without her husband.

Dickens, Charles (1812-1870)

Novelist. Rogers knew Dickens well, and spent time with him at seaside resorts such as Ramsgate as well as in London.

Disraeli, Benjamin (1804-1881)

Conservative politician and Prime Minister from February to December 1868, and again from February 1874 to April 1880. Rogers was a friend of Disraeli's father Isaac D'Israeli. There is little evidence of their relationship being more than a distant acquaintanceship.

Douce, Francis (1757-1834)

English antiquarian and Keeper of Manuscripts at the British Museum 1799–1811. Douce shared Rogers's interests in collecting and antiquarianism and they had many friends in common, including Isaac D'Israeli (q.v.).

Fox, Elizabeth Vassall, 3rd Baroness Holland (1771?-1845)

Society and political hostess. Fox was initially married to Sir Godfrey Webster (1747-1800) and had two children who survived infancy. In 1794 she met Henry Richard Fox, 3rd Baron Holland (1773-1840) (q.v.) in Naples, and was divorced by Webster in June 1797, after she gave

birth to Fox's son Charles Richard Fox in 1796 (d.1873). After marrying Fox in July 1797, they had five further children together, with two surviving childhood (Henry Edward Fox, 1802-1859, and Mary Elizabeth, 1806-1891). Rogers knew Lady Holland and her family extremely well, passing much time with them at Holland House. However, Lady Holland's relationship with Rogers varied and, as the correspondence from Rogers to Lady Holland shows, Rogers gossiped to Lady Holland about other people but also to other people about the Hollands.

Fox, Henry Richard Vassall, 3rd Baron Holland (1773-1840)

Whig politician and Hispanophile. Holland House contained an extensive library which attracted visitors from different political and social circles. Rogers was a good friend to Lord Holland, providing him with information on draft of works and manuscripts, as well as sharing his own poetry and work with Holland in turn.

Gladstone, Catherine (1812-1900)

Philanthropist and political hostess. Catherine married William Ewart Gladstone (q.v.) in 1839 who became four time chancellor of the exchequer and four times Prime Minister between 1852 and 1894. As well as managing her own household and those of her brother and sister, she also supported charities and causes that she appealed to Rogers's financial assistance for.

Gladstone, William Ewart (1809-1898)

Liberal politician, four times Chancellor of the Exchequer and four times Prime Minister between 1852 and 1894.

Gladstone started his political career as a Tory, and Rogers was witness to the changes of both the political landscape but also of Gladstone's political principles, that eventually led to the foundation of the Liberal Party after Rogers's death, in 1859. Rogers's biographer Clayden remarks that Rogers was Gladstone's 'personal friend' (Clayden, Vol. 2, p.387).

Godwin, William (1756-1836)

Philosopher and novelist. Godwin was renowned for his political treatise *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793), and Rogers owned a copy of Godwin's *Life of Chaucer* (2 vols., London: T. Davison, 1803). Rogers referred to Godwin as a 'man of Genius' and lent him money at his request (as did many of Godwin's acquaintances). Rogers was involved in Godwin's financial affairs, which included asking Lord Byron to send the money received for copyrights of his works from Murray to Godwin instead, as Byron would not accept money for his work in 1816.

Grey, Charles, 2nd Earl Grey (1764-1845)

Whig politician and Prime Minister. Grey was Prime Minister from 22 November 1830 to 16 July 1834, during which time the Great Reform Bill of 1832 was passed. Rogers was a friend and ardent supporter of Grey, particularly of his reform policies.

Grey, Maria, Countess Grey (d.1879)

Wife of Whig politician Henry George Grey, 3rd Earl Grey (1804-1870) (q.v.). Rogers would have known of and possibly met with Maria Grey through her husband.

Herschel, Sir John Frederick William (1792-1871)

Mathematician and astronomer. Rogers was on very good terms with Herschel, his wife and their children.

Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound, Mary, Countess of Minto (1786-1853)

Political hostess. Wife of the diplomat and Whig politician Gilbert-Elliot-Murray Kynynmound, 2nd Earl of Minto (1782-1859). Rogers probably met her in Rome in 1821, as he stated in a letter to his sister Sarah that 'Lady Minto is a very agreeable and pretty woman' (Clayden, Vol. 1, p.331).

Lawrence, Thomas (1769-1830)

Painter and portraitist. Lawrence was elected President of the Royal Academy in 1820, and retained the position until his death in 1830. Rogers and Lawrence shared a passion for art, and Lawrence created a pencil portrait of Rogers which was used as an engraving in editions of his poetry.

Lockhart, John Gibson (1794-1851)

Conservative, editor, critic, a reviewer in the *Quarterly Review*, and biographer of Sir Walter Scott. Lockhart was also the son-in-law of Sir Walter Scott (q.v.). They were friends through Scott, and Lockhart asked Rogers for recollections of Scott for his biography.

Lowther, William, 1st Earl of Lonsdale (1757-1844)

Conservative politician and patron of the arts. Lonsdale paid back the debt his family owed William and Dorothy

Wordsworth's father in 1802, and Lonsdale became a lifelong friend to the Wordsworths. Rogers visited Lonsdale's estates.

Mackenzie, Henry (1745-1831)

Novelist and writer. Mackenzie is best known for his sentimental novel *The Man of Feeling* (1771). Rogers met Mackenzie at the philosopher Adam Smith's house in Edinburgh in 1789, and their correspondence is some of the earliest surviving letters from Rogers to an individual not of Rogers's family.

Masquerier, John James (1778-1855)

Artist. Masquerier lived in France and was one of the few artists to be given permission to make life drawings of Napoleon. *Napoleon Reviewing the Consular Guard in the Court of the Tuileries* was one of his most famous works. Rogers was friends with Masquerier and his wife Rachel (unknown dates, married in 1812), and shared his love of art, French culture and travel.

Miller, William (1796-1882)

Engraver. Miller engraved some of the impressions that Turner had painted for Rogers's *Poems* (1834), which undoubtedly increased Turner's popularity and also cemented Rogers's reputation as a leading popular poet due to the marketability of including illustrations alongside his work.

Moxon, Edward (1801-1858)

Publisher and poet. Moxon's friendships with Charles Lamb and Rogers enabled him to become a publisher, as

Moxon borrowed £500 from Rogers in 1830. Moxon's move to Dover Street in 1833 to set up a bookshop as well as a publishing house was encouraged by Rogers. Moxon published Lamb's *Album Verses* (1830), Wordsworth's (q.v.) six volume edition of his poems (1836-1837), Tennyson's (q.v.) poetry (1855-1869), and the first edition of Percy Shelley's posthumous poems (1839).

Peel, Sir Robert (1788-1850)

Conservative politician and Prime Minister from December 1834 to April 1835 and August 1841 to June 1846. Peel had a keen interest in the arts and commissioned a portrait of Rogers alongside sculptures and portraits of other leading poets such as Southey, Wordsworth and his Harrow School-fellow Lord Byron.

Phillips, Thomas (1770-1845)

Portraitist. Philips undertook portraits of notable individuals, including politicians and poets such as Byron, Blake, and Rogers. Phillip's portrait of Rogers (c.1817) is similar to his portrait of Blake, and brings attention to the forehead of the subject, highlighting the themes of memory and imagination, which are key subjects in Rogers's works.

Robinson, Henry Crabb (1775-1867)

Diarist and journalist. Robinson's acquaintances were spread across several generations, and included Wordsworth, Coleridge, Thomas Clarkson and Lord Byron. His diaries, kept from 1811 to his death in 1867, provide invaluable descriptions of meetings with Rogers,

particularly in the later years where Rogers's health and age kept him house-bound, relying on individuals like Robinson to visit for company.

Scott, Sir Walter (1771-1832)

Poet and novelist. Scott was one of the bestselling poets and novelists of the nineteenth century, his works including the Waverly Novels, written between 1814 and 1832, and poems such as 'The Lay of the Last Minstrel' (1805), 'Marmion' (1808) and 'The Lady of the Lake' (1810). Rogers first met Scott in London in 1803, and although Scott did not share Rogers's politics, they did share similar social and literary circles.

Shelley, Mary (1797-1851)

Novelist. Rogers had known Shelley's parents William Godwin (1756-1836) (q.v.) and Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) as they lived in Newington Green, where Rogers had grown up. Shelley was famous for her novel *Frankenstein* (1818), and Rogers's engagements with Shelley from the 1830s onwards demonstrate that he was an important figure in inviting her into literary circles, helping to establishing her son, and also negotiating the publication of her late husband Percy Bysshe Shelley's poems in 1839.

Somerville, Mary (1780-1872)

Mathematician. Somerville studied science and later was both influenced by and an influence on her second husband William Somerville (1771-1860). She published scientific papers and knew the scientists John Herschel and Charles Babbage, who shared Rogers's social circles.

Southey, Robert (1813-1843)

Poet. Southey was Poet Laureate from 1813 to 1843. He was a friend of Wordsworth (q.v.) and Coleridge's brother-in-law. His works include *Madoc* (1805) and *Wat Tyler: A Dramatic Poem* (1817), although one of his bestselling and longest enduring legacies was his biography of Lord Nelson, published in 1813. Despite Southey's Conservative politics, his literary interests and his particular interests in Hispanism, made him an occasional visitor to Holland House. Southey knew Rogers through Wordsworth as well as his Holland House contacts.

Tennyson, Alfred (1809-1892)

Poet. After the Poet Laureate Wordsworth (q.v.) died in 1850, Rogers was offered the Poet Laureateship by Prince Albert, but Rogers declined due to his age and health and suggested Tennyson instead, who was Poet Laureate from 1850 to his death. Tennyson had first met Rogers in 1833, and although Tennyson was not initially impressed by Rogers, Rogers did like Tennyson's poetry and their friendship developed in the 1840s.

Wellesley, Arthur, 1st Duke of Wellington (1769-1852)

Army Officer, Conservative Politician and Prime Minister (1828-1830). According to the *Table Talk of Samuel Rogers* (1856), Rogers and Wellington went walking together and met at events as well as privately (pp.288-289).

Wellesley, Richard Colley, 1st Marquess Wellesley (1760-1842)

Conservative politician. Wellesley was the elder brother of the Duke of Wellington and despite his political differences with Rogers, they shared a keen interest in literature, particularly classical literature. Wellesley privately printed his collection of Latin verses *Primitiæ et Reliquiæ* in 1840, and sent them to Rogers to critique.

White, Adam (1817-1878)

Scottish naturalist and zoologist. During the 1840s and 1850s, White was responsible for publishing lists of the specimens in the British Museum. Rogers probably knew White from his connections at the British Museum.

Wilberforce, Samuel (1805-1873)

Bishop of Oxford 1845-1873. Wilberforce was the son of the politician William Wilberforce (q.v.), and was offered the Bishopric of Oxford by Robert Peel (q.v.), who knew both Wilberforce and his father. Rogers probably knew Samuel Wilberforce through the shared political and religious interests of his father William Wilberforce.

Wilberforce, William (1759-1833)

Politician and slavery abolitionist. Wilberforce introduced and campaigned for many political reforms which Rogers shared.

Wilkie, David (1785-1841)

Painter. Rogers probably met Wilkie at Holland House, where Wilkie was drawn due to his love of art and also to meet potential patrons who could commission works from him.

Wordsworth, Dorothy (1771-1855)

Writer. Although Wordsworth was not published during her lifetime, Rogers encouraged her, as he believed that her journals held interest to the public as travel narratives. Wordsworth was friends with Rogers and his sister Sarah, and probably met Rogers in 1801 when Rogers met her brother William (q.v.) in the Lake District.

Wordsworth, William (1770-1850)

Poet. Wordsworth was Poet Laureate from 1843 to his death in 1850, and was known for his works *Lyrical Ballads* (first published 1798) and *The Excursion* (1814). Wordsworth probably met Rogers in 1801, when Rogers travelled to the Lake District with his friend Richard Sharp. Wordsworth asked Rogers for advice on publishing collections of his work, as he knew that Rogers was experienced with and knowledgeable about the publishing and bookselling market.

Appendix:
Archival Locations of Samuel Rogers's Letters

United Kingdom

National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth:
4 letters to Edward Copleston
1 letter to A. Hayman
1 letter to Sarah Rogers
1 letter to unidentified

Woodhorn Museum and Northumberland Archives, Ashington:
1 letter to unknown

Chatsworth House, Bakewell:
2 letters to 6th Duke of Devonshire

Bath Central Library, Bath:
1 letter to unknown

National Motor Museum, Beaulieu:
1 letter to Frances Kemble

Birmingham Reference Library, Birmingham:
1 letter to unknown

University of Birmingham, Birmingham:
1 letter to Edward Ash
1 letter to Samuel Sharp
1 letter to unknown

Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge:
1 letter to Thomas Grenville
1 letter to Mr Mackay
1 letter to Sarah Rogers
1 letter to I. F. Tuffer
1 letter to unknown

Girton College, Cambridge:
1 letter to Josiah Parkes
4 letters to Nora G. Dunlop
3 letters to Jane Catherine Gamble

Trinity College, Cambridge:
5 letters to J. W. Blakesley
12 letters to Dawson Turner

2 letters to Jane Catherine Gamble
1 letter to William Whewell
1 letter to William Wordsworth

University of Cambridge, Cambridge:
1 letter to Mrs Graham
1 letter to Abraham Hayward

Cumbria Record Office, Carlisle:
2 letters to 1st Earl of Lonsdale
1 letter to Henry Lowther

Cheltenham Ladies' College, Cheltenham
1 letter to unknown

University of Durham, Durham:
4 letters to Countess Grey
4 letters to 2nd Earl Grey
2 letters to 3rd Earl Grey

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh:
1 letter to Lady Chantais
1 letter to James Clark
1 letter to Lady Denman
1 letter to Catherine Dickens
1 letter to Edward Ellice
2 letters to Mrs Ellice
1 letter to Mrs Hope
1 letter to John Kenyon
2 letters to John Gibson Lockhart
1 letter to Violet Lockhart
4 letters to Henry Mackenzie
1 letter to William Miller
3 letters to Lady Minto
1 letter to Sarah Rogers
3 letters to Mr Rutherford
2 letters to Mrs Rutherford
6 letters to Walter Scott
1 letter to Walter Sneyd
1 letter to Adam White
1 letter to Samuel Wilberforce
1 letter to David Wilkie
10 letters to unknown

Scottish Record Office, Edinburgh:
2 to Charles Eastlake
2 to unknown

University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh:
1 letter to Peter Cunningham
1 letter to unknown

University of Exeter, Exeter:
1 letter to Edwin Landseer

Glasgow District Libraries, Glasgow:
1 letter to unknown

Strathclyde Regional Archives, Glasgow:
1 letter to John Maxwell

Wordsworth Trust, Grasmere:
1 letter to Edward Quillinan
1 letter to Rotha Quillinan
1 letter to James Spedding
2 letters to unidentified
1 letter to Francis Wrangham
2 letters to Christopher Wordsworth
1 letter to Dorothy Wordsworth
36 letters to William Wordsworth

Harrow School, Harrow on the Hill:
1 letter to unknown

University of Lancaster, Lancaster:
1 letter to George Jones

Brotherton Library, Leeds:
8 letters to George Crabbe, Jr
1 letter to Thomas Pringle
1 letter to Julia Robinson
5 letters to unknown

Leeds District Archives, Leeds:
1 letter to unknown

Leicestershire Record Office, Leicester:
7 Letters to Henry Halford

Tennyson Research Centre, Lincoln:
1 letter to Alfred Tennyson

Liverpool City Libraries, Liverpool:
2 letters to unknown

Liverpool Record Office, Liverpool:
1 letter to George Cumberland
1 letter to Catherine Dickens
1 letter to Sarah Rogers
1 letter to Sutton Sharpe
2 letters to unknown

University of Liverpool, Liverpool:
1 letter to Lady Esher
1 letter to Count Zamoyski

British Library, London:
2 letters to John Allen
1 letter to Charles Babbage
2 letters to Lady Georgiana Bathurst
1 letter to Francis Bennoch
1 letter to Lady Bligh
1 letter to Lord Byron
2 letters to G. S. Cantley
5 letters to George Cumberland
1 letter to Maria Denman
10 letters to Alexander Dyce
1 letter to Henry Ellis
1 letter to Caroline Fox
1 letter to Henry Fox (4th Lord Holland)
4 letters to Catherine Gladstone
2 letters to William Ewart Gladstone
1 letters to Anne Graham
9 letters to Lord Grenville
3 letters to Thomas Grenville
1 letter to John Cam Hobhouse
76 letters to 3rd Lady Holland
17 letters to 3rd Lady Holland
55 letters to 3rd Lord or Lady Holland
1 letter to Lord Lansdowne
1 letter to Harriet Lee
1 letter to James Mackintosh
1 letter to Lord Morley
1 letter to Anthony Panizzi
1 letter to Francis Palgrave
1 letter to Thomas Park
1 letter to Robert Peel
1 letter to Mr Phillips
1 letter to Frederick Reynolds
3 letters to Sarah Rogers
1 letter to the Royal Literary Fund

3 letters to Richard Wellesley
6 letters to unknown

Dr Williams's Library, London:
17 letters to Henry Crabb Robinson
1 letter to James Masquerier
1 letter to Rachel Masquerier

Geological Society, London:
5 letters to Robert and Charlotte Murchison

London Metropolitan Archives, London:
3 letters to Lady Jersey (withdrawn by the current Lord Jersey in 2009)
1 letter to Miss Seward
1 letter to unknown
1 letter to B. Wall

Hackney Archives Department, London:
1 letter to Duchess of Sutherland
1 letter to unknown

India Office Library and Records, London:
1 letter to Mountstuart Elphinstone
1 letter to Horace Hayman Wilson

National Gallery, London:
1 letter to Treasurer of the National Gallery

National Portrait Gallery, London:
1 letter to William Brockedon
1 letter to Thomas Phillips

Public Record Office, London:
2 letters to Lord John Russell

Royal Academy of Arts, London:
1 letter to Keightley Archibald
6 letters to Sir Thomas Lawrence

Royal College of Physicians, London:
1 letter to unknown

Royal College of Surgeons, London:
1 letter to Agnes Baillie
5 letters to Joanna Baillie
2 letters to Sophia Baillie

Royal Society, London:
3 letters to Sir John Herschel

Society of Antiquaries, London:
1 letter to Mrs Lock

Swiss Cottage Public Library, London:
4 letters to William Beattie

University College, London:
11 letters to 1st Baron Brougham and Vaux
1 letter to Joseph Parkes

Victoria and Albert Museum, London:
1 letter to Sir Edwin Landseer

Kent Archives Office, Maidstone:
1 letter to Lady Mahon
1 letter to Sir Robert Peel
1 letter to Lord Stanhope

John Rylands University, Manchester:
1 letter to Catherine Dickens
3 letters to unidentified
1 letter to Robert Wallis

Derbyshire Record Office, Matlock:
1 letter to Mrs Arkwright
1 letter to Sarah Siddons

Norfolk Record Office, Norwich:
1 letter to Edward Moxon

University of Nottingham, Nottingham:
2 letters to Countess of Charleville

Bodleian Library, Oxford:
1 letter to William Beckford
1 letter to Clara Burdett
1 letter to Frances D'Arblay
2 letters to Benjamin Disraeli
1 letter to Cadell and Davies
1 letter to Isaac D'Israeli
2 letters to Francis Douce
1 letter to Lady Dunmore
1 letter to William Gilpin

1 letter to William Godwin
1 letter to Countess of Guildford
1 letter to Sir Robert Hay
3 letters to Harriet Mellon
1 letter to Edward Moxon
1 letter to Thomas Phillips
1 letter to Samuel Jackson Pratt
1 letter to Mary Shelley
1 letter to Mary Somerville
6 letters to unknown
2 letters to Samuel Wilberforce
1 letter to William Wilberforce

New College, Oxford:
3 letters to Catherine Smith

Somerville College, Oxford:
1 letter to Harriet Lee

Taylor Institution, Oxford:
1 letter to Prince Albert

Newstead Abbey, Ravenshead:
1 letter to Mr P. Du Cane
1 letter to Mr Robinson

Berkshire Record Office, Reading:
2 letters to Lady Emily Pusey

University of Reading, Reading:
21 letters to Thomas Moore
1 letter to unknown

Saffron Walden Museum, Saffron Walden:
1 letter to unidentified

Harrowby Manuscripts Trust, Sandon:
1 letter to Lady Bentinck
1 letter to Mr O'Brien
1 letter to Susanna Ryder, Countess of Harrowby
1 letter to Frances Ryder, Countess of Harrowby

University of Southampton, Southampton:
1 letter to Duke of Wellington

Staffordshire Record Office, Stafford:
1 letter to Lord Hatherton

1 letter to Duchess of Sutherland

Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, Stratford-upon-Avon:
2 letters to Lady Georgiana Chatterton
1 letter to Joseph Archer Crowe
1 letter to Charles James and Lucia Mathers

Torquay Museum, Torquay:
1 letter to unknown

Warwickshire Record Office, Warwick:
4 letters to Miss Dormer

Wisbech and Fenland Museum, Wisbech:
1 letter to Charles Dickens

Castle Howard, York:
1 letter to Lady Parke
1 letter to Miss Parke

International

Harry Ransom Center, Austin:
1 letter to Garrick Club
1 letter to Gould
1 letter to Mrs Sheridan
1 letter to Robert Southey
1 letter to J. Taylor

Houghton Library, Harvard:
1 letter to Eliza Aders
1 letter to James Brown
1 letter to Lord Byron
1 letter to James Freeman Clarke
3 letters to Benjamin Robert Haydon
1 letter to Lord Holland
1 letter to Francis Jeffrey
1 letter to Thomas Lawrence
1 letter to George Livermore
1 letter to Sir Charles Lyell
1 letter to Mrs Milman
3 letters to Edward Moxon
1 letter to Anthony Panizzi
1 letter to Bryan Waller Procter
1 letter to J. & J. Robins, Merchants
1 letter to Sarah Rogers

1 letter to Robert Monsey Rolfe
1 letter to Sarah Siddons
2 letters to Charles Sumner
10 letters to unknown
1 letter to Daniel and Caroline Webster
1 letter to Willis

Beinecke Library, New Haven:
1 letter to Beau Brummell
1 letter to Mrs Greg
1 letter to Henry Hallam
32 letters to John Mitford

Morgan Library, New York:
1 letter to Sir Henry Bunbury
1 letter to Sir George Beaumont
1 letter to Lady Bell
1 letter to Cadell and Davies
1 letter to Mrs Collins
1 letter to Francis Chantrey
3 letters to Catherine Dickens
1 letter to Lady Dover
1 letter to Mrs Ferguson
1 letter to Catherine Gladstone
1 letter to Mr Horner
1 letter to Mr Hughes
1 letter to Mrs Jameson
1 letter to Anthony Panizzi
1 letter to Edward Quillinan
1 letter to Lord Spencer
5 letters to unknown
1 letter to W. Wilkins

New York Public Library, New York:
1 letter to Elizabeth Aders
3 letters to Alexander Baring, Lord Ashburton
2 letters to Anne Baring, Lady Ashburton
1 letter to Mr Austen
1 Letter to Joanna Baillie
1 letter to Lady Bessborough
1 letter to John Bingham
1 letter to Lucy Bingham
1 letter to Henry Edward Bunbury
2 letters to Charles Burney
1 letter to Lord Byron
1 letter to Alexander D’Arblay
1 letter to Cadell and Davies

1 letter to Augustus Wall Callcott
1 letter to William Ellery Channing
1 letter to Miss Courtenay
1 letter to Mr Crowe
8 letters to Maria Denman
1 letter to George Dyer
1 letter to Charles Lock Eastlake
2 letters to Lady Georgiana Fane
1 letter to Edwin Wilkins Field
1 letter to Mary Field
1 letter to Charles Finch
2 letters to Anne Flaxman
1 letter to John Flaxman
1 letter to Mary Ann Flaxman
1 letter to 4th Lord Holland
2 letters to Samuel Carter Hall
1 letter to William Hayley
1 letter to Abraham Hayward
1 letter to Louisa Hope
1 letter to Mr Horner
1 letter to Mrs Horner
1 letter to Mr Howell
1 letter to Washington Irving
2 letters to Anna Brownell Jameson
1 letter to Maria Jekyll
1 letter to Mr Jones
1 letter to Mrs Kean
1 letter to John Kenyon
1 letter to Lady Caroline Lamb
1 letter to Edwin Henry Landseer
1 letter to Lady Lansdowne
1 letter to Lord Lauderdale
4 letters to Harriet Lee
1 letter to Adam Lodge
1 letter to Lady Augusta Lowther, Countess of Lonsdale
1 letter to Mrs Malcolm
1 letter to Thomas Maude
1 letter to George Miller
1 letter to William Miller
1 letter to Mary Ann Milman
3 letters to Lady Morgan
1 letter to Emma Isola Moxon
1 letter to John Murray
1 letter to Anthony Panizzi
1 letter to Bryan Waller Procter
1 letter to Lady Theodosia Rice
5 letters to Daniel Rogers

14 letters to Martha ‘Patty’ Rogers
3 letters to Mary Rogers
1 letter to Sam Rogers
24 letters to Sarah Rogers
1 letter to Thomas Rogers
1 letter to Joseph Severn
2 letters to Samuel Sharpe
2 letters to Lady Mary Shee
3 letters to Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley
1 letter to Esther Jane Sheridan
1 letter to Robert Southey
1 letter to Mrs Stanhope
1 letter to Lady Elizabeth Stuart
1 letter to Thomas Noon Talfourd
25 letters to unknown
1 letter to Mrs Walsh
1 letter to Mrs Warre
1 letter to William Edward West
1 letter to David Wilkie
1 letter to William Wordsworth
1 letter to Archbishop of York
1 letter to Madame Zorzi

Bibliography

Primary Materials

Manuscripts

Bodleian Library, Oxford, Abinger c.10, c.14, c.48-50; Autogr. b.10, c.24, d.43; Beckford c.34; Dep. c. 372; Dep. Eng. Hist. c. 1074/1-2; Hughenden; Douce D.31; Eng. Lett. C.63, E. 116; Montague D.18; Montague D.5; Wilberforce c.8, d.14

British Library, London, Add.MS.37312; 40492; 40547; 44356; 44361; 46227; 51646; 51647

Chatsworth House, Derbyshire, Devonshire MSS

Cumbria Archive Service, D/LONS/L1/2/60/44

Dr Williams's Library, London, Henry Crabb Robinson Collection, I.ii.13; Masquerier Album

University of Durham, Earl Grey Family Papers

Edinburgh University Library, La.II.646

Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin, Robert Southey Collection, Container 2.6

Lincoln Central Library, Tennyson Research Centre, Letter 5050

Liverpool Central Library, Hornby Library, Synge Collection

University of Liverpool Libraries, Hope Autographs, no.77-78; MS/20/829/132

National Archives, London, Brougham Papers

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh, MS.581; MS.582; MS.648; MS.869; MS.929; MS.966; MS.1003; MS.3876; MS.3878; MS.3887; MS.6362; MS.9836; MS.10306; MS.11906; MS.15048; MS.19454

National Portrait Gallery, London, Heinz Library and Archive,

Registered Packet 2515 (1-104), Brockedon Albums
Royal Academy, London, Lawrence Papers
Royal College of Surgeons of England, MS0014/7, Hunter-Baillie Letters, Volume 4.1, 1704-1923
Royal Society, London, Royal Society Library, HS14
Wisbech and Fenland Museum, WISFM : 2003.35.282
Wordsworth Trust, Dove Cottage, Grasmere,
WLMS A / Rogers, Samuel / 1-10

Journals and periodicals

Athenaeum, April 1831; January 1828; October 1833; December 1855
Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, August 1818; February 1819
British and Foreign Review, 1842
Champion, 14 June 1814, 7 April 1816
Critical Review, April 1792
Edinburgh Monthly Review, February 1819
Edinburgh Review, October 1813
European Magazine, October 1792; July 1794
Fraser's Magazine, January 1833
Gentleman's Magazine, February 1781, February 1819
Leisure Hour, June 1889
Literary Chronicle, June 1828
Literary Gazette, December 1833; 22 December 1855
Metropolitan Magazine, November 1835
Monthly Review, June 1792
Morning Post and Gazetteer, January 1799; March 1813; 6 November 1829; 21 January 1830
New British Lady's Magazine, April 1819
New Monthly Magazine, May 1820

Quarterly Review, July 1813
Sun, 19 April 1816
Temple Bar, August 1880
Times, 6 June 1825
Universal Magazine, August 1796
University Magazine, July 1867

Samuel Rogers

A comprehensive bibliography of works by Rogers, including those unauthorised and published anonymously, follows. These works have been informative in tracking the development of Rogers's career and professional reputation, even if not quoted from in this thesis. The list is organised as follows:

> Editions of Rogers's letters, poetry and prose
> Anthologies in which Rogers's poetry comprises a large part of the publication. (Other anthologies that include only one or a few works by Rogers are listed under 'Other Primary Works'.)

Editions of Rogers's letters, poetry and prose

———————, *Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers* (London: Edward Moxon, 1848).
———————, *Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers* (London: Edward Moxon, 1856).
———————, *Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers* (London: G. Routledge, 1869).
———————, *Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers,* ed. E. Bell (London: George Bell, 1875) [Aldine edition].

————————, *Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers,* ed. Epes Sargent (Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company, 1854).
————————, *Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Rogers,* ed. Epes Sargent (Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company, 1860).
————————, *An Ode to Superstition, with some other poems* (London: T. Cadell, 1786) [Anon]
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts 1792* (London: T. Cadell, 1792*)* (4 edns) [Anon]
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell; and C. Dilly, 1793) [Anon]
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts, 1794* (London: T. Cadell; and C. Dilly, 1794) [Anon]
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (Boston: David West, 1795).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell, jun. and Davies; and C. Dilly, 1795).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell, jun. and Davies; and C. Dilly, 1796) (2 edns).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell, jun. and W. Davies, 1798).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell, jun. and W. Davies, 1799).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts, By Samuel Rodgers* (Wilmington: Franklin Press, 1800).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell, jun. and W. Davies, 1801).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell, jun. and W. Davies, 1802).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; With Other Poems* (London: Thomas Bensley, 1802).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (Dublin: W. Porter, 1802) [Anon].

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, and Other Poems, [and] The Pains of Memory by Robert Merry* (New York: David Longworth, 1802).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1803).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (Dublin: P. Wogan, [1804]) [Anon].

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: Parsons and Galignani, 1805).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, and Other Poems by Samuel Rogers; and The Pains of Memory, by Robert Merry* (Wilmington: Hezekial Niles, 1805).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; in Two Parts. To which are added The Pains of Memory* (Portland: Daniel Johnson, 1805).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1806).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, and Other Poems. By Samuel Rogers, Esq. And the Pains of Memory, by Robert Merry* (New York: Evert Duyckinck, 1808).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; A Poem in Two Parts* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1810).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory* (Belfast: Samuel Archer, 1815).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, with Other Poems* (Paris and London: Theophilus Barrois, 1818).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, and Other Poems to which is added, the Pains of Memory. By R. Merry, etc.* (New York and Richmond: B. and W. A. Bartow, 1820).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, with Other Poems* (Belfast [1821?]).

————————, *Les Plaisirs de la Mémoire: Poème de Samuel Rogers, traduit de l'anglais en vers français, avec le texte en regard et des notes; suivi de la charte et d'un conte, traduits également de l'anglais, par M. Albert-Montemont* (Paris: Peytieux, libraire, 1825).

————————, *Illustrations of the Pleasures of Memory and Other Poems by Samuel Rogers*, *engraved by Charles Heath* (London: 1825)

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory; a Poem in Two Parts* (London: British Poets of the Nineteenth Century series, 1828).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, with Other Poems* (Belfast: Simms & McIntyre, 1830).

————————, *The Book of Pleasures, with the Pleasures of Imagination by M. Akenside and The Pleasures of Hope by T. Campbell* (Philadelphia: Key and Biddle, 1836).

————————, *The Book of Pleasures* (Philadelphia: F. W. Greenough, 1839).

————————, *The Poems of the Pleasures* (Philadelphia: J B. Lippincott, 1841).

————————, *The Book of Pleasures* (New York: Clark and Austin, 1851).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, with Other Poems* (Paris: Baudry, 1852).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory, by S. Rogers. The Pleasures of Hope, by T. Campbell* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1858).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory* (London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston [1865]).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory* (London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston, [1866]).

————————, *The Pleasures of Memory* (Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co., 1870).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Low and Searle, [1875]).
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory* (Boston: Osgood, 1877) [reprinted Oxford 1989]
————————, *The Pleasures of Memory* (Germany: 1836)
————————, *An Epistle to a Friend, with Other Poems, by the Author of The Pleasures of Memory* (London: T. Cadell, Junior, and W. Davies, 1798) (2 edns)
————————, *Verses Written in Westminster Abbey after the Funeral of Charles James Fox* (London: T. Bensley [1806]) [Anon]
————————, *The Voyage of Columbus: A Poem* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1810) [Anon]
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1812)
————————, *Poems (*Philadelphia and New York: Bradford and Innskeep, 1813)
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1814)
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1816)
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1820)
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1822)
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1827)
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1833)
————————, *Poems* (London: T. Cadell; E. Moxon, 1834)
————————, *Poems,* 2 vols. (London: T. Cadell; E. Moxon, 1836)
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1839)
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1840)
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1842)
————————, *Poems* (Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1843)
————————, *Poems* (Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard, 1844)

————————, *Poems,* 2 vols. (London: Edward Moxon, 1845)
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1846)
————————, *Poems* (Philadelphia: Uriah Hunt & Son, 1846)
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1849).
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1851).
————————, *Poems* (New York: Leavitt & co., 1851).
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1852).
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1853).
————————, *Poems* (New York: Leavitt & Allen, 1853).
————————, *Poems* (London: Edward Moxon, 1854).
————————, *Poems,* ed. Samuel Sharpe (London: Edward Moxon, 1860).
————————, *Poems* (London: G. Routledge; New York: E. P. Dutton, 1890).
————————, *Jacqueline, A Poem* (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1814) [Anon, 2 edns] [published with Byron's *Lara*]
————————, *Human Life: a poem* (London: John Murray, 1819) (3 edns)
————————, *Human Life: a poem* (Philadelphia: M. Thomas, 1819)
————————, *Human Life, a poem* (Cambridge MA: from the University Press, 1820)
————————, *Human Life,* tr. Ital V. Paciotti (Turin, 1820).
————————, *Italy, a poem. Part the First* (London : Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1822) [Anon]
————————, *Italy*. *Part the First: A Poem* (London: John Murray, 1823) [Anon]
————————, *Italy*. *Part the First: A Poem* (London: John Murray, 1823) [acknowledged Rogers as author]
————————, *Italy. Part the Second: A Poem* (London: John Murray, 1828)

————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: T. Cadell and E. Moxon, 1830) [illustrated by Turner and Stothard]
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: T. Cadell and E. Moxon, 1836)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1838)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1839)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1840)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1840)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1842)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1844)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1848)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1852)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1854)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Edward Moxon, 1859)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Routledge, 1886)
————————, *Italy: A Poem* (London: Routledge, 1890)
————————, *Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers, With a Memory,* ed. Alexander Dyce (London: Edward Moxon, 1856) (3 edns)
————————, *Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers, With a Memory*, ed. Alexander Dyce (New York : D. Appleton and Company, 1856) (2 edns)
————————, *Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers, With a Memory*, ed. Alexander Dyce (New Southgate : H.A. Rogers, 1887)
————————, *Recollections of the Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers, With a Memory*, ed. Morchard Bishop [Oliver Stonor] (London: Richards Press, 1952)
————————, *Recollections,* ed. Wiliam Sharpe (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1859) (3 edns)

————————, *Recollections* (Boston: Bartlett and Miles, 1859)
————————, *Reminiscences and Table-Talk of Samuel Rogers […] collected by G. H. Powell* (London: R. B. Johnson, 1903)
————————, *Italian Journal,* ed. J. R. Hale (London: Faber and Faber, 1956)
————————, *Italian Journal, trans. Germany 1986*

Anthologies in which Rogers's poetry comprises a large part of the publication

Rogers, Samuel
————————,*The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White, Complete in One Volume* (Paris: A. and W. Galignani, 1829).
————————, *The Poetical Works The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Carey & Lea, 1830).
————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Carey & Lea, 1831).
————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: J. Grigg, 1836).
————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: J. Grigg, 1839).
————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Grigg & Elliot, 1841).
————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Grigg & Elliot, 1843).

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Grigg & Elliot, 1845).

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Grigg & Elliot, 1848).

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Grigg & Elliot, 1849).

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1850).

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1852).

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1854)

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1855)

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1856)

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co., 1859).

————————, *The Poetical Works of Rogers, Campbell, J. Montgomery, Lamb and Kirke White* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1865).

————————, *Italy, The pleasures of memory, Human life, and other poems* (London: Standard Poets, Vol. 7, [1845]).

————————, *Miscellaneous Poems with E. C. Knight, W. R. Spencer, Samuel Rogers, and others* (Windsor: privately printed, 1812).

Other Primary Works

Abrams, M. H. (ed). et al, *The Norton Anthology of English Literature* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1962).

Adams, W. H. Davenport (ed.), *The Household Treasury of English Song; Specimens of the English Poets* (London: Nelson, 1869).

Adams, W. H. Davenport, *The Students' Treasury of English Song, containing choice selections from the principal poets of the present century* (London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1873).

Aikin, John (ed.), *Select Works of the British Poets* (London: Longman & Co., 1820).

Anonymous, *The Living Poets of England: Specimens of the Living English Poets, with Biographical and Critical Notices and an Essay on English Poetr*y, 2 vols (Paris: Baudry, 1827).

————————, *The Poems of the Pleasures* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1841).

The Album, Vol. 1 (London: J. Andrews, 1822).

Ault, Norman, *A Treasury of Unfamiliar Lyrics* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1938).

Baillie, Joanna, *The Collected Letters of Joanna Baillie*, 2 vols., ed. Judith Bailey Slagle (Madison, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1990).

Baillie, Joanna, *Further Letters of Joanna Baillie,* ed. Thomas McLean (Madison, Teaneck: Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2010).

Bartlett, John, *A Collection of Familiar Quotations with Complete Indices of Authors and Subjects* (Cambridge: John Bartlett, 1858).

Bell, Robert (ed.), *Art and Song: A series of Original Highly Finished Steel Engravings from Masterpieces of Art of the Nineteenth Century Accompanied by a Selection of the Choicest Poems in the English Language* (London: Bell and Daldy, 1867).

Blake, William, *The Letters of William Blake*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes (London: Hart-Davis, 1956).

Blessington, Lady, *Strathern* (London: Henry Colburn, 1845).

Boniface, Alexandra and Stone (eds.), *Beauties of Classical English Poetry* (Paris: Baudry, 1824).

Brougham, Henry Peter, *Lives of Men of Letters & Science, Who Flourished in the Time of George III* (London: Charles Knight, 1845).

Brydone, Patrick, *A Tour through Sicily and Malta: in a series of letters to William Beckford* (London: W. Strahan, and T. Cadell, 1773)

Bull, C. R., *Regency Poets* (London and Melbourne: Melbourne University Press in association with Oxford University Press, 1941).

Burns, Robert, *A New edition of the Life and Works of Robert Burns, as originally edited by James Currie*, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: Macredie, Skelly and Muckersy, 1815).

Burton, Charles, *The Bardiad; a Poem* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1823).

Byron, Lord George Gordon, *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (London: James Cawthorn, 1809).

————————, *The Giaour* (London: T. Davison, 1813).

————————, *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (London: John Murray, Cantos I and II 1812, Cantos III and IV 1818).

————————, *The Prisoner of Chillon* (London: John Murray, 1816).

————————, *Don Juan* (London: John Murray, 1819-1821; London: John Hunt, 1822-1824).

————————, ed. Jerome McGann, *Complete Poetical Works*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980-6).

———————, *Byron's Letters and Journals: The Complete and Unexpurgated Text of all the Letters Available in Manuscript and the Full Printed Version of All Others*, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, 12 vols. (London: John Murray, 1973-94).

Callcott, William Hutchins, *The Bee. A duet for 2 trebles, with an accomp. for the piano or harp, the poetry from Rogers's Pleasures of Memory* (London: [s. n.] [c.1824]).

Camilla, Francis (ed.), *The Romantics and Victorians* (New York: the Macmillan Company, 1961).

Campbell, Alexander (ed.), *The Beauties of Poetry* (London: Printed for Tegg and Castleman, 1804).

Campbell, Thomas, *The Pleasures of Hope* (London: Mundell & Son; and for Longman & Rees, and J. Wright, 1799).

———————, *The Pleasures of Hope, with other poems*, Thomas Campbell (Belfast: Simms & McIntyre, 1830).

———————, *Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*, Vol. 1, ed. William Beattie (London: Edward Moxon, 1849.

Carey, David, *Beauties of the Modern Poets* (London: W. Wright, 1820).

———————, *The Mansion of the Poets: Beauties of the Modern Poets* (London: W. Wright, 1820).

The Carlyle Letters Online, Duke University Press, [http://carlyleletters.dukejournals.org/cgi/content/full/14/1/lt-18420326-TC-CHDI-01?], accessed 01/04/2013.

Carter, Charles Thomas, *Dear is my little Native Vale: [Song, words] from the "Pleasures of Memory"* (London: W. Hodsoll, [1800]).

Chambers, Robert (ed.), *Cyclopædia of English Literature*, Vol. 2, ed. Robert Chambers (Edinburgh: W. and R. Chambers, 1844).

Cheever, George Barrell, *Studies in Poetry* (Boston: Carter and Hendee, 1830).

Clare, John, *The Letters of John Clare*, ed. Mark Storey (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

Clayden, Peter William, *Rogers and his Contemporaries*, 2 vols. (London: Smith, Elder, & co., 1889).

————————, *The Early Life of Samuel Rogers* (London: Smith, Elder, & co., 1887).

Clayton, E. B. (ed.), *The Bouquet: Consisting of The Pleasures of Hope, The Pleasures of Memory, and The Pains of Memory* (New-Brunswick: L. Deare, 1814).

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *Biographia Literaria; Or, Biographical Sketches of My Literary Life and Opinions*, 2 vols. (London: Rest Fenner, 1817).

————————, *Zapolya: A Christmas Tale, in Two Parts* (London: Rest Fenner, 1817).

Collins, Vere Henry Gratz (ed.), *A Book of Victorian Verse, chiefly lyrical* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928).

Creevey, Thomas, *The Creevey Papers: a selection from the correspondence & diaries of the late Thomas Creevey, M.P.*, 2 vols., ed. Sir Herbert Maxwell (London: John Murray, 1903).

Croker, John Wilson, *The Correspondence and Diaries of the late Right Honourable John Wilson Croker, LL.D., F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty from 1809 to 1830,* 3 vols., ed. Louis J. Jennings (London: John Murray, 1884).

Cunningham, Peter, *Handbook of London: Past and Present,* 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1850).

D'Arblay, Frances, *The Wanderer: Or, Female Difficulties*, 3 vols. (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1814).

Dana, Charles A. (ed.), *The Household Book of Poetry* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1858).

De Marivaux, Pierre, *La Vie de Marianne, ou Les Aventures de Madame la Comtesse De* ***, 4 vols. (London: Prault, et Fils Libraires, 1782).

De Quincey, Thomas, *Confessions of an English Opium Eater and Other Writings*, ed. Grevel Lindop (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Devey, Joseph, *A Comparative View of Modern English Poets* (London: E. Moxon, Son, and Co., 1873).

Disraeli, Benjamin, *The Revolutionary Epick* (London: Edward Moxon, 1834).

D'Israeli, Isaac, *The Literary Character: Or the History of Men of Genius*, 2 vols. (London: Henry Colburn, 1828).

Dickens, Charles, *The Life and Adventures of Martin Chuzzlewit*, 19 monthly instalments (London: Chapman & Hall, January 1843 to July 1844).

————————, *The Letters of Charles Dickens,* eds. Madeleine House and Graham Storey, et. al., 12 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965-2002).

Drayton, Michael, *The History of Queen Mab; or, the Court of Fairy* (London: M. Cooper, 1751).

Eagles, John, *Felix Farley, Rhymes, Latin and English, by Themaninthemoon* (Bristol: J. M. Gutch, 1826).

Eastlake, Lady, *Journals and Correspondence of Lady Eastlake*, ed. C. Eastlake Smith, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1895).

Edgeworth, Maria, *Tales of Fashionable Life,* 6 vols. (London: J. Johnson and Co., 1812).

Essex, Timothy, *Eight English Canzonetts: for a single voice, with an accompaniment for the piano forte or harp* (London: published for the composer, [1799]).

————————, *Eight English Canzonetts: for a single voice, with an accompaniment for the piano forte or harp* London: published for the composer, [18--]).

Evans, Marjorie R.. (ed.), *Anthology of Victorian Verse* (London: Methuen, 1949).

Fairer, David and Christine Gerrard, *Eighteenth Century Poetry: An Annotated Anthology*, 3rd ed. (Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015).

Fields, James T., Edwin P. Whipple (eds.), *The Family Library of British Poetry* (Boston: Houghton, Osgood and company, 1878).

Fitz-Greene, Halleck, *Selections from the British Poets* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1845).

Fox, Henry Edward, ed. Earl of Ilchester, *The Journal of the Hon. Henry Edward Fox* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1923).

Fox, Henry Richard, *A Dream* (London: Bensley and Sons, 1818).

Frost, William (ed.), *Romantic and Victorian Poets* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1961).

Garnett, Richard, *The Universal Anthology* (London: Clarke Company Ltd., 1899).

Gladstone, W. E., *The Gladstone Diaries*, ed. M. R. D. Foot and H. C. G. Matthew, 14 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968-1994).

————————, *The State in its Relations with the Church* (London: John Murray, 1838).

————————, *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government* (London: John Murray, 1851).

————————, *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1858).

Grant Duff, Mountstuart E., *The Victorian Anthology* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co, Ltd., 1902).

Godwin, William, *Caleb Williams,* ed. Gary Handwerk and A. A. Markley (Canada: Broadview Press Ltd., 2000).

Gray, Thomas, *Designs by Mr. R. Bentley for Six Poems by Mr T. Gray* (London: R. Dodsley, 1753).

Gray, Thomas, *Poems* (London: J. Dodsley, 1768).

Greenblatt, Stephen (general ed.), *The Norton Anthology of English Literature,* 2 vols. (New York; London: W. W. Norton & Co., 2012).

Grey, Henry George, 3rd Earl, *The Colonial Policy of Lord John Russell's Administration*, 2 vols. (London: Richard Bentley, 1853).

Grigson, Geoffrey (ed.), *The Romantics: An Anthology* (London: G. Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1942).

——————— (ed.), *The Victorians: An Anthology* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1950).

Hall, S. C., *The Book of Gems. The Modern Poets and Artists of Great Britain* (London: Whittaker and Co., 1838).

———————*A Book of Memories of Great Men and Women of the Age, from Personal Acquaintance* (London: Virtue & Co., 1871).

Harley, James, *The Press, or Literary Chit-Chat, A Satire* (London: Lupton Relfe, 1822).

Hayward, Abraham, *A Selection from the Correspondence of Abraham Hayward, Q. C., from 1834 to 1884, with an account of his Early Life*, 2 vols., ed. Henry E. Carlisle (London: John Murray, 1886).

Hazlitt, William and Leigh Hunt, *The Round Table: A Collection of Essays on Literature, Men and Manners*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable and co.; London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1817).

———————, *The Spirit of the Age* (London: Henry Colman, 1825).

Hodgson, Francis, 'The Pleasures of Poetry. By S.R.', *Leaves of Laurel; or New Probationary Odes, for the Vacant Laureateship*, ed. Q. Q. and W. W. (London: T. Becket and J. Porter, 1813).

Hogg, James (ed.), *The Poetic Mirror: Or the Living Bards of Britain* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, ond Brown; Edinburgh, John Ballantyne, 1817 [2nd edition]).

Holland, Sir H., *Recollections of Past Life* (London: Longman Green, 1872).

Holland, Lady, *Lady Holland to Her Son, 1821-1845*, ed. Earl of Ilchester (London: John Murray, 1946).

Howitt, William, *Homes and Haunts of the Most Eminent British Poets*, Vol. 2 (London: George Routledge & Co., 1847).

Hunt, L., *The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt*, 3 vols. (London: Smith Elder, 1850).

Ilchester, Earl of, *Chronicles of Holland House* (London: Murray, 1937).

Inglis, Robert, *Gleanings from the English poets, Chaucer to Tennyson, with Biographical Notices of the Authors* (Edinburgh: Gall & Inglis, 1862).

[Irving, Washington], *The Sketch Book*, Geoffrey Crayon [pseudonym] (New York: C. S. Van Winkle, 1819).

Jameson, A., *Companion to The Most Celebrated Private Galleries of Art in London* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1844).

Jolowicz, Henrich (ed.), *British Diamonds* (Dresden: Lewis Ehlermann, 1863).

Kellogg, Bernard, *A Text-Book of English Literature* (New York: Clark and Maynard, 1884).

Kelly, Michael, *Go, You May Call it Madness, Folly, the Words by the Author of The pleasures of Memory and the Melody by Mrs. Crouch, Adapted for the Harp or Piano* (London: [s. n.], [c.1802]).

Kemble, F., *Records of Later Life* (London: Bentley, 1882).

Kirkland, Caroline, *Garden Walks with the Poets* (New York: G. P. Putnam and Company, 1852; and London: T. Nelson & Sons, 1858).

Knight, Cornelia, *Autobiography of Miss Cornelia Knight, Lady Companion to the Princess Charlotte of Wales*, Vol. 1 (London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1861).

Lamb, Caroline, *Glenarvon*, 3 vols. (London: Henry Colburn, 1816).

Lardner, Dionysus, *The Lives of the Most Eminent Literary Men*, *Cabinet Cyclopaedia*, 10 vols. (London: Orme, Brown, Green & Longman's, and John Taylor, 1829-1846).

Leonard, R. M., *The Pageant of English Poetry* (London, New York: H. Frowde, 1909).

Lesage, Alain-René, *Le Diablo Boiteux* (Paris: Musier et Fournier, 1707).

Lewis, Matthew Gregory, *The Monk, A Romance*, ed. D. L. Macdonald and
Kathleen Scherf (Canada: Broadview Press Ltd., 2004).

Liechtenstein, Princess, *Holland House* (London: Macmillan, Third Edition, 1875).

Living Poets of England: Specimens of the Living British Poets, Vol. 1 (Paris: Baudry, 1827).

Locker-Lampson, Frederick (ed.), *Lyra Elegantarium: A Collection of Some of the Best Social and Occasional Verse by Deceased English Authors* (London: Edward Moxon, 1867).

Lockhart, John Gibson, *Life of Robert Burns*, *Constables Miscellany* Vol. 23 (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable, 1828).

Longworth, David (ed.), *Longworth's Selected Modern Poets*, 3 vols. (New York: the Shakespeare Gallery, 1802).

Lytton, Edward Bulwer Lytton, Baron, *The Life, Letters and Literary Remains of Edward Bulwer, Lord Lytton, by his Son; with Portraits and Illustrations* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, 1883).

Marlay, Charles Brinsley, *The Marlay Letters, 1778-1820*, ed. R. Warwick Bond (London: Constable, 1937).

Macaulay, Thomas Babington, ed. G. O. Trevalyn*, The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay* (London: Longmans, 1876; repr. 1959).

Mackenzie, Henry, *The Man of Feeling* (London: T. Cadell, 1771).
————————, *The Miscellaneous Works of H. Mackenzie*, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: James Robertson; London: Thomas and Joseph Allman, 1819).
————————, T*he Man of Feeling* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Madden, R. R., *The Literary Life and Correspondence of The Countess of Blessington,* 3 vols. (London: Newby, 1855).

Martineau, Harriet, *Biographical Sketches* (London: Macmillan, 1869).

Mathias, Thomas James, *The Pursuits of Literature* (London: Becket, 1808).

Melbourne, Elizabeth Milbanke Lamb, Viscountess, *Byron's 'corbeau blanc': the life and letters of Lady Melbourne*, ed. Jonathan David Gross (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997).

Merriam, H. G., *Edward Moxon Publisher of Poets* (New York: Columbia U.P., 1939).

Merry, Rogers, *The Pains of Memory* (London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1796).

Milford, Humphrey Sumner (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Regency Verse* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928).

——————— (ed.), *The Oxford Book of English Romantic Verse* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1935).

Mitford, William, *The History of Greece* (London: J. Murray and J. Robson, 1784).

Moir, David Macbeth, *The Poetical Literature of the Past Half-Century*, David Macbeth Moir (Edinburgh: W. Blackwood and Sons, 1851).

Moore, Thomas, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron with Notices of his Life*, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1830).

———————, *The Unpublished Letters of Thomas Moore*, 2 vols., ed. Jeffrey W. Vail (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2013).

Münchhausen, Baron, *Gulliver Revived or the Singular Travels, Campaigns, Voyages, and Adventures of Baron Munikhouson, Commonly Called Munchausen* (Oxford: G. Kearsley, 1786).

Noyes, Russell (ed.), *English Romantic Poetry and Prose* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

Oldham, John *The Satyr Against Vertue. Pindarique Ode* (London, 1710).

Ottley, William Young, *Engravings of the Most Noble the Marquis of Stafford's Collection of Pictures in London* (London: T. Bensley and Son, 1818).

Palgrave, Francis Turner, *The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical Poems in the English language* (Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1861).

————————, *The Golden Treasury*, ed. Christopher Ricks (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1991).

Pope, Alexander, *The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated in a Dialogue between Alexander Pope, of Twickenham in Co Midd Esq; on the One Part, and his Learne Council on the Other* (London : printed by L. G. [Lawton Gilliver] and sold by A. Dodd; E. Nutt; and by the booksellers of London and Westminster, 1733).

Price, F. G. Hilton, *A Handbook of London Bankers* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1876).

The Quarterly Review Archive, ed. Jonathan Cutmore [https://www.rc.umd.edu/reference/qr/index/06.html], accessed 01/12/16.

Redding, Cyrus, *Fifty Years' Recollections, Literary and Personal, with Observations on Men and Things* (London: Charles J. Skeet, 1858).

Richardson, Samuel, *Clarissa: Or, the History of a Young Lady*, 7 vols. (London: Samuel Richardson, 1751).

Rivers, David, *Literary Memoirs of Living Authors*, Vol. 2 (London: R. Faulder, 1798).

Roberts, R. Ellis, *Samuel Rogers and His Circle* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1910).

Robinson, Henry Crabb, *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson*, 2 vols., ed. Thomas Sadler (London: Macmillan, 1872).

Roscoe, W. C., 'The Conversation And Poetry of Rogers', *Poems and Essays*, Vol. 2 (London: Chapman and Hall, 1860).

Sanders, L., *The Holland House Circle* (New York and London: Puttnam and Methuen, 1908).

Savile, Bourchier Wrey (ed.), *Lyra Sacra: Being a Collection of Hymns Ancient and Modern, Odes and Fragments of Sacred Poetry* (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1862).

Scott, Walter, *Lay of the Last Minstrel* (London: Longman, Rees and Orme, 1805).

———————, *Rokeby: A Poem* (Edinburgh: Printed for John Ballantyne and Co. Edinburgh; and Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, London, 1813).

Shee, Martin Archer, *Elements of Art, A Poem; in Six Cantos* (London: William Miller, 1809).

Shelley, Mary, *Rambles in Germany and Italy in 1840, 1842, and 1843* (London: Edward Moxon, 1844).

Shelley, Mary, *The Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley*, 3 vols., ed. Betty T. Bennett (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980-1988).

Shelley, Mary, *The Journals of Mary Shelley,* ed. Paula R. Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert (Baltimore, Md.; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

Shelley, Percy Bysshe, *The Poetical Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. Mary Shelley (London: Edward Moxon, 1839).

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, *The Letters of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, 3 vols., ed. Cecil Price (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966).

Sitwell, Edith (ed.), *The Pleasures of Poetry: A Critical Anthology* (London: Duckworth, 1932).

Smith, David Nicol (ed.), *The Oxford Book of Eighteenth Century Verse* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1936).

Smith, Sydney, *The Letters of Sydney Smith*, 2 vols., ed. N. C. Smith (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953).

Southey, Robert, *Madoc* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1805).

————————, *New letters of Robert Southey*, 2 vols., ed. Kenneth Curry (New York; London: Columbia University Press, 1965).

————————, *Robert Southey: Later Poetical Works, 1811-1838*, Tim Fulford and Lynda Pratt (eds.) (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012).

————————, *The Collected Letters of Robert Southey*, gen. eds. Lynda Pratt, Tim Fulford, Ian Packer <http://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/southey_letters> [accessed 01/10/16]

Tenhove, Nicholas, *Memoirs of the House of Medici, From its Origin to the Death of Francesco, the Second Grand Duke of Tuscany, and of the Great Men who Flourished in Tuscany within that Period*, trans. Sir Richard Clayton (Bath: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1797).

Tennyson, Alfred, Baron, *The Letters of Alfred Lord Tennyson*, 3 vols., eds. Cecil Y Lang and Edgar F. Shannon (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981-1990).

Thomas, Alexander, *The British Parnassus, at the Close of the Eighteenth Century: A Poem, in Four Cantos* (London: Mundell & Son, 1801).

Thornbury, Walter, *Two Centuries of Song, or Lyrics, Madrigals and Sonnets and other Occasional Verses of the English Poets of the Last Two Hundred Years* ed. Walter Thornbury (London: Sampson, Low, Son and Marston, 1867).

Toovey, Alfred Dixon, *Biographical and Critical Notices of the British poets, with Specimens of their Poetry* (London: Kent & Richards, 1848).

Townsend, Joseph, *Dissertation on the Poor Laws,* ed. Henry Vassall Fox (London: Ridgeways, 1817).

Verral, Charles, *The Pleasures of the Possession; Or, the Enjoyment of the Present Moment Contrasted with those of Hope and Memory. A Poem.* (London: C. Rickman, 1810).

Walmisley, Thomas Forbes, *Six Canzonets, composed & respectfully dedicated (by permission) to Her Royal Highness, the Princess Sophia, of Gloucester* (London: Monzani & Hill, [between 1807 and 1813]).

Ward, Thomas Humphrey, *The English Poets*, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1880).

Watts, Alaric A. (ed.), *The Laurel and Lyre: Fugitive Poetry of the Nineteenth Century* (London: Frederick Warne & Co., 1867).

Wellesley, Richard Colley, Marquess, *Primitiae et Reliquaie* (Londini: Gulielmi Nicol, 1841).

---------- *The Wellesley Papers: The Life and Correspondence of Richard Colley Wellesley Marquess Wellesley*, 2 vols. (London: Herbert Jenkins Ltd, 1914).

Wood, Emma Caroline, *Leaves from the Poets' Laurels* (London: Edward Moxon, 1865).

Wordsworth, Dorothy and William Wordsworth, *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, III. The Middle Years. Part II. 1812-1820, 2nd edn. rev. Mary Moorman and Alan G. Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

————————, *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. Ernest de Selincourt, V. The Later Years. Part I. 1821-1828, 2nd edn. rev. Alan G. Hill (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978).

Wordsworth, William, *Memorials of a Tour on the Continent* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1820).

————————, *Memoirs of William Wordsworth, Poet-Laureate, D. C. L.,* 2 vols., Christopher Wordsworth, ed. Henry Reed (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1851).

————————, *The Excursion: Being a Portion of The Recluse, a Poem* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1814).

————————, and Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Lyrical Ballads, with Other Poems*, 2 vols. (London: T. N. Longman and O. Rees, 1800).

————————, *Lyrical Ballads*, ed. Michael Schmidt (London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2006).

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Howard, Philip B. Daghlian and Irvin Ehrenpreis (eds.), *The Familiar Letter in the Eighteenth Century* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1966).

Auden, W. H. (ed.), *Nineteenth Century Minor Poets* (London: Faber & Faber, 1966).

Barker-Benfield, G. J., *The Culture of Sensibility: Sex and Society in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

Barbier, C. P., *Samuel Rogers and William Gilpin*, *Their Friendship and Correspondence* London, Glasgow, New York: Oxford University Press, 1959).

Beeton, S. O., *Beeton's Great Book of Poetry: From Caedmon and King Alfred's Boethius to Browning and Tennyson* (London: Ward, Lock, & Tyler, 1870).

Benson, Theodora, *London Immortals* (London: Allan Wingate, 1951).

Besterman, T. (ed), *The Publishing Firm of Cadell & Davies* (Oxford and London: Oxford University Press, 1938).

Bew, John, *Castlereagh: The Biography of a Statesman* (London: Quercus, 2014).

Blocksidge, Martin, *The Banker Poet: The Rise and Fall of Samuel Rogers* (Brighton, Chicago and Toronto: Sussex Academic Press, 2013).

Brand, C. P., *Italy and the English Romantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957).

Burke, Tim, 'Southey's anti-professional fantasy: writing for pleasure and the uneducated poet', *Romanticism*, Vol. 17, No.1 (2011), pp.63-76.

Bloom, Harold, *English Romantic Poetry: An Anthology*, 2 vols. (New York: Garden City, 1963).

Brewer, John, *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Harper Collins, 1997).

Bushell, Sally, *Text as Process, Creative Composition in Wordsworth, Tennyson and Dickinson* (Charlottesville and Louisiana: University of Virginia Press, 2009).

Butterfield, Herbert, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1965).

Carpenter, H., *The Seven Lives of John Murray* (London: John Murray, 2008).

Catalogue of the library of the late Samuel Rogers, *Esq.; which will be sold by auction by Messrs. Christie and Manson* (London, 1856).

Clemit, Pamela (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Cole, Richard Cargill, *Irish Booksellers and English writers 1740-1800* (London: Mansell, 1986).

Davis, Richard W., *Wellington, Peel and the Politics of the 1830s and 1840s* (Southampton: University of Southampton, 2002).

Dyson, Anthony, *Pictures to Print: the Nineteenth-century Engraving Trade* (London: Farrand, 1984).

Evans, Alfred Alexander, *Victorian Poetry* (London: University of London Press, 1958).

Evans, Marjorie Ruth (ed.), *An Anthology of Victorian Verse* (London: Methuen, 1949S).

Fairer, David, *Organising Poetry: The Coleridge Circle, 1790-1798* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Faflak, Joel and Julia M. Wright (eds.), *A Handbook of Romanticism Studies* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).

Favret, Mary A., *Romantic Correspondence: Women, Politics and the Fiction of Letters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Ferry, Anne, *Tradition and the Individual Poem: An Inquiry into Anthologies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001).

Frost, William (ed.), *Romantic and Victorian Poetry* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1950).

Gash, Norman, *Sir Robert Peel: the Life of Sir Robert Peel after 1830* (Harlow: Longman, 1972).

Gaskins, Avery F., 'Samuel Rogers: A Revaluation', *The Wordsworth Circle*, Vol. 16, No. 3, (Summer 1985), pp.146-149.

Gaunt, Richard A., *Sir Robert Peel: The Life and Legacy* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010).

Gerrard, Christine (ed.), *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006).

Giddey, Ernest, *Samuel Rogers et Son Poeme 'Italie'* (Geneva: Droz, 1959).

Giddey, Ernest, 'Byron and Samuel Rogers', *Byron Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (1979), pp.4-19.

Gill, Stephen, *Wordsworth and the Victorians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).

Gilmour, J. S. L., 'The Early Editions of Rogers's Italy', *The Library*, Fifth Series, Iii (1961), 137-140.

Gittings, Robert and Jo Manton, *Dorothy Wordsworth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

Gladstone, W. E., *W. E. Gladstone*, 4 vols., ed. John Brooke and Mary Sorensen (London: H. M. S. O., 1971-1981).

Goldberg, Brian, *The Lake Poets and Professional Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Golding, Catherine J., *Posting It: The Victorian Revolution in Letter Writing* (Florida: University Press of Florida, 1993).

Gravil, Richard and Daniel Robinson (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of William Wordsworth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

Greenblatt, Stephen (ed.), *The Norton Anthology of English Literature,* 2 vols. (New York: London: W. W. Norton & Co., 2012)

Greenfield, John R., *British Romantic Poets, 1789-1832* (Detroit: Gale, 1992).

Hale, J. R., 'Samuel Rogers the Perfectionist', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (November 1961), 61-67.

Hale, J. R., *The Italian Journal of Samuel Rogers* (London: Faber and Faber, 1956).

Hall, Elizabeth, 'Samuel Rogers and an Unpublished Coleridge Letter', *Notes and Queries*, 37 (March 1990), 20-22.

Halsey, Katie, *Jane Austen and her Readers, 1786-1945* (Cambridge: Anthem Press, 2012).

Hamilton, James, *A Strange Business: Making Art and Money in Nineteenth-century Britain* (London: Atlantic Books, 2014).

Hawksley, Lucinda, *Charles Dickens and his Circle* (London: National Portrait Gallery, 2016).

Heath-Stubbs, John and David Wright (eds.), *The Forsaken Garden: An Anthology of Poetry, 1824-1909* (London: Sedgwick & Jackson, 1950).

Higgins, David, *Romantic Genius and the Literary Magazine: Biography, Celebrity, Politics* (London: Routledge, 2005),

Holcomb, Adele M., 'A Neglected Classical Phase of Turner's Art: His Vignettes to Rogers's Italy', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 32 (1969), 405-410.

Holmes, Richard, *Sidetracks: Explorations of a Romantic Biographer* (London: Harper Collins, 2000).

Hornbeak, Katherine Gee, *The Complete Letter Writer in English 1568-1800* (Northampton, Mass.: Collegiate Press, 1934).

Jacobus, Mary, *Tradition and Experiment in Wordsworth's 'Lyrical Ballads' (1798)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

Jung, Sandro, *James Thomson's* The Seasons, *Print Culture, and Visual Interpretation, 1730-1842* (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2015).

Kelly, Linda, *Richard Brinsley Sheridan* (London: Sinclair-Stevenson, 1997).

———————, *Holland House* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2013).

Knapman, D., *Conversation Sharp* (Dorchester: The Dorset Press, 2003).

Korte, Barbara, Ralf Schneider and Stefanie Lethbridge (eds.), *Anthologies of British Poetry: Critical Perspectives from Literary and Cultural Studies* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000).

Kriegal, A. D. (ed.), *The Holland House Diaries 1831-1840* (London, Henley and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977).

Kucich, Greg, *Keats, Shelley, and Romantic Spenserianism* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991).

Leavis, F. R., *Revaluation* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994).

Little, Geoffrey (ed.), *Imperfect Apprehensions: Essays in English Literature in Honour of G. A. Wilkes* (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1996).

Lowenthal, Cynthia, *Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and the Eighteenth-Century Familiar Letter* (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 1994).

MacCarthy, Fiona, *Byron: A Life* (London: Murray, 2002).

Marchand, Leslie J., *Byron: A Portrait* (London: John Murray, 1971).

May, Charlotte, 'Don Juan the Mock-Byronic Hero', *Aspects of Byron's Don Juan*, ed. Peter Cochran (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), pp.255-264.

McGann, Jerome, *Byron and Romanticism*, ed. James Soderholm (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Mitchell, L. G., *Holland House* (London: Duckworth, 1980).

Moorman, Mary Trevelyan, *William Wordsworth: a Biography*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957-1965).

Murphy, Peter T., *Poetry as an Occupation and an Art in Britain, 1760-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

Ogden, James, *Isaac D'Israeli* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

Pearson, John, *Stages & Serpents: A History of the Cavendish Family and the Dukes of Devonshire* (Bakewell: Country Books, 1983 repr. 2002).

Piggot, Jan., *Turner's Vignettes* (London: Tate Gallery, 1993).

Pinion F. B., *A Tennyson Chronology* (Boston: G. K. Hall & Co., 1990).

Powell, C., 'Turner's Vignettes and the Making of Rogers's 'Italy'', *Turner Studies*, 3 (1983), 2-13.

Prendergast, Amy, *Literary Salons Across Britain and Ireland in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

Rajan, Tilottama, *Dark Interpreter: the Discourse of Romanticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980).

Roberts, John (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Classical World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Robinson, Alan, *Imagining London, 1770-1900* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Roe, Nicholas, *Wordsworth and Coleridge: The Radical Years* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988).

———————, *The Politics of Nature: William Wordsworth and Some Contemporaries* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002),

Roe, Nicholas (ed.), *Romanticism: An Oxford Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Russell, Gillian and Clara Tuite (eds.), *Romantic Sociability: Social Networks and Literary Culture in Britain, 1770-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Rycroft, H., 'Samuel Rogers, His Illustrators, J.M.W. Turner and Thomas Stothard and Other Friends', *Book Handbook*, no.3 (March 1947).

Saintsbury, George, 'Lesser Poets, 1790-1837', *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, Vol. 12, ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915).

Schmid, Susanne, *British Literary Salons of the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

Schoenfield, Mark, *British Periodicals and Romantic Identity: The 'Literary Lower Empire'* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Shattock, Joanne (ed.), *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, Vol. 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Skarda, Patricia, 'Samuel Rogers', *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 93: British Romantic Poets, 1789-1832,* ed. John Greenfield (Detroit: Gale Research, 1990), pp.224-35.

Slagle, Judith Bailey, *Joanna Baillie, A Literary Life* (London: Associated University Presses, 2002).

Sloniker, Raymond Hurst, 'Evolving Romanticism in the poetry of Samuel Rogers' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1955).

St Clair, William, *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

————————, 'The Biographer as Archaeologist', in *Mapping Lives: The Uses of Biography,* ed. Peter France and William St Clair (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp.219-234.

Todd, William Mills, *The Familiar Letter as a Literary Genre in the Age of Pushkin* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1973).

Vail, Jeffrey W., 'Samuel Rogers: A Passion for Little Girls', *The Wordsworth Circle* 42, no. 3 (Summer 2011), 217-25.

Van Remoortel, Marianne, 'The Secret life of the Della Cruscan Sonnet: William Gifford's "Baviad" and "Maeviad"', *The Modern Language Review*, 102, No.2 (April, 2007), pp.311-325.

Varney, Andrew, *Eighteenth-Century Writers in their World: A Mighty Maze* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

Vulliamy, C. E., *English Letter Writers* (London: Collins, 1945).

Warner, Jerry, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century-America* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1990).

Watkins, Charles and Ben Cowell, *Uvedale Price (1747-1829) Decoding the Picturesque* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012).

Watkins, Daniel, *Anna Letitia Barbauld and Eighteenth Century Visionary Poetics* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012).

Watson, J. R., 'Samuel Rogers: The Last Augustan', *Augustan Worlds: New Essays in Eighteenth-Century Literature*, ed. J. C. Hilson, M. B. Jones, J. R. Watson, Richard Hoggart (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1978), pp.281-97.

————————, *Pre-Romanticism in English Poetry of the Eighteenth Century: The Poetic Art and Significance of Thomson, Gray, Collins, Goldsmith, Cowper & Crabbe* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1989).

Weeks, D., 'Samuel Rogers: Man of Taste', *PMLA*, LXII (1947), 472-486.

Werry, R. R., 'Samuel Rogers's Approach to the Blank-Verse Dramatic Dialogue', *Modern Language Notes*, LXII (1947), 127-129.

White, Simon, *Robert Bloomfield, Romanticism and the Poetry of Community* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

Winship, Michael, *American Literary Publishing in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: The Business of Ticknor and Fields* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Wu, Duncan, *Wordsworth's Reading, 1770-1799* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

————————, *William Hazlitt: The First Modern Man* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Zionkowski, Linda, *Men's Work: Gender, Class, and the Professionalization of Poetry, 1660-1784* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001).