

# INTRODUCTION

Jonathan Cutmore

The essays in this collection contribute to a renewed scholarly commitment to explore the cultural impact of early nineteenth-century periodicals.<sup>1</sup> During the Regency, contemporaries credited the *Quarterly Review* with great power to influence literary opinion and the sale of books. Consequently, its many famous reviews – of Keats, the Shelleys, Byron, Wordsworth, Crabbe, Hemans, Hazlitt, Hunt, Austen and Scott – are quoted by reader-reception specialists, by literary historians, by biographers of Romantic-era figures and by students of book history. Also, because its political, foreign policy and economics reviews represented the cream of conservative writing in the period, and because some of its core contributors were connected with the highest levels of government, historians frequently cite the journal. It is perhaps surprising, then, that hitherto no critical study of the early *Quarterly Review* has appeared.

The preservation of thousands of relevant documents (in the John Murray Archive, the Sir Walter Scott Collection, and elsewhere) makes the *Quarterly* ideal for testing theories of the formation and conduct of early nineteenth-century periodicals. To facilitate such an experiment in the present instance, the editor supplied the contributing essayists with transcriptions of primary sources that relate to the journal during the editorships of William Gifford (1809–24) and John Taylor Coleridge (1825).<sup>2</sup> With each essayist addressing either a major topic (politics, classics, the business of reviewing) or a major contributor (Scott, Southey, Barrow), the collection strikes a balance between treating the journal as a monolithic cultural formation in which individual voices were editorially suppressed and as a collaborative enterprise that was shaped by the publisher's, editor's and contributors' sometimes competing motivations and interests. Whatever their positions on questions of theory, all of the essayists regard the *Quarterly* not as a cultural sampler, nor as historical background, but as a textual artefact worthy of detailed study.

This introduction begins with an overview of the nature and sources of archival *Quarterly Review* materials, it then reflects on the essayists' use of those and

other materials, and it closes with a look at what the archives tell us about the publisher John Murray and his editor William Gifford, the two men primarily responsible for making the *Quarterly Review* a successful commercial venture and an effective instrument of conservative propaganda.

We can lament Gifford's stipulation in his will that upon his death his papers – he specified in particular his *Quarterly Review* papers – should be destroyed, for with them went an important part of the journal's history. There are, however, consolations. While Gifford dealt with many of the journal's minor writers and some lesser-known names, such as the Oriel College intellectual Edward Copleston, it was his publisher, John Murray, who was the constant correspondent of the *Quarterly's* most prolific contributors, Sir John Barrow, John Wilson Croker and Robert Southey.<sup>3</sup> A number of their letters to Murray that are preserved in the John Murray Archive were made available to the essay writers in the form of the editor's transcription. The editor also supplied the contributors with annotated transcriptions of unpublished letters of Murray, Gifford and Ellis from the Sir Walter Scott Collection at the National Library of Scotland and from other major caches of Gifford correspondence, such as the twenty-seven letters to George Ellis at the British Library (BL Add. MSS 28099). The Gifford-Ellis letters cover almost the full period of Ellis's contribution to the *Quarterly Review* and are an invaluable source of knowledge about Gifford's editorial practice and of his handling of a senior, friendly contributor. Ellis was an intimate of three other co-founders of the *Quarterly* – Walter Scott, Richard Heber and George Canning – and he was well connected to the ruling class. As he was the reviewer of Scott and Byron, letters addressed to him by his editor are intrinsically interesting. We find in these letters information about Ellis's cooperation with Canning on a series of foreign policy articles and about his collaboration with Canning and Huskisson on essays on political economy. So these letters give us some insight into the *Quarterly's* sources of authoritative information, the formulation and reception of its views on two of the great writers of the period, and how the journal served the interests of literary and political elites.

The mother lode of *Quarterly Review* materials is the John Murray Archive, formerly at 50 Albemarle Street, London, now permanently housed at the National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. In the Archive we find caught as if in amber every letter related to the *Quarterly Review* that passed over the threshold of 32 Fleet Street and, from mid-1812, of 50 Albemarle Street, the offices of John Murray, Bookseller. John Murray II cast no letter aside and each of his successors, recognizing the value of what their forebear had preserved, kept the collection together. Most of the *Quarterly Review* letters at John Murray's, many hundreds of them, are naturally addressed to the publisher, including stacks of

letters from Gifford, Barrow, Croker, Ellis and Southey, along with smaller collections of letters from a host of other contributors and supporters.

In addition to the boxes of Gifford letters to Murray and some Gifford odds and ends, the third John Murray pulled large groupings of Gifford's letters into the archive when he was contemplating a history of the journal (an effort that was absorbed into Samuel Smiles's project, his *Memoir of John Murray*). The Hay family gave John Murray III fifty-eight of Gifford's letters to Robert William Hay, an MP and civil servant who was well known to some of the journal's other principals, Canning, Croker and Barrow. The Gifford-Hay letters provide a view of the editor's handling of a prickly, talented civil servant and they supply further evidence of the extent of government cooperation in the production of political and diplomatic articles in the *Quarterly Review*. John Murray III also obtained Gifford's correspondence with John Taylor Coleridge, the *Quarterly's* second editor. Coleridge, who was the poet's nephew and a close friend of John Keble and Robert Southey, was a Christian jurist – his letters to Gifford show that he was also a partisan moralist, the righteous scourge of the Cockney and Satanic Schools, of Hunt and Shelley.<sup>4</sup> Another valuable source in the Murray Archive is the firm's letterbooks. These preserve, some in Murray's own hand, copies of the publisher's correspondence. Because Murray was selective about what he copied in these books, their contents are of considerable interest. The editor made available to the essay writers his transcription of some of the letters in the letterbooks, of other letters in the Archive, of John Murray's register of books loaned to contributors, and of Murray's early *Quarterly Review* memoranda.

Also offered to the essayists were transcriptions of thirty-seven letters from William Gifford to Edward Copleston, the holographs of which are deposited at the Devon Public Record Office.<sup>5</sup> Through them we can trace Gifford's sometimes sycophantic, not always deft handling of an important contributor and collaborator. The other letters made available to the essayists by way of the editor's transcriptions are: Gifford to Murray and Murray to Croker from the Iowa collection;<sup>6</sup> Gifford to Canning from the Harewood deposit at the West Yorkshire Archive; Gifford to Horton from the Derbyshire Public Record Office; Gifford to Copleston from the Northumberland Public Record Office; Gifford to Copleston from the National Library of Wales; Gifford to George D'Oyly from the Wellcome Library, London; Peter Elmsley to Gifford from the Westminster School, London; Scott, Murray and Gifford letters from the Morgan Library in New York; Croker and Lockhart correspondence from the Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Scott and Gifford letters from the Houghton Library, Harvard University; Canning to Gifford from the Beinecke Library, Yale University; and, from the Perkins Library, Duke University, Gifford to Canning letters and letters from Gifford to Canning's secretary, John Backhouse. Courtesy of Dr Henry Sanford and the Master and Fellows of Trinity

College, Cambridge, the editor and Christopher Stray learned much about Gifford's editorial practice from the fascinating collection of James Henry Monk letters that relate to the publication and reception of Monk's 1819 review of Brougham's education committee.<sup>7</sup> Naturally, the essayists supplemented the *Quarterly Review* documents with their already extensive knowledge of period-specific archival material and secondary sources.

In using these various materials, the essayists demonstrate the complexity of the early nineteenth-century conservative publishing milieu. They identify the range of conservatisms reflected in the *Quarterly's* pages: the Canningite liberal conservatives, Oriel Noetics, Porsonian classicists, evangelical Saints and the Romantic Conservatives. We learn from the essayists that, while each of these groups attempted to use the *Quarterly* to market its version of conservatism, a degree of uniformity was imposed upon them, for although the journal's first editor accepted contributions from a broad spectrum of writers, he attempted to preserve in the *Quarterly*, as best he could, a distinctive liberal-conservative voice. The essayists debate just how successful Gifford was in his effort to produce a homogenized 'house voice' that represented the Canningite faction in Parliament.

Far from being discussed as a specifically liberal-conservative organ, the *Quarterly* is often mistakenly described as a reactionary agent of government control, the literary equivalent, as Hazlitt put it in his vitriolic *Letter to William Gifford* (1819), of the secret police. While the *Quarterly* partly fulfilled its promise that in its pages readers would have access to privileged and authoritative information, information from high government figures and from executive members of the civil service, the journal and the government were not hand in glove. As I state in my essay herein, while the *Quarterly's* conductors supported 'principles English and Constitutional', they hesitated to promote specific government measures and, Canning excepted, most government men. Boyd Hilton shows that the *Quarterly Review* was top to bottom a political project, an ideological counterblast to the *Edinburgh Review*. But, as he points out, the journal's association with a political faction, the Canningites, and tensions between the publisher, the editor and one particular contributor caused the *Quarterly* to support the government's positions only inconsistently. Hilton demonstrates that for most of Gifford's tenure the *Quarterly* was out of step with the nation's evolving conservative constituencies. He shows that the editor was unsympathetic to the growing influence of evangelicalism and the High Church on British conservatism, while Croker, who greatly influenced the publisher's political sympathies, did not respond to the increasingly 'Burkean' tenor of conservatism in the 'Tory' party. Bill Speck reflects that with one of the *Quarterly's* most prolific contributors, Robert Southey, adamantly opposed to the liberal economic policies favoured by Canning and his cronies, on some important

issues the *Quarterly* did not consistently support the liberal conservatives' position.

A reason why during Gifford's reign the journal failed to achieve ideological coherence was that the aims and values of some of its core staff were in conflict. An aggressive editor, through his blue pencil interventions Gifford created the *Quarterly's* imperious, self-assured style, but conditions on the ground ensured that he could not entirely suppress his better writers' individuality or completely resist Murray's efforts to dilute the journal's political character. Highlighting the negotiations that took place between the *Quarterly's* co-founders during the lead-up to the publication of the first number and over the course of the journal's early years, Kim Wheatley and Sharon Ragaz explain that editorial power was distributed between Murray, Gifford and Scott. Wheatley points out that in debating the *Quarterly's* tone and manner – specifically whether they should adopt the *Edinburgh's* vituperative style – the *Quarterly's* founders put political, literary, commercial and personal considerations into play. In her essay on Sir Walter Scott, Ragaz concentrates on the great man's sometimes difficult relationship with Gifford and Murray. She demonstrates that, regardless of the tentative nature of Scott's long-term association with the *Quarterly*, the journal found its footing in large part because Scott lent the conductors his 'experience, advice and prodigious efforts in the matter of contributions' and by that means 'helped to ensure good management, wise editorial policy and a high standard for the articles'.

In discussing Robert Southey's accomplishment as a *Quarterly* reviewer, in their complementary essays Lynda Pratt and Bill Speck highlight Southey's independence. They show that despite Gifford's effort to control him by excising from his articles whatever might give offence to liberal conservatives, Southey produced a distinctive and distinguished body of work. Pratt concentrates on Southey as a literary reviewer, in particular on the 'complex relationship between "Southey" the author and "Southey" the critic' that brought him into conflict with contemporaries such as Coleridge, Wordsworth, Byron and Shelley. Speck focuses on Southey's programme of social and political reform and on his relations with the journal's publisher. His essay examines how far Southey supported government policies while he defended his own views where they differed from government. Both writers qualify the impression Southey himself retailed, that his *Quarterly Review* articles were hopelessly distorted by Gifford's edits.

J. M. R. Cameron provides an example in his essay on the Admiralty's Second Secretary, Sir John Barrow, of how one powerful official cultivated his association with the *Quarterly* to further his and his department's interests and, in doing so, acted with a considerable degree of editorial independence. Cameron argues that, by virtue of the popularity of Barrow's articles, and their great number, far

from being subsumed into the *Quarterly*'s collective voice, the Second Secretary influenced the journal's character and reputation.

If individual personalities greatly shaped the journal's editorial complexion and its commercial fortunes, so did intellectual collectives in the Church and the universities. By examining the treatment of classics in the *Quarterly Review*, Christopher Stray demonstrates the impact of intellectual networks and *Sitz im Leben* on the periodical's content and manner. He argues that the history of the involvement of classicists in Gifford's *Quarterly Review* is in part that of the contrasting styles of the two universities: in Oxford, his own alma mater and the home of his advisor Edward Copleston, Gifford may have felt more comfortable; he was active, though, in recruiting like-minded reviewers from Cambridge. Stray also traces a complex history of interaction between the *Edinburgh Review* and *Quarterly Review*, one which involved both differences of belief and commercial rivalry.

As we have seen, then, collectively the essayists demonstrate that grounding discussion of theoretical questions in empirical evidence leads to a nuanced definition of the *Quarterly* as a conservative journal and to a recognition of the push and pull between individual and corporate voices.

The balance of this introduction epitomizes what we learn from the archives about the journal's day-to-day conduct and especially about the crucial relationship between John Murray and William Gifford. Because at the beginning of an enterprise and at points of transition men form alliances and lay bare their motives, the present volume's essayists tend to emphasize the *Quarterly*'s formative years and the appointment of a new editor upon the first editor's retirement. Of particular note in the journal's early history is the often acrimonious relationship between Gifford and Murray. The tension between the two men stemmed from the competing sets of values that drove their participation in the journal. We find that, in setting up and conducting the *Quarterly*, Murray pursued commercial interests while Gifford represented his political patron, George Canning, in a defence of what he called 'the cause', the protection of the Constitution against the incipient threat of radical reform. Especially in the first few years, the *Quarterly* was consequently conducted under a divided command: the publisher was determined to safeguard his investment, while the editor, weakened by Canning's twelve-year exile from high office (1810–22), was unable entirely to resist Murray's editorial intrusions. Through the *Quarterly Review* materials we can trace how Murray and Gifford nevertheless achieved success and how they and their coadjutors benefited thereby.<sup>8</sup> We find that success rested on two pillars. It was the structure of the journal's relationship with government – and Gifford's handling of that relationship – along with its conductors' ability to attract talent that made the journal an asset to its political sponsors, and to its publisher,

editor, writers and readers. The journal's prestige brought patronage benefits to some of Gifford's collaborators, while its conservative readership benefited by having their views defended and their prejudices confirmed in the periodical press.<sup>9</sup>

Strategically, the *Quarterly* was a project in Murray's long-term scheme to achieve commercial success by identifying his firm with the establishment. That he was 'anxiously and firmly attached to the government' (*QR* Letter 51)<sup>10</sup> and that he was conservative by temperament there can be no doubt; but it is not at all clear that he was a man of strong, perhaps any, core political convictions. We glean from the archival evidence that his alliance with government secured for him revenue, reputation and a stable lucrative market.

The other founders of the *Quarterly Review*, in contrast – Scott, Canning, Ellis and Gifford – were British nationalists whose primary motivation in establishing the journal was 'to further the cause' (*QR* Letter 3). Only in a narrow sense did they set up the journal to prop up a weak conservative Ministry; more broadly and generously they desired to advance a political and social vision. With a high degree of sincerity,<sup>11</sup> these men wished to promote a complex of conservative ideas, that Britain was a beacon of Christian civilization and that her glory was embodied in national 'establishments' – the universities, courts, Church, king and aristocracy, parliament, the unwritten Constitution, and, not least of all, the Anglo-Scottish literary tradition.<sup>12</sup> Historians of canon formation have noted that in the long eighteenth century British conservatives touted English and Scottish literature as an expression of *national* genius, as an 'establishment' on a par with the monarchy, parliament and the Church. In the wake of the Anglo-Scottish Union of 1701, the ideological tsunami of the French Revolution, and the 1800 Act of Union with Ireland, promoting the idea that there was a national literature was a component of the state-sponsored effort to articulate a distinctive British identity. The literary establishment, like other national establishments, was to be protected from erosion by foreign interlopers. As a manifestation of this effort to preserve and defend the nation, during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era conservatives such as William Gifford partly defined British literature, character, manners and politics in contradistinction from French models. Christian British nationalism had a considerable impact on the *Quarterly* as it more or less directed Gifford's and his sympathetic contributors' choice and treatment of subjects for review.

As a principled conservative, the first editor of the *Quarterly Review* was not a partisan supporter of the conservative governments of the day; he thought that many of the 'Tory' ministers were weak and self-serving. Archival materials inform us, then, about the limits of government influence on the journal and about how much and in what ways the *Quarterly* served the establishment or was manipulated by it. We find that while Gifford, Murray and their gentle-

men gave general support to Cabinet, their allegiance to ‘the present men’ was not slavish (*QR* Letters 4, 41, 75, 97, 140). From their earliest negotiations, the journal’s principals – Murray, Scott, Canning, Heber, Ellis and Gifford – agreed that while the *Quarterly* would ‘to a certain extent’ serve the Crown (*QR* Letter 8) it was not measures and men but rational Christianity and the Constitution that the journal would actively support. Thus it was that in 1810 Prime Minister Perceval met with a surprise when he tried to have an article on the bullion question inserted in the *Quarterly Review*. Because the view he espoused conflicted with the position the journal had already taken on the matter, Gifford ‘manfully vindicated [the *Quarterly*’s] independence’ by turning away the first minister of the Crown (*QR* Letters 70, 71). In 1813 Prime Minister Liverpool experienced a similar rebuff when he tried to influence the *Quarterly*’s position on the renewal of the East India Company charter. As it is not in the nature of power to reward independence, Gifford’s pluck, coupled with his association with Canning, in the long run probably damaged the *Quarterly*’s ability to attract contributions from high politicians and extract information from government (*QR* Letter 148). ‘It is really astonishing that they [the Cabinet] will not take more advantage of us, and influence a great portion of the country which we have brought almost to their feet’, Gifford wrote to Canning in 1817 (*QR* Letter 183). It was a complaint he uttered often (*QR* Letters 57, 111, 162, 180), but in doing so he forgot he had warned the ministers not to expect an automatic entrance into the *Quarterly Review*.

The *Quarterly Review* materials show, however, that Gifford and Murray were able to call upon government for practical help. Most importantly, high officials fed authoritative privileged information to the editor and his collaborators (*QR* Letter 187). While there is no evidence that the Treasury provided a subvention, the *Quarterly*’s connection with government brought indirect financial benefits, with ministries rewarding Murray and his writers with contracts, patronage and promotions (*QR* Letters 93, 229). Managing the journal also involved posting a massive amount of correspondence – ‘I have 42 Letters before me to answer’, Murray once complained (*QR* Letter 174). To ease this significant burden on themselves and the journal’s contributors,<sup>13</sup> Gifford and Murray relied heavily on the franking privileges of men they knew in government and the civil service;<sup>14</sup> it seems that one of the journal’s political sponsors, the chief administrator of the postal service, Sir Francis Freeling, also got involved, possibly to deflect Murray and Gifford’s postage costs (*QR* Letter 160). For strategic reasons, though, no member of the *Quarterly*’s editorial group received direct financial support from government specifically for their work on the periodical – the *Quarterly* would have lost credibility with the public had it become known as a Treasury journal.<sup>15</sup>

Under Murray and Gifford's tutelage the *Quarterly* was not, then, in any facile way a government organ. It was, however, what the hyper-Protestant *Anti-jacobin Review* supposed it to be, a mouthpiece for the Canningites, which was another reason why governments under Perceval and Liverpool were somewhat wary of it.<sup>16</sup> Gifford initially agreed to serve as editor only as long as Canning remained in office. He accepted the position, he told Canning, 'because I know of no other whom you could securely trust – with me, you are perfectly safe' (*QR* Letter 3; cf. Letters 89, 257).<sup>17</sup> A definition of the *Quarterly Review* as a Canningite journal should, however, be qualified by Canning's formal disbanding of his party in 1813 and by the observation that the statesman's influence on the periodical was largely achieved through his surrogates, Gifford, Ellis and Heber. As an initiator of correspondence relating to the *Quarterly Review*, Canning is represented in few letters; and yet his silence, if properly understood, signifies not indifference or irrelevance but governing influence. Canning was involved in planning the *Quarterly* (*QR* Letters 10, 11) and, with Ellis, he wrote a number of articles; but for the most part he exercised control passively. He was the great man whose will Gifford and Ellis consulted before embarking on any article of political note (*QR* Letters 20, 114, 144, 148, 188). At a minimum, Canning's unwavering sponsorship of Gifford meant that Murray could not remove him, much as he wanted to upon occasion – at times of stress Murray tended to seek a scapegoat and, in the matter of the *Quarterly*, Gifford was always at hand to serve that purpose (*QR* Letters 59, 60).

Archival materials help us gain a nuanced view of government support for the *Quarterly Review*; they also help us measure the relative contribution of those who shaped its editorial character. The materials reveal that the production of any given article was a collaborative affair, as was the general conduct of the enterprise. Some contributors, such as Walter Scott and George Ellis, helped formulate editorial policy. Others helped sub-edit the *Quarterly*. To get through all the work that bringing out an issue involved, and to ensure that arcane topics were adequately treated, Gifford employed a legion of sub-editors. Many of his more reliable writers played this role: Barrow sub-edited Croker and Croker, Barrow; Gregory sub-edited Young and Young, Gregory; Copleston sub-edited Dudley; Heber, Scott; Scott, Erskine, and so on. Many of the same men who wrote for the journal or who undertook a sub-editorial role were also recruiters for it.

Collaboration did not mean that Gifford was editor in name only or that the *Quarterly Review* was merely the sum of its parts. After all, he directed this sub-editorial activity; he filtered the results; and, without exception, he vetted the journal's political content. The situation was complicated, however, for Gifford and Murray were engaged in a contest for executive control. Early on, Scott took sides with Murray, but as Sharon Ragaz points out in her contribution to

the present volume, Scott was active in the journal for mere months. Despite his promises to Gifford that he would assist in the editorship and that he would be a steady supplier of articles and men (*QR* Letter 4), no sooner had the first issue appeared than Scott's interest trailed off. The archives also confirm, however, Scott's importance in carrying the project forward: he organized political and literary sponsorship; he articulated an editorial policy; he suggested a marketing strategy; and, perhaps most important of all, he inspired confidence in Murray, Canning, Gifford and the others that the project could succeed. But after the initial issue, published on 1 March 1809, he barely kept his hand in. Between the ninth number, published in April 1811, and the twenty-seventh number, published in March 1816, he contributed nothing. The reasons for Scott's withdrawal are complex: his energies were needed elsewhere – to manage his difficult business relationship with the Ballantyne brothers for instance – but a major consideration was that he found it an imposition constantly to be pressed for copy by Gifford, Murray and Heber. In any case he could persuade himself that the journal had achieved the goals he had set for it in October 1808 (*QR* Letter 4). By 1811 its success was assured, or at least the danger of its imminent collapse had passed; it had to some extent undermined Archibald Constable's power by diluting the novelty of the *Edinburgh Review*; and it certainly had successfully challenged the *Edinburgh's* intellectual and ideological monopoly. The *Quarterly* was an important episode in Scott's life, but it was only an episode.<sup>18</sup>

Once Scott absented himself, Murray had one major competitor for top-to-bottom control of the journal, his editor. A contest of wills between Murray and Gifford was played out intensively in the period 1809 to 1811, with the selection of articles and the assignment and management of contributors as their chief battleground. The names Penrose, Kidd, Conybeare and Monk were flashpoints (*QR* Letters 27, 30, 45, 83, 195). These were men Gifford recruited or encouraged whose articles were either rejected by Murray or amended in circumstances that, in each instance, humiliated Gifford and caused him seriously to consider whether he should continue as editor. The answer always was, yes he would continue, but it was increasingly on Murray's terms. The best Gifford obtained from Murray was the delineation of separate spheres of influence. The older man, Gifford, would supervise the university crowd, the clerics and classicists, he would police articles for sloppy expression and lapses in 'taste' and, as Canning's agent, he would monitor the journal's political ethos. The younger man, Murray, would manage the prestige contributors – Southey, Barrow and Croker. It was an accommodation that Gifford was forced to accept because Canning's day-to-day influence was weak and because Murray's practical power over his editor was strong.

Delving into archival *Quarterly Review* materials, we discover that, during the journal's first years, John Murray transformed himself from a junior member of the British publishing fraternity and a peripheral member of the *Quarterly's*

editorial coterie into a man who, by 1815, was acknowledged as ‘the Prince of Booksellers’<sup>19</sup> and who in 1817 claimed, without fear of contradiction, that he ‘alone created’ the *Quarterly Review*, ‘the most formidable engine that ever was invented, in support of the laws and Religion of his Country’ (*QR* Letter 216).

John Murray extended control over Gifford and his other gentlemen by using money strategically, to buy loyalty, to advertise success and to create dependencies. It was not market pressure or ‘impulsive generosity’<sup>20</sup> alone that drove him to pay so well; his extravagance may have been risky, even foolish, but it was extensive and systematic. He used money not by threatening to withhold it, but by throwing it at his editor and contributors, by rewarding those of his gentlemen for whom, as Scott put it, receiving compensation of fifteen or twenty guineas was ‘a matter of convenience to them’ (*QR* Letter 4). He supplied gratis subscriptions to the men and women he wished to compliment, flatter or do business with. To the men upon whose loyalty he depended he sent gifts: to the inveterate bibliophile Richard Heber, fine first editions; to the voracious reader Southey, rafts of free books; in later years, to the ailing Gifford, permanent access to carriage, horse and driver; to Barrow and Croker, his most prolific contributors, Murray sent cheques so generous that both men felt obliged to return them. Money was an effective, if expensive, means of control.

Through his largesse Murray created, for those of his gentlemen who were susceptible, an ‘income stream’ and with it a ‘lifestyle dependency’. Certainly Southey and Gifford were not immune. Judging by his complaint to Canning in 1824 that by his retirement from the editorship he would lose half his income (*QR* Letter 257), the payment Gifford received from Murray was more important to him than he otherwise let on. As for Southey, to secure the quality of research and writing that he brought to the journal, Murray paid his best writer the astonishing figure of £100 per article, regardless of length.<sup>21</sup> Southey resisted by asserting his dignity, but with his own and the poet Coleridge’s children to feed, he could not practically refuse payment or, like Gifford, Croker and Barrow, insist upon being paid less:

Your pay is very liberal, and the price which I receive for my writings is by no means a matter of indifference to me, but it can make no difference in the manner of my writing. The same diligence, the same desire, – and the same power (whatever that may be) were brought to the task when you paid me ten guineas per-sheet, as when you raised it to 100£ per-piece. This last is a great price, and it is very convenient to me to receive it. But I will tell you with that frankness which you have always found in my correspondence and conversation, that ~~work at that price~~ I say suspect my time might be more profitably employed (as I am sure it might be more worthily) than in writing for your journal ~~at the~~ even at that price. (*QR* Letter 196)

Despite his threats to stop contributing to the *Quarterly*, oft repeated, all he could do was bluster and enjoy the insults about Murray – an intolerable coxcomb, a

secret drinker – that his friend Grosvenor Bedford retailed for his benefit: ‘Murray’s an ass as we well know and have agreed upon long ago – a liberal ass enough perhaps – but still an ass.’<sup>22</sup>

We see in the *Quarterly Review* materials that money was the most obvious, but not the only, form of currency Murray used to control his men. Foremost among his other means were the journal’s fame and reputation, means that Gifford also used to achieve particular purposes. The *Quarterly* enjoyed a prestige that has few parallels in journalism, then or now. T. F. Dibdin, a noted contemporary bibliophile, described the fevered demand for the *Quarterly* in the 1820s:

In the history of Literature, the subscription-book of Mr. Murray ... would cut a splendid figure: and the ease and dexterity with which each number is divided into allotments, and distributed according to the copies subscribed for (the payment being PROMPT) by the several great bookselling houses, would astonish a looker on ... At sun-rise, the QUARTERLY TREE reaches to the sky ... At sun-set, it is levelled to the earth ... and every man hugs his *log* (alias, number) with eager and undiminished delight. What a SUB-NOTE might be here appended, as to the *sensations* which certain numbers ... are known to have some times produced?<sup>23</sup>

Obtaining just such a degree of estimation with the public was a key strategic goal that Scott, Murray and Ellis agreed in their letters of October and November 1808 (*QR* Letters 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14). Archival materials give us an idea of how the *Quarterly* achieved success and how its principals used what they called the journal’s ‘credit’ as a commodity of exchange. The journal held out the promise that in its pages readers would have access to privileged and authoritative information, information from high government figures, from executive members of the civil service, from the bishops and from the great minds of the nation’s universities. Gifford also cultivated the *Quarterly* as a source of reliable historical information. To that end he incubated major well-documented treatises, such as the articles Robert Hay produced on Russia’s entry into the war against Napoleon, the articles John Wilson Croker wrote that he based on the memoirs of French revolutionists, and the article the Duke of Wellington sub-edited on the battle of Waterloo. The Second Secretary of the Admiralty, Sir John Barrow, made use of official documents in his articles on voyages in search of a north-west passage and on history-making explorations of discovery in deepest Africa, the Himalayas and the South Pacific. It was just because his articles combined these two types of authoritative information – official and historical – that they were highly popular and brought great credit to the *Quarterly Review*.

Gifford stipulated that a primary reason he had joined the *Quarterly*’s van was to stand up for literature, the Constitution, the Church and Christianity. ‘I had long seen’, he wrote to Edward Copleston, ‘with thousands besides, that the Government was calumniated, the great literary Establishment of the country depreciated, the Church insulted, and even Religion itself attacked [by the

*Edinburgh Review*] with the unfairest and most odious weapons: and I flattered myself that when a fair opportunity was afforded, the friends of Order, Morality and rational Piety, would muster in their defence' (*QR* Letter 30). Because he saw more clearly than most of the other members of the journal's editorial machine that the *Quarterly* was committed to defending these national 'establishments', Gifford perspicaciously insisted that classical and religious topics should form part of the journal's regular fare. Referring to reviews of Latin and Greek texts, Murray's verdict was that 'more than one ... *learned* Article clogs us sadly' (*QR* Letter 61). That was not Gifford's opinion. As an imitator of Horace and Persius and as a translator of Juvenal, Gifford was attracted to the classics, but the reason he went out of his way to admit Greek and Latin articles was to cater to an important recruiting pool, men at the English universities. As Christopher Stray points out in his essay herein, publishing esoteric reviews of Greek texts was also a coded language meant to reassure the journal's subscribers who read the ancients that the *Quarterly* supported the classical edifice of British culture.

Gifford also met forceful, even contemptuous resistance from Murray, Ellis and Erskine when he championed the insertion of religious articles in the journal (*QR* Letters 26, 29, 59, 61). The editor persevered because he alone among the journal's principals recalled that the *Quarterly* was in part set up to rally a defence of the established Church and rational Christianity. Encouraged by his hyper-orthodox best friend John Ireland, the Dean of Westminster, Gifford showed an awareness that many of the journal's patrons expected the *Quarterly* to be an engaging persuasive advocate for the Church, and to promote Christianity as one of the nation's core values (*QR* Letters 7, 89, 146).

Gifford believed that historical, religious and classical articles elevated the journal above ephemera and created a demand for second, third and fourth 'editions' (*QR* Letter 148). It was a demand that saw complete runs of the periodical sold in large numbers to the end of the century, runs that were then passed down from generation to generation.<sup>24</sup> While it is unknown how many subscribers who bought the *Quarterly* had no intention of reading it – such as the Earl of Buckinghamshire, the leaves of whose copies to this day remain uncut –<sup>25</sup> it is clear that he and others like him were purchasing prestige by association; they displayed the journal in their country homes or London flats to advertise their intellectual credentials, their allegiance to the conservative administration, and their loyalty to Church and king.

Because the *Quarterly*'s prestige also brought credit to its writers, between John Murray's gentlemen there was intense competition over the selection of books to review (*QR* Letter 58), over the matching up of books and contributors (*QR* Letters 47, 83), and over the ordering of articles in a given issue (*QR* Letter 194), including which articles would occupy the privileged positions of first and last (*QR* Letter 61). Successful contributors asserted or were granted possession of

swaths of intellectual territory. In the case of George Ellis, this meant ownership of individual authors – Lord Byron and Sir Walter Scott; in the case of Sir John Barrow, mental dominion over real geography – China, the Arctic, Africa, the South Pacific. Only one man, Richard Heber, ever exercised complete independence from Gifford and Murray in the matter of commissioning contributors and assigning books for review (*QR* Letters 47, 48, 75, 91). That his exercise of this power was anomalous and deeply inappropriate is evidenced in its chaos-inducing results. Gifford was left in the embarrassing position of having to tell a key collaborator such as Ellis or Scott to stop progress on an article they had begun because Heber had assigned it to another writer. Heber got away with this behaviour because he was present at the creation, because he was an effective recruiter for Gifford, and because he was Canning and Scott's particular friend.<sup>26</sup>

Gifford himself had a practical use for the journal's credit – as a commodity to be traded for regular copy. Although the *Quarterly's* success, he said, only served to alarm him – he feared it could not be sustained – it did offer to alleviate his 'perpetual dread lest any assistance should be withdrawn' (*QR* Letter 122). Gifford used the journal's prestige to attract and retain contributors, but in that regard he faced a challenge. The pride of association that he could hold out as incentive to potential contributors was a tricky asset. It was not easily convertible, for bragging rights accrued to contributors only if their authorship was known, and the *Quarterly's* rule, at the time conventional among review periodicals, was that its authors remain anonymous. One of the purposes of secrecy was 'the production of a corporate voice and corporate responsibility';<sup>27</sup> anonymity also benefited the *Quarterly* by permitting the journal to imply a fine pedigree for its articles that they did not always deserve. Letting it get out that Canning, Scott and Southey were contributors created a significant advantage, for association with the good and the great helped cast a glow of privilege and quality over the whole journal (*QR* Letter 53). Anonymity could raise all boats; it could also – at least in the imaginations of readers – elevate the already good into the realm of the sublime. When Gifford was fortunate enough to find a writer whose contributions created a sensation – as Lord Dudley's articles did – the author's hidden face, Junius-like, became the object of fevered speculation. Readers constructed a charismatic personality for their author; the powers they attributed to him were beyond all reason: 'It is impossible that any *known* name could support the high character which our *anonymous* assistant sustains', Gifford gleefully informed Murray (*QR* Letter 63). Novelty and competence, nurtured by promotion and speculation, helped gain the *Quarterly* the inflated credit that is the natural concomitant of extraordinary fame.

While it was one thing to let it be known that great men wrote for the periodical or to encourage readers to get excited about its good writers, it was quite another to reveal that very ordinary men also wrote for the *Quarterly*. As Croker

warned Murray in 1823, should that truth come out the benefits of anonymity to the individual writer and to the journal as a corporate enterprise would evaporate: 'If you were to publish', he said, 'such names as Cohen and Croker and Collinson and Coleridge, the magical WE would have little effect, and your Review would be absolutely despised – omne ignotum pro mirifico'.<sup>28</sup> The potential danger or disadvantage of revealing an author's name meant that Gifford only selectively permitted it. He shared his secret knowledge with a collaborator, or permitted an author to let his name be known, when he thought it would benefit the *Quarterly*.

The *Quarterly Review* materials present us with examples of the variety of ways Murray, Gifford and their correspondents maintained or manipulated the policy of anonymity. In some instances it was Murray and Gifford's writers who, often for political reasons, insisted that they vigorously *keep* their secret. In the most elaborate cases, such as those of Robert Grant and Lord Dudley, even the publisher and editor were not permitted to know their authors' identities. Grant's father, Charles Grant, a high official in the East India Company, was an associate of William Wilberforce, James Stephen and Lord Teignmouth – the so-called Saints. The Saints had interests – such as their parliamentary alliance with the radical 'Mountain' against slavery and the slave trade – that might have been compromised had it become known that Grant was writing for the *Quarterly*. After all, a slave owner, George Ellis, was one of its co-conductors; the journal might at any moment come out with an article that would contradict and embarrass the Saints. To hide his handwriting, Grant had his friend John Thornton transcribe his drafts. Reginald and Richard Heber, Lord Teignmouth and Zachary Macaulay conveyed drafts and proofs between Grant and Gifford. Even more than Grant, Lord Dudley was determined not to be discovered. We find in Gifford's letters that Copleston – who acted as mediator between Gifford and Dudley – directed the editor to go to extraordinary lengths to remain ignorant of the identity of his 'anonymous friend'. Dudley also used an amanuensis and Copleston compelled Gifford and Murray to employ servants as runners and a London bookseller, 'Mr Budd', to act as a blind post office (*QR* Letter 103).

Few authors were quite so particular about maintaining anonymity as these two men; indeed, many of the *Quarterly's* writers itched to have their names known. Gifford did sometimes grant a writer permission to claim his article in public, but when he did so, he often had an ulterior motive. A good case in point is that of James Henry Monk, the primary author of an important article on education that appeared in 1819.<sup>29</sup> By permitting him to reveal his authorship, the editor used Monk as a screen. As was his wont, Gifford submitted Monk's article to Croker for sub-editing; Croker then showed the article to Lord Lonsdale, whose interests were alluded to in the article; Lonsdale insisted that the reference to him be deleted. Croker and others also supplied arguments and drew conclu-

sions; Canning polished the article (*QR* Letter 204). Except for Canning's helpful additions, it had not been Gifford's idea to let these men manipulate Monk's article to such an extent. Indeed he fiercely resisted Lonsdale's interference and he tried to remove some of the added material, but Murray and his allies Croker and Barrow faced him down (*QR* Letters 201, 202, 203, 205). In so doing, they showed contempt for his authority and humiliated him into filling the ugly role that Hazlitt accused him of occupying, that of 'literary toad-eater to greatness, and taster to the court'.<sup>30</sup> Gifford now had to ensure that his masters' interventions would not become known: 'That a word proceeds from me' (by which he meant Monk's collaborators) 'must *never never* be hinted', Gifford gravely impressed upon his young contributor. Counselling discretion, he disingenuously permitted Monk to admit to relatives and close friends that he was the article's author (*QR* Letter 197). Gifford knew his man. Like a colt out of the gate, Monk giddily revealed his role to his girlfriend and to anyone else who cocked an ear in his direction; his letters make delightful reading (*QR* Letters 206, 209, 212, 214, 215).

Letting an individual contributor forgo anonymity was one thing. What Gifford seldom did was confide his personal knowledge of an author's identity. When he did so, it was usually to a member of the inner circle. The other founders of the *Quarterly Review* had access to this secret knowledge by right; Gifford did not and could not withhold it from them. It is telling, however, that he could and did make an exception with Murray. In part this was because he was in competition with his publisher, in part it was because, as publisher – Southey liked to point out that Murray was a mere 'tradesman' – Murray's status was different in kind from that of the other founders, but it was also because, as he warned Scott, he thought Murray could not be trusted: 'The vanity of being in a secret, is too great for him' (*QR* Letter 121).

Given the value Gifford placed on possession of even a *single* author's name, it is a wonder that he ever gave up the pearl of great price, the key to *all* contributors. The *Quarterly Review* letters reveal that by giving out this key Gifford brought only one newcomer into the journal's inner circle, the future provost of Oriel College, Edward Copleston, to whom he repeatedly insisted 'I have no secrets' (*QR* Letters 45, 92, 207). To understand why Copleston alone outside the co-founders was admitted to the elect, we need look no further than the great number of men he brought to the *Quarterly*: Blomfield, Elmsley, Mitchell, Monk, Penrose, Davison, Grey, Phillpotts, Whately, Senior, Berens, Mitford and Dudley. From the blunt flattery of Gifford's letters to Copleston (*QR* Letter 99), and from his giving up this precious possession, we can see that Gifford had found in this collaborator whom he called 'the man of men' an indispensable ally (*QR* Letter 34).

The power the *Quarterly's* success gave Gifford was limited and he was not terribly adept at using it. Murray, though, employed the *Quarterly's* assets aggressively: to negotiate favourable terms with other publishers who clamoured to be

associated with his firm (*QR* Letter 51); to obtain commissions from government;<sup>31</sup> and to manipulate the men his success depended on, his authors and his editor. Murray, with Gifford's assistance, gained this power by increasing the *Quarterly's* putative value. Following Scott's instructions (*QR* Letter 4), he boosted the *Quarterly* above Grub Street journalism by applying the lessons the *Edinburgh* taught him: he resisted the temptation to puff his publications by commissioning positive reviews of them in the *Quarterly*; he paid his writers handsomely and insisted that all contributors accept compensation regardless of their class or means; and, with Gifford, he published, among lighter fare, lengthy informative reviews which, contemporaries believed, qualified as permanent contributions to history, biography or literature. In each of these respects, the *Edinburgh* paved the way, but Murray and Gifford went where the *Edinburgh* could not go: they extended the reach of politically-focused journalism into respectable conservative households of the middle class and aristocracy, Hazlitt's 'mob of well-dressed readers,'<sup>32</sup> and they made association with review journalism a desirable career move for aspiring conservative professionals in the Church, law, the civil service and government.<sup>33</sup>

Alone among the quality periodicals, the *Quarterly* benefited its writers to the extent of potentially qualifying them for major patronage.<sup>34</sup> During Gifford's tenure it was the conservatives who dispensed patronage, primarily of course to their confrères. So a man's association with the *Edinburgh* or another 'serious' journal that espoused questionable political opinions – the *Critical*, the *Monthly*, the *Westminster* – may have garnered him intellectual respect, but it is doubtful that it would have helped him gain a patronage appointment.<sup>35</sup> Writing for a conservative journal such as the *British Critic* or the *Antijacobin* might qualify one for patronage, but only of a minor sort, because even members of the same general political species held these journals in contempt.<sup>36</sup> To the extent that association with the *Quarterly* helped its men receive patronage – men such as Copleston, Ireland, Blomfield, Davison, Grant, Heber and Monk, to name a few – it did so because the journal's quality reflected well on their services to the Crown.

The success of those of John Murray's gentlemen who, as Gifford put it, 'wrote for promotion' (*QR* Letter 113), is good evidence of the journal's respectability and the marketable value of its fame. That association with the *Quarterly* commanded real benefits can be readily illustrated. To return to James Monk, it was generally acknowledged that his 1830 elevation to the bishopric of Gloucester was in part a reward for his 1819 article on Brougham's education committee. Monk's elevation was resented, however, because there was a suspicion – not unfounded, as we have seen – that he deserved diminished credit for the review. Monk, it was thought, had merely supplied the article's matter, its 'coarse cloth', whereas Canning had supplied its 'gold lace and spangles' (*QR* Letter 268). A less complicated, but also controversial, instance is that of the valuable *Quarterly*

*Review* writer the Reverend John Davison. In 1817, Lord Liverpool presented him to the vicarage of Sutterton, Lincolnshire, at £1,400 per year. So rich was this living that Davison thought there must have been a mistake and asked the Prime Minister for a clarification. The episode raised eyebrows at Oxford because Davison was appointed ahead of men thought by partisans to be more deserving.<sup>37</sup> As he was a man of relatively slight accomplishment, only his association with the *Quarterly* explains his receiving, repeatedly, the Prime Minister's patronage.

We see in the archival materials that in virtue of its success the *Quarterly Review* became a commodity of exchange to all who were associated with it, to its founders, conductors, writers and readers alike. For their part, John Murray's gentlemen clothed the regime in respectable dress and so qualified themselves for lucre and for fame. Its readers benefited by being informed and entertained, and by having their views justified and confirmed in a respectable periodical. In the end, by maintaining a degree of independence from government while at the same time obtaining the government's imprimatur, the publisher and his editor satisfied their sometimes competing aims: John Murray made money and became the 'Prince of Booksellers'; William Gifford paid fealty to his political master George Canning and, in doing so, promoted British nationalism and the liberal conservatives' political vision.

### Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation to the essay contributors for, on short notice, generously responding to my request to contemplate the significance of the materials I had collected and for abiding with me when the project hit a rough patch in early 2007.

I give heartfelt thanks to my wife, Sylvia Jones Cutmore, who over the course of too many years has sacrificed time and treasure to the 'books'. I am grateful to my children, Benjamin, Laura and Philip, for struggling with me over many a hard-to-read word in the Gifford letters, and for being patient whenever I drew their attention to another and yet another *Quarterly Review* connection.

I also wish to thank Christopher Stray for his cheerful encouragement and ready assistance; Donald Reiman for initiating the publication of the *Quarterly Review Archive* on the University of Maryland's *Romantic Circles*; Iain Brown, Principal Manuscripts Curator at the National Library of Scotland, and his staff for guidance concerning the Sir Walter Scott materials; and Virginia Murray, John R. Murray and the late 'Jock' Murray for access to the John Murray Archive when it was at 50 Albemarle Street.

JC  
April 2007