

Introduction

THE DIARY OF JOHN CAM HOBHOUSE**Introduction, December 2009**

This edition will never be completed: there is too much diary for one lifetime's editorial work. But it now contains all of Hobhouse's diary for the duration of Byron's life.

My thanks to the late Ian Gilmour, Chris Little, Anthony Peattie, Jack Gumpert Wasserman, and Jonathan East for their assistance in different sections.

The amount of online encyclopaedia information has increased a thousandfold since the job started, and I'm sure the whole document will get annotated in time. Meanwhile, notes pending are marked by an asterisk.

Biography

John Cam Hobhouse, later Baron Broughton (1786-1869), politician and best friend of Lord Byron, the eldest child of Sir Benjamin Hobhouse, bart., by his first wife, Charlotte, heiress of Samuel Cam of Chantry House, Bradford, Wiltshire, was born at Redland, Bristol, on 27 June 1786. He had two brothers, and two sisters, one of whom died in infancy. His background was one of unenfranchised nonconformity and commercial wealth – important factors for the understanding of the way his politics developed. His father was a noted Unitarian who campaigned for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts: his mother was also a dissenter. He went to Lewin's Mead, John Prior Estlin's Unitarian school at Bristol, then to Westminster, and then to Trinity College, Cambridge. Here he obtained the Hulsean prize in 1808 (for an essay *On the Origin and Intention of Sacrifices*), graduating B.A. in 1808 and M.A. in 1811.

His mother died in 1791. From his father's second marriage, to Amelia Parry, he acquired fourteen half-siblings.

At Cambridge he founded a Whig Club, and became the close friend of Byron, with whom in 1809 he travelled across Portugal and Spain to Gibraltar. From Malta he and Byron were encouraged by English naval and diplomatic intelligence to travel into Albania, where they stayed with Ali Pasha from 19-23 October 1809: an English naval force meanwhile took over most of the Ionian Islands, a fact on which Ali congratulated them. They then went into Greece, where they were surprised to discover considerable anti-Turkish feeling amongst the inhabitants. They based themselves in Athens, visiting Marathon on 24 January, and then went via Smyrna to Constantinople, where they attended an audience with Sultan Mahmoud II on 10 July.

On 31 October 1809 Hobhouse records, "Byron is writing a long poem in the Spenserian stanza" – the first reference to *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*. Prior to its publication, Hobhouse had seen Byron as his poetic equal. Lines 247-62 in the first edition of *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (1809) are by him. In their absence from England, Hobhouse's anthology *Imitations and Translations* was published, containing several poems by Byron, and on

Introduction

returning he published a comic poem, *The Wonders of a Week at Bath*. Neither volume was a success, and Hobhouse's references to Byron's great success are few and far between. On the other hand, his account of their eastern tour, *A Journey through Albania, and other Provinces of Turkey*, went through two printings. It is notable for its final section, about the aspirations and failures of Sultan Selim III. The book brought him a Fellowship of the Royal Society in 1814.

From May 1813 to February 1814 he made a long tour through wartime Europe, visiting Stralsund, Berlin, Vienna, Leipzig, Prague, Fiume, Weimar and Amsterdam. The suffering he witnessed affected him. When, in April 1814, the news broke of the abdication of the greatest of his heroes, Napoleon, he hurried to Paris, accompanied by Henry Grattan – Byron had at first agreed to go, then changed his mind. On 3 May Hobhouse was disgusted to witness Louis XVIII entering the capital.

Throughout this period he was a member of the Holland House Whig circle. He considered, but rejected, the idea of standing as M.P. for Cambridge University.

He heard about Byron's engagement to Annabella Milbanke via an unnamed third party. However, on 2 January 1815 he acted as best man at the wedding, having made an attempt – probably with Byron's encouragement – to dissuade the minister from performing the ceremony. Annabella learned about this, and it increased her dislike of him, which she shared with Augusta Leigh.

Upon Napoleon's escape from Elba, Hobhouse again went to Paris, where he met Benjamin Constant, and witnessed Napoleon's attempt to become a constitutional ruler. He saw Bonaparte on several occasions. Waterloo – the news of which reached him as he was trying to cross the Swiss border with Michael Bruce – depressed him, and he was disgusted by the second reinstatement of Louis XVIII, "this king of shreds and patches". In the following year he published an account of the Hundred Days, *The Substance of some Letters written by an Englishman resident in Paris during the last Reign of the Emperor Napoleon*, in which he displayed his hatred of the Bourbon dynasty and his sympathy with Bonaparte – despite the death of his brother Benjamin at Quatre Bras. The book – the third edition of which was dedicated to Byron – was reviewed in the *Quarterly*, which affected to read it as a parody. Its French translation was seized by the government, and both printer and translator were fined and imprisoned.

Hobhouse wrote the prologue to Charles Maturin's *Bertram*, which opened at Drury Lane on 9 May 1816.

He was loyal to Byron throughout the separation from Annabella, drawing up "a full and scrupulously accurate account" of the events. This was printed privately in 1870 in the wake of the Beecher Stowe controversy, and reprinted in *Recollections of a Long Life* (II 191-366). He had seen Byron off at Dover on 25 April, and, in the autumn of 1816, with Scrope Davies, visited the poet at the Villa Diodati, near Geneva, arriving on the day Shelley left. He and Byron dined often with Madame de Staël at Coppet, and made two Alpine tours. Passing the Simplon in October, they visited Milan, where they were entertained by Ludovico di Brême, and met Vincenzo Monti, Stendhal, and Silvio Pellico, whose tragedy *Francesca da Rimini* Hobhouse translated, assisted at first by Byron. In Austrian-occupied Milan, Byron and Hobhouse found that their politics created an appreciative audience for them such as they had never experienced in England. They then visited Venice and Rome together. During late 1817 and early 1818 Hobhouse wrote some of the notes for Canto IV of *Childe Harold*; the poem was afterwards dedicated to him by Byron. The section on Italian literature in his book *Historical Illustrations to the Fourth Canto of Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* was written for him, in uneasy collaboration, by Ugo Foscolo. In 1823 he was outraged when Foscolo proposed to his step-sister Matilda.

Hobhouse became a member of The Rota, a dining club for the promotion of reforms. In 1819 he contested the parliamentary seat of Westminster, which had become vacant on the suicide of Sir Samuel Romilly. He stood as a radical, supported by his father and by Sir Francis Burdett, but was defeated on 3 March by George Lamb, Lord Melbourne's brother. Riots followed, and a breach opened between him and the Holland House Whigs.

Introduction

At this time he wrote several political pamphlets, and an anonymous reply written by him to a sarcastic speech of Canning's attracted much attention. In 1819 he published an anonymous pamphlet entitled *A Trifling Mistake, &c.* To the question "What prevents the people from walking down to the House, and pulling out the members by the ears, locking up their doors, and flinging the key into the Thames?" he answered that "their true practical protectors ... are to be found at the Horse Guards, and the Knightsbridge barracks" (*A Trifling Mistake* pp. 49-50). The House of Commons' analysis of this passage ignored the answer, read the question as rhetorical, and found Hobhouse guilty of breach of privilege. Arrested on 14 December 1819, he remained in Newgate (in rooms next to the Governor's) until the dissolution of parliament on 29 February 1820. On 5 February 1820 the Court of King's Bench had refused to interfere with the Speaker's warrant, and Hobhouse could only respond with a protest in the *Times*. Prior to his release he issued his address *To the Independent Electors of Westminster*.

While he was in Newgate, the Cato Street Conspiracy occurred. Mrs Arbuthnot records in her diary Wellington's conviction that if it had succeeded, and the conspirators had offered Hobhouse the headship of their provisional government, he would have accepted. In later years Hobhouse and Wellington were on excellent terms.

With Francis Place as what we would call his campaign manager, he now (25 March 1820), succeeded in beating Lamb at Westminster, and was returned to parliament as Burdett's colleague. Hobhouse's radicalism was qualified, and his statements of principle were guarded. The exact nature of the franchise extension he envisaged was unclear. He believed in a fairer distribution of franchises and voting rights, but never said what suffrage he envisaged. He was much clearer when attacking corrupt privilege. When in Newgate he rebuffed overtures made to him by William Cobbett. Cobbett thought of him as playing Sancho Panza to Sir Francis Burdett's Quixote.

By this time Burdett was much more important to him as a friend than Byron.

He was a supporter of Queen Caroline throughout her ordeal in 1820. He made his maiden speech in the House of Commons on 9 May (on the use of government agents such as George Edwards, who had fomented the Cato Street debacle), and thenceforth was an active debater, supporting many liberal measures, including prison reform and libel-law reform. He became the leading parliamentary spokesman for the state regulation of factory labour – though by the 1840s his outrage over child labour had lessened, and he listened too much to manufacturers' demands. His Select Vestries Bill of 1831 was an important step towards the establishment of fair and representative local government. He assisted at the foundation of London University.

Hobhouse had advised against the publication of *Don Juan* I and II in 1819 – but he did correct the poem's proofs, which show, in their margins, his amusing altercations with Byron. Canto I stanza 15, on Romilly's suicide, was suppressed on his initiative. The circulation of Byron's lampoon on his imprisonment, *My Boy Hobbie, O*, which he discovered on 16 April 1820, was a severe disillusionment, stoically born. The poem laughs at him from an élitist Whig viewpoint; Byron either affects to mock him – or, mistaken, really does mock him – as a friend of Cobbett and Orator Hunt. He visited Byron for the last time at Pisa in Sept 1822, where he met Teresa Guiccioli. When they parted, on 22 September, Byron said, "Hobhouse, you should never have come, or you should never go".

He was one of the most active members of the London Greek Committee. On 14 May 1824 he received the news of Byron's death. In July, as one of Byron's executors, he proved Byron's will, and superintended the funeral at Hucknall Torkard on 16 July. He went on censoring Byron to the end. Had he desired the preservation of the Memoirs, which Byron had given to Thomas Moore, to Hobhouse's fury, and which had sold by Moore to John Murray, they would probably not have been destroyed on 17 May (fearful perhaps of their contents, Hobhouse does not seem to have read them). After Byron's death he at first

Introduction

resolved to go to Greece himself in order to manage the Greek Loan, although ultimately Henry Lytton Bulwer went in his place.

An admirer of *The Corsair* and *Childe Harold IV*, he was out of sympathy with Byron's later works. He loathed *Cain*, and confessed in a diary entry for 1 June 1828 to having read *Don Juan* X XI and XII for the first time, and to have discovered Byron to have been "a great humourist". The possibility that *Don Juan* contains numerous references and jokes, only detectable to a close friend of Byron such as Hobhouse, is strong. Hobhouse refused to give Moore any help in the writing of his *Life* of Byron. Having campaigned twice without success for the placement of Thorwaldsen's statue of Byron in Westminster Abbey, he saw it in 1844 put in the Wren Library at Trinity, where he admitted it went very well.

Hobhouse's need for more than casual female company seems to have been in abeyance throughout Byron's life, although in 1821 he did express a fondness for Susannah Burdett. In 1827 he fell in love with another of Burdett's daughters, Sophia, and proposed, but was refused. After an affair with the wife of a Wiltshire friend, he married, on 28 July 1828, Lady Julia Tomlinson Hay, sister of the eighth Marquess of Tweeddale, and niece both to Lord Lauderdale and to "King Tom" Maitland. Not a robust person, she collapsed after the ceremony, but bore him three daughters, Julia, born in 1829, Charlotte in 1831, and Sophia in 1832, before dying of tuberculosis on 3 April 1835. The well-connected marriage gave Hobhouse entry to Almack's. His daughters survived a smallpox attack in 1840, but Julia died of cholera on 5 September 1849. Hobhouse's friend Peacock composed a moving elegy.

Grey's 1832 Reform Bill corrected, in Hobhouse's view, the inequities of the old system, and his radicalism cooled. He thought the Chartists foolish dupes, and the Tolpuddle Martyrs misguided. By 1836 Francis Place was describing him as "live lumber" (quoted Joyce 283). He succeeded his father as second baronet on Sir Benjamin's death on 12 August 1831, and on 1 February 1832 was appointed Secretary-at-War, being admitted to the Privy Council on 6 February. He tried to reform his chaotic department, and in the teeth of much opposition succeeded in abolishing several sinecures, and in restricting flogging in the army to certain defined misdemeanors – although he was regarded by many as having failed in not abolishing it completely. His attempt at reducing the size of the army was not successful, and, discouraged, he exchanged the post for that of Chief Secretary for Ireland on 28 March 1833. His tenure of this office, one more difficult even than the previous, was short-lived.

In April 1833 he refused to vote with the government against the abolition of the House and Window Tax, on the grounds that he had urged its abolition while independent. He resigned both his office and – to the incomprehension of many – his seat for Westminster. However, though he offered himself for re-election, he found that his conservatism had lost him popularity, and on 10 May was defeated by Colonel George Evans. He was pelted on the hustings. Tory collusion was suspected.

On Melbourne's coming to power in July 1834 he accepted the post of First Commissioner of Woods and Forests. Melbourne's confidence in Hobhouse's loyalty may have been strengthened by his knowledge of the part he had played in discouraging Byron's elopement with Melbourne's late wife, Lady Caroline Lamb, on 29 July 1812. Melbourne and Hobhouse were often the sole guests at Buckingham Palace dinners. Hobhouse was returned for Nottingham at a by-election, also in July 1834. In 1841 he was accused of having won the by-election by bribery and intimidation (traditional approaches, without which campaigning in Nottingham would have been difficult), but was exonerated twice by select committee. He stood again for Nottingham in 1847, bribed no-one, and lost to a Chartist – the economic depression in Nottingham was an important contributory factor in his defeat. However, he was returned as member for Harwich (one of the country's most corrupt constituencies) at a by-election in April 1848, without even canvassing.

Introduction

On the dismissal of Melbourne in November 1834, Hobhouse resigned with the rest of his colleagues. When Melbourne formed his second administration Hobhouse was pressed to resume his old post at the War Office, but on his refusal was appointed President of the Board of Control for India, with a seat in the cabinet, on 29 April 1835. He was present at Queen Victoria's first council at Kensington Palace on 20 June 1837.

He was one of Palmerston's strongest supporters on the question of the Russian threat in Central Asia, and was in part responsible for the English occupation of Afghanistan in 1838, the installation of the unpopular puppet ruler Shah Suja, and the subsequent death-march from Kabul of January 1842 – in which his nephew, John Byron Hobhouse, was killed. The retreat, plus his acquiescence (at least) in what looked like Foreign Office editing of certain dispatches from India, represented a low-water-mark in his reputation. He had resigned, with Melbourne, in September 1841.

On 10 July 1846 he resumed the India post, with a seat in Lord John Russell's first cabinet – of which, it was noted, he seemed one of the most conservative members. An unembarrassed imperialist, he promoted railway development in India, and approved of Dalhousie's annexation of the Punjab in 1849.

Though he was delighted by the fall of Metternich, the 1848 continental revolutions worried Hobhouse, and he anticipated a Chartist equivalent in England.

He was created Baron Broughton of Broughton de Gyfford on 26 February 1851, and, upon his final retirement from office, on the resignation of Russell on 21 February 1852, was made a K.C.B (22 April 1852). From this time he withdrew from public life. He debated for the last time during the discussion of the Government of India Bill in July 1858. He spent his retirement at Tedworth House, Wiltshire, and at his house, 42 Berkeley Square, by revising his books and enjoying the society of his friends. He died after a short illness at Berkeley Square on 3 June 1869, aged eighty-three, and was buried at Kensal Green.



Hobhouse's tomb, Kensal Green

Hobhouse was a vigorous debater (speaking for the most part without notes), an excellent classical scholar, a competent versifier, an entertaining companion (though he was shy at unfamiliar social gatherings), and a staunch friend. On 10 April 1826, while speaking in the Commons, he invented the phrase "His Majesty's Opposition", the phrase gaining instant currency. The barony became extinct on his death, while the baronetcy descended to his nephew, Sir Charles Parry Hobhouse. There are no direct Hobhouse descendants.

Hobhouse was short, and of pugnacious appearance, inheriting a hooked nose from his mother. He was fond of shooting and fishing, though he rarely caught anything. A sceptic when young, he became a comfortable church-goer when older. There is a mezzotint by C.

Introduction

Turner, after James Lonsdale's portrait, a miniature by Sir William Newton, an engraving by Henry Meyer after a drawing by Adam Buck, and a portrait by Sir Francis Grant, as well as many caricatures. His writings are best approached as useful but partial repositories of information. A collection of his diaries and correspondence is mostly in the British Library, although one (that for Rome in 1817) is missing, and four volumes of his diary are in the Berg Collection in New York.

Recollections of a Long Life

Hobhouse's privately printed *Some Account of a Long Life* (1865) was augmented by his daughter, Lady Dorchester, with edited entries from his diary and extracts from his other books, which was published by John Murray as *Recollections of a Long Life* in six volumes between 1909 and 1911, on very thick paper with large print. One's fingers constantly tell one that one has turned over two pages, when one hasn't. It's as if, having committed herself to six volumes, the editor is afraid of putting too much in.

Lady Dorchester's selection is very partial indeed. One can see that she wouldn't in Edwardian times wish to include her father's intimate details, but to exclude, for example, all references to Francis Place, seems over-conservative, as well as misleading in historical terms. One can't tell from the pages dedicated to 1820 that Hobhouse had a magnificent electoral triumph from Sloane Street to the Strand on 6 April 1820 (watched with pride by all the family), nor what the subject of his maiden speech was on 9 May. When she allows him to say of Byron, on II 136, that he "is a Queen's man," our general knowledge is supposed to tell us which Queen it was, and what being her "man" involved, for all references to the Trial of Queen Caroline are cut.

Here is Hobhouse's "official" account of a conversation with Queen Victoria:

(July 30 1838): I informed the Queen I had spoken to the Russian Ambassador on the subject, and that he had denied all intention, on the part of his Government, of countenancing the Persian movement towards the Indus. The Queen smiled, and said that "of course the Russians would deny participating in the aggression; but their words made very little difference, except when founded on facts"(RLL V 159).

Here is the real diary:

(July 29th 1838): I mentioned to Her Majesty the Russian Ambassador had said the Russian Government disavowed all intentions of pushing forward the Persians towards the Indus, to the danger of our Indian Empire, but that there was good reason to apprehend that they were the instigators of this movement on the part of the Shah. Her Majesty smiled, and said that "of course the Russians would deny any such motives – but that their word made but little difference" (BL.Add.Mss.56559 ff. 178-9).

Lady Dorchester has cut "to the danger of our Indian Empire", and amended the last sentence to, "... their words made very little difference, except when founded on facts".

Here's a later example not only of the way she polishes up the style, but of her editing by mute omission, sections which might give too much offence:

(October 8 1840): ["Captain Abbott, our Envoy at Khiva"] gave me some dreadful accounts of the state of society and manners of the Afghans at Herat.

He said that the Nizam Futteh Khan, brother of Dost Mahomet, was put to death in this way. He was brought into an apartment in which were the relatives of those whom he had destroyed or injured. When there, one of them walked up to him, and, saying "This is for what you did to my father," cut off one of his hands. Another came up to him saying, "This is what you did to my brother," and cut off his remaining hand. A third exclaimed, "And this is what you did for my friend," and tore out one his eyes. All which he bore without a murmur, until a woman came to him, and saying, "And this is for what you did to me," she then cut off his beard. He burst into tears. Some bystanders then rushed upon him and cut him to pieces (RLL V 295).

Introduction

The real diary has:

(October 9th 1840): Rode out with Captain Abbott. He gave me some dreadful accounts of the state of society and manners of the Afghans at Herat. He said that the Nizam Futteh Khan, brother of Dost Mahomet, was put to death thus. He was brought into a room where were the relatives of many whom he had destroyed or injured. One went up to him, and, exclaiming "This is for what you did to my father," cut off one of his hands. Another said, "This is what you did to my brother," and cut off his other hand. A third said, "And this is for your wrong to my friend," and plucked out an eye. All which he bore without a murmur, until a woman came up to him, and said, "This for what you did to me," and cut off his beard, at which last indignity he burst into tears. Others then rushed upon him and put him to death.

Captain Abbott told us that he had seen two men hanging by the heels in the bazaar at Herat, with their bowels ripped up, the punishment for [a] man stealing. One, asked whether he was dead, said "No but I hope soon to be so" – the other asked for a pipe ((BL.Add.Mss.56563 ff. 90-1).

But still heavy cutting and embroidery is needed to render acceptable Hobhouse's account of the reception of the news of Sir William Macnaghten's murder by the Afghans in 1842. The real diary reads, with square brackets for those sections to be cut by Lady Dorchester

(March 8th 1842): Indian Mail telegraphed. Sir W. Macnaghten had been assassinated at Cabul by <the/>a son of Dost Mahomed – *at a conference. I went to the House of Commons at four on the Marylebone Vestry Bill, and saw Mr Bowring, with whom I had some conversation on Indian affairs. He is not at all alarmed for the result in Afghanistan, nor is anyone, I think, who is at all acquainted with the facts – however much the loss of distinguished men may be deplored.* Macaulay said to me very truly that for Macnaghten himself, the catastrophe was perhaps fortunate; he would have had to bear the responsibility of the late disasters. Now he will be lamented and *pitied* (BL.Add.Mss.56563 ff. 90-1).

This changes under Lady Dorchester's scissors and pen. The italicised words in the following, which convey greater humanity to the reactions, are, as can be seen, her invention:

On March 8 [1842] the Indian Mail was telegraphed. *The news was very distressing.* Sir W. Macnaghten had been murdered at Cabul by a son of Dost Mahomed. *Much consternation prevailed in departments connected with India.* But Macaulay, truly enough, observed to me that, for Macnaghten himself, the catastrophe was perhaps fortunate; had he lived, he would have had to bear all the responsibility of the recent disasters. Now he would be lamented, and *excuses would be found for his mistakes* (RLL V 54).

If anything convinces one of the need for a full edition of Hobhouse's diary, it is looking through *Recollections of a Long Life*.

Hobhouse and Byron: Politics

It's important to understand that the English political system in Hobhouse's time was, before 1832 and even after, so bizarrely unfair and illogical – so overtly corrupt – that to be against it did not qualify a person as a radical. With a government which made so clear its estimate of the English people as a menace to be contained for the sake of England, one could reconcile constitutional radicalism and social conservatism with a perfectly clear conscience. On March 15th 1822, Hobhouse reports Peel as saying that "the intelligence of the people increasing required increasing <intelligence> influence in the Crown'!!!" On May 16th of the same year, he writes of hearing one Tory say to another, "I shall vote with them tonight – I think it does good to yield a point or two to the people now and then' – as if the people were the great enemy". Democratic ideas such as we understand hadn't caught on at all. Universal suffrage was an eccentric idea, and votes for women unthinkable. The Bishop of Asaph had in 1802 delivered himself of the opinion that, "In this country my Lords, the individual subject ... has

Introduction

nothing to do with the laws but to obey them”.¹ “Parliament,” uttered Lord Stormont in 1832, “had never been intended as a popular representation, but a Representation of the land and the owners of the land”.² Yet the questions, who were the owners? and, which parcels of land? had been decided haphazardly: “It is government by certain detached portions and fragments of property, selected from the rest and preferred to the rest, on no rational principle whatever”.³ The people whom Henry Brougham was in 1832 to characterise as “those middle classes who are also the genuine depositaries of sober, rational, intelligent and honest English feeling”⁴ were not represented at Westminster. As the Marquis of Tavistock says to Hobhouse on July 18, 1821 he finds ...

... no love of freedom amongst the higher classes, and that any talk on old constitutional principles was received with a laugh. [He] agreed that the tradesman was the most liberal and enlightened class of the whole empire.

Even after 1832, representation, though numerically more fair, and though the richer “tradesmen” (or as we would say, “businessmen,” were included), was still confined to a well-propertied slice of society – and this is what Hobhouse had always aimed at.

In 1820, when Hobhouse entered parliament, Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield and Leeds returned no M.P.s; Old Sarum, consisting of two empty cottages on Salisbury Plain, returned two. Even when a city did return an M.P., the candidates could rarely stand without the financial and political support of one or more local aristocrats – thus, the Lords controlled to a large extent who sat in the Commons. In extreme cases, every single vote in a borough could be purchased. In Glasgow and Edinburgh this wasn’t too much bother, for each city boasted just thirty-three voters. Another such was Grampound in Cornwall, which even Castlereagh found an embarrassment, and which was disenfranchised in 1820. Hobhouse hated the corruption, ignorance and complacency to which such a system led. On June 17 1818, he writes, of an electoral party he’s attended at Shaftesbury in Dorset:

The drunken electors added three times three. We sat boozing and roaring till near eleven. After Shepherd and I left them, fighting began. The Englishman is nowhere so degraded an animal as at a borough election. The franchise is the greatest curse that can befall a town.

“Byron,” writes Heinrich von Treitschke, “has no place in the political history of his mother country.”⁵ A harsh verdict, and one that some would contest. We can’t deny that Byron gave up his parliamentary career after three speeches, and, though he left a proxy vote on quitting England in 1816, he is never recorded as having used it. How he felt about Hobhouse’s political success in 1819 and 1820 is only in part to be found in the song *My Boy Hobby, O*: we don’t really know that he understood the extent of Hobhouse’s triumph, or, thinking about what he did understand, whether he envied it, felt inadequate and guilty about it, or merely smiled at it. Matthew Arnold would have us believe that

The falsehood, cynicism, insolence, misgovernment, oppression, with their consequent unending crop of human misery, which were produced by this state of things, roused Byron to irreconcilable revolt and battle. They made him indignant, they infuriated him ...⁶

... and yet Byron’s revolt took the shape of self-exile. It was Hobhouse who stayed at home, and did battle.

¹: Edward Pearce, *Reform! The Fight for the 1832 Reform Act* (Jonathan Cape, 2003: “Pearce”) pp.79-80.

²: Pearce p.83.

³: Quoted Pearce p.85.

⁴: Quoted Pearce p.192.

⁵: Heinrich von Treitschke (1929), quoted Pointner at Cardwell III ii, 239.

⁶: Matthew Arnold, *Essays in Criticism*, ed. S.R.Littlewood (Macmillan 1960), p.115.

Introduction

On the politics of Italy Byron made no impact at all, except as a posthumous, literary icon, and in Greece he had as little luck, only becoming of real value to the Greeks in his death.

Hobhouse, on the other hand, worked steadily and patiently, sitting on committees, roughing-out papers for Francis Place to assent to or not as he deemed expedient, canvassed, went on to the Westminster hustings, suffered a prison sentence, and finally rode in triumph, not through some ideal Byronic Persepolis, but from Hyde Park Corner to the Crown and Anchor. He was of the group which, in only a dozen years, got the 1832 Reform Act passed.

The question which we ask as we read through the diary, and as Hobhouse's affectionate memory of Byron recedes, and as Sir Francis Burdett replaces him (though the memory returns with full force when Byron dies), is, what would Byron's attitude have been to the questions to which his friend has such bold and ready answers? "I still retain my 'Buff and blue'" boasts Byron in the Dedication to *Don Juan*: that is, he's proud of his consistent Whiggishness. But for Hobhouse by 1819, the mainstream Whigs, represented in the Commons by Tierney and in the Lords by Byron's friend and part-time literary mentor Lord Holland, have become a horde of mealy-mouthed, hypocritical would-be placemen who offer, except on Catholic emancipation, no alternative to the detested Tories. They benefit from the same corrupt system, and support it. Worse, they pretend (in the comfort of Brookes's, at least), to be his friends – which the Tories never do. The drama climaxes amusingly in George Lamb's challenge to Hobhouse in 1820, which Hobhouse accepts with eagerness, only to find Lamb withdrawing it the next day, like the Ancient Pistol or Bobadil he is. Throughout, Hobhouse is supported with enthusiasm by Byronic cronies like Scrope Davies and Michael Bruce – even the ambiguous Douglas Kinnaird, sometimes almost as much a rival as an ally, sees eye to eye with him most of the time. Where would Byron have stood *vis-à-vis* Hobhouse's candidature for Westminster? Would the easy mockery we find in *My Boy Hobby, O* have been as easy if Byron were there in London, and more closely acquainted with events? Would Byron have moved further to the left? Would he have traipsed about Westminster from tavern to tavern and assembly room to assembly room, canvassing for his friend, with the stalwarts Kinnaird, Davies, and Bruce, for company? Would he have stood by him on the hustings? Or would his status and dignity as a peer forbid it? Would he have been paralysed by what Nigel Leask calls "his fear of infection by forces which negate and subvert Whig liberty and rationalism"?⁷ Where would he have stood on the question of Queen Caroline? From the safety of Italy, all he manages for her is a dirty joke about couriers and coursers, and two other references, in *Don Juan* V and in the opening of *The Irish Avatar*. Would his easy assumption of class outrage at the "Cato Street Conspiracy" have been the same had he known, as Hobhouse and most Londoners did, what a squalid, wicked pre-election stunt the whole thing was?

We cannot tell, for much is left by Byron unsaid; but it's possible to guess. To Murray he writes, on March 23 1820 (enclosing *My Boy Hobby, O*, with Hobhouse out of Newgate over a month):

Pray give *Hobhouse* the enclosed song – and tell him I know he will never forgive me – but I could not help it – I am so provoked with him and his ragamuffins for putting him in *quod*, he will understand that word – being now resident in the flash capital. (BLJ VII 59)

His assumption that Hobhouse is surrounded by low, designing labouring levellers – as Marino Faliero is – is gross. The "ragamuffins" who put him in *quod* (if any did), were Kinnaird and Edward Ellice – Byron's friends, men of his own London circle. Byron's assumption that his friend has somehow become a Painite leveller reads like a wilful aversion of his eyes from the truth. "... the Radicals seem to be no better than Jack Cade or Wat Tyler," he writes to Hobhouse on March 29 (BLJ VII 63), showing only his ignorance. He's prepared to side even with Southey if by doing so he can re-interpret what his friend is doing at Westminster in such a way as will enforce his sense that he's right to keep out of it all. To Hoppner he writes on April 18th that Hobhouse's election

⁷: Nigel Leask, *British Romantic Writers and the East* (Cambridge 1992), p.60.

Introduction

... will eventually be a millstone round his neck, for what can he do? he can't take place? He can't take power in any case – if he succeeds in reforming – he will be stoned for his pains – and if he fails – there he is stationary as Lecturer at Westminster. – –

Would you go to the House by the true gate
 Much faster than ever Whig Charley went
 Let Parliament send you to Newgate
 And Newgate will send you to Parliament. (BLJ VII 78)

Reformers, he writes to Hobhouse (now a Reforming M.P. and proud of it), are “low designing dirty levellers who would pioneer their way to a democratical tyranny” (BLJ VII 99). Democracy he defines in *My Dictionary* as “an Aristocracy of Blackguards”. (BLJ VIII 107). Sir Francis Burdett, Hobhouse’s colleague, mentor, and ally, is, he confides, “as sweet and silvery as Belial himself – and *I think the greatest favourite in Pandemonium*” (BLJ IX 14: *Detached Thought* 5).

Perhaps, had he been in London, Byron would have learned the difference between a thorough-going radical like William Cobbett, and a gentleman moderate like Hobhouse (who, for instance, never liked the idea of the ballot, on the grounds that if voting were secret one wouldn’t know who had voted for one!) But Byron did not want to know that there were fine distinctions, or even coarse distinctions, between one radical and another. He had above all to believe that his remaining aloof from English politics was the best thing to do; and English politics had to be re-written, in the teeth of all the evidence, to enforce his self-esteem.

In contrast to Hobhouse’s committed, professional work, Byron’s dabbings in continental liberalism look amateurish to suicidal, ineffective and confused as were the movements with which he allied himself in Italy, and blood-soaked, mendacious, greedy and barbarous as the people were with whom he meddled in Greece. In Westminster one could counter rhetoric with less untruthful rhetoric, and with action – and sitting on the Commons Water Committee, as did Hobhouse, was action. In Italy all rhetoric was hollow, and there was no action. In Greece, there were oceans of soggy rhetoric and of bloody action, and a person looking for honest politics drowned in them both.

The “Cato Street Conspirators,” under interrogation, named Hobhouse as one of republican leanings whom they might have asked for help in the remote event of their plot succeeding.⁸ Wellington, as reported by Mrs Arbuthnot, certainly thought Hobhouse would have accepted the presidency of a Cato Street Commonwealth. This looks like Tory paranoia, and such a feeling, occasioned by guilt at what the Tory government has done, may indeed colour the suspicion. But on September 4 1821 Hobhouse says that, other than Sir Robert Wilson, who is about (though they don’t know this), to be cashiered from the army for ordering the troops to stop firing on the mourners at Queen Caroline’s funeral, “There is not a more active man alive, and if the day should ever arrive for *doing something*, would be invaluable”. The suspicion that his friends in London are contemplating revolution may have percolated through to Byron in Italy, via letters now lost, either from Hobhouse, or more likely from Kinnaird, and this would explain Byron’s increasingly nervous apprehension that, in the government funds, his money is not safe. By all means have a revolution on the continent – but when it’s a question of one’s own investments being endangered by a revolution at home, one becomes strangely half-hearted.

The nearest Hobhouse comes to pinning his colours to the mast is in the safety of an otherwise dull section on the ruins of Republican Rome, in *Historical Illustrations*:

⁸: Arthur Thistlewood claimed intimacy with H. A Bow Street magistrate named Richard Birnie recorded one of the conspirators, William Simmons, as saying, “Thistlewood [...] says he will introduce me to many respectable at his end of the town friends [...] some of whom will surprise me, that he had lived in Sir Benjamin Hobhouse’s family and knows the younger one the member for Westminster, and has often conversed with him and that he is a perfect republican, and that he Simmons thinks that Mr Hobhouse will be the man who will gain this Country its Liberty ... [H.] will see what can be done among the higher orders of people [...] and that he will tease oppose and punish the Borough mongers” (Home Office file HO 44/6, quoted John Gardner, *From ‘Poverty to Guilt’*, KSR 16, 2002, pp.121-2). If H. had ever met Thistlewood (Wellington thought he had), he never lets on.

Introduction

... the Rome which the Republican Florentine regretted and which an Englishman must wish to find, is not that of Augustus and his successors, but of those greater and better men, of whose actions his earliest impressions are composed.

We have heard too much of the turbulence of the Roman democracy and of the Augustan virtues. No civil tranquillity can compensate for that perpetual submission, not to laws but to persons, which must be required from the subjects of the most limited monarchy. The citizens of the worst regulated republic must feel a pride and may indulge a hope superior to all the blessings of domestic peace, and of what is called established order, another word for durable servitude. The struggles for supreme though temporary power amongst those of an equal condition, give birth to all the nobler energies of the mind, and find space for their unbounded exertion. Under a monarchy, however well attempered, the chief motive for action must be forever wanting, or feebly felt, or cautiously encouraged. Duties purely ministerial, honours derived from an individual, may be meritoriously performed, may be gracefully worn: but, as an object of ambition, they are infinitely below the independent control of our fellow-citizens, and perhaps scarcely furnish a compensation for entire repose. The natural love of distinction on any terms may push us into public life; but it palsies our efforts, it mortifies our success, perpetually to feel that in such a career, although a failure is disgraceful, a victory is inglorious;

“Vincere inglorium – atteri sordidum”

These are the sentiments of Agricola and the words of Tacitus, and bespeak the real value of the subordinate dignity, which is all that can be attained under a Domitian or under a Trajan, under the worst or under the best of Princes.⁹

If Hobhouse really was a republican he kept the fact well-hidden in later years. *Illustrations* was composed largely in the erotic never-never land that was Venice: in Westminster, if you wanted to succeed, you were more circumspect.

Hobhouse, painting, and music

Hobhouse is a thorough philistine, who doesn't think of himself as one: he *believes* he loves painting and poetry. But he treats art as what we would call a general knowledge quiz, a memory test in which a gentleman must keep ahead of the opposition. On August 26 1821 he writes:

Looked over Guerino's pictures engraved chiefly by Bartolezzi, and [was] ashamed to find I did not know the story of Sophonisba, which I confounded with that of Sigismonda – which I also confounded with another tale in Boccaccio – must correct this inaccuracy, and if I find my memory fail, must not talk at all.

For some time he is, in Vienna in 1813, never far from the company of Beethoven, but doesn't never mention him, being more impressed by the proximities of Waldstein and Razumovsky, Beethoven's patrons. He sinks lowest on December 18 1813:

Went to the *Schöpfung* of Haydn in the theatre after <breakfast> dinner. Χαπε, and home.

The oratorio, the ambiguous meal, and the prostitute, are given equal value by the diarist.

Hobhouse and Byron: Literature

On August 8 1821, Hobhouse wrote to Murray:

I do not think so highly of the poetry of Sardanapalus as of that of the Doge nor do I believe the work itself to be so dramatic – at least, not according to the English notions of the drama –

⁹: Hobhouse, *Historical Illustrations to the Fourth Canto of Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* (1818), pp.197-7.

Introduction

After all, if it be not presumptuous in me to say so, I should venture to assert that tragedy writing is not Lord Byron's fort – That is to say that it will not turn out to be the best thing that he can do – According to my poor way of thinking the Corsair & the IVth Canto [*of Childe Harold*] will always bear away the palm

The literary relationship between Byron and Hobhouse was as important as that between Byron and Southey, though it was less monolithic, less intense, and less conducive to Byron's creativity. A lot of it was in Hobhouse's mind: read the prose fragment attached to *Mazeppa*, reading it as spoken by Hobhouse about Byron, and you will see what I mean. But whatever Byron wrote with Hobhouse by his side, Hobhouse felt it necessary to parallel somehow, with some kind of literary act, no matter how subsidiary. He gave fourteen lines to the first edition of *English Bards*; he edited *Imitations and Translations*, as well as writing most of it; alongside *Childe Harold I and II* he wrote *A Journey through Albania and some other Provinces of Turkey*; he interfered pedantically with the preface to *Lara*; he wrote *Historical Illustrations to the Fourth Canto of Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*; and he corrected the proofs of *Don Juan I and II*. He makes no reference to *Manfred*. Only with *Cain* does he, on October 28 1821, find himself protesting:

... returned to Murray the bookseller the proofs of *Cain* a poem by Lord Byron – Burdett and I read this poem – which is inconceivably ridiculous and dull – I think it alternate raving and drivelling with scarce one specimen of real poetry or even musical numbers in it – He says in a letter to Kinnaird that it is written in his purest metaphysical manner. Some will call it blasphemous – and I think the whole world will finally agree in thinking it foolish – yet I hear Tom Moore says it is the best thing Byron ever wrote ...

... and after that his interest drains away. Burdett, not Byron, represents the focus of the rest of his long life. I believe he reads no more of *Don Juan* while Byron lives. His friend's greatest masterpieces pass him by. Of *The Vision of Judgement*, even, he makes no mention.

The first, second, and fourth cantos of *Childe Harold* are quite different in tone and preoccupations from the third. Byron was in Hobhouse's company for all of the composition of the first two, and for the revision and extension of the fourth, but it was in Shelley's society that he wrote much of the third. This is not pointed out often enough. The misanthropy, the pessimism, the rage, the sense of being at a dead end, which flows through the "Hobhouse cantos," are absent from the Shelley canto, even though the self-dramatisation remains constant.

Hobhouse and Society

Hobhouse can't do without society, but only on his terms, and not for society's sake: dinner parties are evaluated by how much he's learned from the conversation at them.

He's a snob, wedded, despite his radicalism, to the English class system. He can't adjust to the friendly relationships which he sees between masters and servants in Italy.

Hobhouse and his Family

Introduction



Whitton Park, Hounslow

It's to a letter from Mrs Byron to her son that we owe the knowledge that Benjamin Hobhouse had no idea, during the continental excursion of 1809 and 1810, about where or with whom his son had gone. But father and son are quickly reconciled (on February 4 1811) and remain firm supporters each of the other for the rest of their lives, despite Sir Benjamin's increasing conservatism.

Hobhouse's step-mother hardly figures in the diary: his mother, who died when he was five, not at all.

His brother Benjamin Hobhouse seems to be John Cam's favourite relative, and his death at Quatre Bras is the biggest tragedy of his early life. His other brother Henry is the India merchant with the difficult wife (though for Hobhouse all women not his sisters are difficult). Brother Henry must not be confused with Cousin Henry "Home Office" Hobhouse, who organises censuses and may have something to do with setting up the Cato Street Conspiracy. Isaac, his only step-brother, gets expelled from Harrow twice, from Oxford once, and ends up at the "ultra-radical" Trinity, Cambridge (June 19-21, 1822): though he doesn't graduate.

Keeping track of Hobhouse's sister and half-sisters is difficult, there are so many of them. Sophia seems to be the oldest, may be his full sister, and accompanies him, his brother Henry and Henry's wife, on the Italian tour, 1816-17. Harriett Theodora is the one with health problems; in January 1823 she marries the future Bishop of Madras, and bears their first child on March 24, 1824. Charlotte rides; Matilda and Amelia ("Matty" and "Melly"), travel through Italy with John Cam and Isaac in 1822: Amelia seems to have a Brucknerian obsession about numbers. Matilda is Hobhouse's darling; she's the one who enjoys metaphysics (Sep 29, 21), is bored by men's conversation (August 12, 21), who can't bear to think of Hobhouse alone (see March 7, 1827), and to whom Ugo Foscolo proposes (March 22, 1824). Later she makes an advantageous Italian match, to Hobhouse's misery, for he thought they'd grow old together (March 27, 1827). She plays the piano (July 18, 22). Joanna rarely gets a mention (see May 26, 22, July 4, 24, and Nov 3, 24). Catherine appears on Nov 3, 24. And there are seven more ...

Hobhouse and Women

In England, Hobhouse could not live openly with a woman to whom he was not married, as Douglas Kinnaird did with Maria Keppel. The proximity of his stepmother, his conservative father, and above all his sister and unnumbered stepsisters, would have made such a situation impossible. However, it's also true that there was no woman in England with whom he would have wanted to live. On August 20 1815 the diary records,

Mlle Butler sits up with me till one and I make no use of this opportunity, no thanks to my virtue neither – I'm afraid of repulse first, and discovery afterwards.

Plain, shy, furtive, lecherous, and paralysed with fear for his public and private reputation, his love life (Mlle Butler being a *possible* exception), consisted of distant crushes

Introduction

which he could normally talk himself out of, and instances of sex-on-the-street too numerous to be counted. Collaboration of a kind, not just with Byron, but with others, is implicit, even explicit, in some parts of Hobhouse's writing. On 9 June 1810 in Constantinople, he reports that he and Byron entertained

Two *Χαμαιτυπες*, ["whores"] but not touchable, one having black teeth and the other being a perfect Gorgon.

Untouchable they may have been, but his account book still records, on that date, "*Χαμαιτυπαι* .. 40 / Pimp .. 10".

On August 27 1814, in Vienna, we hear that he

... committed a debauch with Mr Barrett at Rothman's where the Duchess d'Acherenza and the Princess Hohenzollern were dining with two young men.

Which gives us pause, until we decode it as meaning that the two young men were Hobhouse and "Barrett," who is his friend Samuel Moulton-Barrett (1787-1837) subsequently M.P. for Richmond and perhaps related to Edward Moulton-Barrett, father of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, *were* the "two young men," and that each had one of the two noble ladies, who are, as he has already told us, "the most notorious battered jades in Germany".

A distressing section from London is in the diary entry for 7 April 1820:

... called on a *Piece* with Kinnaird. *She* poor girl said she should not care if she died tomorrow – I asked her why? – She said "*I am tired!!!*" This is the best reason I think, and I am sure this poor creature was sincere in what she said.

In late November or early December 1817 he writes to Murray from Venice:

I must confess I feel an affection for it [*CHP IV*] more than ordinary as part of it was begot, as it were, under my own eyes: for although your poets are as shy as elephants or camels of being seen in the act of procreation yet I have not unfrequently witnessed his lordship's coupleting and some of the stanzas owe their birth to our morning walk or evening ride at La Mira ...

Hobhouse affected an admiration for Rousseau's *Confessions*, and was, like Rousseau, adept at being economical with the truth. Much of what I am about to write will thus be (perhaps forever) speculative. He makes no mention in the diary of *The Wonders of a Week at Bath*, the unsuccessful attempt at imitating Christopher Antsey's *A New Bath Guide* which he published in 1811. It's unsuccessful because in it Hobhouse eschews all sexual jokes, thereby showing (a) that he's missed (or can't face) the selling-point of Antsey's work, and (b) that his own sex-life can only be furtive. What exactly went on behind the following three diary entries will be (perhaps mercifully forever) unknown:

... going through the Rue Richelieu I was aborded [*sic*] by a woman who made me several singular propositions *à la Justine* – beginning with the most brutal – (May 2 1815: Paris)¹⁰

Displaced a waiter who was looking at my girl undressing. (July 30 1816: Ostend)

Chambermaid volunteered smut – asked after "Dulce Count". I said, "Oui, tout ce que vous voudrez". I was at this Hotel in 1815, but like a dunce had forgot the name. Bed, twelve. (January 27 1818: Paris)

¹⁰: Broughton Holograph Diaries, Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection, The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations, Vol. 3 f.161.

Introduction

Hobhouse and Travelling

Hobhouse was a bold traveller, but never a cosmopolitan one. For him, it was not “What do they know of England, who only England know?” so much as “What do they know of the rest of the world, who know not England?” For him, English scenery and English architecture were the measure of all. “Ecklow”, a village in Belgium through which he passes on August 1, 1816, and whose name he can’t be bothered to grasp, he describes as “looking like Sodbury.” On Christmas Day 1809 he records

Turned round the corner of a little hill and saw the citadel of Athens.

Road more wide, and plain through grounds cultivated with wheat and vineyards, then through olive grounds for an hour, and afterwards, for the last hour, on a broad Newmarket Road without trees.

On May 13 1810, we get the following:

First view of Constantinople two o’clock, the white minarets of Sultan Achmed and Santa Sophia looking like Kings College Chapel at a distance.

Gaps in the Narrative

The most important actual gap is between January 12 and July 30 1817, which would have detailed Hobhouse’s and Byron’s tour of Rome and the surrounding areas, and perhaps the genesis of *Childe Harold IV*. Lady Dorchester writes, inaccurately:

Byron was at Rome from May 5, 1817, to May 28, 1817 [sic]. Mr. Hobhouse left Rome on May 21, 1817. Unfortunately, the Diary with the account of Lord Byron and Hobhouse in Rome cannot be found, hence a gap between their parting at Venice, December 4, 1816, and their meeting at La Mira, July 31, 1817; but as Hobhouse was absorbed in antiquarian researches, embodied in his work entitled, “Notes in Illustration of Canto IV. of ‘Childe Harold,’” and Lord Byron occupied composing the fourth canto or riding in the Campagna, probably there was not much to record of special intercourse between the two friends.¹¹

But *Childe Harold IV* was started, according to its earliest manuscript, on June 26, and Byron finished the draft on July 19. According to his later, surviving diary, Hobhouse does not hear about it until he comes back to Venice on July 31. In both *Some Account of A Long Life* and *Recollections of A Long Life*, he writes that he kept no diary for the Rome visit:

I set out for Rome on [December 16] ... taking the longest road by Arezzo, and I turned a little out of my way to visit Cortona. Thence by Thrasimene I went to Perugia, and so on, by Terni, to Rome.

At Rome I stayed until the 21st of May, and then went to Naples. From Naples I made the usual excursions in the usual manner, hiring, as Forsyth says, on each occasion, “a Cicerone and asses.” Thus provided, I visited Portici and Herculaneum, Vesuvius, Salerno, Pompeii, and Pæstum. I returned, on one of these trips, by Amalfi. I visited Posilippo frequently, and all the contiguous wonders as far as Misenum. As this was my first sight of these enchanting shores, I was too much dazzled by their beauties, and too ignorant of the treasures they contain, to record any detailed

¹¹: *RLL*, II 71n1.

Introduction

account of those days of delight. But even now, after almost half a century, the remembrance of them has a charm for me beyond any present enjoyment.¹²

Hobhouse's Rome diary may yet turn up. Meanwhile, there are strange disappointing, and even puzzling, omissions. We know from other sources that on August 30 1816 Byron, Hobhouse and Scrope Davies discovered Shelley's signature in an Alpine inn, with the legend "democrat, philanthropist and atheist" next to it in Greek, and that Byron scratched the words out. Hobhouse – whose attitude to Shelley one would love to know in detail – does not mention the incident.

Hobhouse is in Byron's company for nearly the whole of the composition of *Manfred*, but never mentions the work, either at the time or later, when it has been published.

During the first half of 1823 occurs the fatal correspondence between Hobhouse and Byron, which leads to Byron's last journey to Greece. There is, in the diary, no record of it.

Hobhouse and his Diary

Hobhouse wrote his diary at intervals, often using notes from day-books, none of which seem to have survived. Every time he write up the previous fortnight or so, **I have printed it in red.**

Editorial

The material is transcribed from the manuscripts with much tidying-up. I have not treated his manuscript style as Holy Writ, but have modernised and repunctuated throughout. Hobhouse rarely begins a sentence with a capital and is irregular in his past participle endings: sometimes he apostrophises them, sometimes he includes the "e", sometimes he puts nothing. He often employs superscripts, especially in "L^d" and "M^r". I have not used these, but have given "y^e" when he uses it for comical effect. He frequently uses as pointer a small promiscuous splodge which I have felt at liberty to interpret either as a full stop or a comma, as grammar or rhetorical effect seems to dictate. If there is no pointer where one seems called for, and his mood is spontaneous, I have used an editorial dash. I have also added punctuation where I feel it is needed.

The following symbols apply:

A word or phrase <printed in angle brackets> with bold type surrounding, has been deleted by Hobhouse.

A letter or letters <placed/>printed in angle brackets with diagonal indicates one letter or word over another, which Hobhouse intends it to delete. The letter or word within the brackets is the one beneath, and the letter or word to the right of the diagonal and end-angle-bracket is the overlying one.

A word or phrase {printed in curled brackets} is either overlineated, underlineated or interlineated by Hobhouse.

A word [added in square brackets and unemboldened] is one which I feel necessary to clarify a phrase which would otherwise be puzzling.

A gap within [] square brackets represents a word I am unable to read.

The volumes

(unless otherwise stated, all numbers are B.L.Add.Mss.)

¹²: *Some Account of A Long Life*, I 100-1: see also *RLL*, II, 71-2.

Introduction

47231	7th/8th July – 1st September 1809
56527	8th July – 26th December 1809
56528	8th – 23rd November 1809
56529	27th December 1809 – 19th October 1810
56530	20th October 1810 – 19th January 1813
56531	12th September – 16th October 1812
56532	20th January – 7th September 1813
56533	7th September – 29th November 1813
56534	14th October – 29th November 1813
56535	30th November 1813 – 2nd January 1814

Berg 1	3rd January – 28th January 1814
Berg 2	28th January – 1st July 1814

47232 (front to back) 1st July – 29th March 1815

Berg 3	29th March – 15th June 1815
Berg 4	15th June 1815 – 5th April 1816

47232 (back to front)	5th April – 21st July 1816
56536	22nd July – 22nd September 1816
56537	22nd September – 5th November 1816
56538	5th November 1816 – 12th January 1817
56539	12th January – 31st January 1817

GAP (volume lost) 1st February – 29th July 1817

47233	21st May – 29th July 1817
47234	29th July 1817 – 14th February 1818
47235	15th February – 11th September 1818
56540	11th September 1818 – 30th January 1820
56541	30th January 1820 – 8th February 1821
56542	8th February – 8th August 1821
56543	8th August – 3rd October 1821
56544	3rd October 1821 – 2nd May 1822
56545	3rd May – 23rd July 1822
56546	23rd July – 16th November 1822
56547	16th November 1822 – 7th May 1823
56548	9th May 1823 – 19th June 1824
56549	20th June 1824 – 5th August 1825

POST- AND NON-BYRONIC MATERIAL

36455-83	General Correspondence, 1774-1867
42093	49 Letters from Byron to Hobhouse and Kinnaird
43744-65	Diaries, April 1842 - July 1863
46914	Correspondence with Foscolo
46915	Correspondence with Palmerston
47222-5	Correspondence with Burdett, Kinnaird, Fox, Brougham, Peacock et al.

POST-BYRON DIARY

56550	5th August 1825 - 4th July 1826
-------	---------------------------------

Introduction

	1st November 1826 - 1st June 1827
56551	3rd July 1826 - 31st October 1826
56552	2nd June 1827 - 10th August 1828
56553	11th August 1828 - 28th March 1829
56554	29th March 1829 - 27th July 1830
56555	28th July 1830 - 30th September 1831
56556	30th September 1831 - 22nd June 1832
56557	23rd June 1832 - 10th May 1833
GAP	11th May 1833 - 27th June 1835
56558	28th June 1835 - 30th June 1836
GAP	1st July 1836 - 22nd January 1838
56559	23rd January 1838 - 10th August 1838
56560	10th August 1838 - 31st May 1839
56561	31st May 1839 - 4th November 1839
56562	4th November 1839 - 10th June 1840
56563	10th June 1840 - 24th April 1841
56564	24th April 1841 - 12th April 1842
43744	12th April 1842 - [
43745	
43746	
43747	-] 20th June 1845
GAP	21st June 1845 - 6th November 1853
56566	7th November 1853 - 26th June 1854
56567	26th June 1854 - 23rd June 1855
43759	23rd June 1855 - [
43760	
43761	
43762	
43763	
43764	
43765] - 4th July 1863
56568	5th July 1863 - 10th June 1865
56569	Essay and verses on conversation
56570	Notes chiefly on antiquities of Rome
56571	Miscellaneous correspondence and literary papers

Abbreviations

- Arbuthnot*: The Journal of Mrs Arbuthnot, ed. Francis Bamford and the Duke of Wellington, two vols, Macmillan 1950.
- BB*: Byron's Bulldog, The Letters of John Cam Hobhouse to Lord Byron, ed. Peter W. Graham, Ohio 1984.
- BFH*: Byron, Foscolo and Hobhouse, the Record of a Collaboration, by E.R. Vincent, C.U.P. 1949.
- Blessington*: Conversations of Lord Byron, ed. E.J. Lovell, Princeton 1969.
- BLJ*: Letters and Journals of Lord Byron, ed. Leslie A. Marchand, John Murray 1973 - 1994.
- Burnett*: The Rise and Fall of a Regency Dandy The Life and Times of Scrope Berdmore Davies, by T.A.J. Burnett, John Murray 1981.
- Camporesi*: Ludovico di Breme, Lettere, ed Pietro Camporesi, Einaudi 1966.
- CPW*: Lord Byron the Complete Poetical Works, ed. Jerome J. McGann and Barry Weller, O.U.P. 1980 - 1993.
- CMP*: Lord Byron The Complete Miscellaneous Prose, ed. Andrew Nicholson, O.U.P. 1991.
- DJP*: Lord Byron Don Juan ed. Steffan Steffan and Pratt, Penguin 1973.

Introduction

- DJV*: Byron's Don Juan A Variorum Edition, ed Steffan Steffan and Pratt, Austin 1972.
- Italy*: Italy: Remarks made in Several Visits from the Year 1816 to 1864, by the Right Honourable Lord Broughton G.C.B, John Murray 1859.
- Journey*: A Journey through Albania and Other Provinces of Turkey to Constantinople during the Years 1809 - 1810, by John Cam Hobhouse, James Cawthorne 1813: second edition.
- Joyce*: My Friend H by Michael Joyce, John Murray 1948.
- LBW*: Lord Byron's Wife by Malcolm Elwin, Macdonald 1962.
- LBF*: Lord Byron's Family by Malcolm Elwin, John Murray 1975.
- Letters*: The Substance of Letters from Paris, by John Cam Hobhouse, James Ridgeway 1816.
- LLB*: The Late Lord Byron, by Doris Langley Moore, John Murray 1961.
- LBAR*: Lord Byron Accounts Rendered, by Doris Langley Moore, John Murray 1974.
- Marchand*: Byron a Biography by Leslie A. Marchand, Alfred Knopf 1957.
- Recollections*: Recollections of a Long Life ed. Lady Dorchester, John Murray 1909 - 1911.
- Reminiscences*: Parry Hobhouse, Charles. Some Account of the Family of Hobhouse and Reminiscences, Leicester, no date (1907 or post).
- Shelley*: The Diary of Frances Lady Shelley, ed. R.Edgecumbe, John Murray 1912.
- Some Account*: Some Account of a Long Life (sic on title page: on cover, Recollections of a Long Life) 5 vols 1865.
- Thorne*: The House of Commons, 1790-1820, ed. R.G.Thorne, Secker and Warburg, 1986.
- TLB*: To Lord Byron, ed. George Paston and Peter Quennell, John Murray 1939.
- Travels*: Travels in Albania and other Provinces of Turkey in 1809 and 1810, by the Right Honourable Lord Broughton G.C.B., John Murray 1855.
- Vassallo*: Byron the Italian Literary Influence by Peter Vassallo, St Martin's Press 1984.
- Wright*: The Works of Lord Byron, with his Letters and Journals, and his Life, ed. Thomas Moore (and John Wright) 17 vols, John Murray 1832.

Quotations from long poems by Byron are given by Canto, Stanza and Line, thus: VIII, 23, 2.
 Quotations from Shakespeare are from the text edited by Peter Alexander, Collins 1951.