

E. MORRIS MILLER

AUSTRALIA'S FIRST TWO NOVELS

ORIGINS AND BACKGROUNDS

SP

23/74

UNIVERSITY OF TASMANIA



Association copy for permanent retention

This title has an association
with the University of Tasmania

The author(s)/editor(s)
was a member of University staff

AUSTRALIA'S
FIRST TWO NOVELS
ORIGINS AND BACKGROUNDS

BY

E. MORRIS MILLER

HOBART
1958

Cent
Rare
PR
5299
'S356
Z74
1958

SP

23/7

First published in two parts in the
Papers and Proceedings
of the
Tasmanian Historical Research Association
Volume 6, No. 2 (September, 1957)
and
Volume 6, No. 3 (December, 1957)

Published separately, 1958

Supplementing Appendix to Chapter 1 of
Pressmen and Governors (1952)



57 020

Edition of 150 signed copies

No. 72

Emmeline

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
SAVERY'S <i>QUINTUS SERVINTON</i>	
I. Summary of the Plot	2
II. Comment	5
III. Circumstances and Date of Writing	6
GRIMSTONE'S <i>WOMAN'S LOVE</i>	
I. Summary of the Plot	13
II. Time and Place of Composition	15
III. Comment on the Plot and its Setting	16
IV. Characters	19
BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	
I. Henry Savery	22
II. Mary Leman Grimstone	23

AUSTRALIA'S FIRST TWO NOVELS:

ORIGINS AND BACKGROUNDS

Introduction

The years 1829 and 1830 have had striking significance for the beginnings of drama and fiction in Australia, more particularly in relation to Tasmania than elsewhere. In 1829 David Burn who, at "Rotherwood," Ouse, had composed the first drama, written in Australia, on a local theme, entitled "The Bushrangers," was busy with the arrangements for its production at the Caledonian Theatre, Edinburgh. He was also interested in the staging of W. T. Moncrieff's operatic drama, *Van Diemen's Land* (1830), which dealt mainly with Michael Howe, and was partly inspired from Hobart by W. G. Elliston. In the *Tasmanian's* review of it, the drama was attributed incorrectly to Mrs M. L. Grimstone who, two years later, was also incorrectly recognised by the British Museum as the anonymous author of *Quintus Servinton*, the first volume of which was printed in Hobart in the latter part of 1830. This attribution was repeated in Andrew Block's *The English Novel, 1740-1850: a catalogue*, (1939, p. 96). The author, Henry Savery, disguised the place and date of its writing, as though it might have been written in England, prior to his coming to Tasmania. As a convict, Savery was disembarked at Hobart in December, 1825, but the novel was certainly not written before 1829. The three volumes of *Quintus Servinton* were re-issued by Smith, Elder & Co., London, in 1832, the year of publication of Mrs M. L. Grimstone's novel, *Woman's Love*, which, the author definitely stated in the Preface, was written in Hobart, where she resided for three years (March, 1826 to February, 1829). And yet its major incidents were recorded as having occurred in 1829; whereas in February of that year she sailed from Hobart on board the *Sarah*, with Mrs Henry Savery as a fellow passenger. Both Savery's *Quintus Servinton* and Grimstone's *Woman's Love* have topographical settings in Devonshire.

During Lathrop Murray's editorship, the *Colonial Times* (1826) opposed the Government's placement of Savery in the Colonial Secretary's office on the assumption that he would be used to assist the editorial staff of the *Hobart Town Gazette*. Unknown to those two men at the time, they had associations in common with Shropshire. Murray's ancestral home was at West Felton where he died on 2 November, 1850. His death was registered at Oswestry and noticed in the *Shrewsbury Chronicle*. When a school-boy, "Quintus Servinton" was a boarder for some years at an ancient grammar school situated at Oswestry, and he was familiar with Chester and Shrewsbury. In March, 1833 Savery was conducting the *Tasmanian* during a brief absence of Henry Melville from Hobart. Thomas Richards contributed anonymously a review of a pamphlet, published by James Gordon, which led to a court case; and Savery's ticket-of-leave was temporarily withdrawn. In that year the *Hobart Town Magazine* commenced its eighteen months' run. For it Richards wrote several short stories, the first of this genre to be written and published in Australia. Some of them were set in Shropshire and Wales at places which Savery had described in his *Quintus Servinton*.

These temporal and topographical associations among early Tasmanian writers aroused my interest in Mrs Grimstone's novel, *Woman's Love*, a copy of which was not available anywhere in Australia until the last year. It happened on this wise. Mr D. H. Borchardt, University Librarian, drew my attention to a Grimstone manuscript item in the catalogue of a London bookseller, Colin Richardson. Through correspondence it was learnt that Mr Richardson had obtained copies of Mrs Grimstone's *Woman's Love* (3 vols.) and *Jew and Gentile* (2 vols.). These were secured post-haste for Dr W. L. Crowther's collection. To our delight it was found that the books were inscribed by the author to her sister in Hobart, Mrs Stephen Adey, who also signed each volume. The misprints in *Woman's Love* were corrected in the author's hand-writing. These five volumes have come back to the town to which they were originally sent from London. And it is most probable that the *Jew and Gentile* copy was handed to Lathrop Murray for his review in the *Tasmanian* (21 February, 1834), which quoted passages relating to the scars branded unjustly upon the arms of convicts.

With the novel *Woman's Love* in my hands for the first time, it was an easy lure to investigate the problem of the date of its composition in relation to that of *Quintus Servinton*. And an intensive reading of their contents has left in me a sincere respect for

them as literary productions. There is a tendency to mark down our pioneer writings and to treat them merely as passable in a historical sense. An Australian critic, T. Inglis Moore, has expressed the view that Savery's novel has more merit in it than is usually accepted. And I am convinced that the two novels have an intrinsic appeal, even though they are not notable in the class of early Nineteenth Century fiction. The one reveals a cultural standing among convicts not ordinarily appreciated, and the other is plea for the recognition of women's intellectual qualities as qualifications for public life. And to corroborate my opinion that *Woman's Love* is worth some notice for its own sake, apart from its historical association with our literary beginnings, I quote a contemporary review from *La Belle Assemblée, or Court and Fashionable Magazine*, edited by Mrs Caroline Norton (Vol. 15, June, 1832, p. 135). Having desired "a better designation" for the novel, the reviewer proceeds :—

It comes recommended to us by a novel circumstance ; it was written in Van Diemen's Land, and it has something of the warmth and freshness of the scenes amidst which it was composed. We like both its sentiment and its style—its persons and its plot. Of the many accomplished female writers that have shed such a lustre upon our modern literature, few have surpassed Mrs. Grimstone in the grand art of concealing art, and of telling a story with that air of grace and unaffected simplicity, without which it is so difficult to keep one's eyes open through the tedious extension of three formidable volumes.

The reviewer adds "that the story has an agreeable mixture of sun and shadow ; and that the characters, though coloured perhaps by fancy, owe their outlines to nature and truth . . ."

The *New Monthly Magazine* (1832) was also complimentary, though discriminative. The work was described as "agreeable and graceful," but "deficient in power and novelty." It could "look but for a short-lived reputation."

It is an interesting coincidence that Savery's *Quintus Servinton* was noted in the April number of *La Belle Assemblée* (1832, p. 137). The copy may have been sent in by Mrs Grimstone who herself was a contributor to that society magazine. The reviewer takes a facetious turn, referring to the novel as "one of a very extraordinary character ; nothing less indeed, than a three-volumed tale, with 'Hobart Town, Henry Melville, printer,' on the title-page." With "the sweetly-romantic name," "one might imagine the printer to be the hero of the tale. The hero, however, is entitled 'Quintus Servinton.'" The reviewer goes on to say : "We are much more attracted by the quality of the paper, the respectability of the type, the solidity of the covers, and the beauty of the yellow labels, than by any of the woes and wonders of the story itself." Yet he hopes "novel-loving readers will have curiosity enough to glance at a work that is ushered in under such unusual auspices."

SAVERY'S QUINTUS SERVINTON

I. Summary of the Plot

Volume 1

Quintus Servinton, the fifth son of Mr — and Charlotte Servinton, was born at Lartingham Hall in the county of Durham, England, in 1772. He was one of a family of eighteen, there being an equal number of both sexes. When his birth was near, a gipsy woman warned his father that the fifth son would thrice undergo great reverses of fortune during his thirtieth and fortieth years of life, but that he would attain a happy and peaceful old age.

To provide for his large family, Mr Servinton mortgaged a portion of the family estate, and became an active partner in a firm of bankers in Durham county. For this purpose he took a town house. The elder sons, not caring for banking as a calling, were the victims of "high notions," and sought recognition as country gentlemen. Nevertheless they pursued commercial careers. The younger sons entered a seminary in a neighbouring town.

In 1782, Quintus being in his tenth year, the bank became financially embarrassed through the failure of a London firm which had been given a substantial credit. The emergency having been met, Mr Servinton cut his household expenses, sold the Hall and removed his family to the city. Anxious as ever over the gipsy's prophecy, Mr Servinton determined to develop and strengthen the character of Quintus by means of an education that would combine a classical training with commercial knowledge. At twelve years Quintus was enrolled in a residential school,* romantically situated at "Rundleton," on the banks of a tributary to the Severn, near Oswestry in Shropshire. There the boy remained for more than six years.

* This is certainly drawn from the Oswestry Grammar School, founded in 1407. In Savery's time the Headmaster was the Rev. Dr James Donne.

The story of his schooling runs on over six chapters. These concern mainly the training of an adolescent under a competent Headmaster (Dr Simpson).

When Captain of the school, Quintus falls for an indecisive love-affair with a farmer's daughter. It is complicated by unsolicited experiences with men of the world, who chance to meet him as he pursues a school runaway from Chester to Liverpool. The Headmaster eases the unhappy lot of Quintus by imparting to him conventional advice on boy and girl calf-love. A strange phase of the cure is an arrangement that Quintus accompany the Master's wife on a convalescent tour of the adjoining Welsh provinces. The lady confides in Quintus that she suffers from displays of temper and offers him some wise cracks on women. A fitting opportunity to leave school comes when Quintus is appointed to a clerkship in a London business firm.

Two outstanding weaknesses in the character of Quintus that affected him throughout life marked his school-days—an excess of petulance and a tendency to conceal ambitious projects arising from a presumptuous self-sufficiency.

Quintus now begins his career in the twofold world of finance and society. Both fields are advantageously cultivated. The over-ruling Providence that guided his mother is changed to his own self-centred direction. Fortuitous circumstances lead to early commercial successes. Though barely twenty-one, self-dependence and diligent application had stood him in good stead, but the moral dangers confronting an all-too-satisfied self are not anticipated. His London connections open the way to social prospects in Dorset and Devon.

A second love-affair stirs his sensibility somewhat mildly. It runs an airy course in provincial circles. A collateral feature is the audacious hospitality of an Eighteenth Century fox-hunting parson whose enthusiasm for kennels and stables parallels his pulpit vagaries. At a country squire's table a wine-drinking episode rivals the taste of Willoughby Patterne in Meredith's *Egoist* of a later date.

Volume II

On his return to London, Quintus' affection for the Devonshire maid (Fanny Villars) quickly subsides. Into the pattern of his life there enters a town-bred treasure, Emily Clifton. Fortuity plays its accustomed part. Betrothal, marriage, and the birth of a son, Olivant, follow felicitously. Business prospects rise. But the traits in Quintus' character, evoked during his schooling, sustain their ascendancy. An all-wise Providence is overlooked. The corner-stone of self-confidence, restless ambition and wild speculation are chosen, and humility and prudence are put aside.

As Quintus advances in his twenties, a change occurs in his affairs. Good fortune gives way to ups and downs in home and business. Fluctuations, due to variations in government policy, affect his social standing. He conceals temporary losses from his wife who, at all times, desired his full confidence. A calamitous fire destroys his manufactory, and he fails to reap the reward of his expectant speculations.

While awaiting an opportunity for a new start, Quintus joins a cousin in the ownership of a literary and semi-political journal for which they wrote articles. Convalescing from a sudden illness, Quintus takes another holiday in Devonshire. On the way the archaeological features of Stonehenge are set forth in a commonplace book. He enjoys the excessive conviviality of a gastronomic squire whose cellar and table benefit from local smuggling.

City politics now engage Quintus more and more, and he continues to write partisan articles. Intimacies are thus formed with leading business men. Refusing a good offer in the West Indies, he enters into a partnership. The capital is provided by the partner. Quintus brings experience to the enterprise. The venue is changed from London to a town in the West of England, but this is not specifically indicated. The Servintons now reside with Emily's parents in a nearby village (called "Mapleton," and taken from Stapleton, near Bristol).

The future is again bright with prospects. Family felicity is radiant under a cloudless sky. "Time now flew with rapid wings" (Vol. II, p. 176). The peace of the home is paralleled with the social ease of a small community surrounded by scenic charms. Fresh business successes add to Quintus' responsibility and the literary journal is allowed to go down gloriously in its prime—a resolution taken from the motto of the Savery family.

Having begun his thirty-first year, Quintus recalls the gipsy's prophecy. What do the future years portend? The plot of the story has reached its central plateau. The author takes stock and analyses the traits of his leading character, which is himself in most particulars. The good qualities of Quintus are contrasted with the vicious. He has enjoyed everyone's confidence. His ability and integrity are accepted unquestioningly. A business man of repute,

he comports himself with dignity and is welcomed in society. But behind all these worthy attainments there is an inordinate self-sufficiency which cannot take criticism of his grandiose schemes. The sweets of his married life are being soured by an injudicious restlessness, the domestic offshoot of his ambitions. His unwillingness to confide in his wife sorely tried his faithfulness as a husband.

The impending break in a union of hearts, though never manifested in an open quarrel, emphasises the incompatibility of domestic harmony with undisclosed commercial speculation. (Both in form and content, the novel suffers from too much repetition of this problem).

From now on the dissolution of Quintus Servinton's enterprise occupies the foreground. Despite his partner's financial limitations, Quintus imprudently extended the firm's credit disproportionately to its resources. He posed as a magnate among friends and clients. As his involvement becomes acute, Quintus hears of the use and abuse of risky transactions in bankruptcy. He is fascinated by the subtle practice of fictitious bills of exchange, even though backed by a firm's solvency, in financing a temporary embarrassment. In page after page the author cleverly traces the accountancy operations and legal outcome of these tortuous commercial fictions. The upshot is that Quintus signs a faked bill for £500 and salves his conscience by the fact that his business is solvent and that no real persons are likely to suffer.

The deed done, Quintus is faced with the enormity of his offence in the eyes of the law. He is distraught both at home and in the office. He sees no direct way out of the labyrinth of errors. He resolves to hasten to the Isle of Wight and board a ship bound for the West Indies. When he learns that his wife and son arrive there, Quintus seeks an escape by jumping overboard. He is rescued and taken to an inn, only to be arrested. The magistrate commits him to Newgate to await trial. Emily remains faithful throughout—the lodestar that Quintus failed to follow when difficulties pursued him hard. The motif of the story's composition may be taken to be a tribute to a woman's fidelity.

Volume III

The first two chapters of Volume III describe the trial and imprisonment of Quintus Servinton early in 1805. He refused to act on the suggestion of the Recorder that he plead "not guilty," having been advised by friends to the contrary. On conviction he received the death sentence which was commuted to transportation for life. The next two chapters narrate Quintus' experiences on the hulk at Woolwich and the transport, *Tamar*. He was treated as a privileged prisoner, having been allotted firstly to the service of the hulk's doctor and then to that of the ship's surgeon-superintendent, with whom he has much converse on the ways of Providence. He has also theological arguments in friendly fashion with a Scottish divine (drawn apparently from John Dunmore Lang, Savery's fellow passenger on the *Medway*).

On arrival at his destination Quintus is impressed with the progress of the settlement (Sydney, 1805 being in name substituted for Hobart, 1825). The work of colonisation carried out by prisoners is praised. Quintus was soon to learn that recommendations from home counted for little, and that privileges depended upon the "superior excellence of future conduct." He was given an inside clerical job in a department linked with the Governor's office. During leisure he was permitted to devote his talents to the business problems of others. He had still a capacious eye for expansion, and early successes gained for him "influential adherents."

This advance, while praiseworthy even for a "free" migrant, was a disadvantage to one under "bond." Any indulgence Quintus received brought upon him much disfavour from others. He suffered, too, from the political discord of the time. An opposition faction sent unjustified complaints against Quintus directly to the Secretary of State, who instructed the Governor to remove him to another department.

These disturbed eighteen months were followed by ups and downs for another eighteen months. The new duties drew upon Quintus' ability in handling accounts. This qualification came under the notice of Mr Crecy, manager-partner of a large agricultural establishment, financed by partners resident in England. Quintus became *homme d'affaires* to Mr Crecy. Initial progress was succeeded by set-backs, and Crecy was unjustly superseded by an agent from England. Both he and Quintus were accused of mismanaging the affairs of the company, which were referred to an arbitrator for investigation. Misguided by false reports, the Secretary of State directed the Governor to remove Quintus to the interior.

About this time Quintus was expecting the arrival of his wife Emily, to whom he hoped to be assigned. In anticipation he had entered into commitments, typical of his grandiose ambitions, but again mischances occurred. The firm friendship of a free citizen, Mr Leicester, sustained him.

On the voyage out Emily, with the child Olivant, was protected by a young lawyer, Alverney Malvers, a friend of the family, who was on his way to take up a legal appointment in the government. Though affable, courteous and honourable, he was affected by an excess of self-assurance, which was fraught with harassing consequences for the Servintons.

After nearly four years of separation, Quintus and Emily met. The "first burst of joy" was soon followed by a receding gaiety. Quintus did not inform Emily of his speculations, made ostensibly in their joint interest. This was a repetition of the old mistake. Worse still, he was about to be served with a writ as a debtor. Advantaged by his official position, Malvers relieved Quintus from this embarrassment.

Meanwhile Malvers, led astray by the calumniators of both Crecy and Quintus, misjudges their conduct. He presumes that Quintus is no fit husband for Emily and should not have persuaded her to come out. As protector of Emily, he entreats her to put herself under the care of Mrs Cecil, the wife of the Chief Justice. This unnecessary separation of husband and wife brings about a domestic wreckage, which Leicester endeavours to salvage. He finds Quintus at home in a state of collapse through an attempted suicide, and seeks medical aid. Backed loyally by Malvers who realises his mistake, Leicester arranges for the return of Emily to her husband.

While convalescing at home with his family, Quintus is arrested for a debt which should have been paid by the trustees of his property. The mediation of the Governor is sought. On his advice Emily agrees to go back to England and plead her cause personally before the Minister. Meanwhile, exhorted by Leicester, Quintus remains voluntarily in the debtors' prison. There he finds solace in meditation, devoted to the remembrance of his wife who had suffered so much for his wrongdoing. News reaches him that Crecy's accusers had been exposed, and his own integrity upheld.

In London Emily obtains her husband's pardon after seven years of enforced exile. As foretold by the gipsy, this good fortune occurred in his forty-first year. Emily returns. In 1812-3 she and Quintus voyage leisurely back to England. With their son they settle down in Devonshire, and enjoy a life of retirement in pleasant surroundings.

II. Comment

Quintus Servinton, the author says, is "no fiction or the work of the imagination, either in its characters or incidents . . . But it is a biography, true in its general features and in its portraiture of individuals . . ." It is not a novel in the strict sense, lacking the synthesis that binds interactions of characters, and it is not straight-out autobiography, though based upon "real occurrences." It has some likeness to a *Dichtung und Wahrheit* pattern, but eludes that classification. It may be described as the life-story of a fictitious character, "Quintus Servinton," drawn from the experiences of an anonymous author, though changed in setting and emphasis.

Generally, the narrative is fairly straightforward. Knowing the end from the beginning, the author proceeds at ease and without resort to passion. He seeks to guide the reader by signposts in the form of verbal hints that indicate what is likely to happen. Running comments on events break in upon the course of the story. In these Savery evinces no mean insight into human nature, its aspirations and set-backs. He is well-informed on the subjects of his discourse, but tends to over-indulge his analytical ability, and so robs his imagination of much of the richness it may have possessed for a first flight in fiction. His biographical approach, with Quintus Servinton as the centre of the synthesis, puts out of court conflicts of passion between the characters. There are oppositions between groups as political factions, but rarely, except towards the close, do contentions between individuals occur. Emotional imbalances are usually recorded in descriptions or show up in comments. Even the love episodes are devoid of complications, being separate in time and place. Dramatic relationships are not emphasised. There is generally an excess of sentimentalism, even to the point of insipidity, which has something in common with the lack of animation in the amorous incidents. These characteristics weaken the design of the work as a novel.

To a reader willing to detach his attention from the progress of the story, the analyses of character, homiletic disquisitions, explanations of financial moves in business, and descriptions of scenic rambles in Chester, Wales, and the southern counties of England, are of intrinsic interest. If transposed to an appropriate selective work, these paragraphs would call forth a pleasing response. But here the setting is unenlightened. Lacking in dramatic quality, Savery tends to substitute these side-attractions for concentration of movement and

detracts from the action of the plot. In this way he increases opportunity for instruction and denies the general reader the entertainment he expects.

To come to Savery's *Quintus Servinton* for mental absorption is to come to a world apart—a backward glance into the time-overlap between the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. The moral looseness of the titled society of the period is outside the author's range. He is more concerned with the new order that established itself as the Whig domination passed. But moral formalism is still in evidence, and elegance in existence is displayed in a leisurely mood. Satisfaction is found in mental detachment. The chronological recording of the changing phases of a man's life is presented as a warfare between the good principle and the bad, whatever one's occupation. The homiletic bias is quite open and minor characters are named according to the trait each illustrates, after the fashion of Bunyan. It is taken for granted that the ways of Providence are at all times at man's disposal. Troubles come from a human lack of observance of a providential oversight.

Isolated in a debtors' prison, Savery is set for a mental evaluation of his successes and failures. Whatever be the occurrences that were his lot, their appraisal of worth or blame was related to his loyalty, or disloyalty, to a wife whose goodness and simplicity of heart were paragons of conduct. But it may be said that she was too crystal-clear and ethereal a character for placement in the tense world of fictional creation. Savery's experiences with women were restricted. He lived in social circles in which religion, though inconspicuous, was effective for good. The homes of vice never lay in his path and the bad he found in the men he mixed with was due to their unreasoned opposition to his aims and achievements rather than anything intrinsically evil in themselves. The melioristic position taken up by Savery drew him away from the muse's fire. The fervour that was left in him was too self-centred and circumscribed for an imaginative writer. He failed to let himself go in full blast. There was a timidity in him that stifled his talents, and maybe the social fetters imposed upon him rendered his inferiority unbearable, and he quaked before it. The barrier between "bond" and "free" was too firmly fixed in his sum of things. He had not the strength of heart to break it down as a social reformer, though his own hard portion, uninviting for a man of culture, elicited the sympathies of the community's leaders at a moment when he himself became a defeatist under economic pressures. And had there not been so deep a line of cleavage between the administration and its political opponents, Savery might have found a way to final redemption. Nevertheless, in the third volume of *Quintus Servinton*, he left us with a document which, though imaginative in design, may be regarded as a source-book for a social history of the Colony in its early period, revealing a phase of convictism that contrasts widely with the soul-scarred stories given currency in the later novels of Caroline Leakey, Marcus Clarke and Roy Bridges. And it seems fairly certain that William Hay was influenced by Savery's writings in framing a social background for the cultured convict as represented in his *Escape of the Notorious Sir William Heans* (1919).

III. Circumstances and Date of Writing

A. The Third Volume in Particular

In considering the date of writing of *Quintus Servinton*, we have first of all to free the mind of the existence of Henry Savery who came to Hobart in December, 1825, and to regard the author as anonymous—one whose literary existence is dissociated from the real. In the Introductory and Conclusion chapters the author states that he had copied the following work of "biographical fiction" from a manuscript which came into his hands from "Quintus Servinton" himself, who had written his own life-story as a warning to others against the ills that follow an excess of self-sufficiency.

In editing the document for publication, the author as editor would presumably make some modifications to fit it in with the date of its revision. For instance, the manuscript states that Quintus Servinton was born in 1772; and he was about sixty years old at the time when his visitor received it. That would be about 1832, and the month was given as August. But Chapter V of the third volume (p. 106) commences with the sentence: "Twenty and five years ago, New South Wales was not what it has since become, an important English colony . . ." The adverb "ago" clearly dates from the time when the presumed manuscript was being revised for treatment as a novel. As the printing was in process towards the end of 1830, the "twenty and five years ago" would take us back to 1805, which was the year of the fictitious arrival of "Quintus Servinton" as a convict. Hence there is a discrepancy of two years between the date of the manuscript's receipt as given in the "Conclusion" (i.e., 1832) and that of its revision for publication (i.e., 1830). Further, in the "Conclusion" (Vol.

III, p. 400) the author writes : "The preceeding pages have embraced, as it would have been seen, forty years of my narrator's life" (i.e., 1772-1812). The subsequent events, until the time of the author's acquaintance with the narrator, covered a period of "about twenty years" (i.e., up to 1832). The "forty years" ends at 1812, the year of Quintus' fortieth birthday and his departure for England from New South Wales. The additional twenty years end at 1832. Also, the age of Quintus' grand-child, mentioned in the "Conclusion," is given as his "fourteenth year." To fit in the child's age with that of his father, Olivant, whose year of birth was about 1795/7, would have been under twenty when he married. Even so, on this liberal calculation, it is difficult to date the meeting of the author and the narrator as August, 1830. And there is the chronological problem, arising from the fact that the first volume was actually dated and advertised as published at Hobart late in 1830.

In his "Preface" the anonymous author says : "When the manuscript of the following pages were nearly completed and ready to be placed in the hands of the Printer, orders arrived for embarkation on a distant service." He avers that the revision of the original manuscript was not actually completed before he left England for Van Diemen's Land. He then had the alternatives before him : to complete the revision during the voyage and send it from Hobart to London for publication ; or to defer its publication until he himself had returned. Luckily, on arrival, he found a printing press in operation in Hobart and was thus enabled immediately to have the revised manuscript printed and published locally. This was indeed a tall order. On his own showing it was admitted that at earliest the author had received the narrator's manuscript in August, 1830. Assuming that he had left post-haste for Van Diemen's Land, it would take him at least four months to reach his destination. That would be in December. And yet the year of publication of the first volume appears in the imprint as 1830. To have fulfilled the conditions of time thus imposed upon him, the printing must have commenced almost instantaneously on arrival, the title page and preface being run off before the text. Sometimes it happens that the imprint of a book as dated on a title-page corresponds with the commencement of printing and not with its completion.

These chronological discrepancies would not concern contemporary critics, for questions on the date and place of writing and printing would not then be raised. The fact that the novel was printed in Hobart was beyond dispute ; and nothing else seems to have mattered except comment on the authorship, and there appeared to be little doubt on that score in Hobart. But the time and place of writing do become important when they are raised in connection with other books, written in Hobart at an earlier date, such as *The Hermit in Van Diemen's Land* and *Woman's Love*.

Henry Melville, the printer, has definitely asserted that Henry Savery was the author of *The Hermit in Van Diemen's Land*, which, commenced to be printed in 1829, was published in 1830, and he vouched for Savery as the author of *Quintus Servinton*. In its Preface we are informed that it is "the first publication of this nature that has ever been issued from a Colonial press." The implication is, of course, that *The Hermit in Van Diemen's Land* was not a novel, though its dialogues were fictitious. But our problem for the moment concerns the date of writing and printing of *Quintus Servinton*. In the Introductory Chapter and Conclusion it is stated that the original manuscript was received and the revision practically completed before the anonymous author reached Van Diemen's Land, the date being thus fictitiously indicated as 1830. We have now to relate these statements to the facts of Henry Savery's life, including his known authorship of *Quintus Servinton*.

We shall proceed to set out in succession the sources of the "occurrences," which Savery moulded into the plot or scheme of the third volume of *Quintus Servinton*.

We know enough of the experiences of Henry Savery, from the time of his arrest in 1824, and his transportation to Hobart, to say definitely that the third volume of *Quintus Servinton*, published in 1831, could not have been written until several years after Savery's arrival in Van Diemen's Land. The "occurrences" recorded in this volume are authenticated as to time and place, and they range from the end of 1824 to 1829-30. And so the date of its composition corresponds closely to the time-outlook indicated by the author. Ignoring the miscalculation of 1832, we may accept, in round figures, the author's date of writing to be about 1830.

A report of Savery's trial appeared in the *Bristol Gazette and Public Advertiser* of 7 April, 1825. It refers to his plea of guilty, the court proceedings and the death sentence. The issues of 28 April, 30 June, and 7 July, 1825, make reference to the commutation of sentence and the removal of Savery from Bristol gaol to the *Justitia* hulk at Woolwich with other prisoners.

From the official despatches of 1826-27, printed in the *Historical Records of Australia*

(Series III, vols. 5-6), we have definite information on Savery's treatment as a privileged prisoner prior to and during the voyage. He served directly under the *Medway's* surgeon-superintendent who recommended him for favourable placement on arrival. There were local complaints against his employment as a convict in the Colonial Secretary's Office. These reached the Minister of State in London who ordered Savery's removal to another less advantageous position. There is also mention of the fact that, having much leisure time on his hands, Savery was free to place his commercial talent and experience at the disposal of others. Also, he had opportunities for writing in the evening after the public offices closed. His scholastic and business qualifications classed him among the educated convicts, the beneficial treatment of whom, both in the interest of the prisoners and the government, became the subject of a controversy between Lieutenant-Governor Arthur and the Minister of State.

Now it happened that very shortly after Savery's arrival at Hobart in December, 1825, he came under prominent notice in the opposition press. It was presumed that he had been granted privileges of a sort, shown by his early employment as a "convict writer" in the Colonial Secretary's Office. It was alleged that he was associated in some literary capacity with the *Hobart Town Gazette*, and even facetiously linked with Alfred Stephen in the editorship. But this was firmly denied by the editor, James Ross. There was, of course, an easily-fabricated motive underlying these newspaper comments. Scarcely six months before Savery's coming, the partnership of James Ross and Terry Howe, of Launceston, who possessed a printing press, was accepted (and probably arranged) by Arthur in order that they might publish an official gazette, with newspaper features, in support of government policy. By this means Arthur sought to counteract the opposition newspaper (then known as the *Hobart Town Gazette*, afterwards the *Colonial Times*), controlled by Andrew Bent, with the editorial assistance of E. H. Thomas and R. Lathrop Murray. In December, 1825, rumours were current that a new arrival, named Henry Savery, was a man of literary ability. How easy then to jump to the conclusion that his talent would be availed of by the administration in the production of a combined gazette and newspaper! Feelings ran high between the government and the non-official pressmen. Their political supporters brought the quarrel directly to the notice of the Minister of State, who did not reconcile this considerate treatment of a convict with ministerial policy. And so Savery's privileged position became a matter for local inquiry at the instance of the Minister. What is of immediate concern to us is the fact that Savery, with a literary reputation, was a marked man in the Colony. And yet, though differing from Arthur and his officials, there were some professional and business men who had leanings towards Savery for his knowledge of commercial practice. It is of interest to observe that in this Savery affair there was no clear-cut line of cleavage between convict and free, as some of his press opponents had suffered the obloquy of transportation. An exclusive union among emancipists was never a strong feature of early Tasmanian politics.

Later events, basic for the narrative of the third volume, support more strongly the view that it could not have been written before the end of 1829.

The prejudices from which Quintus suffered through his employment with Crecy's "agricultural establishment" relate to real incidents that ranged from 1826 to 1830. In May, 1826 Captain B. B. Thomas arrived in Hobart and shortly afterwards set up at Cressy the headquarters of the Van Diemen's Land Establishment for horse and stock breeding on a large scale. He was the residential partner, acting for his London co-partners. In a personal capacity Savery was employed by Thomas to assist him in keeping the company's accounts. The venture met with unforeseen difficulties, and relying on information that later turned out to be inaccurate, the home directors dissolved their partnership with B. B. Thomas. In June, 1828 Thomas resigned and Thomas Dutton was appointed to succeed him. Savery came in for a large share of the mistrust thus engendered. On his own initiative Dutton had settled in Tasmania in 1826 and engaged in pastoral pursuits. As the newly-appointed agent for the Establishment, he reported to Arthur that its affairs were in a desperate condition and requested further grants of land (Despatch, 2 October, 1828). Meanwhile Thomas had taken action against his former colleagues, and the matter was submitted to arbitration. Early in 1830 he was awarded substantial compensation. Both Thomas and Savery were exonerated for any alleged mishandling of the Establishment's affairs.

The Thomas incident caused a local stir and Savery was condemned in many quarters. In 1832, the year following the publication of *Quintus Servinton*, Savery made application for his ticket-of-leave. He was supported by the recommendations of some fifty leaders in the professions and commerce, including heads of government departments. Among them were Alfred Stephen, C. McLachlan, W. Peet, and C. B. Lyons, all of whom made special mention

of Savery's good conduct as disclosed by the report of the inquiry into the affairs of the Establishment, and expressed regret at their previous misjudgment of his character. His prison-associate of 1829, Thomas E. Wells, testified to his blameless fulfilment of duty.

In Chapters V, VII, IX and XIII of the third volume of the novel, Savery traces Quintus Servinton's connections, as *homme d'affaires*, with the agricultural establishment under the direction of Mr Crecy (a name taken from Cressy, the headquarters of B. B. Thomas). The company's activities are not definitely indicated. Motives leading to dissensions are stressed, and emphasis is laid on suspicions induced by enemies to break down Crecy's confidence in Quintus, and also to bias Malvers against the latter in his relations with his wife Emily. The exoneration of Crecy and Quintus by the arbitrator is given a last-minute mention in the novel, like a stop-press newspaper paragraph. In these situations Savery defends Quintus and presents him in a favourable light. In this way he seeks a measure of compensation for his own misfortunes.

Mrs Eliza Savery, with her son Oliver, arrived at Hobart on 30 October, 1828, on board the *Henry Wellesley*, nearly three years after her husband. On the same ship the newly-appointed Attorney-General, Algernon Montagu ("Alverney Malvers" of the novel), was a fellow passenger, who, at the instance of Mrs Savery's family, agreed to act as her protector during the voyage. This fact was confirmed in a despatch to the Minister of State from Lieutenant-Governor Arthur, dated 17 August, 1829. Arthur also referred to an action taken by Henry Jennings for the Saverys against Montagu, on the ground of his alleged failure to fulfil an offer of assistance to Savery and his wife in respect of a writ against Savery for debt, and its consequences for Mrs Savery's own property. The despatch mentioned rumours of domestic differences between Mrs Savery and her husband. It was presumed that these arose from misrepresentations of Savery's actual position in letters to his wife. The upset affected Savery mentally. Within a week of Mrs Savery's arrival, he attempted suicide and was attended by Dr William Crowther with whom he was personally acquainted (*Tasmanian*, 14 November, 1828). On his recovery, a further writ was issued against Savery on 19 December, 1828, when he was taken into custody and removed to the debtor's division of the Hobart Gaol. Having now found herself to be in a hopeless situation, Mrs Savery, with her son Oliver, returned to England by the ship *Sarah*, which sailed from Hobart on 11 February, 1829.

(Savery expected that his wife would return at a convenient time. About three years later he made an official application to enable Mrs Savery to take out a passage to Hobart).

These incidents are the main sources for the domestic relations of Quintus and Emily Servinton, as recorded in Chapters IX to XIII of the third volume of *Quintus Servinton*, as well as the experiences of Quintus in a debtors' prison, where he had a genial companion in Mr Allen (probably drawn from Thomas Wells). In his treatment of the character of Alverney Malvers, Savery displayed no animosity against Algernon Montagu, who in later life as a judge was much criticised. He is here represented as an officious young man whose lack of experience in marital relations was a serious handicap for him in his role of a wife's protector.

(Confirmation of Savery's detention for debt is given in his letter to the Colonial Secretary, dated 27 December, 1828, as well as in Peter De Graves's request [13 March, 1830] for Savery's release and assignment to Major Hugh McIntosh, of New Norfolk. There is also Savery's private letter to Jocelyn Thomas [27 February, 1830], in which he refers to his unfortunate circumstances from October, 1828 to February, 1830).

B. The Work as a Whole

We may conclude then that the third volume of *Quintus Servinton* was not written before 1829. But we have yet to determine when and how the idea to compose the work suggested itself to Savery, and whether the first two volumes were in manuscript before that year. We are not to be "taken in" by the verbal camouflage of the preface which presumes that the manuscript of the book was almost ready for the printer prior to the sudden "embarkation on a distant service." This is simply, as we have hinted, the disguise of an anonymous writer. Savery adopted a similar device to cover up temporarily his identity as the author of *The Hermit in Van Diemen's Land*, when he referred to himself as one newly-arrived in the Colony, having a link with the London "Hermit," then generally known to the literary world of that time. The presumption of an existing manuscript, of which the novel is a representation, separates the author from the material which he asserts has come unexpectedly into his hands. He becomes the narrator of events in the life of the writer of the manuscript,

who has lived at other times in other places. And in this instance the time-coincidence in the "lives" of the manuscript's "author" and the novel's "author" is the year of its receipt and the year of its revision, which is intended to be one and the same, *viz.*, 1830.

We can find no definite urge for Savery to write his life-story at the time of his imprisonment in the Bristol Gaol, while awaiting trial and eventual transportation. He had been successful in business within limits that did not extend beyond the average, and he had enjoyed what may be termed as a sound classical education, that bordered on the University level. Clearly he was a man of talent, capable of using to advantage what he had attained scholastically. He also had literary interests that could readily be developed into authorship. He was acquainted with literature generally and followed politics in relation to the nation's commerce. But he was too young to have felt the disturbing influences of the French Revolution at the time of its outbreak; and his teens were not caught up in the whirl of soldiering occasioned by the European victories of Napoleon. When he reached manhood, he was called on to face the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars in a business career, linked with West Indies plantations. His experience was the common lot of the majority of the young men of his generation. He by-passed military fashions. For relaxation he turned to the social life of the southern counties of England, where some branches of his family had flourished for centuries.

Unless enlivened later by unique happenings, the early life of Savery, even with its commercial successes, had not in itself sufficient prompting for autobiographical reflection. Nor did a perverse nature, the sport of aberrant self-sufficiency, warrant a drive for literary aspirations. And even when after sentence his detention in the Bristol Gaol lengthened into three months, there was no exceptional occasion for recording the inner conflict of vice and virtue that led to his own undoing. And he had in no sense a flair for an imaginative projection into his subsequent career that might give his post-adolescence a significance beyond what was the ordinary lot of multitudes of his fellows. Then, too, at Bristol, Savery was close to his wife and family, and the prospect of transportation did not bar the way to future redemption and economic recovery. And he knew that his friends were in touch with the administrative authorities that could place him in a position of privilege among his fellow convicts. These expectations were ample to fill his mind with anticipations of better things, and there was no disturbing stimulus to take the world into his confidence. He was aware that his personal belongings and household refinements were being packed for use and display overseas. All these matters doubtless engaged his attention fully, as Savery awaited the turn of events that would direct his course to a new mode of life under an assignment to his wife, whose loyalty and encouragement buttressed his hopes, whenever these seemed to totter.

Then there followed the long months of the sea voyage to Hobart. Benefiting as he did through his privileged position among the convicts—almost a government passenger to boot—Savery might have tried out his literary skill on fragmentary compositions as an off-side occupation, but he gives us no hint of a major endeavour. In those distant years it was a custom among free migrants and returning Australians with a literary bent to indulge in sporadic writing during the voyage. John Dunmore Lang, who was also a passenger on the *Medway*, was prone to occupy some of his leisure time at sea with imaginative exercises. In his *Aurora Australis* (1826), Lang included several of the poems he had written on board the *Medway*, as he voyaged to Van Diemen's Land. One, entitled "A Sonnet," was "written off Hobart Town." Most likely he read his verses to his fellow-passenger, Henry Savery, who, by the way, records in *Quintus Servinton* some theological discussions with the learned doctor. But there does not appear to be any stirring of passion to induce Savery to give himself up to autobiographical writing, when outward bound, any more than when he was incarcerated at Bristol. He happened to be more concerned with hopes for a reprieve and a re-union with his wife and family, whether in the colony or on return home.

Ordinarily, in early Van Diemen's Land, a convict might be expected to pass his days without notoriety, unless he committed fresh crimes or actively opposed the administration. Savery was, above all else, eager to recover his social standing. He had excellent letters of commendation, and he desired to be favourably reported on by those in authority. He was attentive to his duties and conformed to the regulations. But, according to John Montagu, who was a shrewd observer, Savery was "under considerable anxiety and uneasiness." He became, as we have stated, a target for Arthur's opponents because of his usefulness to the Government in its journalistic lines of defence; and the privileges he enjoyed in his private capacity were ever open to attack. He survived these trials of prejudice and misrepresentation

through Arthur's consideration for educated convicts, despite ministerial disfavour at home. Still Savery suffered in mind from these mischances.

The vigour of the press during Arthur's governorship was not without its allurements for professional men, the majority of whom were on the under-side of forty. Prior to the eighteen-thirties the newspapers were the sole outlet for their literary proclivities. These were cultural beds for a nascent colonial literature and to them, whether in league or in opposition, local leaders of thought, well-read in the world's literatures, were attracted. They were drawn together in a nondescript organisation of *litterateurs* who could not disguise a common interest in the spread of learning, whatever their political and social differences. Among them, as a newspaper printer-publisher, Andrew Bent had a standing of peculiar influence. By 1827 Bent's Almanacs had been marked by some literary flavour, and his printery had already set the type for original compositions. He himself had suffered for his devotion to the cause of freedom of expression, but the march of literature could not be stayed. Even official writers were not averse to the zest that their energies felt in attack and defence, and could not resist the bonds that bound them in the province of literature, which favoured intellectual controversy, but never at any time raised up barriers of exclusiveness towards competitors.

Savery was drawn into their midst, and Bent's *Colonial Times* became for him, not solely a centre of criticism of government policy, but a newspaper with a literary outlook. It fostered original contributions and acquainted its readers with literary activities abroad. Its refusal to conform to the government demand for licensed newspapers in 1827 but gave Bent an opening to show, temporarily at all events, his aspirations for a magazine upon which local thought and imaginative writing might be focussed. He founded the *Colonial Advocate* as a periodical (not a newspaper), which ran monthly during 1828. It was an exemplary justification of his faith in literature as a national service. The early numbers of Murray's *Austral-Asiatic Review* (1828) felt the force of these literary trends. At "Rotherwood," Ouse, David Burn was putting into shape his drama, based on Brady's exploits and entitled, "The Bushrangers," which he staged at Edinburgh in 1829. But there is no indication that at that time Savery was acquainted with Burn, who fourteen years later recorded a talk with him at Porth Arthur. During her short stay (1826-9) the presence of Mary Lemman Grimstone was a stimulating feature. She was represented in the *Colonial Advocate*, with which Savery was presumed to be connected in some editorial capacity.

The first half of the year, 1828, seems to have been a high tide in Savery's affairs. He had established himself with the editors of newspapers. He was on good terms with administrative heads, and even Arthur was not inwardly adverse to him. He had set his heart on a non-official career. He was known personally to professional men and business executives. And his accountancy work for the Van Diemen's Land Establishment gave him an insight into pastoral pursuits. These successes no doubt induced him to speculate in real property on his own account in the hope that he might secure a settled living against the day of his wife's arrival. Apparently, in his letters to Mrs Savery, he had allowed his enthusiasms to outdo his reason, and she was led to expect her husband to be in prosperous circumstances. But Savery did not reckon on the vehemence of critics against Captain Thomas's management of the Van Diemen's Land Establishment and the consequent check they were to give to his own run of success. Relying, as he had done in former times, on an over-valuation of his abilities, he seems to have extended his commitments unduly and became financially embarrassed. Business men and administrators ceased to have confidence in him. And so, in order to protect himself personally and to provide for his wife when resident in Hobart, he had handed over his possessions to trustees and left himself without the conventional vestige that he could call his own.

In view of these untoward developments, the expected arrival of Mrs Savery during the last quarter of 1828 portended disaster. In 1827 Savery buoyed himself up at the thought of her coming. The austere John Montagu was moved by the nervousness which Savery displayed in obtaining a certificate for his wife's passage. Archdeacon Bedford vouched for Savery's attachment to his wife and his anxiety for her safety. The vision of a happy reunion soon vanished into thin air. Even Savery's privileges as a prisoner became for him a mental liability. He had it on his conscience that the obligations he had to face as one under bond contrasted to his detriment with those of the man who was recognised as free. As a convict he presumed himself to be at a disadvantage personally. And whether he succeeded or failed, he cozened up in his mind ill-founded assumptions of jealousy and evil reactions on the part of those not favourably disposed towards him. And when Mrs Savery actually arrived on

30 October, 1828, his affairs were so tangled that a writ for debt was pending against him. The demand was staved off through the personal help of Algernon Montagu, the Attorney-General, who was interested in Mrs Savery's welfare, as we have seen. But Montagu himself was somewhat imbalanced and seemed to have mishandled the situation. Domestic infelicity became inevitable. Savery failed to face up to his difficulties and attempted suicide. At the time he was due to serve as a clerk in the Police Office at Bothwell ("the interior"). But on 19 December, 1828, he was removed to the debtors' division of the Hobart Gaol, wrongfully as he claimed for the writ should have been taken against his trustees. On this complicated issue he appealed unsuccessfully to Arthur. His plight became most pitiable when Mrs Savery with her son left for England on 11 February, 1829.

On the departure of his wife and son loneliness held Savery's soul in pawn. He was in debt. He was in prison. He was without a home. But lonely or not, he had countless leisure. What could he do with his time? In *Quintus Servinton* (Vol. III, ch. XII), Savery tells us that Quintus remained in a debtors' prison for more than a year. He had his own apartment and did not desire to be discharged. He spent his leisure hours in a manner befitting his education and attainments. He "sat in judgment on his past." This may refer to an urge to write.

To the leading citizens of Hobart and its environs, Savery was known as an intellectual. He was familiar with their modes of life, and had visited their homes in town and country. He was acquainted with midland centres of topographical interest and the local pastoralists. The Derwent charmed his sensibility. And occasionally he found comfort in a Hobart drawing-room. But these good relations had become irksome remembrances as the breach in his domestic establishment widened. He was left desolate. His loneliness of heart brought him to the verge of melancholia. He featured some of the symptoms in the last chapters of *Quintus Servinton*. But as "Quintus" he put on a bright face and turned his prison room into a retreat for meditation. He drew upon his literary affiliations, and set his imagination to work. He examined himself. Through contemplation he would reach the high road to redemption. Writing would give substance to his thinking. A clear call came to extol the personality of his absent wife and enshrine her devotion in a temple of the muses. As an incentive he strove to recapture the exhilarant days of his friendship and service with Captain Thomas ("Mr Crecy"), when his prospects were traced aloft in a sky of peerless blue.

Savery's relations with Andrew Bent and Henry Melville were revived. Their common interests were later to go beyond purely literary activities, for each had a penchant for farming, and Savery also had a bent that way. In the long run these ventures failed. But at present we are concerned with Savery's desire to write. He had the right sort of connections. Through Bent he had had access to the *Colonial Advocate* and now the *Colonial Times* was at his bidding. He doubtless knew of Mrs Grimstone's contributions and her taste for the novel. Both she and Savery had a liking for Devonshire, and he may have been aware of the manuscript she was taking with her to London for publication. She was a fellow passenger with Mrs Savery on the *Sarah*.

Savery was familiar with the English writings of the Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Centuries. He had certainly read Felix MacDonogh's volumes, entitled *The Hermit in London*,* published a few years before his transportation. The role of the "Hermit" apparently had a lure for Savery in his solitude. Detached from community life, he was able to view men and women as characters for sporadic sketching. And he had aptitude for descriptive writing. Here was a chance for the exercise of his talents! His mood and approach may be illustrated by a quotation from *The Hermit in Van Diemen's Land* :

There is not a more interesting, a more edifying sight than such as is afforded by a clear and serene Sunday in a Christian country. The cessation of labour the day affords, the recreation to the health and spirits of those doomed to work out their existence by the sweat of their brow, the relaxation of the mind to others, who pass their lives in

*While this Paper was in the press, the Tasmanian University Library acquired a copy of *The Hermit in London, or Sketches of English Manners* (New Ed., 3 vols, 1821), not previously obtainable. It is noted that the "Hermits" of MacDonogh and Savery both possess a sufficient sense of self-importance and self-denial to elicit facetious comments on fashionable society and its weaknesses, whether in London or Hobart Town. But whereas MacDonogh is more prone to portray with persuasive irony contemporary vagaries of men and women, Savery is more responsive to local scenes and conflicts to be found in a new-world topography. MacDonogh, however, excels in artifice.

more still and sedentary occupations, are effects sufficiently discernible in the smiling faces of the neatly dressed groups, which are anywhere to be seen in the streets, either going to, or returning from, places of public worship ; or, as the afternoon advances, enjoying by quiet and rational exercise that pure air, which is denied them the other six days of the week. Were a proof wanting that this beautiful world is not the production of mere chance, that it has been shaped and fashioned by infinite wisdom, and is governed by infinite goodness, the institution of the Sabbath would be alone sufficient, in the estimation of any thinking sober-minded person. Happily, however, we live in a country where such proofs are not required, where arguments are unnecessary, to induce belief at least in an over-ruling Providence, however remote this sometimes may be from the practice that is adopted, and where all, in one way or another, mark the Sunday by a something that is different from all the other days of the week.

The eccentricities of detention in the old Hobart Gaol were not lost on Savery. He would know how Andrew Bent, when imprisoned for libel in 1826, wrote letters for publication in his own newspaper, the *Colonial Times*. Thomas Wells, himself a "pioneer" author, was a friendly associate who knew how to get copy to the outside and could advise on policy in any reference to the administration. A resolve on Savery's part to write on people and places would surely appeal to Bent and Melville, even if they did not initiate. And so Savery began to relieve his loneliness of its sting by commenting on manners and customs in Hobart and describing scenes and incidents for the entertainment of readers of Bent's *Colonial Times* in 1829. To hide his identity from the generality, Savery disguised himself as a new arrival, by name Simon Stukeley, from Yorkshire. He fraternises with people from the Governor down to humble folk at work, reveals their ceremonial and foibles, their styles of dress and callings, sports and pastimes, as well as their quarrels and reconciliations. Noticeable features of the "Hermit's" approach were his appreciation of the civilising work of the colonists and his generous references to the Governor and his officials.

The success of the "Hermit" articles raised Savery's hopes. His literary output gained general respect. The urge to go on writing increased in strength. He had practised himself in description, dialogue and delineation of character. As the compositions of the "Hermit" were nearing their end, Savery played with the idea that these morsels might be gathered into a compact piece, integrated by some sort of plot—a story written around his own life with his wife Eliza as the heroine. Through this literary creation he would redeem his lost soul and exalt his wife's selfless service as God's best gift to him. The Gaol would be transformed into the mercy seat of the Most-High. And as she read his story her bent would once more turn to him ; and they would be re-united as man and wife.

This project was ahead of him when, through the good offices of Peter De Graves, he was assigned to Major Hugh McIntosh of New Norfolk. There his mind was enlivened through the instruction he imparted to the De Graves boys as family tutor. He was once more among books. The classics took on a familiar guise. Horace and Terence became his daily portion in the company of the Elizabethans and Augustans. And Henry Melville was nearby with benign words of encouragement. Thus *Quintus Servinton*, commenced in the debtors' prison of Hobart in 1829, was continued in the pleasure of New Norfolk and its district. And Savery's dream of retirement with his wife and son in a Devonshire estate which, as an epilogue, closed the pages of *Quintus Servinton*, no doubt sprang from his aspirations for a farm of his own on the banks of the broad Derwent beyond Glenorchy, where the woodlands and pastures had an ineffable attraction for him.

GRIMSTONE'S WOMAN'S LOVE

I. Summary of the Plot

Volume I

In the late Eighteen-twenties, when under twenty, Belwin Fitzarran, son of Lady Fitzarran, a Roman Catholic, eloped with and married the teen-aged Constance, daughter of a Protestant neighbour, Admiral Rusport. A cousin, Lady Claudia Conway, accompanied them. The families resided in Devonshire. At Rouen the young people are joined by Charles Beresford, then in his late twenties. Some years before he had rescued Belwin from drowning. Claudia's brother, Lord Conway, and the admiral arrive on the scene, and the runaways are turned back. At Dieppe Claudia is attracted to Beresford whom Conway challenges to a duel. Beresford is wounded.

(Beresford's history is recalled. He was born at Keswick where his grandfather [Vincent]

was the vicar. His father, whose origins were unknown, was said to have left Keswick as the result of some trouble with his mother's brother, Hugh Vincent, later to appear as Guy Burroughs. On the death of his mother, Charles Beresford was educated by the vicar's successor, Mr Thornton. When Charles was eighteen, Thornton married a widow with one son, Edward Saville. The youths fell out over the daughter of a French *emigre* and became enemies. Charles left the vicarage to make his way in London. When he met Belwin Fitzarran at Rouen, he was secretary to a diplomat.)

At Fitzarran Abbey, Devonshire, Lady Fitzarran lives the life of a religious recluse since her husband's desertion. (Later he is revealed as a son of the Earl of Morrendale). She has the care of a Protestant ward, Ida Dorrington. Coming with news of Belwin Fitzarran and his bride, Beresford is welcomed at the abbey as a guest. He falls in love with Ida. Soon afterwards Belwin returns. The library being a favourite haunt, Beresford discovers family portraits hidden in an adjoining room. Their mystery is known to Lady Fitzarran's spiritual adviser, Abbe Petroni who enjoins silence upon Beresford.

Claudia's elder brother, the Earl of Dromore, and his family arrive at the Abbey in company with Sir Constantine Grieves, Lady Dromore's brother. Dromore is a paramour of the wife of an adjoining baronet, Sir John Bevill, of Bevill Court.

Volume II

Entertainments on a lavish scale take place at Bevill Court, where Constance's presence is dramatically revealed. She had escaped from her father. Claudia's passion for Beresford develops, and Grieves becomes interested in Ida Dorrington.

Belwin and Charles go out riding and learn the story of an old-time scholarly journalist, Alton Willoughby, who knew better days. On one of his "musing walks" Charles approached a lonely cottage. Through a lighted window he sees Ida giving jewelry to an unknown man and later departing for the Abbey under male escort.

(The reader learns that Ida's mother, Clara Clifford, when an orphan, joined a travelling theatrical company, which included Rachel Melburt. She married a ne'er-do-well aristocrat, named Dorrington, against Rachel's wishes. A year later Ida was born. In France Dorrington deserted his wife and child for a celebrated actress. On her mother's death, Ida was handed over to the care of Rachel Melburt. When eleven, Ida became the ward of Lady Fitzarran, who supplied the needs of Rachel through an intermediary, Guy Burroughs).

Meanwhile Grieves avows his love of Ida, who is not impressed by rank; and Claudia is animated whenever she meets Beresford. Because of his fraternal interest in Ida, Belwin's marital relations with Constance are strained.

The Morrendale-Fitzarran portraits continue to stir the curiosity of Charles Beresford; and from a local antiquary he learns some incidents in the married life of the Fitzarrans and the birth of their son, Belwin.

Guy Burroughs pays secret visits to the Abbey and arranges with Claudia that Rachel take part in the theatricals at Bevill Court. Ida's mysterious moves again come under the notice of Charles, and the course of their love does not run smoothly.

Rachel has become further involved with Burroughs. He seeks her aid to give him cover from the police, who suspect him of counterfeit coinage. They go to a cottage near Fitzarran Abbey. Claudia is induced to act as guardian of their infant after Ida disowned responsibility.

Late one evening, Ida and Charles meet in the open immediately after a visit to her from Burroughs. Ida clears herself of complicity with Grieves. She and Charles realise a common bond in their social dependence. They avow a lasting attachment.

On being informed next morning Lady Fitzarran advises Ida to look to Grieves and leave Beresford for Claudia. But Ida remains true to Charles.

Attended by her loyal friend Claudia, Lady Bevill in death atones for her unconventional relations with Dromore.

The scene now changes to London. Morrendale (Claudia's grandfather) is interested in a career for Charles. Through his daughter (Dowager Countess of Dromore), Edward Saville is introduced to Morrendale House. There he meets Charles for the first time since their Keswick days. Charles treats Saville as a reformed character, but the move is not reciprocated.

Lady Claudia speculates on Charles' future in politics. But Ida is troubled by present misunderstandings due to the importunity of Guy Burroughs. Her unwillingness to accept Grieves offends the aristocratic Dromores.

During a visit to a Royal Academy exhibition, Claudia introduces Ida to the Earl of Santon, and she is attracted by his cultured bearing. In conversation there is mention of Rachel Melburt and Santon becomes suddenly indisposed. Before dinner at Morrendale House, a messenger from Rachel seeks Ida. Charles appears at the same time. Later in the drawing-room Lady Fitzarran is observant and notes : bliss encompasses Ida and Charles ; Claudia's animation foretells a delusive dream ; and Constance fails to appreciate Belwin's riper manhood.

Santon seeks an interview with Lady Fitzarran and confesses that he is Ida's father. Ida is informed and readily accepts his parental protection. Charles' joy is tinged with apprehension as the change in Ida's social standing may effect his relations with her.

The situation becomes critical for Claudia. To Charles she reveals the mystery behind the story of Belwin's father and his marriage with Lady Fitzarran, as well as the secret of the hidden portraits. Her motif is lost on Charles ; and fleeing from his presence, she gives way to sobbing.

Meanwhile Saville raises unfounded suspicions in Morrendale's mind that Charles is an adventurer, who seeks to possess his granddaughter Claudia. Claudia, loyal to Charles, denounces Saville ; but he has already influenced the Dromores against Charles. Lady Fitzarran has left London for the Abbey.

In London Charles meets the French *emigre* of his Keswick days who offers him hospitality. The renewal of this link spells trouble for him. His facial likeness to Guy Burroughs is noted. Saville and Burroughs, assisted by a Keswick girl, falsely involve Charles in their stealing of Dromore's watch and the forging of a cheque in Conway's name. Charles is charged with the crimes and arrested.

Quarrels ensue among the Dromores over Charles and Claudia. They have fallen a prey to the evil suggestions of Charles' enemies. Claudia refuses to disbelieve in him, and Ida learns of his loyalty to her through an intercepted letter. Ida convinces her father (Lord Santon) of Charles' honour. Claudia and Ida profess an undying friendship.

Morrendale and his grandson Conway have a long discussion on crime and punishment, in some aspects suggested by penal administration in Van Diemen's Land. But Conway will not agree to relax the law's rigour against Charles.

Meanwhile Lady Fitzarran has received a package of her late husband's letters from Abbe Petroni, sent just before the latter's death. These reveal that Charles is Lord Fitzarran's son by a former marriage and heir to the earldom of Morrendale. She brings this news to the old earl.

Everything is now concentrated on Charles' defence. The trial is melodramatically presented. Rachel Melburt appears unexpectedly in court at the critical moment and exposes Guy Burroughs, the brother of Charles' mother, as the arch villain in association with Edward Saville and others. Saville paid the full penalty of the law, and the other guilty men were eventually transported to another hemisphere in the South Pacific.

Charles marries Ida and they proceed to Keswick. Constance dies in Rome and twelve months later Belwin, now Baron Elsam, marries Lady Claudia.

(References to discussions in dialogue are omitted)

II. Time and Place of Composition

In the Preface to *Woman's Love*, Mary L. Grimstone writes : "The following pages were written in Van Diemen's Land. A voyage is said to improve Madeira ; I would it had the same effect on a manuscript ; I should then have less occasion to claim indulgence for the defects and deficiencies of this production."

Mrs Grimstone arrived in Hobart in March, 1826 and left for England on return in February, 1829. It is highly probable that she wrote the basic manuscript of *Woman's Love* during the years 1827 and 1828, and revised some portions of it in 1830-1. (She had suffered from a "nervous disorder" in 1829-30). The revision is supported by three references to the enactment of "Catholic emancipation" which actually took place in 1829 (Vol. 2, pp. 191 and 194 ; and Vol. 3, p. 252) ; and three times there is mention of an interval of some twenty years dating from about 1809 (Vol. 1, p. 312 ; Vol. 2, p. 189 ; and Vol. 3, p. 257). Also, the time-sequence of events, described in the main or central portion of the story, may be taken as occurring within the limits of one year. Accepting 1829 as the year of their occurrence, the writer commits some slight discrepancies as to the ages of the characters, Charles Beresford, Belwin

Fitzarran, and Ida Dorrington. Belwin would only be about ten or eleven years of age at the time of his rescue by Beresford ; but this tender age scarcely fits in with the incident as described (Vol. 1, pp. 7-8). Then, also in 1829, Ida would not be much more than eighteen years. But these are small matters. What is significant is that the events, immediately following the elopment and mixed marriage of Belwin Fitzarran and Constance Rusport, appear to occur about the time when Catholic emancipation had been accomplished, *i.e.*, in 1829. When composing her novel in Hobart, Mrs Grimstone would not be aware of the actual year in which the political agitation to remove Roman Catholic disabilities would finally achieve its purpose.

It would seem, therefore, that, although the novel was written, as stated, in Van Diemen's Land during a residence of some two and a half years between 1826 and 1828, it was revised before publication in London about two years later. Thus the dates of the plot's occurrences were most likely adjusted to correspond with the year of passing of Catholic emancipation by the Imperial Parliament. This could easily be done as the events could have happened within a space of about one year. It is hard to conceive that the author would be writing during 1827-8 and have before her mind all the time the placement of the plot's incidents in some future year, depending upon an uncertain political situation. That would be easier in a novel of futuristic fancy. We may therefore plump for the revision of dates by the author on her return to London.

Still there is the backward hold of the time-sequences of the subsidiary or "throw-back" episodes. These do not readily conform to the year 1829 ; they are more conveniently related to the year 1826-7. In terms of the latter chronology, Belwin would be a boy of about thirteen years at the time of his rescue, and this would be consistent with his age of eighteen at the time of his marriage. It is, however, possible to spread the post-marital events of the plot over a two years period by regarding the various time intervals as indefinite. But to accept this chronological arrangement upsets the frequent reference to the twenty years' interval from 1809. Despite these time variations we have no reason to deny the author's statement that in the large the novel was written in Van Diemen's Land. And we know that she resided in Hobart during 1826-8 and that she continued there a literary activity begun in England some years previously.

In the Preface Mary L. Grimstone states that she decided against using local material for her story, as she would most likely suffer unnecessary criticism from members of a small circle in a colonial community. Doubtless she had in mind the vexation that followed the appearance of her "celebrated letter" on Hobart society in the columns of the London *Morning Herald* (1827), reprinted in part in the Hobart *Colonial Advocate* (1828, pp. 141-2). An after-effect of the local reaction to this correctional epistle may be disguised in the request of Claudia that Charles should tell her of faults (Vol. 2, pp. 300-1) : "I know," she says, "the task of correction is an ungracious one—one in which true friendship only will undertake, and I lament to say such friendship it has been my lot to meet but once, and then not with sufficient power to avail myself of it, I allude to Lady Fitzarran . . ."

Despite her exclusion of an Australian theme for a novel, Mrs Grimstone, nevertheless, introduced some antipodean matter into the composition of *Woman's Love*. The most significant references occur in the author's observations on the eccentricities of Miss Clapperton, known as "the Rosilla Parrot" in the Dromore circles. The author alludes to this lady's fondness for "docking" the names of her friends.

This was a liberty she took with the language generally ; which she clipped and mangled in so barbarous a manner, that had deforming the king's English been as punishable as defacing the king's coin, she would have run the risk of taking a trans-atlantic trip and frightening the natives of Van Diemen's Land. Ugly as they are . . . (Vol. I, 283).

Other references relate to the transportation of convicted persons to far lands in the South Pacific, where felons drive the honest savage from his haunts (Vol. 3, pp. 188, 350 and 356), and to the plumage of birds of Paradise (Vol. 2, p. 176). In her other novels, *Louisa Egerton* (1830), *Character, or Jew and Gentile* (1833), and *Cleone* (1834), there are also allusions to transportation connected with the Australian scene.

III. Comment on the Plot and its Setting

1. There is nothing extraordinary about the plot of *Woman's Love*. It is not exciting and the incidents do not arouse the passions. The appeal is mainly directed to the intelligence of readers who are likely to be interested in the status of women in what used to be

exclusively aristocratic circles. We are introduced to a cultured society of titled folk in Southern England whose social poise is disturbed by the irrational conduct of young people who break away from the conventions of good manners. While an elopement may bring to a group of individuals a touch of romance, in this instance it is scarcely more than a means of ushering into an ancestral home the disturbing influences of mixed marriages and the misguided effects of ill-considered love-making that infringes the bounds of fashionable pride and sensibility. The way to a peaceful issue of these upsets is found in the unselfish conduct of women who, despite temperamental divergences, rise above the disloyalties of men prejudiced by malice and envy, and spread the ascendancy for good among the male members of their households.

Set in the post-war period of the closing years of the eighteen-twenties, when Roman Catholic disabilities were on the eve of their parliamentary settlement, and when the industrial revolution had not completely dislocated social classes, nevertheless the novel side-tracks political events and outdoor gaieties of provincial society, and confines itself to the ingenuous forms of indoor life among betters, whose mental outlook is conventionalised by dilettante literary pursuits and orthodox religious observances. There are rounds of visits among neighbouring houses; and the customary after-breakfast and after-dinner conversations are conducted with due formality. On occasion these table-talks are transformed into well-matched dialogues on abstruse subjects. Character contacts operate within a restricted range, and generally take the place of dramatic action. The course of the story has to be traced through analyses of occurrences, with throw-back references to past events that spot the light on significant characters. It is noticeable that, while in the elopement story at the beginning and the trial scenes at the close movement subordinates reason, the long intervening chapters are weighted with homiletic, philosophical and literary discussions, which tend to overshadow emotional upsets and smart disquisitions among lovers.

The love-making is devoid of tension except in after-effects. It is almost passionless. The participants delight in rational discourse on phases of art and literature, or vary this by dissecting ambivalent relationships. Emotional stress is disguised, or if revealed, it is isolated. There is rarely ever an open or heated quarrel or difference. And the solecisms of fleshly pursuits are transcended. Romance is there, felt in the charm of characters and their sincerity of motive. Classical pose and statuesque regularity are allied with ease and grace. But the women's recourse to the period's tears and fainting did not gainsay feminine enlightenment on things of superior import. In the love scenes Mrs Grimstone prefers to portray the high mental quality of her women characters rather than their flashes of wit or irritating glances. Pungent raillery or incisive thrusts to inflict hurt are not in favour. Considerateness is never out of fashion.

Love, woman's love, is extolled as a "moral engine," which uproots jealousy and implants a selfless concern and warmth of feeling for others, never ousted in any degree even by a devotion to the beloved that absorbs the soul's felicity.

It is natural that love should make us demand priority in that breast in which we have lodged our most intimate hope of happiness; but it is neither natural nor right that we should desire to make an exclusive monopoly of its sympathies; the want of a just view upon this point is the source of jealousy, one of the most baneful passions, both in its particular or general effects, that a breast can cherish. The being who can be content to draw *all* his perceptions of pleasure or happiness from one individual must have a very narrow capacity for enjoyment; and narrow as it may be, they who take upon themselves to administer to it, engage in a task of no ordinary difficulty; yet this is precisely the principle upon which lovers set out. [Vol. 3, pp. 106-7].

In this passage Mrs Grimstone expresses the view that the love which unites the hearts of two lovers does not of itself exclude the love of another which reinforces this primary love. Such an exclusiveness of tender feeling would open wide the way to jealousy and the evils that come in its train. The love that bound Ida Dorrington and Charles Beresford did not cast out Claudia Conway in whom unwittingly Charles had awakened a love that, when matured, found expression in a sympathetic understanding of hearts.

2. The social setting of *Woman's Love* reflects the changes in English society that followed the industrial revolution and the agitation for political reform. The exclusive differentiation of classes was then tending to break down. Rank, with its fetish of precedence, was losing its hold on social approbation. The wider sources of the production of wealth and its distribution led to the rising of new avenues of affluence, less sporadic than hitherto. And religious tolerance and education were strengthening their influence in city and country.

Temperament was playing its part in removing social barriers and a commonwealth of character linked families of varying degrees in cultural standing. Irregularities in conduct invaded all groups and their removal or modification called for the recognition of moral equality. To emphasise these tendencies among aristocratic provincials, Mrs Grimstone introduces characters with a rigid outlook who satirise somewhat the foibles and presumptions of such as assume a social superiority devoid of intellectual or artistic taste. These are found both within and without the bounds generally approved by those who stress the significance of "birth" and "rank." And even among the nobility, vulgarity and dissimulation arise in a manner not to be distinguished from their appearance among the poor and dispossessed.

The two leading characters, the hero and heroine, morally at least, appear as orphans. Their unstable fathers concealed their titled rank. The mothers belonged to families with religious and aesthetic interests. In varying degrees the four parents were acquainted with the evils of poverty and licentiousness, and endured the hard lot of malfeasance. The resolve to overcome such disabilities is not the prerogative of so-called social superiors, but springs from an innate goodness that preserves humanity against ultimate deterioration or even destruction. In this moral endeavour all human beings are capable of sharing without discrimination. And those who presume upon their social and material inheritance have no advantage here other than what belongs by moral right to all men and women.

Thus the author, while keeping the plot mainly within the confines of aristocratic circles, holds the opinion that these people have no intrinsic claim to honour and prestige. The hero and heroine are presented as products of an inter-mixture of social orders; the female bias for moral probity and pertinacity predominating. The perversity of the titled fathers, shown in unreasoned reactions against social restrictions imposed upon their upbringing, does not continue in their offspring. These young people have been educated to conform generally to the community's social standards and even better their agencies for good. They recognise that merit and morals transcend privileges that are not earned, and that loyalties need not disown differences inherent in religious observance and political adherence. Above all these manifest a moral strength in human love that is alien to jealousy and self-sufficiency. Marriage for them is a union of hearts independent of privilege, prestige, and power.

3. In an imaginative work it is expected that motivation will be dominant in characterisation. The characters are displayed in action, description and narrative being reduced to a minimum. Dialogue is alert for motif. The individuals in their several ways, whether in speech or action, initiate objectives and make for them. Little will be left to analysis or influence; immediacy is its own solvent. Conversation will be presented as an instrument of movement. Life with its increasing changes of aspect will hold the reader in suspense. The contingent will leave the general panting for place. And we shall find reflection running counter to the real. An appeal to reason comes not into an imaginative offing.

In contrast to this view, Mrs Grimstone's mode of presentation is more intellectual than emotional. For her, imagination works less creatively than inferentially. She has a case to prove, a purpose to set forth or defend, and a viewpoint to sustain. Hence what is inherent in the actual gives way to reticence or analysis. Here reason is at the helm and the appeal to the reader's interest comes through his intelligence. He learns to absorb himself in the subject matter rather than in the clash of personalities. Conflict, of course, is not obviated but it comes in as an after-effect. It is revealed in the analysis of what is expressed or taken for granted in dialogue. In the main the dialogues are argumentative. Some of Mrs Grimstone's characters are devised to expound in generalisations the pet aversions, foibles and posing of sub-standard members of an aristocracy who take to themselves the radiance that belongs to their gifted leaders. They are purveyors of a culture that is not theirs by acquisition. These assertions are not imaginatively delineated in character-response and repartee, but in expository declarations by conventionally selected types. In Mrs Grimstone the romantic soft-pedals to the classical. She brings a highly cultivated mind to the task and expatiates on the intellectual pursuits of social circles with which she is familiar. Her knowledge of moral philosophy and literature is drawn upon effectively, and her skill in aphorismic expression is displayed with talented zest. A reader, who revels in analytical discussion and is not upset by any lack of imaginative realism, will derive much satisfaction from Mrs Grimstone's manner of writing. Her work provides a change from the abstract handling of religious and moral philosophy in the learned treatises of scholars. But rich as *Woman's Love* is in these characteristics, it is not a work to be prescribed for a study of the art of fiction nor for the historical investigation of early Nineteenth Century society. But a collection of her aphorisms or comments on the conduct of life would form an enlightened

anthology of a woman's contemporary philosophising.

4. Mrs Grimstone is of the opinion that a novel should prove instructive as well as entertaining. In a pithy discussion on John Wilson's novel, *The Foresters*, between Ida Dorrington and Claudia Conway, the latter remarks :

The characters in a fiction, like those in real life, must speak to you themselves ; you must be acquainted with their modes of expression, and habits of thought, their likes and dislikes ; in fact, see them in all the camelion [*sic*] hues which nature wears, or takes from circumstances, or they *never* touch you.

In preceding discussions between Ida and Charles Beresford, Ida expresses a preference for the novel over the mediaeval romances that are concerned with the more than mundane affairs of knights and ladies.

The novel may, I think, be regarded as an improvement on the romance ; embracing (when well written) all that charms the imagination in the regions of fancy, as well as much that instructs the heart from the realities of life. It is a species of writing more true to nature, not only in rejecting supernatural agency, and all the list of horrors of which romances are made up, but in the verisimilitude of character. [Vol. I, p. 269].

Ida also criticised Samuel Richardson "who led the way to the modern novel." He "seemed to conceive no medium between excellence and infamy ; whilst in the mingled yarn of real life, we discern none so good, but who are deteriorated by some portion of evil ; none so bad, as not to have some redeeming quality" (p. 270).

This comment by Ida Dorrington comes very near to the guiding principle of characterisation in *Woman's Love*. There is no really bad or villainous character in the piece. Even Edward Saville, who paid the supreme penalty, had acceptable qualities which might have scored the mark if it had not been for some undesirable associates, including one or two of aristocratic perversity.

The author clearly intended to instruct by means of dialogue. Her strong dislike for utilitarianism, which had gained strength in her time, is reflected in a comment of Lady Fitzarran.

Happiness is not to be snatched in the course of a careless flight after pleasure, nor is it thrown into our path by the fortuitous prodigality of chance : something like it may in such a manner be caught up ; but, like that forbidden fruit that brought sin and death into the world, such boons will repay the weak and credulous avidity with which they are seized. The only approaches to happiness are through the avenues of religion and morality. [Vol. I, pp. 238-9].

This moral teaching of Lady Fitzarran, after the fashion of Thomas a Kempis, is strengthened by a preference for heavenly things that she urged upon her ward, Ida Dorrington. What appear to be certainties in this life are mere shadows. The substance abides in a world beyond where we may look for our hope and stay.

O Ida, my child, be not confident of life, nor let the bubbles that float to thee on its stream dazzle thine eyes ; they will break on thy touch, and dissolve in air. Every earthly possession is a shadow, that for a time mocks us with its delusive semblance, and if we rest on such we shall pass, like them, and be no more . . . All that I would conjure thee is, cling not too closely to what must pass from thee and soon—live and love, and be happy here, as happy as thou canst ; but let it be with reference to and remembrance of that world where the bliss, that is here a shadow, is a substance, and the hopes, here vague and fluctuating as the moments of time, will there be fixed and certain as the endurance of eternity. [Vol. III, pp. 102-3].

At the same time we are not to treat this life as solely a vale of tears. We are not to sacrifice mental health, "good spirits," to morbid sentiment as many of our literary geniuses do. Absorption in our own propensities must cease ; and we are to count others better than ourselves.

I regard health and cheerfulness as the two primary blessings to which all else are subordinate, and to attain and preserve these at once a duty due to God and ourselves. So concomitant do I consider them, that where the first exists without the other, I look upon the deficiency in the light of a crime ; for it is certainly a want of gratitude for the most precious of all gifts. [Vol. II, p. 311].

Mrs Grimstone's frequent use of the term, "mental health," may have arisen from her own illnesses.

IV. Characters

The hub of the plot centred round the development of the love of Charles Beresford and Ida Dorrington. It was a case of love at first sight which, having begun as a woodland idyl

amid rocks and ravines in the Abbey grounds, deepened its flow as a river finding its way progressively to the sea. The checks and setbacks were exterior events which, when once resolved, faded out as mere surface disturbances. There were no signs of passion either from jealousy or wantonness, and the customary triangle of wrangling loyalties or disloyalties did not appear. Any emotional infringement of the joy of united hearts, due to the false suggestions of others, was merely a temporary upset which soon resolved itself rationally on the appearance of the truth.

The three leading characters seemed to have been creations designed to fit in with the author's scheme of a triune friendship between a man and two women. The introversion of Ida Dorrington was devised as a foil to the extroversion of Lady Claudia Conway, the man (Charles Beresford) combining in himself traces of both these determining traits. Sir Constantine Grieves, Bt, a contender for Ida's love, was but a means to satisfy the aristocratic narrowness of the women of two generations in the same household. The elopement couple (Belwin and Constance Fitzarran), whose escapade led to the love-match of Ida and Charles, became estranged from one another as the hero and heroine came by the honours denied to them in their childhood. Despite his own deprivation of an inheritance through the discovery of his elder step-brother (Charles), Belwin rejoiced in the latter's happiness, but Constance remained apart. The old Earl of Morrendale, though left childless, found solace in the unwavering loyalty of his granddaughter Claudia. Herein he was compensated for the moral vagaries of his two grandsons (Earl of Dromore and Lord Conway). In an attachment with Lady Bevill, Dromore was used to introduce in a mild form the loose side of country-house gaieties. With the connivance of Morrendale's daughter-in-law (the Dowager Countess), the two brothers, though in conflict with one another, allow themselves to be victimised by the villain of the piece (Edward Saville), who in his boyhood lived under the same Keswick roof as the hero, known at that time as Charles Beresford. Also through Saville, Charles' maternal uncle, as Guy Burroughs, became an intermediary at Fitzarran Abbey between Ida and Rachel Melburt, the friend of Ida's deceased mother.

Morrendale's other daughter-in-law, Lady Fitzarran, dignified and religiously devoted in her sorrow for a lost husband (Ormond Fitzarran, known as Beresford), welcomed to her home as a daughter the orphan Ida and trained her in the way of virtue and lovingkindness. Dutifully she handed Ida over to the protection of her newly-found father, the Earl of Santon (known as Dorrington), who though evilly influenced by Beresford's enemy, Edward Saville, regained his confidence in Charles through his daughter's undeviating faith in her lover's innocence. Two subsidiary characters, the Keswick vicar Thornton and the dispossessed journalist Willoughby, contributed to the cultural amenities of the Abbey and Bevill Court. The conventional quips and cranks, directed facetiously against the aristocracy, were plentifully provided by Mr Walter, the misanthrope, and the Amazonian Miss Clapperton, whose linguistic talents vied with that of Miss Larolles in Fanny Burney's *Cecilia*.

The most dramatic character, with a touch of the real in her, is Rachel Melburt, who links up the Keswick sub-plot with Fitzarran Abbey. She is known to the two villains of the piece and their underworld subordinates. She is acquainted with Beresford's parents. She is also the intimate friend and protector of Ida Dorrington's mother whose unequal marriage she strongly opposed. Through Guy Burroughs, as a disguised intermediary, she preserves the bond between herself and Ida. She wins the favour of the ever-trusting Claudia who falls for her interest in theatricals. This intricate patterning of characters within the milieu of Rachel Melburt is an effective piece of constructive work and allows for her dramatic outburst at the critical moment of Beresford's trial. Her personality is compact of melodrama. Life for her is poised on a knife-edge, and in the court her emaciated body becomes finely-flexed in an ecstasy of passion for the justification of the innocent. Her apologia having been theatrically delivered, death became a fitting consummation of what loyalty stands for in a woman's devotion.

The characterisation of Ida Dorrington, Claudia Conway and Charles Beresford has little relation to real exponents of their distinctive qualities. They are strictly psychological constructions, emphasising traits of character more in contrast than in unison. Of the three, Claudia is the most life-like, due to her emotional ambivalences. From the moment of their first meeting Charles appeared to her as a beau ideal of manhood, talented, well-mannered, debonair. Sure of himself he never posed. In seeming he was as he inwardly conditioned himself. Passion awakened in Claudia's heart, undetected by Beresford. On Claudia's return to Fitzarran Abbey, Charles and Ida were in the toils of love though unconfessed. In Charles' presence Claudia was ever animated, and did not disguise her emotional pleasure. At first she was encouraged by her relatives to believe that Charles was in love with her. When Ida's

ties with Charles suffered shock through her secret associations with Rachel Melburt's unknown intermediary, Claudia's stocks appeared to rise. Unsought she attains an emotional dominance. She reveals to Charles the secret sorrow of Lady Fitzarran's unrequited love of her husband. For Claudia this love, in its sacrificial richness, bore a resemblance to her own love for Charles which he fails to detect. She flees from him broken-hearted. At enmity with her unscrupulous brother Conway, Claudia swings to melancholia. Her grandfather and Ida restore her mind, reinforced by the wise counsel of Mr Thornton. Usually Claudia's impulses overwhelmed any desire for self-examination, but she ever responded feelingly to the fostering confidence of her friends. Her utter lack of jealousy towards Ida revealed an unalloyed susceptibility to what is noblest in human nature—undeviating loyalty. In Charles' crisis this trait in her rose to a superb height.

Ida's nature was so compact of virtue that she almost passed beyond this life's limits. Dependent through parental loss, she lived a sort of enchanted existence. Under Lady Fitzarran's spiritual guidance the attributes of refinement and good nature combined in her character. Reason took on in her the phase of serenity that transfigured controversy, and the mean of her conduct was so stable as to oust ambivalences. So deep was her confidence in those whom she trusted that any disturbance of emotion was a mere superficial variant. She was too faultless for a novelist's plot, and her emotional stability made her an easy creation for the author's rationalism. The eventual discovery of her parentage and rank merely deepened the roots of her loyalties. The placement of her own confidences she took for granted and put everyone at ease. Her solitary emotional breakdown of a major sort was due to a serious and unwarranted allegation against her lover's honour, made by the Dowager Countess, at a time when she was herself distraught and liable to be shaken in mind by undisciplined suspicions. An accidental receipt of a misdirected letter revealed to her how inviolable was Charles' attachment to her. The swing to mental equilibrium was swift and unhalting. From then on Ida accepted her lover's fate as her own.

Intelligent and artistic in outlook, Ida Dorrington preserved what in a later generation may have been described as a pre-Raphaelite charm. Not given to an excess of animation like Claudia, she combined a cultivated mind with gentility which enabled her to present an exterior calm in moments of tension. Though she felt at times the inferiority of her position at Fitzarran Abbey as a dependent, she nevertheless sustained a natural dignity and ineffable pose. Nevertheless what the author made of her was more suited for a stained-glass representation of womanhood than the social finessing of provincial aristocracy.

The character of Charles Beresford, as it developed, became an unearthly product, a type of romantic knight in physical build, mind and poise, but without the shining armour, and yet not devoid of courage. Spiritually he seemed to move in a region of mind that transcended petty jealousies. Completely self-possessed and unaffected by worldly distinctions, he was at home in any society. He neither played down nor played up to people. He took himself and every one else for granted. His sympathy deepened into intimacy where sincerity abounded, calming such as were disturbed and finding a common ground with the jubilant or the sorrowing. His soul was capacious for love which, whatever its variations, had no shadow of turning where loyalty was concerned. Both Claudia and Ida, themselves intimates, found in him separately a spiritual habitation, distinctive and yet without inner walls of partition.

Charles' love for Ida did not exclude his fondness of Claudia and respect for Lady Fitzarran. But his grace, charity and nobility of sentiment were mistaken for pride and presumption by those who sought his downfall or planned other outlets for his affections. Hence he became a surrogate for their own maleficent intentions. These were framed by enemies into criminal offences against aristocratic patrons before it was known that he himself was heir to an earldom. Like Ida Dorrington, he had to come through the trials of dependence. Originally this common lot was a sheet-anchor of their love, but Ida's unexpected elevation in rank left Charles floundering in a mood of inferiority, sprung from a lover's anxiety at their altered relationship. And yet he rejoiced in the domestic happiness that had come to her unsolicited. But her faithfulness was unshaken, and they found felicity in a union of hearts, untouched by what fortune and rank might bestow for good or ill.

Generally speaking, these two characters were cloistral in their setting and function. They were devised to suit intellectually the trends of the plot. What contretemps they experienced came from reflection and not dramatic conflict. Even the intrusion of a rival to Charles in the person of an affluent baronet, Sir Constantine Grieves, was merely episodal, being treated as a subject for abstract discussion by the lovers. Here the author's intellectual cast of mind substituted analysis for action. A penchant for philosophising and homiletic teaching ruled

her heart. This may be interesting for readers who are predisposed to examine incidents and responses, but any direct appeal in the story is lessened for those who prefer absorption in the events as they happen.

The mentality and background of Ida Dorrington and Charles Beresford conformed to the author's conception of the changing conditions of the aristocracy. They had sprung from a union of women with a professional inheritance and men who broke away from the stereotype of country mansions and town fashions. An interfusion of classes in society had been developing since the industrial revolution, and political reforms were making way for the rise of progressives in parliamentary organisations. But in the novel itself the author restricted the main strands of her plot to social visits, parties and dancing; dilettante conversations and theatricals; and conventional interests in art and literature. In the background there are vague references to military service, fox hunting and political careers. But the territorial limits of the love-making among the protagonists are confined to a Devonshire county manor and its surroundings, with minor variations in London town-houses. In some respects the coming and going of these characters bear a resemblance to the scenic changes on the stage of a theatre. Subsidiary participants work out their destiny in distant rural areas.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

I. *Henry Savery*

Little is known of Henry Savery's pre-Tasmanian life in England, except what may be conjectured from *Quintus Servinton* and some newspaper recordings. His family belonged generally to Devonshire and is included in Fairbairn's "Crests," its motto being *Aut vita aut mors gloriosa*. This was quoted by "*Quintus*" when he discontinued the publication of a semi-political periodical (Vol. II, pp. 176-7). Savery's father was a provincial banker, but whether he had a family seat in Durham county or whether the reference to it in *Quintus Servinton* was a blind, it is not known. Savery was born in England in 1794. From the descriptive details of his school-days, it would seem that Savery was educated at the Oswestry Grammar School, Shropshire (disguised in the novel as at "Rundleton"), when the Rev. Dr James Donne ("Dr Simpson") was Headmaster (1796-1833). Founded by David Holbach in 1407, it is one of the oldest grammar schools in England. An old boy is Lt-Col. C. J. A. Moses, General Manager of the Australian Broadcasting Commission. From a paper (with illustrations), contributed by Askew Roberts to the *Transactions* of the Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society (Vol. 5, 1882), and a private letter from the present Headmaster, Mr R. Williamson, it is learnt that class records of the school have not been regularly preserved. The School provided a reputable standard of classical education, together with subjects suitable for commercial callings. Savery's knowledge of the classics is reflected in his Tasmanian writings and family tutorships.

On leaving school Savery commenced his business career apparently in London, where his early successes led to his marriage about 1815 with Eliza Elliott Oliver ("Emily Clifton"), daughter of William Elliott Oliver, of Blackfriars, London. Their son Oliver ("Olivant") was born on 30 June, 1816. About 1817 Savery was the owner of a sugar refinery in Bristol and later took in a partner, the firm having been known as Savery and Saward. Eventually he resided at Stapleton ("Mapleton"), then a village adjoining Bristol, but now a suburb. For obvious reasons Savery avoided mention of Bristol in *Quintus Servinton*. He did not even indicate the business transfer from London. And, without having stated its county, he referred to "Mapleton" and district as the later scene of Quintus' home and social life. (Quintus was imprisoned in Newgate and tried in London).

From the *Bristol Gazette and Public Advertiser* (7 April, 1825) we learn that Savery's trial took place on 4 April, 1825, at the Bristol Assize. He pleaded guilty to an indictment of having forged and counterfeited a note of hand, dated Birmingham, 7 October, 1824, for the sum of £500, with intent to defraud. He had used fictitious names.* He was advised by the Recorder to plead not guilty, but refused. On his having been found guilty, the Recorder passed the death sentence upon Savery. On 20 April, 1825, this was commuted to transportation for life. After sentence Savery was imprisoned at Bristol from 7 April to 1 July, 1825, when he was transferred to the hulk *Justitia* at Woolwich, prior to embarkation on the *Medway* for Van Diemen's Land. He was treated as a privileged prisoner and allotted duty with the Surgeon-Superintendent (Gilbert King). The Rev. J. Dunmore Lang was a passenger for Sydney. The *Medway* arrived at Hobart on 9 December, 1825. A few days later it was discovered that a trunk lodged in the King's Store from the *Medway*, and consigned to Henry Savery,

had been broken open, and that a large quantity of plate and linen was taken from it. The plate was engraved with a crest the description of which corresponded with that mentioned in Fairbairn's "Crests."

Savery was given employment as a convict writer in the Colonial Secretary's Office. Under pressure from local criticism as well as direction from Westminster, Arthur appointed a committee to inquire into allegations against Savery. He was transferred to the Colonial Treasury because of his ability in handling accounts. In 1827 he was permitted to undertake work for Captain B. B. Thomas, local manager-partner of the Van Diemen's Land Establishment. The affairs of the company were inquired into during 1828-9, but Thomas and Savery were exonerated.

Meanwhile Mrs Savery, and her twelve year old son, had arrived on 30 October, 1828. Unfortunately for their domestic felicity Savery's financial position was precarious. Under the strain he attempted suicide, but quickly recovered. His property had been taken over by trustees. In December, 1828 he was placed in the debtors' division of the Hobart Gaol, and remained there for the rest of his wife's stay in Hobart.

At the instance of her family, Mrs Savery embarked on board the *Henry Wellesley* under the protection of Algernon Montagu, then proceeding to Hobart to take up his appointment as Attorney-General. Shortly after arrival he was called upon to give Savery what help he could reasonably undertake. With Arthur's concurrence he concluded that it would be better for Mrs Savery and her son to return home. She sailed by the *Sarah* on 11 February, 1829. Mrs M. L. Grimstone was also a passenger. Savery remained in the debtors' prison until March, 1830, when, at the request of Peter De Graves, he was assigned to Hugh McIntosh in the New Norfolk district. At that time Savery was writing his autobiographical novel, *Quintus Servinton*.

Savery had now acquired some reputation as a writer, and Henry Melville, who had a common interest with him in their agricultural pursuits in the same district, induced him to continue their literary associations. In 1831 Savery contributed to Melville's *Van Diemen's Land Almanack*. Having succeeded in obtaining his ticket-of-leave in 1832, with the recommendations of several leading citizens, Savery began to assist Melville in the office work of the *Colonial Times* newspaper. During a brief absence of Melville from Hobart, Savery had editorial charge and allowed an anonymous review of James Gordon's "Correspondence" with Arthur to appear in the *Colonial Times* columns. Presuming that Savery had written it, Gordon proceeded against him, backed up by Gilbert Robertson who had had a quarrel with Savery. The Court ordered that Savery should surrender his ticket-of-leave. But Arthur and the members of the Legislative Council were aware that Gordon's motive was primarily to harass the Government. The Governor and Council were sympathetic towards Savery who received his ticket shortly afterwards. The review article was contributed by Thomas Richards who publicly acknowledged it.

Savery now extended his agricultural interests beyond his financial limits. He was reported to have improved his farms. But in 1838 he became insolvent, and in the next year his liability to the trustees of Maurice Smith was declared to be about £9,000. For some time his financial affairs were confused, and in 1840 he resorted once more to forged notes to relieve his temporary embarrassment. He was arrested and tried before Mr Justice Montagu. On being found guilty, Savery was sentenced to imprisonment which he served at Port Arthur. There he died and was buried on February 8, 1842.

In this country we have little authentic information on the life and work of Mrs Mary Leman Grimstone. She was the daughter of Leman Thomas Rede, an English expatriate, who

*It is of interest to note that on 23 March, 1812, also at the Bristol Assizes, Francis Greenway (later to be Macquarie's architect) was found guilty of uttering as true a certain forged instrument purporting to be an agreement. Against the advice of the lawyer, Greenway followed the wishes of his friends and pleaded guilty, as did Savery in 1825. M. H. Ellis in his *Francis Greenway: his life and times* (1949, pp. 13-14) comments: "For what if not for use did the Deity endow an artist with the power to counterfeit with pen and brush the actual semblance of existing things, even of Mr. Solicitor Cooke's handwriting." In making this comment was Mr Ellis aware of the quotation used by Savery in reference to forged bills of exchange (vol. II, p. 239), viz.: "*De non apparentibus, et non existentibus, eadem est ratio*" ("what is not apparent must be considered as non-existent.") See H. R. Jones' *Dictionary of Foreign Phrases and Classical Quotations*, (New Ed., 1908, p. 28). The quotation also appears in Fielding's *History of Tom Jones* (vol. I, ch. 8), where it is applied to a woman's blushes.

II. Mary Leman Grimstone

died in Hamburg in 1810. He was a literary man of some note, well known in the United States. His sons (Leman Thomas and William Leman) were authors of plays, William's *Faith and Falsehood* (1837) having scenes set in Van Diemen's Land (see *Pressmen and Governors*, 1952, pp. 60-1).

Mary Leman Grimstone (nee Rede), born about 1800, came to London in 1807. Before she was twenty-one, she published some verse under the pseudonym of "Oscar." Apparently a breakdown in health induced Mrs Grimstone (then a widow?) to join a sister, Lucy Leman Adey, who was about to leave with her husband, Stephen Adey, by the *Cape Packet* for Hobart. Adey had accepted an appointment in the service of the Van Diemen's Land Company. The party arrived on 4 March, 1826. Within a few months Mrs Grimstone contributed verse to the *Colonial Times*. Her anonymous letter on Hobart society to the *London Morning Herald* in 1827 gave rise to much adverse local comment. After her departure occasional poems, published in London annuals and periodicals, were reprinted in the *Hobart press*. She also wrote some short stories on Van Diemen's Land themes.

At the time of publication of her Tasmanian-written novel, *Woman's Love* (1832), Mrs Grimstone belonged to the circle of women associated with the English magazine, *La Belle Assemblée*, edited by the Hon. Mrs Caroline Norton, whose charms by then had attracted Lord Melbourne, later Queen Victoria's Prime Minister. These fashionable connections brought Mrs Grimstone under notice as a writer of novels that pleaded for the recognition of intellectual women in social and political circles. In the double columns of *La Belle Assemblée* (July 1834, pp. 50-2), her *Cleone* (2v., 1834) was reviewed at some length as a novel revealing the "majestic" in woman, while the hero had suffered from the ills of transportation to Van Diemen's Land.

Under the Rede-Grimstone item No. 253 in Colin Richardson's Catalogue 89 (1956), there is mention of "letters from a son presumably John Gillies." This reference would seem to indicate a second marriage and apparently accounted for the use of the name, Mary Leman Gillies, as author of social articles and short stories in the *Peoples' Journal* (vols. I-II, 1846-7). Some of these deal with Van Diemen's Land. In the *British Museum Catalogue* there is listed a number of children's books under the name of Mary Gillies, published during the early eighteen-sixties.

As compared with some of the minor women novelists of the early Nineteenth Century, listed by F. W. Bateson in his *Bibliography of English Literature*, Mrs Grimstone, though omitted, shows up quite favourably. But she comes short of the level that marks the work of Fanny Burney and Mary Mitford of an earlier period. She has not the imaginative directness nor the precision of Jane Austen. Her composition tends to prolixity and moralising; and in her plots she resorts to the over-sudden wiles of coincidence. Her intellect overrides the bias of feelings, but sustains the project to portray women as characters fitted for the best intellectual society. In this effort Mrs Grimstone has a place in the company of Fanny Burney, who doubtless influenced her writing.

Note. About the time when Mrs Grimstone commenced the writing of *Woman's Love* in Hobart, Thomas Gaspey was probably ready for the printing of his anonymous novel, *The History of George Godfrey, written by Himself* (1828). The plot comprised a complicated series of melodramatic episodes, concerning abduction, forgery, fraudulent stock speculations and other crimes, pertinent to the period in England. In the third volume the penal incidents are interwoven with imaginary bushranging in New South Wales. A review appeared in *La Belle Assemblée* (Lond., April 1828, pp. 171-2). The book is listed in *Australian Literature* (1940, v. 2, p. 968) among the non-Australian authors of fiction associated with Australia.

Thomas Gaspey (1788-1871) was an English novelist and historian of some note during the first half of the Nineteenth Century. (See *British Museum Catalogue* and *Dictionary of National Biography*). His son, Thomas W. Gaspey, was known to a previous generation of students in German, familiar with the Gaspey-Otto-Sauer *Grammatik*.