THE EARLY EDITIONS OF FIELDING'S 'VOYAGE TO LISBON.'

ABOUT Wednesday, 12th June, 1754, Henry Fielding, through his brother John, engaged passage to Lisbon on board the 'Queen of Portugal,' Captain Richard Veale, which was to sail on the following Saturday, 15th June. His party consisted of himself, his second wife, Mary Daniel Fielding, his daughter by his first wife, Eleanor Harriot, her friend, Margaret Collier, a maid, Isabella Ash, and a footman, William, whose last name is unknown. For the accommodation of the party Fielding paid thirty pounds, all of which, he thought, went clear into the captain's pocket. The ship did not sail as promised, the event being postponed from day to day as the captain was waiting for more freight and passengers. On or about 22nd June, a week after the announced date of sailing, Fielding invited the captain to dine with him at his house in Ealing. At this meeting it was agreed that the ship would sail on the Wednesday following, 26th June.

The ship was anchored in the Thames near Rotherhithe and Wapping, and Fielding drove in a coach from Ealing to Rotherhithe, a distance of twelve miles, in about two hours. From the coach he was carried in his chair through a jeering rabble

of watermen, and lifted into a small boat which brought him to the ship, into which he was lifted by a block and tackle. Instead of sailing on the promised day the ship remained at anchor off Wapping until Sunday, 30th June, when, in charge of a pilot, it dropped down the river twenty miles to Gravesend.

Saunders Welch and Jane Collier had come with the party from Ealing, and remained with them until Monday, 1st July, when, after dinner, they took post-chaise for London. At six in the evening the captain came on board, and the ship fell down to the Nore. On Tuesday, 2nd July, they passed Thanet and Sheppey, and at 3 p.m. came to an anchor in the Downs, within two miles of Deal. Adverse winds kept them there until Monday, 8th July, and it was during this week that Fielding first thought of writing his journal.

By six on the morning of 8th July, the ship had run south about seven miles, and had passed Dover. In the evening they beat the sea off Sussex, making but little way, though on the morning of 10th July they were in sight of the Isle of Wight. About three in the afternoon the ship passed by Spithead and Portsmouth, and came to anchor on the Mother Bank off Ryde. On the following day, Friday, 12th July, the ladies went ashore at Ryde and drank their tea at an ale-house. While they were away Fielding wrote to his brother John the letter which Jesse first published in 1875. As the wind promised to remain unfavourable, Fielding himself went ashore in a hoy which had brought him the present of half a buck, probably sent him by Mrs.

Roberts, of Appley. The party arrived at the inn at about four in the afternoon, and there is some doubt as to who went ashore with him. There were four in his party, besides the two servants, but when he settles his first bill he speaks of 'five people and two servants.' Here the word 'five' may be a misprint for 'four,' and this is the more probable solution; or he may have written 'five people, two of them servants.' In this case Miss Collier is ignored, and, as a matter of fact, she is not mentioned by name while at Ryde, though the accommodations for the others are particularly described. It has been suggested that Miss Collier may have stayed with Mrs. Roberts, but when a hasty move is made to go aboard ship nothing is said of any of the party being at a distance. The captain clearly spent his nights aboard ship, and it is not likely that Fielding took as his guest either the 'ignorant Portuguese priest,' or the 'rude school-boy,' and there were no other passengers.

Fielding did not bring ashore with him the manuscript of his journal, though he continued his writing while at Ryde. Neither did he bring with him the ship's almanac, and so when he jotted down the events of the following day he became confused as to the day of the month, and wrote 'Sunday, 19th July,' for what was certainly the 14th. This error in the date was carried along until Sunday, 21st July, which he called the 26th. After that, discovering the mistake, instead of correcting it he simply ignored it, but to avoid continuing it, he abandoned the use of the day of the month altogether, and thereafter simply re-

corded the day of the week. There is one exception to this in the first edition (p. 205), where what was really 24th July is made the 20th. This farther confusion was not repeated in the second edition, and presumably it was not in Fielding's manuscript.

The party remained at Ryde until 11 a.m. on Thursday, 18th July, when they went aboard ship, and that afternoon the vessel drifted to St. Helen's, a distance of five miles in as many hours. Here the captain received a visit from a nephew, a lieutenant in the army, who had just returned from Gibraltar or Minorca. A wind from the north cut short this visit, much to the relief of Mr. Fielding, and that night they passed Christ Church and Peveril Point. On Saturday, 20th July, they are off the island of Portland, but adverse winds blew them into Torbay, where they anchored at six on the morning of Sunday, 21st July. There they remained until Saturday, 27th July, when with a favourable wind the real voyage began, and they at last lost sight of the English coast, a month and more after Fielding had gone on board ship.

While anchored in Torbay Fielding bought three hogsheads of 'cyder' from Giles Leverance, of 'Cheeshurst,' for which he paid five pounds ten shillings. One of these he took with him to Lisbon, while the other two were sent to his brother John, to be divided equally between his brother, Saunders Welch, Dr. Hunter, and Andrew Millar. It was here also in Torbay that Fielding had his quarrel with the captain, the account of which was suppressed in the first edition. On

22nd July, having procured his cider the day before, he wrote to his brother John telling him how to distribute it, and telling also of having received a present of half a buck (he says 'a buck' in the Journal) from the New Forest, but he does not say from whom the present came. On the back of this letter, in another hand, is endorsed the correct address of Giles Leverance, which was 'Churston,' instead of 'Cheeshurst,' as it is given in the Journal. This illuminating letter was first printed in the 'National Review' for August, 1911, in 'A Fielding Find,' by Mr. Austin Dobson.

Adverse winds, calms, and gales, with some favourable breezes, met them in the Bay of Biscay, and it was Monday, 5th August, before they sighted the Berlenga Islands, the first land they had seen since leaving the Devonshire coast, and which Fielding asserts were called 'the Burlings' in the charts. On 6th August a pilot came on board, and at noon the ship entered the Tajo, and anchored off Belim, which Fielding calls 'Bellisle,' about three miles below Lisbon. Here they were visited by the Officers of Customs and the Magistrates of Health, and these formalities over, the ship sailed up the river, and at midnight cast anchor before Lisbon. Fielding spent all the next day in a vain effort to secure permission to land from the 'Providore,' but not until seven in the evening was he carried on shore, placed in a chaise, and driven through 'the nastiest city in the world' to a kind of coffee-house, about a mile from the city. And thus the journal ends!

Of what happened in Lisbon after Fielding

FIELDING'S 'VOYAGE TO LISBON.' 29

landed we have but little knowledge. What we have is gleaned from a letter from Fielding to his brother John which is given in Mr. Dobson's essay in the 'National Review,' before mentioned. It is undated, but as it notes that Captain Veale sailed a few days ago, it was probably written the latter part of August, or early in September. With the captain went William, homesick, and with William went £3 10s. 6d., which the footman got to pay a bill and kept. The maid also followed the captain to England, 'where he hath promised to marry her,' observes Fielding. Thereafter he was served by native servants.

When Fielding wrote this letter he was feeling better, though subject to some discomfort through the ill-nature of Miss Collier. He was able to walk a little, and hope of recovery revived, yet on Tuesday, 8th October, he died. He was buried in Lisbon, and there his body still remains. Mrs. Fielding, Harriot, and Miss Collier, must have returned to England as soon as possible after that, for Fielding's will was proved 14th November, 1754. Margaret Collier was one of the witnesses, and she doubtless appeared at that time.

Mrs. Fielding brought with her the manuscript journal of the voyage, and this was sent, as it was, to Andrew Millar to be printed. Millar prepared the 'Dedication to the Public,' or more probably had it written by Arthur Murphy, as Mr. de Castro sagely suggests. This dedication was probably distributed as an advertisement of the book, in an eight-page folder. Otherwise it is impossible to explain Millar's possession of enough copies for a

second edition. On receiving the manuscript, obviously just as it was written, Millar naturally presumed that it was to be printed as the author left it, and therefore the dedication asserts that it was not to be 'patch'd by a different hand.' When the galley-proofs were ready they were sent to Mrs. Fielding, who turned them over to brother John, to whom they were read, and at his dictation innumerable changes were made in the text. What he disapproved of he struck out altogether. If a phrase did not suit him, he changed its form, and in one case he inserted a page or two of his own composition. These changes were not confined to matters of form merely, but extended to matters of fact, and in numbers of cases he altered the phraseology so as to convey a meaning directly opposite to that which his brother had written. Yet John Fielding was a very honourable man, and indeed he was more than that; he was a very generous one, and for many years thereafter he contributed a fourth part of his income to the support of his brother's family. None the less he butchered the child of his brother's brain like a very Hun.

One can imagine the consternation of Andrew Millar when the proofs came back with so much of Henry Fielding crossed out, and so much of brother John written in. But what was he to do? The book was a privately printed affair, for the publication of which the family paid, and to them went the profits of the venture. Without doubt Millar would have gladly changed the promise of the dedication, but it had already been printed and widely circulated, and so must of necessity

FIELDING'S 'VOYAGE TO LISBON.' 31

stand as it was. Without the least doubt, however, Millar saved carefully the original galley-proofs, and when he settled accounts with the family he added to the amount due an unknown, but we may be sure generous, sum for the book itself. Thereafter it was his property, and over it John Fielding had no control. When, during the latter part of the year, the earthquake at Lisbon aroused the interest of the public in that region, Millar got out a second edition, in which all of John Fielding's alterations, additions, and amendments were ignored, and the book for the first time appeared as Henry Fielding had written it.

Much of this story may be thought a matter of surmise, but the truth of it depends on internal evidence, by which it seems clearly established.

First then as to the identity of the person who corrected these proofs and made the changes in the text. It is hardly conceivable that Henry Fielding could have done this himself. We can scarcely believe that when the captain visited the ship at Rotherhithe he acted as Fielding described in the second edition, and that then on revision Henry Fielding cut all this out and substituted a paragraph in which the old salt 'coos like a sucking dove.' Did he write 'the particular tyrant,' and then mildly make it 'the captain?' Did he erase the 'captain who was in reality waiting for more freight' and for it write of 'these unavoidable delays?' Did he change 'swaggered' into 'being unwilling to come to anchor?' Did he alter 'God Almighty' into the less objectionable, 'the Creator'? Did he himself suppress the account

of the captain's nephew and for it write an entirely different and misleading thing? Did he write eleven pages and more of his quarrel with the captain, ending in his threat to leave the ship, and then omit it all in favour of so false a sentence as 'our commander being, as I observed, in good spirits, we spent the rest of this day with much cheerfulness.' The suggestion is unthinkable, save on the assumption that, after the voyage was over, and Fielding had begun to revise his manuscript, he concluded that he had done the captain an injustice, but this is scarcely tenable for two reasons, the first being that he did *not* change his opinion of the captain, but in what was probably the last letter he ever wrote, he tells his brother that, 'Veal is the greatest scoundrel of them all.' Secondly, he clearly did not attempt to revise the manuscript at all. He instinctively hated revision, and being ill had ample excuse for avoiding it. Had he attempted it, he certainly would have corrected the errors in the dates, and that he had discovered them was sufficiently shown when he stopped giving the days of the month. No! Anyone else in the world might have made this revision, excepting only Henry Fielding.

But if Henry Fielding did not make these changes in his lifetime, who would have presumed to have done so after his death? Certainly his wife would not have attempted anything of the kind, and if the wife is eliminated, the brother is the only one left who would have assumed the right to make such changes as he saw fit. But we have not merely an assumption to guide us. The

one who did this thing wrote this passage (pp. 87, 101): 'as did a great number of merchant ships, who attended our commodore from the Downs, and watched his motions so narrowly that they seemed to think themselves unsafe when they did not regulate their motions by his.' Now, when Henry Fielding wrote to his brother from Ryde, he said, the captain is 'a most able and experienced seaman to whom other Captains seem to pay such Deference that they attend and watch his motions and think themselves only safe when they act under his Direction and Example.' The passage interpolated in the journal is clearly but a paraphrase of this sentence in the letter, and at that time the contents of the letter were probably only known to John Fielding himself. Had another editor been writing, he would have had the letter before him, and so would have quoted more accurately. Here one is quoting from memory, and this again points unerringly to John Fielding.

Henry Fielding had vividly described the manners of the nephew of the captain, and this the editor omits entirely, substituting a passage which refers to 'a brother of mine who was at Minorca about fourteen years ago.' Only Henry or his brother John could have written this. The reference here is to William Fielding, the sixth son of General Fielding, by his second wife, and so a full brother to John. Collins says that he was in Dalzell's regiment of foot, and died unmarried in 1752. This is not so, as his marriage to Hester Nichols of Tewkesbury, on 4th August, 1750, is noted in the 'London Magazine' for that month

(p. 380). Probably that passage better describes the conversation of William Fielding than that of the amazing nephew of the captain.

Again, in giving the account of the storm, and the consequent danger to his wife and daughter, Henry Fielding wrote, 'I have often thought they were both too good and too gentle to be trusted to the power of any man I know, to whom they could possibly be so trusted.' Here the editor struck out the words, 'I know, to whom they could possibly be so trusted,' and who in all the world would have done this, save only brother John?

It does not appear that John Fielding knew Captain Veale before the ship was selected. In Henry's letter from Ryde he says, 'Tell yr. Neighbour I am much obliged to him for recommending me to the care of a most able and experienced seaman,' which implies that John Fielding had heard of the man and his ship from others. That he met the captain when he made the bargain is more than likely, and it is even more probable that the captain called on him after his return and gave him some account of the voyage, and many excuses for its delays.

John Fielding was a good man, a kindly man, and he did not wish to have the feelings of the captain hurt, nor yet those of the nephew, and his concern extended to the mistress of the ale-house at Ryde. Her name he changed from 'Francis' to 'Humphrys,' and in doing so he omitted one significant line: 'Mrs. Francis (for that was the name of the good woman of the house),' wrote Henry Fielding (pp. 95, 111), but when John

changed the name to 'Humphrys,' all that followed went with it, for John Fielding was a conscientious man and could not tell a lie.

That the second edition was reproduced from the galley-proofs of the first, there is scarcely room for doubt. An error, most certainly made by the compositor and not by the writer, is the spelling of Petty as 'Petyt' (pp. 125, 147). In another place Fielding certainly wrote 'coach,' and the compositor made it 'couch' (pp. 41, 46), an error which has persisted to this day in every edition. Referring to the scene on the river, and to the small boats which 'ply' between Chatham and the Tower, the types got it 'ly,' (pp. 62, 70). Then we have 'landschape,' so spelled in both editions, but spelled correctly elsewhere (pp. viii, ix). We find 'chappel' and 'chapel' (pp. 106, 123; 139, 163), 'pease' (pp. 99, 116), and 'peas' (pp. 78, 89). We have also 'surprize' thrice, 'surprised' once, and 'surprizing' twice, and in all cases alike in both editions. Then there are 'fresh'ned,' 'enroling,' 'stoln,' 'carelesly,' 'threatned,' and 'hawling.' Such resemblances are impossible unless we grant that the compositor was following the printed page.

Mr. Austin Dobson performed a valuable service to letters in reprinting the text of the first edition, and showing the variations between it and the second, but, after all, the authentic text is that of the second edition, and this should be followed by all editors who desire to preserve undefiled the writings of Henry Fielding.

FREDERICK S. DICKSON.