

III

One final question remains to be asked about the Richardson–Chauncy manuscripts in the period between their acquisition by Jonathan Richardson during the lifetime of Pope and their sale by the Chauncy family in 1887: what light is shed on them by the Elwin–Courthope edition of Pope, in which some of them are cited? Elwin wrote in his preface to the first volume, published in 1871, that

Pope presented several of his manuscripts to the son of Jonathan Richardson, the portrait-painter. . . . Richardson's interlined copy of the first quarto volume of Pope's poetry passed into the hands of Malone, and was ultimately bought by Mr. Croker. The manuscripts which Richardson possessed in the handwriting of Pope were purchased by Dr. Chauncey, and are still the property of his descendants.²³

'Richardson's interlined copy of the first quarto volume of Pope's poetry' is the copy of the 1717 *Works* presented by Pope to Jonathan Richardson the elder, bearing notes in Malone's hand, which is now in the Berg Collection (Smith, 'Alexander Pope', 12). This copy was, as Elwin reports elsewhere, annotated by Richardson the younger, but was evidently not included with the 'first Editions corrected' in the sale of 1776.²⁴ Having been in Croker's possession, it was no doubt among the materials of Croker's on which Elwin founded his work, and readings from it occur in Elwin's first two volumes.²⁵ There are points at which Elwin appears to be citing, and strangely misrepresenting, Pope's manuscripts, when I suspect that he is actually working from Richardson's annotations.²⁶

In his introduction to the third volume of the Elwin–Courthope edition, Courthope thanked Elwin 'for his liberality in allowing me to use his transcript of the Chauncy MS., which throws so much light on the meaning of Pope's satires'; he referred again, a few pages later, to 'the transcript which Mr. Elwin has made from the Chauncy MS.'²⁷ This form of words suggests that Courthope did not realize that the transcript which Elwin had communicated to him included readings from multiple manuscripts.²⁸ The first references to the 'Chauncy MS.' in the collations in this volume are in those to the *Epistle to Bathurst*, where its readings correspond to those of Huntington HM 6007 and HM 6008 (Lot 487

23. *The Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Whitwell Elwin and W. J. Courthope, 10 vols. (London: John Murray, 1871), 1. xviii.

24. Of course, a book might in theory have been owned by Chauncy and then Malone if the latter had bought it at the Chauncy sale of 1790, of which he owned a catalogue — see *A Catalogue of the Greater Portion of the Library of the Late Edmond Malone, Esq.* (London: Sotheby, 1818), 12 (Lot 371) — but there was no 1717 *Works* of Pope in the Chauncy sale.

25. *Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Elwin and Courthope, 1. 90, 97 (*Sappho to Phaon*), 1. 323–332, 346–347 (*Windsor-Forest*), 2. 10, 42 n 3, etc. (*Essay on Criticism*), 2. 420 (*Essay on Man*).

26. See the discussions of some of these readings in Schmitz, *Pope's Windsor Forest*, 13, and idem, *Pope's Essay on Criticism 1709*, 22; Schmitz did not realize that Elwin was working from Richardson's annotations rather than from the holograph, and therefore saw some of his readings as 'incorrect to the point of curiosity' (*Pope's Essay*, 22).

27. *Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Elwin and Courthope, 3. x, 18.

28. Vander Meulen, *Pope's DUNCIAD of 1728*, 43 proposes that Courthope's 'MS.' is 'probably to be construed as plural', but a simple misunderstanding on Courthope's part seems likelier.