The following essay was written with the intention of expanding the information available on Thomas Gardner, his wife Lucy and son Henry Lasher, a family of printer-publishers who ran their business opposite St. Clement’s Church in the Strand from 1739 to 1805. Thomas Gardner (ca. 1712–1765) was a relatively minor printer-publisher with a modest stock of ornaments who appears to have printed only a few hundred items over a thirty-year career, most of them pamphlets, serial publications, or short books. Little is known about Thomas, and even less about his family; he has attracted only a modest amount of scholarly attention and probably his greatest claims to fame are as the publisher of Richard Rolt and Christopher Smart’s *The Universal Visitor* (1756), and as the printer and publisher of most of Eliza Haywood’s later, and most highly-regarded, works, including both *The Female Spectator* (1744–1746) and *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751).

The primary literature on Thomas Gardner (hereafter, Gardner) is limited to two articles and a few entries in works of reference, though his involvement with *The Universal Visitor* has earned him a number of footnotes in the works of Christopher Smart, James Boswell and Samuel Johnson. The entry for Gardner in H. R. Plomer’s “Dictionary” (1932) established some basic facts: that Gardner was a printer and publisher, operating from “Cowley’s Head, without Temple Bar,” on the Strand, and that he was in business from 1735 to 1756. Plomer connects Gardner with publications in 1735, 1739, 1743 and 1756, referencing State Papers in relation to the 1743 item and quoting Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* in relation to the 1756 title. Plomer does not provide a date of birth or death for Gardner, says nothing about the prosecution that the State Papers mention and does not challenge Johnson’s account of Gardner as a publisher who exemplified “the oppression of booksellers, towards poor authors.”

1 The Church of Saint Clement Danes is commonly abbreviated to St. Clement’s.
3 H. R. Plomer, “Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at Work in England. 1726 to 1775” in *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1726 to 1775* (Oxford: Printed for the Bibliographical Society, 1932), 100–101.
In 1981, Gardner was the focus of an article by A. D. Barker entitled, “Printing and Publishing Johnson’s *Marmor Norfolciense* (1739) and *London* (1738 and 1739).” Barker argues (plausibly) on the basis of printing ornaments used in *Marmor Norfolciense* (Checklist 1739.8), that Gardner printed this work, and goes on to argue (implausibly) that Gardner also printed the first four editions of Johnson’s *London*. Barker establishes that Gardner and Edward Cave had a close working relationship, and shared the printing of a number of lengthy works in the mid- to late 1730s (when Gardner was just starting out as a printer) and suggests that they shared the ornaments that appear in those works. Although Barker states that it is “fairly fruitless to reconstruct the [printing] work” of Gardner and Cave to establish who was busiest when *London* was printed, he does attempt to reconstruct the printing activity of each to establish who was in possession of key ornaments used in *London*. Unfortunately for Barker, a much more comprehensive account of the printing activities and ornament usage of Cave and Gardner is needed to build a convincing argument for who owned, and was using, these ornaments when *London* was printed.

Prior to mounting the first part of his argument, Barker explains the value and limits of ornament evidence and provides some new information about Gardner. Drawing on Don McKenzie’s list of *Stationers’ Company Apprentices, 1701–1800* (1978), Barker explains that Gardner was apprenticed to Joseph Downing, a printer in Bartholomew-Close, on 4 October 1726 and obtained his freedom on 5 February 1734, only six months before his Master’s death. Barker expands on McKenzie’s information to show that Gardner first operated as a printer-publisher from Bartholomew-Close in April 1735 and did not move to the Strand until

---


5 The checklist referred to here identifies Gardner’s printing ornaments, and will appear in the next issue of *Script & Print* as part of a larger discussion of the methodologies for collecting and analysing printer ornaments.

6 Barker’s argument is accepted by Ferrero, but rejected by J. D. Fleeman. See Ferrero, *Reconstructing the Canon*, 42; J. D. Fleeman, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Samuel Johnson, 1731–1984* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 16–18 (38.5L/3: a “reimpression from the same type”), 21–22 (38.5L/5), 22 (38.5L/6: “The title is newly set, but the rest of this edn. comprises the sheets of 38.5L/5”). For Barker’s entry on *Marmor Norfolciense*, distinguishing three states, see “Printing and Publishing,” 38–39 (Fleeman 39.4MN/1).

7 Barker, “Printing and Publishing,” 299.

8 As the Checklist shows, three of the four works printed by Gardner in 1738 (the period Barker examines)—and two of three works that may have printed by him (ones with mixed ornaments)—were printed anonymously. Only one of these seven works was known to, or is discussed by, Barker. See Checklist 1738.1–4 and X1738.1–3.

the first quarter of 1739. (This four-year period in Bartholomew-Close is often overlooked; it was not mentioned by Plomer in 1932, and is not mentioned in the entries for Gardner on the British Book Trade Index.)

Having explored the connections between Gardner, Cave, and Johnson in the late 1730s, Barker uses records of the arrest and examination of Gardner and Katherine Brett in 1743 to support his argument that John Brett (husband of Katherine), whose name appears in the imprint of *Marmor Norfolciense*, was only a retailer of that publication, hiding the “real principals”: Gardner, Cave and Johnson. While this is certainly true, the connection between Gardner and Brett was closer than Barker implies. Barker states that “Gardner’s move in 1739 took him to within a very short distance of John Brett.” In fact, as discussed below, Brett and Gardner were next-door neighbours on the Strand. Barker mis-describes Brett as a hawker, rather than as a bookseller acting as a trade publisher, and states that his involvement with *Marmor Norfolciense* was “the incidental result of [Gardner’s] shift of premises”—suggesting that Brett was a randomly selected fall-guy. However, since all of the works printed by Gardner in the second half of 1738 were sold and distributed by Brett—and three of the four new works published by Brett in the same period were printed by Gardner—it appears that Brett had agreed to act


12 “Recognizance for Thomas Gardner, printer, of St. Clement Danes” (9 November 1743); “Notes of bail for Thomas Gardner and William Shopshire;” “Recognizance for Katherine Brett, bookseller, of St. Clement Danes” (25 November 1743); “Examination of Thomas Gardner, printer, on the above pamphlet” (6 December 1743) and related papers (The National Archives, Kew [SP 36/62/201, 202, 222, 240]). Also held at Kew is “Rex v John Shuckburgh and Benjamin Cowse” for publishing two libels entitled *Old England’s Te Deum* (Checklist, 1743.4) and *A True Dialogue Between Thomas Jones a Trooper Lately Returned from Germany and John Smith a Serjeant in the First Regiment of Footguards, 1743* [TS 11/982]—records previously held in the Treasury Solicitor’s Office. While Barker briefly describes, and cites, these State Paper records, he does not explore the case in any detail. For further information, see Checklist.


14 Ibid., 296.

15 Ibid., 288.

16 A *hawker* is someone “who goes from place to place selling his goods, or who cries them in the street;” a *trade publisher* is a bookseller who is paid to sell or distribute someone else’s publications—as a result of this agreement the trade publisher’s name appeared in the imprint and in advertisements for the books. See *OED online*, 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, June 2012, s.v. *hawker*; and, for a discussion of trade publishers, Michael Treadwell, “London Trade Publishers 1675–1750,” *The Library*, 6th ser., 4 (1982): 99–134.

as a trade publisher for all of the works Gardner published in the six months prior to his move to the Strand.\(^\text{18}\) The most obvious purpose of such an arrangement was to simplify the move of Gardner’s business.\(^\text{19}\) This suggests that Brett was engaged not as a randomly selected, “courageous” hawker who “had the nerve” to sell Johnson’s satire,\(^\text{20}\) but as an incidental result of an unrelated arrangement, itself an “incidental result” of Brett’s proximity to Gardner’s new shop.

Barker’s article prompted a brief letter concerning Gardner from Robin Alston in *The Library*.\(^\text{21}\) Alston used early *ESTC* files at the British Library to supply “some missing evidence about the career of Thomas Gardner,” mainly in the form of items printed by Gardner, which were not noted by Barker. The items in question show that Gardner undertook printing for a variety of booksellers and, according to Alston, appeared to be “quite fastidious” in the wording of his imprints, using “printed by,” when working with other members of the trade, and “printed and sold by,” when he was responsible for both printing and publishing.\(^\text{22}\) Gardner’s careful differentiation of printing and selling leads Alston to question Barker’s “repeated admonition about the ‘unreliability of imprints’”—a subject I discuss in my Checklist.

In 1993, Martin C. Battestin identified the manuscript records for “a long running and quite well documented case in Chancery” concerning *The Champion*, a “pivotal” work in Henry Fielding’s career.\(^\text{23}\) The case, between Gardner and other shareholders, provides a useful insight into the organisation of the journal. Since Gardner printed and published a number of journals, including *The Female Spectator* and *The Universal Visitor*, these records also offer some insight into how other journals printed by Gardner may have been managed by, and for, shareholders.\(^\text{24}\) Michael Harris thoroughly explored this new material in his

---

\(^{18}\) See Checklist 1738.3 (published 14 September 1738), 1738.2 (26 October 1738) and 1738.4 (October 1738) for the three works printed by Gardner. The only other work Brett published in the second half of 1738 was *A Modest Enquiry into the Conduct of the Court of Aldermen* (“printed for J. Brett, against St. Clement’s Church, in the Strand,” 1738); *ESTC*: t147389; *Gentleman’s Magazine* 8 (November 1738): [608], no. 11; *Daily Post*, 23 December 1738. Hereafter, *Gentleman’s Magazine* is abbreviated to *GM*.

\(^{19}\) That is, perhaps, with Brett selling the three works before Gardner moved, and directing customers next-door to him after he moved. For more on Brett’s business on the Strand, see Appendix 2.


\(^{22}\) Ibid., 427.


\(^{24}\) As W. B. Coley’s comments on *The Champion* suggest, the role of editors and chief writers has often been over-emphasised; specialists in eighteenth-century journalism have called for approaches to journalistic texts that better recognise the commercial structures and constraints
“Literature and Commerce in Eighteenth-Century London: the Making of The Champion,” an article that has guided later commentators.\textsuperscript{25}

* * * * *

Although much remains unclear about Gardner—such as “where he was born, and who were his parents, and how he got his money at first” (as Nelly says of Heathcliff in \textit{Wuthering Heights})—considerable information is now available concerning him and his descendants, which is explored here for the first time. This information is available partly because, once Gardner moved to the Strand, he and his family stayed there for sixty-five years, regularly appearing in commercial registers and parish records, paying their taxes and almost invariably christening, marrying, and burying their dead at St. Clement’s. More importantly, Gardner died rich (his estate was worth well over £2500 in 1764),\textsuperscript{26} and the various legacies he and his descendants left were managed, for over a century, by a firm of solicitors who have deposited their records with the London Metropolitan Archives.\textsuperscript{27} Over a hundred files—including baptismal certificates, trusts, marriage settlements, leases, will probates, correspondence with executors, inventories of furniture—record the lives of Gardner’s descendants from 1762 to 1875. Only a few of these records were produced by Gardner but his business was a family affair, carried on after his death by his wife and son, so some of the records relevant to these family members are cited below as they help tell the story of the Gardners as printers, publishers and booksellers.

McKenzie’s \textit{Stationers’ Company Apprentices, 1701–1800} informs us that the father of Thomas Gardner, Edward, was a clerk, living in the parish of St. Ann’s Aldergate. As mentioned, he bound Thomas to Joseph Downing on 4 of this type of publication. Katherine King has recently repeated Cole’s warning, suggesting that Haywood’s role as “author” of \textit{The Female Spectator} needs to be reconsidered. See W. B. Coley, “General Introduction” in Henry Fielding, \textit{Contributions to The Champion and Related Writings}, edited by W. B. Coley (Oxford University Press, 2003), xlv–vii; Katherine King, \textit{A Political Biography of Eliza Haywood} (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012), 113–18.

\textsuperscript{25} For a discussion of the findings of Battestin and Harris, see Coley, “General Introduction,” xlvii–l; for King’s debt to Harris, see King, \textit{A Political Biography of Eliza Haywood}, 113–18.


\textsuperscript{27} Messrs. Woodbridge and Sons, solicitors, of Uxbridge, formerly Riches and Woodbridge, have deposited 39.4 linear metres of material with London Metropolitan Archives. The “Henry Gardner” files [ACC/538/2nd dep/4067–171] are among the Middlesex Client Papers. A brief description of the files is available online, http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=074-acc538_2–3&cid=1–2–4. Most of the Woodbridge and Sons’s “Henry Gardner” files concern Henry [II], Henry’s grandson (Thomas Gardner’s son and grandson, both named Thomas, and his son and grandson, both named Henry, are distinguished here using Roman ordinal numbers).
October 1726 for seven years, paying a consideration of twenty-five pounds. According to his eldest daughter, Thomas was born between April 1712 and April 1713, meaning he was probably fourteen when bound, but I have been unable to identify a birth or christening record for him, or a marriage certificate for his father Edward. Gardner obtained his freedom on 5 February 1734 and began operating as a printer and publisher soon after: he printed thirteen plays for Jacob Tonson Jr. and Sr. in the fourth quarter of 1734; he took on his first apprentice on 3 December 1734 and, in April 1735 appeared as a publisher-printer in Bartholomew-Close (at the age of twenty-two). Gardner's early career and his association with Cave is rehearsed by Barker, who dates his move from Little Bartholomew-Close to between December 1738 and May 1739. This date range can be narrowed slightly. Gardner advertised John Fludger's Correct and Familiar Exposition on the Common-Prayer-Book of the Church of England (Checklist X1739.3) in The Weekly Miscellany on 14 April 1739, at “Cowley's Head, without Temple-Bar,” though the imprint of this book uses his earlier address, suggesting the move was very recent. Gardner was likely married by late 1736, he and Lucy (her maiden name is not recorded) had a daughter, Anne, christened on 29 April 1737 and a son, Thomas, on 20 September 1738. The Gardners had three more children after the move from Little Bartholomew-Close: Catherine (christened on 5 October 1742), Henry Lasher (christened on 22 November 1743) and Lucy Mable (christened on 5 May 1745) (Figure 1).

At first, in the imprints of his publications, Gardner gave his new address in the form “Cowley's Head without Temple-Bar” (Checklist 1739.5 and 1739.9, from May–June 1739); later, this was changed to “Cowley's Head, opposite …” or “… facing St. Clement's Church in the Strand” (e.g. 1744.1, 1744.2 from January 1744; 1751.2, 1753.2 from 1751); and, on a few occasions only, as “… against St. Clement’s” (1745.1) or “… near St. Clement’s” (1755.1). As John Rocque's 1738–1744 map of the area shows (see Figure 2), a would-be book-buyer in search of Gardner's shop, travelling west, away from the city of London along

29 Anne states that Thomas was fifty-two in April 1765. See below.
30 Searches of parish records on FamilySearch International (https://familysearch.org) suggest that Gardiner/Gardner was a common name in the period, though Edward Gardners became uncommon after 1700. At St. Clement Danes (but not at St Ann's Aldergate), baptisms are recorded for Edwards in 1658, 1660, 1664, 1675, 1679 and 1686; and burials in 1722, 1724, 1729, 1733, 1738 and 1739; but there are no records for an Edward as the father of a Thomas, at St. Clement's or St Ann's Aldergate. An Edward Gardner was, from 1696–1729, curate of St. Anne and Agnes, Aldersgate and St. John Zachary. See The Records of Two City Parishes: A Collection of Documents Illustrative of the History of SS. Anne and Agnes, Aldersgate and St. John Zachary, London, from the Twelfth Century, compiled and edited by William McMurray (London: Hunter & Longhurst, 1925), 125, 417a.
Figure 1: Family tree for Thomas and Lucy Gardner.

Fleet Street, passed through Temple-Bar, at which point the road widened and forked, becoming the Strand on the left, and Butcher Row on the right. These two roads diverged and, after about one hundred metres, passed on either side of St. Clement’s Church (at which point Butcher Row became the “Back Side of St. Clement’s,” then Holywell Street, also known as “Bookseller’s Row”); about two hundred metres further along, the roads passed on either side of St. Mary le Strand, after which they merged once more. “Without”—meaning outside or beyond—

Figure 2: Detail from John Rocque, A Plan of the Cities of London and Westminster (1746), sheets c11 and d14.

Temple-Bar, includes much of the area described and, since St. Clement’s was surrounded on all sides by shops, the terms “opposite,” “facing,” “against” and “near” St. Clement’s does not significantly reduce the area in which Cowley’s Head may have been situated. However, the implication of all these addresses is that Gardner’s shop was somewhere either on the Strand between Temple-Bar and Milford Lane or facing St. Clement’s from Butcher Row or the Back Side.

Fortunately, since Thomas was succeeded in the same building by his wife Lucy, and his son Henry, the exact location of Gardner’s shop appeared in commercial registers from 1778 as no. 200 on the Strand. (See Figure 4.) A few details about this building appear in the wills of Thomas and Henry. When Thomas Gardner wrote his will in 1764, he left to his wife “the house that I now live in situated in the Parish of St Clement Danes … and also the house in Milford Lane which I have annexed to my said dwelling house in the Parish and County aforesaid for and during her natural life and after her decease I give the same to my son Henry Lasher Gardner and his heirs and Assigns for ever.” This “messuage [i.e., property] in the Strand” formed part of the marriage settlement of Henry Gardner and Mary Mucklow in February 1776. Both the settlement and Henry’s will, made in May of the same year, specify that the two houses (now one) were situated “in the Strand at the North West end of Milford Lane.” As I explain below, the families of Thomas and Henry Gardner occupied this building until ca. 1805.

The building was—briefly—no. 207, before the street numbering stabilised ca. 1777. Ian Maxted records Henry Gardner at no. 207 before his appearance at no. 200 on the Strand, citing Kent Directory (1774) and Lowndes’ London Directory (1777) [which, however, does not record a street number for Gardner before 1778]. Other sources place him at no. 207 in 1776 and 1777 but at no. 200 thereafter, implying that he moved in 1777. He did not move. In the London Directory for 1776, James Green (a hatter) is recorded at no. 200 on the Strand, but in the London Directory for 1778 he is recorded at no. 193. Likewise, John Baird (jeweller and watch-maker) is at 197 in 1776, but at no. 190 two years later, and Joseph Burnthwaite (linen draper) is at no. 178, then at no. 171. Obviously, all of these business did not move seven numbers along the Strand in two years: the numbering changed. See Ian Maxted, The London Book Trades, 1775–1800: A Preliminary Checklist of Members (Folkestone, Kent: Dawson, 1977), 88b; The London Directory for the Year 1776 (London: T. Lowndes, 1776), 8 (Baird), 27 (Burnthwaite), 63 (Gardner), 69 (Green); The London Directory for the Year 1778 (London: T. Lowndes, 1778), 8 (Baird), 26 (Burnthwaite), 62 (Gardner), 69 (Green). See also An Account of the Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor: Began Anno 1750 (London: John Johnson, for Thomas Field and Co., 1777), 20: “1773 [date of admission] Mr Henry Gardner, No. 207. Strand.”

“Will of Thomas Gardner, Printer and Stationer of Saint Clement Danes, Middlesex” (12 April 1762; codicils dated 26 August 1763 and 4 July 1764; will proved 18 April 1765). National Archives [PROB 11/907/420], 348v.

The property, “in the Strand at the North West end of Milford Lane,” was settled on Mary as a “Marriage Portion” or jointure, by way of a trust. “Settlement on the marriage of Henry Lasher Gardner & Miss Mucklow of a messuage in the Strand” (attested copy, 12 February 1776). National Archives [ACC/538/2nd dep/4070].

“Will of Henry Lasher Gardner, Bookseller and Stationer of Saint Clement Danes, Middlesex” (4 May 1776; codicil dated 1 September 1800; will proved 14 March 1808). The National Archives
Gardner successfully carried on the business of publishing and bookselling until his death on 7 April 1765. My Checklist offers only a partial record of Gardner’s printing between 1734 and 1765, since it is limited to items readily available in digital form and is largely made up of works which are identified as having been printed or published by Gardner. However, it is clear that Gardner’s printing is dominated by what may be categorised as literary, practical, political and religious works (in that order). There is a good deal of overlap of categories in works such as Stephen Guazzo, *The Art of Conversation* (1738.4; literary and practical), John Lindsay, *A Brief History of England, Both in Church and State* (1763.1; political and religious), so distinctions are necessarily arbitrary. Nevertheless, the general pattern is clear: Gardner’s output focussed, at first, on religious works (in the mid- to late 1730s), then political works (late 1730s to mid-1740s), practical works (mid-to late 1740s), and finally on literary works (mid-1740s to the mid-1750s). Haywood accounts for almost two-thirds of Gardner’s literary output and a notable feature of his political publications is a number of anti-Whig and pro-Jacobite works (such as 1740.1 *Considerations on the Management of the Late Secret Expeditions*, 1742.1 *The Right Honourable Sir Robert Walpole, (Now Earl of Orford) Vindicated*, 1744.1 *A Compleat View of the Birth of the Pretender*, 1746.1 *A Brief Account of the Life and Family of Miss Jenny Cameron*, and 1746.5 *Memoirs of the Lives and Families of the Lords Kilmarnock*).

Apart from what his publications and copyright purchases themselves tell us about him and his business, three events illuminate his activities: Gardner’s 1743 arrest and questioning over the publication of *Old England’s Te Deum*, his 1748 Chancery case against his fellow shareholders in *The Champion* and Boswell’s record of Johnson’s comment concerning *The Universal Visitor*, made ten years after Gardner’s death.37 The first two events, explored by Barker and Harris, will not be discussed in depth here. As stated, Barker offers a brief account of the first of these events:38 on 17 November 1743 “several Publishers of Pamphlets, &c. were taken into Custody by his Majesty’s Messengers” for “selling Pamphlets;”39 Gardner was examined on 6 December and released on bail of two hundred pounds on 9 December but his case appears not to have gone to trial.40 Harris rehearses Gardner’s role as shareholder (one-sixteenth), printer and business manager for *The Champion*. As Harris explains, Gardner became involved in May

[PROB 11/1475/156], f. 362v.

37 A possible fourth event illuminating Gardner’s business activities is a 1753 Chancery case brought by “Thomas Osborne, bookseller of Greys Inn, Middlesex” against “John Hill, doctor in physic and Thomas Gardner” (C 11/201/26). Gardner registered the copyright for, but did not print, Hill’s *Urania* in 1754; it is possible—if the case relates to Gardner—that this publication prompted the litigation. See Checklist X1754.1.
39 *Daily Advertiser*, 18 November 1743: [1a].
40 National Archives, Kew [PRO SP 36/62], ff. 240r–v, 201r–202r.
1741, when the periodical was paying “substantial dividends” to the shareholders, but within a year “things started to go wrong” and in 1743 the name and management of the journal changed. In November 1748, Gardner was seeking two hundred pounds from the shareholders for his expenses over the previous six years; the Chancery case wore on for seven years, by which time some of the shareholders and, as Harris states, “the case itself was dead.”

* * * * *

Regarding *The Universal Visitor*: Johnson’s comment about “Old Gardner,” made on 6 April 1775, has been unfailingly repeated in commentary about him, and is quite often the only information given. Boswell quotes Johnson as follows:

Johnson. “Old Gardner the bookseller employed Rolt and Smart to write a monthly miscellany, called ‘The Universal Visitor.’ There was a formal written contract, which [Edmund] Allen the printer saw. Gardner thought as you do of the Judge [that judges should have no other occupation]. They were bound to write nothing else; they were to have, I think, a third of the profits of this sixpenny pamphlet; and the contract was for ninety-nine years. I wish I had thought of giving this to [Edward] Thurlow, in the cause about Literary Property. What an excellent instance would it have been of the oppression of booksellers towards poor authours!” (smiling.) [Thomas] Davies, zealous for the honour of the Trade, said, Gardner was not properly a bookseller. Johnson. “Nay, Sir; he certainly was a bookseller. He had served his time regularly, was a member of the Stationers’ company, kept a shop in the face of mankind, purchased copyright, and was a bibliopole, Sir, in every sense. I wrote for some months in ‘The Universal Visitor,’ for poor Smart, while he was mad, not then knowing the terms on which he was engaged to write, and thinking I was doing him good. I hoped his wits would soon return to him. Mine returned to me, and I wrote in ‘The Universal Visitor’ no longer.”

Boswell’s anecdote is very widely known because it appeared in such a frequently printed and read biography. Only seven months after Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*

---

42 Ibid., 108.
was published his anecdote was repeated in an anonymous biography of Smart,\(^{45}\) appended to an edition which, according to Karina Williamson, “remained the source of all collections of Smart’s poetry for the following century” and “laid the foundations of the Smart canon.”\(^ {46}\) Consequently, the anecdote about “Old Gardner” has had a long life in Smart scholarship as well. Indeed, the story was soon proverbial: in 1813 Lord Byron warns Thomas Moore that John Murray “has a design upon you in the paper line. He wants you to become the staple and stipendiary editor of a periodical work. What say you? Will you be bound, like ‘Kit Smart, to write for ninety-nine years in the Universal Visitor?’”\(^ {47}\) A few years later Robert Anderson comments, in his biography of Smart, “Never, surely, did rapacious avarice dictate a more unreasonable bargain, or submissive poverty place itself in a more humiliating situation.”\(^ {48}\) In 1848, John Forster represents “old Gardner the bookseller” as the acme of rapacity, beside whom the villain of his biography of Oliver Goldsmith (Ralph Griffiths) “looked less ill-favoured.” Gardner was the one, Forster writes, “who had gone to Kit Smart in the depths of his poverty, and drawn him into the most astounding agreement on record…. It was undoubtedly a thing to remember, this agreement of old Gardner’s. The most thriving subject in the kingdom of the booksellers could hardly fail to recall it now and then.”\(^ {49}\) In 1865—a century after Gardner’s death—Walter Thornbury was maintaining the rage at “Old Gardner,” who “basely decoyed poor crazy, drunken Kit Smart.”\(^ {50}\) And in 1887 Wray W. Hunt suggested that “confinement of the madhouse” may have been “less galling [for Smart] than the tyranny of the bookseller and the alehouse.”\(^ {51}\)


\(^{49}\) Forster’s somewhat-cryptic prose implies that Boswell’s anecdote originated with Joshua Hawkins. It did not. Nevertheless, this suggestion is taken up by G. J. Gray, “A Bibliography of the Writings of Christopher Smart, with Biographical References,” Transactions of the Bibliographical Society 6 (February 1903): 287, no. 32, who, citing Forster, suggests “it would appear that Johnson’s remarks were made to Goldsmith [by Hawkins].”

\(^{50}\) Walter Thornbury, Haunted London (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1865), 208.

\(^{51}\) This comment follows Hunt’s reference to “old Gardner, the bookseller.” See, Wray W. Hunt, “Letters to the Editor,” The Spectator 60, no. 3059 (12 February 1887): 227a.
In the second, “revised and augmented” edition of his *Life of Samuel Johnson* (1793), Boswell added a footnote to this oft-cited anecdote, which is rarely quoted:

There has probably been some mistake as to the terms of this supposed extraordinary contract, the recital of which from hear-say afforded Johnson so much play for his sportive acuteness. Or if it was worded as he supposed, it is so strange that I should conclude it was a joke. Mr. Gardener, I am assured, was a worthy and liberal man.\(^{52}\)

Boswell’s footnote was prompted by a letter from Thomas’s daughter, Anne. This letter was kept by Boswell, along with another sent by her in 1793.\(^ {53}\) In her first, flattering and deferential letter of 22 December 1791, Anne asked Boswell to omit the whole paragraph concerning her father in any future edition. Boswell’s compromise was the footnote above. Although Anne was clearly less than satisfied with this footnote, when it appeared over a year later, she acknowledged his attention to her request on 6 August 1793, in a somewhat cold and impersonal letter.\(^ {54}\) In her first letter, Anne had written (in part):

I have lately been very highly entertained in reading your Life of Dr. Johnson—the life and conversations of such a man, related by such a friend, must edify and entertain all who read it. But there is one short paragraph in it (with all due deference I speak it) that I believe the Dr. did not perfectly understand, relative to the late Mr. Gardner, Printer, opposite St. Clements Church in the Strand, and his connexion with Mr. Smart when the Universal Visitor was published.

I, Sir, have the honour of being Mr. Gardner’s eldest daughter—his true character as a Christian, and a Gentleman in the real sense of the word, makes it no impropriety for me to esteem it an honour to be so nearly related to him. His memory is deservedly dear to all who really knew him, as well as to me. Your benevolent disposition will therefore lead you to make every allowance for the feelings of an affectionate child—hurt at the least appearance of shade cast over the character of a much revered parent.

I will suppose the book must be reprinted—which prompts me to solicit the favour of you to permit that whole paragraph to be left out—it begins, “Old Tom

---

\(^ {52}\) James Boswell, *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL. D.*, 2nd ed. (London: Henry Baldwin, for Charles Dilly, 1793), 2.218–19n. This footnote appears in scholarly editions of *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, but appears to have been cited by only two Smart scholars. See Gray, “A Bibliography of the Writings of Christopher Smart,” 287 and Arthur Sherbo, *Christopher Smart, Scholar of the University* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1967), 104.

\(^ {53}\) Yale University Library [Gen. MSS 89; Boswell Collection; Series II. Correspondence; Box 22; Folder 529; letters of Anne Gardner (C 1332–1333)]. A transcript of these letters appears in *The Correspondence and Other Papers of James Boswell relating to the Making of the Life of Johnson*, edited by Marshall Waingrow, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001), 2.453–55 and 557, the first edition of which was published in 1969. The letters are also available online, http://brbl-zoom.library.yale.edu/viewer/1167182.

\(^ {54}\) The tone and purpose of this letter is somewhat misrepresented by Ferrero, who says that Anne wrote “to thank Boswell for his kind footnote.” See Ferrero, *Reconstructing the Canon*, 42.
Gardner, and my dear father was but fifty-two when he died—This was of no consequence, nor should I have marked it, only with submission to observe that as the worthy Dr. was misinformed in one particular, he might also in another. I hope, for the credit of human-nature, it was not from Mr. Edmund Allen—because he had received numberless kindnesses from my father and mother.

In her second letter, Anne begins:

Mrs. Gardner's acknowledgements to Mr. Boswell for his attention to her, in adding his note to the paragraph in the "Life of Dr. Johnson" on her late dear Father, whose memory is so justly revered by her. Had Dr. Johnson really known him he could not even in joke have spoke so very lightly of so good a man—and his humanity would have suffered if he had known that by that lightness he was giving a lasting wound to the feelings of an affectionate daughter.

Although Anne wrote this second letter—the handwriting is unmistakably the same in both—she now writes in the third person. She also emphasises the fact that Boswell has only added a “note,” rather than omit the whole passage as she had requested, and she reminds him of the “lasting wound” the still-present anecdote has caused to “the feelings of an affectionate child.” And, just in case the message was not clear enough, she sealed her second letter with black wax, a sign of mourning, though her first had been sealed in red. As we have seen, and as Anne might have predicted, Boswell’s anecdote gave a lasting wound to both her feelings and the future reputation of “Old” Gardner.

Some scholars have become sceptical of this “somewhat apocryphal story,” but the contract was located by Stuart Piggott and a summary of it published by him in 1929. (The contract has since been lost, but a full transcript was

---

55 Anne might have added that Smart signed his contract with Gardner ten years before Gardner died, in November 1755, when he was probably only forty-two years old.

56 The seal used by Anne displays arms used by more than one branch of the Gardner/Gardiner family: on a chevron gules between three griffin’s heads erased, two lions counter-passant of the field. These arms were, however, granted to Sir William Gardiner, 1st Baronet (1628–1691) in 1660 as the arms of “Gardiner, of London.” It is possible that Anne knew of, or believed there was, a connection between her family and that of Sir William. See Edward Kimber and Richard Johnson, The Baronetage of England (London: G. Woodfall [and eighteen others], 1771), 2.137–38 (no. 173); Joseph Edmondson, A Complete Body of Heraldry (London: Printed for the Author, 1780), vol. 1, s.v. Gardiner. For Henry [II]’s gift of a “framed and glazed copy of the Coat of Arms of Thomas Gardner” to his brother, see below.


58 Stuart Piggott, "New Light on Christopher Smart," The Times Literary Supplement 28, no. 1428 (13 June 1929): 474.
Anne hoped that, “as the worthy Dr. was misinformed in one particular, he might also in another,” but the account given by Johnson is accurate in most details (parties involved, term of contract, shared profits). As Piggott states, “Johnson had evidently gained his information from some reliable source … although he had made a slight error as regards the share of the profits [and] … there is a very important clause freeing the parties from the contract should the paper fail to pay its way for six months.”

An even more important clause, included in Piggott’s summary but not emphasised by him, is the “non-compete clause.” Johnson states that Smart and Rolt “were bound to write nothing else,” whereas the contract states that the parties will not “Engage or concern himself in any Work or Undertaking of a like nature or kind or do … any act matter or thing whereby the said Work or Undertaking may be prejudiced.” Johnson imagined a “general or total restraint of trade,” preventing Smart from writing anything at all, which would have been unreasonable and unlawful, rather than “an agreement in partial restraint of trade,” preventing Smart and Rolt from setting up a competing journal, a constraint that was certainly reasonable and lawful.

If the contract had been contested, Gardner and Allen would have had to establish that the non-compete clause was necessary to protect their legitimate business interests, that the time period covered by the clause was reasonable and the consideration (i.e., payment) sufficient. It seems unlikely that Gardner and Allen would have had any difficulty defending the contract since engaging in “any work or undertaking of [a] like nature or kind” would self-evidently prejudice or obstruct the sale of the journal—i.e., damage their legitimate business interests.

59 J. D. Fleeman, Bibliography of the Writings of Samuel Johnson, 1731–1984 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 664–69; Fleeman notes that the contract “was preserved in the Public Museum, Reading and later the Central Library, Reading” (ibid., 663n1) “but [the] present whereabouts [is] unknown” (664). The source of Fleeman’s transcript is not clear—he states only that the contract “is transcribed here, by kind permission of Reading Central Library.”

60 Piggott, “New Light on Christopher Smart,” 474. The “escape clause” in this “supposedly notorious contract” is not mentioned by Hill and Powell, but is mentioned by Ryskamp, Pottle and Ferrero. See Boswell, Boswell’s Life of Johnson, 2.345n2; Boswell, Boswell: The Ominous Years, 1774–1776, 129n2; Ferrero, Reconstructing the Canon, 12, 29.


62 Boswell, Boswell’s Life of Johnson, 2.345; Fleeman, Bibliography of the Writings of Samuel Johnson, 668.

63 William Wetmore Story, A Treatise on the Law of Contracts Not under Seal (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1847), 483–86: [§550] “An agreement in general or total restraint of trade is void, although it be founded on a legal and valuable consideration;” but [§551] “an agreement in partial restraint of trade, restricting it within certain reasonable limits or times, or confining it to particular persons, would, if founded upon a good and valuable consideration, be valid. And this modification of the rule obtained as early as during the eighteenth year of the reign of James I. (1621).”

64 Story, A Treatise on the Law of Contracts Not under Seal, 485–86.

65 Fleeman, Bibliography of the Writings of Samuel Johnson, 668.
interests—and the contract would “become Absolutely void”\(^{66}\) if the journal were unprofitable for six months, a reasonable limit. Commentators have suggested that an equal share of the profits in *The Universal Visitor* was not “a good and valuable consideration”: assessments range from Robert Anderson, who considered the contract evidence of Gardner’s “rapacious avarice,” to Mashall Waingrow, who believed that the contract “appear[es] to substantiate [Johnson]’s complaint.”\(^{67}\)

In fact, Johnson’s complaint is not substantiated by the contract and the assessments of Anderson and Waingrow range from the wildly to the mildly unreasonable. Fielding’s one-eighth “Writing Share” in *The Champion* is rightly described by Harris as “clearly acknowledg[ing] his importance to the project,” and Gardner informs us that *The Champion* paid “substantial dividends” to the shareholders in 1741.\(^{68}\) Evidently, Smart and Rolt accepted risks as partners and shareholders that they would not have been exposed to as employees paid for their writing by the sheet. From the tone of commentary cited, it seems likely that Smart and Rolt’s one-quarter shares and substantial dividends would have been celebrated if *The Universal Visitor* had been a success. But, had *The Universal Visitor* been a success with Smart and Rolt engaged as employees, the substantial dividends accrued by Allen and Gardner (alone) would have been represented as “rapacious avarice” and evidence of exploitation of “poor crazy, drunken Kit Smart.”

The (modest) interest of Smart and Johnson scholars in Thomas Gardner has been further stimulated by the discovery of an annotated copy of *The Universal Visitor* that appears to have belonged to Anne. The book, once in the British Museum, but now lost, is mentioned by Walter Graham in 1930 and Roland B. Botting in 1939.\(^{69}\) The reliability of the attributions, detailed by Botting and assessed by Ferrero,\(^{70}\) depend on Anne being Thomas’s daughter.\(^{71}\) Ferrero suggests

\(^{66}\) Ibid., 669.

\(^{67}\) Anderson, “The Life of Christopher Smart,” 1.vii; *The Correspondence and Other Papers of James Boswell relating to the Making of the Life of Johnson*, 2.454n1.

\(^{68}\) Harris, “Literature and Commerce in Eighteenth-Century London”: 103, 106.

\(^{69}\) Each writer spells the first name differently; Graham spells it “Anne,” Botting “Ann.” Botting is more specific than Graham, placing the name in quotation marks and noting that the annotation appears on the titlepage. Walter Graham, *English Literary Periodicals* (New York, T. Nelson & Sons, 1930), 174; Botting, “Johnson, Smart, and the Universal Visitor”: 294.

\(^{70}\) Ibid.; Ferrero, *Reconstructing the Canon*, throughout, but esp. 41–43 and 104.

\(^{71}\) Graham names the annotator, then treats the annotations as authoritative, but makes no claim for the authority of the annotations based on a familial connection. It is not clear whether he considered a close familial connection to be established by the name alone or whether he considers a familial connection irrelevant to the authority of the annotations, though the former is more likely. For Botting, the authority of the annotations depends on a familial connection. He suggests that Anne “may have been a relative … perhaps his daughter or his wife.” Although Botting acknowledges that, as “almost nothing is known of Gardner, the question cannot at present be settled,” he goes on to suggest that the annotations show inside knowledge and “markedly” strengthen “the possibility of some such relationship.” Graham, *English Literary Periodicals*, 174–75; Ferrero, *Reconstructing the
that the annotated copy in question may have belonged to either Anne Gardner or Ann Hedges Gardiner (ca. 1715–29 October 1789), whom Johnson knew well, believing the difference in spelling of the surname “is not significant.” However, though Anne Gardner spelt her first name as both “Anne” and “Ann,” none of the Gardners used the spelling “Gardiner” for their surname in any of the documents or in any of the publications they were responsible for, although, as Ferrero states, the name did appear as “Gardiner” in a few advertisements. On this basis, it seems that Boswell’s correspondent was more likely the annotator than Mrs Gardiner; but, until the book is located again, the exact identity of the annotator—and thus the value of the annotations—is likely to remain a mystery.

The claim, made by Davies and rightly rejected by Johnson, that Gardner “was not properly a bookseller” is not challenged by Plomer; but Barker suggests the reason Davies made the claim may be that Gardner was trained as a printer and only later branched into publishing. Another possibility is that while Gardner purchased copyrights and registered them with the Stationers’ company, he did not participate in copyright auctions as the more established and powerful members of the book trade did. In the seventy-seven surviving catalogues of books and copyrights auctioned between 1735 and 1763 the name “Gardiner” appears only twice, in one catalogue, as the buyer of two lots of books in quires. Even if this annotation is for Thomas Gardner, and it may not be since none of the books were later advertised or issued by him, it is clear that he had no role in the broader trade in copyrights.

---

72 Ibid., 42–43.
73 Ibid., 42.
74 Anne spells her name thus in her letters to Boswell and her father spelt it Anne in his will but, when Anne acted as a witness to the marriage of each her sisters, she signed her name “Ann Gardner.” See “Will of Thomas Gardner,” f. 348v; St. Clement’s Church marriage register entries for 27 March 1770 (Lucy Mable) and 27 June 1771 (Catherine).
75 Ferrero, Reconstructing the Canon, 42.
77 A Catalogue of the Bound, and the Remainder of the Quire Stock of the late Mr. Richard Ford, Deceased: Together with his Copies, which will be Sold by Auction … Tuesday the 14th of November, 1738 ([London, 1738]), 3, lots 15 (five titles; forty-seven books; bought for six shillings and sixpence) and 22 (six titles; fifty-seven books; bought for seven shillings). These seventy-seven catalogues are nos. 47–182 (Ward 48–Longman 123) in Belanger’s list of copyright auctions. See Terry Belanger, “Booksellers’ Trade Sales, 1718–1768,” The Library, 5th ser., 30 (1975): 298–302.
78 As Belanger argues, copyright auctions were used by the respectable trade to safeguard de facto perpetual copyright after the legal basis for it had been removed in 1709. Since auctions were attended by invitation only, to receive an invitation at all was a mark of recognition that a bookseller was in good standing with the respectable trade. Booksellers who infringed copyrights were excluded, thus cutting them off from a valuable supply of new and cheap (remained) books as well as copyrights. See Belanger, “Booksellers’ Trade Sales, 1718–1768,” 296.
Gardner’s death was reported in three newspapers, each notice providing unique details: *Lloyd's Evening Post* reports the death, on 7 April, of “Mr. Thomas Gardner, Printer,” describing him as “one of the Burgesses of the Duchy Court of Lancaster;” *The London Chronicle* reports the death on 8 April, of “Mr. Thomas Gardner, an eminent Printer,” noting that this occurred “after a lingering illness;” a few days later, *The Westminster Journal* stated that Gardner had died “at his house in the Strand.” Regarding Gardner’s position as a Burgess, Dodsley’s *London and Its Environs Described* (1761) explains that the City and Liberties of Westminster comprised nine parishes: St. Clement’s being one of the seven in the two Liberties (the “Liberties” being Westminster and the Duchy of Lancaster). The “City and Liberties” were governed under the authority of the Court of Burgesses, which in turn derived its authority from the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey; the office bearers being, in descending order of seniority: a high steward, high bailiff and two head burgesses, other bailiffs and burgesses and their assistants, followed by church wardens, beadles, constables and watchmen. Each of the sixteen burgesses had a ward under his jurisdiction and “in all respects” the duties of these burgesses “resemble those of the aldermen’s deputies of the city of London.” Gardner, then, held a significant civil and ecclesiastical position, which was likely a financially-rewarding one.

After Gardner’s death, his property—and his business as a bookseller and publisher on the Strand—passed to his wife Lucy (d. 14 February 1789). As

---

79 *Lloyd's Evening Post*, 5–8 April 1765; *London Chronicle or Universal Evening Post*, 6–9 April 1765; *Westminster Journal*, 13 April 1765. Gardner’s lingering illness may explain why a few of his longer publications were printed by others in the years prior to his death. See, for example, Checklist X1755.2.
80 The City is comprised of two parishes (St. Margaret’s and St. John the Evangelist); and the Liberties is comprised of seven (St. Martin’s in the Fields, St. James’s, St. Anne’s, St. Paul’s Covent garden, St. Mary le Strand, St. Clement’s Danes, and St. George’s, Hanover square, and with the precinct of the Savoy). *London and Its Environs Described* (London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1761), 280. London and Its Environs Described, 280–83. As well as a Burgesses and his assistant, St. Clement’s had two church wardens, five overseers of the poor, eight constables, sixteen scavengers, two beadles, and twenty-eight watchmen. See, ibid., 283 and William Maitland, *The History and Survey of London, From its Foundation to the Present Time* (London: T. Osborne and J. Shipton, 1756), 2.1336b.
83 All “fines, forfeitures and strays,” within this jurisdiction—i.e., due to the Court leet—belonged to the High Bailiff (who held his office for life); the High Bailiff also managed the elections in Westminster, which rendered his position “very beneficial.” It seems likely that the position of Burgess afforded related, but lesser, financial opportunities. *London and Its Environs Described*, 282. The system of patronage, by which individual office-holders profited from their “place,” reached its apogee under Walpole, but continued well into the nineteenth century. See Clive Emsley, *Crime and Society in England: 1750–1900*, 4th ed. (Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge, 2013), 168.
84 Lucy—sole executrix of Henry’s will—is identified by first name only in parish and legal records connected with her husband and children (see below for details); for her obituary see “Deaths,” *GM* 59 (February 1789): 184b.
well as “goods, chattels, wearing apparel, jewels, [and] plate,” Thomas left Lucy his “Stock in Trade, Copies, Books, [and] debts.” As we have seen, the copies (copyrights) were likely only those that Gardner had purchased directly; of these, only one seems to have retained any commercial value. Certainly, between 1766 and 1769, Lucy advertised only a single work (as “Mrs. Gardner”) and appeared in the imprint of only three works (as “L. Gardner”): all of these works were by Eliza Haywood. The last of these books was published in 1769. By this time, but probably earlier, Lucy had been joined in the business by her son Henry.

Henry Lasher Gardner (12 February 1776–29 February 1808) was apprenticed to his father on 4 July 1758 (at the age of fourteen) for a term of seven years. In June 1760, he was turned over to Charles Bathurst to serve out the remaining five years of his apprenticeship, which ended three months after his father’s death in 1765. While his mother carried on Thomas’s business, Henry established his own name as a bookseller and publisher “opposite St. Clement’s Church in the Strand.” In the first half of 1767 (at the age of twenty-three), he appears at that address as a bookseller in advertisements for works published by others, and in which he appears to have had no stake (his name does not appear in the imprints of the books themselves). In March 1768, he attempted, unsuccessfully, to set up his own weekly periodical; it lasted three weeks. From 1769 he began publishing

86 “Mrs. Gardner” advertised a “new Edition” of The Female Spectator (Spedding, A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood, Ab.60.8) in St. James’s Chronicle or the British Evening Post, 8–10 April 1766; “L. Gardner” appears in the imprint of Ab.69.4 The Invisible Spy in 1767, Ab.67.7 The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless in 1768, and Ab.68.4 The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy in 1769.
87 Henry Lasher Gardner’s christening at St. Clement Danes is recorded in the FamilySearch site [reference: pal:/MM9.1.1/JQFG-QRD], naming his mother (Lucy) and father; I have not located his place of marriage, but his marriage settlement dates his marriage (to Mary Mucklow) to ca. 12 February 1776; Henry died 29 February 1808; his will was proved on 14 March 1808 [PROB 11/1475/156]. See below for more details about Henry.
88 McKenzie, Stationers’ Company Apprentices 1701–1800, 26 (603) and 136 (no. 3143); Henry’s father died 7 April 1765, his apprenticeship ended on 4 July 1765.
89 The Entertaining Medley (London: C. Parker, Robertson and Roberts, 1767); ESTC: t98505; four booksellers are named in advertisements who are not in the imprint, including “H. Gardner, opposite St. Clement’s Church, in the Strand,” Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser, 10 March 1767; Joseph Wilson, Nicodemus’s Gospel (London: for the author, 1767); ESTC: n67873; two booksellers are named in advertisements who are not in the imprint, including “H. Gardner,” Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser, 23 March 1767; Joseph Gee, Observations on the Growth of Hemp and Flax in Great-Britain ([London: H. Gardner, 1765]); ESTC: t104323; printed without any imprint, but advertised as “printed for H. Gardner, opposite St. Clement’s Church, in the Strand; and J. Walter, at Charing Cross,” Public Advertiser, 16 May 1767; Etienne François Vernage, The Happy Life: Or, The Contented Man (London: R. Main, 1767); ESTC: t109719; three booksellers are named in advertisements who are not in the imprint, including “H. Gardner,” Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser, 13 June 1767.
90 The Covent Garden Chronicle (London: H. Gardner, March 1768); ESTC: p. 3020; no. 1 St. James’s Chronicle, 3–5 March 1768; no. 2 St. James’s Chronicle, 5–8 March 1768; no. 3 St. James’s Chronicle, 12–15 March 1768; no. 4 St. James’s Chronicle, 17–19 March 1768; advertised again St. James’s
a series of new works under his own name and in partnership with others. A few years later he began regularly reprinting works by Haywood: he reprinted two in 1771, one in 1772, two in 1773 and two in 1776. Thomas Gardner’s will is quite clear that his Strand property was to remain with his wife “for and during her natural life” and only after her death pass to “Henry Lasher Gardner and his heirs and Assigns for ever.” However, it appears that Lucy settled the shop on Henry shortly before he married, early in 1776, and allowed him to buy from her the furnishings she had inherited from Thomas. (See Appendix 1.) When Henry settled the property on Mary and their children, the property was described as having been “formerly in the possession of Thomas Gardner, deceased, afterwards in the possession of Lucy Gardner, and now in the possession and occupation of the said Henry Lasher Gardner.” Henry is described in this settlement as “lawfully rightfully and absolutely” the owner, with “a good sure absolute and indefeasable Estate of Inheritance in fee simple” without any limitation.

Chronicle, 24–26 March 1768 with the explanation: “The Publication of this Number … has been deferred solely on account of the General Election for Members of Parliament.” Only a single copy of no. 2 (9 March) is recorded in ESTC.

91. The earliest appears to be The History of Jack Wilks, A Lover of Liberty (London: H. Gardner, 1769); ESTC: t72456; Public Advertiser, 31 January 1769.

92. Spedding, A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood, Ab.58.9 and Ab.60.9 (1771), Ab.67.8a (1772), Ab.69.6 and Ab.70.4 (1773) and Ab.64.4 and Ab.68.5 (1776). Under the Copyright Act of 1709, Gardner’s copyrights to works by Haywood expired fourteen years after their first publication. Since the earliest of these works was published on 21 June 1743, the latest on 26 February 1756, the copyrights expired between 21 June 1757 and 26 February 1770—after Thomas Gardner’s death. Lucy reprinted Ab.69.4 The Invisible Spy in 1767, within the fourteen years of the Act (the copyright expired 12 November 1768), Ab.67.7 The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless in 1768, outside the fourteen years (the copyright expired 14 October 1675), and Ab.68.4 The History of Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy in 1769, also outside the fourteen years (the copyright expired 19 December 1766). The copyrights had expired on all of the works reprinted by Henry; however, as noted, publishers continued to treat copyright as perpetual, and the courts continued to support them in this belief, until 1774. So, it is not clear whether Lucy would have needed to transfer the Haywood copyrights to Henry. Only one of Gardner’s “perpetual” copyrights was challenged in London, when Andrew Millar et al. printed Ab.60.10a The Female Spectator in 1775, but this was the only serious challenge Henry faced to his control of Haywood’s later works (ignoring piracies and magazine reprints, such as those in James Harrison’s The Novelist’s Magazine between 1783 and 1788). See Spedding, A Bibliography of Eliza Haywood, 275 and entries Ab.69.4, Ab.67.7, Ab.68.4.


94. Since this 1775 “Inventory of furniture” is one of the few documents to offer any insight into Thomas Gardner’s household—he will contains no more details than those already quoted—I have transcribed it in full below. See also, “Settlement on the marriage of Henry Lasher Gardner & Miss Mucklow.”

95. “Settlement on the marriage of Henry Lasher Gardner,” 1r.
whatsoever. By 1785 Lucy and her eldest daughter Anne were living at 40 Park Street, Grosvenor Square, a very fashionable address.

Henry seems to have been slightly more active as a publisher than his father but a lot less active as a printer. While the ESTC records 152 publications for Thomas over a thirty-year period (1735–1765; ca. five per year), Henry appears in the imprint of two hundred publications in the thirty–three years to 1800 (ca. six per year), and a further ten appeared in the following five years. (ESTC does not offer a complete record of printing to 1800, but it is likely to be similarly incomplete for the two men.) However, Henry had twenty apprentices to Thomas’s two. As Figure 3 shows, Thomas had five or more apprentices for most of the time he was in business in the Strand and, at one point, seven. According to Keith Maslen, Samuel Richardson had four apprentices and employed twenty compositors and pressmen in August 1734. At the same time William Bowyer, a leading London printer, had three, and employed nineteen compositors and pressmen plus a warehouseman and a corrector. And in 1753, when Richardson had five apprentices, he employed forty compositors, pressmen, including a warehouseman, corrector and an overseer.

96 Ibid., 6r.
97 In 1785, a “Mrs. Gardner, Park Street” appears in the List of the Stockholders in the Worshipful Company of Stationers ([London, 1785]), 5 (dated on internal evidence; see ESTC: t203492). Lucy’s 1789 obituary and Anne’s 1791 and 1793 letters to Boswell (see above) give the same address (40 Park Street, Grosvenor Square). Also in 1793, Anne is listed as a subscriber to William Lempriere’s A Tour from Gibraltar to Tangier. See “Deaths,” GM 59 (February 1789): 184b: [14 February 1789] “In Park-street, Grosvenor-square, Mrs. Gardner, relict of Mr. Tho. G. printer, the Strand, and mother to the bookseller [i.e. Henry Lasher Gardner];” William Lempriere, A Tour from Gibraltar to Tangier, 2nd ed. (London: J. Walter, 1793), v, as “Mrs. Ann Gardner, Park Street, Grosvenor Square.” The area around Grosvenor Square, the northern part of the Grosvenor estate, now known as Mayfair (including Park Street), was developed in the 1720s. The “high social status of the Square” (and, therefore, the surrounding streets) is reflected in the fact that “people of title consistently made up half or more of the residents down to very recent times.” See “Grosvenor Square: Introduction.” Survey of London, vol. 40: The Grosvenor Estate in Mayfair, Part 2 (The Buildings) (1980), 112–17, online <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=42125>.
98 As I explain below, while Henry was trained as a printer, he may have lacked equipment.
99 Copac and Worldcat record either “H. Gardner” or “H. L. Gardner” in imprints as follows: 1801 (2); 1802 (1); 1803 (3); 1804 (1); and 1805 (3). These totals include two separate, multi-volume editions of The Plays of William Shakespeare illustrated by Henry Fuseli.
100 Nineteen of the items in the Checklist were printed by Gardner, or contain at least one of his ornaments, but do not include his name in the imprint; while Barker lists fourteen books that appear in the “Monthly Catalogue” of the GM as being published by Gardner between April and December 1739—of these five cannot be located. Both facts suggest that ESTC offers an incomplete record of Gardner’s activity. See Checklist and Barker, “Printing and Publishing,” 290.
101 Gardner had seven apprentices for three months, between 2 February 1748 (when Thomas Lymer started) and 3 May 1748 (when Jonathan Lowndes finished). See McKenzie, Stationers’ Company Apprentices 1701–1800, 136 (nos. 3145 and 3144).
102 Keith Maslen, Samuel Richardson of London, Printer: A Study of his Printing Based on Ornament Use and Business Accounts (Dunedin: University of Otago, 2001), 11–12.
The two-digit code for each apprentice is the last two digits of the number assigned by McKenzie; “f” indicates an apprentice was freed; “†” indicates the year Gardner died. See McKenzie, *Stationers' Company Apprentices 1701–1800*, 136; nos. and dates with Gardner, as follows: 3142 (3 December 1734–3 March 1747); 3146 (2 December 1735–2 December 1741); 3148 (7 December 1738–2 April 1745); 3144 (2 December 1740–3 May 1748); 3154 (2 February–2 November 1742); 3138 (6 April 1742–4 October 1748); 3137 (7 November 1742–7 November 1749); 3135 (2 April 1745–5 August 1755); 3141 (5 August 1746–5 August 1753); 3152 (3 November 1747–5 August 1755); 3145 (2 February 1748–2 February 1755); 3140 (3 April 1750–5 July 1757); 3151 (2 July 1751–7 March 1756); 3149 (5 February 1754–6 March 1759); 3153 (2 March 1756–7 September 1762); 3139 (7 July 1757–7 July 1764); 3136 (6 July 1758–4 September 1764); 3143 (4 July 1758–3 June 1760); 3150 (8 June 1762–7 August 1770); 3147 (3 August 1762–7 November 1765).
The scale of Thomas’s printing business “can be measured”—like Richardson’s or Bowyer’s—“in terms of the workmen he employed.” The fact that, in the decade from 1746–1755, Thomas usually had six apprentices at a time, suggests that he also had a substantial staff of compositors, pressmen and assistants, and ran a business “able to foot it with other leading London printers.”

As William Strahan acknowledged, however, a printer’s living offered a mere subsistence compared to “other Branches” of the book trades. Thomas participated in “the more lucrative area of bookselling,” as did Henry; but Henry was also a shareholder in the English Stock of Stationers’ Company, which maintained a monopoly on a substantial group of the most important and profitable copyrights. Cyprian Blagden describes the shareholders in the English Stock as a “commercial oligarchy” within the Stationers’ Company, established as a result of a shift in the balance of power from printers to booksellers. James Raven described this “office-holding (and dividend rich) hierarchy” as operating a “trading cartel.” Shares were relatively expensive, limited, and share-holders were elected—an arrangement that had favoured the richer, more senior and influential members of the trade, but which became less exclusive throughout the eighteenth century.

It is not clear precisely when Henry left the Strand, but he is last listed as a “freeholder,” living in the Strand, in a Westminster poll in July 1802. In 1803,
his “long and studious acquaintance with the parish of St. Clement Danes” is mentioned in a joking letter, as qualifying him to “procure intelligence” for *The Pic-Nic* concerning “the very interesting concerns of Drury-lane, Clare-market” and surrounds. Henry’s eldest son, Thomas [III], finished his apprenticeship under his father on 2 February 1804, and on Boxing Day of the same year transferred his share in the Strand property to his brother (Henry [II]). Henry’s apprentice, William Nunn, finished his apprenticeship on 1 October 1805, the last year in which Henry’s name appears in the imprint of any book. John Rose, a cheesemonger took out insurance policies on Henry’s shop on 6 September and 10 December 1805, and in an 1810 plan of the area he is listed as the occupier, but by 1814 he was leasing no. 7 on Pickett street (facing the other side of St. Clement’s).

* * * * *

At about the time that Henry left the Strand (1803–1805) plans were well advanced for demolishing the shop and house that the family had inhabited for over sixty years. All of the building which, in the eighteenth century, separated the Strand from Butcher Row, the “Back Side of St. Clement’s” and Holywell Street—that is, all of the buildings which blocked the view of St. Clement’s from Temple Bar, and St. Mary le Strand from St. Clement’s—have since been demolished, and the two churches now stand on islands surrounded by traffic. Likewise, all of the buildings on the Strand opposite, facing, against and near St. Clement’s have been demolished and the road widened at this point. These changes were first promoted by William Pickett, Lord Mayor of London 1789–1790.

---

116 The Sun fire insurance policies are held at the National Archives [MS 11936/434/779200 and 779922].
117 A list of “Capital Freehold Property,” being sold by Whinstanley and Son, includes “No. 7, ditto [Pickett Street] on lease to John Rose, Cheesemonger;” *The Times* (7 December 1814): 4d. Pickett Street was formed, on the north of the Strand, by the demolition of Butcher’s Row and the Back Side.
118 William Pickett (ca. 1736–1796), Alderman of Cornhill Ward in May 1783, Sheriff 1784, Lord Mayor of London 1789. See *GM* 80 (December 1796): 1062, 17 December: “As an active and worthy magistrate, his loss is much to be lamented. His unremitting exertions to accomplish his favourite object, the widening of the street without Temple-bar, from his first publication on that subject in 1789 … almost to the last moment of his existence, will long be remembered.”
Church.” In 1789, he put forward a well received “Plan for Making a Convenient and Handsome Communication Between the Cities of London and Westminster,” and lived just long enough to see an Act passed for carrying out part of the project. The Act led to the demolition of Butler’s Row in 1802, but other parts of Pickett’s plan—such as the demolition of Holywell Street and Wych Street—were not completed for another century.

The 1795 “Act for widening and improving the Entrance into the City of London near Temple-Bar” set out to demolish “all the Houses and Buildings” on the north side of the St. Clement’s and “to leave the Ground now covered therewith open, for the Purpose of making a large and commodious Street,” and to dismantle and rebuild the church with an orientation parallel to the new street (which was to make a “straight Line from the North End of Temple Bar aforesaid to the North East Corner of Wych Street”). In 1798, after “considerable Progress” had been made on this plan, another Act was approved “to explain, amend and enlarge the Powers of” the 1795 Act. The second Act authorised the “purchase all the Houses, Buildings, Lands, Tenements, and Hereditiments, situate on or near the South Side of the Strand” to “make a commodious Way or Passage round the said Church”—thereby “permitting the said Church to remain in its present Situation” and avoiding “much unnecessary Expence, Inconvenience, and Delay.” The demolition and rebuilding set out in these two acts, the north side of the Strand, followed by the south side, took place between 1795 and 1811. (See Figure 4.) Although Butcher’s Row and the Back Side were demolished and replaced by

122 The *Statutes at Large, From the Thirty-Fifth Year … to the Twenty-Eighth Year of the Reign of King George the Third, inclusive* (London, George Eyre and Andrew Strahan, 1798), 223–25 (Ch. 126).
123 Ibid., 937–40 (Ch. 66).
124 *First Report from the Select Committee on Metropolis Local Taxation* (London: House of Commons, 2 May 1861), 74: “Appendix, No. 11: Return of the Date of each Improvement in the Metropolis chargeable to the Coal Duties” dates the “Widening and improving the entrance into London, near Temple Bar, improving the Strand and Fleet-street, and formation of Pickett-street …” to “From the Year 1795 to 1811.”
Figure 4: A plan which "exhibits the houses in the situation in which they originally stood previously to their demolition" in Londina Illustrata (plate dated 11 February 1811).

Figure 5: Engraving of C. John M. Whitchelo’s view of the “East end of St. Clement’s Church, the North Ends of Essex Street, New Court, Milford Lane, and Arundel Street, with the grotesque appearance of antient houses about to be pulled down . . .,” in Londina Illustrata (plate dated 11 February 1811).
1802; only the “commencement” of this “extensive plan” is acknowledged in 1806, suggesting that Gardner’s shop, on the South side had not yet been demolished.\(^\text{125}\)

Clearly, Henry Gardner and his son Thomas [III] were well aware of the changes being made opposite, and had long been aware of the plan to demolish their house and shop at no. 200 on the Strand. It appears that Thomas [III] did not take over the business at the end of his apprenticeship and move it elsewhere. Instead, Henry wound up the business and Thomas [III] transferred his share in the Strand property to his brother Henry [II], probably to simplify the sale of the building to the city.

Although there are a number of nineteenth-century images of the site occupied by the Gardners between 1735 and 1805, there are no detailed images of the building that pre-date Henry’s departure, leaving us with only Lucy’s 1775 inventory of the house (Appendix 1) and a few descriptions of the immediate area south of St. Clement’s.\(^\text{126}\) In 1735, when Thomas Gardner moved to the corner of Milford Lane and the Strand, Robert Seymour described the spot as follows:

*Milford-lane, which opens out of the Strand, against St. Clement’s Church, and this Lane runs down on the Backside of Essex-street to the Water Side, a Place much pestered with Carts and Cars, for the bringing Coals and other Goods from the Wharfs by the Water Side, and therefore this Lane is but ill inhabited, with old Buildings, and the rather for that the Entrance into it out of the Strand is so narrow.*\(^\text{127}\)

This part of the Strand was described as “a very narrow and dangerous defile” in 1787;\(^\text{128}\) and “a great obstruction, and an enormous nuisance to the public at large” in 1789.\(^\text{129}\) In 1853, six tenements were demolished on the east side of Milford-lane behind what was once Brett’s shop at no. 201. These building are described as being “a quaint and not unpicturesque piece of old London,” each having


\(^{126}\) Legal descriptions of the property manage to be comprehensive but vague. In the marriage settlement of Henry and Mary, for example, the property is desciried as; “all that messuage or tenement situated lying and being in the Strand at the north west end of Milford Lane in the said Parish … together with the yard, backside, and all ways, waters, watercourses, lights, easements, profits, commodities, emoluments, appurtenances whatsoever to the said messuage or tenement or premises or any of them belonging or in any wise appertaining or therewith used, enjoyed, or accepted, respected, deemed, taken or known as part, parcel, or number thereof….” “Settlement on the marriage of Henry Lasher Gardner,” 1r.


\(^{128}\) “Letter from Captain —— … September, 1787,” in *The English Lyceum: Or, Chose Pieces in Prose and in Verse*, vol. 2 (Hamburg: Printed for the Editor, 1787), 15.

\(^{129}\) *The Analytical Review* 4 (May 1789): 98 (art. 68).
a small enclosed space in front … [with] a bay, in which were the principle windows, originally casements; these bays were timber-framed, filled with lath and plaster; but the end tenement, at the corner of Little-Essex-street, was entirely of timber, except the chimneys; there were remains of the original exterior panelling, the weather board being modern. The tenements had no windows in the rear, being placed close to the chapel and the back of the houses in Essex-street.  

Although the entrance into the Strand from Milford Lane is described by Seymour as “narrow,” each building in this 1853 description had an “enclosed space in front” and early nineteenth-century illustrations show a footpath on both sides of the lane.

In 1878, John Diprose stated that “On the south side of the Strand the houses facing the church were at one time old-fashioned, overhanging, almost touching the church.” But it seems that Diprose was mistaken: the only sources (including illustrations), which describe overhanging buildings of this sort, refer to buildings in Milford Lane and Butcher’s Row on the north side St. Clement’s. The only illustrations of the south side of the Strand, which includes any of the buildings near Milford Lane show neo-classical structures set back from St. Clement’s. The view of St. Clement’s preferred by artists was one looking south and south-west from the north and north-east of the church, a view taken from the gap between the end of Butchers Row and the start of the Back Side, which includes as a backdrop some of the building on the Strand between Essex Street and Milford Lane. The views by Johannes Kip (ca. 1710) and Benjamin Cole (1756) are closest to the north and show very little of the eastern (front) face of the church; consequently, they are unlikely to show any of the buildings close to Milford Lane in the background. The view by John Maurer (1749) is south-west, showing the eastern face of the church; but because the end of Butcher’s Row obscures the view of the Strand from this perspective, the top of only a few buildings close to Milford Lane are visible. Nevertheless, in all three views it is evident that none of

130 “Metropolitan Improvements,” The Illustrated London News 22, issue 612 (12 March 1853): 197, the text refers to an illustration captioned “Old Houses in Milford-Lane, Strand, just taken down.”

131 Walter Thornbury, Old and New London (London: Cassel Petter and Galpin, 1878), 3.71a. Thornbury’s account (including the image) is probably indebted to “Metropolitan Improvements” (see previous note).


133 Johannes Kip, “To the Right Hon. … Early of Exeter… Patron of the Noble Structure, the Church of St. Clement Danes” (ca. 1710). London Metropolitan Archives [Pr.W2/CLE].


135 John Maurer, “A Perspective View of St. Clements Church in the Strand” (1749) and “Vue de l’Englise de St. Clemens dans le Strand” (1753). Harvard University Library, Robert Adam extra-illustrated copy of Boswell’s Life of Johnson [MS Hyde 76 (3. 4. 279. 3)] and London Metropolitan Archives [Pr.W2/CLE].
the buildings on the South side of the Strand between Essex Street and Milford lane were the “old-fashioned, overhanging” structures Diprose suggests.

The one remaining—and the most useful—view is that by C. John M. Whichelo (1810) (see Figure 5). Since the demolition of Butcher’s Row had changed the Strand into “a large and commodious Street” by 1810, a new viewing position was possible for Whichelo: east of the church, looking west along the south side of the Strand. Unfortunately, it is not absolutely clear whether Whichelo’s watercolour depicts the street exactly as it was in 1810 or, as the caption to his view implies, it is an imaginative reconstruction of the Strand as it looked before the “grotesque” and “antient houses” on the Strand had been pulled down (a few years earlier?) and replaced by “a circular row of stately buildings.”

However, even if the view is only broadly accurate in detail, it is evident that none of the buildings overhang the road or come even close to touching the Church anywhere near Milford Lane. In fact, the building looks remarkably similar to the one that replaced it (see Appendix 3): a four-story Georgian-style structure, with three pairs of windows above street level.

Whichelo’s representation of no. 200 as a narrow four-story building (see Figure 6) is consistent with an inventory of furniture made by Lucy in 1775. Lucy’s inventory is probably not a list of all the furniture in the household and so it may not list every room; however, included is the kitchen (usually in the basement); yard and laundry (probably in an outbuilding), shop, “Compting House” and parlour (ground floor), dining room and “Clossett” (on the first floor), “Fore” and “Back” rooms (second floor); “fore” room and Closet (third floor). Three of these rooms have beds (second and third floors), three have dining tables (ground and first floor), suggesting a conventional terrace layout. Under the Building Act of 1774, the building was a “second rate” structure, worth between £350 and £850 in ground rent and occupying between 500 and 900 square feet of floor space (46–84 m²).

Missing from Lucy’s inventory is any indication of Gardner’s “Printing House,” warehouse, workrooms or accommodation for apprentices. Also

---

136 Whichelo’s view occupies the top half of a plate published in *Londina Illustrata*, entitled “The Strand, Preparatory to its Improvement in the Year 1810;” Figure 4 occupies the bottom half of the same plate. See, *Londina Illustrata: Or, A Collection of Plates* (London: Robert Wilkinson, 1808–1815), no. 8 (dated 11 February 1811).

137 C. John M. Whichelo, “Part of the Strand, from Essex Street to Norfolk Street.” London Metropolitan Archives [W.W2/STR].

138 For the four rates or classes of building (those relating to terraces) defined by the 1775 act, see Ian A. Melville and Ian A. Gordon, *Inspections and Reports on Dwellings* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2005), 201–3.

139 Gardner mentions “his Press, in his Printing House,” as the place where *Old England’s Te Deum* was printed, in his 1743 deposition. See, PRO SP 36/62, f. 240r. Although the number of “outdoor” (i.e., off-site) apprentices increased in the eighteenth century, the practice was condemned; and it is likely that Gardner housed and fed his apprentices rather than paid them wages. Blagden, *The Stationers’ Company*, 249.
missing is any indication of the building Thomas mentions in his will, the house in Milford Lane which he had “annexed” to no. 200. The inventory’s single set of stairs leading to single rooms, front and back, seems to describe Thomas’s “dwelling house” alone. The absence of these work rooms from Lucy’s inventory may not indicate that these rooms were not in use by Henry, just that Lucy had no claim over the furniture in them. But, as mentioned above, Henry did little printing and had no apprentice until 1796 (when Henry took on his son Thomas [II] as an apprentice) suggesting he did not have, or did not have any use for, any printing equipment. From the evidence of Lucy’s inventory, it seems likely that Henry did not inherit the building in Milford Lane and its fate remains

140 Although it is possible that the basement of no. 201 included some storage space not indicated in Lucy’s inventory, it is extremely unlikely to have held any workrooms for printing because of the need for light to compose type.
unclear. But, if Henry did not inherit his father’s printing equipment and workshop, it would go a long way to explaining why he undertook no printing.

When Henry Gardner died in February 1808 he was living “At Clapham, Surrey.” Henry was buried with his mother-, father- and sister-in-law at St. Mary, Islington, possibly in expectation that his wife would be buried with him (and her parents) at a later date. Although Henry left his wife “all [his] Share and Interest in the English Stock of the Company of Stationers,” along with much of the rest of his property, he still left over £5000 in annuities to his sons and his brother-in-law. And when Mary died five years later, “Mrs. Mary Gardner, widow of H. L. G., formerly bookseller in the Strand,” was living in Nelson Square, off Blackfriars Road. Nelson Square was laid out ca. 1807, and the first houses were not occupied until 1808, so it seems likely that Mary moved into “the most attractive residential square south of the Thames” only after his death.

It seems, then, that Henry Gardner died rich, like his father. But of his children, it was Henry [II], for “many years first receiver of Customs in the Long room,” rather than Thomas [III], his one-time apprentice on the Strand, who

141 I have been unable to find any evidence to indicate whether the property was sold or leased, either by Lucy or by any of Henry’s three sisters (and two brothers-in-law).


144 “Will of Henry Lasher Gardner” [PROB 11/1475/156], ff. 362v–64r; “Declaration of trusts. Mr & Mrs Henry Lasher Gardener to Horatio Mucklow and Thomas and Henry Gardner” (31 December 1805) and “Appointment (and copy). Mr & Mrs Henry Lasher Gardner to Henry Gardner their son” (27 June 1806). National Archives [ACC/538/2nd dep/4072 and 4073]. Horatio Mucklow (11 March 1755–27 July 1816), son of William (1729–25 March 1788) and Mary (1721–19 March 1806), was Henry’s brother-in-law.


carried on this tradition of dying rich.¹⁴⁸ It is not entirely clear what became of Thomas [III], but it is clear that the heir-apparent to the Gardners' business did not take up the trade of printing, publishing and bookselling. Possibly, he did not need to work. The last records I can locate for him are from 1845.¹⁴⁹ In March of that year he appears in the will of his brother as “Thomas Gardner, of the Octagon Plymouth in the County of Devon, Gentleman”—the recipient of £500, a large silver platter (marked “T. G. to H. G.”), a pair of silver candlesticks and a “framed and glazed copy of the Coat of Arms of Thomas Gardner.”¹⁵⁰

Monash University, Melbourne

¹⁴⁸ The value of the estate of Henry [II]—who did not marry and had no children—is not entirely clear, but the bequests enumerated in his will amount to more than fifteen thousand pounds, an approximate equivalent is £1.7 million in 2013. “Will of Henry Gardner of York Place;” “Historical Price Converter widget.”

¹⁴⁹ In 1840 and 1842, a “Thomas Gardner, Esq. (Plymouth)” appears as a “Director” and “Member of the Local Board” of the “Plymouth Company of New Zealand,” a company which was set up to facilitate the settlement of New Plymouth in New Zealand. William Bridges, the secretary, had his office at no. 5 on The Octagon. See, The Spectator, no. 608 (22 February 1840): 190; Information Respecting the Settlement of New Plymouth, in New Zealand (London: Smith and Elder, 1841), 17; Latest Information from the Settlement of New Plymouth (London: Smith and Elder and Co., 1842), [53]. And in July 1845 a “Thomas Gardner, Esq. Plymouth” appears in the “Committee for Guarding Our Privileges” in Minutes of the Methodist’s Conferences from … 1744 (London: John Mason, 1848), 213. Henry [II] gave fifty pounds to the Wesleyan Missionary Society in his will (“Will of Henry Gardner of York Place,” 79r). It is likely, but not certain, that these references are to Thomas [III].

¹⁵⁰ Actually, the address and bequest appear in the will proper (1844; ibid., 78v), and the property in the codicil (1845; ibid., 81r). The wording—“my framed and glazed copy of the Coat of Arms of Thomas Gardner”—suggests Thomas Gardner obtained a grant of arms (a hand-painted exemplification of arms, issued on vellum by the chief herald) and that this is a “framed and glazed copy” (i.e. duplicate) of that grant of arms. It is likely that Anne’s seal was also based on this design.
Appendix 1: Inventory of Furniture at no. 200, the Strand, in 1775

The following inventory was sent to Henry Gardner, probably from a barrister’s office (in Grey’s Inn), and seemingly at the request of Lucy Gardner. Lucy sought payment for the furniture at no. 200, the Strand, all of which became hers at the death of her husband, Thomas. Although this furniture might be expected to pass to Henry when Lucy died, she clearly wanted to be paid for it (in 1775) so that, if Henry were to die before her, the furniture could be passed on to Henry’s wife or children without any dispute over ownership. It took more than four months for Henry to agree to this request. Twenty of the forty-five line items have been ticked off (the essentials: the beds and the kitchen equipment; items valued—at right, in pounds, shillings and pence—at a total of twenty-one pounds, sixpence). This marking may indicate that, at first, Henry planned on buying his mother out of less than half of the items listed. In the end, however, Henry agreed to buy all the items and rounded the total up to fifty pounds. That Lucy sought to be paid for this furniture in this way, makes it clear that she had moved out of the building by 1775. And the fact that she made her request in writing from a barrister’s office, may suggest a less than amicable relationship between mother and son. If so, this over-payment may also suggest an attempt to improve matters.

The document consists of an envelope, the outside of which is addressed to “Mr Gardner[,] Strand;” inside is written: “Mr Gardner is desired to peruse & return the inclosed to be indorsed, if he approves of it — It will give to M[rs] G— all M[rs] G— may die posse[se]d of. Grey’s Inn Sat’ Noon.” The inventory has been prepared on a single sheet of paper, folded to make four pages (two of which remain blank): on [1r], written sideways, is “Inventory of furniture[..] 27 Oct. 1775;” on [2r] appears the text below, endorsed (at bottom left) with the note “Mem. March 19, 1776. Allowed & Paid my Mother Fifty Pounds for the Furniture mentioned in this Inventory.”

151 National Archives [ACC/538/2nd dep/4069].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closet 3 P' of Stairs</td>
<td>Bedstead, &amp; Bedding, New Curtains</td>
<td>√ 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>Stove &amp;c</td>
<td>√ . 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 P' of Stairs Fore Room</td>
<td>Bed &amp; Bedding, New Curtains</td>
<td>√ 2 12 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double Drawers</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Window Curtains</td>
<td>. 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinett</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Press</td>
<td>√ 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 leaf Screen</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 P' of Stairs Back Room</td>
<td>Bed &amp; Bedding</td>
<td>√ 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drawers</td>
<td>. 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chimney Glasse</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brass Stove and Fenders</td>
<td>√ . 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dressing Drawers</td>
<td>. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 P' of Stairs Fore Room</td>
<td>Brass Stove and Fender</td>
<td>. 7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greene Moorzen Curtains</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Room</td>
<td>7 Chairs India Table</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sail Cloth</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carnett [sic]</td>
<td>4 14 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chimney, Plate &amp; Curtain</td>
<td>1 11 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side Board</td>
<td>√ . 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stove and Fender</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pair Glass</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clossett</td>
<td>Dining Table</td>
<td>. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Range and Crane</td>
<td>√ . 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ironing Table</td>
<td>√ . 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dining Table</td>
<td>√ . 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Do</td>
<td>. 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spitt and Backs</td>
<td>√ . 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dripping Pum</td>
<td>. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boiler and Pott</td>
<td>√ . 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard</td>
<td>Water Tubb</td>
<td>√ . 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>√ . 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Tubb</td>
<td>√ . 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cistern</td>
<td>√ 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>Lanthorn</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Stools</td>
<td>√ 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bath Stove</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comtuing House Parlour</td>
<td>Glasse</td>
<td>√ . 10 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd &amp; Old Chairs</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dining Table</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Table</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glass Candlesticks, Shades &amp;c</td>
<td>√ 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Castors</td>
<td>√ . 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carpets</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curtains</td>
<td>. 10 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Appendix 2: John Brett at no. 201, the Strand

John Brett established himself “at the Golden-Ball, opposite St. Clements Church in the Strand,” almost exactly a year before Gardner. And, like Gardner, he appears to have passed on his business and his property to his son, whose successors remained in the building into the early nineteenth century. In late 1738, Brett published the first books printed by Gardner at no. 200 in the Strand. In 1803, sixty-five years later, the last book published by his son was printed by William I. Clement (the last of Brett successors) at no. 201.152 Because of the long connection between the two businesses, a short account is offered here, which corrects, and somewhat expands, existing accounts.

Brett appears to have begun business in Westminster Hall and moved to the Strand very soon afterwards. In March 1738, he was selling shares in Thomas Foubert’s mysterious “just and curious machines” and accepting subscriptions for William Doyle’s engraved maps of the Bay of Tramore from this location.153 A two-volume set of books, with Brett at Westminster Hall in the imprint, appeared in July—but by April 1738 he had already established himself in the Strand.154

John and Catherine Brett had at least two sons (Peter and Charles) who were living on the Strand in 1745. Charles, who was arrested and interviewed along with his mother and father in April 1745, was apprenticed six months later to John Nicholson II, a printer in Fleet Lane.155 Peter married Mary Pickering on 11 July 1762 and took over the shop by February 1764.156 Peter appears to have gone into

155 Catherine Brett’s “Information upon oath agst. Spavan” (10 April 1745), National Archives [SP 36/65 pt. 2], f. 25, which refers to Charles as “one of her sons;” for the “Information upon Oath of John Brett about Charts of Merryland” (8 April 1745) and “Information upon oath of Charles Brett” (10 April 1745), see ibid., ff. 16–17 and 24. Charles Brett was apprenticed on 1 October 1745. McKenzie, *Stationers’ Company Apprentices 1701–1800*, 248 (5761).
partnership with Robert Hall Westley in 1789, a partnership which ended in 1798. On 18 September 1798, Westley advertised his move:

R. H. Westley, Bookseller, Stationer, and Newsman; returns his grateful acknowledgements to his Friends, Customers, and the Public for the great encouragement he has received for more than ten years, and respectfully informs them, that he has removed from No. 201, opposite St. Clement’s Church, in the Strand, to No. 159, opposite the new Church … N. B. Periodical Publications regularly delivered; printing correctly and expeditiously performed; Copper Plates neatly engraved; Books bound in the most elegant manner…

A few weeks after Westley’s departure, Brett advertised his continuing presence at no. 201:

News-Papers. P. Brett, No. 201, Strand, London, thinks it necessary to inform his numerous Friends in the Country, that he still continues the Business of forwarding Newspapers by the Post to all parts of the Kingdom; which Business he has carried on in the same House upwards of 40 years.

Within seven months of Westley’s departure, however, William Clement took over from Brett at no. 201. Clement occupied the shop until at least 1810, shortly after which the building was demolished.

Although John Brett advertised his address as “the Corner of Milford Lane” on at least two occasions (in 1738 and 1756) the exact location of his shop did not appear in commercial registers until 1779. Thereafter, Peter appears at no. 201 on the Strand, which is the north-east corner of Milford Lane, opposite both Gardner’s shop and St. Clement’s Church. In 1878, John Diprose described the


159 St. James’s Chronicle, 27–29 September 1798.


161 Clement appears on the 1811 plan of the Strand illustrated above (Figure 4).

shop of Westley, “the Whig bookseller,” as “the rendezvous of some of the good old reformers,” but no description of the interior appears to survive. However, like Gardner’s shop at no. 200, Brett’s shop appears on the 1811 plan of the Strand (Figure 4) and in the background of Whichelo’s view of the “East end of St. Clement’s Church …” (Figures 5 and 6).

Appendix 3: no. 200, the Strand, after 1805

It is not possible to offer a detailed account of the demolition and rebuilding of the Strand from the plans drawn up and published between 1795 and 1811 because of the way in which they combine old and new details. Figure 4, for instance, published 11 February 1811 (which includes street numbers on the Strand properties and the names of residents), is a copy of the “Plan of the City’s Intended Improvements at Temple Bar” drawn up by the City Surveyor’s Department and engraved in 1810 (which includes street numbers but not names), itself a copy of a pen-and-ink “Plan of the City’s Intended Improvements at Temple Bar” (dated 1802) that does not include street numbers or names. Also, at some point in the three decades following Gardner’s departure, the street numbering of the Strand changed again (it had previously changed ca. 1777). The renumbering was probably the result of the 1795–1811 changes, but was possibly also due to the constant rebuilding that occurred elsewhere along the Strand in the early to mid-nineteenth century (with groups of buildings being replaced by larger, single structures). Whatever the reason for the change in street numbering, it exacerbates the difficulties of tracing an individual buildings (or building sites).

However, the fate of no. 200 after 1811 is reasonably clear from images. In May 1842 the office of The Illustrated London News (1842–2003; hereafter ILN) occupied a single room on the second floor of no. 198 on the Strand. The ILN was enormously successful. Not only did it soon take over the entire building, but it remained in this location for all but forty years into the late twentieth-century, periodically illustrating its premises in the pages of the newspaper. An illustration from 29 October 1842 shows the whole four-story building: two faces are covered in signage for the ILN and the ground floor appears to be entirely occupied by ILN offices and shop. The building shows two faces because it is on a corner, seemingly

164 For example, in 1852, nos. 188–91 on the Strand were replaced with a single structure in the Palladian style. See “Metropolitan Improvements,” The Illustrated London News 22, issue 612 (12 March 1853): 197.
165 Peter Biddlecombe, “As Much of Life as the World Can Show,” ILN vol. 250, issue 6667 [125th Birthday of the Illustrated London News (Special Number)] (13 May 1967): 41.
of Milford Lane and the Strand, though the street number (“198”—rather than 200, which was the number of Gardner’s corner shop) is clearly visible. The location is confirmed in an illustration printed ten years later that focuses on the lower floors so that the bustling scene immediately outside the building can be depicted in detail. In this illustration, a sign for “Milford Lane” is clearly visible on the wall facing the laneway, establishing that this building is either the same one occupied by Gardner at no. 200 the Strand or is has been built on the site of what was once no. 200 the Strand.

In a pencil sketch of ca. 1855 and in an engraved view of the Strand by Thomas Hosmer Shepherd, five shops are shown in their entirety, the first and last of which are numbered: at no. 198 we have the ILN office—clearly the same building seen in 1842 and 1852—and at no. 194 the premises of Thomas Brown—maker of “Enuka Shirts … the best and most perfect-fitting shirts made.” The three intervening shops are clearly nos. 195, 196, 197, and all five shops are a similar width and style. In 1856, the five shops appear in another ILN engraving, from a slightly different angle and with only very slight differences of detail. (See front cover, an image affording probably the clearest nineteenth-century view of this section of the Strand.) Further illustrations printed in ILN show that, by 1887, the ILN office had expanded and the ILN building had been combined with its neighbour (no. 197) and, by 1893, both buildings had been given a make-over. In 1905, the ILN left the building(s), at which point the site was cleared and the “magnificent” and “stupendous” Ingram House built. Because this 1905

167 See London Metropolitan Archives catalogue nos. p7523126, for the sketch, and p7522888, for the print; the latter with the caption “St. Clement Danes, Westminster” and imprint “London: Publish’d for the Proprietors by W. Sprent, 47 King Square E. C. ” For Brown’s advertisement, see The Times, issue 21,997 (9 March 1855): 15, col C.
168 “Peace illumination Strand,” ILN vol. 28, issue 804 (7 June 1856 [1st issue]): 616. There appear to have been two issues of this date. The first has the illustration cited, which appears in the “List of Engravings” as “the Strand Illuminated” (ibid., 614); the second has a full-page image, captioned “The Peace Commemorations. The Fireworks in Victoria Park,” replacing the one cited and two others. Only the second issue appears on Gale Cengage’s The Illustrated London News: Historical Archive, 1842–2003.
169 Woodblock prints appears in features on the “Illuminations and Decorations” for both the Queen’s Jubilee and the marriage of the Duke of York and Princess May of Teck. The buildings depicted are very similar (both four-story buildings, with the same number of windows), but the latter has only a verandah and decorative cornices. See ILN vol. 91, issue 2515 (2 July 1887): 12; ILN vol. 103, issue 2830 (15 July 1893): 78.
building replaced multiple properties on the Strand, it was numbered 196, but it was occasionally described—more accurately—as nos. 195–98.\textsuperscript{171}

From the available images it appears that the building which stood on the corner of Milford Lane and the Strand from ca. 1810 to 1905 was a brick and stone, Georgian-style structure, like the buildings which stood beside it in the illustration from 1855. That is: above the street, three pairs of symmetrically-arranged windows, later decorated with mouldings, and, at street level, a ceiling-height display window, interrupted only by the entrance and exit. This style of building was popular between 1720 and 1840.

The later history of the site is, briefly: Ingram House was badly damaged during the London Blitz; St. Clement’s was twice damaged before being completely gutted by fire on 10 May 1941; and whatever building had existed on what had once been Brett’s corner of Milford Lane was destroyed and the site (nos. 199–203) left vacant until 1957, when “Huddersfield House,” later “Yorkshire House,” was built.\textsuperscript{172} In 1945 the owners of \textit{ILN} bought the freehold to Ingram House, which was restored in 1951, but demolished in 1961 to make way for a “disastrous … medley” of six “crudely detailed” ten-story office blocks, which occupied much of the block running back from the Strand between Milford Lane and Arundel Street as far as Tweezers Alley (see Figure 2). All of these buildings were demolished in the last few years to make way for a mixed residential/commercial development designated no. 190, the Strand.\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{171}The address for “The New Ingram House” is given as “195–198, Strand” in “Back to the Site of Our Birth,” \textit{ILN} vol. 218, issue 5853 (23 June 1951): 1010.

\textsuperscript{172}Six “picturesque wooden houses” on the eastern side of Milford Lane (mentioned above), were replaced in 1852 by Ingram, Cooke & Co.’s “Milford House,” the new and “commodious premises” used to print the \textit{ILN} until the building was bombed during the Blitz. See, \textit{Norton’s Literary Gazette and Publisher’s Circular} 3, no. 10 (15 October 1853): 181: “The eminent publishing house of Ingram, Cooke & Co., have removed their establishment from 227 Strand, to more commodious premises at Milford House, Milford Lane, Strand;” “Forging New Links with the Past”: 986–87; “The Famous Home of ‘The Bell’s of St. Clements’ Reduced by Enemy Air Action to a Noble Shell,” \textit{ILN} vol. 198, issue 5327 (24 May 1941): [633]. “Huddersfield House,” later “Yorkshire House” is so-called because it is the London office of the Huddersfield Equitable Permanent Benefit Building Society, later the Huddersfield Building Society, later the Yorkshire Building Society (established in 1864).