

THE FORMATION OF THE GALLERY OF ART IN THE LIVERPOOL ROYAL INSTITUTION, 1816–1819

Edward Morris

In 1819 a single room full of paintings in the newly founded Liverpool Royal Institution in Colquitt Street was opened to the Proprietors and their families. The thirty-seven paintings were described in the accompanying *Catalogue of a Series of Pictures illustrating the Rise and early Progress of the Art of Painting in Italy, Germany, etc., collected by William Roscoe Esq. and now deposited in the Liverpool Royal Institution, Liverpool 1819*. The catalogue was arranged chronologically and by school; art historical notes on individual artists and the development of the various schools of painting represented were given; sizes, inscriptions, detailed titles were provided, so, occasionally, were provenances, early attributions and related engravings. The catalogue included a diagram showing how the paintings were hung; one wall contained early Italian works up to and including Michelangelo, the next later sixteenth-century Italian pictures but including a copy after Schongauer and a small work by Catena, the third wall had fifteenth- to sixteenth-century Netherlandish, German and French paintings, the last supported a portrait by Rosso Fiorentino; no pictures were hung over doors but unfortunately at least two panel paintings were directly over fireplaces. Yet more significant was the carefully drafted Preface¹

A few individuals conceiving that, as the following PICTURES form a series from the commencement of the Art to the close of the fifteenth century, their value would be enhanced by their being preserved together, have united in purchasing and presenting them to the

LIVERPOOL ROYAL INSTITUTION; in the hope that by preventing the dispersion of a collection interesting to the history, and exemplifying the progress of Design, they may contribute to the advancement of the FINE ARTS in the Town of Liverpool.

For the first time in Britain a group of important old master paintings had been bought and placed on permanent exhibition with the avowed intention of improving public taste. The attributions in the catalogue were optimistic but the thirty-seven pictures — most of the fourteenth-, fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century paintings formerly owned by William Roscoe and now in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool — included Simone Martini's *Christ Discovered in the Temple*, Ercole de Roberti's *Pietà* and *The Entombment* by the Master of the Virgo inter Virgines. The Liverpool Royal Institution's small art gallery was by no means the first British permanent art gallery. The Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, was opened in 1683 but its small picture collection was antiquarian and scientific in tone; also in Oxford General John Guise bequeathed some 200 Italian sixteenth- to seventeenth-century old master paintings in 1765 to Christ Church.² In 1815 in Cambridge, Richard, Viscount Fitzwilliam bequeathed to the University 144 paintings, mainly Dutch and Flemish but with a few Italian paintings from the Orleans Collection; the paintings were received by the University in 1816 and temporarily exhibited in the old Perse School, Free School Lane; the present Fitzwilliam Museum was not opened until 1848. In 1810 Sir Peter Bourgeois bequeathed his magnificent collection of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century old master paintings to the Master, Warden and Fellows of Dulwich College 'and their successors for ever' expressing his

desire that they may be kept there and preserved for the inspection of the public upon such terms pecuniary or otherwise at such times in the year or days in the week as the said Master, Warden and Fellows of the College for the time being may think proper.

A special gallery was built at Dulwich for these paintings and it was opened to the public in 1817.³

However, the Liverpool Royal Institution Gallery of 1819 marked a decisive step forward within the context of museum history. The Dulwich, Cambridge, and Christ Church, Oxford, Collections resulted from single bequests of great collections to

well established educational institutions, and similar bodies — City Guilds, Municipal Corporations, etc. — had also acquired accidentally collections of paintings. The Liverpool Royal Institution was conceived from its inception in 1814 as in part a permanent art gallery.⁴ Its collection of paintings was formed not from the casual bequest of a single owner of a large partly inherited collection but from the deliberate purchase of a group of old master paintings with money raised by public subscription. Moreover the purpose of the formation of the Liverpool Royal Institution Art Gallery was didactic; the paintings themselves, seen as a series showing the rise of painting in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries in Europe, exemplified the progress to be expected from art in Britain (and Liverpool in particular) in the nineteenth century; the didactic purpose was also apparent in the detailed 1819 Catalogue; the Oxford, Cambridge and Dulwich collections had mere handlists in the early nineteenth century.⁵ The *Catalogue Raisonné* was not new in England in 1819 but until then only private collections had profited from its application.⁶ Certainly at Dulwich at least public instruction was among Bourgeois's motives in bequeathing his collection there and the gallery at Dulwich was open to the public free — although visitors had to obtain tickets at Colnaghi's and elsewhere in London, which, before the railways, must have restricted admission to the wealthy⁷ — whereas the Liverpool Royal Institution Gallery was only open free to the Proprietors, their families and friends; other visitors had to pay although there were concessions for students and women. However, the Liverpool Gallery had a clear public purpose and institutional permanence from the start; the proprietors' powers over the collections were clearly defined and, crucially, they did not have the right to sell or dispose of any of the paintings; moreover the Royal Institution received an initial grant of £1,000 from the Liverpool Town Council reflecting the Institution's public role and value.⁸ Similarly the situation of the Liverpool Gallery — in the centre of a great commercial city — gave it a public relevance that the more cloistered London suburbs or university towns could not offer.

The European context offers another reason for studying the formation of the Liverpool Royal Institution collection. The great cities of Germany and Italy had enjoyed at least partial political independence from the fourteenth to the eighteenth

century and had thus acquired princely collections of old master paintings which in the Age of the Enlightenment were gradually opened to the public and regarded as sources of public instruction.⁹ No conscious and premeditated effort was therefore needed there to create new public museums and art galleries. France, like Great Britain, had been centralized from at least the fifteenth century but the confiscation at the Revolution of aristocratic and church collections made the creation of museums, even if seen only as depots, inevitable and Napoleon's decree of 1 September 1801 created fifteen new provincial French museums largely to house confiscated works of art.¹⁰ This dispossession, whether by a revolutionary populace, as in France, or by Catholic monarchs as in the secularization of religious orders by Joseph II of Austria, or simply by the turmoil of the Napoleonic wars, made the formation of public art collections throughout Europe easy and natural. The position in Britain was entirely different; aristocrats were not dispossessed by war, revolution (or taxation); the Anglican Church's small collections of paintings were equally safe; so were those owned by other religious and charitable foundations in Britain; certainly old master paintings flooded into Britain from Europe as a result of political and religious upheaval there but the importers (and often even the original owners) had to be paid; certainly the British royal collections — though then barely up to European standards — might have formed the nucleus of a new national collection but the doctrine of the Civil List, by which national income and expenditure had been progressively since 1688 separated from the monarch's private income and expenditure, would have disinclined any British king from allowing his art collections to slip over the barrier from private to national and George IV, with his recurring difficulties over the Civil List, would have been the last to do so.¹¹ To all these British obstacles preventing the easy establishment of public art galleries was added one peculiar to Liverpool; it was pre-eminently a new commercial 'boom' town without the respectable seventeenth-century past or the eighteenth-century embryo cultural life of even Manchester or Birmingham, let alone London, Norwich or Bristol. The slave trade, on which the prosperity of eighteenth-century Liverpool largely depended, was held, rightly perhaps, to have deadened its cultural aspirations. Moreover the

founders of the Liverpool Royal Institution were well aware of this disadvantage. B. A. Heywood, addressing the proprietors of the Royal Institution in 1822, remarked that Liverpool was 'poor and decayed' under Elizabeth I with only 766 inhabitants, that there were even fewer in 1660, while by 1821 there were 120,000.¹²

For all these reasons the campaign to establish a permanent art gallery in Liverpool was peculiarly significant and, as the first of its type in Britain, deserves detailed study. William Roscoe's collection of paintings, the nucleus of the Royal Institution's Gallery, were collected mainly from the London art market between 1804 and 1816; about half the Italian paintings dated from before the High Renaissance; about a third of the northern paintings from before 1700;¹³ there was therefore a strong bias — within the climate of early nineteenth-century taste — towards the 'primitives'. Only the earlier paintings passed from Roscoe's collection into the Liverpool Royal Institution and few of the later pictures, except his works by J. H. Fuseli, can now be traced but it is probably true to say that the earlier pictures were superior — by any standards — to the later, although this may simply reflect the fact that 'primitives' offered better value for money on the London art market in the early nineteenth century — Roscoe never paid much for any pictures.¹⁴ He saw his collection, drawings, prints and paintings, primarily as illustrative material for art history and only attributed any aesthetic value to the post-High Renaissance pictures now largely untraceable;¹⁵ this didactic attitude encouraged him in his desire to use the collection for public instruction¹⁶ — a combination of ideas taken over by the Liverpool Royal Institution in their 1819 *Catalogue* largely written by Roscoe.

Roscoe's knowledge of art history was considerable; he contributed an introductory essay on the art of engraving to Joseph Strutt's *Biographical Dictionary of Engravers*, 1785–6, and at the same period contributed two further essays, the 'Remarks on Etching' and 'Idea of a Chronological Collection of Engravings', to a proposed but never published third volume of Strutt's work.¹⁷ Developing from his famous *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici*, 1795, and his *Life and Pontificate of Leo the Tenth*, 1805, were Roscoe's never completed or published 'Historical Sketch of the State of the Arts during the Middle Ages' and his 'An

Historical Inquiry into the Rise, Progress and Vicissitudes of Taste, as exemplified in Works of Literature and of Art' both of 1809–1810¹⁸ — the latter work eventually appearing however in 1817 as his Royal Institution inaugural lecture as chairman: *On the Origin and Vicissitudes of Literature, Science and Art and their Influence on the present state of Society*.¹⁹ By 1814–1815 Roscoe had begun his 'Catalogue of a Private Collection of Books, Pictures, Drawings, Medals and Prints illustrating the Rise, Vicissitudes and Establishment of Literature and Art in Europe'²⁰ which eventually appeared in less happy circumstances in 1816 as his sale catalogue. Roscoe was moreover friend, patron and correspondent of Fuseli,²¹ the only British artist of his period who was also a competent art historian, and Roscoe also had helped to organize in 1774, 1784, 1787²² and 1810–1814²³ exhibitions of contemporary paintings in Liverpool.

Early in 1816 the bank in which Roscoe was the senior partner, Roscoe, Clark and Roscoe, was forced to suspend payments. All but two of the creditors agreed to an arrangement by which the bank would have repaid them over a period but the opposition of these two, Charles Blundell of Ince, son of the great collector Henry Blundell, instigated by Peter Ellames, a Liverpool solicitor under whom Roscoe had served his articles, compelled Roscoe to sell his collections immediately.²⁴ At the sale in September 1816 Roscoe still apparently hoped that benefactors would emerge to buy the collection for Liverpool; the drawings were offered as a single lot for £1,000 and all the paintings (the later works as well as the 'primitives') — except the most valuable — as two lots, one Italian, one Northern, for £1,000 and £500 respectively; there were no takers and a *Memoranda* was published presumably by the auctioneer, Roscoe's friend and adviser, Thomas Winstanley, immediately after the sale;²⁵ it described the failure of the drawings and less expensive paintings to sell as three lots and went on:

When we view in the large and opulent town of Liverpool so many public Institutions and such large sums instantly raised, and lavishly expended, to carry them into effect, is it not to be wondered at and much to be regretted, that the truly patriotic wishes of the late intelligent possessor of this highly valuable Collection, so feelingly and so forcibly expressed (at the end of the Advertisement), when the sum required was so small, should not have met with a correspondent

feeling, in a few of the more enlightened and public spirited Individuals of the place, to have carried them into effect? More especially, when the incalculable advantages, resulting from the constant view of such a combination, both of the curious and excellent in Art, are taken into consideration; and the gratifying prospects, which such a Collection (continually encreasing) would have held forth, both to the present and rising generation, for the cultivation and improvement of an elegant and correct taste, in one of the highest and most rational enjoyments of refined life. Fertilis assiduo si non renovetur aratro, Nil nisi cum spinis gramen habebit ager. Ovid.

What happened at the sale is not clear. Roscoe stated both publicly and privately that he did not intend to buy in at the sale but for some paintings no bids were received or even where there were bids ownership remained with Roscoe. Some other paintings were bought by local dealers who did not dispose of them.²⁶ By June 1818 both the unsold pictures and, probably, some of those bought by local dealers were back in Roscoe's possession and were valued — together — at 1,553 guineas; Roscoe, however, offered them for sale to the Liverpool Royal Institution at 1,200 guineas;²⁷ but included in this valuation and offer were six pictures, an Andrea del Sarto transferred from panel to canvas at £150, a Domenichino at £70, a Guido Reni at £50, a Rubens *Head* at £100, a Titian *Landscape* at £100 and a Carracci at £30, only the last of which appears to have been certainly in the 1816 sale, the others having been probably acquired by Roscoe since that sale.²⁸ All the pictures included in Roscoe's valuation and by then already physically in the Liverpool Royal Institution, except these six post-High Renaissance paintings, which were sent for sale to London, were bought from Roscoe by a group of local subscribers for the Liverpool Royal Institution Gallery of Art and these were the paintings listed in the 1819 *Catalogue*. Of the thirty-seven paintings in the 1819 *Catalogue* all but four were indeed in Roscoe's 1816 Sale. These four, none of great importance, were presumably from Roscoe's collection as the title page of the 1819 Catalogue states that all the pictures listed in it were from his collection; they were probably either acquired by Roscoe after 1816 or were accidentally omitted from the sale. Assuming that the subscribers agreed with Roscoe's offer and valuations they therefore paid 1,200 guineas, less £500 on account of the six later pictures which they refused to buy, making £760 in all,

and for this the Liverpool Royal Institution received most of Roscoe's collection of pre-High Renaissance paintings. At the 1816 Sale, thirty-two of these thirty-seven paintings had made about £625²⁹ — one of them at the sale having certainly attracted no bids.

It is not easy to determine who was responsible for the preponderance of 'primitives' in the 1819 Liverpool Royal Institution Collection. Roscoe certainly wished to include six High Renaissance and Baroque paintings but on the other hand he seems to have made no attempt to retain after the 1816 Sale any but the early pictures. The most probable solution is that the early pictures proved unsaleable at the 1816 Sale — and afterwards in the hands of local dealers — just because they were 'primitives' while the later pictures were rapidly dispersed through the art market to collectors after the 1816 Sale. There seems little evidence that Roscoe bought in any paintings through local dealers at the sale although by June 1818 when he made his offer to the Liverpool Royal Institution he almost certainly had bought back early paintings from Dr. Peter Crompton, Dr. Thomas Stewart Traill, William Robinson, William Ford, John Ballantyne and one unidentified buyer at the 1816 Sale listed in marked catalogues as Mason. Dr. Peter Crompton, a Unitarian, lived at Eton House, Wavertree, near Liverpool and stood unsuccessfully as a Whig Member of Parliament for various Lancashire seats; Dr. T. S. Traill was the eminent doctor and scientist and one of the founders of the Liverpool Royal Institution; William Robinson, William Ford and John Ballantyne were booksellers and dealers of Liverpool, Manchester and Edinburgh respectively.³⁰

More instrumental than these men, however, in the formation of the Liverpool Royal Institution Collection were the subscribers who provided the £760 (probably) to buy the Institution's first thirty-seven pictures from William Roscoe. Their action was all the more creditable in that the Royal Institution had lost about £5,000 from the failure of Roscoe's bank.³¹ They are listed as W. Ewart, G. P. Barclay, R. Benson, C. Tayleur, Jos. Sandars, Jos. Reynolds and B. A. Heywood.³² W. Ewart must be William Ewart (1763–1823), father of the great Radical pioneer of public libraries and of design education, William Ewart (1798–1869). The father, however, like many of Roscoe's Radical friends, later rallied to Canning

and Huskisson; he came originally from Scotland but settled in Liverpool just like John Gladstone, his great friend who named his son William Ewart Gladstone after him. William Ewart senior was a partner in Ewart and Rutson, American, East Indian and general commission merchants.³³ Jos. Sandars can be safely identified as Joseph Sandars (died 1860), partner in Sandars and Claxton, corn merchants of Liverpool; he was a Radical, protesting in 1817 against the suspension of Habeas Corpus and supporting electoral reform in 1831; he was a moderate member of the Liverpool Society for the Abolition of Slavery and a founder of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway.³⁴ B. A. Heywood must be Benjamin Arthur Heywood (1755–1828), the banker; at first he was a partner in Liverpool of the firm Parke and Heywood and in Lancaster of the firm Parke, Heywood and Conway; in 1788 his interests moved to Manchester where he founded a new bank with his brother Nathaniel and father Benjamin.³⁵ He seems, however, to have retained close links with Liverpool; his pamphlet on credit was published there in 1819;³⁶ he addressed meetings of the Proprietors of the Liverpool Royal Institution in 1822, 1824 and 1825 and was indeed their president 1823–5. He was a cousin of Arthur Heywood, another banker and William Roscoe's organizer at his successful fight for a Liverpool seat in Parliament in 1806. Charles Tayleur, merchant of 61 Duke Street, Liverpool and ship owner of Liverpool and Warrington, Robert Benson, merchant of 72 Duke Street, Liverpool, George Barclay, merchant of George Barclay and Co., or Barclay, Salkeld and Co., both at Goree Piazzas, Liverpool, and Joseph Reynolds of the Coalbrookdale Ironworks can all be traced through their connection with the Rathbone family, merchants of Liverpool.³⁷ William Rathbone (1757–1809) was a Quaker Liverpool merchant and reputedly the first importer (in 1784) of American cotton into England; he was, like his son William Rathbone (1787–1868), a strong Radical opposed to slavery and the Napoleonic Wars and in favour of parliamentary reform.³⁸ William Rathbone (1757–1809) was the only notable merchant in Roscoe's Literary Society in Liverpool of 1783–1793³⁹ and thus was one of the few Liverpool men to bridge — like Roscoe — the gulf between commerce and culture. George Barclay and Charles Tayleur were in the Rathbone circle in the first decade of the nineteenth century.

Robert Benson senior married Sarah, sister of William Rathbone (1757–1809), in 1781, and he and that William Rathbone formed the firm of Rathbone and Benson, merchants, of Liverpool in 1789 — the firm that later became more famous in 1809 as Rathbone Brothers.⁴⁰ Robert Benson junior, merchant of 72 Duke Street, Liverpool, was the benefactor of the Liverpool Royal Institution. In 1786 William Rathbone (1757–1809) married Hannah Mary, daughter (by his first wife) of Richard Reynolds of Bristol, a great Quaker philanthropist and partner with Abraham Darby in the Coalbrookdale Ironworks. Joseph Reynolds was the son of this Richard Reynolds (by his second wife) and succeeded his father at the ironworks. His daughter, Hannah Mary, married in 1817 Richard Rathbone (1788–1860), second son of William Rathbone (1757–1809).⁴¹ The Rathbone family themselves do not appear in the official list of subscribers but William Roscoe's son, Henry Roscoe, stated that William Rathbone (1788–1860) was the leader of the subscribers.⁴² The providers of Britain's first notable permanent art gallery were therefore predominantly (like Roscoe himself) Radical, Nonconformist and mercantile; the Liverpool landed families, the Stanleys, the Blundells, the Molyneux, the Gascoynes are not represented although all played a major part in Liverpool affairs and at least the first two were great collectors. It was a new gallery and the work of new men.

NOTES

- 1 Roscoe's altered draft which includes a reference to a letter from Dr. Thomas Stewart Traill is in the Liverpool Royal Institution Archives, Liverpool University, MS.3.52(8).
- 2 J. Byam Shaw, *Paintings by Old Masters at Christ Church, Oxford* (Oxford, 1967), pp. 3ff.
- 3 *Catalogue of the Pictures in the Gallery of Alleyn's College of God's Gift at Dulwich* (London, 1926), pp. xi–xv, 301–2.
- 4 *Resolutions, Reports and Bye-Laws of the Liverpool Royal Institution March 1814 – March 1822* (Liverpool, 1822), pp. 25–28 quoting the Detailed Plan of the Liverpool Institution of August 1814 which specifies among its proposals: 'Collections of Specimens of Art'. Henry A. Ormerod, *The Liverpool Royal Institution, A Record and a Retrospect* (Liverpool, 1953), pp. 9–41 is the other major source of information on the Liverpool Royal Institution.
- 5 Shaw, *Paintings by Old Masters*, p. 15; *Dulwich Catalogue*, p. xxx; and Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, *Catalogue of Paintings* (Cambridge, 1960), I, p. vii.

- 6 The most important of these for Liverpool was probably *Engravings of the Most Noble the Marquis of Stafford's Collection of Pictures in London, arranged according to schools and in chronological order with remarks on each picture by William Young Ottley* (London, 1818). Ottley was one of Roscoe's friends and advisers. The detailed catalogues of the Musée des Monuments Français and the Musée Napoleon were probably the decisive influence.
- 7 *Dulwich Catalogue*, p. xv.
- 8 *Resolutions, Reports*, p. 5 quoting from the Report of the State of the Liverpool Royal Institution 14 March 1820; see also Ormerod, *Liverpool Royal Institution*, p. 35.
- 9 N. Pevsner, *A History of Building Types* (London, 1976), pp. 114ff.
- 10 Clement de Ris, *Les Musées de Province* (Paris, 1849–1861), I, p. 4 reproduces the decree.
- 11 See W. T. Whitley, *Art in England 1821–1837* (London, 1930), pp. 35–6 and Victoria and Albert Museum, Press Cuttings Book, VI, p. 1704.
- 12 *Resolutions, Reports*, pp. 3–4.
- 13 These figures are based on Roscoe's Sale Catalogue: *Catalogue of the genuine and entire Collection of Drawings and Pictures the property of William Roscoe which will be sold by Auction by Mr. Winstanley* (Liverpool, 1816). As for the drawings only about a quarter were pre-High Renaissance (or pre-1700 if northern rather than Italian).
- 14 The extent and source of Roscoe's wealth have not been investigated. Ian Sellers, 'William Roscoe, the Roscoe Circle and Radical Politics in Liverpool 1787–1807', *T.H.S.L.C.*, CXX (1968), p. 54 writes: 'Roscoe, by means which are even to-day obscure, acquired his personal fortune'. Roscoe, however, was an attorney from 1774 to 1796 and Robert Robson, *The Attorney in Eighteenth Century England* (London, 1959), pp. 56–58, 68ff, 73–4, 77, 119ff demonstrates the wealth of that profession.
- 15 Roscoe's Advertisement to his *Catalogue of the genuine and entire Collection* runs: ' . . . yet as they (the paintings and drawings) extend beyond the splendid aera of 1500 there will be found several productions of a higher class . . . '.
- 16 *Catalogue of the genuine and entire Collection*.
- 17 Henry Roscoe, *The Life of William Roscoe* (London, 1833), I, pp. 67ff.
- 18 Roscoe, *William Roscoe*, I, pp. 460ff.
- 19 Roscoe, *William Roscoe*, II, pp. 155ff. It was printed as *A Discourse delivered on the opening of the Liverpool Royal Institution, 25th November 1817*.
- 20 Roscoe, *William Roscoe*, II, p. 56. Thomas Noble in a letter of 26 Oct. 1814 offered Roscoe help in this project (Liv. R.O., Roscoe Papers 2806).
- 21 Hugh Macandrew, 'Henry Fuseli and William Roscoe', *Liverpool Bulletin*, VIII (1959–1960), pp. 5ff.
- 22 Joseph Mayer, *Early Exhibitions of Art in Liverpool* (Liverpool, 1876), *passim*.
- 23 He was Treasurer of the Liverpool Academy of Arts which organized these exhibitions.
- 24 Roscoe, *William Roscoe*, II, pp. 103ff.; *The Farington Diary*, ed. J. Greig (London, 1928), VIII, pp. 54, 83; Letter from William Roscoe to John McCreery 18 June 1816 (Liv. R.O., Roscoe Papers 2525); Letter from

- William Roscoe to Thomas Coke of 11 June 1816 Letter from William Shepherd to Thomas Coke of 2 October 1816: MSS. of Earl of Leicester, Holkham Hall, Norfolk (hereafter Holkham MSS.).
- 25 A copy is in the Manchester City Libraries stuck into their copy of the Roscoe 1816 Sale Catalogue.
 - 26 Both Trevor Fawcett in *The Rise of English Provincial Art* (Oxford, 1974), p. 98 and C. P. Darcy, *The Encouragement of the Fine Arts in Lancashire* (Chetham Soc., 3rd series, XXIV, 1976), p. 60 state that Roscoe did in fact buy in many of the paintings at his sale despite his denials.
 - 27 Letter from Roscoe to Dr. Thomas Stewart Traill of 16 June 1818 (Liv. R.O., Roscoe Papers 4861 A).
 - 28 Correspondence between Roscoe, a Mr. Smith and William Bullock, one letter dated 14 December 1819 (Liv. R.O., Roscoe Papers 573-4) and letter from Roscoe to Thomas Coke of 4 April 1819 (Holkham MSS.).
 - 29 Taking the highest possible figure derived from the printed price list in the Manchester City Libraries.
 - 30 The buyers at Roscoe's Sales can often be identified from lists of buyers stuck into the copies of the sale catalogue now owned by the British Museum and the Getty Library. A printed price list is stuck into the Manchester City Libraries' copy.
 - 31 Ormerod, *Liverpool Royal Institution*, p. 12.
 - 32 *Resolutions, Reports*, p. 17.
 - 33 W. A. Munford, *William Ewart M.P. 1798-1869* (London, 1960), pp. 17-21.
 - 34 G. J. S. Broomhall and John H. Hubcock, *Corn Trade Memories* (London, 1930), p. 153 and *A Letter addressed to the Liverpool Society for the Abolition of Slavery* (Liverpool, 1824). He was also a buyer at Roscoe's 1816 Sales.
 - 35 John Hughes, *Liverpool Banks and Bankers* (Liverpool, 1906), pp. 96-7.
 - 36 *Arguments demonstrating from recent facts the solid foundation of individual circulating credit, and showing that it is impossible by the legislative enactments at present under consideration to restore and retain the circulation of gold coin in this kingdom* (Liverpool, 1819).
 - 37 *Reynolds-Rathbone Diaries and Letters 1753-1839*, ed. E. Greg (London, 1905), pp. 21-149, containing the diary of Hannah Mary Reynolds Rathbone (1784-1809), wife of William Rathbone (1757-1809), mentions all four of them.
 - 38 Both of these William Rathbones are in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; see also Eleanor F. Rathbone, *William Rathbone, a Memoir* (London, 1905).
 - 39 Roscoe, *William Roscoe*, I, p. 127.
 - 40 *Reynolds-Rathbone Diaries, passim*, and *Records of the Rathbone Family*, ed. E. A. Rathbone (London, 1913), pp. 88-89. Robert Benson, too, was a buyer at Roscoe's 1816 Sales.
 - 41 See particularly *Reynolds-Rathbone Diaries*, Appendices VI and VII.
 - 42 Roscoe, *William Roscoe*, II, p. 140. Moreover in late 1816 Roscoe was actually living with the Rathbones (letter from Roscoe to Thomas Coke, 16 November 1816 (Holkham MSS.)).