MR. SMOLLETT'S VICE OF PLAYGOING, which so appalled her Presbyterian neighbors, apparently infected Dyce. The young man who marveled at Colman's pasteboard elephants acquired an addiction to worthier spectacles, and he became associated with scores of actors, playwrights, and others involved with nineteenth-century theater. His account of this tribe will alter no reputations; rather, it is a vademecum displaying the variety of talent and temperament in this crucial period of British stage-history.

I have divided the articles into "Major Characters" (the Kembles and Keans) and "Minor Characters" (the rest). For the first group, Dyce's capsule biographies will suffice; his summary treatment of the others must also suffice, though at least one of them, Dora Jordan, is considerably more than minor. Nearly all the persons in this chapter are in the DNB, and further information can be derived from the basic bibliography that I have appended below. It supplements Dyce's notes, the titles in which were generally "standard" in their time. I refer to this bibliography with short titles in my own notes.

This chapter is valuable primarily for its elaboration of Dyce's expert judgment. At the same time, he has left us a great deal of new factual information. Hillebrand (see below) does not record Edmund Kean's
drunken fit over his son's body; the American letters of Charles Kean supplement those in Carson; the Kenney epistles show the timeless stratagems employed in backstage finagling; and so on. As Dyce ingenuously says of Raymond's *Memoirs of Elliston*, these essays will be "entertaining to those who are interested in the biography of players."

Dyce's observations began when the precise and artificial "neoclassicism" of Kemble was giving way to Kean's "naturalism." The latter style is exemplified by the amazing boast of Kean's son: "We shall have in one scene [of *King John*] 150 persons on the stage." (Not surprisingly, the younger Kean also derides an attempt by Samuel Phelps to perform *Richard III* as Shakespeare wrote it.) Although fair to both sides, Dyce's appreciation of Kemble is perhaps heightened by his personal antipathy to Edmund Kean ("a low blackguard") and by nostalgia owing to the manifest and progressive theatrical decay in his lifetime.

Much of "John Kemble," chiefly the remarks on Kemble's acting, first appeared in *The Album* IV, no. 8 (April 1825), 253–72, an essay signed "D." Dyce has added several anecdotes, while altering or excising many others. I do not know why he failed to credit his previous article, nor can I explain his evident intention not to indicate that Mrs. Charles Kemble's letters were to William Harness. In the latter case, it should be noted that his over-all intention is unclear.

Some comment is necessary on two of the "minor" articles. The current opinion of Mrs. Piozzi's letters to Conway is that they are a "diabolical fabrication" (James L. Clifford, *Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale)* [Oxford, 1941], p. 470). Clifford cites Percival Merritt, *The True Story of the So-called Love Letters of Mrs. Piozzi: "In Defense of an Elderly Lady"* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927). And Merritt, in turn, reprints an important review of the *Letters* from the *Athenaum*, no. 1815 (9 Aug. 1862), 169–72, the thesis of which is that the letters were distorted by the anonymous editor. Dyce has overlooked the *Athenaum* review; Merritt does not take into account the article in the *New Monthly Magazine* cited by Dyce; and with that I will let the matter rest.

Finally, "George Raymond" is the fullest piece on this author that I have been able to locate. The *DNB*, that house of many mansions, has
seen fit to exclude him, and in ascribing the *Lone Hut* Nicoll wavers between him and one "Richard John Raymond" (*English Drama*, IV, 389, 606). Nicoll does not list *More Plots Than One*.


