

## More accurate publication dates for H.C. Andrews' *The Heathery*, particularly volumes 5 and 6

R.J. CLEEVELY\*, E.C. NELSON\*\* and E.G.H. OLIVER\*\*\*

**Keywords:** dates of publication, *Erica* L.

### ABSTRACT

Using three types of evidence—dated watermarks; dates of flowering of *Erica* L. species in cultivation in England; dates on which Andrews prepared the original drawings—it is concluded that the six volumes of Henry Charles Andrews' *The Heathery* were published as follows: volume 1, not earlier than June 1805; volume 2, not earlier than 1806; volume 3, 1806; volume 4, 1807; volume 5, not before 1816; volume 6, late in 1828. Consequently, most, if not all, of Andrews' new names for *Erica* species were first published in *Coloured engravings of heaths*.

### INTRODUCTION

Henry Charles Andrews published *The Heathery* as a convenient, working edition of his lavish, large-format part-work *Coloured engravings of heaths*. When completed, *The Heathery* comprised six volumes, each containing 50 hand-coloured plates with accompanying brief text, and an alphabetical index numbering the plates. The introductory pages were essentially similar to those in *Coloured engravings* but the text was revised according to experience. Inevitably, the 'Introduction' (in vol. 1) was quite different and solely an explanation of the new work; it contained a statement that *The Heathery* would be published in parts (as all Andrews' other publications had been) and that 'when one volume is completed, every necessary requisite for binding will be given'. However, it is our contention that this was not the case, and that the individual volumes of *The Heathery* were published as separate, complete volumes. There is no evidence known to us in the form of wrappers or partial sets of unbound parts that *The Heathery* were issued, like *Coloured engravings of heaths*, in sequential fascicles for later collation and binding.

As with *Coloured engravings of heaths*, which has been discussed in detail by Cleevely & Oliver (2002), the dates of issue of *The Heathery*, especially the last two volumes, are problematic. The title pages of the six volumes are dated as follows: 1, 1804; 2, 1804; 3, 1806; 4, 1807; 5, 1809; 6, 1804 (for comment on the title page of the last volume, see below). Hitherto, taxonomists (e.g. Dulfer 1965) have accepted those dates as the correct publication dates, except for that of vol. 6; for the sixth volume, 1812 has been the date generally cited in botanical monographs following Pritzel (1872). Kerkham (1988) gave 1804–1809 as the date range for publication of the six volumes of *The Heathery* but also remarked

that 'Vol. 6 must have been published much later as there are 1826 watermarks in it.' Stafleu & Mennega (1992) accounted for only the first four volumes stating the dates from the title pages.

At present, we have been unable to discover how *The Heathery* was advertised, sold or distributed. We have not been able to trace any published references to it in contemporary periodicals.

In this paper we present evidence supporting Kerkham's (1988) remarks and contradicting the title page dates for vols 1, 2, 5 and 6. We conclude that those dates are far too early, and in particular that instead of publication of vols 5 and 6 of *The Heathery* preceding publication of *Coloured engravings of heaths*, those two volumes, like the previous four, were published after the relevant fascicles of *Coloured engravings of heaths*.

We have examined the sets of *The Heathery* held in the following libraries and a private collection; data extracted from these copies are held by the authors on a database: 1, Lindley Library, Royal Horticultural Society, London (complete); 2, The Linnean Society of London (partial set, vols 1–3); 3, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew (partial set, vols 1–3, parts of vols 4 and 5); 4, Bolus Herbarium, University of Cape Town (cited as BOL by Kerkham (1988)) (complete); 5, Compton Herbarium, National Botanical Institute, Kirstenbosch (formerly in Cape Government Herbarium) (complete); 6, Molteno Library, National Botanical Institute, Kirstenbosch (partial set, vols 1–3); 7, South African National Library (formerly called South African Library), Cape Town (cited as SAL by Kerkham (1988)) (complete); 8, Walter J. Middelmann, Rondebosch, Cape Town (complete).

It is surprising that so few complete copies seem to exist, and the occurrence of incomplete sets of the plates, especially from the later volumes, might indicate that these could be obtained separately, or even in fascicles, although, as noted, we do not consider this to be the case. Alternatively, it might be that the volumes really were heavily used as 'working' tools—Andrews described *The Heathery* as a 'green-house companion'—and suffered accordingly.

\* High Croft, Gunswell Lane, South Molton, Devon, EX36 4DH, United Kingdom.

\*\* Cultivar Registrar, The Heather Society, Tippitwitchet Cottage, Hall Road, Outwell, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire, PE14 8PE, United Kingdom.

\*\*\* Compton Herbarium, National Botanical Institute, Private Bag X7, 7735 Claremont, Cape Town.

MS. received: 2002–10–11.

## THE HEATHERY: PLATES

The plates published in *The Heatherly* are directly related to the plates in *Coloured engraving of heaths*. Comparison of the individual illustrations indicates that *The Heatherly* plates, which, as noted below, are invariably dated *after* the companion ones in *Coloured engravings of heaths*, show only a small portion of the plant as portrayed in the main work. Many, but not all, *The Heatherly* illustrations are reversed and in some instances alterations are evident. The enlarged dissections, arrayed along the bottom of each plate in *The Heatherly* are also either mirror images or redrawn or new. The redrawn dissections sometimes differ in details—broader appendages, filaments omitted, or the ovary now included in the small gynoecium/androecium dissection—and in most of these cases the whole drawing is redone with the anthers in different positions and with a different aspect. Reversed images corroborate evidence of the engraved publication dates that Andrews prepared new plates for *The Heatherly*, often, but not always, using the printed plates from *Coloured engraving of heaths* as the templates. Had he used his original drawings as templates for the engravings published in both books, the images would all have had the same orientation.

Regarding engraved dates on botanical illustrations published in Great Britain during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, under an Act of Parliament (8 George II.c.13) passed in 1734, authors of an engraved work were granted copyright protection 'to commence from the day of the first publishing thereof, which shall be truly engraved with the name of the proprietor on each plate, and printed on every such print or prints' (see Henrey 1975: II, p. 664; Stearn 1940). Thus the legally required engraved date *should* be the exact date of publication. However, by the early nineteenth century, although this act and several subsequent ones were still in force, authors, including Andrews, began to abandon the practise of engraving dates on their illustrations, probably because the necessarily lengthy process of production of these hand-coloured illustrations meant that engraved dates were not the true dates of publication.

## THE HEATHERY: VOLUMES 1-4

It is generally accepted that the first four volumes of *The Heatherly* are not of nomenclatural significance. While the dates on the title pages are not always consistent with the contents, amending the dates of publication of these volumes will not cause shifts in the priority of names.

Volume 1 has a title page dated 1804, but according to the dates engraved on the 50 plates, almost two-thirds (29) of the plates were not prepared until 1805. The latest engraved date is June 1805 (*Erica walkeria*: t. 50). It should be noted that with a single exception, all the engraved dates in this volume post-date those on the corresponding plates in *Coloured engravings of heaths*. The one exception is the plate depicting *Erica pubescens minima* which is dated May 1805 in *The Heatherly* (t. 39) but 1 June 1805 in *Coloured engravings of heaths* (vol. 2: t. 124).

The watermarks in copies of this volume are confusing. While the dates 1804 and 1805 predominate in the copies we have examined, it is clear from paper dated 1808, 1810, 1812 and 1822 that both plates and text pages were reprinted on more than one occasion, probably as customers requested copies or back numbers.

We conclude that contrary to the date on the title page, vol. 1 was issued not earlier than June 1805.

Volume 2 has a title page dated 1804, but according to the engraved dates this could not have been issued before 1806. Forty-two plates are dated 1805, six are dated 1806. Without exception, all the engraved dates coincide with or post-date those on the corresponding plates in *Coloured engravings of heaths*. Watermark dates range between 1803 and 1805, although one text page with 1808 has been noted.

We conclude that contrary to the date on the title page, vol. 2 was issued not earlier than 1806.

Volume 3 has a title page dated 1806 and 36 plates are also so dated. Two plates are dated 1805 but none is dated 1807. As with vol. 2, all the engraved dates coincide with or post-date those on the corresponding plates in *Coloured engravings of heaths*. We have not detected any anachronistic watermarks in this volume; the dates that can be determined are 1803, 1804 and 1805.

It is probable that this volume was completed in 1806, and as it would be odd if it was published before vol. 2, the two could have been issued together.

Volume 4 has a title page dated 1807. Five plates are dated 1806 and 26 are dated 1807. One 1809 watermark date has been detected but could indicate a reprinting of that plate (*Erica canaliculata minor*: t. 157). As with vols 2 and 3 all the engraved dates coincide with or post-date those on the corresponding plates in *Coloured engravings of heaths*.

These suggest that vol. 4 was completed and perhaps published in 1807.

In a catalogue issued in 1813, Andrews stated that he had 'finished his various botanical works' and sought 'to remind ... his Patrons' that they 'may now complete their sets'—*Coloured engravings of heaths* was stated to comprise three volumes and *The Heatherly* just four volumes (Andrews 1813: [i]). Judging by Andrews' phraseology, he deemed these works complete. Thus it seems that publication of volume 5 of *The Heatherly* and volume 4 of *Coloured engravings of heaths* had not been commenced in 1813.

## THE HEATHERY: VOLUMES 5 AND 6

The evidence for much later dates than those stated for vols 5 ('1809') and 6 ('1804') is three-fold; first, dated watermarks [as noted by Kerkham (1988)]; second, the dates when the portrayed heathers flowered in England; third, the dates on which the original drawings were stated to have been prepared by Andrews.

As far as we can ascertain, the sixth volume did not have a separate, new title page. For some unknown reason, Andrews re-used the title page of volume 1 but had it modified by hand, the Roman numeral 'V' being neatly inserted before the original numeral 'I'. Thereby the volume number was amended from one to six, whereas the date '1804' remained unaltered. He followed the same procedure with vol. 4 of *Coloured engravings of heaths*, re-using the title page of the first volume and inserting by hand the Roman numeral 'V' after the 'I' (see Cleevely & Oliver 2002: 249).

### Watermarks

When using watermarks to date publications, several points have to be borne in mind. Despite the requirements of the Paper Act of 1794 that enabled paper manufacturers to qualify for exemption from the payment of Excise Duty on any paper produced for export, they were not meticulous in changing the date used in their moulds. The date 1794, in particular, occurs in many publications printed between that year and 1801. Secondly, in a study of dated papers, Heywood (1950) concluded that the average interval between the making of a paper and its actual use was a little under three years.

Although virtually all the watermarks found in *The Heathery* are of Whatman papers, these were made at two different mills and by two separate businesses. The watermark 'J. WHATMAN' was retained by William Balston when he sold the premises of Turkey Mill to the Hollingworth Brothers in 1806, on the dissolution of the partnership he had had with them since 1794. The name of the mill was added to the Whatman name in order that it could continue to be used by the Hollingworths from 1807.

Balston briefly used 'WRB' upon opening his new Springfield Mill (one of the first to rely on steam power) in 1807. After 1814, he adopted various other designations with the Whatman mark which reflected the management of the new business. These included 'J. Whatman & W. Balston' and later 'J. Whatman & W. Balston & Co.', followed, after 1822 when his son joined him, by 'W. Balston & Son' (Balston 1954).

The occurrence of the dated watermarks 'W. Balston & Co. 1815' and 'Balston 1815' in copies of *The Heathery*, apart from the date itself, support the thesis that the publication date of vol. 5 cannot be earlier than 1816. It has been claimed by Balston (1954: 124) that 'there is only one known instance of a Balston watermark after 1816', although other examples in that work and our current examination refute this.

As already noted, Kerkham (1988) remarked that 'vol. 6 must have been published much later as there are 1826 watermarks in it.' However, it must be kept in mind that we have detected watermark dates as late as 1822 in vol. 1, so we urge treating the watermark evidence with circumspection.

The following is a summary of the watermark evidence: Volume 5: in the examined copies, we have detected six plates with dated watermarks for 1812, eight text pages and two plates with 1815, and one text page and two plates dated 1816; Volume 6: in the examined copies, we have

detected the following dates: 1824 (four: one plate; three text pages); 1825 (five plates); 1826 (ten; two plates; eight text pages); 1828 (one plate).

### Dates of raising and flowering

All the plants portrayed in *The Heathery* and in *Coloured engraving of heaths* were cultivated in English gardens, and Andrews proclaimed on the title page of *Coloured engraving of heaths* (1802: vol. 1) that 'the drawings [were] taken from living plants only.' Given this, the dates of raising and of flowering are clearly of importance in determining dates of publication because, put simply, a plant could not be included in any illustrated work until it had been raised in an English garden or nursery and grown until it bloomed. This is especially significant when it is recognized that many of the heathers included in vols 5 and 6 of *The Heathery* were horticultural variants, sometimes artificial hybrids, produced in England. Some plants were even unique, known to Andrews only from a single individual.

There is however one difficulty with Andrews' dates, as demonstrated by this example. Regarding *E. beaumontia*, Andrews stated that 'This fine new species of *Erica* was raised from Cape seed last Autumn, 1827, and flowered the ensuing summer for the first time at the Nursery of Messrs Rollisson, Lower Tooting ...'. To raise seedlings of any heather and get them to bloom within nine months, which is the approximate interval between 'late Autumn 1827' and the 'ensuing summer', is impossible. Even with modern glasshouse facilities the minimum time from seedlings appearing to flowering is  $\pm$  three years. Thus Andrews' dates of raising are suspect, although he may only have reported the information that Messrs Rollisson gave him. As for flowering dates, there is no apparent reason to doubt their accuracy because only plants that had bloomed are illustrated.

The dates that Andrews gave in vol. 4 of *Coloured engraving of heaths* for plants which he also featured in vol. 5 of *The Heathery* and which post-date its stated year of publication, 1809, are summarized in Table 1. For vol. 6, only those which post-date 1819 are summarized.

TABLE 1.—Dates of *Erica* plants featured in vols 5 and 6 of *The Heathery*

Vol. 5	
<i>dumosa</i> (t. 213)	raised 1815
<i>sulphurea</i> (t. 241)	raised 1814
Vol. 6	
<i>bauera</i> (t. 252)	bloomed autumn 1823
<i>beaumontia</i> (t. 253)	raised 1827; bloomed 1828
<i>costata superba</i> (t. 256)	raised 1820
<i>droseroides minor</i> (t. 259)	raised autumn 1820
<i>minutiflora</i> (t. 270)	raised 1822
<i>ruber-calyx</i> (t. 285)	raised 1825
<i>russeliana</i> (t. 286)	raised summer 1824
<i>suaveolens</i> (t. 292)	raised 1828
<i>templea</i> (t. 293)	raised about 1820
<i>tenuiflora carnea</i> (t. 294)	raised 1824
<i>vernix rubra</i> (t. 298)	raised 1823, bloomed spring 1824
<i>viridiflora</i> (t. 299)	first observed 1820

Those dates alone are sufficient to point to publication dates not earlier than 1815 for vol. 5, and not before 1828 for vol. 6.

### Drawing dates

Given the relationship between the plates in *Coloured engravings of heaths* and *The Heathery* when Andrews gave a date for the illustration in the former (Table 2), it can be argued that this date must also apply to *The Heathery*. Andrews dated the following illustrations (see Cleevly & Oliver 2002).

TABLE 2.—Dates of *Erica* illustrations in *Coloured engravings of heaths* and *The Heathery*

Vol. 5	
<i>argenteiflora</i> (t. 202)	1814
<i>praestans</i> (t. 231)	June 1810
<i>regerminans</i> (t. 235)	1810
<i>splendens</i> (t. 240)	1816
<i>taxifolia major</i> (t. 243)	1809
<i>thunbergia</i> (t. 244)	October 1815
Vol. 6	
<i>cruciformis</i> (t. 258)	1819
<i>exurgens hybrida</i> (t. 261)	autumn 1824
<i>foliacea</i> (t. 263)	summer 1822
<i>glomerata</i> (t. 264)	1818
<i>imperialis</i> (t. 266)	November 1818
<i>lawsonia</i> (t. 267)	summer 1818
<i>mirabilis</i> (t. 271)	summer 1824
<i>nivalis</i> (t. 274)	May 1820
<i>peltata</i> (t. 276)	1823
<i>pellucida rubra</i> (t. 277)	1816
<i>quadrangularis</i> (t. 280)	1819
<i>radiata discolor</i> (t. 281)	autumn 1826
<i>reflexa</i> (t. 283)	summer 1822
<i>refulgens</i> (t. 284)	1819
<i>serpyllifolia</i> (t. 289)	summer 1826
<i>transparens</i> (t. 296)	February 1820
<i>undulata</i> (t. 300)	summer 1828

Thus there are illustrations in vol. 5 that were not prepared until 1816, and the final illustration in vol. 6 was not completed until the summer of 1828.

### CONCLUSION

As long as it is accepted that *The Heathery* was published as a sequence of separate, intact volumes, the watermarks in vol. 5 indicate a publication date not earlier than 1815 and the raising and blooming dates corroborate that year, whereas the dates on which the plates were drawn, imply that this volume cannot have been issued before 1816 when Andrews drew *E. splendens* (t. 240).

Regarding vol. 6, the watermarks signal that it cannot have appeared earlier than 1826, whereas the raising and blooming dates point to publication late in 1828, a date that is confirmed by the fact that Andrews only drew *E. undulata* (t. 300) in the summer of 1828.

We conclude that the dates of publication of H.C. Andrews' *The Heathery* are: Volume 1: not before June 1805; Volume 2: not before 1806; Volume 3: 1806; Volume 4: 1807; Volume 5: not before 1816; Volume 6: late 1828.

As a consequence, it can be concluded that most, if not all, of H.C. Andrews' new names for *Erica* species were first published in *Coloured engravings of heaths*.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to Tony Swann and Walter Middelman for their co-operation, and to the staff of the several libraries noted for access to copies of *The Heathery*.

### REFERENCES

- ANDREWS, H.C. 1794–± 1828. *Coloured engravings of heaths*. The author, London. 4 volumes.
- ANDREWS, H.C. '1804'–'1809'. *The Heathery; or a monograph of the genus Erica*. The author, London. 6 volumes.
- ANDREWS, H.C. 1813. *A catalogue (raisonné) of the original and select pictures: now exposed to the public, at the London gallery, 22, Piccadilly, late Bullock's Museum*. The author, London.
- BALSTON, T. 1954. *William Balston, papermaker (1759–1849)*. Methuen, London.
- CLEEVELY, R.J. & OLIVER, E.G.H. 2002. A preliminary note on the publication dates of H.C. Andrews' Coloured engravings of heaths (1794–1830). *Archives of natural history* 29: 245–264.
- DULFER, H. 1965. Revision der südafrikanischen Arten der Gattung *Erica* L. 2 Teil. *Annalen des Naturhistorischen Museums in Wien* 68: 25–177.
- HENREY, B. 1975. *British botanical and horticultural literature before 1800. II. The eighteenth century history*. Oxford University Press, London.
- HEYWOOD, E. 1951. *Watermarks, mainly of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries*. Hilversum.
- KERKHAM, A.S. 1988. *Southern African botanical literature 1600–1988*. South African Library, Cape Town.
- PRITZEL, G.A. 1872. *Thesaurus literaturae botanicae*, edn 2. Brockhaus, Leipzig.
- STAFLEU, F.A. & MENNEGA, E.A. 1992. *Taxonomic literature. Supplement I: A–Ba*. Koeltz Scientific Books, Königstein.
- STEARN, W.T. 1940. Bibliographical notes: CX Schneevogt and Schwegman's 'Icones Plantarum Rariorum'. *Journal of Botany* 78: 67 (note 7).