A Dickens Photographer Identified: Adolphe Naudin

LEON LITVACK

In the archives of the Charles Dickens Museum there exists a cabinet photograph of the author, surrounded by his friends, family, and three dogs, on the lawn at Gad’s Hill. The description on the back of this image, dated 1864, identifies the photographer as Robert Hindry Mason (1824-85); however, a careful scrutiny of the evidence tells a different story.

The image has been published before: in B.W. Matz’s Memorial edition of John Forster’s *Life of Charles Dickens*, and in J.W.T. Ley’s *The Dickens Circle*. While it is relatively unfamiliar today, when it was first issued it had a popular appeal. It appeared in November 1864, as the first image of the inaugural issue of *Naudin’s Portfolio*, a series of six small assortments of photographs (issued monthly, until April 1865), comprising well known public buildings, such as Strathfeld Saye House (home of the Duke of Wellington) and Broadlands (country seat of Viscount Palmerston), together with an image of the Oxford Boat Race Crew, and cartes de visite of such famous figures as Anthony Trollope, Marcus Stone, and Mrs. Henry Wood. The cabinet photographs, each of which occupied an entire page, were accompanied, on the opposite leaf, by a description, written by Hamilton Hume, the series editor. The text for the Dickens image, entitled ‘GADSHILL’, ran as follows:

GADSHILL, in the parish of Higham, Kent, on the old high road between Canterbury and London, is the spot described by Shakespeare, where Henry Prince of Wales and his dissolute companions robbed the Kentish carriers, and the auditors who were carrying money to his father’s exchequer:—
“But my lads, my lads, to-morrow morning, by four o’clock, early at Gadshill: there are pilgrims going to Canterbury with rich offerings, and traders riding to London, with fat purses: I have visors for you all, you have horses for yourselves.”

Gadshill Place, the subject of our picture, and the residence of CHARLES DICKENS, Esq., stands on the summit of Shakespeare’s Gadshill. The house itself is of no very great age, and was formerly used as a parsonage. It is a singular coincidence that, when a boy, this spot, which the noble fancy of our greatest dramatist has rendered ever memorable, had a peculiar fascination for Mr. Dickens, and the resolutions which he then made, at some future day to become possessor of the property, have been fully realized. Since the estate came into his possession, the house has been so improved and added to that very little of the old building can be recognized. In the valuable library at Gadshill are the original manuscripts of “David Copperfield,” “Dombey,” “Bleak House,” “Martin Chuzzlewit,” and, in fact, of all Mr. Dickens’ works, with the exception of the papers of the immortal Pickwick.

Amongst the group upon the lawn will be recognized Mr. Dickens, Mr. Fechter, Mr. Wilkie Collins, and Mr. Charles Allston Collins.

On the back cover of the publication the aim of the series is outlined:

The object of this Work of Art is to present the public, monthly, with a collection of Photographic Portraits and Biographical Memoirs of those Men and Women who have made themselves celebrated in the various walks of life. . . . To make the Work more valuable and attractive, a large-sized Photograph will be given of the country seat of some distinguished individual, and an interesting account of the same.

Despite this claim, there is little to hold the attention of readers interested in the particulars of Dickens’s mansion: none of the features of the building, or the garden
(about which he was very particular), or the tunnel which ran under the Gravesend Road, is given prominence. Also, only four of the people are identified by name – and not in the order in which they appear in the image.

Fig. 1: Adolphe Naudin, ‘GADSHILL’ (cabinet size albumen print). By kind permission of the Charles Dickens Museum.
The circumstances under which the photograph was taken are unknown, and its date cannot be conclusively established, other than to say that it was probably taken in the early autumn of 1864. What is clear, though, is that Dickens was rather particular about opportunities for engagement with photographers. On 12 October 1864 he wrote to an unidentified photographic artist named Charles Manby, displaying his aversion to having himself photographed: ‘I really am not free to sit. If I sat at all, I should have to sit to half a dozen other people first – and I hate it altogether – and am as little disposed ever to sit again as anybody living can well be’. By this date he had already sat for Antoine François Jean Claudet (1797-1867) and John Jabez Edwin Mayall (1813-1901), as well as for (George) Herbert Watkins (1828-1916) and his brother John Watkins (1823-74). He had also been photographed by Robert Hindry Mason in 1862 and 1863, and would sit for him again on 6 August and 14 November 1866, and possibly other occasions. Clearly Dickens knew the importance of publicity, and photographic images of him were widely and cheaply available to his audiences on both sides of the Atlantic. On occasion he provided friends with signed copies of cartes de visite, which would have increased the value of the images considerably. In the 1860s he had made agreements with three British photographers – Mason and the Watkins brothers – to produce high-quality posed images of him in a fascinating series of guises. It is curious, therefore, that he should agree to this other photograph to be taken by Naudin.

Adolphe Naudin is largely known for his production of the six numbers of Naudin’s Portfolio. He opened a studio at 124 Brompton Road, in London’s West End in late September 1864. In the advertisement which appeared in the Times he announced himself as the purveyor of ‘Vignettes, miniatures, and full-size portraits (plain or coloured)’, and stated that he was able to capture images of ‘Horses, dogs, mansions, interiors of rooms’, and could take on commissions in ‘any part of England’. An advertisement appeared in the Times on 31 October 1864 for Part 1 of Naudin’s Portfolio,
which had sold out within a month, thus prompting a second edition to be issued. The images in the Portfolio were on display in Naudin’s studio, and were available for purchase as either individual cartes de visite or cabinet photographs. Naudin traded until at least May 1867, after which all trace of him is lost.

As an effective artistic image, the photograph does not stand up well to scrutiny. The composition clearly emphasises the front of the house, and in particular the pillared portico, with wooden seats on each side, the ornate lantern at the apex of the small roof, and the bay-windowed library, which is at the centre of the image, with Mamie’s bedroom directly above; the human subjects are dwarfed by this imposing structure (Fig. 1). Several features of the garden are in sharp focus – for example, the laurel bush in the foreground on the left, and the variegated holly on both sides of the front door; the geraniums which grew under the windows are also visible. It is difficult to establish the identities of most of the subjects – except, perhaps, the recumbent Dickens, who is dressed in a grey tweed suit and bowler hat; his outfit is identical to the one worn in other photographs taken by Mason in the summer of 1863. His gaze is directed off to his left, and he does not seem to be aware of his family or his guests. Dickens is not at the centre of the action in this image, though his pose does seem relaxed – entirely appropriate for a man who was comfortable in his domestic surroundings.
A close-up of the figures (Fig. 2) offers greater detail and interest. They are arranged in the style of the *tableau vivant* – a photographic genre which was made popular in this period by Oscar Gustav Rejlander. Wilkie Collins (on the extreme left), a trusted Dickens companion, whose literary powers reached their height in the 1860s, appears to be carrying a light-coloured bag or similar object. He has moved during the taking of the photo, and so appears blurred. It is possible that this was not noticed by the photographer, because the developing of the glass plate would only have occurred later. Yet the fact that this imperfect image was published might mean that only a single shot was taken, and the opportunity was not to be missed, or repeated. Collins is also bending forward slightly, as if he has been walking, and has just entered the frame unexpectedly. Next to him is Dickens’s favourite dog Turk, who was a familiar feature at Gad’s Hill; but the animal is easy to miss in the large photograph, because its light
colour blends in with the semicircular driveway just behind. Next in line is Wilkie’s younger brother, Charles Allston Collins, who wears light coloured trousers, a dark coat, and a cape over top of that; he is much more heavily clad than the other subjects, and seems to be supported by a stick. The additional layers of clothing may be explained by Collins’s chronic ill health, about which Dickens was rather intolerant.\(^{24}\) His mode of dress might also speak to his artistic – even Bohemian – nature, which would be appropriate for an associate of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.\(^{25}\)

Then there are four female figures, in the centre of the photograph, under the library window. The best fit for the identity of the woman sitting next to Charles Collins is Bessie Dickens (1840-1907), who married the novelist’s son Charley on 19 November 1861;\(^{26}\) the authority for this identification is J.W.T. Ley, in *The Dickens Circle.*\(^{27}\) Dickens did not attend the couple’s wedding, on account of his having quarrelled with Bessie’s father, the publisher Frederick Evans, over the publication of the ‘Personal’ statement of June 1858.\(^{28}\) Bessie and Charley were familiar with one another from childhood,\(^{29}\) and their marriage seems to have been a happy one; they had eight children together, and Dickens was clearly fond of the six who were born in his lifetime: Mary Angela, Ethel Kate, Charles Walter, Sydney Margeret, Dorothy Gertrude, and Beatrice.\(^{30}\) It is unclear how Bessie felt about her father-in-law, and Naudin’s image provides the occasion for an interesting interpretation. Mamie (who sits to her left) has her arm around Bessie: clearly a sign of affection, and perhaps of invitation into the family, as well as protection from the wrath of Dickens. Though there is no evidence that Dickens displayed antipathy towards Bessie,\(^{31}\) she must have been acutely aware of his dislike of her father, and she would have reason to tread carefully in his presence. Here she sits at the opposite end of the family group from Dickens, keeping her distance, and respecting his space. Bessie (whose face is in sharper focus than many of the other subjects) looks directly at the camera, and has her hands comfortable folded in her lap, as if to claim a confident,
self-assured position for herself in this tableau.

Mamie Dickens, dressed in a white shawl, dark skirt or dress, and a dark hat, is perched above Bessie, and seated on a low chair. On her lap Mamie balances her dog, Mrs. Bouncer, a Pomeranian who was a great favourite at Gad’s Hill; her front paws are clearly visible against Mamie’s dark clothing. She was a present from Arthur Smith and his wife, and Mamie called her ‘the very sweetest and most bewitching of her sex’; she took the dog with her when she accompanied her father on reading tour to Carlisle, as well as on a visit to Paris.

Mamie, like her sister-in-law, looks out directly at the camera – and the viewer. The pose speaks of a comfortable relationship between her and Bessie. Next to her, seated on a higher chair, is her sister Katey. Dickens’s two daughters were not only a great comfort to him, but also key figures in his emotional life – particularly Katey. Indeed Dickens often spoke about Mamie and Katey in more favourable terms than he did about his sons. The fact that these two are placed at the centre of the picture may be seen as a testament to their centrality in Dickens’s domestic life, about which both speak in their reminiscences.

Katey wears dark clothing, and she gazes off to her right, past the camera. She appears self-assured, with her hands in her lap. She wears a hat with a light-coloured feature (perhaps a feather) at the front. She is tended to by her aunt, Georgina Hogarth, who stands to one side behind her, adjusting her collar. Georgina (who ran the household at Gad’s Hill) here demonstrates her care for and attention to others. Dickens remarks on this aspect of his sister-in-law’s character in correspondence, when her health declined in the summer of 1862:

I (who know her best, I think) see much in her that fills me with uneasiness. The change that two months have made, is extraordinarily great. All that alacrity and “cheer of spirit” that used to distinguish her, are gone. . . . You may imagine with
what solicitude Mary, Katie and I watch the condition of our best and dearest friend — the most unselfish, zealous, and devoted creature that ever lived on earth, I thoroughly believe. No one can ever know what she has been to us, and how she has supplied an empty place and an ever widening gap, since the girls were mere dolls.38

It is clear from this letter how much Dickens cherished Georgina (whom Slater calls his ‘chief sustainer’),39 and how much he depended upon her in the absence of a wife. Her pose here, and her mode of dress (which is less ostentatious than that of the other women) establishes her as a selfless nurturer and carer, a pillar of family life, ‘holding them all together’, as Dickens intimates in a letter to Cerjat.40

Next in line, and closest to Dickens, is the actor Charles Fechter, who looks up and to the left, perhaps at Mamie and Bessie. Dickens befriended him in the early 1860s, and had great respect for his theatrical ability; he told his friend Cerjat that Fechter was ‘far far beyond any one on our stage’, and added that he was ‘a real artist and a gentleman’.41 According to Ley, Fechter ‘exercised a fascination over the novelist that was unique in the latter’s life’;42 this is borne out in correspondence, in which Dickens replies to a letter from Fechter, saying ‘you could scarcely understand how highly I prize your letter, without knowing how highly I have appreciated and admired you’.43 It was Fechter who presented to Dickens the famous Swiss chalet, which stood in the shrubbery at Gad’s Hill, and was a favourite place to which Dickens could retire and write.44

Just in front of Fechter, but hardly noticeable because of the way it is lying, is an unidentified dog, which may be one of Dickens’s ‘three or four small dogs in the [na]ture of canine parasites and toadies’ whom he mentioned in a letter to Percy FitzGerald.45 Behind this animal stands Charley Dickens, whose marriage had displeased Dickens, as noted above. Dickens intimated to Cerjat in March 1862, ‘My eldest boy – married
not particularly to my satisfaction – is in business as an Eastern Merchant in the City, and will do well if he can find continuous energy; otherwise not’. He looks in the opposite direction to his father, as if to indicate that their relationship is one characterised by dissatisfaction – perhaps on both sides. Charley had by this time embarked on a business venture in paper-making, of which his father disapproved, partly owing to the fact that members of the Evans family were also partners; he was also struggling to earn a living in the tea trade. Notwithstanding his personal difficulties Charley’s pose is confident: hands in pockets, and legs spread. His watch chain, visible over top of his waistcoat, indicates that he is a man of business, and thus concerned about time. He stands over his two sisters, despite the fact that they had earned a more enduring and assured place than he had in their father’s heart.

As noted above, Dickens seems distracted in this image. Gad’s Hill was for him a haven, a place where he could be himself, and play the part of the country squire. His daughter Mamie writes: ‘he was a “home man” in every respect. . . he found there sympathy and the companionship of his “own familiar friends”. . . . No man was so inclined naturally to derive his happiness from home affairs’. This was particularly true when he had visitors, as she confirms:

He was delightful as a host, caring individually for each guest, and bringing the special qualities of each into full notice and prominence, putting the very shyest at his or her ease, making the best of the most humdrum, and never thrusting himself forward. In this photograph the viewer does not get the sense of Dickens the professional, or Dickens the celebrity, or Dickens the consummate businessman; instead the image presents him as a relaxed and carefree individual, at one with the landscape, the house, and its occupants.

The most curious subject in the image is the one who stands apart from the rest of
the company, on the extreme right: Hamilton Hume (1839-72), the series editor of *Naudin’s Portfolio*. He was an author and journalist, who in 1864 had written a play about the American Civil War entitled *Troubled Waters*. He struggled as a writer, and went bankrupt in 1865. Dickens did not know him well at the time the photograph was taken. Hume only came to wider public notice in 1865, as Secretary of the Eyre Defence and Aid Fund Committee, which sought to support Edward John Eyre, the Governor of Jamaica who had suppressed the Morant Bay Rebellion. Dickens is believed to have subscribed to the Eyre Defence Fund, and so in this context must have had some contact with Hume. The Eyre Controversy, however, took place after the publication of the image under discussion. His pose is relaxed, with hands in his pockets; like Charley, Hume sports a watch chain, thus identifying him as a businessman. Publishing a photograph of Dickens and Gad’s Hill would have been an important commercial venture for him. It may be that, having obtained the commission for Naudin, Hume thought of no more fitting tribute to himself than to include himself in the company represented in the photograph. It may have boosted Hume’s reputation, and may have given an incentive to admirers to purchase other numbers in the series.

In this context, it would be useful to look at the reviews of *Naudin’s Portfolio*. The *Athenaeum* was rather candid, and pointed out the deficiencies of the image: ‘a black picture; the house hard, and the group of sitters blurred’. The *Art-Journal* (the most artistically expert of the papers which published reports of the *Portfolio*) surmised that the work was not destined to be popular, because ‘the figures on the lawn are too small to be easily recognisable’. The *Era* also commented on the inadequacies of the Gad’s Hill photograph:

In this picture the artist has had great difficulties to contend with, as nearly all his figures are dressed in dark clothes; the consequence is, that there is no relief or effect obtained, the individuals being so run into each other, that some of their
outlines are scarcely perceptible, and it would require an intimate friend to discover which was which.

The Era’s reviewer also took issue with the price (3s 6d), noting that while the work was ‘beautifully got up’, at this level it ‘must necessarily have an exclusive and aristocratic circulation’. Hume and Naudin were of course sensitive to such comments, but adapted them to their advantage. In the second monthly number of the Portfolio, they did quote from these reviews, but conveniently left out the critical remarks quoted above, and elided phrases in the original to give them a more positive spin.

Other journals were more complimentary. The Standard believed that the series ‘is likely to attain a well-deserved popularity’, while the Morning Post was far more fulsome in its praise:

The first number of this elegant work of art will no doubt receive the encouragement it deserves; and, if the subsequent parts are equal to the one already given to the public, the “Portfolio” will no doubt find its way into every fashionable drawing-room. . . . The work is entitled to success, for, while being brought out at a very moderate price, no expense or trouble appears to have been spared in making it a valuable, useful, and elegant addition to the drawing-room or library table. The photographs are beautifully executed, and the letter-press is so carefully arranged that the memoirs, though concise, contain all that is interesting of the celebrities whose likenesses are given. The “Portfolio” will be cordially welcomed by every one, and may be classed as one of the best publications that has been offered to the public for many years.

It seems clear that the Morning Post was appealing to a more wealthy audience than the Era; nevertheless these reviews indicate that there was a market for such images of famous people and the houses they inhabited.

In using this photograph to illustrate publications about Dickens, scholars like Matz
and Ley make no mention of the photographer; nor do they examine the context in which the image was originally published. Such omissions do a disservice to both the artist and the subject, because photographs exercise a pervasive influence over us. As Susan Sontag notes,

> In teaching us a new visual code, photographs alter and enlarge our notions of what is worth looking at and what we have a right to observe. They are a grammar and, even more importantly, an ethics of seeing. Finally, the most grandiose result of the photographic enterprise is to give us the sense that we can hold the whole world in our heads – as an anthology of images.\(^60\)

These observations are highly significant in terms of how we visualize Dickens: through photographs, we feel that we know him, his friends, and his family, and can recognize their unique features. We can, in Sontag’s words, ‘hold’ them in our ‘heads’. Naudin’s photograph may be lacking in artistic merit, and there are things about it which we will never know; but a serious study of it adds considerably to what we know about the Dickens of Gad’s Hill – that ‘House Beautiful’ and ‘goal of his earthly pilgrimage’\(^61\) the place where he could be a delightful, charming host, consummate family man, and most at peace with himself.

---

1 The term ‘cabinet photograph’ describes a standard size for early photographic prints, measuring 5 ½ X 4 inches.
3 ‘Carte de visite’ refers to a photograph measuring 3 ½ X 2 ¼ inches, which was mounted on card, and often kept in albums which became a common feature in Victorian homes. Mamie Dickens kept such an album; see Pilgrim *Letters* 11, p. 462.
4 Gad’s Hill was the site of Falstaff’s robbery of the Canterbury pilgrims in Shakespeare’s *Henry IV Part One*.
5 In 1851 the house was occupied by the Rev Joseph Hindle, Vicar of Higham; see Alan S. Watts, *Dickens at Gad’s Hill* (Reading: Elvendon Press, 1989), p. 17.
For details of Dickens’s childhood fascination with the house see Michael Slater, *Charles Dickens* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), pp. 8, 17.

*Naudin’s Portfolio* 1: November, ed. Hamilton Hume (London: Adolphe Naudin, 1864); pages unnumbered.

A careful scrutiny of available evidence does not reveal a definite date when all of the subjects in the image assembled at Gad’s Hill. Sources consulted include the Pilgrim Letters, surviving issues of the *Gad’s Hill Gazette*, and *The Letters of Wilkie Collins* (2 vols., Basingstoke: Macmillan 1999). Dickens himself was at Gad’s Hill in mid- to late-June 1864. He then spent ten days in France (probably with Ellen Ternan), and returned on 7 July. He was at Gad’s Hill during much of July and August, and received Lady Molesworth and Percy Fitzgerald during this time. He held discussions with Charles Fechter about a new play in the late summer, and Wilkie Collins proposed to visit in mid-September. In October 1864 Dickens, Wilkie Collins, and Georgina Hogarth all stayed at Dover. Dickens was definitely at Gad’s Hill on 5, 6, 11, 16, 20, 23, 29 September, and on 1, 10, and 25 October 1864. Wilkie Collins was there from about 10-14 September (see *Letters of Wilkie Collins* 1, p. 250; dated 9 September 1864).


Claudet was among the first to practise daguerreotype portraiture in England; in 1853 he became ‘Photographer-in-ordinary’ to Queen Victoria. He had studios at 18 King William Street, Strand (1843-51), then at 107 Regent Street (1851-67). In 1849 he produced several daguerreotypes of Dickens, which had until recently been wrongly identified as by J.J.E. Mayall; see Craig Schneider, ‘That Mayall is a Claudet: Half-Plate Daguerreotype of Charles Dickens at the Library Company of Philadelphia’, *The Daguerreian Society Newsletter* 15.3 (2003): 4-7.


Herbert Watkins had a studio at 215 Regent Street. He came to public notice when he produced a series of photographs of distinguished contemporaries, published under the title *National Gallery of Photographic Portraits* (1857-8). John Watkins had a studio at 34 Parliament Street, Westminster.


The photograph was produced using the collodion process, which was invented in 1850, and involved spreading a viscous, light-sensitive liquid onto a glass plate; when this was transferred to a camera and...
exposed to light for a few seconds, an image was captured. The wet plate was then developed, and the image fixed. For further information see Helmut and Alison Gernsheim, *The History of Photography from the camera obscura to the beginning of the modern era* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969), pp. 197-206.


24 Dickens wrote about his concern for his son-in-law to his friend WWF de Cerjat: ‘Charles Collins continuing in a very poor way and shewing no signs of amendment, he and my daughter Katie went to Wiesbaden and thence to Nice where they are now. I have strong apprehensions that he will never recover, and that she will be left a young widow’ (Pilgrim Letters 10, p. 443; dated 25 October 1864). Collins died in 1873 from stomach cancer.


26 See Pilgrim Letters 9, p. 548.

27 *The Dickens Circle*, facing p. 316. This is the only known image of Bessie Dickens, if Ley’s identification is correct

28 See Dickens’s letter to Frederick Evans of 22 July 1858, in which he writes: ‘I have had stern occasion to impress upon my children that their father’s name is their best possession and that it would indeed be trifled with and wasted by him, if, either through himself or through them, he held any terms with those who have been false to it, in the only great need and under the only great wrong it has ever known’ (Pilgrim Letters 8, p. 608). See also his letter to The Hon. Robert Lytton: ‘My son married with my knowledge and consent, because I very well knew that he couldn’t help it. The name the young lady has changed for mine [that is, Evans], is odious to me; and when I have said that, I have said all that need be said’ (Pilgrim Letters 9, p. 548; dated 23 December 1861).

29 See Dickens’s comments to Esther Nash, Pilgrim Letters 9, p. 390; dated 5 March 1861.


31 In a letter to Charley, written while Dickens was in the United States, the author sends his love to Bessie (Pilgrim Letters 11, p. 495; dated 30 November and 3 December 1867).

32 Mrs. Bouncer was greatly favoured by Dickens, and was often mentioned in his letters to Mamie when he was away from Gad’s Hill. On one occasion he wrote: ‘In my mind’s eye I behold Mrs. Bouncer, still with some traces of her late anxiety on her faithful countenance, balancing herself a little unequally on her bow fore-legs, pricking up her ears, with her head on one side, and slightly opening her intellectual nostrils. I send my loving and respectful duty to her’ (Pilgrim Letters 9, p. 315; dated 23 September 1860). Mamie noted that her father ‘had a peculiar voice and way of speaking for her, which she knew perfectly well and would respond to at once, running to him from any part of the house or garden directly she heard the call’ (‘Charles Dickens at Home, with especial reference to his relations with children, by His Eldest Daughter’, Cornhill Magazine, new series 4 [Jan 1885]: 45).

33 ‘Charles Dickens at Home’, p. 45.

34 See Pilgrim Letters 9, p. 523, and Letters 10, p. 157; dated 27 November 1861 and 7 November 1862.


36 Dickens wrote to his friend W.C. Macready: ‘Boys all well. (I never sing their praises, because they have so often disappointed me)’ (Pilgrim Letters 11, p. 150; dated 2 February 1866).


38 Pilgrim Letters 10, pp. 99-100; dated 2 July 1862, to WC Macready.

39 *Dickens and Women*, p. 174.

40 Pilgrim Letters 10, p. 443; dated 2 February 1866. For an extended treatment of Dickens’s attitude towards Georgina see Slater’s *Dickens and Women*, pp. 163-78. See also the ‘Violated Letter’, dated 25 May 1858, in Pilgrim Letters 8, pp. 740-1.

41 See Pilgrim Letters 10, p. 53; dated 16 March 1862.

42 *The Dickens Circle*, p. 334.

43 Pilgrim Letters 10, p. 52; dated 15 March 1862.
44 See Pilgrim Letters 11, p. 3; dated 7 January 1865.

45 Pilgrim Letters 11, p. 119; dated 30 November 1865. The named dogs resident at Gad’s Hill at the time included Turk and Mrs. Bouncer (discussed above) as well as Linda (a St Bernard). Sultan (an Irish bloodhound), a gift from Percy FitzGerald, arrived towards the end of September 1865 (see Pilgrim Letters 11, p. 95; dated 23 September 1865). Don (a Newfoundland), the gift of Frederick Lehmann, arrived in October 1865, and Bumble (the son of Don and Linda) was born in 1866. On the general topic of Dickens and canines see Beryl Gray, The Dog in the Dickensian Imagination (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

46 Pilgrim Letters 10, p. 52.

47 For the eventual bankruptcy of this business in 1868 see Pilgrim Letters 12, pp. 138-40, 149, 166, 170.

48 Dickens believed that Charley had inherited from his mother ‘an indescribable lassitude of character – a very serious thing in a man’ (Pilgrim Letters 7, p. 245; dated 14 January 1854).

49 My Father as I Recall Him, pp. 11-12, 19-20.

50 See ‘Public Amusements’, Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper, 3 July 1864.

51 See list of bankrupts in The Morning Post, 22 March 1865. Hume also founded and edited the Tory comic serial Will-o-the Wisp in the late 1860s.

52 Hume published a biography of Eyre, entitled The Life of Edward John Eyre, Late Governor of Jamaica (London: Richard Bentley, 1867). The British Library erroneously identifies the author as Alexander Hamilton Hume, the Australian explorer. For a review of Hume’s volume see The Morning Post, 20 April 1867, p. 2.

53 See Pilgrim Letters 11, p. 116, note 10. Dickens’s friend Thomas Carlyle was also a strong supporter of Governor Eyre, and corresponded with Hume on several occasions.


57 See back cover of Naudin’s Portfolio 2 (December 1864).

58 ‘Naudin’s Portfolio’, Standard, 23 November 1864, p. 3.

59 ‘Naudin’s Portfolio’, Morning Post, 22 November 1864, p. 3.


61 Slater, Dickens and Women, p. 174.