PROJECT MUSE®

Joseph Ritson, Percy Shelley and the Making of Romantic
Vegetarianism

Timothy Morton

Romanticism, Volume 12, Number 1, 2006, pp. 52-61 (Article)

Published by Edinburgh University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/rom.2006.0006>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/199846>

Joseph Ritson, Percy Shelley and the Making of Romantic Vegetarianism

And the poor beetle that we tread upon
In corporal sufferance finds a pang as great
As when a giant dyes.

William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, III, i, 78–80, quoted in
Joseph Ritson, *An Essay on Abstinence from Animal Food, as a Moral Duty*, p. 50¹

The antiquarian Joseph Ritson (1752–1803, see fig. 1) opposed the bibliographical practices of his rival, Thomas Percy. It was an era during which the past was constructed and contested, and the category of the domestic antique was born.² If as Nick Groom has suggested Percy was the Malcolm McLaren of his era, a brilliant entrepreneur who masterminded a great balladic swindle, Ritson was XTC's Andy Partridge, finding in the ballads an authentic English countercultural tradition.³ Ritson's attitude to the text was deeply political. His sense that they should be preserved in their authenticity is interwoven with his republicanism, which insists upon the genuine voices of equal participants. Deconstructionists may balk at this: but let us remember that Jacques Derrida always insists upon a careful scrutiny and history of the text, his own tortuously slow prose manner serving to fetishise it, but also to make it visible in all its parts – a technique that makes deconstruction resonate with the sceptical empiricism of

Ritson's day. Percy may appeal to fans of Baudrillard, but Percy is not the only antiquarian on the block.

Ritson was an English Jacobin.⁴ He supported the French Revolution and was known in jest as 'Citizen Ritson'. As well as issuing editions of ballads, he wrote books on atheism and vegetarianism – subjects dear to many republican hearts. Vegetarianism was many things during the Romantic period: a cutting edge of bourgeois consumer style; a thread of continuity from the religious radicalism of the seventeenth century; a logical extension of Enlightenment discourse on the rights of women and men. Thomas Percy's copy of *An Essay on Abstinence from Animal Food* (1802) contains Sayer's satirical cartoon of him pasted onto the front board. In it, Ritson is treading on the Bible (and Percy's *Reliques*) in open-toed sandals while a cow leans through the window, breaking the boundary between human and animal realms, and munches on one of Ritson's carrots. In real life, Ritson had a dog whom he called – Ritson. The 1960s, it seems, had happened before. Vegetarianism and abstinence from alcohol were signs of revolutionary sobriety, a straight, masculine civic humanism, not the effeminate weakness that it signified later.⁵

Richard Phillips, the vegetarian and publisher of Paine's *Rights of Man*, published *Animal Food*. The book is radical republican in

Figure 1. James Sayers (1748–1823), caricature of Joseph Ritson, c. 1803. Bodleian Library, Shelfmark Montagu 551, opposite page 177. Reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. Staring at a frog that looks like a witch's familiar, Joseph Ritson is using gall to write religious and literary slander in his commonplace book about the Bible, Parsons, and the antiquarians Percy, Warburton and Warton, while treading in open toed sandals on a copy of his rival Thomas Percy's ballads. In his pocket is 'The Atheist's Pocket Companion'. A starving cat on the top shelf (next to a copy of Ritson's *Essay on Abstinence from Animal Food*) is prevented from catching rats by a chain. A cow leans through the window and munches lettuce from a bowl that rests on a bill of fare featuring 'Nettle Soup / Sour Crout / Horse Beans / Onions Leeks'. The caption below the cartoon reads: 'Impiger iracundus inexorabilis acer / Blakgardos skurilos Graniverosq^{ue} macer'; for some reason 'Blakgardos skurilos Graniverosq^{ue}' is in Greek script. This is cod rhyming and alliterative Latin-Greek for 'Impetuous, irascible, severe, bitter, / Scurrilous blackguard and eater of grains'. One line below we read: 'Fierce meager pale no Commentator's Friend [space] Purs Lit. [a quotation from a comment on Ritson in Thomas James Mathias's *The Pursuits of Literature*, 1800] / Let his portion be with the Beasts in the Grass of the Earth Let his heart be changed from Man's / and let a Beasts heart be given unto him [space] And he was driven from Men and did eat / grass till his hairs were grown as Eagles feathers and his Nails like Birds Claws / 4th Ch David' (the description of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel 4.15–16, 33).

style as well as in content. Ritson consistently puts 'god' in the lower case, demoting him to from proper-name status to that of a mere concept, and superstitious one at that. Likewise, Ritson refers to himself as 'i' in the lower case. He tended to use phonetic spellings, bringing to mind the revolutionary debates over language conducted by Lord Monboddo and Horne Tooke: 'approximateëd', 'almost', 'Engeland' (pp. 12, 33, 88; so many that a liberal use of *sic* would have made this essay look ridiculous). *Animal Food* is typographically egalitarian. The book reads like a republican assembly of quotations, juxtaposed without hierarchy, without much guiding narrative interference. In this fashion it set the stage for later vegetarian publications, such as Howard Williams's *The Ethics of Diet* (1883), whose anthologising technique similarly brings a number of voices to participate equally in a symposium, an assembly: Porphyry, the Church Fathers, Schopenhauer and Percy Shelley speak to one another across nations and across times.⁶

No wonder Ritson's book appealed to Percy Shelley when he started to compose *Queen Mab*; perhaps even earlier, at Oxford, or during his residence at Poland Street in London (ironically, the restaurant currently occupying the space below his old lodgings looks distinctly carnivorous). So attached was he to Ritson, and such a case did he think it made for an impeccable ethical stance, that he and one of his lawyers, Basil Montagu, a friend of the Wordsworths and a Godwinian, marked it up during the custody trial for his children with Harriet.⁷ Or so the story goes. There is no definite evidence of this specific event. The trial record stated 'that Percy Bysshe Shelley avows himself to be an atheist ... he hath since his said marr[iage] written & pub[lished] a certain Work called "Queen Mab" with notes & other Works & that he hath therein blasphemously derided the truth of the Xtian Revelation & denied the existence of a God as Creator of the

Universe'.⁸ *Queen Mab* was one of the pieces of documentary evidence submitted to Chancery on 10 January 1817. His first wife's suicide by drowning and the blasphemous character of *Queen Mab* put him in danger of losing his children. The case against him was in part that he wanted to 'educate them [his children] as he thinks proper' (726r). This would literally have meant, for Shelley himself if not for the judges, that his children would become vegetarian atheists, little Ritsons. Shelley marked passages in Ritson pertaining to the diet of children (Ritson, pp. 49, 83).

Shelley may have used Ritson's book to defend his integrity as well as his vegetarianism – to defend, in other words, his integrity by means of his vegetarianism (see Ritson pp. 42–3), before Lord Eldon in Chancery on 24 January 1817.⁹ Eldon made up his mind against Shelley two months later, delivering his judgement on 27 March. To Shelley's mind, vegetarianism could guarantee his character, just as for Rousseau Plutarch's biographies show their subjects' integrity by displaying their private behaviour. *Animal Food* could also be used to vindicate Shelley's treatment of his children, defending the idea that children should be brought up on a vegetarian diet. It cuts both ways. Ironically, Shelley's own declaration in Chancery (2 February 1817) itself breaks off tantalizingly: 'my notions of the education of children with respect' – to marriage? religion? Or was it with respect to diet?¹⁰ The master's report of 1 August by William Alexander exaggerated Eldon's judgement against Shelley, and bestowed upon Harriet's family, the Westbrooks, the determination of the upbringing of Eliza Ianthe and Charles Bysshe Shelley. It says nothing about diet, though there is mention of the need for little Ianthe and Charles to learn to say grace before and after meals in the arrangements made for their care.¹¹ Shelley had had a brush with the highest legal authorities in the land, concerning the

upbringing of his children, their 'diet' in its broadest sense (Greek: *diaitia*, way of life).

SHELLEY'S COPY OF RITSON

This essay will not rehash the arguments on Shelley and Ritson in *Shelley and the Revolution in Taste*, which I still regard as valid.¹² Instead, I present some examples of the extent to which Shelley admired and pored over his copy. There is no sign that he had ordered it specifically in preparation for writing *Queen Mab*, as he did with numerous other texts.¹³ Nevertheless, there are borrowings from and references to it in both his essays on vegetarianism and in the note to *Queen Mab*, suggesting that he had thumbed through his own copy for some time.¹⁴ *Animal Food* bulked so large in his life that at several points in his biography of his friend, Thomas Jefferson Hogg feels provoked to rail against 'Joe' Ritson.¹⁵

Shelley's copy of *Animal Food* is found at the Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas at Austin, where it was acquired in 1946 or 1947.¹⁶ On the title page is written 'Basil Montague' (the name of Shelley's lawyer), top left, and just below it, faintly visible, on the right, 'Percy Shelley' in his characteristic autograph. It looks as if someone had at some stage tried to erase it. Why? Montagu's signature is also somewhat erased. Leaving aside an accidental erasure by someone in the library, and the very unlikely thought that a bookseller might have erased it and devalued the book, we are left with various possibilities. Although Mary Shelley might have erased it, afraid of the publicity surrounding her late husband, it is unlikely that she would have had access to what had become Montagu's copy. The book may have simply been signed by Montagu to prevent its loss in the bustle of a trial.

There is no marginal writing in the book, but the text has been marked extensively. One kind of marginal line is formed by a swift short upward stroke followed by a downward one.

Given my knowledge of Shelley's hand in manuscripts in the Bodleian, at UTA and elsewhere, I have concluded that this stroke could indeed be Shelley's.¹⁷ While some of these could be passages selected by Shelley and Montagu for the trial, it is surely unlikely that all of them could be. Who would want to take up unnecessary time quoting from a book? Throughout the copy a harder mark appears together with a softer mark: for example softer marks appear on page 44, harder ones on page 45. I suspect that the softer mark is definitely Shelley's: it carries a trace of his characteristic autograph, a slight downward flick. They may indicate a hasty reading, or simply a scholar's slapdash use of a pencil. This is not to say that the other marks are not by Shelley.

Montagu became interested in vegetarianism because of his work with Shelley; he himself was opposed to the death penalty and compiled and published readings against it.¹⁸ Mary Shelley had read some of these, most likely on Percy's recommendation.¹⁹ Montagu also published work on the deleterious effects of alcohol.²⁰ It is unlikely Montagu would have honed in upon so many passages so pertinent to lines of poetry Shelley wrote after *Queen Mab* and before the trial. These are very small signs, and I do not wish to push interpretation too far. It is possible that Shelley marked the book differently, more than once. Perhaps Shelley marked it up and then gave it to Montagu to demonstrate something.

In what follows, I only quote from those passages against which Shelley placed an emphatic line. (Text in square brackets indicates where the marking-up breaks off.) There are approximately sixty marked passages. Following the marked text provides a fascinating lesson in the reasons for and contexts of Shelley's vegetarianism. At the start of the book, Shelley records his interest in Ritson's presentation of different theories of human origins: 'Man, in like manner, may, with equal propriety, be arrange'd under the monkey-

kind; there being the same degree of analogy between the man and the monkey, as between the lion and the cat; and there being, also, in each of these classes, intermediate animals of different sizeës, ranks, or degrees, by which the several species, which compose it, are approximateëd or connected, like the links of a chain' (p. 12). Shelley notes Ritson on human destructiveness: 'Of all rapacious animals, man is the most universal destroyer. The destruction of carnivorous quadrupeds, birds, and insects is, in general, limited to particular kinds: but the rapacity of man has hardly any limitation. His empire over the other animals which inhabit this [globe is almost universal]' (pp. 30–3).

There is much in Ritson that is Miltonic – an appropriate choice for a republican writer. There are marked passages that resonate with *Queen Mab*: '[the tiger] tears the body for no other purpose than to plunge his head into it, and to drink large draughts of blood'. Ritson has 'panthers, ounceës, leopards' stalking through this paragraph, as do numerous ferocious cats in Shelley's radical didactic poem tamed at last by human revolutionary impulses – the source for both may be *Paradise Lost* (p. 35).²¹ Ritson must have influenced Shelley's view of nature, which superimposes an ultra-materialist view ('there is neither benevolence nor intention in nature') and something more intentional, where some animals are cruel, some gentle (p. 37). Ritson is almost Schopenhaurian: 'The noxious multiplication of shel-fishes' and the fact that 'Every animal, man, beast, fish, fowl, appears to be infested by one or more species of lice' demonstrate that the whole is 'a system for the express purpose of preying upon each other, and for their mutual misery and destruction' (pp. 37, 38). Nature is a charnel ground, like the vision given by the angel Michael to the fallen Adam in the eleventh book of *Paradise Lost*: 'For man to have a just and perspicuous idea of the bountys of nature, he should visit hospitals, and not churches.' Shelley places a tick next to these

lines. It is probable that *Animal Food* itself put the idea of *Paradise Lost* 11 into Shelley's mind: Ritson is explicitly describing 'shocking catalogue' that was 'exhibited to Adam' (p. 39).

It is likely, on this evidence, that Shelley had read and annotated his copy of Ritson before producing such texts as *Queen Mab*. The motif of nature as an emergency room was so strong to Shelley that he worked it into poetry throughout the rest of his life (Morton, *Shelley*, pp. 57–60). In contrast, and perhaps significantly, Pope's verse on vegetarianism remains free of marking (p. 54), though his essay in *The Guardian* on cruelty to animals is marked (p. 61).²² Thomson and Pope are marked, as is Ovid on the primitive diet of 'wild strawberries' (p. 166) – fuel for 'Mazhengi'? It is possible that Shelley learnt about the Essenes' vegetarianism, a subject he incorporated into his tale *The Assassins*, by reading Ritson: 'Josephus observes that the Essenes, a sort of Jewish monks, live'd commonly to a hundred years, by reason of the simplicity of their diet, and regular life' (p. 149). The list of longevity at the end of *A Vindication* has a precedent on page 148.

Shelley marks Ritson on comparative anatomy: 'the teeth and intestines of man being like those of frugivorous animals, he should, naturally, be range'd in this class' (p. 41).²³ Ritson cites Rousseau's account of Brassavolus' report on the younger daughter of Frederick, king of Naples (p. 43): as soon as she put a bit of flesh into her mouth, 'she was seiz'd with a vehement syncopé, and falling to the earth, and rolling herself thereupon, would lamentably shriek out. This she would continue to do for the space of half an hour, after she was return'd to herself' (p. 43). Shelley's mark explicitly emphasizes the final sentence, and one wonders whether this is a precedent for the way Beatrice in his drama *The Cenci* speaks of having been forced to eat the flesh of animals (2.2.64–9). Shelley notes George Cheyne's *Essay on*

Health (p. 50), a vegetarian treatise by Samuel Richardson's doctor. Cheyne had worked on his own obesity with a vegetarian diet. Later Shelley marks the citation from John Arbuthnot, Cheyne's contemporary (p. 87).

Other significant allegiances are evident. Despite his mocking of Adam Smith in *Queen Mab*, Shelley ticks the margin at Ritson's citation of him: "'It may, indeed," says doctor Adam Smith, "be doubted whether butchers-meat is any where / a necessary of life'" (p. 81). The seventeenth-century Behmenist vegetarian Thomas Tryon, who had also written against slavery, is marked: "'The eating of flesh," [Tryon] adds, "and killing of creatures for that purpose, was never begun, nor is now continue'd for want or necessity, or for the maintenance of health, but chiefly because the high, lofty, spirit of wrath and sensuality had gotten the dominion in man, over the meek love, and innocent harmless nature, and being [so rampant, could not be satisfy'd except it had a proportionable food]"' (pp. 82–3).²⁴ Tryon reappears in a grisly citation about a meat market, whose ambience resembles Shelley's descriptions of martial carnage. Tryon contrasts the market with 'a herb-market':

In one a thousand pieceēs of the dead carcaseēs of various creatures lye stinking, the chanel[sic] running with blood, and all the placeēs ful of excrements, ordure, garbage, grease, and filthyness, sending forth dismal, poisonous scents, enough to corrupt the very air. In the other, you have delicate fruits of most excellent tastes, wholesome medicinal herbs, savoury grains, and most beautiful, fragrant flowers, whose various scents, colours, &c. make at once a banquet to all the senseēs, and refresh the very souls of such as pass through them, and perfume all the circumambient air with redolent exhalations. This was the place, and food, ordain'd for mankind in the beginning. (p. 221)

Benjamin Franklin had read Tryon on vegetarianism. There was a continuity between Tryon's Puritan radicalism and the republican vegetarianism of the later revolutionary period, via such Tryonists as the young Franklin, let alone Tryon's own rhetoric, which was anti-colonialist and pro-animal rights.²⁵ Shelley marks Ritson's citation of Robert Pigot's *Biographical Anecdotes of the Founders of the French Republic*, 'seeing its influence is so considerable and so happy [sic] on beauty of person, and tranquility [sic] of soul' (pp. 83–4).²⁶ Shelley also marks a passage on John Oswald, the vegetarian Jacobin, whose poor children were literal 'sans culottes' (pp. 199–200). He also marks a passage on the vegetarian publisher Richard Phillips, who had gone to prison for publishing Thomas Paine (pp. 201–2). Ritson put Shelley in touch with the radical vegetarian fraternity.

Shelley was interested in Ritson's castigation of blood sports: '[The barbarous and unfeeling sports (as they are call'd) of the Engleish, their horse-raceing,] hunting, shooting, bul [sic] and bear-baiting, cock-fighting, boxing-matches, and the like, all proceed from their immoderate attraction to animal food. Their natural temper is thereby corrupted, and they are in the habitual and hourly commission of crimes against nature, justice, and humanity, at which a feeling and reflective mind, unaccustom'd to such a diet, would re-volt; but in which they profess to take delight. The kings of Engeland have from a remote pe[riod] been devoteēd to hunting; in which pursuit one of them, and the son of another, lost his life]' (p. 88). Shelley's own essay 'On the Game Laws' also contains vegetarian language.

The end of *A Vindication* alludes to Ritson on Pythagoras: 'never take anything into the stomach that once had life'.²⁷ Ritson's Pythagoras shines through Shelley's prose. Shelley marked the following passage: 'the Samian philosopher, a man of universal knowledge, who flourish'd about 500 years

before Christ, forbad to kil, much more to eat, liveing creatures, that had the same prerogative of souls with ourselves: and ate nothing himself that had had life. The truth is, he enjoin'd men not to eat of things that had life, but to accustom themselves to meats that were easeily prepare'd, quickly at hand, and soon got ready without the help of fire' (p. 170). Shelley's Plutarch is also striking similar to Ritson's (p. 48). It is perfectly possible to deduce that Shelley used this copy to compose *A Vindication*. Furthermore, Shelley gleaned direct knowledge of Orphism from Ritson (p. 170). This is very significant, given the central place of Orpheus (language as an 'Orphic song', for instance) in such works as *Prometheus Unbound* (4.415). One need look no further than page 173 (the citation of Ovid) for a precedent for the ecotopian vision in *Queen Mab* 8. Shelley was fascinated by Ritson's references to the poetic language of the Golden Age (pp. 174).

ROMANTIC VEGETARIANISM

Vegetarianism was pervasive during the Romantic period. It inspired many different classes and groups. John Tweddell, the classicist friend of Wordsworth in the 1790s, became one.²⁸ It is possible that in Paris Wordsworth associated with John Oswald, the Scot who had emigrated and become a vegetarian Jacobin. Oswald was averse to eating animals, but he signed up to be a pikeman surrounding King Louis at the guillotine. Such juxtapositions excited ridicule in the British reactionary imagination, a panicked inability to maintain a stable image of the enemy. James Gillray depicts Jacobins both as vegetarians and as cannibals. Other vegetarian Jacobins, such as Pigot, who appended vegetarian arguments at the end of his political writings, were visible in British culture. The British perceived their ideas of universal human rights and their simultaneous desire to execute justice as asymmetrical, as queer. In Germany, Hegel

synthesized the two poles, declaring that the reign of absolute freedom was also that of absolute terror. Shelley's vegetarianism, like his atheism, was very provocative to a class that refused even Hegel's form of understanding of the phenomenon of the French Revolution. In addition, I have identified seventeen writers on vegetarianism who do not seem to have been practitioners (twenty including Rousseau, Hegel and Schopenhauer).²⁹ Add to this numerous groups, and eleven writers on animal rights who were not explicit vegetarians or writers on the subject.³⁰ The result is a list of forty-nine figures in total, excluding groups. We can only assume that this is the tip of the iceberg.

Romantic vegetarianism also had medical determinants.³¹ Callow, the medical bookseller, published *A Vindication of Natural Diet*. Callow had issued the work of Shelley's doctor, William Lawrence, and his vegetarian friend, John Frank Newton. Some have argued that Shelley's vegetarianism was entirely a product of his fear of syphilis.³² We would do well to consider it in a much broader medial context than this, since the culture of medicine in the Romantic period was leading Shelley and his circle, especially the Newton-Boinville set based in London and Bracknell, near Windsor, to adopt vegetarianism and various associated practices, such as the drinking of distilled and spring water. William Lambe, a doctor connected to the circle, recommended the use of Malvern water.³³ Ritson's book recommends vegetarianism for a multitude of ailments and for prolonging life to a 'green old age' (pp. 159–61).

Anthropology and physiognomy were discourses that contributed to the practice and theory of vegetarianism. In a form of primitivism, vegetarian food was thought to be closer in form to the diet of early humans. For Lambe, it was a symptom of the relatively developed but not yet decadent phase of agricultural society. Humans had emerged

from the forests, but were not yet wasting away in cities – an argument Lambe shared with Thomas Trotter, the ships's doctor turned specialist in diseases of the nervous temperament and of addiction. In Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* the creature eats in a primitivist manner, and specifies that he and his mate will be vegetarians in their South American home.³⁴ Ritson and Shelley shared the inconsistent logic of Romantic vegetarianism – it was both a means to rise above one's carnal animality, and a way of returning to nature. This inconsistency is not as absurd as scholarship has persistently made it out to be.³⁵ For both writers, revolutionary from the assembly room to the dinner plate, nature is an unfinished project that hails humanity from the future.

The scientific, diachronic view of early humankind could be mapped on to historical, social and synchronic views of the working classes and colonial subjects. Throughout vegetarian literature, including Ritson's, the Scots, Welsh and Irish find their place next to the Tahitians and other indigenous peoples. This is not so much, or not necessarily, a straightforward critique of the centre by the margins: such a postcolonial reading omits the ways in which it could be very handy for metropolitans to think of themselves as primitives or indigenous peoples. There is a correlation between the Rousseauvian myth of the noble savage and the bourgeois myth of the self-made man. This correlation construes society as a blank sheet or open space. In this blank or open space, identity could be reduced to simple matters of style: what one wore or what one ate took on a greater and more reified significance. Thus, nowadays, we select between different styles of identity in a postmodern market where, say, *being* Chinese is attenuated to *eating* Chinese.

Thus we return to vegetarianism. It was a convenient form of social distinction in an increasingly consumer society that had been

emerging through the long eighteenth century, and that had reached a reflexive moment of *consumerism* by the Romantic period.

Benjamin Robert Haydon was amazed to find Shelley eating broccoli as if it were a piece of chicken.³⁶ That is the whole point: Shelley was ready to display his form of portable identity in public. Identify had become decidedly liquid. Romanticism was not just the theory and practice of a few poets. At one point in *Animal Food* Ritson refers to 'Man or brute': 'The onely mode in which man or brute can be useful or hapy [sic], with respect either to the generality or to the individual, is to be just, mild, merciful, benevolent, humane, or, at least, innocent or harmless, whether such qualities are be natural or not' (p. 40). We often speak of Enlightenment humanism, but the impulse of the Enlightenment, when pushed beyond a certain limit, deconstructs the centrality of the human. What emerges from Shelley's intimate attention to Ritson's book is the seed of an intensely politicized and philosophically profound practice of abstaining from animal food, which flourished in the early decades of the nineteenth century. ■

The University of California, Davis

NOTES

I would like to thank Susan Rivers for invaluable research assistance; and Rachel Howarth, Head of the Reading Room at the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin, and Richard Oram, Librarian, for their very helpful support. I would also like to thank the members of the Davis Humanities Institute seminar on food studies for 2004–2005, who kindly commented on a version of this paper, and in particular: Cynthia Brantley, Jean-Xavier Guinard, Lynette Hunter, Alice McLean, Janet Momsen, Kimberly Nettles, Georges Van Den Abbeele and Michael Ziser.

1. Joseph Ritson, *An Essay on Abstinence from Animal Food, as a Moral Duty* (London: printed for Richard Phillips, 1802); William Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, ed. by Brian Gibbons (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

2. Susan Stewart, 'Notes on Distressed Genres', in *Crimes of Writing: Problems in the Containment of Representation* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 66–101.
3. Nicholas Groom, 'Never Mind the Ballads, Here's Thomas Percy: The *Parergon* Situation', *Angelaki*, 1.1 (1993), pp. 86–94.
4. The principal biography is Bertrand Harris Bronson, *Joseph Ritson, Scholar-at-Arms*, 2 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1938).
5. Orrin Wang, 'Romantic Sobriety', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 60.4 (December, 1999), pp. 469–93.
6. Howard Williams, *The Ethics of Diet: a Catena of Authorities Deprecatory of the Practice of Flesh-Eating* (London: F. Pitman, John Heywood and Manchester: J. Heywood, Deansgate and Ridgefield, 1883).
7. Shelley's other lawyers were Charles Wetherell, a lawyer for radicals, and a Mr Bell.
8. Public Record Office Chancery Equity Suits C 33/638, ff. 726r–727r (f. 726r).
9. Edward Dowden provides an extensive account in *The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, 2 vols (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1886), II, pp. 76–95. See also Newman Ivey White, *Shelley*, 2 vols (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1940), I, pp. 418, 481–3, 489–97.
10. MS. Shelley adds. c.5, fols 96–7; in *The Bodleian Shelley Manuscripts: A Facsimile Edition, with Full Transcriptions and Scholarly Apparatus*, ed. by Alan Weinberg (New York and London: Garland, 1997), p. 97v.
11. Public Record Office C38 1148, 234v–235; C33/672 9881, 1488. Shelley eventually prevailed in the choice of guardians, after a petition to Lord Eldon on 28 April, confirmed on 25 July. He also maintained some visitation rights (once a month).
12. Timothy Morton, *Shelley and the Revolution in Taste: The Body and the Natural World* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 152–7; Timothy Morton, *Radical Food: The Culture and Politics of Eating and Drinking, 1780–1830*, 3 vols (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), I, pp. 1–32 (16–17).
13. *The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley*, ed. by Frederick L. Jones, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964), I, pp. 342–3, 344–5.
14. *Shelley's Prose: Or The Trumpet of a Prophecy*, ed. by David Lee Clark, (London: Fourth Estate, 1988), pp. 84, 90, 95.
15. See Morton, *Shelley*, pp. 67, 71.
16. The card from the card catalogue reads: 'An/Sh44/Zz802r/Rare/Books/Col'; 'RITSON, JOSEPH, 1752–1803. / An essay on abstinence from animal food, as a / moral duty. By Joseph Ritson . . . London: Richard Phillips . . . 1802. Wilks and Taylor, / printers . . . / 2p.l., 236p. 21cm. // Signatures: 2 leaves unsigned, B–P8, Q6. / Autograph of Basil Montague, on t.-p. / Shelley and Montague, his lawyer, are supposed to have used and marked this copy, during the trial for his children. // 1. Vegetarianism. // 86015 TxU46/47-10675B1 9-R3-McV 9-23060.' The accession number is 86015. 'Zz' in the catalogue card refers to a volume related to Shelley but not by him; it was added to George Aikin collection.
17. While this is not an exact science, there have been systematic attempts to account for marks in books. See Roger E. Stoddard, *Marks in Books, Illustrated and Explained* (Cambridge, Mass.: Houghton Library, Harvard University, 1985).
18. Basil Montagu, *The Opinions of Different Authors upon the Punishment of Death* (London, 1809–12).
19. Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, *The Journals of Mary Shelley 1814–1844*, ed. by Paula R. Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), I, p. 94.
20. Basil Montagu, *Some Enquiries into the Effects of Fermented Liquors* (London, 1818).
21. Percy Bysshe Shelley, *Queen Mab*, in *The Poems of Shelley*, ed. by G.M. Matthews and Kelvin Everest, 3 vols (London and New York: Longman, 1989–), I, 8.79 (tigress) 8.124 (lion).
22. Alexander Pope, 'Cruelty to Put a Living Creature to Death', *The Guardian*, 61 (21 May 1713).
23. There are other markings in Ritson's chapter on comparative anatomy (pp. 44–9).
24. According to Ritson, this is from Thomas Tryon's *Way to Health*, p. 267. Boehme was very influential on early modern vegetarianism. See Ken Albala, 'Jacob Boehme and the Foundations of a Vegetarian Food Ideology', AHA Conference Washington, D.C. January 2004.
25. Timothy Morton, 'The Plantation of Wrath', in *Radicalism in British Literary Culture, 1650–1830: From Revolution to Revolution*, ed. by Timothy Morton and Nigel Smith (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 64–85.
26. In inimitable radical antiquarian style Ritson hypercorrects the prose of others. The citation is from Robert Pigot, *Biographical Anecdotes of the Founders of the French Republic* (London 1797), p. 194.

27. *Poems*, I, p. 422.
28. I am grateful to Nicholas Roe for pointing this out to me.
29. Anon., *Bruce's Voyage to Naples* (1802), William Blake, Henry Brougham, James Burnet (Lord Monboddo), John Taylor Coleridge, William Godwin, David Hartley, Benjamin Robert Haydon, Thomas Jefferson Hogg, James Henry Leigh Hunt, Thomas Medwin, Benjamin Moseley, Thomas Love Peacock, Horace Smith, Thomas Taylor, John Trelawny, Thomas Trotter.
30. Robert Browning, Church of Swedenborgians in Salford (Henry Cowherd), Newton-Boinville set in Windsor (Harriet de Boinville and her family, the Newtons, the Shelleys and others), Richard Phillips's family, Harriet Shelley, John Tweddell, Members of the Vegetarian Society (founded 1847), and, of course, by necessity, the emerging working class; Samuel Taylor Coleridge, William Cowper, Henry Crowe, Thomas Lord Erskine, Rev. C. Hoyle, James Montgomery, John Lawrence, Anon. in *The Medusa* (radical underground newspaper), Samuel Jackson Pratt, Mary Wollstonecraft, Thomas Young.
31. Onno Oerlemans has recently stressed this aspect of vegetarianism in *Romanticism and the Materiality of Nature* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002).
32. Nora Crook and David Guiton, *Shelley's Venomed Melody* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
33. *Reports of the Effects of a Peculiar Regimen on Scirrhus Tumours and Cancerous Ulcers* (London: printed for J. Mawman, 1809), pp. 37–8.
34. Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, *Frankenstein or the Modern Prometheus: the 1818 Text*, ed. by J. Rieger (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1974, 1982), p. 142.
35. See, for example, Harris Bronson, *Ritson* I, p. 165.
36. Benjamin Robert Haydon, *The Autobiography and Memoirs of Benjamin Robert Haydon (1786–1846)*, ed. by T. Taylor, 2 vols (London: Peter Davies, 1926), I, p. 253.