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Abstract
This thesis is a scholarly biography of the nineteenth-century Hobart bookseller, William Legrand (ca.1818 –1902). Currently an iconic figure, once a well-known amateur scientist, antiquarian, and local “character,” Legrand produced the first book on Tasmanian land shells and secured scarce colonial materials for important collections of Australiana. This study argues that Legrand’s past and continuing Tasmanian presence has greater significance than currently recognised. My archival research substantially increases existing knowledge about him. Applying theoretical knowledge in detailed analysis of existing and fresh material, I probe the cultural significance of Legrand’s previously untraced links with historical figures, places, events, and intellectual movements. His many-faceted career offers valuable insights to developments in early Australian science and notions of national identity.

The Introduction considers relevant theoretical concepts about biography, foregrounding issues influencing this biography’s eventual hybrid form. The diversity of objects significantly associated with Legrand has called for the adoption of theoretical viewpoints other than those of biography in several sections. Chapter 1 explores the Legrand photographic portraits, several recently unearthed. I argue that three in particular are central to understanding Legrand’s enduring cultural presence. By exploring all nine, I provide a useful overview of Legrand’s Hobart career. Chapter 2 examines controversies and speculations about Legrand’s pre-colonial life, investigating views by Legrand’s contemporaries, alternative hypotheses, official records, and historical evidence. Its detailed exposition of a still-open line of enquiry and analysis of present findings provides a firm basis for further research into what may remain the mystery of Legrand’s origins. Chapter 3, examining Legrand’s colonial existence from 1855 to 1868, solves the mystery of his immigration and explores his attempts to forge a new life and gentlemanly career. I examine his links to developments in science and technology within the newly self-governing
colonies, and explore wider implications of the previously unknown fact that Legrand briefly worked in Queensland. Chapter 4 examines Legrand’s newspaper account of his 1869 visit to Recherche Bay. Long valued as rare primary source material about this significant remote settlement, the article gained increased relevance during recent campaigning to preserve heritage sites there. The chapter analyses Legrand’s text in historical, literary, and biographical terms. Chapter 5 examines Legrand’s later Hobart years, from 1869 until his death in 1902, approaching his complex career in terms of nineteenth-century models of self-improvement and the influences of imperialism and notions of “rational amusement” on colonial science. The chapter analyses Legrand’s chief conchological and antiquarian achievements in terms of their cultural and regional significance. It examines his intellectual, political, business, and social links. Chapter 6 moves from contemporary reports of Legrand’s decline and death to the afterlives of things closely associated with his life, including possessions, reputation, photographs, anecdotes, letters, and a range of later tributes. The chapter then turns to recent evidence of Legrand’s cultural afterlife: his incidental relevance to literary research on Marcus Clarke, his major importance for a literary work by Christopher Koch, and the ongoing popularity of one particular photograph of Legrand. The Conclusion reflects on Legrand’s enduring cultural significance.
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INTRODUCTION

This study has its origin in a chance encounter with an old photograph, a late nineteenth-century portrait of William Legrand. As I later learned, the image is widely-known, almost a commonplace; but it was new to me, and its impact was considerable. Nothing seemed to have been done to accentuate the image in any way. It was simply a reduced-scale print reproduction of the original, one amongst a miscellany of over 200 images covering a variety of different topics in Dan Sprod’s edited selection, Victorian and Edwardian Hobart from Old Photographs (1977). Most of these pictures held considerable interest for me, but the photograph of Legrand proved unforgettable. Perhaps this was partly due to Sprod’s caption:

Second-hand bookseller William Legrand regards the camera of John Beattie in quizzical fashion. The rare Tasmanian items displayed in his Collins Street shop can only give rise to feelings of frustration in modern collectors (Image 70).

The words certainly struck me as apt at the time. More recently, I have come to appreciate them as a masterly summation of Legrand’s best-known public persona, captured and perpetuated in this portrait (Fig.1). Though brief, the caption conveys not only key details about the work but also its interactive potential. What Sprod establishes here are a series of issues we cannot separate. First is the cryptic significance of the shabby but self-assured Legrand, with his mysterious past, eccentric manner, and enigmatic gaze. Secondly, the “rare Tasmanian items” are commodities which he gathered and traded: shells, books, manuscripts, pictures, and miscellaneous antiquities that accrued value in local and regional histories. The objects of value to Legrand as a collector were also connected to the continuity and development of Tasmanian identity, in particular, the identification of
regional fauna and changing attitudes towards the island’s discarded colonial past. The image captures an historical moment in late Victorian culture and grasps Legrand’s moment in popular memory.

Legrand has long been a subject of interest, regarded as a curiosity by contemporaries and as an intriguing historical figure since then. The ongoing problem has been that so little information about him was ever available. Yet the existence of several high-quality photographic portraits of Legrand in circulation since the 1890s suggests that he was considered noteworthy in his own day, making the scarcity of other documentation all the more puzzling. These photographs have intrinsic value as cultural artifacts providing insights to historical times, and they have retained ongoing popular appeal. Over time, Legrand has become an iconic figure widely associated with Hobart’s past.

A useful adjunct to the archival images is the small body of information about Legrand assembled by previous researchers, and separately published at different times over the years. In all, these brief but invaluable resources amount to three short articles (two by scientific writers, another by a librarian) and one elegant small volume (an edited collection of several old letters containing contemporary descriptions of Legrand). Collectively the gathered material indicates Legrand’s past and continuing importance. He had been a conchologist of some note, produced a pioneering work on Tasmanian land shells, and in another capacity had sourced some scarce Tasmanian colonial materials for a significant historical collection now held by the Auckland Public Library.¹ Yet though widely-known as a Hobart “character,” and featured in a few colourful and long-remembered anecdotes, Legrand clearly was regarded as an enigma by contemporaries, and his personal history has

₁ The terms “conchologist” and “conchology” are used throughout the thesis because they were the terms commonly applied in Legrand’s day as referring to the scientific study of shells and of the molluscs which made them. Peter Dance devotes an appendix in Shell Collecting: An Illustrated History to tracing the evolution of the rival terms “conchology” and “malacology,” and to discussing varying meanings assigned to each over the years (270–274).
remained a closed book. A biographical study of this obscure yet influential colonial figure seems long overdue.

Alongside ample scholarly justification for this project, the personal interest aroused by my unscheduled encounter with the Beattie photograph also has played its part. As further reading has shown, such unpremeditated fascination with a randomly-encountered image is more common than one might at first think, and even is not without scholarly respectability. Two references of particular relevance here are the social historian Raphael Samuel’s critical discussion of “an old photograph’s power to take one unawares” (374) and the biographer Richard Holmes’s description of an experience reported by numerous writers of lives as the “illogical feeling that your subjects somehow choose you” (Sidetracks 4).

At the initial stage, then, the available resources for this project were the existing biographical materials (the three articles, the book, the six archival photographs, and Sprod’s pithy caption for one image) and my unwavering personal interest in the Beattie bookseller. The foreseeable problems for the biographical study were several, but first and foremost was the possibility that the currently minimal quantity of information about Legrand meant that nothing else had survived. This caused uncertainty as to what the study could hope to achieve, what goals should be set, what approaches would be required, and in what eventual form the work should be presented. A pragmatic solution was to allow the study to evolve, and to respond or adapt to any further source material as it emerged. At this point, it was helpful to be reminded in an article by the historian-biographer Christine Wiesenthal of what she describes as “the biographer’s necessarily emergent methodology, which cannot know its outcomes in advance of their discovery” (70). However there seemed at least a chance that the newly-emerging evidence might dictate major changes of perspective in order to do full justice to Legrand. In particular, the need to adopt a science history approach might arise, and this could involve heavy reliance on expert advice about
matters scientific. As it has turned out, further investigation of Legrand’s current scientific significance reveals that his contribution is now of mainly historical interest and that here, as elsewhere, fuller biographical information would be useful.

The aim of the project has continued as it first began, namely: to produce the most comprehensive biography of Legrand currently possible, taking into account his life and career, and his past and ongoing cultural significance. A parallel aim has been to assemble a scholarly record of my research findings which will be of use to later researchers, whether of Legrand or within wider cultural fields of relevance. In view of this intent, and conscious of what the historian Penny Russell has described as “a tension between the imperatives of biography and the imperatives of history” (2), the need to provide a clear trail of evidence, argument, speculation, and assumption has assumed particular importance throughout the thesis. Yet the bias and enthusiasm of the biographer is inevitable.

As Richard Holmes suggests, “every biography is the interpretation of a life, and [. . . ] many different interpretations are always possible” (“The Proper Study?”16). Some aspects of Legrand’s life and career suggest that they might be usefully interpreted from a microhistorical perspective. The historian Jill Lepore defines “microhistory” as a term upon which there is currently no agreement but which is clear in one key principle: it is an approach which does not “seek to profile an individual and recapitulate a life story” for purely biographical reasons (130–132). In a microhistorical study the value of examining an individual life “lies in how it serves as an allegory for the culture as a whole” (Lepore 141). As will be shown, in some ways Legrand’s life exemplifies aspects of his particular time, place, and cultural milieu; and furthermore, the significance attached to him at various times during his colonial life and also later tells us something about those cultural times. Yet it has been possible and is currently more useful to examine these aspects within the framework of
biography. Revealing as Legrand’s story may be in historical and cultural terms, what is needed at present is fuller information about the historical figure himself.

Though this project has focussed on Legrand’s life as individual rather than cultural or social history, a source of much inspiration has been a paper written by an historian (an historian of gender, at that) discussing aspects of an approach with clearly microhistorical connotations. Moreover, it centres on an historical figure totally apposite to Legrand: a wealthy, well-educated, upper-class, socially prominent, and copiously-documented woman. This resource so stimulating and useful to my project is Penny Russell’s unpublished paper, “Affecting Women: or, On Weeping in Archives,” delivered at the International Federation for Research in Women’s History Conference in Sydney, July 2005. Russell explains how she uses biographical research as a tool for achieving her further goal:

In pursuit of history, I pursue the shifting constellations of meaning that press upon and emanate from a person, a document, a significant, contested moment from the past.

Most often in my research I examine the historical moment through the eyes, experience, or self-representations of an individual. In recent years that individual has been Jane, Lady Franklin [...]. (2)

Clearly, by pursuing history in this way Russell has come to “know” Jane Franklin in soundly biographical terms, an acquaintance which has extended and deepened during several different studies examining various historical moments or social trends. Though Russell’s overall perspective is that of the historian, she is fully conscious of parallel influences affecting historians, biographers, and also novelists, despite their different purposes. Her paper presents and exemplifies a useful reminder that there are more ways than one of gaining biographical insight to an historical life. Its insight and practicality is
relevant to biography in general, and especially for this study of Legrand. Particularly useful was Russell’s discussion of how she encountered but made use of significant problems within the vast Franklin archive. Surprising as it seems, these were problems remarkably similar in nature to those presented by the meagre Legrand archive: firstly, the absence of self-disclosure in material left behind by the human subject; secondly, the presence of strong bias and/or creative license in accounts written by others.

Russell’s explanation of her strategies for overcoming these obstacles has reinforced and refined research approaches used for the Legrand project. Firstly, Russell encountered a frustrating lack of self-disclosure in Franklin’s voluminous personal diaries and letters. They proved “outwardly directed,” and essentially impersonal (4): “[t]hey are about her,” but in the sense that they deal with what she saw, read, and noted as useful or significant (3). Russell’s strategy for gaining closer insight to her subject was to explore these documents historically, as communications lying “at the point of interface between herself [Franklin] and her world — a world she constituted in her imagination, a world of ideology and discourse which in turn forged her subjectivity” (3–4). Of necessity, this has been a major strategy used for extracting any sense of Legrand in person from the few extant examples of his written communication.

Secondly, Russell found that the wider Franklin archive presented other obstacles to understanding her chosen subject, but that these could be destabilised and made use by means of specific strategies. One was to critically analyse the relevant texts. This strategy exposed the resoundingly masculinist perspective of commentaries relating to Franklin’s predicament after the disappearance of her husband’s polar expedition. Another strategy used by Russell was to apply her by now empathetically-attuned biographical knowledge of Franklin in reading the archival documentation. This gave her insight to Franklin’s probable inner responses to the official indecision, long delays, and personal rebuffs characterising
the organisation of searches to find the lost expedition. Similarly, Russell could gauge the
inaccuracy and undoubtedly exacerbating effects of published works about Franklin by
contemporary writers “who had little acquaintance with her [and] usually none at all,” but
produced “purple prose or execrable poetry” expounding her supposed sentiments at the
time (6). Remote as Legrand and the existing primary sources about him might seem from
such historically significant issues, the same strategies (analysis of rhetorical stance and
allowing research insight to interrogate contemporary opinion) have been required for
dealing with his slender archive.

Apart from these aspects, there also happens to be a contextual link, since
Russell’s paper explores historical issues highly relevant to this study of Legrand on account
of the Franklins’ Tasmanian connection. Firstly, Jane Franklin’s frequently-criticised and
largely resented efforts, as governor’s lady, to participate in Tasmanian public affairs had
not been forgotten in Legrand’s day, while her efforts to found a museum and cultural
centre were remembered with appreciation by some. More importantly, Sir John Franklin’s
patronage of Tasmanian science during his term as colonial governor and his eventual long-
lamented loss in leading the ill-fated polar expedition were motifs of shared sentiment
which repeatedly resounded for members of the Royal Society of Tasmania during
Legrand’s association with it. Overall, the significance of the Franklin expedition was long
influential at many levels throughout the wider Tasmanian community at that time.

In terms of the Legrand project, heightened consciousness of the different ways in
which lives can be written about and of the different ways in which his life might be
considered significant inflects the study’s overall approach. As the extensive footnotes
throughout the thesis suggest, a biographical study of Legrand connects to social, scientific,
cultural, political, economic, regional, national, imperial, literary, collecting, and publishing
histories, and in often unexpected ways. Despite remaining gaps and silences in the record,
as far as can be determined the thesis in its present form delineates everything that is currently known about the long-elusive William Legrand.

**Finding an overall form**

Even well into this project, it was impossible to anticipate directions in which the study might develop or to predict the final form, let alone to impose a formal structure on the work. Given that more than a century had passed since Legrand’s death and that so few details of his life or examples of his work seemed to have survived, the existing scarcity of primary source materials at least made the research agenda clear, if dauntingly open-ended. The aim has been to track down and integrate every surviving shred of evidence or information about Legrand, no matter how insignificant, fragmentary, peripheral, or even dubious it might seem. Whatever was unearthed, together with what already was known would shape the study. This array of evidence would influence the focus and form of the ongoing archival research, the range of my theoretical reading, and the structure of the biography itself.

As Wiesenthal states so succinctly, “the artful part of biography begins in finding a form that somehow both ‘fits’ the individual life” and “allows the biographer to signal that life’s retelling as an artifact [sic] [. . .].” (66). It was clear that a study of Legrand’s life was unlikely to emerge in conventional biography form. In view of the nature and limited extent of his cultural output, it hardly could aspire to the classic “life and letters” model of literary and publishing biography, while the significant absence of early source materials suggested it would not even range across “the seven ages of man” deemed by Nigel Hamilton as the essentials of biography (138), and “what the reader wants to know, intrinsically: the beginning, the middle and the end of the life-cycle” (138–9). The study seemed equally unlikely to conform to Hamilton’s assertion that “[l]ove stories fuel much of biography” (174). Instead, the material evidence pointed to Legrand’s career as having been the driving
force of his colonial life, highlighted his aloofness and eccentricity, and created the impression that his social interactions were centred on his work roles and characteristically focussed on such items as shells and books.

Further unconventionality of form arises from the fact that the study relies considerably on a diverse array of scattered and also frequently highly subjective items of evidence. Legrand’s apparently habitual reticence as to his inner life and biographical details means that any surviving contemporary observations, hints, rumours, or speculations about him hold more than gossip value for his biographer, despite the need for highly sceptical scrutiny of this evidence. Different versions of Legrand’s life were circulating even before his death, partly fuelled by his own hinting at an exotic past. Later representations and more recent uses of the original materials also are considered. In short, it is necessary for this biographical study to signal not only that it is an artefact, but the extent to which the primary materials it deals with are being examined as artefacts. A form eminently suitable as an overall framework for the work is recently described by the biographer Phyllis Rose as “the school of literary biography, [which,] whether or not the subject is a literary figure, tends to see all facts as artifacts [sic] and to see content and argument as co-partners of fact” (31). Yet it would be inappropriate for my study to adopt Michael Hollington’s view of this form, since he sees “most literary biographies” as being “paradoxically ‘necrographies’ in which the death of the subject provides an essential focus for a retrospective structuring and often harmonizing of the events of that person’s life” (11). Though the few surviving contemporary accounts about Legrand were indeed recorded during his late years or soon after he died, and mostly with commemorative intent, Legrand’s story does not end with his death. Instead, it has continued, diversified, been elaborated, and maintained a discernable cultural presence, making the present time the appropriate focus for this study’s retrospective structuring.
The fact of Legrand’s continuing and evolving cultural significance increases the study’s microhistorical dimension, as does the recent turn to researching obscure colonial pasts as a way of better understanding earlier times. In discussing this trend, the historian Alan Atkinson has observed that “hunting for voices is the historian’s essential task” (25).2 Despite the predominantly biographical focus of the present study, Atkinson’s comment has relevance not only in the microhistorical sense, but also in terms of methodology. A key approach in researching Legrand’s culturally significant but scantily-documented life has been to hunt for voices: to locate and to listen to those of his contemporaries and, more importantly, to discern traces of the subject’s own voice hidden within primary materials dealing ostensibly with impersonal topics such as shell descriptions or the itemising of sale goods.

The twists and turns of the ongoing research, the gradual development of a feeling of intuitive relationship with the biographical subject, and the complexities of balancing the often divergent imperatives of biography and history have imposed a self-reflexive approach which has influenced the evolving biographical narrative. At times a temptation to tell the story of the biographical research has threatened to displace the appropriate focus on the biographical subject. Yet since the surviving record of Legrand’s life is fragmentary, miscellaneous, and still emerging, and because social and cultural value clearly has been attached to many material objects associated with him at various times, the ethnographic notion of the “social life of things” underlying the recent turn to object biography suggested a useful structure for engaging with significant aspects of the research and for better understanding Legrand’s early and ongoing importance. It also has influenced the study’s eventual form. As described by Ian Donaldson, object biography “sets out to narrate the life histories of certain physical objects — how and where they were made, how they work, how

---

2 Atkinson here is discussing convict histories.
they have travelled, what they signify culturally — in relation to the lives of particular people with whom the objects have been associated” (23–24).

A recent paper by Karen Schamberger and others emphasises the personal as well as the cultural aspects of this relationship between people and objects. It defines object biography as “an analytic process that has emerged within material studies as a way to reveal and understand object agency” (276). The paper throws light on processes through which human and object lives become interwoven in various and complex ways. This has particular relevance for the Legrand project, since to position the objects he collected or left behind simply as “relics or illustrations” (277) is to ignore the powerful effect many of these objects had on his lived experience, and their direct though different effect on later lives.

Influential as object biography has been on my examination of material evidence for this biographical study and on the eventual form of the thesis, the central focus throughout remains Legrand himself. The core concern has been to trace the life history of this long-elusive historical figure and to present as comprehensive a personal biography as presently possible. Consequently, the study’s overall perspective has remained that of the literary biography form described by Rose, though in detail and in structure the eventual form also reflects the centrality of “things” to Legrand’s life, career, and continuing cultural significance. It also considers some of these individual items biographically, as objects with ongoing separate lives. The fact that the research for this project has involved such prolonged and intensive pursuit of records, objects, and voices which might lead to Legrand has greatly influenced the study’s eventual form, not only in transparent ways, but also in its effect on my evolving relationship with Legrand. At times, the mood has been adversarial, the determined researcher pitted against the obstinately evasive biographical subject. Latterly, a spirit of adventure has prevailed, as the ongoing digitisation of records gives the researcher new and far-reaching weapons of detection. Yet frequently, there have been
uncomfortable feelings of trespass, of questioning the ethics of hunting down the details of a life so carefully camouflaged by its rightful owner, especially one no longer present to parry or dispute any later assumptions made. At times, only my awareness of Legrand’s cultural importance and the conviction that he deserves to be better known seemed justification for such dogged research. The uncovered material has ranged from the mundane to the amazing but overall, the research has yielded unexpectedly rich information which extends and deepens understanding of Legrand and also of his social and cultural milieu. Throughout this process, my regard for Legrand has fluctuated widely, ranging back and forth across and beyond the extremes of approval, sympathy, pride, disillusionment, amusement, dislike, and respect.

Choosing the narrative style

The structural focus of this study has been largely determined by the fragmentary nature of the biographical evidence. Not only was Legrand notoriously reticent about the details of his life, but any such evidence was further obscured by layers of self-disguise. Furthermore, this heavily self-censored and at least partly-fabricated personal history has been told and retold in various largely fanciful ways by others. As a result, a primary task for this biographical study has been to establish the historical trajectory of Legrand’s life, to examine significant aspects and events chronologically and contextually, and to present these findings in a logical sequence. Yet it has been difficult to decide on the narrative form most appropriate to both subject and content. Given Legrand’s eccentricity, the diverse but intermittent traces of his life, and the nature of his continuing and evolving cultural presence, the study seemed to require a new form.

Several different approaches were considered, including those touched upon earlier, but in each case there seemed a risk of detracting from the study’s intended central focus, the historical figure himself. Eventually, the complexity of balancing the competing
claims of methods variously suited to one or other of Legrand’s several cultural “lives” drove me back to a highly traditional narrative form not unlike that recently described by the biographer and critical writer Mark Kinkead-Weekes as the “old-fashioned chronological approach” (236). As he points out, despite its well-documented drawbacks, “[t]his approach brings immediate advantages,” in particular, that “[m]isconceptions show up, puzzles can be clarified, [and] unexpected connections appear, simply through careful attention to the exact sequence and context of events” (237). It must be noted that Kinkead-Weekes’s article refers specifically throughout to the use of a chronological approach for literary biography in the narrower sense, that is, in writing critically about literary figures. Yet clear parallels exist between this focus and the task of placing the historical evidence of Legrand’s life alongside the numerous fictive and rhetorical elements associated with it. Moreover, there is obvious usefulness in providing even a partial chronological account of Legrand’s life and career, in view of the very limited information available to date.

The same critical article reiterates another “old-fashioned chronological approach” argument: that presenting the events of the life in order of their occurrence enables the reader to gain deeper understanding of the subject who experienced them (251). The supremacy of this argument has been challenged successfully by numerous fairly recent biographies. These works variously employ a wide range of imaginative approaches, encouraging engagement with the subject in many different ways, and frequently by using a non-linear chronology. Yet though a more imaginative biographical treatment of Legrand may well be undertaken in the future, the present study responds to the current need for a

---

3 The features Kinkead-Weekes discusses in the article quoted above closely parallel those discussed by the biographer and early theorist of the genre, André Maurois, in his classic work, Aspects of Biography (1929). Yet on the whole, Kinkead-Weekes views these features from a considerably different perspective, and in no way prescriptively.

4 The drawbacks he mentions include increased length and slowed pace, whereas “[t]o be able to treat relationships or problems thematically, abstracted from chronology, brings obvious advantages in both clarity and economy [. . . .]” (251).

5 Also Maurois 51.
more cautious approach and a chronological overview of his life, career, and ongoing significance. Many of the bare facts have remained hidden for a century and a half, and it is to be hoped that others will be recovered. In view of the project’s archeological intent, there is appeal in Kinkead-Weekes’s optimistic view that “the strictly chronological approach” can be “a way of inviting the reader in on more equal terms,” of freeing the material from “being enclosed in the biographer’s analytic structure” (251). Obviously, such factors as narrator bias and the randomness of surviving evidence are not necessarily overcome by the adoption of a chronological approach, yet this method of narration still offers the clearest, most open, and potentially most useful way of presenting the research findings on such an elusive biographical subject.

It was at the stage of having finally decided upon a chronological approach as the study’s narrative form that that major structural difficulties arose. These did not stem, as originally anticipated, from major issues such as the competing claims of history and biography, of object and human biography, or of research journey and detached analysis. Nor was there eventually even a lack of representative material. Instead, the problems arose over which chronology to follow in dealing with the various “things” central to Legrand’s story and to his ongoing importance. For example, was it more important to examine an anecdote about Legrand’s early life within the temporal context of its possible concoction, or of its first known release, or in discussing the more distant phase to which it allegedly referred? The solution was to acknowledge and accommodate the reality that many such “things” (objects, memories, images, written texts) had multiple roles in the overall story of Legrand’s life, career, and continuing presence. Accordingly, each incidence has been dealt with separately, wherever it occurs naturally within the overall chronologically-structured narrative. This means that some things are dealt with several times, but as largely different entities according to their particular aspect or function significant at different stages within
the narrative. In the case of the anecdote cited as an example above, the content is examined alongside other evidence in the chapter dealing with Legrand’s youth, then discussed in a later chapter in terms of its obituary function, and again discussed in the final chapter in terms of its recent re-appearance as a story unrelated to Legrand.

Yet though a chronological narrative has been employed throughout most of this study, Chapter 1 is an exception. Functioning as a prologue, it gives an overview of Legrand’s public life by discussing the nine surviving original photographs of him. Furthermore, it deals with these images in a largely thematic way, as representations of Legrand in his various best-known public roles: bookseller, shell specialist, and “character.” The last to be examined are two early images presenting Legrand in a less-familiar personal role: that of aspiring gentleman. Discussing the nine images and the depicted roles in this thematic order creates a progression from best-known to least-known, ending with the recently-discovered earliest image of all. In this way, the initial chapter leads logically into the study’s second chapter, which deals chronologically with Legrand’s virtually unknown early years. Subsequent chapters follow his story in chronological sequence. Here again, the progression is from unknown to well-known, since it was during the later years of his life that Legrand acquired the status of being a widely-recognised Hobart “identity”. As in the case of other “things” incorporated when and wherever significant to Legrand’s story, the photographs reappear at various intervals throughout the narrative. As part of their ongoing lives as “things,” they function within this study as familiar signposts marking a way through the previously uncharted territory of Legrand’s life history.

To return to where I began, it has been the photographs which have exerted a powerful determining influence on this project. They grasp so much of what remains important and intriguing about Legrand: his enigmatic, oddly compelling personal presence; his vast, varied, and uncatalogued collections of objects ranging from the rare to the trivial;
his genuine cultural contributions, in various ways ranging from the obvious to the obscure;
and his iconic significance as emblem of Old Hobart.
CHAPTER 1: Photographs of Legrand

William Legrand might have faded entirely from memory but for the ongoing lives of several early Tasmanian photographs taken at intervals between about 1860 and 1896. In all, nine separate images of Legrand are known to survive, but it is the three most popular which have kept him in the public eye (Figs. 1–3). These present him in his role as Hobart’s first antiquarian bookseller, whether cheerfully posing outside his shop or contentedly browsing inside. Over the years, they have been reproduced as lantern slides, in newspapers, and in books.¹ One has been used as cover picture on an international journal, and also was used as the business postcard of a Hobart bookstore; another has long featured on an official Tasmanian tourist brochure; and all three have been mined as source material for a recent historical novel.² In a gesture Legrand undoubtedly would appreciate, framed copies of these three iconic images currently hang amongst other images of celebrated bookmen, writers, and cultural figures on the walls of a busy Hobart bookshop.³ For some time now, images of Legrand have been freely available online at the Tasmanian State Library and the Archives Office of Tasmania websites, and also can be found on the National Library of Australia’s Picture Australia website. As well, some have been posted on privately-operated sites.⁴

¹ Fig. 1 has featured as an illustration in several late-twentieth century books. In chronological order these are: Sprod’s 1977 Victorian and Edwardian Hobart (illustr. 70); Daniel O’Keefe’s 1982 Australian Album — The Way We Were: Australian Photographs 1860–1920 (39); David Moore and Rodney Hall’s 1983 Australia: Image of a Nation 1850–1950 (191); Michael Cammon’s 1983 Australia: A History in Pictures (101); and James Dally’s 1985 Bibliophile and Bibliopole (frontis).

² Fig. 1 was used as cover picture on the American Book Collector 21.8 (1971) edited by W. B. Thorsen, who refers to Legrand as “still remembered in Australian bookish circles” (2). As will be discussed in Chapter 6, the same image was used as a postcard by Fullers bookstore until well into the 1980s. A detail from Fig. 3 appeared in the Illustrated Tasmanian Mail 9 Nov. 1933 (33), and has long been used as cover image for the Tasmanian Tourist Bureau brochure, Antiquarian and Secondhand Booksellers and Printsellers in Hobart. The relevant novel, Christopher Koch’s Out of Ireland (1999), is discussed in Chapter 6.

³ The Hobart Book Shop, Salamanca Square, Hobart.

⁴ Current examples are the Thomas J. Nevin/Tasmanian Photographer site at <http://tasmanianphotographer.blogspot.com/>; and Tasmania in Photographs at <http://tasphotos.blogspot.com/search/label/Biotica>.
Of the six lesser-known photographs of Legrand, four emphasise aspects of his Tasmanian life other than book-dealing: his career as a naturalist (Figs. 4–5), and contemporary perceptions of him as an eccentric (Figs. 4, 6, and 8). Another two images, which apparently predate most of the others, are head-and-shoulders portraits of Legrand in the role of private gentleman. To the modern eye, these two are highly unflattering. One is a carte-de-visite in which he looks quite elaborately-dressed but somewhat dishevelled, weary, and perhaps deeply troubled (Fig. 9). The other is a moody sepia study showing him as well-dressed but unusually long-haired for the period, facing the camera with a dour and wary expression (Fig. 10).

My thesis begins with a chapter on the photographs because they are immediate and central to a study of Legrand. Even in a physical sense, they link closely to his life: not only did he participate (as subject) in their making, but a number of the surviving photographs most probably were his own personal copies, stored away in the depths of his shop until it closed in 1902. Furthermore, the intended and the perceived messages transmitted by the photographs, and the ongoing lives of the artefacts themselves, are keys to understanding Legrand’s significance, past and present. For over a century these images have functioned as the durable public record of Legrand’s otherwise poorly-documented life. Even today, it is through the three most popular photographs that people are likely to encounter his name, or find him of interest. Yet the pictures are responsible for more than simply perpetuating Legrand’s memory: they have shaped, and continue to shape, the ways

---

5 Two are currently accessible online at the Tasmanian State Library site: Fig 5 at <http://catalogue.statelibrary.tas.gov.au/item/?id=666856>; and Fig 6 at <http://catalogue.statelibrary.tas.gov.au/item/id?=666852>. Both images also are available on the NLA Picture Australia site at <http://www.pictureaustralia.org>. Fig. 8, not currently online, has featured in a 1988 photography exhibition referred to later this chapter.

6 Fig. 10 is currently accessible online at the Tasmanian State Library site <http://catalogue.statelibrary.tas.gov.au/item.?id=667362>; and also on Picture Australia.
in which he is remembered, stimulating the ongoing curiosity about him which lingers more than a century after his death. In a very real sense, these photographs live on as Legrand.

Strangely, despite the continuing interest in Legrand and the general scarcity of other biographical material, the images themselves seem never to have been fully examined for what they might reveal about the life, career, and social significance of their subject. Discovering this surprising fact has highlighted a wider need for what already was planned as the most appropriate focus for this first chapter. To locate and examine the full range of surviving images has seemed a logical and direct way of approaching the visual legacy of this shadowy figure now so firmly a part of Australian cultural memory. An advantage of the approach is that it enables us see the three best-known, now iconic images (Figs. 1–3) within a wider, and sometimes contradictory context. At the same time, it places equal emphasis on the other less well-known images, potentially forcing them to reveal previously hidden or overlooked details of biographical and cultural relevance.

Collectively, the images are an odd assortment. Several are striking examples of early Australian photography, and this, together with their colonial content, gives them cultural and historical value beyond their biographical links with Legrand. The others, though less distinguished, are no less useful in what they add to current knowledge of the subject, and in what they convey about their times. A continuing mystery is why Legrand, an individual of apparently limited social and financial status, should be so frequently photographed, and often by such highly competent early photographers. For Legrand’s biographer, this suggests that the subject must have been of considerable local significance, while the fact that so many of the images survive bespeaks the interest of early collectors. Also significant from a biographer’s perspective is the enduring appeal of several of the images, which continue to be reproduced, some to the point of cliché. It seems remarkable that these century-old photographs — anchored to their social and cultural times by subject
matter, narrative conventions, and the fact that most (and possibly all) were produced originally for commercial purposes) — should still, and in very different times, retain popular appeal, cultural significance, and economic value as a commodity.

Close reading of these visible reminders of Legrand’s past provides useful information about his life, career, efforts at self-representation, and even various ways in which he was perceived by contemporaries. It also suggests lines for further enquiry. Yet questions arise for which there are no clear answers. In particular, since the photographs are authored texts, and moreover, depictions of an habitually evasive subject, how far can we trust them as biographical evidence? Then again, to what extent do the artfully arranged details of the images accurately reflect significant aspects of the subject’s life and career? Most importantly, which (if any) of these varied, and in some cases unsettling, portrayals of Legrand comes closest to reflecting an authentic “self”?

This chapter turns to the life of “things” in examining these nine nineteenth-century photographs as “substantial texts in their own right” (Samuel 20) as well as tangible links to the physical existence of William Legrand. The discussion is based on my original research using primary and archival secondary materials, and on theoretical works by Raphael Samuel (1994) and by Jennifer Green-Lewis (1996, 2000). In addition, I have referred to John Tagg’s edited work on photographic representation (1988) and to works on Australian early photography by Alan Davies and Peter Stanbury (1985), by Lenore Frost (1991), and by Chris Long (1995). A comment by Elizabeth Edwards referring to anthropological photographs (2001) also has influenced my consideration of the Legrand photographs as biographical evidence. Edwards argues for understanding images as not merely representations “of” things, but as cultural objects with their own “social biographies” (13).
**Considering approaches to the photographs**

It must be noted that the Legrand photographs are a miscellany rather than a coherent collection. They consist of four individual studies, a set of two clearly related images, and a later set of three others. Considering these photographs as cultural objects further highlights their diversity. They were made at several different times, and by perhaps as many as six individual photographers; and they reflect differing social, economic, and physical contexts. Furthermore, the extant originals were preserved, or else managed somehow to survive, under varying circumstances; and they remain scattered, held within one or other of several separate archival collections. For Legrand’s biographer, his presence in each photograph links them as a notional portrait-gallery, and this effect is heightened now that several of the images can be accessed online. This recent virtual archive extends the photographs’ ongoing lives; but to a degree, it also distances the viewer from the original items, for example by de-emphasising differences in print size, or through variations in captions.\(^7\) Few, mainly solitary copies of the originals have survived, and it remains unclear as to whether or not they once appeared in sets, or in various sizes. Similarly, little or no original documentation survives, so that useful information such as exact dates, photographers’ names, or traces of early provenance are unlikely ever to be known. Meanwhile, the three least-known of all the Legrand images are currently not available online, and maintain ongoing lives of quiet obscurity.

As mentioned, the fact that as many as nine separate images of Legrand were made remains a puzzle. Nineteenth-century technology (and in particular, the invention and spread of *carte-de-visite* photography in the 1860s) had made it possible, and then increasingly fashionable, for members of the middle-classes to “[have] their likenesses taken frequently

\(^7\) The comment is intended as general: the official sites give currently known details, and are acknowledged as reference points on private sites. Yet the ambiguous early labelling (handwritten on the card) of one archival copy of Fig. 2 possibly has been responsible for occasional later misconception that Ikey Solomon, not Legrand, was the figure shown — implications of which are discussed in Chapter 3.
during their lives” (Davies 110). Yet from what is known of Legrand, it would seem uncharacteristic for him to be greatly influenced by whims of fashion, especially when his colonial lifestyle seems to have been far from affluent. On the other hand, evidence from elsewhere suggests that the self-made Legrand had middle-class aspirations, and he certainly engaged actively in self-promotion as regards his various social roles, despite remaining guarded about his inner self. He undoubtedly understood the advertising power of photography, and also may have been interested in the technology itself. It may be of some relevance that one of his known acquaintances was a pioneering Tasmanian photographer, and it also is quite possible that Legrand’s intellectual curiosity extended to the science of photography (as the process and the practice were then regarded).

Viewers “expect a photograph to tell a story” (Samuel 328), and whatever Legrand’s repeated exposures to the camera may have meant to him, it seems logical to assume that these photographs taken at intervals over the years might represent significant chapters in his life history. Yet though the surviving images do indeed shed light on Legrand’s life, career, and cultural milieu, one needs to resist the temptation to read them too literally. In Samuel’s view, it is never wise to “take photographs on trust and treat them as transparent reflections of fact” (329). He points out that nineteenth-century photographs were “quite self-consciously self-fabricated with a view to narration or visual effect” (330), and that much Victorian photography was “painterly in origin and intention even if it was documentary in form” (319). To varying degrees, the Legrand photographs adhere noticeably to these conventions: all display documentary intent; all are painterly in their carefully contrived compositions; and their historical and biographical content is subtly suffused with romantic, or sometimes comic, narrative. Furthermore, as viewers across the distance of time we cannot expect to read old photographs exactly in their original sense:

---

*Morton Allport was the early photographer.*
each image “belongs to a distinct moment; each owes its qualities to particular conditions of production, and its meaning to conventions and institutions which we may no longer readily understand” (Tagg 35). As Berger suggests, each image reflects the exercise of human choice as to what was “worth recording” (Berger 293). What we usually encounter is an artfully edited text.

Another complication is “the meaning which a picture acquires retrospectively in the course of its subsequent career” (Samuel 328). Clearly, distortions of original meaning arise when old photographs are, or have been, “exhibited later in the promotion of different realisms and in the service of different narratives” (Green-Lewis, Framing 2), which is the case for several of the Legrand images. Even the consistent popularity of the three favorite Legrand images must be regarded with caution, history being “never more chameleon than when it appears to stay the same” (Samuel x). Furthermore, in addition to rhetorical factors, and to the inevitable overlay of the viewer’s personal and cultural perspective, an old photograph may acquire belated significance on account of more recently available knowledge being brought to it. In short, despite the seeming transparency of old photographs as artifacts capturing particular moments in time, as “historical documents, fragments of a past, [they] have meaning only when they are put to use. Their meaning resides with the reader” (Dodge 346). Yet despite these many factors which make the photographs of Legrand challenging to work with as biographical material, critical opinion offers strategies as well as caveats. Green-Lewis advances the helpful opinion that “perhaps most crucial to any reading of nineteenth-century photographs is an awareness at the outset of the [current] [. . .] fondness for particular visions of the Victorian world” (Framing 14). Samuel takes the proactive view that:

---

9 Original emphasis.
If we are not to be at the mercy of these images, and if we are to use them to construct new narratives or pursue different problematics, we need to be able to take a critical distance [. . .]. Photographs, if we are to use them as illustrations, or as empirical evidence about the past, need historical criticism.

(329)

The cautions of Green-Lewis and the critical guidelines suggested by Samuel, underpin this discussion of the Legrand photographs, which will focus on these images to determine what they tell us about the life, career, and cultural significance of the subject himself.

Samuel emphasises that “photographs, if we are to use them as historical illustration, or as empirical evidence, about the past, need historical criticism” (330). He advocates genre analysis as an approach which may help identify narratives present within photographs, and also “the archetypal images underpinning them” (329). Secondly, attention to what he calls “the grammar of photography” — that is, formal analysis of composition, lighting, and frame — offers a step towards understanding effects the photographer intended to achieve (330). Thirdly he lists what he calls “record linkage”: the matching of images with relevant information. Here he adds the specific advice that noting what is included and what excluded “might help piece together the original contexts” (330).

Particularly helpful as regards the Legrand photographs is Samuel’s advocacy of genre analysis such as “would routinely be applied to a literary text,” to help pinpoint aesthetic choices made, as a way to accessing possible textual meanings (330). With photographs this analysis should cover ideology (for example, the pseudo-science of phrenology, the cult of genius, varieties of romanticism, and the popularity of the pastorale, all strongly influential on nineteenth-century photography); historical iconography (including archetypal images as well as contemporary codes of pose and posture); and also the narrative forms available within the photographer’s social and political climate (330).
Samuel further adds that critical analysis should extend to “the here-and-now, asking why a photograph is, in contemporary terms, appealing” (330). This last point is of particular relevance as regards the ongoing lives of Legrand photographs.

Green-Lewis also advocates aspects of the necessary critical distance delineated by Samuel, particularly given the contemporary vogue for Victorian images. She addresses important issues of transmission and appreciation, and points out that “it is worth considering what kind of a world these frequently reproduced photographs depict, for, as Foucault has noted, a ‘period only lets some things be seen and not others.’” She then suggests asking: “To what kinds of Victorian things do we [now] give visibility? What do we want to see?” (“At Home” 38).

This chapter will focus initially on the three best-known photographs of Legrand (Figs 1–3). These are the “bookseller” portraits whose ongoing lives have contributed so greatly to keeping their subject before the public eye. In addition to original prints of these images there exist surviving plate glass slides of all three, presumably made by the Hobart professional photographer and amateur historian, John Watt Beattie. These artifacts suggest that the images had very considerable public exposure during Beattie’s popular lantern slide evenings. This in turn suggests the particular vision of the past the three images might have been called upon to evoke. Beattie belonged to the Historical and Geographical Section of the Royal Society of Tasmania, the “small group of enthusiasts” active between 1899 and 1904 and again from 1921 to 1927, to whom Stefan Petrow attributes the arousing of interest in Tasmanian history (“Antiquarian Mind” 67). He describes their approach as antiquarian, conservative, and imbued with a sense of place. They stressed the need to gather and preserve Tasmanian historical records of many kinds before these were scattered,

---

10 Those certainly Beattie’s are Q12021 and Q2001.15.6.4 in the TMAG collection. Beattie (1859–1930) emigrated from Scotland in 1878, and became a full-time photographer in 1882. His output and influence were substantial, especially in landscape photography: his “work shaped the accepted visual image of Tasmania” (Rimon 42).
destroyed, or lost to time. In general, they skirted the issue of Tasmania’s convict past, preferring to focus on explorers, early administrators, and on advancement towards the current status quo (“Antiquarian Mind” 72, 73).\textsuperscript{11} It is easy to see how the three Legrand slides could contribute to a narrative congruent with this view, in presenting picturesque, non-confrontational reminders of old Hobart streetscapes, and of a Hobart bookman’s antiquarian interests.

In this chapter the three “bookseller” pictures are discussed individually, and in chronological order. Then the less well-known images of Legrand are discussed, grouped in clusters according to which of three other aspects of his public persona they apparently aimed to feature: the shell specialist, the eccentric, or the gentleman. These six images are not discussed in chronological order, even though several predate at least some of the famous three; instead, they are considered in terms of what they can tell us about Legrand’s life, career, and various public personas.

\textit{Legrand’s first bookshop: 7 Elizabeth Street}

The earliest of the three “bookseller” photographs is a streetscape attributed to Alfred Winter (Fig. 2). He was active in Hobart as a professional photographer between about 1869 and 1883, and there may be some significance in the fact that he occupied a studio quite near Legrand’s business premises during the years 1874 to 1878.\textsuperscript{12} Winter’s photograph shows Legrand standing at the door of his first known bookshop, at the address then numbered as 7 Elizabeth Street.\textsuperscript{13} The dates of Legrand’s tenancy narrow the time

\textsuperscript{11} Beattie, however, had a deep interest in the convict days, and a large, well-known collection of associated artifacts.

\textsuperscript{12} Winter (ca.1837–1911) made paper prints of Tasmanian subjects from at least 1866, but apparently set up in Hobart about 1869 (Long 127).

\textsuperscript{13} Archival copies of this photograph are listed variously: as “W. Legrand Booksellers Shop, Next Robb’s Saddler, Elizabeth St” Alfred Winter, ca. 1837–1911. Date 18—” in the SLT Allport collection; and as Legrand’s Old Shop in Elizabeth Street (a lantern slide made about 1902 by J. W. Beattie) in the TMAG collection; and as Ikey Solomon’s Shop, ca. 1860 in the AOT Pretyman collection. Winter’s image (with parts of his studio labels visible) also appears in the AOT online database of a miscellaneous collection of
frame to between 1866 and 1880, and Legrand’s appearance and dress suggest the early- to mid-1870s as the most likely time.\textsuperscript{14} His hair and whiskers are still quite dark and, in styles typical of the 1870s (Frost 33), he wears a single-breasted reefer jacket, a contrasting deep V-necked waistcoat, and a tall-crowned hard felt hat, and his hair is centre-parted.

In terms of what Samuel would call the “grammar” of Winter’s photograph, both composition and framing clearly identify the main focus as Legrand and his shop. Lines of directionality attract the viewer’s eye from the slanted verticals of the stacked shutters at the left towards and along the rising diagonal of the footpath, up along the dark vertical of the doorway at far right, then back across the distinctively curved roof-top of Legrand’s shop, and finally down the vertical mid-line to footpath level, where Legrand is framed within the darkened doorway at the side of his shop. The high-key tonality of the photograph focuses attention on the shop, with the dark textures of doorways, walls and chequered windows encircling the bland central block of the bookshop building. At the visual core of this composition is Legrand, lounging in his sunny doorway. The contrasting tonality of his garments echoes tonal elements of the whole picture, while the lines of his artfully “natural” pose harmonise with the lines of the tall shutters stacked nearby. In this one eloquent photograph, Winter achieves both a descriptive streetscape and a genre shot of Legrand “at home.”

As regards contextual links, this image of Legrand shows remarkable congruence with the persona he projects in his autobiographical article, “A Trip to Recherche Bay” (1869).\textsuperscript{15} Winter’s photograph presents the bookseller as smartly-dressed and confident, a

\textsuperscript{14} Perhaps significantly, Winter’s studio premises were only a short distance further up Elizabeth Street from Legrand’s shop at the time, numbered as 19 in 1874 and 1875, and as 23 in 1878 (Long 127).

\textsuperscript{15} The article is discussed in detail in Chapter 4.
man-about-town. Even photographed from afar, Legrand’s strong features are noticeable: a direct gaze, a prominent nose, and a broad face framed by luxuriant hair and whiskers. The bookshop is small, but the window display suggests that it is orderly. In these closely contemporary narratives (Winter’s photograph and the “Recherche” article) Legrand projects as cheerful, astute, and independent. At the same time, other striking contextual links in Winter’s photograph relate to Hobart’s earlier history. Clearly visible on the exposed front and side of Legrand’s Elizabeth Street shop is the faded signage generally accepted as left behind by a notorious earlier proprietor — Isaac (Ikey) Solomon, tobacconist. After sensational and prolonged entanglements with the law (matters closely followed by the press in both England and the colonies) ex-convict Solomon apparently rented this small building for some time before his death in September 1850. The fact that Winter’s photograph signals past and present proprietors of these premises suggests that inferences were being made. Even from this distance, parables of colonial modernity are apparent in the composition’s movement from unkempt allotment to imposing three-storied Georgian edifice, with Legrand’s humble brick building sandwiched in between. In such a reading, Legrand’s shop symbolises transition — in terms of architectural style; community evolution, prosperity and stability; and cultural progress (the urbane proprietor and orderly window display of the bookshop superseding the fading disreputable past). Signs of colonial progress were popular topics at the time, and were a central theme of the 1880 Melbourne Intercolonial Exhibition (where works by Winter were amongst those displayed).

16 A matter discussed in Chapter 3.

17 Consciousness of the lingering Solomon signage on his own shop premises may explain, in part, Legrand’s emphasis in his “Recherche” article on a faded old inn sign rescued from elsewhere for further duty at the settlement.

18 The buildings are discussed in detail in Chapter 3.
Winter’s photograph of Legrand’s Hobart establishment also can be read in terms of transnational context, as an antipodean reflection of momentous transformations then taking place at the heart of empire: the mid-nineteenth century modernisation of central London, during which photography and photo-journalism played a new and significant role in recording and transmitting images of ancient streetscapes just prior to, and during, their demolition. According to Lynda Nead:

London became part of a highly concentrated discourse on the modern [. . .]
[wherein] the language of improvement provided the terms for modernity […].
Improvement was a way of differentiating the city’s past from its modern present;
it was also, paradoxically, a way of ensuring the enduring presence of the historical past within the narratives of modernity. (5)

A similar discourse has attended the Alfred Winter photograph of Legrand’s shop, though at times the fact of Legrand’s occupancy has been down-played, or even expunged in the process. One such example is a 1966 newspaper article reproducing the image just before the shop’s demolition (“Hobart’s Oldest Shop is Closing.” Saturday Evening Mercury [Hobart] 19 November 1996: 11).Whilst recalling some of the building’s past history, the article places clear emphasis on civic progress. It begins, “The shop is shut for the first time in more than a century,” and goes on to state that “Hobart’s oldest business premises will be razed to make way for the city’s newest office block.” It highlights the early occupancy of the notorious “Ikey Solomon, a London ‘fence’ who was transported to Van Diemen’s Land, and survived to set himself up as a businessman,” and the long ownership of the

---

19 London newspapers and journals, which carried frequent reports and images of the modernisation, were available in the colonies. The transformation of such large swatches of the old familiar London surely would have emotional impact for many colonists, especially those who had known the old streetscapes well.
shop’s esteemed final occupant, Harold Sargison, who had bought the premises in 1922.\footnote{A particular emphasis of the article is that the hearty Sargison, then eighty-seven years old, had no intention of retiring from business, and had “spent weeks helping to dismantle and shift the stock and equipment from his old shop” to his new premises (11).} An unstated though clear contrast of ancient and modern is observable here in the temporal opposition of the disreputable Solomon (expatriate, and career specialist in stolen valuables) and the estimable Tasmanian-born Sargison, a creator of valuables recently described by the artist-writer Janet Fenton as “more than a jeweller: [ . . . ] a ‘master craftsman in silver and gold,’ much loved in Hobart for his personality as much as his artistry” (86).\footnote{Among well-known examples of Sargison’s artistry are his crafted souvenir spoons (1940s), the gold monstrance for Hobart’s St. Mary’s cathedral (1932), and the Tasmanian Parliament mace (1956).} For Legrand’s biographer, however, there is a pleasing parallel between past and last occupants of these premises in the coincidence that Sargison (like Legrand) was a keen outdoor naturalist, and that during his custodianship the old Elizabeth Street shop functioned as a central depot for the Tasmanian Field Naturalists Club (J. Fenton 86).

Whether Winter’s photograph originally was commissioned or freelance, at the time it clearly had documentary appeal, and this it has retained despite the differing responses to modernity over the years.\footnote{For example, the current resurgence of interest in the convict past, and efforts to retain old streetscapes often is accompanied by a sense of loss, in regret for old buildings which might well have been spared; yet a similar nostalgia is usually absent from earlier comments about old buildings and changing streetscapes.} Yet while older erstwhile contemporaries of Legrand could accurately interpret the scene, by the latter half of the twentieth century Winter’s image seems generally to have been associated with Solomon’s occupancy, sometimes to the extent that Solomon, rather than Legrand, was named as the human figure depicted.\footnote{For example, in a Hobart Mercury article (24 July 1946: 5) and a Saturday Evening Mercury feature (14 Dec. 1972: 13), both discussed in Chapter 3; and in the second edition (2002) of Levi and Bergman’s Australian Genesis (239). The tendency may well have been influenced by the titling of a copy of Winter’s photograph in the E.R. Pretyman collection as Solomons [sic] Tobacco Shop, Hobart (AOT NS1013/1/71). Alternatively, it may date to the artistic license taken with the Winter image when using it for a generic purpose, the first example found to date being a 1946 Mercury article incorporating an illustration by D. Colbron Pearse, discussed in Chapter 3.} Yet to Legrand’s biographer, the 1870s streetscape is a significant link to the
subject’s early Hobart career as book-dealer, entrepreneur, and antiquarian, and to his productive years as a Tasmanian conchologist. The tiny Elizabeth Street building remains Legrand’s first known colonial address. It was from here that he moved into other commercial ventures alongside his secondhand book-dealing; and it also was here, presumably in the back regions of the shop, that he laboriously collated his self-published pioneering works of conchology: Catalogue of Tasmanian Land Shells (1870), and Collections for a Monograph of Tasmanian Shells (1871). From this same base, he set forth on numerous shell-collecting expeditions, corresponded with intercolonial and overseas shell collectors, and maintained a prolonged presence at the Royal Society of Tasmania’s museum. By the time he posed for Winter’s photograph, various print references of the day suggest that Legrand was already an established Hobart identity.

**Legrand’s second bookshop: 60 Collins Street**

The second of the three iconic photographs of Legrand shows him posed outside his later book shop, at the premises in central Hobart where he settled late in 1879 (Fig. 3). The two-story conjoined building was situated between the Argyle Street corner and Crouch’s auction mart, and faced north-west across Collins Street. Though at one time Legrand apparently occupied more space than a single apartment of this complex, the photograph (seemingly taken between 1885 and the early 1890s) documents his final address, 60 Collins Street. The image is unattributed, but later was reproduced by Beattie, whose lantern slide copy survives (TMAG Q2001.15.6.4). An uncropped print version of

---

24 Matters discussed in Chapter 3.

25 Judging by Legrand’s appearance, and variations of his Collins Street address, or addresses, as shown in relevant Hobart street directories of the time (more fully discussed in Chapter 5). Yet one archival copy records the date as 1895 (Legrand’s Bookshop AOT NS1013/1/1895).

26 Described as “photograph positive black & white glass lantern slide. J.W. Beattie.1902 c.” O’Keefe assumes the original was a Beattie work made about 1895 (39–40), as does the contemporary review of O’Keefe’s book in the *Tasmanian Mail* (“Way We Were” 9 November 1982: 12–13).
the original also exists, showing a little more of the other side of the conjoined building (Legrand’s Bookshop AOT NS1013/1/1865).27

The anonymous photographer appears to have been familiar with Winter’s image of Legrand’s first shop (Fig. 2): indeed, there seems clear intertextuality between the two photographs, right down to details such as the almost identical pose of Legrand and also the apparently studied inclusion of a nearby empty doorway emphasising the occupancy of Legrand’s shop premises. In its composition the Collins Street photo signals the intention of documentary realism by using the convention of the front-face view in portraying shop and occupants. A narrative is suggested through the items of particular significance being framed by rectangular shapes and also underlined by the horizontals of the street, lower roof-line, sign, and upstairs roofing. Thus we read of the building’s part-tenancy (represented by the truncated roof shape and the offset chimney of Legrand’s portion, and the full cast-iron adornment of the shared central archway); the presence of living-quarters above the shop; the bookshop wares (in the window array); and details of occupancy (in the imposing signage, “Legrand. Bookseller. 60,” with Legrand and a female companion framed in the doorway beneath). Like the Winter photograph, this picture has the air of the genre shot. It elaborates a pattern of pairs (upstairs-downstairs, shop-storeroom, outdoors-indoors, workspace-dwelling, man-woman), suggesting a narrative of Legrand as still the man-about-town (symbolised by the hat and walking stick), but more conventionally housed than before, and now apparently domesticated. As in the Winter photograph, Legrand is bearded, bewhiskered, and smiling; again, he looks directly at the camera with a knowing eye. Once again lounging against the doorpost in characteristic crossover-leg pose, he nevertheless transmits alertness and physicality. Overall, Legrand appears contented, cheerful, and confident. He sports a stylish hat and trimmed whiskers, although his clothing seems on the

whole shabbier. By contrast, his companion is noticeably tidy, with smooth centre-parted hair, dignified dark gown, and long white apron. The predominantly rectangular shapes of the composition accentuate the diagonal and curved lines inscribed by the two people standing in the doorway — framing not only their central presence, but their apparent friendship. It is this human and more painterly portion of the photograph which is frequently reproduced — displaying in detail the pair in the doorway, the shop window, and the signage above.\(^{28}\)

As regards biographical information, the photograph firmly establishes Legrand’s business name and address, but raises the question of his companion’s identity.\(^{29}\) Generally, she is assumed to be his wife, Bethia Morey, which indeed may be so. On the other hand, apart from the record of their marriage in 1863, no later mention of Bethia has emerged, and other evidence (though slight) suggests the woman in the photograph is quite probably someone else. Possible candidates are Mary Briggs, later rumoured to be Legrand’s sister; and Sarah Lucas, a member of the Finlayson family with which Legrand appears to have been a longtime acquaintance.\(^{30}\) The list is not exhaustive. What does seem clear from the picture is the rapport between the two at the door, and also between them and their photographer. It is the immediacy of this human quality at the heart of the documentary image which gives the picture life: “an old photograph’s power to take one unawares” (Samuel 374). The homely grouping and steady gazes of Legrand and the woman in what is apparently a genre shot have the potential to evoke a “hallucinatory sense of oneness with

---

\(^{28}\) As two examples, the current brochures and bookshop display already mentioned. The detail used by the Illustrated Tasmanian Mail (1933) also included the upstairs portion immediately above the doorway.

\(^{29}\) Despite this bold signage, contemporary references seem frequently to have used the spellings “Le Grand” or “Le Grande”, with one known instance of “Legrond” (“Commentator,” Critic 13 October 1916, in Hume, Historical Records 2: 157) Yet three knowledgeable and affirmed customers of the bookshop, J. E. Calder, W. B. Walker, and W. E. L. H. Crowther (all referred to in later chapters) used the spelling “Legrand.”

\(^{30}\) Both women, and also the Finlayson family acquaintance, are discussed in Chapter 5. Mary Barden also is discussed in fuller detail in Chapter 2, and Sarah Lucas reappears in Chapter 6.
the past” (Samuel 374) for modern viewers accustomed to traditions of the old family album, or familiar with the many still-surviving physical traces of colonial Hobart.

A minor feature of the photograph which adds information of belated significance about Legrand is a detail in the upstairs windows. One upper-story room has its blind down, suggesting that it was used as living quarters, while the other appears to contain stacked bookshelves. From this it would seem that the ground floor storage space already had proved inadequate to accommodating Legrand’s stock. This fact links directly to a later description of conditions at the Collins Street shop as reported by a correspondent for the Launceston Daily Telegraph, almost certainly the Hobart-based A.W. Hume.31 Having picked his way around downstairs “in a gloomy light through the alleyways which were packed from floor to ceiling with volumes, ancient and modern,” he found that: “On the upper story of the building, there were four rooms, which held thousands of volumes. Order there was none; when the shelf room gave out, the books were thrown on the floor” (“At the Capital” Daily Telegraph [Launceston] 2 July 1902: 3).

A very much later article (possibly also by Hume) echoes this same impression in reporting the writer’s recollection of having gone “through the library with one of Legrand’s executors.” There is slight imprecision as regards detail in this account; perhaps the fact that sixteen years had passed since the event may account for this. The article was published the year after the Great War ended, when there apparently was fresh interest in the whereabouts of Legrand’s stock:

Every room was chocked up with books, with the dust of generations on them [. . .] the litter was terrible, the books were all packed up in the passages of the ground floor, and the upper stories to the attics were crammed with all sorts of odds and ends in the literature line. Volume was stacked upon

---

31 The Hobart journalist and amateur historian Alexander Williamson Hume (1850–1925) collected old print materials, and wrote extensively about the early days for the Critic.
volume, without regard to order, and some very valuable books were
discovered by those who fossicked about for them (Critic 24 Jan. 1919, in
Hume, Historical Records AOT NS 21/26/1: 203)

*Legrand in old age, Collins Street*

While these and other journalistic accounts paint vistas of cluttered and
predominantly worthless stock having been hoarded by Legrand, the third of the well-
known “bookseller” photographs shows him standing bemusedly inside his Collins Street
shop, surrounded by an array of clearly valuable antiquarian items (Fig. 1). Taken probably
in 1896, it presents Legrand as a stooped figure with graying hair and whiskers, and an
intelligent face.\(^{32}\) He is smiling, and his sharp eyes look directly at the camera. Presumably,
the photograph was not commissioned by Legrand. It was a work of commercial, and
possibly also of personal value to the photographer, John Watt Beattie — a fellow-collector,
and an amicable business acquaintance of Legrand’s, who was photographing and collecting
material about other old Tasmanian “characters” around this same time. The image would
have been made using the dry-plate method, of which Beattie was an early proponent.\(^{33}\) For
photographing the subject “at home”, rather than outdoors or in the studio, Beattie would
need to use extra lighting (O’Keefe 39), and the imported artificial brilliance imparts a
gleam to various smooth surfaces undoubtedly less noticeable in the bookshop’s everyday
dimness — backs of leather-bound volumes; the turned legs of Legrand’s solid old chair;
even the tops and turned-up toes of his weathered boots, and the slub of the corded carpet
underfoot.

\(^{32}\) Although the TAHO Allport collection copy, *Legrand in his Shop* (Fig. 1) is unattributed, the TMAG lists
another copy as “J.W. Beattie. Photograph print. Gelatin silver panel print. 1902 c.” At least one other one
archival copy has the photograph mounted on card stamped with Beattie’s studio name. According to James
Dally, the portrait “is dated 24 February 1896” (9). No copy studied by me bears this date mark, although
considerable circumstantial evidence arising from my research adds credence to Dally’s finding.

\(^{33}\) The dry-plate had “supplanted the wet plate in 1879, the year Beattie began his career” (*Tasmanian Mail* 9
Nov. 1982:13).
As regards pictorial composition, the lines of the laden bookshelves draw the viewer’s eye from left to right, across to the central vertical figure of Legrand; then down, past the pale landscape and curved chair behind him to the floor, which is scattered with rolled papers and a large old poster proclaiming, “Reward, £25”. This visual journey produces a narrative about the kinds of materials associated with Legrand’s bibliographic career, in direct contrast to the customary accounts undoubtedly familiar to many viewers at the time, which emphasised the bookshop’s dimness and clutter.

Still more importantly, the photograph is a character portrait of Legrand, an apparent genre study of the bookseller at home in his den. Directionality, tonality, and Legrand’s central placement all focus the viewer’s gaze on the subject himself. Dignity is assigned through use of the three-quarter pose, and by positioning the camera at a low angle (so that the viewer looks up to Legrand). Posed with studied Victorian naturalism, Legrand stands beside a bookshelf, dressed in shabby work clothes and swathed in a large, tattered apron. Seemingly interrupted from his reading, he “regards the camera [. . .] in quizzical fashion” (Sprod illust.70). The image is warmly persuasive. Another modern commentator has enthused that Beattie “captured Legrand in what was, no doubt, a typical engagement: a book, or manuscript in his hands, he is glancing up at friend or customer to mutter wisdoms through his tangly beard” (O’Keefe 40).34 Since at least 1902, when the photograph was reprinted as an obituary tribute by the Tasmanian Mail, this image has been seen as epitomising Legrand.35

As regards its contextual links to time and place, the photograph features shop items of clear historical significance: in particular, sets of large leather-bound tomes, and a

34 The same comment was quoted verbatim by the Tasmanian Mail reviewer (9 Nov. 1982: 13).

large painting of Hobart Town as seen from across the Derwent. Several details also represent transition — the convict-era reward poster contrasting with what are possibly official volumes from the self-government era; the romantic seascape an evocation of the early times; and amongst these the stooped, preoccupied presence of Legrand himself, the knowledgeable custodian of old works now nearing the end of his own days. The photograph weaves the romantic narrative of a kindly-faced old bibliophile, happiest when pottering about amongst his treasures. A comparable vision informs one obituary description of Legrand:

When he got hold of anything valuable or curious he was loth [sic] to part with it. He had a keen palate when it came to the appreciation of customers. To some he was barely civil; for others he would go to any trouble. With the customers of his heart he was never sordid or grasping. (Clipper [Hobart] 5 July 1902, in Hume, Historical Records)37

This same passage echoes a traditional bibliophile trope in recalling how Legrand once refused to sell to a mercenary-minded customer for ten shillings something which “five minutes later passed into another customer’s hands for half-a-crown. Legrand liked the second customer, and had a book-lover’s contempt for the first.”38

As Samuel reminds us, “Romanticism built on time’s ruins. Its idea of memory was premised on a sense of loss” (ix). In the case of Beattie’s fin-de-siècle photograph, its nostalgic romanticism has contributed in large measure to the work’s longevity. The elegiac

36 The picture has been attributed to the Norwegian-born convict artist, Knut Bull (James Dally, qtd. American Book Collector 1), but as far as can be seen, it also bears resemblance to seascapes by the later artist, Haughton Forrest. Expert opinion was sought during research for the present thesis, but the identity of the work could not be established from the photograph. Efforts to resolve the mystery are continuing.

37 The prose style and sentiments of this piece suggest it was not composed by Hume.

38 For example, the same trope is present in several descriptions of the widely-known Scots/American bibliophile and bookseller William Gowans (1803–1870), early biographical commentator on the writer Edgar Allen Poe, with whose fictional character William Legrand (in “The Gold-Bug”) the Hobart bookseller has been compared (Dally 26).
evocation of an era ending perhaps also may have been a factor in rekindling local interest
in Legrand and his bookshop after the end of World War One — and perhaps even in the
opening of a Hobart second-hand bookshop named after Legrand on the eve of World War
Two. More recently, “a vertiginous sense of disappearing worlds” has been an impetus for
“the historicist turn in national life” (Samuel 150). This has given rise, in Australia as in
Britain, to “the antiques boom of the 1960s”, and “the rise of Victoriana” in the 1970s
(Samuel 337, 342). Again, national initiatives such as celebration of Australia’s “bi-
centenary” year in 1988 also promoted interest in local pasts. Sprod’s 1977 caption for
Beattie’s “bookseller” portrait of Legrand contains the remark that “the rare Tasmanian
items displayed in his shop can only give rise to feelings of frustration in modern
collectors” (illus. 70), while more general comments by others elsewhere express local regret
at the quantity of rare Tasmanian historical items lost to the mainland and overseas. The
Beattie photograph rapidly became iconic, and has remained so, possibly in part because it
personalises and celebrates the history of the place to which it belongs. In this way,
Legrand, epitomised by this image in particular, but also a familiar presence on account of
the other two “bookseller” images, has remained emblematic of Old Hobart, and of the
antiquarian book trade in general.

Writing in 2000 Green-Lewis commented in her essay, “At Home,” on “our
fin-de-siècle romance with Victorian culture” (30), and proposed reasons for the
twentieth-century “classificatory shift [. . .] that has taken images of the nineteenth
century to market as conveyors of identity and authenticity” [creating] “a thriving
business that services its customers’ nostalgia in the manner of photography itself:
with the promise of access; with the solace of retrieval; with the pleasures of loss”

39 Discussed further in Chapter 6.

40 The view remains current. The same sentiment has been expressed at intervals over the years — for
example, at the sale of Legrand’s goods in 1902, and (in general, and entirely remote from any reference to
Legrand) by members of the Historical and Geographical Section of the RST (1899–1904, 1921–1924).
(29). The continuing allure of the Beattie “bookseller” photograph owes much to prevailing sentiments such as Green-Lewis describes. Certainly, as Sprod notes, the artifacts on display whet the appetites of current collectors (illust. 70). Overall, the picture’s long-continuing popularity seems firmly based in its potential to evoke feelings of loss and nostalgia, whether in terms of place, or vanished artifacts; or else through a sense of the irretrievability of a captured moment. Yet there is more to the picture’s appeal than this: the vibrant central figure of Legrand brings the photograph to life, creating the impression of immediacy. Furthermore, the portrait has an interactive quality that seems the genuine projection of the subject’s personality. The secret to this is not so much in the contrived spontaneity of the photographer’s “capture” of the subject in the act of glancing up from his work (O’Keefe 40), but in the directness of Legrand’s gaze: his “quizzical look” as it meets the gaze of the viewer (Sprod, illust. 70). The overall effect is one of shared humour — perhaps evoked by some pleasantry being exchanged at the time the shutter fell, but apparently quite genuine. It is as if Legrand is sharing with the viewer his amused participation in “the artifices of Victorian photography” (Samuel 319), including the whimsy of the absurdly tattered work-apron more threadbare than the clothes it covers.

At a more serious level, the photograph seems issuing a personal statement (by both Legrand and Beattie) about Legrand’s significance as antiquarian. A corroborating narrative is achieved through the inclusion of a small detail intimately connected with Legrand’s career: the glass inkwell armed with its long-handled pen, centrally placed, and close to hand on the desk of the bookshelves beside which he stands. It can be seen as allusion to the incalculable quantities of words penned by Legrand over the years in his characteristically jagged, often indecipherable script — book lists, articles for publication, conchological observations, research notes, drafts of his shell treatise, and numerous
Legrand’s scratchy script has attracted considerable comment over the years. An otherwise admiring contemporary once complained:

Mr. Legrand, though a well educated man writes a villainous hand. I have been obliged to take his list down to him, to get him to decypher [sic] many of his intelligible words, and have written such as he meant to use, under his scrawls. I wrote in pencil in his shop, and inked them in afterwards. (Calder, qtd. Dally 20)

Yet the longer one studies this eloquent and engaging photograph, the less trustworthy it seems. For a start, there is suspicious discrepancy between the orderly array of Legrand’s colonial wares as shown and the reports emerging only slightly later of overwhelming amounts of long-undisturbed clutter throughout the dim shop, extending even to its upper regions. This discrepancy may well be explained by the fact that Legrand’s showroom undoubtedly would be carefully arranged for the Beattie photograph. Furthermore, it is very likely that during Legrand’s final years he may have concentrated on specific colonial material for which he had ready buyers, paying little attention to other areas amongst his previously accumulated stock, and that these neglected goods were those later described as dust-covered and disordered. Even so, a carefully-folded suit coat draped over an easel peg, almost out of sight in the background, hints at the contrived nature of Legrand’s attire in the photograph; and a huge leather satchel partly-visible beneath the easel raises suspicion that the prestigious painting displayed may have been on loan for the occasion. Furthermore, comparison with Beattie photographs of other subjects taken around the same time in the Royal Society Room at the Hobart museum highlights striking similarities between the tomes, shelves, chair, fireplace, walls, and skirting boards shown in the Legrand photograph.

These works are discussed in Chapter 5.
and those apparent in the Society room pictures.\textsuperscript{42} These echoes probably arise from understandable coincidence; and certainly it has been long accepted that the photograph truly reveals the interior of Legrand’s Collins Street shop. Still, Beattie had strong connections with the Society, and was himself a noted collector of Tasmaniana, and no doubt could have supplied photogenic props if needed. The composition’s only element of inarguable authenticity is the presence of Legrand himself.

\textit{The shell specialist}

Of the six lesser-known photographs of Legrand, the two portraying him as a conchologist and the two where he appears to be clowning are companion pieces to one or other of the two later “bookseller” photographs discussed above. Seemingly always less publicised than the popular three, they are indeed far less appealing.\textsuperscript{43} Yet they provide further links to Legrand’s life and career through their intertextuality with each other and with the three more famous images. In particular, they forge a rich iconic association between the entrepreneurial colonial figure and two well-known London conchologists, highlighting the fact that nineteenth-century amateur science could pave a way to social advancement.

The earlier of the “conchologist” photographs (Fig. 4) appears to have been made close in time to the popular picture of Legrand and his woman companion at the Collins Street shop, and possibly even was made on that same day.\textsuperscript{44} It is a small \textit{carte-de-visite},

\textsuperscript{42} Expert opinion has been sought, and the strong points were made that the floor coverings are clearly dissimilar in both images, that the bookshelves are at different angles, and the books (as far as can be seen) are not identical. Even so, the possibility of photographic trickery as regards the setting lingers, and perhaps warrants further investigation.

\textsuperscript{43} Though the fact that one of them is in \textit{carte-de-visite} format suggests that multiple copies of that image may once have been in circulation.

\textsuperscript{44} As supporting evidence, Legrand’s face and whiskers, and also the sun’s angle, and details of the doorway and street-front panels seem the same in both images. Noticeable though minor differences are that the shop windows are shuttered in this composition but not in the other, and that Legrand wears slightly different clothing in each.
photographer unknown, taken outdoors in full sun, showing Legrand poised on his doorstep as if about to leave the shop — perhaps to deliver the book in his hand. No longer lounging against the doorpost, his stance is noticeably stooped. His general appearance is lean, dishevelled and gipsy-like, and particularly noticeable are his wild hair, large nose and long brown hands. He is casually dressed, wearing a pale jacket and loosely buttoned waistcoat, ill-fitting narrow trousers of apparently poor quality material, and square-toed, probably elastic-sided boots. Overall, the clothing seems typical of the late 1860s, but since this appears another of Legrand’s “in role” poses, the other factors date the picture more reliably.

It is the nautical neck cloth and cap which suggest the photograph’s intention of projecting Legrand’s persona as conchologist. The picture shows striking similarity to an iconic photograph of the notable English conchologist and publisher, Lovell Augustus Reeve (1814-1865) (Fig. 7b), whose best-known work, the Conchologia Iconica (1843–1878) was for some time a standard reference, and was a key text cited by Legrand in his own shell treatise. While the use of Reeve iconography in this photograph of Legrand might seem a surprising assertion, other evidence suggests links between Reeve and Legrand. Firstly, the entrepreneurial London-based Reeve had other interests besides conchology. A noted publisher, he was a “keen supporter of the educative and documentary value of photography,” and in 1858 he not only produced the first book illustrated with

---

45. The carte-de-visite, a relatively cheap though “usually artistically dull” pictorial process, was introduced to Hobart in 1861 (Davies and Stanbury 113), and “became the predominant form of the photographic portrait” for some time (Long xi). Typically, each measured 6.3cm.x 10.5cm and were mounted on card. In Tasmania, as elsewhere, collecting cdvs was a popular hobby.

46. The semi-fastened waistcoat may have been an affectation of style, rather than carelessness, since in photographs of 1860-69, Lenore Frost has noted “a quirk of this period […] was to wear several middle buttons of the waistcoat undone, displaying the shirt” (27).

47. The first fifteen volumes were published by Reeve. After his death, George Sowerby, the second, edited the last five volumes (Dance, Shell Collecting 158-9). In 1885 the Royal Society of Tasmania library catalogue listed the volumes issued to 1878, thus Legrand may have used these when compiling his own shell treatise.
stereo photographs, but also began publishing an ambitious photography magazine certainly read in Australia (Macleay Museum parags.1–2). Tasmanian photographers were early practitioners in the field, and a relevant example well-known to Legrand was Morton Allport, solicitor, naturalist, art enthusiast, and leading Fellow of the Royal Society of Tasmania. Allport was an accomplished amateur photographer who contributed three photographs published in Reeve’s pioneering magazine. A second, more direct, and highly significant link between Legrand and Reeve is that Tasmanian shells sent by Legrand appeared in the continuation of Reeve’s *Conchologia Iconica*, undertaken by George Sowerby (W. L. May, “Fluvial Mollusca” 65). Analysing the Legrand carte-de-visite in terms of its assumed intertextuality with the Reeve portrait produces a narrative of the self-made businessman as practical conchologist and successful publisher of shell manuals. In this scenario, Legrand holds a copy of his definitive work, *Collections*, just as Reeve has his hand on a volume of the *Conchologia Iconica*, and the strikingly similar nautical caps worn by both men are a reminder of the historical links between sailors, sea voyages, and shell collections.

Whether coincidentally or not, there are obvious career parallels between Reeve and Legrand, and considering these throws light on the figure of the self-made savant within

---

48 The Stereoscopic Magazine: A Gallery of Landscape Scenery, Architecture, Antiquities and Natural History. Accompanied with Descriptive Articles by Writers of Eminence. London: Lovell Reeve, 1858–1865. Published monthly at 2 shillings and sixpence; each issue contained three stereo photos with descriptive letterpress (see North Waterloo Directory). Issues were later bound into five volumes. The magazine ran for seven years only, as Reeve died in 1865 (Macleay Museum parag. 2).

49 Allport’s photographs were published in issue No. 49, July 1862, now vol. 4 (1862-3) (Holland, “Contents of The Stereoscopic Magazine Published by Lovell Reeve”). Originals of the three images are in the George Eastman House collection, Rochester, NY.

50 William May (1921) states authoritatively that “Sowerby […] in the Conch. Icon. [sic] described seven species of Physa, mostly sent him by Legrand” (“Revised Census of Tasmanian Fluviatile Mollusca” 65). Questions arise as to whether Legrand’s shells arrived prior to Reeve’s death, and whether Legrand had earlier contact with Reeve. Before emigrating, Legrand may well have been familiar with Reeve’s curio shop and his later publishing house in central London.

51 Dance has identified the book in the Reeve portrait as being a volume of the *Conch. Icon*. (Shell Collecting Plate XXXII).
the changing world of nineteenth-century science. Reeve was an amateur conchologist who rose to prominence from apparently humble beginnings as a grocer’s apprentice. Attracting notice and substantial backing for an early work on conchology, he bought and profitably sold a Dutch shell collection, and “established himself as a dealer in natural objects and as a publisher specializing in natural history books” (Dance, “Reeve” parag. 2).^52 Similarly, Legrand began his Tasmanian career in connection with the grocery trade, established himself as a dealer in old books and natural objects, then advertised himself as also a stationer and bookbinder, and eventually self-published his own pioneering work of conchology. In the colonies, Legrand also attracted some financial backing for his scientific project, though not to the extent of the Linnean Society’s munificence towards Reeve; but though Legrand’s book seems to have been taken seriously, it was never commercially printed.

Another parallel between the careers of Reeve and Legrand is striking, whether or not it was coincidental: just as Reeve (in 1848) ceased dealing in the natural objects which had interested him since boyhood, so Legrand (only a little before the Reevesian photograph was taken) had relinquished his own celebrated shell collection, painstakingly assembled over many years. The reasons behind Legrand’s seemingly abrupt abandonment of his former passion are mysterious; but as his London counterpart had been, he was a businessman, and the profitable sale of his collection ahead of the 1890s depression no doubt helped ensure his economic survival. In all, whether or not Legrand consciously followed Reeve’s lead, the small, long-forgotten, Reevesian carte de visite seems a significant comment on Legrand’s colonial conchological career.

^52 The Linnaean Society assisted in the publication of Reeve’s first major work, Conchologia Systematica (1840–41), issued in two volumes, and illustrated with 500 plates by the Sowerbys. Kelly’s 1846 June edition of the London Post Office Directory lists “Reeve Bros. lithographers, letterpress printers and publishers of illustrated scientific works, 8 King William-street, Strand” (Winton 436). In 1848 Reeve sold his shell-dealing partnership, thereafter concentrating solely on publishing (Dance, Shell Collecting 158).
The second of the two “conchologist” photographs of Legrand (Fig. 5) clearly was taken on the same day as Beattie’s indoors “bookseller” photo (Fig. 1), and therefore probably early in 1896. Legrand appears plump-faced and is warmly-dressed. His thinning, wispy hair and full moustache retain some dark colour, but the bushy beard is grey. More noticeable here than in the other photographs are his large hands, with their tapering fingers and notably long nails. As usual, his most striking facial features are the prominent nose and shrewd, piercing gaze; but here, his expression is serious and he seems weary. Significantly, neither this nor any of other photographs show Legrand wearing spectacles, those standard props for depicting old age or scholarly pursuits. One can assume Legrand had strong eyesight — something also apparent from his successful fieldwork in detecting tiny, well-camouflaged land shells. The photograph shows him seated at the familiar bookshelf, rugged-up in his high buttoned waistcoat and oversized reefer jacket, the tattered apron tossed to one side. One hand holds open a book, and the other rests on the large conch shell held on his lap. As regards composition, the photograph effectively employs line and tonality (through gleaming vertical book spines and the slanted angles of lower-placed books and the background painting) to focus the viewer’s eye on the face of Legrand, and then (following the curved line of his coat sleeve) to move the eye to the conch, to the book (parallel on the shelf above), and back again to the face. Undoubtedly, the visual narrative centres on Legrand’s long years of conchological study.

The photograph employs the standard cliché of posing the sitter alongside symbols of his work, but here again associations between Legrand and an eminent conchologist are suggested through striking parallels with a well known study of the famous English adventurer-collector, Hugh Cuming (Fig. 7a). Surviving photographs of Cuming show him in old age and do not disguise that “he was a man worn out by years of travel, toil and ill-

53 The “conchologist” photograph is held by the W. L. Crowther collection, State Library of Tasmania, under the title of “Mr. Legrand, Bookseller, Hobart. J. W. Beattie, ca. 1895.”
health” (Dance, Shell Collecting 170). From his three collecting voyages around Polynesia, the west coast of South America, and the Philippine islands, Cuming had brought back a wealth of specimens new to European conchologists, and shared his trophies amongst various interested parties. As one example, “the Cuming collection was Reeve’s principal source of illustrative material” (Dance Shell Collecting 159), and eventually it was purchased by the British Museum.

That a photograph of Legrand should refer iconically to the famous Cuming is not surprising, but there also are clear parallels (perhaps belatedly apparent) between the two men’s careers. Both were practical, self-taught, intentionally scientific collectors, and both eventually were accused of amateurism and inaccuracy. Cuming was privately disparaged by some on account of his social status and personality, and after his death, harsh criticism was levelled at his scientific accuracy, especially in his labelling methods. One particularly vicious comment referred to “the many miasmas arising from the pestilential conchological swamp of the Cuming collection” (M.K. Connolly, qtd. Dance, Shell Collecting 167). A far milder observation was made by Legrand: “Although this shell is described as Tasmanian, I have great doubts of the correctness of the habitat. I do not know of, neither do I believe that there is a single specimen in the hands of a collector or Museum in Australia. The type specimen in the British Museum was formerly in the collection of the late Mr. Cuming” (Collections Helix spec.1).

Eventually, the also socially marginal Legrand himself came sharply under attack, and his labelling of shells at the Hobart museum was described with sarcasm as demonstrating the same flawed methods used by Cuming (Brazier “Trochidae” 194). Knowledge of this denigration of Legrand’s scientific practice adds significance to Beattie’s

54 The voyages were, respectively, 1827–1828, 1828–1830, and 1836–1840.
55 Discussed in Chapter 5.
use of Cumingian iconography in the late 1890s photograph. It would be interesting to know in what ways the evoked parallels between the two old conchologists were meant to be read, and whether the Tasmanian photograph was intentionally ambiguous. Beattie’s treatment of his subject is at least sympathetic. In this, and also in its timing, the portrait seems linked to the apparent sudden flurry of acknowledgement accorded Legrand by members of the local scientific community around the turn of the century, as he neared the end of his life.  

Yet the interpretation of photographs is not just a matter of considering individual pictures within specific socio-historical contexts: we need also to read for different performances of identity amongst the images. To search for signs of essential identity within a photographic image is a slippery business, as these images of Legrand make particularly clear. In the later photographs, for example, on the same day Legrand was portrayed as a bookseller, we find him also represented as a conchologist and as a clown!

*Legrand in comic role*

The humour of the two “clowning” pictures is dated, and they lack the pictorial appeal of the companion images in the two sets of later photographs of Legrand. The earlier one shows Legrand still posed in his Collins Street doorway, but now adopting a raffish stance — hands thrust in the pockets of his crumpled jacket, and a battered felt hat askew on his head (Fig. 6).  

His smiling expression appears somewhat strained but, as usual, he gazes directly at the camera. In terms of iconography, intertextuality is apparent though the reference is difficult to pinpoint. Through the small clue of what seems a rolled paper spill, or perhaps a quill, protruding from under Legrand’s hat, there seems an implied link to Victorian portrayals of eccentricity — one image that comes to mind is the well-known

---

56 For example, in addition to appreciative mention by C. E. Beddome (1888) and H. D. Atkinson (1895), the more formal recognitions by W. F. Petterd (1888) and R. M. Johnston (1890). To a modern reader, all these tributes, to varying degrees, sound a conciliatory note.

57 Crowther collection, State Library of Tasmania, the print described as maker unknown, Mr. Legrand at the Door of His Bookshop – Collins St (18--).
The later “clowning” photograph, one of the three Beattie indoors images of Legrand, shows him standing, as before, in between the tall bookshelves and the large seascape painting (Fig. 8). The image provides a full length, full-face view of Legrand. He wears the same work clothes as in the companion “bookseller” and “conchologist” portraits, with the addition of a large, dark fur cap worn on his head. One hand clasps a small, bound volume to his hip; while the other holds another book, a finger keeping it open at a particular place. Legrand stands very crookedly, and looks uncomfortable. It may be that maintaining his awkward stance sufficiently long for it to be recorded on camera was painful for the elderly Legrand; but in any case, it is difficult to believe he would relish assuming this ludicrous pose. Here again, iconic referents are difficult to place, though the cap may link to whaling, to polar exploration, or to military adventures of the Crimean War era. Overall (though perhaps belatedly), the photograph conveys striking overtones of “old lag” portraits taken long after the cessation of transportation to Tasmania — in particular, one studio photograph by Beattie of an ancient ex-convict decked out in convict clothing, leg irons, and chains. In either case, the human subject is displayed as a quaint colonial relic, an object of curiosity. More recently, the “clowning” image of Legrand has featured as an object of admiration: used as a display poster and as catalogue cover image for the

---


60 Its presence returns us to the “bookseller” portrait, where the cap is partly visible, placed to one side of the desk inkwell.

61 He was by then in his seventies, and appears from his posture in numbers of the photographs to have some slight physical infirmity.

62 Bill Thompson Allport Library and Museum of Fine Arts, SLT (AUTAS001125883736).
important exhibition, Masterpieces of Australian Photography 1850–1960 by the Josef Lebovic Gallery, held in Sydney in 1988.63

As regards links to Legrand’s life and career, the “clowning” photographs are reminders that many contemporaries regarded him with disdain, whether or not as an eccentric. One disdainful customer (James Backhouse Walker) described him as “a true specimen of the book-stall man, dirty and rapacious” (qtd. Dally 11). Yet a former customer of a later generation recalled Legrand more jovially: as “the old sportsman,” and “obliging,” but as physically “dirty” (Crowther qtd. Dally 9). From the move to Collins Street onwards, Legrand and his shop appear to have been regarded as synonymous. In 1881, according to the otherwise approving J. E. Calder, Legrand’s shop was “a good deal of a piece with himself in matters of neatness” (qtd. Dally 25), a situation which only escalated over the next twenty years. According to the description given by a reporter who had visited the closed-up shop at the end:

Legrand was a collector of curiosities, and one room contained an assortment of odds and ends the like of which would only be found in a marine store in “Radcliffe Highway” or “Seven Dials” over half a century ago. Stamp albums, bayonets, handcuffs, cooking utensils, works of art, old fashioned volumes [. . .] laid about and formed a chaos of confusion that was painful for a person who was gifted with the bump of order to look on. (Daily Telegraph [Launceston] 2 July 1902: 3)

Even so, eccentricity apparently worked to social and commercial advantage for Legrand, and the “clowning” photographs may have been an attempt to capture or to capitalise on this fact. Throughout an era when dealing in secondhand goods had derogatory connotations, it was Legrand’s alert, enigmatic, and unpredictable personality, together with his reputation

for arcane knowledge, which apparently endowed the shop with its own *cachet*, and maintained him on the social map in a class of his own. His Collins Street signage, “Legrand. Bookseller. 60,” marked the site of a local institution.

The unconvincing gentleman

Reading across the surviving images of Legrand produces no static singular subject. Even so, the two last photographs for discussion have proved a jarring reminder to the biographer that the subject remains opaque; that perhaps no amount of research can hope to resolve the question of Legrand’s authentic “self”; and that in any case, my feelings towards him remain complex. Both images show Legrand in role as private gentleman. Neither photograph seems to have been well-known, though one (Fig. 10) now appears online. What appears the earlier of the two (Fig. 9) emerged only during the latter part of the thesis research. Possibly the earliest of all the surviving images of Legrand, it is a solitary *carte-de-visite* expertly assessed as made in the 1870s and as displaying “the hallmarks of that period — a vignetted close up, mounted on squared-cornered thin card, with pale blue line around the edge” (Davies, personal correspondence 27 May 2008). Whether through unfortunate circumstance, the photographer’s lack of skill, or simply the unprepossessing appearance of the sitter, this small portrait lacks appeal of any sort. Yet it is of much biographical significance in suggesting a gentlemanly “self” Legrand sought to present during the phase of his eminence as an authority on Tasmanian shells. Not only does he appear more elaborately-dressed here than in the other surviving photographs, but this is the only one where he does not look directly towards the viewer. The nature and condition of his attire are somewhat puzzling. He wears a wide-collared, soft-fronted shirt; a tie loosely-knotted in a wide soft bow; and an ill-fitting striped waistcoat with horseshoe-shaped neckline. Were these special occasion clothes, or perhaps souvenirs of a dandified past, or were they borrowed finery? Whatever the case, they are untidily covered by a shabby, wide-
lapelled coat with sloping shoulder-line, possibly a reefer jacket. Is Legrand’s dishevelled appearance in this photograph the result of hasty posing, or of inattention to detail; or was it deliberate — for example, a wish to transmit the appearance of romantic, moody, or erudite distraction? Perhaps the semi-profile view set up by this image was the photographer’s attempt to achieve a physiognomic portrait by emphasising Legrand’s wrinkled forehead and prominent nose. Indeed, both the “gentleman” photographs can be seen as typical of what Helen Groth describes in *Victorian Photography and Literary Nostalgia* as “[t]he nineteenth-century fascination with the face as the transparent boundary between public and private selves, presence and absence” (16). According to her:

> Informed by the widely disseminated principles of Physiognomy, and later Phrenology, most Victorians subscribed to a greater or lesser degree to the belief that the contours of the face revealed a secret history that no amount of sophistry could mask. The invention of photography only amplified and mystified the metaphysics of presence that underpinned this equation of sight with insight. (16)

The second of the portraits of Legrand posed as a gentleman is a solitary sepia study, photographer unknown (Fig.10). It is a more polished work than the earlier carte-de-visite, yet with still less appeal. Its recorded date is 1880, but Legrand’s clothing and hairstyle suggest earlier.\(^64\) Even allowing for his clothing to be old-fashioned, his hair seems darker than in the Winter photograph, though the use of hair dye cannot be dismissed. Following Victorian conventions, the photograph is a head-and-shoulders, three-quarter face view of the subject, and he sits against a fronded background screen. The image fades off towards the edges, creating the central “vignette” where the chiaroscuro effect of high tonality places strong emphasis on the face. To modern eyes, this is not a flattering portrait. It accentuates

\(^64\) In particular, the wide collar, broad reveres and baggy sleeves of his jacket, the matching high-buttoned waistcoat, and the 1860s fashion of his long, straight, centred-parted (and possibly, oiled) hair.
Legrand’s broad, furrowed brow; sombre deep-set eyes; prominent nose; and thick facial hair. He seems tense and humourless; his complexion is flaccid, his expression harried.

Well-dressed and posed as a gentleman, he eyes the camera with bleak suspicion. The photograph perhaps was commissioned by Legrand, or it may be an amateur or experimental work (possibly even by a personal acquaintance). In terms of genre, iconography, and narrative, it clearly concedes to the claims of photography as being both science and art, the idea prevalent at the time.

The portrait’s iconography suggests antipodean affinity with the Victorian vogue for photographing great thinkers — the famous Julia Margaret Cameron “Dirty Monk” photograph of Alfred, Lord Tennyson comes readily to mind (Fig.11).65 Tennysonian iconography might explain Legrand’s unfashionably long hair as well as his pensive pose in this colonial portrait, perhaps as allusion to his own bibliographic interests. Here again, the influence of Reeve is possible — the successful conchologist turned publisher capitalised on “the happy marriage of commerce with the cult of hero worship” through photography works which “lured potential customers in with aspirational titles” (Groth 35–6).66

Legrand’s gentlemanly attire and troubled look in this early photograph add to (rather than answer) enduring questions about his mysterious past. Only the latter half of his long life was spent in Tasmania, and despite persistent speculations and rumours, Legrand was as much an enigma then as he is now. Ultimately, the anonymous sepia study of its exotic, inscrutable subject is perhaps the most fully documentary image of the nine discussed — a reminder of how little ever was known, or is likely to be known, about the personal identity

65 Tennyson jokingly referred to it by this alternative title; today the descriptor is commonly used. The image was taken May, 1865, and Cameron thought highly of it, using it as frontispiece in her “ill-fated two volume Illustrations to Tennyson’s ‘Idylls of the King’, and Other Poems” (1875), published in London (Groth 153, 172). It is currently the cameo image of Tennyson used for the Oxford DNB entry (see Ricks).

66 For example, Portraits of Men of Eminence in Literature, Science, and Art, with Biographic Memoirs, vols 1-3. London: Lovell Reeve, 1863–5. The volumes, containing “photographs from life by Ernest Edwards, B.A.” and others, and edited by Reeve, include an image of Cuming (vol.2) and images of a number of other men of science (vols. 1 and 3) (Holland “Contents” 1–12).
of William Legrand, despite his long years as conchologist, bookseller, and antiquarian of Hobart town.

In all, the nine surviving images of Legrand are layered texts, combining documentary evidence, Victorian artifice, and the subject’s evident collusion in each narrative. As I have suggested here, they offer rich insights into Legrand’s various incarnations. Yet informative as these photographs are, there remains a puzzling dissonance between the dour “gentleman” portraits (Fig. 9, Fig. 10) and the later seven images (Figs. 1–6, Fig. 8). Considered as a group, the seven less-formal photographs can be seen as clearly interrelated even though contrasting. They consciously portray different aspects of Legrand’s long-remembered public personas: the bookseller, the conchologist, and the Hobart “character.” Yet the two earlier images are difficult to place in context. They show an unfamiliar manifestation of the biographical subject, and also are devoid of interactive appeal. Who then is this strange other Legrand portrayed in the two “gentleman” portraits? Do we see here different early versions of the entrepreneurial persona —perhaps the aspiring conchologist hoping to convey his respectability, seriousness, and erudition? Alternatively, is the fussily-dressed subject of the small carte-de-visite (Fig. 9) simply Legrand uncomfortably decked-out for some important function, or else trying on a persona he hoped might advance the cause of his scientific career? Similarly, could it be that the larger Tennysonian portrait was commissioned by Legrand for the purpose of sending home, or to elsewhere abroad, some pictorial evidence suggesting his gentlemanly status in the colonies? Whatever the case, these two cryptic “gentleman” images represent a currently unknown facet of Legrand’s colonial life. Importantly, they may be the closest tangible link we have to Legrand’s cultural past, and in particular, to his personal appearance and style when he first arrived in Tasmania as a middle-aged immigrant who ever after chose to obscure the details of his former life.
CHAPTER 2: Who Was William Legrand?

Though many rumours circulated, little was known by Legrand’s contemporaries about his pre-immigration past; and even the few reminiscences apparently circulated by him seem likely to have been fabrications. In the continuing search for reliable information about the elusive Legrand, the recent widening and acceleration of access to archival records of many kinds raises fresh hope of uncovering at least something of his early history. Traces of even humble, un-newsworthy, or very brief lives emerge from the recently digitised pages of old documents; and news from the past can be read word for word, exactly as it first appeared in print. Increasingly available in this form are archival records such as census returns; government records of births, deaths, and marriages; parish records; street and trade directories; early newspapers; government gazettes; applications for passports; subscription lists; passenger shipping lists; trial reports; hulk records; and the colonial records of transported convicts. Despite the uneven coverage provided by current projects, and also gaps in the records themselves, it has been possible to trace the pre-immigration lives of many of Legrand’s known colonial acquaintances, and in biographically useful detail. It also has been possible to pursue a number of promising leads to his own past, some arising from information about his associates, and others from exploring the archival records of families surnamed Legrand.

Yet unassailable documentary evidence of the Tasmanian Legrand’s earlier identity still has not emerged, a result deeply disappointing to the biographer but undoubtedly one which would please Legrand. But in view of the quantity of archival information currently available about his contemporaries, the absence of his own early records only gains in significance, and intensifies curiosity about him. It also arouses suspicion that the immigrant Legrand had severed all ties with his former life and then covered his tracks well. This in turn raises questions as to what might have prompted his
wish to disappear, and why he felt the need to maintain such intense personal secrecy. Even so, the image of Legrand as a fraudulent figure, or as one possibly hiding a discreditable past, seems contradicted by contemporary accounts of his colonial career — accounts of Legrand as reliable in business; as studious, industrious, and pedantic, and not averse to issuing forthright statements; images supported by clear evidence of intellectual honesty, and striving for accuracy in his scientific work. Yet the two opposing biographical narratives need not be mutually exclusive. They simply may represent contradictory aspects of a complex personality, confirming the view apparently held by Legrand’s Tasmanian contemporaries: that he maintained two distinctly separate lives, one personal and closely-guarded; and the other public, career-oriented, and better known. The enigmatic personality for which he was noted during his Tasmanian years may well have been a mask of convenience, consciously projected in order to protect his personal privacy, and possibly also to camouflage discrepancies between his educational background and his colonial aspirations. Yet if indeed Legrand had secrets to hide, he chose his colony well: in post-penal Tasmania, a significant number of the populace had personal or family histories they preferred not to mention, and local custom accommodated this reticence. As shown by Alison Alexander in a recent paper on Tasmanian social attitudes of the time, it was generally “considered taboo to ask people about their past [. . .] for fear of upsetting them” (“Reality and Reputation” 58).

Legrand’s Tasmanian identity was part enigma, and part role-related; and, in time, he became widely regarded as a colourful Hobart “character.” Eventually, he was viewed by some in a softer light, as a venerable figure representing the past — an image perpetuated by Beattie’s late-1890s photographs of him (Fig.1 and Fig. 5 in particular). That past was colonial Tasmania. The casting of Legrand as genius loci was appropriate in many respects;

1 Aspects discussed in Chapter 5.
not least that he had abandoned his own early history, and had reinvented himself as emphatically Tasmanian. His transformation owed much to personal and societal discretion; to geographical distance, and the passage of time; to his colonial reputation as a hoarder of antiquated goods; and to prevailing sentiments of regional nationalism.

**Hunting for evidence of the unknown past of William Legrand**

This chapter focuses on the search for further information about Legrand’s origins and pre-immigration life. Inevitably, what can be retrieved is fragmentary, and piecing it together entails a degree of speculation. Yet despite the lack of formal evidence, or of remaining family, it has been possible to discover biographically useful information elsewhere, sometimes from expected sources. Much of it has been gathered by sifting, sorting, and piecemeal retrieval, drawing upon an eclectic range of primary materials — for example, archived newspapers, directories, notes of meetings, advertisements, and subscription lists; written history; a significant nineteenth-century literary work; and records left by relevant contemporaries of Legrand. The chapter breaks other new ground in first assembling all known remnants of what Legrand’s contemporaries had to say about his early life, and then examining these views alongside other historical evidence. The comments have survived by finding their way into print. Most are newspaper accounts published around the time of Legrand’s death, or not long afterwards. Others have lingered in manuscript form, merely as incidental items within private correspondence archived on account of its authorship: these have appeared in print only quite recently, in James Dally’s edited work, *Bibliophile and Bibliopole: Six Letters from James Calder to Sir George Grey* (1985).

Even a biographical study such as this one, built from fragments, silences, and assorted material objects, feels a compulsion to begin from the beginning — to start with the subject’s origins, and to consider the life story, along with its changing cultural significance,
all in temporal order. An irony is that the various primary materials referring to Legrand’s youth were produced towards the end of his long life, and bear the imprint of later times, and often of hortatory circumstance. Most of the information, in fact, comes from the obituaries, and it is Legrand’s Tasmanian death certificate which provides the only official statement as to his origins. According to this document, he was born in England, at some time between late 1815 and early 1816 (Reg. BDM 683/1902). These details may well have been supplied by Legrand himself, since he was reportedly lucid during the final weeks of his life, which were spent in care, with the end being clearly in sight (“Well-known Hobartian,” Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5).

In researching this chapter, a further irony emerges in the fact that although quantities of hitherto untapped biographical detail have been found, this has produced no clear answer as to Legrand’s original identity; in fact, has created further uncertainties. As a consequence, the chapter advances and explores several opposing hypotheses. These are:

(1) that the colonial Legrand kept his original surname, or used a variant, and therefore may be traceable in early records;

(2) that the Tasmanian identity we recognise as Legrand was entirely illusory, being the sustained enactment of a character borrowed from a work of fiction;

(3) that the colonial Legrand had assumed an entirely false name, and is therefore probably untraceable;

(4) that, irrespective of the above possibilities, the seemingly exaggerated credentials claimed by the colonial Legrand still may lead to biographically useful information.

---

2 The official record of his death states that William Legrand, bookseller, died at the Charitable Institution, New Town, 1 July 1902, aged eighty-six. It records the cause of death as “senilis.”

3 The newspaper report, written shortly before Legrand’s death, gave his age as eighty-four, thereby suggesting his birth date as somewhere between late 1817 and early 1818.
The chapter considers each hypothesis in turn, weighing up each within discussion of the particular segment of research from which it arose. The segments vary in length. In particular, the first segment is disproportionately long, and itself falls into two sections. This is because it explores in some detail the possibility of links between Legrand and one particular family encountered within the English records.

**Searching the records for traces of Legrand’s origins and early life**

A key strategy used in searching for earlier source material was to work from the details given on Legrand’s Tasmanian death certificate, and to trawl the English records, looking for a person of similar name born between about 1810 and 1820. Allowance was made for variations in spelling, and for the possibility that the colonial Legrand had not always been known as William. The earliest available English census records showed that in 1841 the surname was less common than had been expected, and occurred mainly in the south-east corner of England. Three families appeared of particular interest in terms of the research focus. Not only were they suitable as regards time and place, but other things about them would correlate with the Tasmanian Legrand’s interest in ships, conchology, and science, and with the way that colonial contemporaries found him somehow foreign despite his apparently native command of English.

Firstly of interest were the Channel Islands families which had no age-appropriate William, but several Le Grands who were mariners. This fact seemed of relevance in view of many references elsewhere to sea-faring Le Grands travelling in Australian waters, and two in particular. One was Francis Le Grand, master of the *Bee*, a brig trading between Sydney and destinations such as Chile, New Zealand, and Guam during the late 1830s and 1840s (Nicholson, “Index” 5; “Shipping Intelligence,” *Sydney Morning Herald* 19 November 1842: 2; 5 July 1843: 2; 31 October 1843). He probably was also the Le Grand

---

4 A relevant third presence in Australian waters during the 1850s was the French captain, A. Le Grand, who is mentioned in Chapter 3.
commanding other vessels in Australian waters during these same years. In addition, there was Frederick William Le Grand R.N., surgeon-superintendent on the **Adelaide** in 1849, and on the **Rodney** in 1850, both voyages transporting convicts to Van Diemen’s Land (―Naval Intelligence,” *Times* [London] 5 August 1850: 8; Bateson 356–57; Nicholson 451). No positive leads to the Tasmanian Legrand emerged, however.

Secondly of interest was a Bavarian-born William Le Grand, a naturalised British subject long resident in south London, and described in 1851 as a “Retired Provision Agent” (PRO HO107/1567). His birth-date consistently appeared as 1795, yet his name, his commercial interests, and his foreign background suggested him as a candidate for further research. Other coincidences also appeared — in particular, his wife’s surname had been Harvey (a name possibly, if briefly, associated in business with the Tasmanian Legrand); and a son, Robert William Le Grand, had later settled in Queensland and acquired the calling of “Gentleman” (Record of death, Reg. BMD 1911/002451/002845). Though the possibility exists that these connections eventually may prove relevant, at present there seems no link between this family and the biographical subject.

Thirdly of interest was a William Le Grand born about 1819, the second son of George Le Grand, stockbroker, and his wife, Charlotte (formerly Unwin). The parents were married at Bermondsey in 1811, and apparently settled near Camberwell in the parish of St Mary Newington, now south London — then a semi-rural area rapidly becoming urbanised, not far from the docks and the burgeoning commercial, industrial, and naval establishments.

---

5 A potential cause of confusion for later researchers is that one regularly mentioned in the local press was the “PACKET BRIG WILLIAM, Le Grand, Commander,” engaged in coastal traffic between Sydney and Launceston (“Advertising,” *Sydney Morning Herald* 29 Aug. 1842: 1).

6 The same certificate records his surname as “Le Grande” and his father’s profession as “Officer in the Army.” According to Johnson and Saunders, he also claimed Huguenot ancestry (19). Reportedly, he had been earlier on the Victorian goldfields, had returned to England, and later (in 1871) he and his family emigrated to Queensland as settlers. He established himself in the Fassifern district, became a successful vintner, and founded the wine-growing industry at Purga, near Ipswich (Johnson and Saunders 19).
along the central section of the south bank of the Thames. Although currently no conclusive evidence links their son William to the Tasmanian Legrand, he remains a likely contender, and the subject of continuing investigation. His suitability is not just a matter of chronology, but a composite of many factors — in particular, his distant but lingering claim to foreign background; the social and cultural environment of his formative years; the nature, and location of his business career; and his sudden and permanent disappearance from England. So well do these factors tally with the currently-known profile of the Tasmanian Legrand that the English figure of ongoing interest is discussed here in considerable detail — firstly in terms of his early cultural milieu, and secondly by tracing his business career.

Origins and early life of the potentially relevant William Le Grand born ca. 1819

The foreign background of this English figure of interest has been traced by past and present genealogists of the related Jacob and Le Grand families. Originally from Flanders, the Le Grands settled in England about 1572, where they were associated with the silk-weaving trade and belonged to the congregation of the Walloon (or Strangers; later, Huguenot) chapel established within Canterbury cathedral. A few generations on, a Le Grand younger son married into the English establishment, his wife being a daughter of George Wren, minor canon of Canterbury. The marriage signals the Anglicisation of that particular branch of the Le Grand family. The children and later descendants of this couple received solidly English baptismal names, with Wren regularly included, and appear to have led unexceptionably English lives. Yet the Walloon descent apparently was not forgotten: at least two English families into which Le Grand daughters married began a still-evident tradition of conferring Le Grand as a middle name, suggesting that it remains of significance. Even so, while much appears to have been compiled about the line and many

---

7 George’s father, George Wren Le Grand (1759–1835), and apparently also some other family members, owned property at Newington.
distinguished members of these families, only recently has research resumed into the line which continued the original Walloon surname.\(^8\) It may be that the nineteenth-century Le Grands’ involvement with trade and commerce left them at a social distance from the contributors to the records of the establishment families into which Le Grand daughters had married. Yet viewed with hindsight, this ongoing commercial focus maintained a very long family tradition, continued across different and varying commercial fields. Significant within this context is a newly-discovered item of archival evidence which suggests that, for all the family’s Englishness, at least some Le Grands retained links with the former Walloon community (“Law Report,” \textit{Times} [London] 24 April 1835: 6).\(^9\)

The William Le Grand born about 1819 assuredly would know of his family’s cultural heritage and subsequent “urban gentry” status, and presumably also that his immediate forebears included a Canterbury surgeon and a wealthy London businessman. Perhaps he may have been only too well aware that other branches of his father’s extended family included clergymen, administrators, distinguished military officers, landed gentry, writers, translators, and even an eminent naturalist-antiquarian. Within his own family group, William was the third-born of six or seven children, at least five of whom survived to adulthood.\(^10\) Strangely, no further information about him appears on the existing family tree, though his three brothers and their descendants are recorded in some detail. Whatever the reason for the original omission, the information about William’s adult career reported in

\(^8\) By Claire Le Grand, a direct descendant.

\(^9\) This was a tangled law suit eventually decided in the Rolls’ Court at Westminster originating from a will made in 1775 and involving several bearers of originally Walloon surnames: Le Grand, Lepine, Legrew, Ferard, Agace, and Sebire (\textit{Ferard v. Griffin} 24, 26, 29 Jan.; 23 April, 1838. S. C L. J. Ch. [N. S.], 195). The Le Grand concerned (as former executor of an Agace family Will) was the father of the William Le Grand born ca.1819 who is the subject of particular interest here.

\(^10\) Baptism dates are recorded by family historians for Charlotte Wren (1815) and George Wren (1817). Birth dates are recorded for William (1819), Constantine (1821), Arthur Wellington (1825), and John Smith (1828). I have found no further record of Constantine, but possibly one for an earlier child not recorded on the family tree, a stillborn Le Grand daughter buried at St George’s, Southwark (Record of Burial 5 Jan. 1819).
English newspapers of the day may well explain any family wish to forget him. The figure emerging from these press reports would dovetail neatly with the scenario of a Tasmanian Legrand hiding a deeply discreditable past.

The early years of this English Le Grand, in terms of physical, social, and cultural settings also would tally with the known interests, knowledge, and capabilities of the Tasmanian Legrand. Official records for the young Le Grand of interest begin with his baptism in 1820 at the family church of St. Giles, Camberwell (Record of Baptism IGI 0820773). The family’s continuing connection with this parish suggests that William’s boyhood passed within rambling distance of remnant countryside, and of urban open space such as the historic Kennington Common, by then unkempt wasteland; the vast Kennington cabbage gardens, later transformed into the Oval cricket grounds; and the recently-established Surrey Zoological Gardens at Walworth, with their zoo, exhibitions, and spectacular public entertainments.  

11 Further to the east were the leatherworks, brickworks, new railway yards, and other manufacturing developments, which together formed an industrial corridor extending northwards to the Thames dockside. By 1820, there were four metropolitan bridges converging on the Kennington area, and this factor had induced many affluent people to move to the cross-river borough, since it had made commuting to London increasingly feasible.  

12 William’s stockbroker father perhaps was one such commuter. He was successful in his career, though not apparently wealthy; and he probably conformed to the general description issued in 1855 by his authoritative contemporary, Francis Playford, that “few Brokers have ever been known to amass fortunes, though most of them, with a moderately

---

11 Kennington Common was enclosed in 1852; the Oval opened as a cricket ground in 1846; the Surrey Zoological Gardens began in 1831, but were overshadowed by the Great Exhibition (1851) and never recovered.

12 The two most recent at the time were the Vauxhall Bridge (1816) and the Southwark Bridge (1819).
good connexion [sic], make fair incomes” (qtd. Kynaston 176). In terms of class, the calling of stockbroker had none of the glamour or prestige often associated with it in modern times: in the nineteenth century it was a “trade” career. Yet Le Grand senior evidently had wide business interests and also the backing of inherited resources. Family middle-class values are indicated by the fact that the Le Grand sons received a scholarly education until they were at least thirteen or fourteen years old. After that, they began their working lives. By the census of June, 1841, the eldest son, George Wren Le Grand, was an East End grocer, accompanied by the third son, fifteen-year old Arthur, recorded as “Assistant” (PRO HO107/708/4.10/13).13 William, now twenty-one, was a stockbroker, and presumably numbered amongst the droves of commuters who “walked daily into the city along principal roads,” including the Thames bridges (Kynaston 149–150). Earlier that same year he had married Eliza Dunman, whose father, later styled “Superintendent of Stock Exchange,” apparently lived on-site in the city (PRO HO107/1532/57/26).14 At the time of the 1841 census, the young couple was living in Blucher Street, Lambeth (PRO HO107/1064/1), at some distance from William’s parents though in the same civil parish of St Mary Newington.

Interestingly, the dwelling places of William and his parents were quite near those of two people later associated with the Tasmanian Legrand — namely, Bethia Morey, and Julian Edmund Tenison Woods. The 1841 census shows that Bethia’s family was living at 1 Meadow Row, off New Kent Road, not far from the elder Le Grands’ home in Deverell Street, Lambeth. Her father William Morey was a window-blind maker, and there were four children besides Bethia, who was then almost three years old (PRO HO1071/1065/7).15

---

13 Their address was Hoxton Old Town, Tower Hamlets. Possibly they were living above the shop.

14 This description of Thomas Dunman is quoted from the 1851 census.

15 George and Charlotte Le Grand (recorded on the 1841 census in PRO HO107/1065/2) apparently lived for many years at Deverell Street, Lambeth.
Morey’s brother and business partner, Benjamin, also lived nearby, and by 1845 had taken up premises very close to the Blucher Street address of William Le Grand (Kelly, in Winton 378).\(^{16}\) Again in 1841, and again not far from the home of the elder Le Grands, at the gentlemanly address of West Square, Southwark, lived James Dominick Woods, lawyer, with his wife and seven children — amongst them, Julian, then aged nine (PRO HO107/1086/2).\(^{17}\) Reportedly, it was in this same year that Julian’s interest in natural history was aroused by the return of an uncle from the East Indies, bringing a collection of artifacts and shells that were installed in a room of the Woods home as a sort of museum (Eriksen 3).\(^{18}\)

Considered in broader terms, the enthusiasm for natural science was general, widespread, and much promoted in England at that time; and conchology was regarded as a useful and healthy family pastime, as well as a reputable field of scientific study (Barber 17–18). This cultural climate undoubtedly played an important part in developing the scientific interests of not only Tenison Woods, but also of the young man who later settled in Tasmania as William Legrand. Significantly, a wave of important new shell publications was appearing at this time, including several English works designed for the collector — those of particular note being G.B. Sowerby’s *Conchological Manual* (1839), S. C. T. Hanley’s *The Young Conchologist’s Book of Species* (1840), and Hanley’s new edition of William Swainson’s *Exotic Conchology* (1841).\(^{19}\) A lesser work produced in America proved noteworthy for reasons of copyright rather than quality. This was *The*

---

\(^{16}\) Listed in Kelly’s 1846 directory as: “Morey, Benj., window blind maker, 2 Chancery pl., Camberwell New road” (Winton 378).

\(^{17}\) Though listed as “lawyer” in the census, Woods senior worked as parliamentary reporter for The Times.

\(^{18}\) Dr Nicholas Augustin Woods, a surgeon in the East India Co., newly returned to England on the Oriental (Eriksen 3).

\(^{19}\) These writers are discussed later in connection with the Tasmanian Legrand’s colonial career.
Conchologist’s First Book (1839). Allegedly composed by the poet and fiction writer Edgar Alan Poe, but probably largely put together by an American compiler of natural history books, Thomas Wyatt, it was widely considered a plagiarised version of an 1833 publication by the Scots naturalist Captain Thomas Brown (Dance, *Shell Collecting* 185–6; Ackroyd 68; Moldenhauer 470–2; Quinn 275–7).

Around this same time, a conchological event of a different kind was of incalculable significance for shell science generally. This was the return to England of the adventurer-collector Hugh Cuming, at the end of his third great collecting voyage. Having spent the best part of four years in scouring the Philippines for specimens, he arrived at London in mid-1840, and immediately began distributing his shells amongst conchologists (Dance, *Shell Collecting* 153–8). These new and exotic specimens aroused great interest, and for many years Cuming’s collection would provide rich materials for conchological publications — a well-known example being Lovell Reeve’s beautifully-illustrated *Conchologia Iconica* (begun in 1843), used as a key reference by the Tasmanian Legrand during his colonial shell studies.

20 The full title of the Poe publication, as displayed on the title page, was *The Conchologist’s First Book: or, A System of Testaceous Malacology, Arranged expressly for the use of Schools, in which the Animals, according to Cuvier, are given with the Shells*. It was published in Philadelphia by Haswell, Barrington, and Haswell. It is widely accepted that the near-destitute Poe earned $50 by lending his name as nominal author to this publication, a cheaper edition of a previous compilation by Wyatt. The work sold well; and ironically, appears the only one of Poe’s books to go in to an American second edition during his lifetime (Quinn 277).

21 Brown was not, as his title might suggest, a mariner. He had served in the Forfar and Kincardine Militia, and from 1816 onwards he published many natural history books (Jackson 2). The 1833 work supposedly plagiarised by Poe was *The Conchologist’s Text-Book, embracing the arrangements of Lamarck and Linnaeus, with a Glossary of Technical Terms* [sic]. A long-popular text, it ran to nine editions by 1870, at least two of these edited by William Macgillivray, whose son John made significant contributions to Australian natural history (see Chapters 3 and 5).

22 Cuming arrived in London 5 June 1840 (Dance, *Shell Collecting* 157). Even J. E. Gray, long-serving Keeper of the British Museum and a stern critic of Cuming, conceded that “every conchologist, both scientific and amateur, is greatly indebted to him” (726).

23 In criticising Cuming’s repute, J. E. Gray was scornful of “the description and figuring of [Cuming] shells lately made known chiefly falling into the hands of dealers, like Mr. Reeve and Mr. Sowerby” (728) and also stated that even Dr. Louis Pfeiffer, a leading European authority on land shells, often had been given syntype specimens to describe by Cuming, not necessarily the exact shell upon which a new type species was to be established (728). Pfeiffer was another authority cited by the Tasmanian Legrand.
These coincidences of name, place, and temporality emerging from the English records offer clues which may well link to the origins and early social connections of the colonial Legrand. Though most of these links currently remain speculative, the cultural coincidence of the upsurge of interest and knowledge within the field of shell science occurring at that time has indisputably clear links to the Tasmanian Legrand’s later conchological career.

The business career of the potentially relevant William Le Grand born about 1819

Whatever were the cultural interests of the young English sworn-broker, William Le Grand, his London business career continued apace.24 His name and counting-house address appear in the 1846 edition of Kelly’s Post Office London Directory, where he was self-described as a “british [sic] & foreign stock & share broker, 10 Shorter’s court & Stock exchange” (339). 25 Yet by the following year, the young Le Grand was in difficulties. This reverse, and also the intermittent falterings of his career thereafter, were duly noted in the records of the Stock Exchange, from which source they have been taken for analysis by the English historian David Kynaston in his recent authoritative work, The City of London, Volume 1: A World of Its Own, 1815–1890 (1994). Kynaston chooses Le Grand as “a symptomatic if perhaps extreme example” of major problems within the Stock Exchange of the day — specifically, too many “inadequately capitalised firms”; the “relatively easy entrance qualifications” for aspiring stockbrokers; and “too many members, often of slender means, unable to resist the lure of speculation on their own account” (176). Around 1847,

---

24 The term “sworn-broker” was in common usage at the time. It signified brokers licensed by the Corporation of London. They paid an admission fee on being sworn, an annual “broker’s rent” fee, and also had to enter into a substantial “broker’s bond” as guarantee of good behaviour. By Le Grand’s time, each broker additionally had to provide two sureties, each required to pledge £250 for the broker’s good behaviour (“Sworn Brokers’ Archives” 2).

25 Shorter’s Court was just outside the Stock Exchange, running in from 5 Throgmorton Street, and housed a cluster of small offices and shop dwellings. Due to the sudden boom in railway shares, “the Stock Exchange during 1846 was in a state of almost permanent turmoil, with the arrival of many new members who were often of flimsy financial standing” (Kynaston 152).
these vulnerabilities were compounded by the effects of significant external factors, such as a major credit crisis, widespread crop failures, wildly fluctuating markets, European political turmoil, and local political unrest. There was a wave of financial failures, including even figures of prominence such as the head of the Bank of England, and “some thirty-three significant commercial houses in the City” (157, 166). It was within this climate, in May 1847, that that William Le Grand first failed on the London Stock Exchange. He was readmitted in August, having “promised most rigidly that he would not enter into any speculation for himself,” but went on to fail three more times — in 1848, in 1851, and finally in 1853 (176). Evidently, the lure of speculation on his own account proved his undoing. Perhaps his several readmissions to the Exchange owed as much to his father’s solid reputation as a stockbroker as to his own professions of contrition and promises to exercise greater caution. Whatever the case, George Le Grand senior died early in 1850, “after prolonged suffering” (Times [London] 28 March 1850: 9); and before long, the son’s career took a dangerous turn.

A year later, at the time of the 1851 census, and therefore only three months before his third failure, William Le Grand was living in style with his wife and their young daughter in a commodious house on the city outskirts, at fashionable New Hampton (PRO HO107/1604/225/11).26 Significantly, the Le Grand household employed three domestic servants at a time when middle-class status was upheld by having only one (B. S. Rowntree, qtd. T. May 228). Le Grand’s third failure was recorded in May 1851, but “only months later” he was readmitted to the Exchange, having been “admonished, warned, and reminded of previous promises, such as to obtain sufficient cover to guard against possible loss”

26 According to the census entry for the single household at 38 New Hampton High Street, Hampton, on 30 March 1851, those present were: “William Le Grand, aged thirty-one, head of household, Stock Broker; Eliza Le Grand, aged twenty-nine, wife; Eliza, daughter, aged six, Scholar; Arthur Le Grand, brother, Commercial Clerk; Agnes L. Le Grand, brother’s wife; Marianna Weidtman, aged nine, visitor, born Hampton, Scholar”; and three named servants, all born London (PRO HO107/1604/225/11).
Le Grand’s readmission clearly had required a drastic scaling-down of his personal assets, and significantly, it was two close family members who now signed as his sureties. His professional credibility tarnished, his earning capacity at low ebb, Le Grand lasted less than two years. From at least May 1853, he was misappropriating funds entrusted to him by investors; by early September, he had embezzled over £5,000; and he then disappeared overnight, leaving his clients to discover their losses.\(^\text{27}\) News of the fraud spread quickly, together with the information that he had failed for a fourth time, and had left the country (\textit{Daily News} [London] 2 Nov. 1853: 6; 12 Dec.: 3; “Court of Aldermen: Flagrant Conduct of a Broker.” \textit{Morning Chronicle} [London] 2 Nov. 1853: 2; \textit{Times} 12 Dec. 1853: 4).\(^\text{28}\) In October 1853, Le Grand’s professional affairs were examined by the governing committee of the Exchange. They unanimously pronounced him “guilty of dishonourable and disgraceful conduct”, and his name was ceremoniously blacklisted (qtd. Kynaston 177).

The victims of his fraud were eleven small investors, many of them elderly, and all could ill-afford their losses.\(^\text{29}\) The option available to them was to petition the Court of Aldermen, a body composed of twenty-six prominent London tradesmen. Their separate cases were heard during November and December of 1853, and the proceedings were

\(^{27}\) As a measure of the amount embezzled, the authoritative Leone Levi states the following range of annual incomes from statistics of the British Tax Office for 1850–1851: “Middle Classes” £100–£500; “Higher Middle Classes” £500–£3,000; “Higher Classes” £3,000–£50,000 and upwards (49). Interestingly, “Lower Middle Classes” included teachers and clergymen, and in 1855 the annual salaries for “Certificated [school] Masters” are stated as ranging between £87.19.3 and £101.16.7 (51). The combined incomes of “a working man’s family” were estimated to average about “20s. a-week, or £52 a-year” (53).

\(^{28}\) The same article was repeated in each of these three London papers on 2 November, though the wording of the column headings varied.

\(^{29}\) Those defrauded by Le Grand, and the sums invested were listed as: James Lightfoot, of Wellesley-street, St. Pancras, beer retailer (£405/10/0); Henry Earle Lovell, of 8 Clarence-street, Old Kent-road, house decorator (£310, and a further £44/11/8); Henry Humpheries [sic], of 18 St Mary’s-hill, London, and his widowed mother (£508/15/0, followed by a further £89/7/6); Phillip Newberry and his wife, of Norwood (£1002/10/0); Henry Cushen (£24/13/6); John Weekley, of Margate (£303/7/6); James and Ann Burrell (£625); and Ann Kershaw (£900). In addition to this, Thomas Dunman claimed that Le Grand had not repaid a debt to him of £690.
reported in great detail in the newspapers of the day. The eventual decision of the Court was
to refer the whole matter to the City Solicitor, and to rule Le Grand’s two sureties liable to
forfeit their bonds of £250 each. (Daily News [London] 2 November 1853: 6, 12
December.: 3; “Court of Aldermen,” Morning Chronicle [London] 2 November 1853: 2;
“Flagrant Conduct of a Sworn Broker,” Observer [London] 6 November 1853: 3; Times 12
Dec. 1853: 4). These sureties also could ill-afford such financial losses. One of them was Le
Grand’s elder brother, George, father of an already numerous family, and not long
established in business as a “Grocer, [Tea] Dealer, and Chapman, of Lambeth-walk”
(London Gazette 6 Jan. 1854: 66). A month after forfeiting the bond money, George was
declared a bankrupt (London Gazette 6 January 1854: 66), and thereafter was reduced to
working as a warehouseman. The other surety was Thomas Dunman, the father-in-law of
William Le Grand. He was criticised for promptly selling up the defaulter’s household
furniture and pocketing the proceeds; yet the exercise recouped Dunman only £117 of an
additional £690 allegedly borrowed by the now-vanished Le Grand (“Flagrant Conduct,”
Observer [London] 6 November 1853: 2). It also may be that Dunman’s reputation at the
Exchange was heavily compromised by Le Grand’s defection. As for the fugitive
stockbroker, he apparently was not heard of again. His wife and daughter remained in
England, and at the census of 1861 they were living with the elderly Dunmans at their
modest East London cottage (PRO RG9/304/118).

30 George clearly fell on hard times: the 1861 census shows him employed as a warehouseman for a wholesale
jeweller, his wife working as a milliner, and their twelve-year-old eldest son already in the workforce (PRO
RG09/384/90/22). By the 1871 census, George had risen to being manager of a tea warehouse (PRO
RG10/734/48/22); and in 1881 (then aged sixty-four) he was listed as an insurance agent living at Deptford,
his household including seven family members, three boarders, one servant, and three lodgers (PRO
RG11/714/108/9).

31 It perhaps may be significant that the Dunman family were resident on site at the Exchange at the time of the
1851 census, at “Stock Exchange, Shorter’s Court, St. Bartholomew by the Exchange, London” (PRO HO
107/1532/57/26), but that Dunman’s address was listed as “8 Avenue-terrace, Bow” when evidence against Le
Grand was being heard (Observer [London] 7 Nov. 1853: 2).

32 Eliza Le Grand and her daughter Eliza (aged sixteen) were listed in 1861 at the home of Thomas and Mary
Dunman, “Somerset Cottage,” Park Road, Poplar. Thomas’s occupation was given as “Strong Room Keeper,
**Considering the evidence**

The timing of Le Grand’s disappearance would dovetail neatly with the arrival in Tasmania in 1855 of the enigmatic William Legrand. It even would allow an appropriate interval during which he might have gained experience in foreign countries, or even at sea, when he could have begun refashioning his personal identity. Of similar relevance in this case would be the earlier intervals when the English Le Grand was debarred from the Exchange: presumably, at these times he needed to find work in other fields to tide himself over financially — especially during his longest suspension, which lasted about ten months, finishing in March 1848.

In summary, there is a strong case for continuing the search for further evidence to either prove, or disprove, the possible connection between the defaulting English stockbroker and Tasmania’s William Legrand. Yet there are several arguments against the likelihood of this link. Perhaps the strongest is the commonsense view that a fugitive from English justice who fled to the colonies would remain at risk of extradition (Todd 208–14). Thus it would seem unlikely for Legrand to continue using a variant of his original surname — especially since almost certainly, he would have heard about Ikey Solomon’s extradition from Hobart Town. Though this event had occurred many years earlier, during the convict colony era, Solomon’s escape and recapture had roused much interest in both hemispheres of the Empire: the ongoing drama was widely publicised in newspapers, journals and pamphlets of the day. The whole affair lingered long and vividly in general memory and even was alluded to in more literary works. In summary, the flamboyant Solomon had

---

33 Currently the subject of ongoing research.

34 In particular, a clear allusion is made in the title of William Makepeace Thackeray’s satiric anti-Newgate novel, *Catherine: A Story by Ikey Solomons, Esq., Junior*, published serially in *Fraser’s Magazine* (1839–1840). Sackville-O’Donnell has identified references to the historical Ikey Solomon in an early essay in Dickens’s *Sketches by Boz* (1833–1837) but she argues against the frequently-expressed general view that
escaped from custody before his London trial in 1827, and later arrived in Hobart Town as a free settler. Before long, he was recognised, arrested, taken back to England for trial, sentenced to transportation for fourteen years, and returned to the colony as a convict in 1831.35

Yet despite the obvious perils of recognition, it seems that the London Le Grand, having fled the country, was never formerly charged, and so was not technically a fugitive from the law.36 Several aspects adding credibility to the possibility of a link to the 1853 defaulter are that the Tasmanian Legrand appears to have reinvented himself for his new life in the colony, and that his seemingly deliberate projection of an exotic, pseudo-French persona appears to have been intended specifically to disguise his English origins. Colonial controversy as to his cultural background shows that the hints of exoticism served this purpose well. The plausibility of such masquerade would be enhanced by common knowledge of French refugees fleeing to England at several different times, both before and after the fall of the ancien régime in 1798, and by the fact that Legrand was recognisably a common French surname. Even so, given the delayed, but continuous import of British news to the colonies, there seems a fair chance that at least some Tasmanians might have

---

Dicken’s characterisation of Fagin in Oliver Twist (1837–1839) was based on him (xx, 153). It was a mere forty years after Solomon’s extradition and only about twenty years after his death that Alfred Winter’s eloquent photograph of the Elizabeth Street shop was created. Solomon’s story retains interest to this day — for example, the historical figure, fictionally rendered, appears as the central character in Bryce Courtenay’s recent Australian novel, The Potato Factory (1995). Recent biographical studies of Solomon include books by Tobias (1974) and by Sackville-O’Donnell (2002), and a book chapter by Levi and Bergman (2002).

35 See Sharman for a summary of these events, and Sackville-O’Donnell for fuller detail.

36 Significantly, the cases against Le Grand were heard by a London civic body apparently in considerable disrepute at the time. For example, whether by accident or design one newspaper even printed the report of the Le Grand affair immediately below a long article reporting evidence given to a current government commission, including description of the Court of Aldermen as “an irresponsible body, being elected for life,” and “corrupt” in terms of pecuniary and political influence. These were reported as stated by the secretary of the City of London Municipal Reform Association (“Corporation of the City of London: Government Inquiry,” Morning Chronicle [London] 2 Nov. 1853: 2). Though the main concerns raised were about the levying of money, the distinction between a Court of Aldermen and a full judicial court can be deduced from this report. It would seem that Le Grand took advantage of the existing system by disappearing prior to the aldermanic hearing, thereby avoiding referral to a higher court: at large, he was a “defaulter,” not officially a criminal.
known of London financial scandal attached to an Englishman named Le Grand. Whether or not anyone would make the vital connection is the case in point.

Other circumstantial evidence further supports the possibility of a hidden link between the enigmatic colonial and the defaulting stockbroker. Firstly, the Tasmanian Legrand appears to have maintained a low social profile for very many years following his unobtrusive arrival in the colony. Secondly, it was more than a decade after the London stockbroker’s disappearance that the colonial Legrand first began to attract local attention. Thirdly, it was “in role” — appearing as a studious, scientifically-committed conchologist — that he made this public debut. Lastly, though Legrand eventually became well-known in Hobart, it was always as a “character” within one or more of his public roles, rather than in a personal sense; and he maintained this social distance for the rest of his life.

**Pursuing leads to the colonial Legrand’s identity from a literary direction**

But perhaps the origins of William Legrand lie elsewhere. Possibly the Tasmanian identity we recognise as Legrand was entirely a matter of illusion, a counterfeit persona borrowed from fiction. Strong arguments for this possibility — and again, both for and against a possible link between the errant stockbroker and the enigmatic colonial — arise from the clear and striking similarities between the colonial figure and the fictional character of exactly the same name featured in Edgar Allen Poe’s famous short story, “The Gold Bug” (1843). James Dally seems to have been the first to draw attention to this intertextuality. He mentioned it as a footnote in *Bibliophile and Bibliopole*, together with the enigmatic comment that “it is likely” Legrand arrived in Tasmania already “familiar with Poe’s story” (26). Dally’s wording is subtly cautious, but the radical inference is clear: he suggests that the public persona of the colonial Legrand mimics Poe’s fictional character. To read even the first three paragraphs of Poe’s story alongside surviving descriptions of the
Tasmanian Legrand is sufficient to show the validity of Dally’s inference. Poe introduces his fictional William Legrand with the statement:

He was of an ancient Huguenot family, and had once been wealthy; but a series of misfortunes had reduced him to want. To avoid the mortification consequent upon his disasters, he left New Orleans, the city of his forefathers, and took up his residence at Sullivan’s Island, near Charleston, South Carolina (283).

Poe’s Legrand was “well educated, with unusual powers of mind, but infected with misanthropy, and subject to perverse moods of alternate enthusiasm and melancholy” (284). He lived as an eccentric recluse, hidden away in a hut “at the more remote end” of the semi-desolate island, surrounded by his hoard of books (284). One of his favorite amusements was “sauntering along the beach and through the myrtles in search of shells or entomological specimens” (284).

These details have clear parallels in contemporary descriptions of the Tasmanian Legrand. The similarity extends even to the story’s plot, which builds to a denouement vindicating a sudden, inexplicable obsession of its clever, curmudgeonly protagonist. Poe’s Legrand has identified, and then solved, an unusual cryptogram — an old pirate treasure map. His two companions are convinced that he has gone mad, but eventually proved wrong when both the buried treasure and the problem’s solution are revealed. Whether the perception originated with beholders or was transmitted by the Tasmanian Legrand himself, a similar trope echoes in several contemporary anecdotes about the historical colonial figure. These turn on the contrast between his eccentric personality and his sharpness, arcane knowledge, and impressive earlier connections. If the Tasmanian Legrand identified with Poe’s fictional character in any personal sense, the story’s theme of superior intelligence triumphing over the conventional interpretations of lesser minds may perhaps have been an aspect which appealed to him.
It would be interesting to know when, where, and how the Tasmanian Legrand became familiar with Poe’s tale. It was first published in the Philadelphia Dollar Newspaper in June 1843, then reprinted in other American newspapers, and quickly became widely popular. It appeared in book form in an American collection of short stories in 1845; in its first French translation, published in the Belgian Revue Britannique, also in 1845; and in a pirated English edition in 1846. Thereafter, it was circulated widely, in English and foreign language editions. Certainly, it was sufficiently widely-known to be cited as analogy by the popular press in colonial Australia (“News and Notes. By a Sydney Man,” Brisbane Courier 25 February 1865: 5). In John Holroyd’s post-Dally article, “The Grand Bibliopole: William Legrand” (1991), the writer suggests that Legrand possibly encountered Poe’s story through Charles Baudelaire’s influential 1856 French translation (11). Yet in view of the numerous early editions of “The Gold-Bug”, the publishing context within which Holroyd’s suggestion appeared, and also the probable unreliability of the contemporary sources he cites, there seems no reason to favour the proposed Baudelaire connection ahead of other likely avenues of supply.37

In any case, issues of greater biographical significance arise from Legrand’s lived intertextuality with a literary counterpart. These are questions about when and how the incidence began — and more importantly, to what extent the assumed persona was akin to his original identity, or whether it was entirely a matter of artifice. From the scant evidence which survives it would seem that Legrand’s collecting instincts were innate, and that his Tasmanian shell-hunting expeditions began soon after his arrival in the colony in 1855. Whether or not he acquired the literary connection immediately, it appears to have been in play about the time he was becoming known as a conchologist — that is, at least by the late

37 Firstly, Holroyd’s article was written for Explorations, the journal of the Institute for the Study of French-Australian Relations, with the explanatory statement by Holroyd that: “William Legrand […] appears in these pages because of his French background” (9). Secondly, the article relies for this point on unsubstantiated claims for Legrand’s French connections — in particular, on surviving apocryphal tales which research for the present thesis suggests provide details of questionable veracity.
1860s. The parallels are most strongly evident in anecdotes circulating near the end of Legrand’s life, though the stories themselves seem to have been set in motion considerably earlier.

Whether the intertextuality with Poe’s fictional Legrand was a calculated disguise or a gradually-acquired veneer, no doubt the colonial Legrand found it convenient to appear in that role. Surviving photographic images of Legrand suggest that he was a consummate role-player. Yet why choose Poe’s Legrand as model? Perhaps “The Gold-Bug” story had particular currency at the time, or perhaps the attributes of its protagonist suited, and therefore were easily adopted by this particular middle-aged settler, reinventing himself (perhaps even as to his name) for a new life in the colonies. In either case, this would suggest that the colonial impersonator might have been any one of countless untraceable new settlers — perhaps arriving under another name, or simply not listed in what survive of the immigrant records. On the other hand, if it was the very coincidence of almost identical surnames which inspired Legrand’s intertextual relationship with Poe’s character, then the case is reversed, for this would greatly increase the possibility of a link between the colonial figure and the defaulting English stockbroker.

Recorded speculations about Legrand’s origins

Neither the official records, nor the evidence of links to Poe’s fiction work produce any definite information as to Legrand’s origins. The same also must be said for the few surviving contemporary comments about Legrand, which consist mainly of seemingly apocryphal anecdotes. Yet considered collectively — whether as a general consensus of opinion; or as a range of individual, authored, and highly subjective texts — the comments have complex value as primary sources. They provide insights to Legrand’s cultural niche within the society of his day; and they suggest numerous avenues for further investigation. Moreover, a number of the comments themselves lead ongoing lives of cultural
significance: together with the best-known photographic images of Legrand, they are the basis for modern re-interpretations of their enduringly interesting, yet biographically elusive subject.

Of the surviving contemporary comments, those which speculate on Legrand’s cultural origins seem to hint at the possibility of an exotic past. Plainly, there was something about Legrand’s appearance and demeanour which made him difficult to place as regards his cultural background, while opinions varied as to his social class. In 1881, James Erskine Calder, an old colonist who knew Legrand well, described him as “somewhat Frenchified in his manner, though I do not know that he is a Frenchman either, for his English is not the English of a foreigner at all” (qtd. Dally 25). Later recollection of Legrand prompted the Lambeth-born journalist, Robert Sparrow Smythe, to wonder what “could possibly induce a Frenchman in those times to try his fortune in V.D.L.?” (J. L. F., *Mercury* [Hobart] 29 July 1902: 2). Calder considered Legrand “a well-educated man”, even though he wrote “a villainous hand” (qtd. Dally 20). Yet many years later, he was recalled less favourably from the 1870s by a columnist for the Hobart *Critic*, presumably Alexander Williamson Hume, as “a representative of the old bookstall trade [. . .] a Frenchman named Leground” (*Critic* [Hobart] 13 October 1916. Hume, *Historical Records* 2: 157). A more recent recollection was provided by Sir William Crowther (born 1887), medical practitioner, member of a long-established Hobart family, and a noted collector of Tasmaniana. He had been “a schoolboy customer” of Legrand’s late in the bookseller’s life, and “knew him as *Monsieur* Legrand — ‘a courtesy title’” (qtd. Dally 25).

---

38 Calder, Letter to Sir George Grey, 27 November 1881(Dally 25).

39 Hume (born 1850) wrote a series of articles remembering Hobart in the 1870s, many under the pseudonym of “Commentator” (Ely, “Sights and Sounds of Hobart”: 62). Hume’s summary treatment of Legrand and his Elizabeth Street habitat, and also the misspelling of his name, are surprising in view of an earlier article discussed in Chapter 6 as being apparently also his: a vivid account of a visit to Legrand’s Collins Street shop in 1902 (“At the Capital.” *Daily Telegraph* [Launceston] 2 July 1902: 3).
Last recorded, and of dubious accuracy, is a tale passed down as family lore by descendants of Christopher Briggs, a former convict who later farmed in the Brown’s River district south of Hobart. According to this story, not only had Briggs been married to a sister of Legrand, but “William Le Grand and his sister claimed to be the children of a French aristocrat (Peer of France) who walked with King Louis XVI and escaped from France before King Louis was guillotined” (Allen L. Briggs, letter to Ian Pearce. 14 April 1986). Seldom is there smoke without fire, even within family lore; and tracing this apparently fanciful tale to its origins has provided rich historical detail and material of direct relevance to the biographical project. The Briggs wife in question is assuredly Mary Barden, who has proved French-born, but no aristocrat. She was the eldest child of English servants employed within the British enclave at Boulogne-sur-mer, where Mary was christened in 1827 (Record of Baptism IGI C800081/0576995 IT 3). There was an English military presence at Boulogne, it was a fashionable coastal resort, and it also attracted numerous middle and upper class British residents because of the cheaper costs of living and of educating their children (“Living in France,” Caledonian Mercury [Edinburgh] 28 July 1827: 2). At the time, it was a convenient overseas refuge for British persons “having fled from their creditors” (“House of Lords,” Caledonian Mercury [Edinburgh] 25 December 1830: 2) — a precedence of interest, given the later flight of the disgraced broker Le Grand.

---

40 The writer names as his informant Christopher Isaac Briggs (born 1876), grandson of the relevant ex-convict and a previous wife, and born not long after Mary Barden had married into the family.

41 Briggs (1801–1885) arrived in Van Diemen’s Land on the Gilmore in 1832. Later, he applied for his three sons to follow him as emigrants, but his first wife remained in England. His second wife was Frances Glover, who died at Brown’s River in 1874; and later that same year he was married to Mary Barden in Hobart. Their acquaintance with Legrand is more fully discussed in Chapter 5.

42 According to the IGI Record of Baptism for Mary, she was born 31 Jan. 1827 (IGI 0576995 IT 3). Though the official record of her death (as Mary Briggs) gives her year of birth as 1824 (Reg. BDM Tas. 1114/1901), this suggests an error, since the burial information apparently supplied by her daughter gives evidence for the early 1827 birth-date (Record of Burial, Alex. Clark and Son 5/223; Headstone of Mary Briggs TFHS Hobart 94250/HBFH_17280). Similarly, the family newspaper notice states that Mary died “in the 73rd. year of her age” (“Deaths,” Mercury [Hobart] 17 Aug. 19 1901: 1)
The Barden family returned to England in 1830, part of a general English exodus during the growing political turmoil in France which culminated in the overthrow of the Bourbon monarchy. Interestingly, another member of an expatriate group fleeing to England in 1830 was Haughton Forrest — comparable in being about the same age as Mary Barden and born at Boulogne-sur-mer, though dissimilar in belonging to a socially prominent family. Forrest also later emigrated to Tasmania: already established as a highly productive and successful marine and landscape artist, he spent the last forty-eight years of his life there, and his canvases featuring grandeurs of Tasmanian scenery contributed substantially to publicising the island’s beauty, particularly in association with J. W. Beattie’s photographic endeavours.43

By the time of the 1841 English census, the Bardens were settled in Sussex, and Sarah was working as a laundress at Clement’s Field, Ore, near Hastings. Her husband was absent at the time, but the six Barden children were with her. These included the fourteen-year old Mary, who was described as “born foreign parts” while the two children next below her in age were recorded as “born Boulogne” (PRO HO107/1105/5.26/5). By the 1851 census, most of the Bardens were living in London. Mary had an infant daughter, Sarah, who was put out to nurse at Marylebone (PRO HO107/1488/145/23); and at the same time, Mary seems to have been employed as a maid in an upper-class household at Paddington (PRO HO107/1467/41).44 Tracing Mary’s employment history through subsequent English census records leads to the conclusion that she was highly competent in her field of work, of respectable appearance, and probably possessed other qualities as well. Her last documented
English position appears on the English census record for 1871. Mary, here described as “widow,” was housekeeper to the distinguished Blackwood family, who then were living in a grand house at Shooter’s Hill, now part of south-east London (PRO RG10/762/65/73). At some time during the early 1870s, Mary emigrated to Tasmania, and not long afterwards married Christopher Briggs. Eventually, she arranged the emigration of her married daughter, Sarah, who had followed in her mother’s career footsteps, rising to the position of cook to a wealthy household at a fashionable Kensington address by the time of England’s 1881 census (PRO RG11/45/7/5).

It is possible that Legrand had known the Barden family during his pre-immigration years; though it seems unlikely that Mary Barden was, as claimed, his sister. Yet the possibility of a half-siblinging relationship cannot entirely be ruled out, since Mary’s mother, Sarah Marshall, was already thirty-three when she married the considerably younger George Barden in 1826 (Marriage license George Barden of Icklesham, ESRO PAR 511/2/2/4). Still, the chance of locating any family link between the Bardens and William Legrand seems remote, since Mary’s only descendant died in 1930, and the name Sarah Marshall is dauntingly common within British records. All that can be said with any degree of certainty is that the colonial Legrand in his later years showed kindly feelings towards a woman whose long-dead mother had been yet another Sarah Marshall, and that there is no evidence of any such interest shown by Legrand in the comparably-aged daughter of Mary Briggs.

45 The head of household was [Stevenson] Arthur Blackwood, a social reformer then rising rapidly to prominence in a Treasury career. His wife was Harriet, Dowager Duchess of Manchester, and the family included her daughter, Lady Sydney Montague, and six Blackwood children, one of whom was the later noted writer of supernatural fiction, Algernon Blackwood (1869–1951), present as a young child at the time when Mary Barden was housekeeper (PRO RG10/762/65/73; George Johnson).

46 Sarah’s husband, Joseph Templeman, was employed in the same household as a groom. He accompanied Sarah to Tasmania, and they apparently first found work in Hobart before moving to Brown’s River, where Mary Briggs already was established.

47 Record of death, Sarah Ann Templeman (Reg. BDM Tas. 677/1930).
Contemporary summations of the Tasmanian Legrand’s life and career

Of the surviving contemporary comments about Legrand, a cluster refers to his pre-immigration past. These particular statements were published in 1902, the year of his sudden decline and death. Though the earliest of them appeared while Legrand was still alive, it can be considered as virtually an obituary, in view of its timing and its obvious memorial intent. This first-published commentary is significant in that it evidently contains Legrand’s own final comment on his early years. It is an article reporting an interview which took place at the Hobart general hospital two weeks before Legrand’s death, and just as he was about to be transferred to the New Town Charitable Institution. The visiting reporter found Legrand frail, but added, “His mental faculties are good, with the exception that his memory fails him a little” (Mercury 16 June 1902: 5). The article based on the interview went swiftly to press, and there even would have been time for Legrand to have seen the printed version. It was a respectful and detailed account, almost a full column in length, entitled, “A Well-known Hobartian, Mr. Wm. Le Grand” (Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5). Today it reads as somewhat patronising in parts, but it clearly was intended as warm tribute. Equally clear is its intention to place on record the summary of Legrand’s life gathered from the interview. Whether or not Legrand tailored his reminiscence to suit the values and sensibilities of his recorder, and whether or not the article was extensively revised to suit editorial tone or memorial intent, the biographical detail recorded in the Mercury presents Legrand’s background as bookish, respectable, and English.

A notable feature of all the obituary references to Legrand’s past is the number and variety of literary connections ascribed to him by the different commentators. This probably indicates the selection of anecdotes with which Legrand had regaled various listeners; but perhaps also it may reflect what was seen as cultural capital by those who remembered the tales. According to the biographical account published by the Mercury, Legrand had arrived
from London in 1855, and “having, from his early youth, been great lover of books,” he gravitated naturally to book-dealing. The article goes on to mention Legrand’s “excellent literary and commercial education” and to cite many English cultural connections:

In his younger days he came into personal contact with the Landseer family; Geo. Cruikshank, the great English pictorial satirist; Cooper, the celebrated animal painter; Douglas Jerrold; Costello, the once brilliant editor of “The Examiner”, a now extinct London journal; the proprietor of “Lloyd’s Newspaper”; and many others, about whom he can converse with piquancy.

(Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5)

The eventual obituary in the Tasmanian Mail was merely an abridged version of this earlier Mercury article, even as to the title, “Death of an Old Hobartian” (Tasmanian Mail [Hobart] 5 July 1902: 30). Notably different in both tone and detail was another obituary published on the same day by the independent Hobart Clipper. Entitled “Obit: Legrand,” it conveys the impression of familiar acquaintance, and also introduces a fresh batch of English literary associations:

In the vague period of Legrand’s youth he came to know Lady Blessington.

“A fickle, fleshly creature,” he said, “with winning ways and much of the courtesy that is now out of fashion.” He met Charles Lamb, and knew Leigh Hunt well; as to early Victorian days and writers he was an encyclopædia when the rare humour seized him. (Clipper 5 July 1902: n. pag., in Hume Historical Records)

A third obituary for Legrand appeared a fortnight later in the Sydney Bulletin. It was attributed to a correspondent from elsewhere, described as “a Bulletin man”; and the writer

---

48 Understandable since the Tasmanian Mail was a weekly journal produced by Davies Brothers Ltd., alongside their longer-running daily paper, the Mercury.

49 Hobart Clipper 5 July 1902 (Hume, Historical Records).
Possibly was Frank Morton, then employed as a journalist in Hobart, but also freelancing (Andrews and Rutledge parag. 3). Clearly familiar with the earlier farewells to Legrand, he elaborated upon information given previously by others, and added French writers to the list of claimed literary associations:

Legrand, in the far, vague heyday of his youth, had witnessed exploits and encountered notables. He knew Baudelaire in the 40s, and recalled him with a shrug—"a miserable sort of devil with brains, and a tendency to religion."

In the forties, indeed, Legrand was much in Paris, and in some undiscovered capacity came into contact with many lights of his time—Janin, Gautier, Arsène Houssaye, Mermée, Murger, and numbers of the others. Quaintly enough, he remembered them as bibliophiles and viveurs only. Legrand it seems had been a sad enough dog in his time. Additional proof that his golden time lay far back is given by the fact that he met Lady Blessington while that vivacious and various beauty was at the height of her charm. Charles Lamb also he had known; and to the end he contended that Lamb’s disrepute in one matter had been grossly exaggerated by the snobs and prigs of all the later years. (Bulletin 19 July 1902: 15)

If these obituary anecdotes are accepted as having some basis in fact, they suggest that Legrand’s early career existed on at least the periphery of culturally significant groups. Whether or not his connections were actual, or merely vicarious, they offer rich lines of conjecture, many of which yet again raise the possibility of a link to the errant stockbroker. On the other hand, it may well be that the Tasmanian Legrand had absorbed the anecdotes

---

50 Morton had worked for the Bulletin and was in Hobart for a few years only, between 1898 and 1908. The obituary writer’s known Bulletin link, and the prose style and detailed reference to French literature within the obituary itself all suggest that the piece may have been Morton’s work. These same factors cause me to question James Dally’s editorial conclusion that the piece was “almost certainly written by the historian and journalist Alec Hume” (Preface to Bibliophile and Bibliopole).
he later recounted through his own early reading of newspapers and journals, around the
time they first appeared in print. Then again, perhaps he had been told, or overheard, the
anecdotes at a later time, when they were being discussed by others. Alternatively, he may
have acquired his alleged familiarity with the literary celebrities at a very much later date,
from his reading of old newspapers and journals amongst the prodigious quantities of print
materials stored at his Hobart bookshop.

In considering the proposition that the youthful Legrand was actually in some way
involved with well-known painters, illustrators, writers, and editors, a logical imputation is
that he may have had some connection through publishing, or the book trade. Legrand’s
name does not appear within the current listings recorded by the British print trade indexing
projects. But then, these are huge scholarly undertakings, still ongoing. In any case, they
focus on formal indentures, and on identifiable business addresses, and cannot be expected
to cover the myriad of non-trade employees, or informal associates of print commerce. Yet
perhaps Legrand’s involvement was by way of an entirely different field; or perhaps his
own intellectual or political interests, or even his social connections, brought him in contact
with luminaries later claimed as former acquaintances. Legrand’s reference to these
particular literary persons suggests that he was a city man, London-based, but with
experience of life in Paris. Unavoidably, this again raises the possibility of connection with
the person of interest discovered through the English records — William Le Grand, city
stockbroker, upwardly-mobile, adventurer in British and foreign shares. With his flexible
working hours, his social aspirations, his commercial instincts, and also the close proximity
of his business premises to London’s print districts, the stockbroker Le Grand would be well
placed to circulate within the cultural milieu later claimed for the colonial Legrand. It even
seems not beyond the bounds of possibility that such a person may have fluttered on the
periphery of Lady Blessington’s extensive social and literary circle at Gore House, before
the calamitous collapse of that salon early in 1849.

If the colonial Legrand had personal contact with the celebrities cited in the
obituaries, it most probably occurred within the twenty-five year span between 1830 and
1855 — that is, from the time he was about fifteen years old until the accepted date of his
arrival in Tasmania. Any personal contact with Charles Lamb would have occurred early in
this period, since this writer died in 1834. Yet perhaps Legrand was familiar only with
Lamb’s writing; and he certainly could have found easy access to later commentaries on
Lamb’s life and work. It would be interesting to know what lay behind Legrand’s reported
indignation that “Lamb’s disrepute in one matter had been grossly exaggerated by the snobs
and prigs of all the later years” (Bulletin [Sydney] 19 July 1902: 15) — presumably the
various interpretations of the writer’s drinking habits in retirement.51

Currently it is not possible either to prove or disprove the Bulletin claim that: “[i]n
the forties [. . . ] Legrand was much in Paris” (19 July 1902: 15). Still, it would have been
possible for him to have had at least indirect dealings with the French writers later claimed
as acquaintances, even had he remained in London — and especially if he had connections
with the print trade. The combined resources of the Waterloo Directory of English
Newspapers (North, 2003) and the “Biographical Database of Members of the London Book
Trade 1701-1800” suggest that at least several of the mentioned writers maintained a
London presence, even if mostly not in person. For example, in 1833 Prosper Mérimée was

---

51 Interestingly, P. G. Patmore’s publication of his personal recollections of Lamb and others in My Friends
and Acquaintance (1854), was receiving critical censure (as a betrayal of friendship) around the very time of
the Tasmanian Legrand’s final departure from England. Patmore had described Lamb’s alcohol intake as
modest: “a foaming pot of ale or porter” at the end of his long walks (52), and the gin and water taken over
suppers with friends an “artificial stimulus” essential to enable the “literally tongue-tied” writer to speak freely
(55–6). Two decades on, R. H. Stoddard’s widely-read Personal Recollections of Lamb, Hazlitt and Others
(1875) sensationalised these particular observations, referring to Lamb’s “increased [. . . ] libations of porter”
during his later years and his sister’s consequent anxieties about the “temptations” posed by public houses
along his way when he went out walking (“Introduction” xviii). Stoddard cites Patmore’s work and
additionally, writing by William Hazlitt and by Hazlitt’s grandson as his sources for Recollections
(“Introduction” xxii).
one of three named contributors to a literary weekly, The Pirate, published in England by James Pickburn at Bermondsey. Ten years later, Jules Janin was co-editor of The Harmonist, a weekly review of music, the theatres, and the fine arts, a journal designed for upper class readers, and written in both French and English. The stated publishers were Parratt and Mearson, and the journal was produced by Alexander Macintosh, whose large London printery extended across several addresses in the Fleet Street area. Around the same time, Théophile Gautier, friend of Janin, of Arsène Houssaye, and of Henri Murger, became a contributor to the Observateur Français, a political and literary journal which ran from May 1845 to August 1848. Issued weekly, it was produced firstly by the English and foreign printer, Clement Armand of Battersea and central London, and later by Pierre Adolphe Du-Hart-Fauvert, and by Patrick Armand le Dentu. The journal’s editor, Jean Baptist Desplace, appears in the 1841 English census records, living at a Marylebone boarding house and described as “Political Writer” (PRO HO107/675/3). The Observateur Français apparently attracted a dual readership: French sojourners in England, and English families wanting to develop their knowledge of French language and culture.

The London print availability of these French writers does not preclude the possibility of Legrand’s more direct acquaintance with them, or with France. Furthermore, his alleged contact with Charles Baudelaire as yet remains unaccounted for; though if indeed such a meeting took place, it may have been at a different time from Legrand’s exposure to the other French writers, or to their reputations. It may even have occurred during Baudelaire’s months abroad: in mid-1841, the unruly youth was despatched on a long sea-voyage to India; but he broke his journey at Mauritius, and was back in Paris by

52 The publishers are not listed in any of the resources consulted; and though there were several instances of surname of Parratt associated with different aspects of the print trade, those flourishing at the appropriate time were mostly in Yorkshire, with one listed in Cheshire (BBTI). In Kelly’s London directory for 1845, there was an Edward Parratt listed as an advertising agent, at an address in the Strand (Winton 405). Perhaps Parratt and Mearson may have been distributors rather than publishers of the Harmonist.
having resolved to devote himself to literature, Baudelaire was soon mixing with “the whole rabble of literary acquaintances; gossip-writers, pamphleteers, art-critics”; and the frequenters of various cafés (Porché 137) — the type of milieu hinted at with reference to Legrand’s youth by the Bulletin obituary. Whether or not Legrand ever came into personal contact with the prominent identities of the English print world mentioned in his later anecdotes, it would have been possible to gain knowledge of them through newspapers, journals, print shops, and booksellers of the day. In later years the colonial Legrand had the reputation of being such a voracious reader that it seems very likely he had been so for most of his life, and that during his earlier days he would have taken in as much as possible of current news, or gossip, or whatever else of interest was circulated by the press. In fact, the print-associated names singled out for mention in the later Legrand anecdotes may give some indication of his early reading tastes. For example, the illustrator, Cruickshank; and the writers, Jerrold, and Costello were witty and frequently satiric social commentators — as sometimes, though in a far gentler way, was the painter, Sir Edwin Landseer. Cooper and Landseer were enormously popular artists whose work was much described in the press, and whose artistic output was highly influential on English pictorial taste in general. Other details about the Landseers which might suggest other possible points of contact for Legrand are that the family was long-established at Marylebone; that one son, Thomas, was an etcher and print

53 The ship, Paquebot des Mers du Sud commanded by Captain Saliz, left Bordeaux 9 June 1842. Baudelaire is said to have displayed courage and “an attitude of spiritual resolution” during a perilous storm encountered near the Cape of Good Hope (Porché 47). He travelled home from Mauritius on the Alcide, commanded by Captain Judet de Beausejou (Porché 51).

54 Of significance on account of the Briggs family tale that Legrand was a child of a French aristocrat “who had walked with King Louis XVI” are the strikingly similar Baudelaire family tales about the poet’s elderly father, François Baudelaire (1759–1827). Former tutor in the family of the Duc de Choiseul-Praslin, François apparently later bravely assisted many aristocrats during the Terror. His years as tutor are said to have imbued him with the distinctively elaborate “old-fashioned manners which always remained in his son’s memory” (Porché 15). In particular, these were formal rituals of greeting and polite conversation observed by the child during his pleasant outings with François, so that “the poet would often describe to his friends the walks he used to go with his father in the Luxembourg gardens when he was about five years old” (Porché 11).
maker; and that the previously-mentioned elder son, Edwin, was a member of Lady Blessington’s circle. Other more informal social and literary circles around the same time contained the dramatist, journalist, and miscellaneous writer, Douglas Jerrold, and also others named in connection with Legrand.\textsuperscript{55} Again, several of these men were closely associated with \textit{Punch, or the London Charivari}, launched as a periodical in 1841, as a “joint speculation of authors, artists and engravers” (W. B. Jerrold 184).

Notably, two of the Legrand obituaries suggest that he had known the famous hostess, writer, and anthologist, Lady Blessington. As Legrand apparently was a Londoner, it would seem impossible that he would not, at least, know \textit{of} her, since her extravagant and unconventional lifestyle, her literary connections and newsworthy salon, and her sensational financial collapse were long the subjects of public interest and general gossip. In the spring of 1849, during five days of viewing prior to the auction of her disposable property, an estimated total of more than 20 000 people passed through her home at Gore House, gazing around at the opulent interior, and at the rich collection of objects for sale. The auction lasted for twelve days; and writers such as Dickens, Thackeray, and Richard Robert Madden were amongst those who expressed their great sorrow at the dissolution of Gore House and all it had meant (Foulkes 370–373). It seems highly probable that Legrand was amongst the throng of sightseers visiting Lady Blessington’s vacated home. The experience would have

\textsuperscript{55} Names of some of these clubs were: the Mulberry, the Museum, the Whittington, the Hooks and Eyes, and Our Club (Jerrold xxxvi, xxxvii). As another connection of interest in view of the later Legrand anecdotes, Douglas Jerrold was invited to meet Janin in London (Jerrold 269). Also of relevance, because Legrand allegedly was “much in France” in the 1840s, is the knowledge that this description was certainly very true of Jerrold, until at least 1848. In 1841, Jerrold was working in Boulogne when asked to become a contributor to the newly-launched \textit{Punch} (Jerrold 184). He also, as the \textit{Mercury} later claimed true of Legrand, “knew the proprietor of ‘Lloyd’s Newspaper’ [Edward Lloyd]” In fact, the talented Jerrold was editor of \textit{Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper} from 1852 until his death in 1857.
provided an opportunity to gaze freely upon her personal beauty, since an item prominently on display was the sumptuous and famous portrait painted in 1822 by Thomas Lawrence.  

It must be said that Legrand’s alleged description of Blessington as a “fickle, fleshly creature [. . .] with winning ways and much of the courtesy that is now out of fashion” (Clipper 5 July 1902: 130), appears highly uncharacteristic of his own later prose style. If he did use these words, it would seem very likely that he was repeating a description he had read somewhere. Certainly, Blessington was much mentioned in the contemporary press.  

The lady’s death in 1849 gave rise to many sympathetic reminiscences, including publications such as a chapter in P. G. Patmore’s three-volume collection My Friends and Acquaintance (1854); Madden’s detailed, often crisply ironic, two-volume work The Literary Life and Correspondence of the Countess of Blessington (1855); and later, Richard Henry Stoddard’s edited presentation of Patmore’s content in Personal Recollections of Lamb, Hazlitt and Others (1875). Various reviews of these and of other such works also were published, and Lady Blessington remained newsworthy long past her lifetime. In short, it would have been entirely possible for Legrand to absorb his impressions of her vicariously; whether earlier or later in his life — perhaps even as late as when his anecdotes first began circulating. The same might be said as regards Legrand’s alleged association with other famous literary persons. For example, a few autobiographical pieces were published by Hunt, followed by The Autobiography of Leigh Hunt, in three volumes (1850). A new edition of the autobiography, posthumously published with an

56 Margaret, Countess of Blessington, oil on canvas, Wallace Collection, London. It was bought from her sale (Phillips 15 May 1849: 1032, qtd. Wallace Collection Online) by an agent for the 4th Marquis of Hertford, a key founder of the Wallace Collection.

57 One notable example is the long-popular, still-quoted work which devotes much of a chapter to Lady Blessington: the journalist Nathan Parker Willis’s gossipy, three-volume Pencillings by the Way (1835), an expurgated collection of many of the letters he despatched from England to the New York Mirror. These letters appeared in the Mirror between 13 February 1832 and 14 January 1836. The book, and still more the letters, caused offense in relevant English circles, but were decidedly popular in America, achieving the phenomenal statistic for the 1830s of being reprinted in more than five hundred contemporary American journals and newspapers (Tome 115).
engaging foreword by his journalist son Thornton appeared in 1860. Similarly, the first edition of The Life of Douglas Jerrold, a biography written by his son, William Blanchard Jerrold, appeared in 1859. Perhaps it was popular works such as these which inspired later comments suggesting that Legrand knew Hunt, Jerrold, and other celebrities.

One possibility which has not been discussed is that Legrand absorbed anecdotes about the famous people he allegedly knew through conversations with others who had been in contact with these celebrities. In particular, numbers of colonials had genuine connections with the old world cultural milieu; and even if this was not true of Legrand, perhaps he knew others for whom it was so. The memory of Lady Blessington clearly held significance for some Tasmanians, no doubt reinforced by the coincidence that her brother, Robert Power, held prominent public positions in Hobart from 1841 until his death in 1869 (Jones 115, 339). Power was well-known to Tasmanian associates of Legrand, such as J. E. Calder and members of the Hull family — though whether they would be inclined to furnish him with details about Power’s famous sister is another matter altogether. A more likely source of information of literary gossip would seem the entrepreneurial Robert Whitworth, a colonial associate with whom Legrand would have been on a somewhat more equal social footing. Whitworth knew the writer Richard Henry (Hengist) Horne, who had fraternised with eminent English literary figures. As regards other names claimed as associates of Legrand, Horne was the immediate predecessor of Leigh Hunt as editor of the Monthly Repository, and also a grateful recipient of Douglas Jerrold’s help in tiding him over a

58 See also A. R. Love.

59 Legrand’s hitherto undocumented association with Whitworth is explored in Chapter 3.

60 For more on Horne’s close associations with significant literary figures, see Blainey (1968). Horne spent almost seventeen years in Australia. Whitworth’s known association with Horne was during the mid- to late-1860s, but may have begun earlier. In any case, Whitworth’s own literary interests apparently were well-established by the time he emigrated to Australia in 1855, the year after Patmore’s controversial Friends and Acquaintance first appeared in print.
period of unemployment (W. B. Jerrold 263 – 64). During his Australian sojourn Horne wrote a personal tribute to Jerrold senior in the *Melbourne Notebook* in September 1857 (qtd. W. B. Jerrold 263–4) and published a long, two-part memorial essay on Hunt in the Australian weekly newspaper, the *Southern Cross* (3 December 1859: 2; 10 December 1859: 2). These literary offerings must be added to the list of likely secondary sources from which Legrand might later have drawn information about London cultural figures.

This chapter has explored in some detail what the research findings currently suggest as possibly relevant links to the mysterious earlier past of Tasmania’s long-lived and enduringly mysterious William Legrand. No firm conclusion can be drawn from what has been discovered; yet it is important to place on record the evidence gathered so far. The key reasons for this are threefold: firstly, that minimal amount of biographically relevant material has been available hitherto; secondly, that widespread general confusions have arisen as a result of the fragmentary nature of what little has been available; and lastly, because it seems inevitable that research into this interesting and culturally significant Australian life will continue. At this point, the further one probes the more likely it seems that Legrand’s origins may always remain a mystery; and also that his literary and artistic associations relate more, and perhaps entirely, to his own voracious reading — and at that, quite possibly to the last twenty-odd years of his life, when his overstocked bookshop was his world. Yet even these inconclusive findings tell us much about the cultural significance of Legrand. He arrived in the colony unheralded, and perhaps surreptitiously, in the first year of Tasmanian self-government. He reinvented himself as a man of many parts, all of them viable in a changing economy, and many of them useful within the evolving cultural life of Tasmania. Eventually, though his original identity remained a riddle, and though very little was known about his life in general, he came to be seen as representing ideals,

61 Horne also was a member of Jerrold’s club, the Mulberries. Leigh Hunt was another member.
memories, and aspirations of his adopted community, and to embody significant ties with English and other old world culture. During the century and more since his death, Legrand’s own cultural presence has continued, not only in his adopted home city, but also more widely — whether as a name still relevant within shell science, or simply as the enigmatic figure of “Hobart’s musty old book-dealer” (Bulletin 19 July 1902: 15).
CHAPTER 3: Legrand’s early colonial ventures (1855 –1868)

Despite ongoing general interest in Legrand, and recurrent curiosity about his origins and pre-immigration life, his earliest years in the colony have been overlooked until now. Legrand’s career as a bookseller continued so long and was so well remembered that apparently the assumption arose that he opened his first shop soon after he landed at Hobart Town. Yet in fact it was almost ten years after his arrival that he set up as a bookseller in Elizabeth Street. Few traces survive of Legrand’s colonial presence during his first decade in Tasmania; but what little can be retrieved provides useful biographical evidence, and glimpses of the beginnings of his later well-known career. Tracing his activities during this previously unmapped period of his colonial life also gives insights to wider issues of Australian cultural history. In particular, the trajectory of his life and career at this early time links him to developments in science and technology within the newly self-governing colonies; and to a range of colonial figures, some of whom who remained obscure, and others whose names continue to be of significance.

The voyage to Hobart Town

The details of Legrand’s arrival in the colonies have long been unclear. Around the time of his death it was stated that he had arrived in 1855 (“A Well-known Hobartian: Mr. Wm. Le Grande,” Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5; “Death of an Old Hobartian,” Tasmanian Mail 5 July 1902: 30). More recently, the authoritative James Dally has stated (without reference) that Legrand “arrived at Hobart, in a French vessel from Le Havre, in 1855” (26). During my own research, records at the Tasmanian State Archives yielded no mention of when, or how Legrand first came to the colony.¹ Research into French ships in the vicinity at the relevant time revealed that in 1855 France was actively encouraging direct trade with the Australian colonies, including lowering its import duty on raw wool; that

¹ Currently, with the rapid progress of the Tasmanian Archives digitisation program, there seems a good chance that the official record of this event soon may emerge.
French trade ships, as well as whalers, regularly called at Hobart Town; and that the visiting ships included several which hailed from Le Havre. A “Mons. Legrand” travelling at this time proved irrelevant, since he was returning to France as sole passenger aboard the Juste, which left Hobart Town for Le Havre laden with a cargo of wool (Colonial Times [Hobart] 8 Mar. 1855: 2). Of possibly greater relevance, although five years earlier, was the presence in Australian waters of the Cachelot of Le Havre, commanded by a Captain A. Legrand. In 1850, having first brought passengers from France to California (Maritime Heritage Project: Gold Rush Ships, Passengers, Captains 3–4; G. Stewart 133), this vessel then was employed for a while in the Pacific trade. Late in 1850, still under Captain Legrand, she took on a cargo of coal at Newcastle in New South Wales (Maitland Mercury and Hunter River General Advertiser 7 December 1850: 2) while her Sydney agents drummed up passengers for her return trip to San Francisco (Sydney Morning Herald 15 November 1850: 1).

At last, solution of the riddle of William Legrand’s arrival has emerged from a newly-released batch of material from the National Library of Australia’s archival newspaper digitisation project. It transpires that Legrand (listed as “Mr. W. LeGrand”) arrived at Hobart Town on 2 December 1855, travelling as an “intermediate passenger” on a Dutch barque, the Vice-Admiral Gobius (“Shipping Intelligence, Port of Hobart Town:

---

2 For example, the Juste, the Mathilde, the Admiral Baudin, and La Brune (Colonial Times [Hobart] 9 March, 13 Feb, 3 May 1855; Courier [Hobart] 6 July 1855, Hobarton Mercury 24 Oct 1855).

3 A book published by Alexandre Dumas, père, Un Gil Blas en Californie (1852), makes use of this same voyage from Le Havre to San Francisco via South America (G. Stewart 132, 133,135). Dumas’s work appeared in various editions in French and in German (in 1852), but not in English until 1906. Local newspaper coverage of the Cachelot’s later Australian visit would seem a likelier possible source of the notion associating William Legrand with a French vessel out of Le Havre.

4 For example, a classified advertisement placed by the ship’s agents appeared regularly for two months in the Sydney Morning Herald (12 November to 10 December 1850) stating that “the fine fast-sailing French ship, Cachelot, A. Legrand, master, 700 tons burthen,” would sail from Newcastle [NSW] for San Francisco “on or about the 1st of December, and has beautiful accommodation for cabin and steerage passengers.” The ship made further news on her departure when briefly grounded on a reef off the Newcastle breakwater. Reportedly, no blame was “attributed to the pilot, as the accident is said to have arisen from the French crew of the Cachelot being unable to understand his commands when given in nautical English” (Sydney Morning Herald 25 Dec. 1850: 2).
Arrivals,” Colonial Times [Hobart] 3 December 1855: 2). Several contemporary newspaper references to this voyage have now reappeared, but so far only this one mentions Legrand by name. The official record of arrival lists names of the cabin passengers, but the others were consigned to anonymity as: “Steerage.12 male Adults, 5 Female ditto, 7 Children” (Return of the Arrival at the Port of Hobart Town). Yet it would seem that, technically, there was no steerage accommodation on this passage: instead, the ship’s hold was crammed with quantities of assorted goods on order for Hobart Town.

This voyage of the Vice-Admiral Gobius began well enough. On 24 April 1855, a fine spring day, the ship departed Gravesend on the mid-morning ebb tide (Times [London] 24 April 1855: 8). She carried only “about thirty-five” passengers, but the cargo was particularly weighty, “consist[ing] principally of iron, lead, beer, spirits, and coals,” and including several crates of earthenware and a carriage, together with more usual merchandise (“Shipping Intelligence, Port of Hobart Town: Imports”, Colonial Times [Hobart] 3 December 1855: 2). As later recorded, “the barque left London [. . .] very deeply laden, drawing about 19 feet water. This, in a great measure, accounts for her making such heavy weather” (Colonial Times [Hobart] 3 December 1855: 2). According to the same report, towards the end of June, having rounded the Cape of Good Hope, the hapless vessel encountered gales lasting eighteen days, and received a battering. Finally, on 12 July, “she had her quarter, and a portion of her bulwarks stove in, her mizzen-mast sprung, and she became otherwise much damaged and leaky.” Thus, in what appears from this distance to have been a fairly desperate situation, “the captain deemed it advisable to bear up for a port and get [the ship] repaired. He accordingly made for Sourabaya [now Surabaya] on the 13th July, and reached it on the 9th August.” In other words, it took four long weeks for the damaged, still heavily-laden vessel to battle its way off-course through the open seas of the

---

5 It would be useful to know whether Legrand already was aboard the Dutch ship when she arrived at London to take on the cargo and small number of passengers for the Tasmania voyage.
Indian Ocean, towards this port on the north-east coast of Java. According to a later report, not only had the ship “encountered a continuation of gales, intense beyond all previous experience, against which she contended for six weeks,” but “her bulwarks were carried away, her boats stove, and all on board experienced the agonies of expected shipwreck” (*Daily News* [London] 29 March 1856: 5). Ship and passengers spent seventy days at Surabaya, where some of the merchandise, including “a carriage belonging to Mr. Walker,” was sold to defray the cost of ship repairs (*Colonial Times* [Hobart] 3 December 1855: 2). Reportedly, “it was found that . . . [the ship] had hardly a bolt which had not started, rendering it little short of a miracle that she had held together at all” (*Daily News* [London] 29 March 1856: 5). The nine cabin passengers were “accommodated at an hotel [sic],” and the twenty intermediate passengers were lodged “in a store fitted up for them” (*Daily News* [London] 29 March 1856: 5).

On 17 October, apparently with a change of captain, the mended barque left port to continue the rest of her journey. Ironically, on that exact day a Hobart newspaper was reporting the non-appearance of the *Vice-Admiral Gobius*, stating that: “[s]erious fears are entertained for this vessel, as she left London early in April, and has been out, therefore, six months” (*Hobarton Mercury* 17 October 1855: 2). Eventually, after a passage of 221 days, the long-overdue vessel dropped anchor in the Derwent early on 2 December. The anxieties and privations of the journey apparently were not considered newsworthy, though they must have been considerable. Remarkably, the human losses were small in number: “a widow lady, Mrs. Lidwell, died of cholera at Sourabaya [sic], and an infant died at sea” (*Colonial Times* 3 December 1855: 2). As was customary, the ship’s surplus stores (and in this case, “a Large Quantity of SHIP’S FITTINGS”) were auctioned alongside the berth of the *Vice-

---

6 While the departure dates reported by London papers were 21 April from London (*Morning Chronicle*) and 24 April from Gravesend (*Times*), the ship may originally have been expected to leave London earlier. Otherwise, the *Hobarton Mercury* must be regarded as in error. In any case, there clearly had been no word of the ship for six months.
Admiral Gobius at the New Wharf (Colonial Times [Hobart] 12 December 1855: 3). Then the claims of consignees who had goods short-delivered began being settled (Courier [Hobart] 29 December 1855: 3). Meanwhile, the passengers had scattered, doubtless glad to be finally ashore. The eighteen classed as bounty immigrants would be employed almost immediately. These perhaps included the “four schoolmasters, intended for the Government” as well as the “farm labourers for R.Q. Kermode, Esq., of Mona Vale” (Colonial Times [Hobart] 3 December 1855: 2). Nothing further has emerged about the others. As a lead to what knowledge, interests, skills, and even attitudes Legrand may have acquired during this long sea voyage from England, it would be useful to know more about the social conditions aboard the Vice-Admiral Gobius, and about the passengers — in particular, those with whom he might be expected to have had most contact. What only can be guessed is the extent to which Legrand’s experience of sea travel, and still more his seventy-day sojourn in tropical Surabaya, may have influenced his outlook, his interests, and his later career. Was it here, in climes once traversed by the famous adventurer-collector, Hugh Cuming, that Legrand began his shell collecting? Certainly, the eventful and prolonged passage from England to Hobart Town would emphasise in full measure the distance between Legrand’s new life, and the one he had left behind.

It seems reasonable to suppose that Legrand had paid his own way to Hobart Town, landed without fanfare, and almost immediately set about finding employment. Currently, the earliest sighting we have of him after his arrival is his own reference to having found a particular shell specimen on Mount Wellington about three years later, in 1858 (Collections, September 1871, species 12). Though Legrand was habitually evasive as regards his own

---

7 Initial research has revealed nothing about this aspect, but the search is ongoing.

8 This was a species previously named by Louis Pfeiffer, a European leading authority on land shells. It was listed in the section of Collections taken from J. C. Cox’s 1868 Monograph of Australian Land Shells, as: “12. HELIX, (Videna) Sinclairi. Pfr., Zeit-Schrift für Malac. 1845. p. 154.” Legrand’s comment on it reads (in part): “The first specimen I ever collected was in 1858 on Mount Wellington, from a small tea-tree
particulars, he was equally pedantic when recording shell details, so that the date claimed for the field trip is likely to be true, though it does not preclude the possibility that he had made other such expeditions previously. Overall, the fact that he was out shell-collecting so early suggests that he arrived in Tasmania already interested in conchology, and perhaps had begun almost immediately to supplement his colonial income through shell-dealing. Legrand’s foraging expeditions probably also had intrinsic appeal for him: as inexpensive recreation, as outdoor activity of an exploratory nature, and as an escape from town. Certainly, these field-work expeditions remained an important aspect of his life for many years.

As regards his regular income after he reached Tasmania, Legrand found employment in the produce trade — an unexceptional occupation, though one which again would fit well against the family background and commercial experience of the errant London stockbroker. We catch a fleeting glimpse of Legrand at work in Hobart Town through a business notice in a local newspaper. This advised readers of the changed management of a grocery and bakery establishment at 163 Elizabeth Street, with the added statement: “Outstanding accounts due to Mr. Turner may be paid to Mr. W. LeGrande [sic], as above, whose receipt will be sufficient discharge” (Hobart Town Advertiser 10 June 1859: 3).\(^9\) Though small and ephemeral, this piece of evidence suggests Legrand’s commercial employment at the time involved at least some minor authority, including financial responsibility.

He seems to have continued in the produce trade for several more years, and his long-lasting association with the Finlayson family probably dates from this time. Andrew

---

\(^9\) The same advertisement appeared in the Hobart Town Daily Mercury, Saturday 11 June 1859: 1. The shop was at the corner of Elizabeth and Brisbane Streets. The departing John Turner was described as “retiring from the grocery & baking business, in favour of Mr. John Barrett,” who appears to have been its previous proprietor.
Hunter Finlayson, a Scot about the same age as Legrand, had emigrated from London with his wife (the former Sarah Marshall) in the early 1840s. By 1847, they were settled at Battery Point, with Finlayson established as a baker and grocer. About fourteen years later, they moved still closer to the waterfront — occupying firstly, mean premises in lower Argyle Street near Constitution Dock (“Notice of Removal,” Mercury [Hobart] 24 August 1860: 2; “Law. Court of Requests,” Mercury [Hobart] 10 April 1863: 2), then moving to a substantial, two-storey building in lower Murray Street (“Notice of Removal,” Mercury [Hobart] 16 February 1863: 1). Four children of this Finlayson marriage survived to adulthood, and there is evidence from the 1870s and 1890s that Legrand maintained significant contact with at least one son and the daughter of the family.

Prospects of change

Following his brief moment in the 1859 Advertiser, Legrand again disappears from the records for almost four years, until 10 March 1863, when he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Tasmania (Mercury [Hobart] 14 March 1863: 2). Soon afterwards, he acquired a further status of respectability: a wife. On 2 April 1863, he married Bethia Morey at the Church of All Saints, in Macquarie Street, Hobart. The official register lists Legrand’s occupation as “corn-dealer.” He was described as a widower aged forty-five, and his bride as a spinster aged twenty-seven (Reg. BDM 231/39/1863 Hobart). She had arrived at Hobart nearly five years before as a bounty immigrant on the Constance (AOT CB

---

10 A recent family history researcher has found evidence of their arrival on the Orleans in 1842, with Finlayson’s occupation listed as “gardener” (Podmore, 2000).

11 Finlayson’s address was listed as 47 Hampden Road on the 1858 Hobart Valuation Roll (Cowley L1-22). Some years earlier, when “Post Receiving Houses” were set up in Hobart, Finlayson at “Hampden-road,” John Barrett of the “lower Elizabeth-street” shop with which Legrand was associated in the 1859 advisement mentioned above, and four other city bakers were amongst the sixteen business proprietors chosen to perform this civic function (Courier [Hobart] 21 April 1852: 2).

12 Then numbered as 9 Murray Street, it was “immediately opposite the Houses of Parliament, and lately known by the sign of the ‘Blue Boar’” (“Notice of Removal,” Mercury [Hobart] 16 Feb. 1863:1).

13 These connections are dealt with in Chapter 5. Finlayson remarried after his wife’s death in Hobart, and there was a second, considerably younger family of the second marriage.
7/12/1/8). Born and bred in the Bermondsey/Newington area of South London, she was a hat-trimmer by trade, but was employed in domestic service in Hobart. Deep mystery surrounds the relationship of William and Bethia Legrand, both then and later. How did they first meet? Was this a partnership begun in hope or perhaps a marriage of convenience; and if the latter, convenient for whom? Still more puzzling is the question of how long the marriage lasted and what eventually became of Bethia.

The ceremony took place at a new and fashionable church designed by the rising young Hobart architect, Henry Hunter. Opened for worship only in 1859, it was built to accommodate the overflow from the Anglican parish of St. George’s at Battery Point, and the new congregation included residents of the big houses then appearing along Hobart’s suburban expansion southwards. Possibly All Saints’ was the local church of Bethia’s employer, and attended by members of his household.14 Perhaps Legrand sometimes was numbered amongst the congregation.15 If so, a relevant factor may well have been that Morton Allport (1830–1878), prominent member of the Royal Society of Tasmania, later described by Legrand as “my friend” (Collections for a Monograph of Tasmanian Land Shells, September 1871), was “a loyal parishioner of All Saints’ Anglican Church, Hobart” (Stilwell parag. 3).16

14 As a bounty immigrant, Bethia is likely to have remained with her original employer, recorded as “T. J. King Esq.,” until the expiry of her bond (Immigration Board CB7/16).

15 From what is known of Legrand, he would seem unlikely to have been a regular churchgoer. Later known associates of Legrand, such as the Finlaysons, and William Burn, apparently had nonconformist religious affiliations. Yet since the Legrand-Morey marriage took place after the issuing of banns, it is safe to assume that both parties attended All Saints’ for at least some period before the ceremony took place.

16 Allport was described as “my friend” in the Sept. 1871 additions to Legrand’s Collections, in the dedication of a shell species listed in the “Additional Index” as HELIX sp. 18, and described in the text as “HELIX (Planispera.) ALLPORTI. Legrand. MSS. Pl. 1. Fig. 2 Helix petterdi, n.a. Cox.” Although Cox probably finalised the wording of the shell description, four facts suggest that the shell dedication came from Legrand himself: (1) it is embedded within a quite long section written largely, and possibly entirely by Legrand; (2) the published shell description cites Legrand’s manuscript as the reference source, suggesting that he was the original describer; (3) Legrand’s preface to Collections mentions Allport’s “great interest in the matter” of the publication; and (4) elsewhere, there is considerable evidence of Allport’s ongoing support for Legrand.
Those signing as witnesses to the Legrand marriage were persons of humbler station. They were the colourful Adam Franklin Aulert, whose wife had arrived with Bethia Morey on the Constance; and Fanny McCann, an earlier bounty immigrant also employed locally as a domestic servant.\(^{17}\) Perhaps all three were friends of the bride, but it also is possible that Legrand and Aulert were earlier acquaintances, and that future research may need to pay attention to Aulert. Comparing his background with Legrand’s colonial career suggests that the two men possibly had many interests in common. Aulert, a Londoner, belonged to a print-trade family, his father an engraver and his uncle trained as a printer.\(^{18}\) The uncle had ventured out early to a recently-annexed British colony in South America to co-produce the local Dutch and English language newspaper, the Essequebo and Demerary Gazette.\(^{19}\) Adam Franklin Aulert, though possibly a painter by trade, spent time working on the London docks and as a mariner.\(^{20}\) Perhaps he shared his uncle’s entrepreneurial spirit, since in 1835 he was listed as supercargo aboard a small ship, the Orizzonte, carrying a group of Texas-bound legal professionals and print-workers from London to New Orleans at

---


18 William Aulert had served his seven years’ apprenticeship (1796–1803) with John Kidgell, engraver, of Gracechurch Street (D. F. McKenzie 202); and Adam Aulert served his seven years (1793–1800) with William Lane, bookseller and printer of Leadenhall Street (McKenzie 207). Their father, apparently of German origin, worked in the East London sugar-refining industry (McKenzie 202, 207).

19 This enterprise was of political significance at the time, and remains of scholarly interest as regards both colonial and print history. Aulert and fellow-printer Thomas Bond soon bought the newspaper from its Dutch proprietor, and they diversified the business (Essequebo and Demerary Gazette, 12 Jan. 1805; 22 Nov 1806; 3 Jan, 10 Jan., 23 May 1807). Their newspaper partnership was dissolved in May 1807, by which time Aulert apparently was running his own plantation (Gazette 23 May, 20 June, 27 June, 10 Oct. 1807). He sold his business assets in 1812 (Essequebo and Demerary Royal Gazette 26 Sept. 1812; Royal Gazette [Essequebo and Demerary] 28 May 1816) and died before 3 April 1818 (National Archives, London PROB 11/160, image: 1434).

20 Aulert (1806?–1881) is recorded on baptism records for two of his ten children as “Labourer in Docks” in 1831, and as “Mariner” in 1837 (Findmypast.com.uk Parish Records Collection). He was listed as a painter, a widower with five children living at Limehouse, Stepney, at the 1851 English census (HO107/1554/105/10).
the time of the Texan Revolution (New Orleans Passenger Lists, 1820–1945). Many years later, when in his fifties, he apparently worked his way to Australia and thereafter earned his living as a painter. Aulert, like Legrand, had remarried in middle-age. He spent several years in Hobart with his new family, living at Battery Point (Hobart Town Daily Mercury 31 January 1860: 2); but by about 1871, the Aulerts seem to have gone their separate ways — Adam to Victoria; and Mary Ann, with their Hobart-born daughter, to Sydney.

It seems likely that the Legrand marriage also was short-lived. No further reference to Bethia has emerged; and though a 1902 published tribute to Legrand contained the statement that “his wife died many years ago” (“Well-known Hobartian” Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5), the information does not necessarily apply to Bethia, and also may be incorrect. Whatever the situation, seven months after his Hobart marriage, Legrand sold up and disappeared. His departure from Tasmania is a little-known fact, traceable only through small fragments of evidence. The most striking relic is an old newspaper advertisement which conveys a sense of finality and even urgency in its announcement of Legrand’s clearing sale (Mercury [Hobart] 26 October 1863: 4). The size and tone of the main advertisement suggest an auction of some substance:

This day


22 Recorded in Hobart Town Gazettes for 1860 and 1861 as Adam Franklin Aulert (painter) occupant of a house and garden 85 Hampden Rd. owned by James M. Wilson. (Annual value of house £16; of garden £16). Twenty years later, he was described as a painter (type unspecified) on his Victorian death certificate (1881/6634); and still later, as “Adam Franklyn Aulertz, artist” on the death certificate of his youngest daughter (RGD NSW 1931/012469).

23 His second wife, Mary Ann, whom he married at St. Matthew’s, Bethnall Green, London, 13 October 1851 (IGI M046988/0849423/ 6900157), travelled under her maiden name on the Constance (AOT CB 7/12/8: 221)

24 Aulert’s death certificate states he was “15 years in Tasmania, 11 years in Victoria” (Reg. BDM 1881/329). Mary Ann Aulert survived him by eight years, dying at Darlington, Sydney. Her death certificate states that she had been for “18 years in N. S. Wales” (Reg. BDM NSW 1889/0004259). Their daughter, first recorded as Elenor Susanna Aulert, was born at Hobart about September 1859 (AOT NS 282/8/5) and died at Campsie, NSW, in 1931, leaving numerous descendants (Death certificate of Helena Susanna Bedwell. Reg. BDM NSW 1931/012469).
MONDAY 26th. October

Macquarie-street, near Barrack-street

Surplus Household Furniture, and Sundry Effects, and Shopfittings

MR WORLEY

Will sell by auction, in Macquarie-street, near Barrack-street, on MONDAY 26th. October, at half-past eleven o’clock, by order of Mr. Le Grand, who is about leaving the colony, without reserve.

SURPLUS HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE and SUNDRIES.

ALSO

Shopfittings, utensils in trade, and many useful articles.

Terms—Cash.

By my reading of this notice, the auction took place at, or outside the premises which had been Legrand’s work-base and home. The omission of a published street number may indicate that his address was well-known. Presumably, it was from here that Legrand worked as a corn-dealer around the time of his marriage. Unfortunately, no records survive to give a clearer picture of his shop-fittings and tools of trade, or to show whether any items of Bethia’s were amongst the “Sundry Effects.” Still more tantalising is the mystery as to whether Legrand’s departure denotes a career change, or whether more pressing concerns motivated sudden flight.

According to a modern commentator, John Holroyd, Legrand already had commenced in business at the Elizabeth Street shop, and may have placed his book stock in storage when he left Hobart (11). Holroyd further states: “Later on Legrand returned to the same premises” (11). To the contrary, there is convincing evidence that Legrand had no

---

25 The lesser announcement in another section stated: “MR. WORLEY.— On the premises, Macquarie-street, near Barrack-street, surplus household furniture and effects, and shopfittings” (Mercury [Hobart] 26 Oct. 1863: 2). Robert Worley’s auction rooms were in Elizabeth Street (Mercury [Hobart] 8 October 1863: 2).
connection whatsoever with that address before 1866. Nor is there evidence of any book-dealing by Legrand before this same date, although it is quite possible that he may have begun trading in a small way earlier as a sideline to his main sources of income. As regards Legrand’s departure from Hobart, two vital slivers of evidence have emerged from the records of the Royal Society of Tasmania which pinpoint his planned destination and suggest the duration of his absence. These are the listings of Legrand as a corresponding member with the address of “Queensland” for the year 1863 and as a Hobart member for 1864. This recently discovered information also solves the long-standing riddle of why there should be a record of Legrand’s arrival in Tasmania for the year 1864, despite existing knowledge that he had been in the colony considerably earlier (Eastley letter 16 Nov. 2005).

**Legrand’s Queensland venture, 1863-1864**

Apart from any reasons he may have had for leaving Hobart, Legrand’s trip to the northern colony undoubtedly was a business venture. His conchology interests probably were at least part of these plans, and in any case, he undoubtedly would regard his financial membership of the Royal Society of Tasmania as useful credentials. No trace of Legrand appears within Queensland records, but this is understandable, given the times, his insignificant social status, and the briefness of his visit. Most details of his northern venture remain a mystery, although fuller knowledge of his later activities prompts useful speculations about the northern venture, and suggests potential leads. Did Legrand travel unaccompanied? (Almost certainly, he returned alone.) Was the move to Queensland

---

26 As later discussed more fully, remnant directories and the Hobart assessment and valuation rolls provide a listing of the shop’s occupants for the relevant years. Legrand’s name does not appear for the Elizabeth Street address until the 1867 roll, suggesting that it was after the publication of the 1866 roll he commenced his tenancy of the shop.

27 I am deeply indebted to Juanita Wertepny at the Special and Rare Materials Collection, Morris Millar Library, University of Tasmania, who unearthed these significant details of Legrand’s membership.

28 The fact that Fellows of the Society were elected would add distinction to this membership, while the fact that continuing membership entailed payment of an annual subscription fee (thirty shillings per annum about this time) could create an impression that he possessed a stable income. In these ways, Legrand may have regarded his membership as a sound financial investment.
intentionally permanent — perhaps another fresh start? Or had Legrand meant all along to return to Hobart? Was he planning to widen his field experience as a conchologist? If so, was this aim inspired by the possibility of a future post at Hobart’s new, purpose-built Museum?

At the time, Queensland was attracting interest as a new frontier in scientific as well as settlement terms, and perhaps Legrand even contemplated working there as a professional collector of natural history specimens. This was, as Loch points out, “a respectable Victorian occupation,” and one with adventurous and even heroic connotations, since collectors of note were “intimately involved in the exploration of Australia” (“Strange Tale” 194). Thus Legrand’s apparently sudden departure from Hobart may well have been a tactical career move. He probably already knew in person, as well as by reputation, the knowledgeable field-collector George Masters, then employed by the wealthy Sydney accumulator of natural history specimens, William John Macleay. Masters’ career was in the ascendancy, and in June 1864, he was appointed as assistant curator and collector at the Australian Museum in Sydney.

Another field-collector Legrand would know by repute, and perhaps also had met, was the talented Scottish-born naturalist John MacGillivray (1821–1867), who was employed around this time to arrange the shell collection of Dr James Charles Cox, the wealthy Sydney conchologist (Calaby parag. 4). He supplied Cox with land snail specimens and invaluable information about habitats of the various species, and his help was

---

29 There seems some likelihood of an early Hobart and/or Queensland acquaintance between Masters and Legrand. The English-born Masters (1837–1912) had travelled in Tasmania as a nineteen-year old in 1856 and collected insects which he later sold to W. J. Macleay. Moving first to Melbourne (where he collected for Dr. Godfrey Howitt) and then to Sydney about 1860, Masters was collecting for Macleay at Port Denison, North Queensland, in 1862–1863 (Tilbrook 79). There seems even greater likelihood of their meeting in person during a later visit to Tasmania by Masters in mid-1867 (Monthly Notices of PPRST for 1867 [1867]: 6).

30 He also retained a part-time position as curator of Macleay’s private museum, an arrangement controversial at the time.
acknowledged by Cox in the preface to the earlier of Cox’s major works on Australian land shells (Loch, “John Magillivray (Cont.)” 5).  

The Cox connection is important with regard to Legrand’s possible Queensland aspirations, since Legrand himself may have supplied some of Cox’s Tasmanian specimens; and more importantly, since Cox later helped with Legrand’s published work on Tasmanian land shells. The Sydney-based conchologist John Brazier, also later involved in the compilation of Legrand’s book, was another worker who supplied shells to local and international collectors. At this time, he had links with the naturalist and painter, George French Angas, previously secretary to the Australian Museum in Sydney between 1853 and 1860, but recently returned to England. From 1863 onwards, Angas published much on Australian shells, and it was Brazier who supplied many of these specimens, an arrangement which lasted throughout the 1860s and 1870s (Loch, “A Strange Tale” 195).

By coincidence, a well-funded field-collector from overseas was working in the Brisbane area precisely when Legrand arrived. This was the German woman naturalist, Amalie Dietrich, who had arrived only three months earlier, in August 1863. She was employed by the Godeffroy Museum in Hamburg, with a ten-year contract to collect throughout Queensland; and the significant botanical, zoological, and ethnographic collections she made were all shipped back to Europe. Legrand may well have known of her presence, which was acknowledged by members of the local scientific community.

31 Cox, James Charles. Catalogue of the Specimens of the Australian Land Shells in the Collection of J.C. Cox. Sydney: Engel, 1864. Loch has described Macgillivray’s later work for Cox as “daily ghost-writing a large part” of Cox’s celebrated and lastingly significant book, Monograph of Australian Land Shells (1868), which appeared soon after Macgillivray’s death (“John Macgillivray (Cont.)” 5).

32 [Koncordie] Amalie Dietrich (1821–1891) was employed by the shipping magnate, Johann Caesar Godeffroy VI (1813–1885). She arrived, as the only saloon passenger, along with 444 German immigrants on the clipper La Rochelle from Hamburg (Courier [Brisbane] 10 Aug. 1863: 2). Dietrich sent home multiple specimens of what she collected and Godeffroy kept the best for his museum, selling the others to European museums and scientists. Dietrich worked in Queensland as far afield as Gladstone (1865), Rockhampton (1866), Mackay (1867, 1869), Lake Elphinstone (1868), and Bowen (1870–1872); and she was recalled to Germany late in 1872. See Sumner’s A Woman in the Wilderness (1993).
although apparently little-noticed otherwise. Throughout the duration of Legrand’s Queensland visit, Dietrich was based in the southern suburbs of Brisbane, maintaining contact with her patron through his local agent, whose office was in Vulture Street, on the south side of the river (Sumner 27, 103).  

Clearly, Legrand was not in the scientific league of these established professional natural history collectors, yet many lesser lights also were employed in the field. Furthermore, despite the economic depression affecting most Australian colonies, it was a time of expansion for a number of colonial museums and collections, and Legrand may have had contacts in mind. Yet if he hoped for employment opportunities with the nascent Queensland Museum, he surely was destined for disappointment. Though he arrived less than five years after the colony had gained self-government, the gentlemanly coterie of Brisbane’s recently-formed Philosophical Society would have little use for a Legrand as they set about establishing a museum. What they most needed was more suitable accommodation, since for the time being, their materials were housed in cramped conditions at the old windmill on Wickham Terrace. More importantly, several leading members of the society were scientifically competent; and furthermore, knowledgeably-assembled existing collections of shells (Legrand’s specialty) and of insects were among the museum’s earliest acquisitions.

33 Johann Christian Heussler (1820–1907), prominent in Queensland as a businessman, politician, and active member of the Acclimatisation Society. The business address is listed in Pugh’s 1863 almanac as “Heussler and Franksen/ Wine, Spirit and General Merchants/ Import Agents/ German Immigration Office/ Brisbane.”

34 The Philosophical Society was formed in March 1859, and began to display its collections in January 1862 (Mather 9).

35 The vice-president Charles Coxen, a brother-in-law of the English naturalist, artist, and entrepreneur, Charles Gould, was primarily an ornithologist; but he, and (in particular) his wife were shell collectors. Other prominent members included the musician and painter Sylvester Diggles, primarily an ornithologist, but also interested in entomology; the taxidermist and collector Eli Waller; and the surveyor Henry Rawnsley, another ornithologist (Mather 36, 68, 174; Evans 46–7). A glowing account of the range, quality, and display of the exhibits six years later is further evidence of the members’ vigorous progress (“The Queensland Museum,” Brisbane Courier 28 Aug. 1869: 6).
Legrand probably focused initially on gaining employment in the commercial field, as he had done in Hobart. Brisbane was an increasingly busy port with an expanding produce market. Yet during most of Legrand’s Queensland visit, unusually wet weather had a marked effect on the local economy. Loads of produce were stalled on roads which became quagmire, river transport was halted, and wharves were submerged or washed away. The prevailing conditions probably restricted Legrand’s employment prospects, and also possibly hampered whatever collecting projects he had in mind. There was continuous rain upstream from Brisbane in December 1863, followed by a further saturation in February 1864 which caused major flooding in Ipswich and areas of submersion in Brisbane city and Milton (Known Floods in the Brisbane and Bremer River Basin 5). Then the first cyclone recorded in Queensland battered the south-east corner from 17 to 19 March, causing serious widespread flooding and considerable financial loss (“The Late Gale and the Flood,” Courier [Brisbane] 21 March 1864: 2). There was more rain in April, with floods in the hinterland; and in early August, torrential rain caused major flooding in Ipswich, with follow-on effects downstream (Known Floods 6). Yet only a fortnight later, there was a gala outdoor ceremony in Brisbane on the hopeful occasion of laying the foundation stone for the capital’s first bridge over the river, a structure intended to remove the inconvenient reliance on ferries as cross-river transport to the south bank settlement and the districts beyond. The general optimism about the infant state’s rising prosperity proved illusory, however, for Queensland would face deeper financial crisis in the mid-1860s.\textsuperscript{36} Whatever Legrand’s intentions in moving to Queensland, it seems unlikely that he made any fortune there. For reasons currently unknown, he chose to leave the colony before a year had passed.

\textsuperscript{36} As regards optimism about the bridge, the temporary wooden structure was completed in June 1865, but collapsed into the river in November 1867.
The Queensland presence of Robert Whitworth

Tenuous but promising evidence suggests that during Legrand’s time in the northern colony he had contact with Robert Whitworth, a known later associate of his. Perhaps these two were previously acquainted, or perhaps Whitworth’s commercial activities in Queensland were the basis of the later association. In any case, the fact that Legrand and Whitworth were both in Brisbane at exactly the same time gives rise to speculation, especially since possible imitation of Whitworth’s business ventures seems apparent in some of Legrand’s Tasmanian ventures later in the 1860s.

Whitworth had emigrated to Sydney in 1855, accompanied by his new wife. He tried several occupations, including “some time in Queensland,” before moving to Melbourne in 1864 (Almanzi parags.1–2).37 His brief Queensland career seems hitherto untraced. The multi-talented Whitworth has earned a place in Australian cultural history as a journalist, dramatist, literary writer, entrepreneur, and boon companion of Marcus Clarke; but it is through his connection with the Melbourne publisher and bookseller, Ferdinand François Baillière, that his activities link him to Legrand.38 During most of 1864, and possibly earlier, Whitworth was the Brisbane agent for the firm of Greville and Bird (Courier [Brisbane] 6 February 1864: 2). They were commercial agents for a range of business enterprises, a number clearly of relevance to Whitworth’s later career, and seemingly also to Legrand’s. The firm had close links with the Empire, a Sydney newspaper which employed Whitworth as a journalist for some time. More importantly, Greville and Bird held the Australian telegraphic agency for Reuters, and at this time were engaged in a

37 His earlier Australian occupations apparently included appearing on the Melbourne stage (1855–1861), “horse breaking in the Hunter valley,” journalism in Sydney in the early 1860s, and writing three plays in 1862 (Crittenden 3).

38 Whitworth seems to have been present in Brisbane from at least early 1863, when he was presented to the governor at a levee (Courier [Brisbane] 23 May 1863: 3). Amongst other aspects of his busy life in Queensland, Whitworth was secretary of two separate new organisations, the Queensland Literary Society (Courier [Brisbane] 4 July 1863: 2; “Epitome,”18 July 1863: 5; “Epitome,”5 Sept.: 3; 23 Nov. 1863: 2) and the Brisbane Theatre Company (Courier [Brisbane] 29 Aug. 1863: 2; 11 Sept. 1863: 3; 23 Sept.: 2).
much-publicised contest of technology aimed at securing the antipodean communication monopoly for its international parent company (Courier [Brisbane] 9 May 1863: 2; 15 December 1863: 4).

In mid-1864, during Whitworth’s watch, Greville and Bird’s office in Queen Street became the temporary venue for a display of high quality books and medical instruments brought to Queensland by F. F. Baillière in person. The visit was heavily publicised through the local press, firstly with a long article introducing Baillière as “the agent appointed by the trustees of the British Museum to visit the colonies for the purpose of purchasing and collecting old pamphlets and newspapers connected with the early days of this portion of the British dominions”, and as also appointed in a similar capacity by the Victorian government (Brisbane Courier 21 June 1864: 2). Though this article stressed Baillière’s “object in visiting Queensland” as being “not for the purpose of procuring rare and antique books, but for obtaining a knowledge of the colony” (2), later editions of the paper carried a classified advertisement stating that Baillière wanted to buy “files” of Queensland newspapers and pamphlets (Brisbane Courier 30 June 1864: 1). Further evidence of saturation publicity for the visit is a later newspaper notice reporting that a second consignment of books from Baillière’s Melbourne store had arrived for display (Brisbane Courier 6 July 1864: 1). Besides demonstrating his current commercial wares, Baillière undoubtedly was cultivating potential backers, contributors, and purchasers ahead of his planned series of colonial gazetteers. These began appearing the following year under the editorship of none other than Robert Whitworth.41

39 Baillière, scion of a London and Paris bookselling and publishing family, had arrived in Melbourne in 1860. His claim to be the Victorian government publisher was disputed at the time and no official record of his appointment seems apparent (Clark, “Baillière” parag. 3).

40 Presumably, the two boxes of books that Whitworth sent off from Brisbane by steamer less than three weeks afterwards (Brisbane Courier 25 July 1864: 2).

41 It was nine years later that an unnamed agent of Baillière arrived to superintend work for the Queensland gazetteer, a project locally welcomed (Brisbane Courier 18 July 1873: 2). The following year saw the
Meanwhile, the gregarious Brisbane agent of Greville and Bird undoubtedly proved an ideal facilitator for Baillière’s Queensland network. Whitworth clearly had a numerous, wide-ranging social circle; and he was well-remembered after he had left the colony, with examples of his later publishing, and literary works being favourably reviewed in the Brisbane press (Brisbane Courier 15 October, 27 November 1867). No firm proof connects Legrand to the Whitworth-Baillière print partnership at this time, yet three items of circumstantial evidence arouse the suspicion of some link. The first is the coincidental timing of Whitworth’s and Legrand’s departures from Queensland. The second is Whitworth’s immediate appointment as editor of Baillière’s soon rapidly-appearing series of colonial gazetteers, together with the fact that, later in this print venture, Whitworth called upon Legrand for Tasmanian information (Editorial, Baillière’s Tasmanian Gazetteer and Road Guide 4).42 The third clue is the apparent change in Legrand’s career focus after his return to Hobart from Queensland. It was notably soon after Baillière’s Brisbane visit that Legrand, and Whitworth left Queensland. Whitworth’s departure dates are unknown, but his replacement as agent for Greville and Bird officially took over on 15 September (Brisbane Courier 21 Sept. 1864: 1). A week earlier, Legrand had begun his two-stage homeward journey. He travelled steerage to Sydney on the steamship Telegraph, captained by the entrepreneurial Audley Coote, soon to launch a controversial onshore career in Tasmania (New South Wales State Records Authority).43 Given that the first page of the ship’s arrivals

appearance of Baillière’s Official Post Office Directory (Professional, Squatting and Trade) of Queensland, 1874, compiled by Whitworth “under the authority of the Postmaster-General,” and printed by Baillière in Melbourne (Brisbane Courier 1 Dec. 1873: 2).

42 The first of these, the Victorian Gazetteer and Road Guide, appeared early in 1865 (Melbourne Argus 3 May 1865: 4). The Tasmanian Gazetteer appeared in 1877. Whitworth’s preface to it stated: “The Editor has largely availed himself of the numerous offers of assistance so kindly tendered, and has, therefore, the greater pleasure in gratefully thanking the following gentlemen, who have personally, or by their influence, materially assisted him in the compilation of the work,” recording firstly, “W. Legrand, Esq.” and secondly, “Rev H. D. Atkinson, Channel Mission,” at the head of his listing of private contributors (4).

43 Arriving at Hobart Town in 1867 with claims of overseas backers, Coote launched a career as concessionaire (later extending beyond Tasmania), and as a Tasmanian politician until 1895 (O’Neill parags. 1–4).
list for this voyage has disappeared, there remains the possibility that Whitworth also was departing Brisbane on that passage.\textsuperscript{44} Certainly, though the surviving second page lists Legrand’s forename as John there is no doubt as to the passenger’s identity.\textsuperscript{45} The \textit{Telegraph} reached Sydney on 8 September; and on the following day, a William Legrand left Sydney for Hobart aboard the \textit{Tasmania}, captained by the genial John Clinch.\textsuperscript{46} As reported in the Hobart \textit{Mercury}, the manifest for this voyage lists six cabin passengers, a cargo described as “sundries,” and Legrand as one of the two steerage passengers.\textsuperscript{47} After a three-day journey, calling in briefly at Twofold Bay on the mainland’s southern coastline, the \textit{Tasmania} docked at Hobart on 12 September 1864 (“Shipping,” \textit{Mercury} [Hobart] 13 September 1864: 2).

\textit{Legrand’s re-establishment in Hobart, 1864–1868}

Little is known of Legrand’s activities during the year after his return from Queensland, but there is sufficient evidence to refute Holroyd’s assertion that Legrand resumed his bookselling at the Elizabeth Street shop upon his return (11). As previously discussed, Legrand had been otherwise employed during his earlier Tasmanian years. Furthermore, as will be shown, it was not until 1866 that he first began his occupancy of the Elizabeth Street premises, and a tracing of the shop’s previous tenants reveals none with

\textsuperscript{44} Permanent disappearance of the first page confirmed by Mary-Anne Warner (correspondence with the author 16 Jan. 2007).

\textsuperscript{45} Data verified by digital copy of original copy supplied by Warner 16 Jan. 2007. Twenty-five steerage passengers on this particular voyage of the \textit{Telegraph} are listed on the surviving page, the names not in alphabetical order (Inward: A List of the Crew and Passengers Arrived in the Steam Ship \textit{Telegraph} of Sydney […] from the Port of Brisbane to Sydney […] 8th September 1864). A John Jones was recorded ahead of Legrand, with William and John being the recorded forenames of the two persons listed immediately after him. This coincidence suggests a probable slip of the pen in the original recording of passenger names. In any case, Legrand’s clearly-documented departure from Sydney for Hobart on the following day seems affirmation of his 8 September arrival at Sydney aboard the \textit{Telegraph}.

\textsuperscript{46} Hobart’s maritime focus and the personal esteem in which Clinch was held locally are strikingly evident in two later Hobart \textit{Mercury} articles, “Death of Captain John Clinch,” 10 June 1875: 2; and “Monument to the Late Captain Clinch,” 22 May 1877: 2.

\textsuperscript{47} See also Marine Board of Hobart report of the ship’s arrival and passenger list (AOT MB 2/39/29: 367).
obvious links to him. In many ways, Legrand’s return to Hobart Town has the appearance of being yet another fresh start; and evident changes in the pattern of his activities suggest that he may have brought back new ideas to invigorate his career. As far as is currently known, his bookselling focus dates to this time. By mid-1866, Legrand had begun assuming public roles for which he has been remembered ever since. In particular, he was reasserting his links with the Royal Society of Tasmania, furthering his repute as an expert conchologist, promoting himself as an antiquarian book-dealer, and establishing his permanent presence in the central business district of Hobart.

The earliest traces of him after his return are references to his participation in the Royal Society’s inaugural “Microscopical Soirée”, a social occasion, with women guests present, which was held in June 1865 to mark the opening of sessions for the year. One report of the event duly found its way to London for publication in the *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science*. It noted the function’s purpose, gave details of the slides on view, and described the proceedings, as follows:

Seventeen microscopes were arranged on tables, and to each instrument a card was attached containing the name of the exhibitor, with a list of the objects for examination. [. . .] Of the Fellows of the Society [. . .] [eleven] exhibited instruments; and Dr. Bright, Mr. Stone and Mr. Legrand kindly acted as volunteers for the occasion. The microscope (by Smith and Beck) belonging to Mr. Stone attracted attention, as being the only one present of the binocular construction. (Agnew 136) 48

Around this same time, Legrand’s other activities at the Hobart museum signal the growth and consolidation of his repute as a conchologist. The Society even apparently hired his

48 A reading of the article in full suggests that Legrand probably owned one of the microscopes on display. Certainly, only three years later he reportedly owned a microscope “of the best kind” when exhibiting slide specimens at a later Society “microscopical” evening (“The Royal Society,” *Mercury* [Hobart] 17 Nov. 1869: 2).
services in 1865, since we learn that “upwards of 2,000 species of shells” were “classified, mounted and labelled by Mr. Legrand, who was engaged for the purpose” (Mercury [Hobart] 21 February 1866: 4). Despite this early progress, the shell arranging at the museum continued as a protracted and, no doubt, congenial task for many years, though whether this later work was paid or unpaid labour remains unclear.  

Legrand evidently used an old but standard conchology handbook of the time, S. P. Woodward’s Manual of the Mollusca; or, a Rudimentary Treatise of Recent and Fossil Shells (1851–6) — a fact which throws doubt on John Brazier’s later denigration of Legrand’s labelling methods (“Trochidae” 194).  

The ongoing project was reported approvingly in the contemporary Hobart press:  

The collection of shells in our museum is at present undergoing arrangement at the hands of Mr. Legrand, and will soon form a very interesting study for our amateur conchologists. The shells are being carded and the generic and specific titles recorded, the habitat and the name of the donor are also being noted. For the convenience of students, the shells are being classified on the system adopted by Mr. Woodward, in his excellent manual. (“Museum,” Mercury [Hobart] 13 January 1866: 2)  

---  

49 Fresh shell donations to the collection added to the time taken. The task was completed in 1879 (PPRST 1879 [1880]:16).  

50 Charles Darwin had written to Woodward in 1856 praising this book and Woodward’s “good service to the cause of Science” (Darwin Correspondence Project Database letter number 1875) and stated that he had “not derived for years so much solid instruction and interest from any other book [. . .]” (Darwin Correspondence Project Database letter number 1856). The book went through many editions, was translated into French (1870), and then updated by Ralph Tate in England (1871) prior to his accepting the chair of natural science at the newly-founded University of Adelaide. In Tasmania, Legrand’s 1870 paper, “On the Land Shells of Tasmania,” noted the limitations of Woodward’s book with regard to Tasmanian species (39), and later the naturalist H. D. Atkinson pronounced Woodward’s book “an excellent treatise so far as recent and fossil genera are concerned, but of little use for determination of specific forms” (“Nomenclature,” Examiner [Launceston] 19 Nov. 1895: 3).  

51 Brazier’s attack is discussed in Chapter 5.
It would seem that contemporary members of the Royal Society valued Legrand’s conchological input, even though others later were cruelly disparaging of his efforts (Brazier, “Trochidae” 194; Morton 122).\textsuperscript{52} For the time being, Legrand was regarded as an agent of scientific progress at the Hobart museum. Typical of the comments recorded at intervals over a period of about thirteen years was the early report:

About 170 varieties of shells have been added to the collection, for which we are grateful to Dr. Cox (Sydney), Mr. G. Masters (Sydney Museum), and Mr. Thatcher (Melbourne). We are also much indebted to Mr. Legrand for arranging and labelling these, and for having presented us with others from his collection. (PPRST for the Year 1866 (1866): 16)

Legrand’s museum work was presumably part-time. Of his business life after his return to Hobart, the earliest evidence is a decorative certificate issued by the Public Library of Victoria, dated 15 November 1866, and signed by the distinguished first Chief Librarian, Augustus Tulk. It acknowledges Legrand’s donation of a copy of James Ross’s \textit{Hobart Town Almanac for the Year 1830}, and states that “W. Legrand Esqre.” of Elizabeth Street was to be enrolled on the official record of contributors to the Library’s collection (Fig. 12). The gift was a small but handsome work, already a quite scarce item of Tasmaniana, and it seems highly probable that Legrand donated it with at least one eye on its potential to advertise his presence as an antiquarian book-dealer.\textsuperscript{53} Whether or not the gift became an esteemed addition to the Victorian library, the donor apparently treasured his certificate of acknowledgement over the years, since the document survived in remarkably good condition.

\textsuperscript{52}Brazier’s comment is mentioned in Chapter 1 and discussed in Chapter 5. Morton’s apparent lack of regard for Legrand’s work is discussed in Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{53}When new, the almanac had sold at the high price of thirty shillings a copy. In 1881, Legrand priced a second-hand copy of the 1830 edition at five shillings (Dally 18).
condition. More recently, it has found permanent safe haven at the State Library of Tasmania (TL.PQ 027.4945).

**Legrand’s Elizabeth Street years, 1866–1879**

The most significant change made by Legrand after his return from Queensland was to set up shop in the central business district of Hobart. *MacPhail’s National Directory of Tasmania for 1867–1868* lists him at 7 Elizabeth Street (14), though it also records the same address for a John Harvey (18).\(^5^4\) The listing for Harvey seems incorrect; but in any case, shortly afterwards Legrand was recorded elsewhere as sole occupant of the Elizabeth Street “house and shop” (*Assessment and Valuation Rolls of Tasmania: Index to City of Hobart 1868* 129). Presumably, his rental expenses were moderate, since the property’s ratable value was between £15 and £13 per annum throughout his tenancy—a reflection of the allotment’s minute area in comparison with the surrounding properties.\(^5^5\) The location would suit Legrand well. It was a short half-block away from at least two different auction rooms, and a similar distance from the Royal Society’s museum; and it was part of a commercial hub at the lower end of Elizabeth Street, then a major thoroughfare leading from the docks to the outskirts of town and the hinterland beyond (Fig.13). Clustered nearby Legrand’s shop were hotels, stables, a coach terminus, and a cab rank; and amongst the passers-by would be travellers proceeding to or from the nearby wharves, comprising another source of potential customers in addition to local trade.

\(^5^4\) Almost certainly, this is an error. Other issues of the *Assessment and Valuation Roll* list John Harvey at 7 Lord’s Place (1865) and a Matthew Harvey at (1) 7 Elizabeth Street, Lord’s Place (1868). Both these addresses refer to the same location, a row of houses or chambers opening on to a lane leading off Elizabeth Street. The lane, still known as Lords [sic] Place, runs alongside the present General Post Office.

\(^5^5\) On the one side of Legrand’s shop there were two buildings at 5 Elizabeth Street, with a combined ratable value of £149; and on the other side were numbers 9 and 11 Elizabeth Street, managed as a single estate, and ratable respectively at £30 and £124 (TFHS Inc. transcr. *Hobart Town Gazette* 8 January 1868: 1544).
Legrand’s conchological and bookselling careers flourished during the thirteen or more years he lived and worked at the Elizabeth Street address.\textsuperscript{56} Being proprietor of his own business establishment was an elevation of his previous social status, and Alfred Winter’s photograph of the jaunty bookseller posed alongside his shop suggests Legrand’s optimism during this period of his life (Fig. 2). Another reference to this occupancy appeared in print some decades later, with a reproduction of the Winter photograph used as illustration.\textsuperscript{57} It was part of an article in the Sydney \textit{Town and Country Journal}, written about 1909 by a visiting journalist (“F. W.”) about his recent interviewing of the Hobart bibliophile, William Walker.\textsuperscript{58} In reminiscing over “an album of [local] views,” Walker reportedly drew particular attention to a copy of Winter’s streetscape, offering the comment:

Now here’s a very interesting photo. That little building there is the present post-office tearooms, with old Le Grand standing at the door of the bookshop which it then did duty as. Poor old Le Grand! He was a character to be sure.

In the seventies and early eighties. (“Tasmania’s Capital—Hobart as a Tourist Resort” parag. 14)

As argued in Chapter 1, Winter’s photograph continues to act as a site of memory associated with old Hobart in general; and with Legrand, Ikey Solomon, and the long-serving Elizabeth Street shop in particular. In a symbiotic relationship between image and subject matter, Legrand’s presence has helped publicise Winter’s streetscape; and the photograph has helped publicise Legrand. The character and significance of the old shop adds deeper meaning to the photograph, and lustre to Legrand’s occupancy; conversely, the building’s importance has increased as a result of the ongoing life of the photograph. Of all

\textsuperscript{56} “Flourished” should be assumed as always a relative term when applied to Legrand’s financial status.

\textsuperscript{57} The Winter photograph, one of several images published as accompaniment to the article, was captioned: “An Old Book Shop, kept by Le Grand in the Eighties” (previous page to article).

\textsuperscript{58} William Walker (1861–1933), a Hobart book collector, especially of Australiana, was the donor of significant collections to the Tasmanian Public Library. See Gaunt (2007).
the surviving artifacts signposting Legrand’s career, this photograph is the one which most clearly demonstrates a separate ongoing life of its own. Quite distinct from its other roles, it remains a striking example of Australian nineteenth-century photography, notable for its aesthetic qualities; its skilful evocation of personality, place, and era; and its lively expression of modernity. Even so, the picture’s enduring charm, and much of its cultural significance derive from its featured subjects. Whether or nor Winter was responding to current local interest in the old Elizabeth Street shop, his photograph reveals an awareness of its social significance. Taking as evidence the tone of later written reminiscences, it is easy to believe that Winter’s precise visual narrative of an historic streetscape in change may have been an influence on later-generation local historians describing this same inner-city area.59

Several of these later accounts mention various occupants of the Elizabeth Street shop, though little has been recorded about the building itself. Its origins would be common knowledge at the time Legrand began his tenancy, but the building stood so long that eventually its history was told as a roll-call of later occupants’ names, and occupations. In terms of Legrand’s biography, the building is of great importance as regards his colonial life and career. It was here that he assembled the self remembered to this day. Contextually, his long occupancy of this building links him closely to the colony’s early days, an era which he did not witness but later came to symbolise. Culturally, the ongoing life and enduring appeal of Winter’s photograph links the lives of Legrand and his first shop indefinitely. Its history is part of his own.

Life and afterlife: the history of Legrand’s first bookshop

Given that the history of Legrand has become virtually synonymous with his bookshops, it seems inappropriate to relate the life of the man without chronicling, even

briefly, the occupancy of these spaces. As explained, the information is important for understanding the cultural patina Legrand has acquired as a result of this relationship. Furthermore, aspects of the chronology shed light on longstanding biographical puzzles — in particular, when and why Legrand eventually moved from his first bookshop; what alteration, if any, in his social status his change of address might imply; and the inter-relatedness, if any, between the move and marked changes in his career focus and public persona which seem to have occurred around the same time.

The old Elizabeth Street building stood for at least 145 years. Situated in a less central location, it might have survived even longer; but in 1966, it fell to inner-city redevelopment. The only clear image of the shop dates from Winter’s 1870s photograph, and knowledge of its earlier decades has been long relegated to the mists of time. Currently, however, through the National Library of Australia’s progressive digitisation of early newspapers, obscure scraps of information relevant to the shop’s distant past are emerging. Details recovered so far confirm and extend the information of a cautiously-worded statement published at the time of the shop’s impending demolition: that the building was “believed to have been originally the offices of the Colonial Bank” (Saturday Evening Mercury [Hobart] 19 Nov. 1966: 11). This information about the building’s original function explains its architectural style, and even suggests possible internal features which may still have been present during Legrand’s occupancy. Pursuing the matter of the building’s origins also has produced explanation as to why the shop’s small, strangely-shaped allotment appears on James Sprent’s early map of the area, made several years prior to the property’s original deed of grant issued in 1847. Sprent’s authoritative map, still consulted to this day, was the result of his “building-by-building survey of the Hobart Town settlement” carried out during the 1840s (Solomon, “Procedures” 262). The relevant map section (Fig. 14) was completed some time between February 1841 and 1843 (Solomon,
“Sprent's Hobart” (52), and therefore is closely contemporary with the operation of the Colonial Bank. Given this knowledge, a close reading of the map explains not only the subdivision, and the much later resumption of this odd morsel of land, but also the real property description recorded on parchment in the huge ledger of original title deeds. Described in lay terms from the map, the allotment looks as if carved from one corner of the much larger block alongside; or, alternatively, as if the larger allotment was laid out to incorporate the already-existing shop building. As described in the 1846 land grant, the small portion of interest was:

two perches and one quarter of a perch or thereabouts, and bounded as follows (that is to say): On the north west by twenty-one links and one half link north easterly along an allotment granted to John Swan commencing at the South angle thereof at Elizabeth Street, On the north east by two links and one half link south easterly also along that Allotment, Again On the north west by 15 links north westerly also along the same Allotment, On the south west by 15 links north west along same Allotment, Again on the north west by 16 links north easterly also along the same allotment, On the north east by 16 links south east along the same Allotment, Again On the north west by 29 links and one quarter of a link north easterly also along the same Allotment, On the south east by seventy five links and one half link south westerly along an Allotment occupied by or belonging to Edward Abbott to Elizabeth-street aforesaid, And thence again on the south west by 17 links and one third of a link north westerly along that street to the point of commencement. (Land Titles Office, Registry of Deeds. 2/2766).

Sprent’s map, which shows buildings as well as boundary lines, is the key to understanding the allotment’s peculiar shape. It follows almost exactly the contours of the building erected
on it, except for the addition of a small rectangular rear yard measuring almost three and a half metres across, and extending back about five and a half metres. A closer look at the building’s irregular shape suggests the strong possibility of a pre-existing L-shaped structure having been extended by the later addition of the geometrically-askew front section — that is, by the windowed room with side door featured in Winter’s photograph. Should this speculation prove accurate, it follows that the more regularly-shaped part of the structure may well have pre-dated the foundation of the Colonial Bank.

Interestingly, the John Swan who evidently released this tiny allotment for bank use was one of the bank’s founders. The new business venture was an entirely local enterprise, and was fairly typical for this era of unregulated banking in the Australian colonies, when numerous small-scale banks opened, and very many failed (Felmingham 38). Hobart’s Colonial Bank opened in August 1840 and was dissolved in late 1843. Begun in financially difficult times, it was forced to close through dissention amongst the shareholders; and yet skilful management ensured there were minimal losses for investors, a noteworthy result for that time (Mulcahy parag. 2). Since the original lease still had two and a half years to run, the directors opted to sub-let the bank premises (Courier [Hobart] 29 May 1845: 3). Even so, the property seems to have changed ownership at least twice before it was granted to Edward Howe in early 1846.

It was possibly quite soon after the bank’s closure that the building became Ikey Solomon’s tobacco store. While it seems ironic that an ex-convict so recently notorious

---

60 John Swan chaired “a very numerous Meeting of the Shareholders of the Colonial Bank” which voted in favour of dissolving the bank (Courier [Hobart] 29 December 1843: 3).

61 M.A. Turvey apparently owned it, and together with W. Dutton (to whom she was related), conveyed it to W. Presnell, from whom it passed to D. Bird (a Presnell relative) and G. Rex (father of the local historian mentioned previously this chapter) (Courier [Hobart] 30 Aug. 1845: 1).

62 If indeed this was the case. Though the story of Solomon’s occupancy persists, to date I have found no firm evidence for the assertion beyond the faded signage shown in the Winter photograph. The authoritative Sackville-O’Donnell makes no specific mention of this shop in tracing Solomon’s return to Hobart as a ticket-of-leave man early in 1838, when he “set up again as a tobacconist and went back to living with his wife and
should be renting such recently respectable premises as those of the late Colonial Bank, this transition is neatly emblematic of the times. It is a reminder of social realities which would be clearly evident in Hobart Town when Legrand arrived, and indeed for long afterwards. Firstly, a significant proportion of the general populace had convict pasts, including many who later prospered in the colony and led highly respectable lives (Bolger 48–9, 70–1). Secondly, while social distinctions persisted, however subtly maintained, much freer interaction between former felon and free settler took place in the commercial sphere. Several names associated with the early life of the Elizabeth Street shop offer evidence of this intermingling: one less extreme example was John Swan, successful in Tasmania as businessman, extensive landowner, and bank chairman. Having been tried but acquitted in England on a charge of receiving, he apparently “was considered by many of Hobart’s social elite to be a man with a shady past” (Hobart City Council 9–10). Yet any lingering shadow clearly proved no bar to his eventual prosperity and respectability, or to his business associations with such men of integrity as Cornelius Driscoll and Thomas Chapman, to mention two of the bank’s executive.

The recorded first owner of the Elizabeth Street property also had some link to the convict system. This was Edward Howe (1803–1852), whose claim to the land was granted 12 February 1846. Whether or not he was one of apparently two early convicts of this name, he later married the widow of a socially prominent ex-convict, and the lady herself also three youngest children in his house at 3 Melville Street” (142). Yet a decade previously, between late 1828 and early 1829, “Ikey had opened a tobacconist-cum-general store in Elizabeth Street” (Sackville-O’Donnell 109). Further research may reveal whether or not, even at this early time, he had some connection with the site of Legrand’s later shop.


64 Thomas Chapman, later Premier of Tasmania, became Swan’s son-in-law in 1843. For more on Chapman, see Green. For more on Driscoll, see Mulcahy.
once had been a convict.\textsuperscript{65} At the time of this marriage, Howe was designated “Coal Merchant of this City” (\textit{Courier} [Hobart] 21 June 1851: 2). He owned other property in Hobart besides his newly-purchased Elizabeth Street building, and seems fairly soon to have let the place to a James Mc Cann (\textit{Hobart Town Gazette} 5 Jan. 1847: 11). Presumably, Ikey Solomon’s occupancy occurred at some time between 1847 and 1850.\textsuperscript{66} Howe’s ownership lasted only four or five years, since he died in 1852, after which the widowed Elizabeth Howe soon sold the property to Henry Brock, a baker, for the sum of £400 (Land Titles Office. 3/8203).

Brock was an early supplier of bread to the government (\textit{Courier} [Hobart] 6 April 1841: 2). He accumulated a portfolio of central Hobart properties, of which the former Colonial Bank building was by far the least valuable. The little shop remained in his ownership until 1881, though well before this date he had moved to Oatlands, where he was a large landholder. It seems that the Elizabeth Street property became run-down during Brock’s ownership. Perhaps not by coincidence, many of the shop’s tenants were short-term lessees.\textsuperscript{67} Some of them remain unknown, but it is possible to assemble a sufficiently full list to dispute Holroyd’s assumption that Legrand had begun the Elizabeth Street bookshop before his 1863 auction of goods and departure to Queensland. Firstly, a possible six- or seven-year family occupancy of the shop is suggested by the tenancies recorded in Hobart directories of Daniel Stuart, general dealer (in 1852); Elizabeth Stuart, greengrocer, and

\textsuperscript{65} John Petchey (1792–1850), transported per \textit{Indefatigable} (1812). Later a versatile and highly successful businessman, he drowned in the sinking of his boat in a regatta race on the Derwent (\textit{Courier} [Hobart] 18 Dec. 1850: 4). Elizabeth (née Callaghan) had been assigned to Petchey as a convict servant around 1823, and later became his second wife (Goodhand parag. 3).

\textsuperscript{66} Since the portion of the building on which the Solomon signage appears gives the impression of having been purpose-built as a bank frontage (thereby dating it to about 1843) and since Solomon died in September 1850. As previously footnoted, there seems some possibility that his lease occurred during an earlier period of the building’s life, yet the signage surely post-dates the bank’s occupancy.

\textsuperscript{67} The old Hobartian, G. W. Rex, recalled some early occupants of this building as “Mr Capurn who hailed from Lincolnshire” (a tailor), “John Dean (baker and store),” and “Messrs. Boyle Robertson Patey (agent,)” He incorrectly stated Hood’s occupancy as being before Legrand’s (\textit{Mercury} [Hobart] 28 July 1910: 3).
fruiterer (in 1857); and of a Daniel Stewert in the 1858 valuations roll (Cowley L1–63). The following year, George Rees, a bookbinder, was listed at this address (Hobart Town Daily Mercury 11 June 1859: 1). During 1860, the shop was untenanted for at least part of the time; and by the following year, its ratable value had declined sharply. It continued at this low rate for the rest of Brock’s ownership, suggesting that the rent probably would be correspondingly low — a factor perhaps of major consideration for Legrand, and for the tenants who were his immediate predecessors. These were a J. Murray Williams (in 1861) and a John Smith (in 1865). As indicated by early directories, and by the Tulk letter (Fig. 12), it was in 1866 that Legrand began his occupancy of the shop. He was the last and also the longest in residence of all Brock’s tenants there.

Legrand may have hoped to remain even longer at 7 Elizabeth Street: it was suitable in so many ways, and no doubt the prospect of moving his stock elsewhere would be daunting. Yet a formal changeover of the shop’s ownership began in 1880, and Legrand’s departure seems in some way linked to this fact. On the other hand, the building shown in Winter’s photograph already was dilapidated, and if Legrand had begun to encounter difficulties in keeping his stock safe and dry, this fact alone might motivate him to move. Whatever the case, by the end of 1879 he was advertising his re-establishment in Collins Street (Mercury [Hobart] 22 Dec. 1879: 1).

The new owner of the Elizabeth Street shop was Robin Lloyd Hood, who apparently bought it for his own business use — another likely reason for the cessation of Legrand’s lease. Significantly, soon after the property changed hands, its ratable value soared dramatically — from £13 annually in Legrand’s day, to £40 by 1885. Since the assessments of neighbouring properties increased only slightly over this period, it seems

---

68 As Rees also was listed at 3 Elizabeth Street, his recorded tenancy may be a clerical error, unless, as was possible, he was using Brock’s property as additional premises.

69 The same advertisement apparently was reprinted daily in the Mercury from at least 24–31 December 1879.
probable that the new owner renovated the little building. Another possible effect on its value was the major redevelopment next door, a project begun in 1881. This was the erection of the stylish A. M. P building on the corner of Elizabeth and Collins Streets, to the design of Henry Hunter. It was a handsome four-storey structure covering most of what originally had been Swan’s grant on that site, and replacing smaller buildings which were old and shabby. With its impressive façade truncating the corner and embellishing the street fronts on two sides, the new A. M. P. building completely transformed the block on which it stood. Alongside this impressive edifice, Legrand’s first little shop continued in its accustomed spot for a further eighty-five years.

Under its new owner, the shop entered the first of three notable phases in its latter-day existence. Hood was a well-known printer and frame-maker, whose works remain of cultural significance. He maintained his involvement with his family’s Liverpool Street print business, and the Elizabeth Street shop apparently was devoted to his frame-making. An earlier example of Hood’s artistry (made in 1856) is the huge, ornately gilded frame surrounding Conway Hart’s life-sized full portrait of Sir Richard Dry which still hangs in the Tasmanian House of Assembly — a work of significance, even now, on account its subject, its commissioning, and its frame-maker.

---

70 Legrand later exhibited an old picture, “a small painting showing the old building on the site now occupied by the A. M. P. Society Office in Elizabeth-street” (“Exhibition,” Mercury [Hobart] 1 Oct. 1896: 2). Research into locating this image continues, but currently other evidence suggests the likelihood that it pictured the building or buildings which had preceded those which were standing during Legrand’s time at his Elizabeth Street shop.

71 Potentially confusing for later researchers is the fact that the nearby street numbers were changed significantly around this time, with 7 Elizabeth Street being recorded as number 21. The allotment shows as number 37 on some later sources (for example, the 1905 Hobart Metropolitan Drainage Board map).

72 Robin Lloyd Hood (1828–1916), arrived from England as a child in 1833 with other family members. The father, Robin Vaughan Hood (c.1802–1888), a carpenter, began specialising as a carver, gilder, and frame-maker; he exhibited such works overseas; and was integral to Hobart’s cultural life as lithographic printer, and fine arts entrepreneur. Younger members of the family continued this tradition.

73 Dry (1815–1869), son of an Irish political prisoner, was the first Tasmanian-born Premier, and was made a Knight of the Realm.
shop was long remembered, and is of particular relevance here because its duration has been conflated in some reminiscences, obscuring Legrand’s previous long tenancy. The confusion may well have come about through recollection of Hood’s earlier tenure of premises a few doors nearer the Macquarie Street corner.\textsuperscript{74} In addition, he apparently later sold stationary items, and even some books, presumably as a sideline to his art business. The facts of the matter are that Legrand was in business at the Elizabeth Street shop for almost thirteen years (from 1866 until the end of 1879) and was succeeded by Hood, who owned and occupied these premises for sixteen years.

The shop apparently passed next to the Mutual Union Insurance Company in 1896 (\textit{MercURY [Hobart]} 24 July 1946: 5); but soon became the Post Office Tea Rooms mentioned by William Walker and long-remembered by Hobartians. By this stage, the old building had acquired an upper storey, and a substantial awning over the footpath outside (Fig.15). These permanent additions rendered the original structure quite unrecognisable throughout the latter portion of its life.

The building’s last and longest phase of occupation began in 1922, with its purchase by the noted silversmith, Harold Sargison. As mentioned in a previous chapter, he used the old shop as work premises, and also as an equipment store for the Tasmanian Field Naturalists’ Club. The building’s supposed centenary was noted by the Hobart \textit{MercURY} in a short article naming a few of its many previous uses and owners, including the comment that earlier “[t]enants included Legrande [sic], a bookseller, and Nettlefold, cabinet-maker” (“Hobart Business Premises Reach Centenary This Year,” 24 July 1946: 5). The accompanying illustration, captioned “Shop with a History,” was described as “a painting by D. Colbron Pearse from an old photograph” (5).\textsuperscript{75} In terms of draughtsmanship, the

\textsuperscript{74} In Lord’s buildings, 1 Elizabeth Street.

\textsuperscript{75} Captain D. C. Pearse was decorated in France during World War One and retired from the British army in India, in 1922. Moving to Tasmania, he worked in advertising and as an artist, but chiefly for the Tasmanian
painting appears a painstaking copy of Winter’s 1870s streetscape (Fig. 2), except that Pearse has added several human figures in presenting his imagined view of the scene as it might have appeared in the late 1840s. In the foreground, he has placed two elegant ladies clad in sweeping gowns, shawls, and deep bonnets, both carrying large muffs. They are standing on the footpath outside what we know as Legrand’s shop, while a well-dressed little girl lingers outside the chequered window-panes of Pearson’s business next door. The more radical alteration of Winter’s streetscape is that Pearse has removed all trace of the jovial Legrand seen standing at the bookshop doorway. Instead, we are shown a hunched and shabbily-dressed figure on crutches hobbling inwards over the threshold, perhaps an “old lag” come to do business with Ikey Solomon inside.

Pearse’s adaptation of the Winter photograph proved to have an ongoing life of its own. In tone as well as content, it projected a narrative very different from that of the original upon which it was based. Yet each artist has dealt with the historical subject of the old shop in ways reflecting his own cultural and commercial times, eras more than seventy years apart. A possible legacy of the Pearse image is its contribution to a later focus on Solomon’s tenure of the shop rather than Legrand’s. Ironically, this trend may have added to the aura of exoticism associated with the historical bookseller, even for viewers conversant with Winter’s photograph and with other facts about Legrand’s Hobart career.76

Sargison eventually sold the Elizabeth Street shop in 1966. It was demolished, along with the more recent A.M.P. building next door, to make way for the construction of the new and larger A.M.P. building which currently towers above the corner of Elizabeth

---

76 For example, in the characterisation of the French-Jewish Hobart bookseller in Koch’s novel Out of Ireland, a work discussed in Chapter 6.
and Collins Streets, covering the full site originally granted to John Swan. Winter’s photograph was chosen as illustration for the newspaper article reporting the old building’s impending demolition (‘Hobart’s Oldest Shop,’ Saturday Evening Mercury [Hobart] 19 November 1966: 11). It seems an irony that the original building once occupied by such habitual practitioners of self-concealment as Solomon and Legrand should have spent the latter half of its long life in disguise (through the addition of an upper story and street awning) and respectability (as tea-rooms and then Sargison’s premises). Though it was in this much-altered state that the old building finally was reduced to rubble, Winter’s long-enduring photograph has preserved a clear image of its early appearance, and celebrates its two most colorful early occupants.

Yet for a while, the building’s brief association with Solomon seems to have gained the ascendancy within popular memory. Six years after the shop was pulled down, Pearse’s painting re-appeared in the Saturday Evening Mercury, this time in connection with a stage production of Lionel Bart’s musical, Oliver, about to open at Hobart’s Theatre Royal (14 December 1972: 12–13). The Pearse illustration accompanied a full-page feature article by Elizabeth Okines entitled “Dickens’ Character — In Olde Hobart Setting” (12). The article gives an outline of Ikey Solomon’s career, linking this historical figure to Dickens’s representation of Fagin in Oliver Twist, and including the journalistic aside: “So it is probably appropriate that Solomon, alias Fagin, will once again play a prominent part in Hobart” (parag. 23).

It is understandable that the arresting links between the old shop, Solomon, and (more tenuously) Fagin might erode public memory of Legrand’s long but less-noteworthy

---

77 Completed in 1968, this was Hobart’s first skyscraper, and remained Tasmania’s tallest building until 1973.

78 The reproduced picture was signposted with a large arrow emblazoned in capital letters. “FAGIN WAS HERE!”(12). The caption beneath reads: “THE original shop at 21 Elizabeth Street — now part of AMP — where ‘Ikey’ is believed to have stayed” (13). A smaller head-and-shoulders portrait, captioned “Artist Jorge Andersch’s impression of ‘Ikey’ (Fagin) Solomon,” also accompanied the article (12).
tenancy, especially during times of renewed interest in the once-ignored convict past. Yet the ongoing life of Winter’s original photograph maintains the historical record of Legrand’s presence, Solomon’s faded signage, and the original external appearance of the old Elizabeth Street shop.

**Legrand’s life at the shop**

Just as Winter’s photograph is an enduring reminder of Legrand’s life and career, what is known about the old bookshop building tells us much about Legrand as occupant. Firstly, despite his poised and dapper appearance in the photograph, and the undeniable assets of the shop’s convenient and central location, the premises were situated at the dowdier end of the block. Though the neighbouring building on the eastern side was large, solid, and handsome, Legrand’s doorway faced in the opposite direction, opening on to the unprepossessing view of the shabbier premises occupying Swan’s old allotment.\(^{79}\) In earlier times, one and possibly both of these buildings functioned as a hotel, but they later became offices and a warehouse.\(^{80}\) Both were set well back from Elizabeth Street, and it seems archeologically significant that Sprent’s map seems to suggest that their Elizabeth Street walls would align with the front of the L-shaped structure I suspect was an earlier-constructed core of the Colonial Bank building. Throughout Legrand’s occupancy of 7 Elizabeth Street, the smaller of these two next-door buildings was often untenanted. The larger one, which opened on to Collins Street, was first rented, and then owned by John Golby Parker.\(^{81}\) He operated a bark mill in his back yard, which presumably accounts for the notably tall, close-boarded fence curtaining off Parker’s allotment from Legrand’s shop, a

\(^{79}\) At the time, numbered 9 and 11 Elizabeth Street.

\(^{80}\) For example, in the 1858 Valuation Roll for the City of Hobart Town, John Swan was owner of both allotments, which were listed with Elizabeth Street addresses and tenanted as follows: John Wright, house and shop (at number 9); Benjamin Cunningham, house (at number 11); and George Stevenson, office and stores (at the back of 11) (Cowley L2–70 [owners]).

\(^{81}\) Parker (1836–1911) had bought the property by 1878.
feature noticeable in Winter’s photograph. Despite this protective barrier, the bark mill undoubtedly would have been a noisy, and probably also dusty neighbour.\textsuperscript{82}

Yet the proprietors of the several nearby premises were respectable men, well-known, and successful in business; if Legrand claimed any acquaintance with them, it would seem to have been to his social advantage. The neighbours in question were, as mentioned, Parker at 11 Elizabeth Street and Leonard Pearson, originally a cabinet-maker, at 5 Elizabeth Street. Pearson’s prestigious upholstery and furnishing warehouse occupied the three-storey street-front building, while his cabinet-making works and his dwelling-place were at the back.\textsuperscript{83} Towards the end of Legrand’s occupancy, Pearson’s building was bought by James Robb, importer and manufacturer of all kinds of harness, saddlery, whips, and similar accoutrements (\textit{Mercury} [Hobart] 19 Nov. 1878: 1). Robb had moved from 51 Elizabeth Street, and his landmark sign of a life-sized horse statue was re-erected at awning level outside his new, more spacious premises.\textsuperscript{84} Legrand’s shop may have faced the wall of Parker’s bark mill, but the structural fact that it seemed to cling like a chiton to the substantial, red brick side of Pearson’s three-story building may well have enhanced the social status of its position. Such neighbourhood factors would be important to Legrand, since during his Elizabeth Street years, he apparently was making a sustained effort to appear gentlemanly.

His business interests were diverse at this time, and he described his address accordingly. For example, he was listed as “opposite Rout’s Auction Mart” when he

\textsuperscript{82} The mill, set up in early May 1868, was lit by gas light so that it could operate at night, as well as throughout the day (\textit{Mercury} [Hobart] 13 May 1868: 2). This continuous activity presumably would have some impact on Legrand’s living conditions, since his shop was also his dwelling place.

\textsuperscript{83} Pearson (c.1801–1887) and wife arrived as cabin passengers on the \textit{Curler} from London in 1833 (\textit{Hobart Town Courier} 23 Aug. 1833: 3). He advertised his removal in June 1847 to new premises at 3 Elizabeth Street, possibly an earlier street numbering of this same property shown in Winter’s photograph (\textit{Courier} [Hobart] 28 Aug. 1848: 1). Pearson apparently had sold the property by about 1875.

\textsuperscript{84} The business premises of James Robb (c.1841–1915) were, and long remained, a prominent city landmark, and the handsome and sturdy old building is still in commercial use.
advertised for sale “a strong four wheel Cab and a Double Set of Harness; price £7. Also a young and useful Horse; price £3 10s. Reason of sacrifice owner leaving the colony” (Mercury [Hobart] 30 June 1868: 1). On other occasions, he gave his address as being near the Tasmanian Times, or near the Telegraph Office.

As regards the establishment and development of Legrand’s career, and also as regards his own creature comforts, the shop was probably more functional and more comfortable than it appears from the Winter photograph. The front room behind the shop’s quaint curved façade would receive considerable natural light through the large windows on its south and west sides, and these windows also enabled Legrand to present a display of his stock to the gaze of passers-by. At closing time, he probably covered the glass panes with some of the wooden shutters shown stacked against Parker’s wall in the Winter photograph. Since the shop had been formerly a bank, it is safe to assume it had at least one chimneypiece, and that there would be two or more small rooms in the L-shaped portion behind the more public front office. Originally, careful attention would have been paid to making the building secure, especially at the back; and for the same reason there possibly was a stout internal door between the windowed front room and the rest of the building. Gas street lights now functioned throughout the central parts of the city; but as yet, very few households had the luxury of gas lighting, and oil lamps were customarily used indoors. Reticulated water was available to this area by the time of Legrand’s occupancy, but within recent memory there had been a public pump nearby, situated in the middle of the road at the corner of Elizabeth and Macquarie Streets. Though apparently already forgotten, in the back yards of Legrand’s neighbours there were filled-in, originally deep private wells previously used to collect the water that seeped through the porous sandstone strata underground. The wells were supplied by clear water seeping downhill from higher levels (Crawford and Ryan 7). One of them was rediscovered by accident in Parker’s yard during
Legrand’s residency at Elizabeth Street (‘An Old Well,” Mercury [Hobart] 8 Oct 1918: 4).85 By that time, the bedrock was a maze of old underground cisterns and barrel sewers; and Legrand’s shop probably had a privy which drained, as did countless others, towards the notoriously polluted Hobart Rivulet.

To have maintained himself in business continuously from 1866 until his death about thirty-six years later is a tribute to Legrand’s commercial acumen — especially since secondhand books were apparently his main stock in trade. His occupancy of the Elizabeth Street shop was essential to the development of his business and scientific careers, as well as to his social presence. The shop gave Legrand the stability and accessibility of a settled and central city address; while the particular layout of the premises would enable him to maintain his two collections separately. Winter’s photograph shows that the book store began, as was logical, at the shop front. Presumably, Legrand’s private shell collection was housed towards the rear of the premises, in or near his living quarters. Somewhere inside he also had set up a printing press. The shop’s small back yard would provide outdoor space where any live shell specimens he collected might be cleaned and prepared for display or distribution. Even so, if the later reputation of Legrand’s over-stocked Collins Street shop is any indication, his combined collections may have outgrown the space available at the Elizabeth Street premises by the time he eventually moved out. Yet this small and historic building which served thirteen years as his first shop not only had enabled Legrand to launch himself in the careers for which he became so well known but also, through Winter’s popular photograph, shaped the way in which he was then and later regarded, and how he is remembered still. In summary, there apparently was good cause for Legrand’s cheerful confidence as he posed for Winter’s camera in the sunny doorway at 7 Elizabeth Street.

85 The same well, or perhaps a close companion, made fresh news a hundred years later (in 1968) during demolition and rebuilding work being carried out on the site once occupied by Parker. Reportedly, “[g]reat difficulty was experienced in attempts to dewater the well because of the continuous inflow” (Crawford and Ryan 7).
CHAPTER 4: “A Trip to Recherche Bay” (1869)

Old photographs of Legrand are not the only relics of his Tasmanian career to lead ongoing lives. Possibly the earliest of all these things is a newspaper article written by Legrand which still finds readers. It refers to a journey he made in February 1869, and it was published in both the Hobart Evening Mail (8 March 1869: 3, 4) and that paper’s briefer country edition, the Weekly News (6 March 1869: 9), as a feature column entitled, “A Trip to Recherche Bay. (From a Correspondent).” Written when Legrand was actively consolidating his cultural presence in Hobart, the article seems to have been a freelance work, and probably another of his entrepreneurial ventures. Whatever its original reception, it has retained a readership on account of the region it describes, Tasmania’s remote and beautiful Recherche Bay, a place which has fascinated outsiders ever since “d’Entrecasteaux’s rhapsodic description” at the time of its European discovery in 1792 (Brown xii).^1^ After British settlement in Tasmania, Recherche “became a kind of half-way house for vessels sailing [from Hobart] up the West Coast and was a popular anchorage for boats engaged in whaling” (Pretyman 120). During the early colonial years “the area […] hosted mainly transients” and earned a reputation for lawlessness; whilst even amongst its later settlers, “[w]hat appealed to many was that the bay was ‘beyond the Pale’” (Poulson 22). At the time of Legrand’s visit, this isolated region some sixty sea-miles south of Hobart still retained an aura of exoticism for urban dwellers. Despite frequent (and usually mundane) mention of Recherche in newspaper shipping notes, and the reporting of occasional entrepreneurial ventures there as they waxed and waned, it remained, as described by Legrand: “a place little known to visitors from town.”

^1^ Bob Brown’s Tasmania’s Recherche Bay (2005). Similarly rhapsodic about its “picturesque beauty” (19) was Dr Joseph Milligan, reporting (1848) to the lieutenant-governor on its unpromising coal measures. Lady Jane Franklin (1838), though visually impressed and eager to explore, commented on the stench of the shore-based whaling industry. As Bruce Poulson reminds, “[a]lthough seen as a place of magical beauty by many, it was for decades the scene of mass destruction of the whales and of the forests” (iv).
Over the years, the region has featured in numerous works — surveys, complaints, reports, travel tales, artistic representations, drama and song, and conservation issues.\(^2\) Within this array, Legrand’s account has the significance of providing information about a little-known era of the area’s past; and of being, in effect, the first social study of the settlement (Appendix B).\(^3\) Legrand’s sympathetic and informative report, based on observations gathered during a fortnight’s visit in 1869, has captured a moment in the history of Recherche. Though a newspaper article might seem insignificant, the text is important for understanding the place, and how it is mapped culturally.

Originally, the article clearly pursued complex goals, functioning through multiple layers of meaning — literal, rhetorical, and personal. In its current life, however, interest has focussed on the literal layer — specifically, on the details about Recherche. This material is indeed valuable, yet the article as a whole is a small gem of colonial journalism, and worth examining as a rhetorical exercise. Though intentionally an ephemeral piece, it contains information of enduring interest about the writer and the wider society, as well as about the place. This chapter explores “A Trip to Recherche Bay” as a biographical fragment, using key coordinates suggested by Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson (2001). It probes the article’s

---

\(^2\) Examples include early artworks by James Erskine Calder (1836) and Francis Russell Nixon (from the early 1850s); later photographs by John Watt Beattie’s studio (circa 1890-1910); and more recently, by Peter Andrews (2004), and Bob Brown (2005). Reports, ranging from functional to the sensational, include Dr James Milligan’s report on the Recherche coal seams (1848), J. E. Calder’s government surveys of whaling leases (1830 –1835) and commissioned report on the oyster industry (1868), quite recent media reports on clear-felling of native forest in the area, and current very detailed studies of the heritage significance of parts of the Recherche hinterland. Reports prior to Legrand’s visit include newspaper complaints about drunken lawlessness (“Drunkenness,” \textit{Courier} [Hobart] 28 April: 4; “Recherche Bay,” \textit{Hobarton Mercury}, 5 July, 1854: 2) and even armed robbery (“Bushrangers at Recherche Bay” \textit{Courier} [Hobart] 20 December 1856: 2). Earlier still, there was contemporary international coverage of the mutinous seizure of the government brig, \textit{Cyprus}, at Recherche (1829), and the event was long-remembered. Written accounts followed, and representations in various other forms have continued to the present day.

\(^3\) It falls between the French explorers’ reports of the area and its indigenous community prior to European settlement, and Bruce Poulson’s recent \textit{Recherche Bay: A Short History} (2004). The long and detailed article by “The Traveller” entitled “Through Tasmania. No. 95” (Hobart, \textit{Tasmanian Mail}, 10 Sept. 1885: 2) discussed later this chapter, also might also lay claim to being considered social comment.
textual layers of literal, rhetorical, and personal meaning, and also considers its literary, social, and cultural significance.

Legrand’s text runs to about 1440 words, and shows no sign of external editing. Written as a first-person recount of a journey from which the author has just returned, it presents an impressionistic overview of Tasmania’s most southerly outpost—a small, scattered settlement, surrounded by thick bush and difficult terrain, and customarily accessed by sea (Fig. 16). As journalism, the article is vivid, engaging, and informative. It is also political—interesting for what is omitted or glossed over, as well as for what is included. It is clearly autobiographical, both in the studied representation of self for a public audience, and because the details of Legrand’s visit, including many people and events described, are verifiable.

Striking parallels exist between this work and surviving photographs of Legrand. In either medium he appears in role, cast as central figure within superficially straightforward narratives which are laden with coded subtexts. Yet in the article, as in the photographs, we catch glimpses of Legrand’s personality (in particular, his dry sense of humour) and find intertextual links to other works and to contemporary societal issues. These textual parallels persist in the way the article and several of the photographs have acquired fresh meaning and new uses during their separate, ongoing lives. To modern viewers, social and commercial themes are more pronounced in the article than in the photographs: and the breezy style of the Recherche text is scant disguise for its persuasive intent. Unravelling precisely what Legrand was selling, and to whom, and why, are keys to understanding much about the article’s socio-cultural and biographical significance. Yet despite this apparent

4 Apparently, a rudimentary bush track towards Recherche existed but was difficult, impassable in wet weather; and consequently little used. “The Recherche traffic [. . .] is by water, and always will be”, was a reasonable assertion made by “The Traveller” in 1885 (26): Recherche was “the last settled place in Tasmania to be serviced by a reasonable road” (Poulson iv).

entrepreneurial intent, Legrand’s enthusiasm for his topic seems both genuine and personal, and his observations and anecdotes add human detail of biographical and historical significance. From another perspective, reading the article in the context of other surviving relics of Legrand’s colonial career (in particular, the photographs, the conchology, and the letters) adds further evidence in support of a central contention of this thesis: that Legrand identified with Tasmania, saw his contribution as intellectually significant, and sought recognition as a Tasmanian cultural figure.

**Social clues**

The article reflects social preoccupations of place and time, in a period of fervent but fraught regional nationalism. Tasmania, having recently gained self-government, was in the throes of prolonged economic depression. Two decades later, the Tasmanian historian James Fenton wrote that the colony had been “in a most critical condition financially” by the end of 1868 (331). Thus Legrand’s article was a product of particularly bleak times. Also, the period was one of increasing conservatism, with social, and cultural respectability and loyalty to the British crown widely emphasised public values. According to the modern historian Michael Roe, Tasmanian self-government “meant a step back rather than forward [. . .] to any believer in liberal democracy” (“Burden of Tasmanian History” 8). Particularly relevant in terms of Legrand’s apparent display of Tasmanian nationalism is the fact that the piecemeal granting of colonial self-government increased political tensions, and economic competition between the recently “independent” Australian colonies (Melleuish xi).

On the financial horizon, entrepreneurial initiatives offered Tasmania some hope of economic recovery — heavily publicised examples being the efforts to create a salmon industry; and widespread exploration for minerals (discoveries of which, at least temporarily, brought economic relief). More specifically, Legrand’s article appeared in the same year as Tasmania’s first tourist guidebook, during the month-long welcoming of the
colony’s new governor, and at midpoint in the trajectory of the ambitious, but short-lived Hobart newspaper, the Evening Mail.6 The article coincided exactly with breaking news of sensational Hobart scandal: the appropriation and serial dismemberments of the recently-buried William Lanne, then regarded as “the last Tasmanian man.” Though seemingly disparate, these four locally significant events were symptomatic of the times and, whether directly or tangentially, they influenced the currency of Legrand’s article. Viewed in retrospect, they form a social context within which “A Trip to Recherche Bay” takes on deeper meaning.

The newly released tourist handbook was Henry Thomas’s Guide to Excursionists between Australia and Tasmania (1869). Though produced by a Victorian and printed in Melbourne, it had considerable local significance, since the commercial advantage of attracting summer tourists to the island colony was widely acknowledged. Yet Thomas’s often florid emphasis on the convict past rankled with islanders, and “seemingly in deference to Tasmanian sensibilities,” the tone of later editions was changed (Young 17). Legrand probably was well-acquainted with Thomas’s work, since he placed a substantial advertisement in the 1870 Guide (lxxxix). Yet his own travel article reads as a report to the metropolis (in this case, Hobart) rather than as an invitation to excursionists. It further, and possibly intentionally, contrasts with Thomas’s Guide through Legrand’s heavy emphasis on his Tasmanian credentials, and on order, civility, and productivity as characterising the community he describes. No doubt, Legrand and his implied readers would know that a significant proportion of the Recherche population in 1869 was former convicts or their families, yet his article tactically avoids any hint of either fact.

Legrand’s journalistic contribution seems something of an innovation for the Evening Mail in being an amateur local travel account published in the literary and wider

---

6 Under its original ownership, it ran from August 1868 to December 1869.
interest section usually occupied by overseas material. Still, the article’s social and commercial themes clearly harmonised with the paper’s general editorial tone. The Mail presented itself as a polished, and avowedly independent publication, and as such, as being a journalistic innovation for Tasmania. It was founded by the idealistic veteran editor, James Allen, reportedly once a fellow journalist of Charles Dickens (“Death of Old Pressman,” *Mercury* [Hobart] 25 Mar. 1886: 2). In Hobart, Allen followed a business pattern he had used elsewhere: setting up in opposition to an established newspaper, and also producing a country edition. His stated aim was to provide cheap but quality coverage for “family reading and country circulation” containing “a record of current events, with the freest and most candid discussion of the leading topics of the day” (*Weekly News* 22 August 1868: 15). Tasmania’s prolonged depression hastened the early demise of Allen’s venture — an end of possibly personal significance to Legrand, by then poised to publish his first book on Tasmanian land shells.

“A Trip to Recherche Bay” assuredly lost impact (though perhaps gained readers) by appearing alongside news of the Lanne scandal. The Aboriginal whaler, briefly ashore between voyages, had died suddenly at his Hobart lodgings, whereupon a macabre

---

7 For example, the paper had published a long and appreciative review of Calder’s local report on the oyster industry (*Weekly News* [Hobart] 29 Aug. 1868: 6). Allen held the view that, happily, Tasmania’s “convict taint” eventually would “wash out, presumably as the once-transported died out (*History of Australia from 1787 to 1882* 252).

8 Allen (1806-1886), arrived in Adelaide in 1839 He was editor of the new *Southern Australian* between 1839 and 1842, then owner (until 1845) of the *South Australian Register*. Co-founder, then owner, of the Adelaide *Times* (1850-1858), he began a weekly country edition, of which Tenison Woods was briefly sub-editor (1855–1856). From 1857, Allen edited the *Herald* in Melbourne, where he also began an unsuccessful penny evening paper. Briefly editor of the Hobart *Mercury* (1865), on his retirement he founded the Hobart *Evening Mail*. After further editorial work in New Zealand, and Victoria, he published *History of Australia* (1882) Allen was a former Baptist minister, and his long career in journalism demonstrates his commitment to ethical principles, honest reporting, and forthright comment, all with the stated intention of avoiding rancour and of reaching readers across all ranks of society (*History* iv-v).

9 Allen’s Tasmanian papers sold for a penny when the Hobart *Mercury* cost threepence.

10 The death of Allen’s son in New Zealand was the stated cause of the paper’s cessation (*Weekly News* [Hobart] 31 Dec. 1869: 6). Allen’s print machinery was auctioned, and the newspaper was absorbed by the *Tasmanian Times*. Legrand’s early work, *Catalogue of Tasmanian Land Shells*, hand-printed by Legrand, appeared in June 1870, six months after Allen’s departure.
competition for possession of his corpse immediately ensued. Rumours of the clandestine dissections which took place overnight were circulating even before Lanne’s well-attended Christian burial service at St David’s. But a few hours after the funeral and again at dead of night, the grave was reopened and the body stolen, leaving unmistakable evidence of its further dismemberment. Horror, accusation, and satiric comment were rife as the moral, social, political, religious, and cultural ramifications of these scandalous events were discussed by press and public. Allen’s editorial expressed the view that: “on the disgusting part of the business we have no inclination to dwell. But the public have a right to know all that can be known about the matter” (Weekly News 10 March 1869: 2.). No record exists of Legrand’s opinion, but assuredly he held definite views on the topic — being personally acquainted with the prominent Hobart citizens (including members of the Royal Society) centrally implicated in the pillage of Lanne’s remains, and also because these deeds were committed in the name of science.

Legrand’s article, submitted shortly before the scandal erupted, shows the influence of wider cultural forces in play at the time. In part, it answers to traditions of travel writing then popular (and also sometimes used to encourage emigration to the colonies): reflective or analytical summaries of colonial experiences, written by educated persons for Home audiences — Tasmanian examples being found in published works by G. C. Mundy (1852), Louisa A. Meredith (1852), H. Butler Stoney (1856), Bishop F. R. Nixon (1857), and Hugh

---


12 The funeral took place on the afternoon of Saturday 6 Mar.1869. Two rival parties of pillagers set forth about midnight; news of the disinterment and further mutilation of Lanne’s remains became general next morning.

13 The first official enquiry was held on the Monday that Legrand’s article appeared in the Evening News [Hobart] 8 Mar.1869, but the article itself probably was printed the night before Lanne’s funeral, since it appeared in the Saturday edition of the Weekly News (6 Mar.1869).
M. Hull (1858, 1859). Legrand’s article differs significantly from such models in that his style lacks literary polish, and because (despite one allusion to England) he writes as a Tasmanian describing a local region for a Tasmanian audience. Yet he clearly aims at achieving a gentlemanly tone akin to that found in these works and, somewhat surprisingly, he seems to have been influenced strongly by Nixon’s book, which describes a pastoral visit to the Bass Strait islands.

Legrand’s article also reflects the development of photographic journalism — in particular, the work of antipodean exponents reporting the spread and growth of townsces in Australia. His account is pictorial in neither form nor style, yet he presents a graphic overview of a defined colonial settlement, recording its current development in terms of its recent past. At the same time, a measure of self-censorship is apparent in his reporting: presumably in line with current colonial sensitivities, he makes no reference to earlier Aboriginal or convict presence at Recherche Bay, or even to the early French explorers. Instead, the past is defined by twenty years of pastoral isolation broken only by a visit from “our late bishop Nixon,” while mention of the famed local shipwreck, George III, contains no hint that this vessel was a controversial convict transport. Undoubtedly, a strong

---

14 Mundy had visited Australia from 1846 to 1850 and his books enjoyed wide circulation — for example, between 1852 and 1857 there were four English editions and two shortened editions in Germany. In addition to works published under her own name, Meredith also wrote (anonymously) the first Tasmanian-produced tourist handbook, Walch’s Tasmanian Guide Book (1871), a work which “manages almost entirely to avoid mention of the convict past” (Young 16).

15 The book was circulated internationally. An appendix to this edition was the publishers’ catalogue of other works “published by, and under the authority of, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts”. Nixon, first Anglican bishop of Tasmania, returned to England in 1863 (six years before Legrand was writing the Recherche article).

16 Even so, contemporary readers may well have known that Truganini, then living in Hobart, was born at Recherche Bay (Poulson 15). Poulson makes the interesting comment that William Lanne, when working as a whaler, was probably the last tribally-reared Aboriginal to visit Recherche Bay (15). Had Legrand been of French descent, as often claimed, one might expect at least passing reference in this article to the French explorers’ visits to Recherche.

17 Nixon himself refers to a visit seemingly in late 1853 or early 1854: having “some important documents to prepare [. . .] [he] put himself on board his little missionary cutter and sought the retirement of Recherche Bay,” where he remained two weeks, conducting church services on two Sundays (“General Intelligence: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel,” Courier [Hobart] 17 July 1854: 3). Legrand’s implied readers
influence on the composition and reception of Legrand’s article would be the contemporary local press — examples of particular relevance being the Evening Mail’s fulsome review of James Erskine Calder’s newly published report on the oyster industry (29 August 1868: 6); and the widespread local press coverage of Tasmania’s newly installed post-separation governor, Charles du Cane.  

**Personal clues**

“A Trip to Recherche Bay” begins with a direct approach to the reader, and is recognisably autobiographical in being structured around the itinerary of Legrand’s recent eighteen-day expedition. Written as a first-person account, it engages the reader by means of its evident sincerity, and its vivacity and charm. Though heavily freighted with names and projects of strategic newsworthiness, the article moves briskly along, buoyed by Legrand’s evident delight in his trip and by the colourful, idiosyncratic style of his journalism. His telegraphic first paragraph sets the tempo, introducing significant names and themes, and summoning up the dignified tone he deploys (often ambivalently) throughout the article:

> I have just returned from a conchological excursion on our south coast […] a place little known to visitors from town. I left town on the 5th by the cutter Ripple, Capt. Domeney; we had a sharp run to Taylor’s Bay, where we dropped anchor to leave

---

18 J. E. Calder, Oyster Culture: A Compilation of Facts (Hobart, Barnard: 1868), an abstract of the [Tasmanian] Oyster Fisheries Act, 1867. The Evening Mail went to the expense of publishing a photographic view of the swearing-in of the governor, taken from the corner of Elizabeth and Macquarie Streets (close by Legrand’s shop) by the Hobart photographer Samuel Clifford (19 Jan. 1869: 2).

19 Sailing from Hobart late on Thursday 5th and arriving back in dock about midnight on Tuesday 23rd.

20 “Ripple, cutter, 15 tons. Built at Port Sorell, 1863; reg. Launceston 1/1864, Hobart 4/1869. Lbd 40.2 x 12.6 x 6.4ft.” (Broxam and Nash, online). William Lemuel Domeney (1827–1898) regularly plied the Channel in the Ripple, carrying produce, supplies and occasional passengers. He also went further afield. Domeney reportedly lost heavily when the Ripple, on her way back from Port Davey with a full cargo of pine, foundered
Mr. Swift and a party of quarrymen to work the quarries there.\textsuperscript{21} [. . .] We arrived at Recherche Bay on Saturday the 7\textsuperscript{th} and spoke the Flying Childers in the Bay. I made Recherche my home, staying at Mr. Domeney’s, and I went in boats from place to place, partly by land and partly by water.\textsuperscript{22} I did not have the pleasure of seeing Mrs. D., that lady being on a visit to town, the result of which was an addition to the population of Recherche.\textsuperscript{23}

From the beginning onwards, Legrand omits mundane or personal details — here, for example, ignoring a day and a half’s sailing in a small, open workboat; and offering no elaborations about his own arrangements.\textsuperscript{24} By contrast, his account names many individuals, and provides rich detail of working lives at Recherche. Furthermore, wherever possible he seems to weave in outside social, and economic detail: the first paragraph, for example, mentions a prestigious new sandstone commission (on Bruny Island); and the approach of a locally significant deep-sea whaler.\textsuperscript{25} Legrand’s characteristic deployment of

\textsuperscript{21} A.H. Swift donated rock samples from this project to the RST (\textit{Report of the RST for the Year 1869} [1870]: 87). Sandstone was quarried on South Bruny in convict days and the new venture mentioned by Legrand (at Little Taylor’s Bay, Ventena Point) remained in operation until the 1890s depression. Remains of jetties where the stone was loaded are still evident at nearby Swift’s Point, at the lower end of Quarries Bay.

\textsuperscript{22} Domeney owned an inn at Mark’s Beach on Gagen’s Peninsula and later, a boarding house at Quiet Cove on the northern side of Recherche Bay (Poulson 22-3). He had the inn at least “from 1867” (Lennox 11), and presumably this is where Legrand stayed. Lands and Survey maps show Domeney’s peninsula land as two blocks, straddling the landward “neck” of the peninsula — the smaller, southernmost block apparently owned by Domeney from at least 1859.

\textsuperscript{23} Seemingly the eighth child, Eva Alexandra Domeney (born Hobart, 1869; died 1878, her death registered at Esperance, Tasmania). Legrand makes no mention of the older Domeney children; but presumably, several would be enrolled at the local school so close nearby.

\textsuperscript{24} The \textit{Ripple}, no doubt carried supplies as well as passengers and its route was southwards down the d’Entrecasteaux Channel to South Bruny Island, then south-west across the Channel to Recherche.

\textsuperscript{25} Swift and some of the workmen returned to Hobart a month later, when the quarry’s first shipment (about eighty tons of freestone for the building of the new National Bank of Melbourne) was ready for loading (“Shipping Intelligence,” \textit{Mercury} [Hobart] 6 Mar. 1869: 2). The mentioned whaler was the barque \textit{Flying Childers}, a local icon, launched Oct.1846 from the Battery Point yard of the outstanding Hobart shipbuilder, John Watson, and said to have been largely built by apprentices (O’May 59-60). Manned by a notably youthful
mildly mock-heroic style first surfaces in the coded reference to Domeney’s wife (above), the gallant turn of phrase subtly asserting the article’s masculine viewpoint, and also introducing themes later addressed.

Despite its self-assured tone, its direct approach to readers, and the rich detail supplied about its topic, the article projects no stable image of Legrand. Instead, as in the surviving photographic portraits (though here within a single text), we encounter a variety of “selves”. Realities of his current situation might account for some of this complexity — a reflection of the effort required to achieve economic viability, let alone social advancement, in economically difficult times. Legrand was by now aged about fifty-one. For the last three years he had been occupant of the Elizabeth Street shop and, in view of the apparent absence of any mention of his wife after 1863, it is likely he lived there alone. He had the upkeep of his shop to consider, and was steadily building himself a reputation as a bookseller, conchologist, and respectable citizen. He was expanding his already extensive and highly-regarded shell collection, and was in the process of collating his first book about Tasmanian shells.26 Within this context, Legrand’s article seems a calculated career venture — an advance into print, a tentative foray into journalism, and an opportunity for free self-advertisement of himself and his existing careers.

The article reminds readers of Legrand’s intellectual, and commercial expertise, and also in other ways projects a socially acceptable image. With what appears a characteristically ambiguous mock-heroic flourish, he introduces his trip as “a conchological excursion,” thereby framing it as scientific exploration, or at least as being

---

26 The book was Legrand’s Catalogue of Tasmanian Land Shells (1870).
rational amusement rather than the more lowly occupation of commercial fieldwork. This high-status envisioning continues throughout the piece — for example, Legrand evokes the metaphor of the hunt (complete with dogs and retainers) in reporting one commercially significant haul of “chitons of very large size.” Similarly, he implies his conchological thoroughness in the statement, “having searched all the coast [. . .] I prepared to return to town.” His print knowledge is advertised subtly in an anecdote featuring his ability to decipher a weathered inn sign at Fisher’s Point, and also implied in his self-important assessment of the local school.27 Still more significant is the clear intertextuality with Poe’s “Gold-Bug” story demonstrated by Legrand’s coded description of his chiton hunt and the two references to his deciphering abilities. The combination of these allusions highlights the link, though the strongest clue is the close parallel between Legrand’s characterisation of his comic Irish companion, Paddy, and Poe’s characterisation of the fictional Legrand’s Negro servant, Jupiter. A literary allusion so likely to be recognised easily by Legrand’s readers was surely intentional. Unfortunately, the interesting question as to whether it was made as a joking aside, or as an attempt to inject borrowed humour, or was included as reinforcement of his public persona remains unanswered. Yet importantly, what does emerge is Legrand’s obvious familiarity with “The Gold-Bug” story, and his self-identification (whether actual or tactical) with the protagonist of Poe’s popular tale.

Legrand’s reference to his own “intended trip to Port Davey” seems also strategic, an indication that he wished to continue this combination of conchology, and journalism, and was canvassing interest.28 Many elements of the article would support this last scenario — in particular, Legrand’s representation of himself as a hardy sailor, vigorous explorer,

27 Legrand tells us the sign was “so perfectly original that Capt. Fisher says he has never been able to read it. I was more successful perhaps from being more used to hieroglyphics.” At another level, this may well be an oblique reference to the skills of the fictional William Legrand, cryptologist as well as conchologist, in Poe’s short story, “The Gold-Bug” — a biographical aspect discussed in Chapter 2.

28 No reference has been found to suggest that Legrand actually achieved his Port Davey visit, although later he had shell specimens from that place.
knowledgeable observer, and reputable reporter. As hardy sailor, he crisscrosses the bay by punt, “coasting it” when the wind is high, and he remains unperturbed by danger at sea when travelling back to Hobart: “the only mishap being the breaking of our jibboom off Long Bay.”

29 As vigorous explorer, he tramps long distances through rough terrain, investigating the hinterland. As knowledgeable observer, he reports in shrewd detail on the settlement’s commercial activities (cabbage-growing, offshore fishing, shipbuilding, and abalone-curing), also mentioning industries past (sawmilling and shore-whaling) and in decline (timber-splitting).

30 As gentleman reporter, he comments on matters religious and educational, and demonstrates a socially acceptable familiarity with England through the quip, “[c]abbages at Recherche are like shrimps at Gravesend.”

31 Clearly aiming to entertain as well as inform, he adds appropriate touches of ironic humour, and garnishes lightly with nostalgic or picturesque references.

Intermixed with Legrand’s representation of this versatile journalist self are obvious references to other agenda. Presumably, these comments enhanced the personal profile

---

29 The event was reported more dramatically elsewhere: “Fresh southerly winds were experienced, and on Tuesday afternoon it was blowing with great violence, and in one of the squalls the bowsprit of the little vessel [Ripple] was carried away in Long Bay” (“Miscellaneous Shipping,” Tasmanian Times [Hobart] 25 Feb. 1869: 2). The mishap had been reported also the previous day: “The Thistle barque arrived from Hospital Bay last night and reported seeing the Ripple, cutter, from Recherche Bay for this port, in the Channel with her bowsprit carried away” (Tasmanian Times [Hobart] 24 Feb. 1869: 2). Yet given Legrand’s sea-going experiences during his eventful passage to Tasmania in 1855, his insouciance over the Ripple’s mishap probably was genuine as well as appropriate to his literary stance here.

30 Cabbages were an ideal cash crop for the area. They flourish in a cool, moist climate; they are hardy as long as they have fairly rich soil; and two crops a year can be raised. Recherche’s position on a sea lane allowed ready access to the Hobart market, with the added advantage of being ideally placed to sell direct to passing vessels.

31 Legrand appears to be insinuating a social distance between large-scale and small-scale cabbage-growers. In addition, there may be an implied comparison between Recherche (once envisioned as a future site for bathing sheds) and Gravesend (at the time, a Kent resort town popular with excursionists from London; and, like Recherche, traditionally approached by boat journey).

32 Such light flourishes would be considered especially appropriate for a weekend paper; and, in any case, Allen, despite his widely-known nickname of “Dismal Jemmy,” apparently had a sense of humour: under his editorship, the Adelaide Times produced several one-off humorous newspapers containing send-ups of various well-known gentlemen. Allen included. Still, the epithet seems to have lingered (“Death of William Mower Ackhurst,” South Australian Advertiser [Adelaide] 22 Aug. 1878: 5; “Blind Institute,” Advertiser [Adelaide] 29 Sept. 1906: 8).
Legrand wished to display. Yet he also presents the people, and initiatives of Recherche Bay in the best possible light. An example of complex agenda appears in Legrand’s account of his trip to the southern shore of the bay. Here, within a few words, he signals regard for conventional pieties, followed by sallies of social comment — moving from evocative description of the old burial ground to insinuating the pastoral neglect of Recherche, with “whole families not christened, and at funerals the service […] read by the school-master.”

His use of the personal pronoun in the reference to “our late bishop Nixon” seems clearly strategic, although ambiguous — presumably signalling Anglican, as well as Tasmanian, affiliation; perhaps highlighting his own long residence; perhaps reaffirming Hobart’s city status; and possibly reminding readers of currently contentious issues. Alternatively, it may be allusion to a remembered conversation, or even indirect acknowledgement of Nixon’s book, *The Cruise of the “Beacon”* (1857). Other examples of persuasive subtext seem more straightforward — in particular, those casting favourable light on the local school-master, Henry Collis. Legrand gratuitously reports on “the state of the school [as] very creditable to the master,” mentioning also that Collis has more than twenty students, operates five days a week, “collects his scholars every morning […] in a boat,” and has

---

33 Legrand almost assuredly refers here to the old whalers’ graveyard at Planter Beach, on the south-east shore of Recherche Bay.

34 “In accordance with British practice, the appointment of the colony’s first bishop by letter patent in 1842 […] had the legal effect of elevating Hobart, as the diocesan seat, to city status” (Boyce 404). Nixon, a “high” church Anglican, served as Tasmania’s first bishop until 1863. Despite accomplishments in other respects, he aroused religious and political tensions in the colony: according to Michael Roe, “with all the contests around him, the wonder might be that his tenure lasted so long” (“Nixon, Francis Russell [1803–1879]” 252).

35 Collis had been about fifteen years in the colonies (emigrating originally to New Zealand in 1851). As postmaster at Swansea (1852–1857), he “assisted Mrs. Collis in the management of the Public School” (Education Dept., Tas. ED2/1/147: 216). H. Butler Stoney’s book appends an 1853 list recording Hannah Collis as teacher of Swansea school (258). The Collis family later returned to England, but by 1864 they were back in Hobart, where Hannah applied (apparently unsuccessfully) for another teaching position (Education Dept., Tas. ED2/1/33: 41). About the same time, her husband was appointed to Recherche, evidently his first official teaching position in Tasmania.
been of great assistance during Legrand’s shell hunting.\textsuperscript{36} Presumably, Legrand was aware of the master’s precarious financial situation: only six months later, after spending more than four years at the grandly-named Ramsgate Public School, Collis sent in his resignation.\textsuperscript{37} “Owing to the trifling compensation received from the Parents of the children in attendance and their not being eligible to obtain Free Certificates,” his wages were insufficient to support himself and his family, and he requested a Public School appointment elsewhere (Education Dept. ED2/1/147).\textsuperscript{38} The picturesque collecting of scholars by boat featured by Legrand (and much quoted since then) may well demonstrate, in addition to Collis’s well-deserved reputation for pastoral care, a pressing financial need to maintain school attendance numbers.\textsuperscript{39}

\textit{Rhetorical clues}

At mid-point in his article, Legrand abandons both the chronology and tone of personal recount and adopts a summative stance. This sudden turn brings about a sharp realisation that the writer is carefully \textit{not} revealing many things he would have seen at Recherche, and also apparently is embellishing others. In particular, his “somewhat sedate

\textsuperscript{36} Achieving regular school attendances was a widespread problem, despite the Tasmanian Public Schools Act (1868) which attempted to make attendance compulsory for children aged seven to fourteen years living within one mile of a Public school. One of many disincentives to regular attendance, especially during financially hard times, was the compulsory payment of school fee. Since these fees formed part of teachers’ wages, a drop in pupil attendance decreased the teacher’s income.

\textsuperscript{37} The “township” of Ramsgate had existed on survey plans since 1833 (Calder’s initial survey) and then included the area now referred to as Catamaran (Lennox 4). Collis’s school was situated close by Domeney’s place, where Legrand was staying.

\textsuperscript{38} The Collis children by then numbered six. After brief appointment to the quite recently-opened east coast school at the Orford quarries, the Collises were sent (in 1871) as pioneer teachers to the Furneaux Islands, Bass Strait. By the end of 1871, they had opened schools on Badger and Cape Barren Islands. Canon Marcus Brownrigg, missionary to the islands, reported Henry and Hannah in 1872 as living and working in great discomfort in a single-roomed tent. “No black-board, maps, desks, nor indeed any proper school equipment were provided by the Board of Education. Mr. and Mrs. Collis are very persevering and painstaking in their duties and are deserving of praise on that account” (89–90). They spent thirteen years teaching in the Straits, until ill-health forced Henry’s retirement. He died at the age of sixty-nine (1 Jun. 1895), followed by Hannah, aged seventy-one (7 Nov. 1899), and they are buried side by side at the old Settlement Point cemetery on Flinders Island (Arnold 2007).

\textsuperscript{39} Interestingly, at a much later date, a Collis descendant, farmer and mailman on Flinders Island, regularly delivered the mail by boat (1904 directory; Diaries of Mr. Collis, the Flinders Island Mailman AOT NS2019).
picture of life at Recherche Bay” (Lennox 11) glosses over documented realities of a few years earlier, mostly still evident many years later. He ignores difficulties of frontier existence and also the settlement’s earlier reputation for lawless behaviour, and instead presents an Arcadian view of life at Recherche. Land and sea are productive, and the people not only hospitable, but universally self-reliant, energetic, hardy, and productive: “every one has his [garden] patch, large or small; [. . .] nearly every one also has his boat [. . .] and after they have done work, they amuse themselves by catching sharks from 70 lbs. to 100 lbs. weight.” Legrand’s entrepreneurial gaze focusses firmly on propitious aspects. He notes the recent closure of the local timber mill, and sharp decline in population at Recherche, yet emphasises the area’s natural potential — for example, listing the many varieties of fish harvested by locals; and mentioning, as a peripheral industry, that a “Chinaman gets his living by curing mutton fish, which go to the Melbourne markets for the Celestials in Victoria.” In similar vein, he elaborates upon the size and cultivation of the significant cabbage crop, noting the use of locally obtained kelp and shark carcasses as plant fertilizer — an image of natural superfluity turned to economic advantage. Maintaining this theme, he extracts humour from a local problem, the dangerous snakes, dryly describing them as “one natural production of which the supply is too great.” At the same time, his emphasis on the snakes’ great size and variety embellishes the overarching theme of Recherche’s natural lushness.

---

40 For example, as discussed by Poulson (2004) and described by A.W. Hume (“Memory of the Past: Capt. J.C. Jones,” Critic [Hobart] 18 Mar.1918, in Humee, Historical Records vol. 3: 174).

41 Poulson suggests this may have been Teck Sing (31). In the year Legrand’s article appeared, the abalone industry (with dried specimens prepared by “the Chinese at South Port”) was a subject brought before the Royal Society of Tasmania by one of its Fellows (Monthly Notes of PPRST 1869 (1870): 3).

42 In describing the cabbage crop, Legrand mentions “the number now in the ground [as] being from 140,000 to 150,000.” Recherche was a major supplier of cabbages to Hobart and did brisk trade with visiting deep-sea vessels. Cabbages were basic shipboard provisions, important on account of their anti-scorbutic properties. By 1885, large-scale cultivation was apparently a thing of the past, although it was remembered that “cabbages during a time of blight that attacked nearly all vegetables in other parts of the colony flourished exceedingly well here, and were sent in quantity to Hobart at 18s. per dozen” (Mercury [Hobart] 12 Sept. 1885: 2; Tasmanian Mail [Hobart] 19 Sept. 1885: 26.).
Much information relayed by Legrand apparently was gathered from Recherche residents: he cites timber-splitters, fishermen, cabbage-growers, and various unspecified others (Collis, presumably, being one). Yet despite this suggestion of social fluidity, the article maintains a careful class-consciousness no doubt considered appropriate for his intended audience. Reading Legrand’s roll call of Recherche Bay inhabitants, one might gain the impression of a settled community functioning along “civilised” lines — that is, exhibiting hierarchical social patterns familiar to mid-nineteenth century readers.\textsuperscript{43} Seen from this perspective, “Mr. Caldwell of Cockle Creek” and Captain Fisher, “formerly a whaler,” constitute the landowning class, with Mr. Williams of “William’s Beach” as token industrialist, and Mr. Collis worthily representing both education and religion.\textsuperscript{44} Beyond this circle is an unnamed general populace, amongst whom Legrand, as gentleman visitor, finds “welcome at every hut” and “everyone ready to assist”. He annexes a token Irishman as prop for a fashionable joke: this is “Paddy”, his companion on one collecting trip, whose foible is referring to chitons as “alligators.”\textsuperscript{45}

Finally, by happy coincidence, aristocracy arrives at Recherche: “On Saturday, February 20\textsuperscript{th}, we were visited by the government schooner Harriet having on board Sir Valentine Fleming and Mr. Bartlett, Assistant Commissary-General; they were on a fishing excursion and had been to Adventure Bay.”\textsuperscript{46} An aura of opportunism clings to this culminating item of social reporting, especially since the visiting notables probably

\textsuperscript{43} Also the substance of much social reporting — for example, the Hobart \textit{Mercury}’s coverage of the Governor of Tasmania’s recent levee (discussed later this chapter).

\textsuperscript{44} Fisher receives chapter coverage in Poulson (26). Legrand presumably refers to the Thomas Williams listed at Recherche in \textit{Macphail’s Directory of Tasmania} (1867-68), probably the person of the same name credited with building the 2-ton cutter \textit{Wanderer} at Port Esperance in 1853, and participating in building the 58-ton schooner \textit{Friends} at Recherche Bay in 1854 (Woolley 153).

\textsuperscript{45} An unconscious irony here is that, almost in the same breath, Legrand clearly is referring to an echidna in the statement, “Our dogs caught a porcupine.”

\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Harriet} left Hobart Thurs 18 Feb.1869, and returned 25 Feb. 1869. Fleming’s two sons made up the party, which visited Adventure and Recherche Bays, Southport and Partridge Island.
anchored well offshore, thus retaining physical, as well as social distance. Here Legrand’s text again renders itself ambiguous: readable as social gossip, or blatant name-dropping, or irony, or as any combination of these. Whatever the case, his mention of the eminent travellers clearly aims at linking the article (however tenuously) to socially significant Hobart events — in particular, the new governor’s first levee, where Fleming and Bartlett had figured prominently less than a month ago.\footnote{On 15 February, 1869, it was Fleming who took the governor’s oath at the official swearing-in ceremony. “There was a great display on the occasion: a procession was formed which numbered about ten thousand”, followed by official welcoming and acceptance speeches (James Fenton 336–7). Bartlett’s position was significant as incorporating that of colonial representative of the British Treasury.} Legrand’s strained attempt to forge this connection would seem further evidence of self-marketing, but also clearly reflects the wider social significance of these vice-regal events. Only a fortnight earlier, the Hobart \textit{Mercury}’s extensive coverage of the governor’s levee had included hierarchical listing of all those issued personal invitations (with Fleming, as Chief Justice, ranked first but one, and Bartlett ranked further below), followed by a list (in alphabetic order) of prominent citizens formally presented to the governor. The combined roll call proclaimed a current “who’s who” of Hobart male society (“Mr. Du Cane’s First Levee,” \textit{Mercury} [Hobart] 22 Jan. 1869: 2). Since Legrand had at least marginal contact with a number of these men (several being members of the Royal Society), such a listing probably held personal as well as commercial and career significance for him, as it would also for other readers.\footnote{Charles du Cane, governor between 1869 and 1874, proved eminently newsworthy. “Sincerely interested in the progress of the colony”, he travelled widely throughout Tasmania lending active support to many initiatives, and also “lectured everywhere, dazzling audiences with his dignity and classical erudition. His speeches were published widely in the mainland press and he drew large crowds on his travels to other Australian colonies...[He] left Hobart after a heavy round of farewells; even Truganini went to his last levee” (Rimmer parag. 4).} For many amongst Legrand’s intended audience, the recent social events involving the new governor undoubtedly would merge with, or rekindle, memories of the previous year’s celebrations in honour of Tasmania’s first official royal visitor — Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, who had
arrived in command of his own ship, the Galatea. The royal visit apparently was an event of immediate and remembered local significance. As one example, many years afterwards, the duke’s sea journey was the subject of work by the popular commercial painter, Haughton Forrest (G. D. Brown 74). Since the artist had arrived in Tasmania fully eight years after the duke’s visit, his choice of this subject would suggest continuing local interest in the topic. Appearing as it did much closer in time to the royal visit, Legrand’s reporting of the government party’s informal visit to Recherche in 1869 aboard the Harriet (whether read as ironic, sententious, or ambiguously either) seems clearly a conscious allusion to the 1868 tour of the “Sailor Prince” aboard the Galatea.

**Structural clues**

“A Trip to Recherche Bay” is richly informative in terms of factual detail, social and cultural nuance, and rhetorical intent; and yet it yields further information through its textual unevenness. Though evidently a considered text, it also is the work of a literary amateur — a factor possibly accounting for its stylistic borrowings and structural shortcomings. A noticeably amateurish feature is its thematic disjointedness (for example, the prolific cabbages being dealt with three times) which highlights the text’s composite nature. Structurally, it appears a travel journal with additions. But then, if we read Legrand’s opening sentence as literal statement (rather than as modest disclaimer, or pose of

---

49 Queen Victoria’s second son, he arrived at Hobart in the wooden steam frigate HMS Galatea, 6 January, 1868. One official engagement was laying the foundation stone of the new Anglican cathedral. According to James Fenton, Lanne, “King Billy, as he was then called”, was introduced, and “[c]lad in a blue suit, with a gold lace band round his cap, he walked with the Prince on the Hobart regatta ground” (381); while a contemporary report in the Tasmanian Times suggests the small aboriginal group brought up from Oyster Bay for the occasion remained on the sidelines (quoted McCreery 37).

50 In Hobart, the impressive triumphal arch at the New Wharf, made of tuns and surmounted by manned whaleboats was emblazoned: “Welcome to Tasmania/Sailor Prince” (Clifford AUTAS 001124851296). Louisa Meredith composed for the occasion “a paean of praise for the Sailor Prince” sung in welcome “by teachers and children under the baton of C.E. Walch, bookseller and lay preacher” (Robson 18). The fact that the Queen’s son was a fully-trained sailor was popular in maritime Hobart. The royal visit gained heightened emotive impact through the attempted assassination of the duke in Sydney (1 March 1868), initially suspected as a Fenian plot. Hobart held thanksgiving meetings for his recovery, and a loyal address was dispatched to the queen. The effects of anti-Irish feeling were intensified in the colonies. Even a light pleasantry such as Legrand’s mention of Paddy needs to be considered against this background.
nonchalance), he admits as much: “I have just returned from … our south coast, and have strung together a few notes on that extreme portion on our sea-board.” Legrand consistently prided himself on his careful conchological field notes: perhaps (with the article in mind) he simply extended his customary practice to include social observations during the Recherche trip. Accepting that he produced a narrative by a linking (rather than recasting) of field notes helps explain Legrand’s prompt completion of the article so soon after his return and also supports the premise that his journalism was a subsidiary venture — an attempt to reap synergistic benefits from the primary business of shell-collecting.⁵¹

An unexpected result of the text’s unevenness is that closer examination of ways in which Legrand’s notes are “strung together” has raised significant questions as to what extent the narrator’s voice can be regarded as his own. The first five “journal” paragraphs (tracing Legrand’s travel to Recherche and four separate trips of local exploration) feature Legrand’s own observations; but in addition, they contain input from his conversations with various informants (which he acknowledges), and also elaborative comment (some apparently derivative).⁵² The next three paragraphs (presenting an overall picture of Recherche) rework and further elaborate the earlier material. The concluding paragraph mentions the visit of the Harriet, then summarises Legrand’s departure and trip home. Overall, Legrand’s textual elaborations are effective and informative, and some add wit and verve to the article. A few, however, are clumsily integrated, and it is these few which arouse the suspicion that an external authorial voice has joined the array of narrating “selves.”

⁵¹ The article was in print nine days after he arrived back at Hobart, but presumably his business would require attention, after his eighteen day absence.

⁵² The statement about pastoral neglect of Recherche seems possibly hearsay, with Collis a possible source; while Legrand’s mention of the George III memorial also may be a relaying of fact rather than personal observation.
Investigation of the suspect material uncovers striking parallels between Legrand’s retelling of the Recherche trip and Bishop Nixon’s narration of the 1854 Bass Strait missionary journey of the Beacon. Similarities appear within content, structure and even turns of phrase. Both writers travel as passengers on working vessels to visit remote, scattered settlements; in addition, many aspects of their explorations are reportedly alike. They “scramble through the bush” (Nixon 36), they find welcomes in the humble dwellings of residents, and note yeomanly virtues displayed by settlers. Each visits a lonely seashore burial ground, drawing forth a moral message. Each describes “approaching the immediate scene” (Nixon 99) of a significant earlier shipwreck, and mentions the official memorial later installed. Each has a close encounter with a poisonous snake, and later makes reference to the larger “diamond” variety. Both comment on the produce, livestock, and soil fertility of the visited areas; both note the roughness of bush tracks. Each singles out a praiseworthy local person as a significantly civilising influence on the community, also mentioning other locals in positive terms — in both texts, these comments tempered by varying degrees of social condescension. The most striking parallels lie within distinctive modes of expression. “Every man” has his boat and cabbage patch at Recherche (Legrand),

53 Nixon had made a previous visit to the Bass Strait islands in 1843 (Nixon 18).

54 Legrand’s insinuation of pastoral neglect of Recherche has something of the pious tone of Nixon’s explanation of his Beacon mission: “I was painfully aware that the few families settled therein were entirely deprived of the means of grace and the ministrations of the Church” (Nixon 1).

55 Nixon saw much physical evidence of the wrecked immigrant ship, Cataraqu (1845), and found the erected memorial already deteriorating; Legrand travelled the beach opposite the wreck site of George III, and mentions, but possibly did not reach, the memorial to the victims erected on the Southport bluff.

56 Nixon has a brush with a whip snake and gives much detail about snakebite treatments (80-1), and later reports having “espied a large diamond snake” (99). Legrand sees “a large black snake in the garden close by the house” and reports whip snakes and diamond snakes as being prevalent at Recherche.

57 Legrand identifies Collis as a civilising force; Nixon makes frequent reference to the stately bearing, personal qualities, and enlightened community leadership of “Lucy Beadon [sic]”, who “daily gathers together the children of the sealers, and does her best to impart to them the rudiments of both secular and religious knowledge” (40-41). Much later, after vigorous campaigning for a government school by Beedon (the more usual of several spellings of her surname), a teacher eventually was supplied — the person appointed being Henry Collis, about a year after his resignation from the Ramsgate school at Recherche Bay.
whilst “every man was his own butcher” at a feast on Flinders Island (Nixon 44).

Furthermore, both writers introduce levity by professing bemusement at local customs — Nixon remains “ignorant of the component parts” of a distasteful local dish he is forced to sample (44); and Legrand does “not understand the matter” of shark-fishing for amusement, since it “seems a very close imitation of work”. A usage of the personal pronoun referent causing puzzlement in Legrand’s text occurs naturally in Nixon’s description of a devout child greeting “his bishop” (78).58 Read alongside Legrand’s final paragraph, Nixon’s reporting of rough weather sounds another familiar note: “the only damage done by the seas which occasionally broke over us was the loss of our starboard gangway, which had not been properly secured” (Nixon 31).59 Other reminders of Legrand’s text arise from Nixon’s description of leaving one place “after a thorough investigation of the coast” (101),60 and his telegraphic reporting of arrival home (114).61

Admittedly, all these similarities involve tropes and expressions likely to be found in other such writing of the times; yet the parallels between Legrand’s article, and Nixon’s earlier work seem too close to be accidental. Though it is hard to reconcile Legrand’s later reputation for pedantic accuracy with such extensive intertextuality, there seems little doubt he has used Nixon’s text as a template for his own article. This might appear to place in doubt the veracity of the Recherche observations but, as earlier discussed, the basic content of Legrand’s article withstands close scrutiny. It is in the transformation of observation to narrative that issues of credibility arise. Authorial rhetoric is only to be expected, especially

58 “The mother then explained; that, hearing that ’his Bishop was coming’, he had earnestly petitioned to be allowed to attend Divine service, to carry with him all his little savings and pocket-money, and to give it to his Bishop [sic], to be expended as he thought proper, for the good of the Church” (Nixon 78).

59 Legrand’s comparable statement is, “the only mishap being the breaking of our jibboom [sic] off Long Bay.”

60 Legrand’s comparable phrase is, “Having searched all the coast.”

61 “FRIDAY, 24th. Landed at half-past nine. Walked over to Bishop’s Town [sic], and found all well at home. Laus Deo. THE END” (Nixon 114).
in view of what Legrand seems to have wished to achieve through his article; but the
substantial, unattributed presence of an external voice is harder to explain. Key questions
are why, and when the intertextuality with Nixon’s work occurred.

One possible motivation is authorial insecurity: Legrand perhaps felt the need to
enlist an authoritative voice in support of his narrating “selves.” A more dramatic (though
less likely) possibility is that Legrand’s personality was so unstable that he appropriated
Nixon’s persona unconsciously when conceptualising his own visit at Recherche.62 Then
again, if Legrand had been recently and deeply immersed in Nixon’s text, some turns of
phrase, unconsciously absorbed, might appear unnoticed within his own prose — especially
if he was elaborating at speed.63 Unfamiliarity with literary conventions seems also a
relevant factor. Legrand’s prose fluctuates in tone between patterns of formal and more
colloquial speech, and occasionally displays non-standard constructions and idiosyncratic
punctuation — suggesting that he was a novice journalist.64 As a literary amateur writing
beyond the limits of his educational or work experience, the information-oriented Legrand
perhaps felt no call to acknowledge what he perceived as mere stylistic borrowings. This
possibility is supported by clear evidence of Legrand’s intellectual honesty elsewhere in his
acknowledgement of content material obtained from others — a trait abundant in his
conchological writing, but even apparent in the article (where he acknowledges information
gathered from Recherche inhabitants, though less formally than in his scientific works). On
the other hand, the intertextuality with Nixon may simply have been a matter of expedient

62 In which case, Legrand’s prose tendency to accentuate his seemingly assumed membership of the Recherche
community might seem symptomatic — for example, “myself and two friends”; “our dogs”; “we were visited”;
and even the grammatical appropriation of the Ripple later discussed.

63 In addition to any effects of haste, Legrand perhaps may have been distracted at a crucial time by the break
and enter incident at his shop the very night before his article was due to go to press (“news of the Day,”
Evening Mail [Hobart] 4 March 1869: 2).

64 One construction, in particular — “myself with two friends” — would seem a personal characteristic of
Legrand’s speech, based on the evidence of similar usage in a later letter to George Robertson (19 May 1895)
discussed in a later chapter. As such, it is a small, indisputable, and rare trace of Legrand’s personal “self”.
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plagiarism — perhaps perceived by Legrand as little different from the common journalistic practice of reusing material from other newspapers. Irrespective of circumstance, the unexpected echoes of Nixon’s voice in the Recherche article are a striking reminder of Legrand’s propensity to appear in role, and to hide his personal identity behind cultural masks.

In terms of the article’s integrity, a central issue is when the intertextuality occurred. Close analysis of “A Trip to Recherche Bay” suggests that even if Legrand had read Nixon’s book before travelling to Recherche, it was afterwards that he took it as a literary model — presumably, once back in Hobart and, in any case, during the elaboration process, when selected field notes were being “strung together,” as he put it, to form a narrative. Similarities of reported experience inevitably would result if (as seems likely) Legrand was using Nixon’s work formulaically — that is, applying it as a template when choosing which parts of his Recherche experience to include in the article. Circumstantial evidence supports this argument: even beyond the self-censorship discussed earlier, Legrand’s recount is clearly topic-selective — for example, many days of the trip remain unaccounted for (even allowing for time spent preparing gathered specimens); and also, there is no mention of land shells (Legrand’s collecting passion). Furthermore, Legrand would be conscious of the need to tailor his writing for approval by his editor, the evangelical James Allen.65 It would be useful to have details of Legrand’s access to The Cruise of the “Beacon” — to know whether he owned a copy himself; whether he borrowed one, either from Collis at Recherche, or from a Hobart acquaintance; or whether he used a copy in the Royal Society of Tasmania’s

65 Nixon’s book also would have wider social appeal. Interestingly, for shorter sea trips from Hobart, Nixon used a “small cutter kept in partnership with” his “excellent friend, the Chief Justice” (Nixon 2) — that is, with Valentine Fleming, who, though generally aloof from community associations, was the first Chancellor of the Anglican Diocese of Tasmania. Legrand’s deference to Nixon in the “Recherche” text thus might seem linked to the article’s later reference to Fleming.
A shred of possible evidence emerges in the final sentence of Legrand’s article—an error of syntax occurring within textual echoes of Nixon’s reporting of damage, and of homecoming:

I left Recherche in the cutter Ripple on Monday afternoon, February 22nd, and arrived at Taylor’s Bay the same evening, and left there the principal part of our cargo consisting of palings, and arrived in the dock at 11pm., the only mishap being the breaking of our jibboom [sic] off Long Bay.

Unless the error is typographical, Legrand’s grammatical appropriation of the Ripple within this final passage (through the implied “I” in the second, and third clauses) suggests hurried completion of the article, and also that Nixon’s work was freshly in his mind at the time—a coincidence suggesting, further, that Legrand had access to a Hobart copy of The Cruise of the “Beacon”.

Yet no matter how deeply or how superficially Legrand’s text was influenced by Nixon’s, the end result is corrosion of authenticity. Paradoxically, the biographer must turn to external sources in order to move closer to the biographical subject.

Parallel sources

Even details of verifiable aspects of Legrand’s trip seem potentially unreliable in the retelling, given Legrand’s persuasive intent, and penchant for role-play. Mostly, he

Collis would seem one likely audience for Nixon’s book. An interesting but unverifiable possibility is that Legrand, reverting to book-dealing whilst at Recherche, acquired the subject copy from the impecunious Collis. Among possible Hobart lenders of the book are the editor, James Allen; the home-grown philosopher, Samuel Henry Wintle; and Legrand’s conchological acquaintance, Rev. H. D. Atkinson (recently arrived, and newly appointed to the D’Entrecasteaux or Channel Mission). Again, the copy listed in the Royal Society’s 1885 catalogue may have been accessioned at a considerably earlier date, and therefore available when Legrand was writing. In 1881, twelve years after his “Recherche” article appeared, Legrand sold a copy of Nixon’s Cruise of the Beacon to Sir George Grey (Dally 32). This same copy is held by the Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Central City Libraries, catalogued as G 919.46 N73. It has no markings which indicate provenance (De Courcy E-mail to author 26 July 2010).

Examples as previously discussed (Nixon 31, 114).

A type-setting error cannot be ruled out; yet a comparable “ownership” quirk occurs in a seemingly hastily written letter to the editor penned by Legrand some years later (Hardwicke’s Science-Gossip 15: 69-70), as mentioned in Chapter 5.
reports with the gaze of an imperial eye focussed on the commercial potential of a little-known region. His journalistic asides reflect urbane detachment, emotions are not mentioned, and the body remains unseen. Noticeably absent are any personal details—for example, about his accommodation and provisioning, whether Recherche stirred him aesthetically, what booty he brought home, who accompanied him on various forays; or details of how it really felt to be travelling on the open-decked Ripple during squally weather, in amongst the cargo of palings and cabbages.69

Ironically as it seems, detail relevant to Legrand’s trip can be extracted from two later, separate articles written by younger contemporaries. These are personal accounts of their own visits to Recherche—contrasting as regards style and content, yet both perpetuating the notion of Recherche as the site of rugged adventure. Each refers to people or places mentioned by Legrand, at the same time incorporating an affective dimension he excludes. The earlier published of the two appeared sixteen years after Legrand’s visit, in a very long feature article, “Through Tasmania, No. 95” in a regular column headed “The Traveller” (Tasmanian Mail [Hobart] 10 September 1885: 26).70 Written by an anonymous “Special Correspondent” it was part of an ongoing series describing different regional areas of Tasmania, appearing regularly for about two years and reproduced in the Tasmanian Mail.71 It presents a detailed account of the terrain, commercial potential, and local colour of the still scattered Recherche settlement; and makes a feature of the residents’ qualities. It extols,

69 Whether tactically, or because the cabbages were stowed below deck, Legrand mentions only the cargo of palings. The Tasmanian Times, however, mentions “a freight of timber and cabbages brought from Recherche,” the dropping of the timber at Taylors Bay, and “a quantity of cabbages brought up to town” (“Miscellaneous Shipping,” 25 Feb. 1869: 2).

70 The same article was reprinted, though as “Through Tasmania, No. 96,” in the Saturday edition of the parent newspaper (Mercury [Hobart] 12 Sept. 1885, supplement: 2).

71 The writer is identified by the Tasmanian historian, Kim Simpson as Theophilus Paul Howard Jones (d. 1901) (personal correspondence to the author 29 Dec. 2009).
in particular, the long-serving “mailman and special constable for Recherche”, Thomas Driscoll (26).72

The second of these two comparable later articles appeared almost half a century after Legrand’s, though it refers to a time only five years after his 1869 “conchological excursion”. Its air of nostalgia probably struck a chord with many readers, since it appeared in the fourth year of World War One. Though shorter and less formal than the Mercury correspondent’s account, it follows a similar pattern (found also in Legrand’s article, and in Nixon’s Beacon account): all four present a colorful sketch of a community, and single out an admirable person for particular praise. This article, entitled, “A Memory of the Past: Capt. J. C. Jones”, was written by the historian-journalist, A. W. Hume, and published in the Hobart Critic (18 March 1918, in Hume. Historical Records 3: 174). The author recalls, in picaresque style, his own youthful, unscheduled visit to Recherche “in the Easter of 1874, [when] a party of twelve engaged the stout little cutter Ripple, Dominey [sic] master, to convey them to Adventure Bay”. Their expedition was held up at Recherche through bad weather — a not uncommon occurrence.73 Hume’s recollection features drunken brawls amongst onshore whalers, highlighting Captain Jones’s skilled leadership in retrieving his ship’s crew.74

In terms of its scope, detail, and sedateness of tone, the Mercury article closely parallels Legrand’s, suggesting the writer not only was familiar with “A Trip to Recherche Bay”, but probably intentionally updating it. In Hume’s article, however, the focus is historical reminiscence, and the tone rambunctious. He may well have known the two earlier

72 Legrand mentions travelling “to Driscoll’s” so perhaps he, too, met the constable. Alternatively, he simply may have been referring to Driscolls Point — according to Poulson, the name by which the area now shown on maps as Sullivans Point was then known, being Driscoll’s base for many years (27).

73 A more famous precedent being the enforced sojourn of Sir John and Lady Franklin’s party in 1838, on their way to Port Davey.

74 At the time described (1874), Jones was captain of the Scottish-built barque, Asia, registered at Hobart, owners Bayley and McGregor.
accounts, yet his swashbuckling style is idiosyncratic, and the article aligns with a later body of writing for which he is well known\textsuperscript{75} — the 1920s weekly newspaper instalments of an imagined guided tour of old Hobart (as remembered from the 1860s, and 1870s).\textsuperscript{76}

Read alongside Legrand’s article, the two later Recherche texts offer interesting sidelights. Legrand gives no indication of the physical or emotional experiences of his journey, beyond general comments such as “being heavily laden” with collected chitons, a possibly tactile implication in the reference to “cutting grass”, and a faint suggestion of recalled tension at being “stuck up in the scrub”.\textsuperscript{77} In sharp contrast, the Mercury’s correspondent (having retraced Legrand’s journey to South Cape Bay) describes himself as returning “wet and hungry”, eager for the supper provided by his hostess, whose “substantial sandwiches had done wonders at midday”.\textsuperscript{78} He also refers to aspects of a colourful past about which Legrand is silent, in reporting that Driscoll’s police duties formerly had included “quelling rows at the public house on Domeney’s Point, [. . .] admonishing disaffected whalers on board, or pursuing deserters” (26). Hume’s account reports similar lively proceedings, almost certainly at Domeney’s establishment (where Legrand had stayed) — although this time it is the whaling captain, not the policeman, who settles the brawl. This most recent account also gives an idea of living conditions aboard the Ripple, as well as life ashore. Stranded indefinitely at Recherche, Hume’s party retreated

\textsuperscript{75} It seems highly probable Hume would know at least the 1885 article, being a Hobart journalist himself at the time it appeared; and indeed, there seem some clear parallels between the content materials of his article and this earlier one.

\textsuperscript{76} Published 1922–1925 (Ely 1989), although other articles of historical reflection by Hume evidently appeared earlier (Hume, \textit{Historical Records}). Hume’s journalistic style, and also the signature title of one of his newspaper columns (“Notes By the Way”) suggest possible echoes of the style of the earlier but widely-known American journalist, Nathaniel Parker Willis.

\textsuperscript{77} Alternatively, “cutting grass” may have been the common name of the particular species. On a solo trek through this rough country, the possibility of becoming hopelessly lost could be a reality.

\textsuperscript{78} His visit to Recherche seems to have been brief: apparently he trekked in from Elliott’s Point, stayed one night with the Driscolls and the following night at the John MacDougall’s (at Catamaran). His account ends at this point, without details of his departure. The fact that he would travel to South Cape Bay during such a brief visit seems a further reinforcement for the premise that his trip was a conscious parallel to Legrand’s.
from “the drenching rain which made life pretty miserable on board the cutter”, to play skittles “in a disreputable tumble-down alley with the whaling crew of the Asia and the Marie Laure [. . .] and drink gin and sing songs in the back kitchen of the pub”.

Tempting as it is to use these two later articles as sources of verification, neither is inherently more reliable than Legrand’s. All three are clearly rhetorical narratives, which set out to legitimise aspects of the Recherche settlement, whilst emphasising its remoteness, and ruggedness, and presenting the narrator as an adventurer. In addition, there seems strong evidence of intertextuality: for example, not only does the 1885 article display clear echoes of Legrand’s account, but its own description of Tom Driscoll is echoed in Hume’s 1918 description of Captain Jones. In short, there is justification for considering the three accounts, not in opposition, but as constituting a group: as comparable examples of a particular genre of travel writing with links going at least as far back as Nixon’s Cruise of the Beacon. Though the writing style of each text differs according to fashions of the day, all show marked similarities in presenting remote settlements along the Tasmanian coast, and their own exploits as travellers.

**Comparative texts**

Combining Legrand’s Recherche account with information from totally unrelated, and intentionally scientific texts produces some biographically relevant information. Evidence from both the travel article, and his own later conchological works suggests Legrand was physically fit. For example, one overland journey reported by his article (from Cockle Creek to South Cape Bay) still remains a five hour round trip, despite today’s well established walking track, complete with duck-boarding in parts. In Legrand’s time, the trail would be less defined, and negotiating the long stretch of tidal marsh along the creek was often difficult, yet Legrand describes the section merely as “three or four miles low and
swampy”. On this same trip, he had the heavy haul of chitons to bring back; and finally, the return trip by punt (from the creek mouth to Domeney’s place) was hindered by heavy seas. Legrand’s longer explorations (towards Southport, and north of the Catamaran River) would be even more strenuous.

Another external source throwing light on Legrand’s activities at Recherche is Woodward’s *Manual of the Mollusca* (1851), for many years a standard work on conchology. Since Legrand arranged and labelled the Royal Society’s shell collection according to this text, it seems likely that he also adopted its methodology when gathering, and cleaning shells. It would be interesting to know if, as he tramped across the hinterland on his collecting forays he followed Woodward’s homely advice that “the small land shells of open and rocky countries may be put in a cotton bag, hung on a coat button” (424). After each day’s shell-hunting Legrand would need to clean any specimens taken live. The ever-helpful Woodward had advice on this process also:

*Land and freshwater snails may be killed instantaneously with boiling water, if a few are done at a time; and cooled by removal to cold water. Every collector finds expedients for removing the animals more or less completely from their shells [. . .]. Bivalves may be boiled, and their soft parts removed when the shells gape. Care should be taken not to injure the ligament or hinge [. . .].* (424–5)

Other practical advice from Woodward suggests not only a possible motive for Legrand’s trip to South Cape Bay, but also his probable methods of dealing with chitons — including

---

79 Milligan (in 1848) encountered “shallow flats, with green rushy borders…succeeded about a mile to the westward by extensive levels of low marshy ground, closely covered with a sward of *Junceae*, *Cyperaceae*, and a sprinkling of coarse grasses” (20). The *Mail’s* correspondent initially found parts of the track “soppy and very soft indeed in parts”; and on the homewards journey, “had to walk knee-deep in water along the marshy side of Cockle Creek, as the tide was up” (26).

80 Samuel Pickworth Woodward, *Manual of the Mollusca; or, a Rudimentary Treatise of Recent and Fossil Shells*. London: 1851, 1853, 1856. Issued in three parts, it went through several editions, was translated into French (1870), and was updated by Ralph Tate (1871). As mentioned in the previous chapter, Charles Darwin thought highly of the work.
how and why the freshly-gathered specimens were carried “tied to pieces of wrack,” and why Legrand and his porters became so remarkably “heavily laden.” If Legrand was following Woodward’s suggestions, flat bits of wood as well as captured chitons dangled from the improvised ropes of sea-weed. On this topic, the Manual proffered the advice of “an experienced conchologist, Mr. W.J. Broderip”:

In detaching chitons or limpets which are all to be sought for on rocky coasts, the spatula or case knife will prove a valuable assistant. Those who have paid particular attention to preserving chitons have found it necessary to suffer them to die under pressure between two boards [. . .]. (425)

Finally, some useful information about Legrand’s Recherche trip has emerged from the regular shipping report column of the Hobart Mercury. Not only was there information about the squall damage to the Ripple, so lightly mentioned by Legrand, but fuller detail about the cargo, and the journey itself. We find that Legrand was not the only passenger travelling aboard Domeney’s cutter: others who disembarked at Hobart were Mrs. Kennedy, wife of Captain Kennedy of the Derwent Hunter, and a Mr. Nicholson (“Shipping Intelligence” 25 Feb. 1869: 2).81 From the brief itinerary listed in the shipping notes it can be seen that even such routine journeys as this trip were arduous, and sometimes hazardous. On Legrand’s return journey, for example, the Ripple left Recherche at noon on Monday; unloaded timber at Taylor’s Bay that night, then departed; battled north through the D’Entrecasteaux Channel during most of Tuesday; and eventually docked at Hobart just before midnight. Thirty-six hours after leaving Recherche, Legrand was back in town. Logic suggests he then shouldered his swag, and walked the short distance from the dock up to his Elizabeth Street shop. Ten days later, his article was in print.

81 The deep-sea whaling barque, Derwent Hunter, had put in to Recherche for supplies. Captain Kennedy travelled up to Hobart a few days later for medical advice. One wonders if Nicholson was amongst Legrand’s mentioned “friends” on the trip to South Cape Bay; though perhaps he came aboard at the Taylor’s Bay stop.
Cultural conventions

Examined as a biographical fragment, “A Trip to Recherche Bay” is notable for the lack of a stable identity behind its narrating voice. Yet one cannot attribute Legrand’s reticence about himself entirely to idiosyncratic evasiveness: “people tell the stories of their lives through the cultural scripts available to them and they are governed by cultural norms about self-presentation in public” (Smith and Watson 176). In telling his Recherche story, Legrand adopts cultural conventions of gentlemanly self-effacement widely prevalent in written texts of his day, and also in keeping with the underlying framing of his journey as a prospecting trip. This structural subtext is highly appropriate — both in view of what Legrand apparently hoped to achieve (personally and journalistically) and in being closely attuned to Tasmanian concerns and initiatives at that time. The article’s pattern of action is a story of investigation and evaluation, with Legrand (in role as “Special Correspondent”) reporting promptly, after returning to the metropolis. His findings, tailored for his audience, are uplifting. He describes a remote provincial settlement successfully evolved from the earlier colonial past — an adaptable, industrious, and commercially productive community; its inhabitants resilient and self-sufficient yet conforming to mainstream cultural patterns. Legrand’s depiction of the settlement functions also at a symbolic level, so that Recherche can be read as Tasmania in microcosm, and its entrepreneurial endeavours as hopeful emblems of Tasmania’s efforts to achieve economic recovery. As participant observer within this subtly triumphalist account, Legrand conveys impressions of himself as sharing positive qualities he attributes to the Recherche community — suggesting that his liberal use of “we” and “our” throughout the text perhaps may be intentional accentuation of his own group membership, aimed at enhancing the effect. Then again, given his personal strivings to secure a living and forge a career during economically difficult times and from a socially marginal position, the entrepreneurial Legrand perhaps truly identified with the hardy
adaptability he perceived at Recherche Bay. There seems genuine warmth in his mention of various Recherche conversations, and genuine interest in the settlement’s ventures.

Ways of thinking about the world and of expressing oneself are culturally shaped. Several aspects emphasised by Legrand clearly reflect “the two dominant concepts of history in the nineteenth-century, [. . .] evolutionary theory and the idea of progress [. . .] [which] came to be seen as synonymous” (Griffiths 10). Legrand’s jest that the boat-handy Recherche inhabitants “belong to the order Amphibia” seems a light play upon notions of evolution. His overall presentation of the Recherche settlement reflects more serious trains of thought, in similar vein. As Griffiths explains:

Australian colonists were haunted by the spectre of degeneration…. Many popularisers of Darwin saw evolutionary theory [. . .] as emphasizing the individual’s effort to conquer environment. A stimulating environment drove organisms to advance themselves, a less stimulating one paralysed them or held them back [. . .]. Changing ecological relationships were an intrinsic part of colonialism. The dangers of the strange, ancient environment could only be overcome by subverting the natural order, making it anew, acclimatising imported species [. . .]. Inheritance and environment were Darwin’s twin engines of change and they both resonated with special meaning in a convict society transplanted to the New World. (12)

Legrand’s article assures its readers that the Recherche settlement (whether viewed in actual terms, or as symbolising Tasmania) triumphantly demonstrates the ideal of progress — and as a free society, not a penal dumping ground. Legrand’s Arcadian Recherche issues a

---

82 Interestingly, J.E. Calder used the conceit in a similar way in a significant earlier article, “Topographical Sketches of Tasmania,” published in the Hobart Town Daily Mercury (21 Jan. 1860: 2). Calder used it in writing about Sandy McKoy, a “character” and renowned bushman of the early days: “Sometimes afloat, sometimes ashore (for he belonged to the amphibia of the island),” he had greatly assisted the pioneering northern surveyors in the 1820s (parag. 7).
hopeful vision of a society advancing itself — of colonial hardiness and ingenuity harnessing the natural environment, by land and sea; and of a rising generation imbibing British culture through efficient teaching at a well-attended school. Recherche (like Tasmania) functions as a self-sufficient offshoot of its metropolis, even hosting visits by imperial representatives. In harmony with its colonising themes, “A Trip to Recherche Bay” abounds in images of the palimpsest. Some strike a chord of melancholy: the beach burial ground with its impermanent wooden markers and graves now “covered by sand”; old tracks of busier times reclaimed by scrub; and lingering fragments of wreckage signing the loss of the George III. Other images are regenerative: tracks “in many places under water” during winter are circumvented by boat-handy settlers; the saw-mill huts stand deserted, but newborns are “an addition to the population of Recherche”, whilst Collis shepherds the upcoming generation and Williams continues the ship-building craft “with the assistance of a boy”; the declining shore-based whaling and timber industries are superseded by productive agriculture; and the former “public house” of whaling days is home to Captain Fisher, “formerly a whaler, now one of the largest cabbage growers.”

This persistent allusion to evolutionary themes raises relevant questions as to where Legrand’s inner convictions lay as regards contemporary controversies over evolutionary theories — especially those within the scientific community, where he sought recognition. But perhaps the article’s evolutionary subtext seems more obvious in hindsight than would have been so at the time of writing; and perhaps, too, the apparent stance merely postures contemporary commonplace rhetoric. In his Recherche Bay article, as in all his scientific writing, Legrand dexterously skirts the issue of his personal beliefs: once more, he evades the biographer.

83 Apparently, there were two public houses there, one the former pilot station: in their day, they were sites of hard drinking, with Fisher’s establishment being singled out in comments about riotous behaviour. (“Drunkeness,” Courier [Hobart] 28 Apr. 1854: 3).
Afterdays

For all its rhetoric of progress, Legrand’s article ushered in no golden age, either for himself or for Recherche. He returned to his bookselling and his conchology, and occupied shabby, rented premises until the end of his days. Recherche for many years remained much as before: a remote outpost populated by a few hardy inhabitants; a rowdy backwater when passing vessels anchored in the bay; and the site of industries which began, and eventually declined. Finally, the settlement disappeared altogether: a century after Legrand’s visit, a solitary householder at Cockle Creek remained the only resident (Poulson 53–4). Yet some families who moved away retained ties with the place, making return visits; and Recherche also had begun to host a new generation of transients — enthusiasts for outdoor living and the natural environment. All this long while, Legrand’s article lingered in obscurity, until the recent upsurge of interest in local history brought it new readers, and a fresh lease of life.

Since the early 1970s, increasing public interest in environmental and heritage issues has stimulated wider appreciation of Recherche Bay’s natural attributes and cultural significance, and a substantial body of current research now documents the Recherche region. It is as a listed item of primary source material about the nineteenth-century settlement that Legrand’s article has embarked on its present life — cited by Richard Ely in The History of the Huon, Channel, Bruny Island Region: Printed Sources (1989); quoted by Geoff Lennox in “Recherche Bay: Some Notes and References to the Early History, with Compilated Material” (1990); and referred to several times in Bruce Poulson’s Recherche

84 Rose Adams, “remained for many years…the only resident” after the death of her husband, Walter, in 1967 (Poulson 52–4).

85 The South-West Track (commencing at Cockle Creek) was specifically an area showing extensive degradation around the time (1968) that Tasmania’s National Parks and Wildlife Services launched a campaign to educate bush walkers in the principles of Minimal Impact Bushwalking (MIB)” (Harper 292-298).
Bay: A Short History (2004). Elsewhere, occasional unattributed quotation of Legrand’s observations suggests that the article also leads another life incognito, as folk memory.

Recently, after a long and difficult campaign, heritage protection has been won for a northern portion of the Recherche Bay area associated with the eighteenth-century French explorers’ visits. For a portion along the southern shore, yet another entrepreneurial development looms, this time aimed at capitalising on the area’s remoteness and scenery: the plan is for an eco-lodge situated at Planter Beach — “a major tourism venture, albeit within a much-loved national park” (Poulson iv). Studies commissioned by the developers suggest the installing of interpretative sites at key places within the area, and these include places mentioned in Legrand’s article.

There seems no doubt that “A Trip to Recherche Bay” has further life ahead as a primary source of information about a little-documented era of the settlement’s history. Yet, as this chapter points out, the article is far from being a straightforward, factual report. To date, its rhetorical dimension seems to have been unrecognised or overlooked by researchers citing its historical content. This is unfortunate, since many aspects of its underlying agenda also have historical significance. To acknowledge this article as the ambitious, though amateurish, artifact it is would increase rather than detract from its documentary potential. Considered in wider cultural terms, Legrand’s article is an engaging text within an observable informal tradition of Tasmanian travel writing. More specifically, it is useful in

---

86 Kostoglou (2000) also mentions in passing an observation made by Legrand, but as “one reference in 1869” and without citing the source (92).


88 Examining the extent of this tradition lies beyond the scope of this chapter: what is being seen here as a tradition are the similarities noted in the four separate travel texts (those by Nixon, Legrand, “The Traveller”, and Hume) discussed within the chapter.
what it tells us about the palimpsestic nature of writing about Recherche Bay — a stream continuing from the earliest European sightings through to the present time.

Read as a biographical fragment, the article proves less than candid, yet still yields richer information than its author would have wished, or foretold. In particular, it provides glimpses of Legrand’s strenuous efforts to advance his scientific and commercial prospects; and insights to his social perceptions and aspirations. It leaves lasting impressions of his personality, and of the public persona he wished to present. For all its amateurism, this many-faceted article remains an important text, elevating Legrand to the role of social geographer. In terms of personal and regional history it links Legrand and the Recherche community to a wider world — to the concerns and priorities of an evolving Tasmanian society, and more recent debates about the environment; to past, and present historical events; to other texts; and to the stories of many other lives, most never before seen as interrelated. Though originally intended as ephemeral, “A Trip to Recherche Bay” has achieved an ongoing life of its own which seems likely to continue within the foreseeable future.
CHAPTER 5: Legrand’s Later Life and Career (1869 to 1902)

Legrand’s venture into journalism apparently began and ended with the publication of “A Trip to Recherche Bay” in 1869. Yet he clearly tried other ways of diversifying his commercial activities during what were frequently difficult economic times. That same year, presumably acting as land agent, he was advertising for sale two New Town cottages, “Proprietor leaving the Colony” (Mercury [Hobart] 24 June 1869:1). Soon after, he placed a substantial advertisement in Henry Thomas’s Guide to Excursionists between Australia and Tasmania (1870), styling himself “Legrand, Bookseller, Stationer &c./Elizabeth-street/Opposite the Tasmanian Times Office/ Hobart Town/ Books sold & Exchanged, Bookbinding, &c.”(lxxxix). Legrand must have seen justification for the expense of advertising in this widely circulated, sturdily-bound Melbourne publication in the prospect of lucrative trade with summer tourists and off-shore customers, as well as with local readers. He undoubtedly pursued other likely business opportunities as they arose, but the roles of conchologist, book-dealer, and antiquarian continued as core concerns. These central strands of his Tasmanian career began early, lasted almost until his death in 1902, and remain important today. Integral to them was the evolution of Legrand’s social role as a Hobart “character,” a figure of enduring local significance.

This chapter examines Legrand’s life, work, and cultural presence from 1869 onwards, and draws on a wide array of primary source materials. Some of these items, like the best-known studio photographs of Legrand, have ongoing public lives, as I have argued, and remain accessible. Others have emerged only recently, in the course of archival research for this thesis. These include numerous small, but invaluable pieces of information found in old newspapers and journals; records of the Royal Society of Tasmania; street directories.

---

1 The office of the Tasmanian Times was at 10 Elizabeth Street.
and business records; and surviving letters in manuscript. Other useful information has been
gathered from Dally’s Bibliophile and Bibliopole (1985), Legrand’s own writings about
shells, published obituaries, and the later tributes to Legrand.

A notable feature of Legrand’s Tasmanian career is that his social, intellectual, and
commercial lives were closely integrated. Yet when individual aspects are examined
separately, they offer different insights to his times, his cultural contribution, and his
personality. Consequently, while the chapter continues to trace Legrand’s life and career
chronologically, it explores various facets individually, and from differing perspectives. As
critical framework, it refers to works by Michael Wolff (1982), and by Anne Baltz Rodrick
(2001) on nineteenth-century models of self-improvement, and to works by John Mackenzie
(1988), and by Tom Griffiths (1996) on aspects of imperial science.

In the first instance, several interpretations of self-improvement appear relevant for
a study of Legrand. These range from the solitary journey of the autodidact to the
interactive, or communal modes of personal development envisioned by publications such
as the British Controversialist (1850–72) and Samuel Smiles’s Self-Help (1859). The
development of Legrand’s career and also the effects of social shaping evident within
contemporary responses to him and to his work seem best understood in the light of the
various nineteenth-century notions of self-improvement.

Secondly, imperialism, as it is understood here, extended beyond economic,
political, and military parameters; as described by MacKenzie in The Empire of Nature, it
was “a habit of mind, a dominant idea in the era of European world supremacy which had
widespread intellectual, cultural and technical expressions” (ix). It produced, among other
things, a preoccupation with acquisition, collecting, cataloguing, and the central display of
natural objects, artifacts, and other goods. The shells, books, and other items Legrand
collected had strong but different connections with both imperial inquisitiveness and
imperial acquisitiveness. Moreover during his Hobart years he played a small, but important role in what I suggest are significant, yet rarely considered, culture industries of imperialism. In addition, the effects of political imperialism also were widely evident in Legrand’s Hobart, and relevant in terms of his career. In particular, the pattern of British settlement in Australia contributed to the development of a strong sense of regional nationalism within the separate Australian colonies, producing what can be seen as a set of antipodean imperial rivalries. These were locally intense, though presumably of little, if any, significance internationally. The regional thinking which coloured inter-colony discourse, which impacted upon Australia’s growth towards nationhood, and which arguably is still apparent within Australian national culture today, had a shaping effect on Legrand’s career, especially as it related to colonial science and colonial attitudes towards Australian historical materials. Furthermore, whether for personal or political reasons, a characteristic of Legrand’s published writing is the rhetoric of Tasmanian nationalism evident within it from time to time.

In order to balance the demands of chronology, critical structure, and the complexities of Legrand’s life and importance, the following sections are organised around particular surviving artifacts. The ongoing lives of these “things”, in many cases, have contributed significantly to Legrand’s cultural longevity.

_A rising respectability: Alfred Winter’s Legrand_

Winter’s early 1870s photograph of the urbane and dapper bookseller beside his business premises captures the gentlemanly persona Legrand apparently aspired to during his Elizabeth Street years. As regards his colonial career, he was then energetically in pursuit of particular reputation as a man of science, and his combination of business ownership, book-dealing, and conchology offered a clear path to respectability. The strategy was highly appropriate to its colonial times, when many younger sons, retired officers, and
other such gentlemen joined the ranks of lesser settlers, all of them hoping to achieve brighter futures by starting afresh in outposts of empire. To begin colonial life in a small way, often to the extent of occupying quite primitive premises, was unexceptional, and seen as no disgrace. On the other hand, to appear gentlemanly in person, to participate in intellectual pursuits, and to show signs of at least imminent prosperity were desirable markers of social acceptability.

Legrand has been remembered generally as a book-seller, yet it was his scientific interests which gained him entrée to polite society, to an intellectual network, and even to public acclaim. His association with the Royal Society of Tasmania was the key to this self-advancement, and it was the scientific work he undertook when based at his Elizabeth Street shop which brought him almost two decades of colonial renown, and ensures him a small but lasting place in Australian science history. In retrospect, Winter’s photograph gains in historical significance by picturing Legrand at about the height of his scientific career. Biographically, it displays him during the phase when his aspirations to respectability were at their height. As regards this chapter, the photograph appropriately introduces key contentions of the thesis as a whole: firstly, that intellectually earnest as Legrand’s commitment to shell study was, his career as conchologist was probably equally as much a product of his social, personal, and economic needs; secondly, that his scientific endeavour was a product and a reflection of his cultural times; and thirdly, that these factors shaping his science activities apply similarly to his book-dealing, and antiquarian careers.

The importance of Legrand’s scientific contribution has diminished yet also diversified over the years, and is currently under review by the Australian amateur malacologist, Robert Burn. In approaching from an entirely different perspective, this thesis considers Legrand’s scientific career as it does his careers as book-dealer and antiquarian, that is, in biographical and socio-cultural terms. Unfortunately, the extent and importance of
Legrand’s collecting and dealing in books, papers, pictures, and other objects seems
destined to remain unquantifiable, simply through lack of surviving evidence. Instead, the
lost relics of his lengthy bibliographic and antiquarian careers exist only within the realm of
legend and anecdote. Their ongoing cultural significance lies not so much in what precisely
they were, but in what they apparently meant to Legrand’s contemporaries, what they came
to represent after the dispersal of his stock, and what they have meant since. Even so, the
few surviving references to what Legrand bought and sold provide useful insights to his life
and times and the biographical task of locating further traces seems well worth continuing.

**Legrand’s association with the Royal Society of Tasmania**

In terms of scientific interest, Legrand had chosen his colony well. There was a
small but active community of amateur scientists in Tasmania, and an already established
tradition of the pursuit, extension, and promotion of scientific knowledge. Amateur
scientific bodies had been set up remarkably early in Tasmania. Not only was its Royal
Society the first to be established anywhere outside Britain, but its predecessors, the Van
Diemen’s Land Scientific Society founded in 1829, and the Tasmanian Society established
by Sir John Franklin in 1837, were both intellectually rigorous groups. The connections
between imperialism and scientific enquiry were embodied in the active encouragement of
the scientific societies by early governors — in particular, by Franklin, and by Sir William
Denison.² These patrons were well-remembered by the Society of Legrand’s day, with
frequent references to them recorded in its journal. Later governors, still imperial
representatives once Tasmania had gained self-government, continued to show interest in
the Society. All such connections were neither officially nor economically imperial, yet the
social positions held by these men and the scientific culture they encouraged were indeed

² For example, Franklin (whose term was 1837–1843) contributed financially to some scientific projects; and
his wife also took an active interest in scientific, and cultural matters, founding Australia’s first museum, the
Ancanthe, on Hobart’s outskirts (Haynes, “Van Diemen’s Land” 499). Denison (whose term was 1847–1853)
facilitated a satisfactory merging of the two then existing local scientific societies in 1848 (Davis 102).
so. Furthermore, the Society’s museum and library housed numerous items which were tangible reminders of its imperial legacy — for example, cases, fittings, and some specimens from Lady Jane Franklin’s Ancanthe museum were acquired in 1853 (Kohlstedt 21; Bowes, 60) and Denison, a keen amateur conchologist, had donated reference texts from his personal library (Iredale and Whitley 27–30).

From the early 1850s, the reorganised Royal Society was the central body promoting science within Tasmania (Hoare 208), and its role widened further during the following decade. By the 1860s, the museums in colonial capital cities were established entry-points for international scientific enquiry, and became involved within what Griffiths describes as “an imperial web of exchange and exhibition” (18) — including the various imperial and international exhibitions which proliferated in the wake of Britain’s Great Exhibition of 1851, and were the symbolic displays of nationhood and advancement (Griffiths 18). Reports of the Society show a wide and active exchange of journals, specimens, and correspondence. It received donations from afar, as well as from nearby — a poignant reminder of imperial connections being the gift of several relics of Franklin’s fatal voyage in search of the north-west passage, items recovered by the Fox expedition (1857–9), which had solved the mystery of the lost expedition.3

It might seem a miracle that an oddity like Legrand was a part of all this. Yet as Griffiths reminds us in Hunters and Collectors, amateur researchers made many useful contributions to scientific understanding, their efforts often later ignored by the rising

---

3 Obtained by Lieut. Hobson of the Fox, and donated by Mrs. J. Buckland (PPRS for the year 1869 [1870]: 85). Franklin’s wife had bought the ship, and financed the search expedition of 1857–1859 commanded by Capt. Francis Mc Clintock, during which the Tasmania Group of islands (71.25 degrees N) was named by the commander “at the request of Lady Franklin, in grateful acknowledgement of many proofs of affectionate sympathy received from the colony over which her husband presided for many years, and, in particular, of the large contributions raised there in aid of her expeditions of search” (Mc Clintock 172).
professional sciences.\(^4\) It was to Legrand’s immediate advantage that the scope of the Royal Society of Tasmania was remarkably broad. Although its members were predominantly men of the upper-middle class, it involved local people in various ways, and its monthly meetings focussed on a wide range of practical as well as scientific matters (Gillian Winter 316). Yet though the reports of the Society highlight the earnest intellectual endeavour of these gatherings, the gentlemanly tenor of the meetings is apparent. Still, there is evidence that Legrand made efforts to appear respectable at the time, that he acquired some gentlemanly acquaintances, and that he was sufficiently presentable to appear for the Society at public displays.\(^5\) Cultural timing also was to Legrand’s advantage: he had arrived in the colony ahead of the rise of professionalisation in the sciences, and during an era when interest in natural history was widely promoted as an appropriate and highly worthwhile activity for all social classes. Importantly, he apparently already possessed knowledge and skills in conchology, and also familiarity with microscopes, in addition to his obvious interest in books and probable experience in the print trades.

Though Legrand had been elected a Fellow of the Society in 1863, he seems later to have let this membership lapse, possibly for financial reasons; yet he maintained ongoing (and apparently, increasingly tenuous) links with the museum until at least the early 1880s. Tracing ways in which Legrand made himself useful to the Society charts how a determined amateur naturalist without means, and with publication in mind, ensured his access to the centralised scientific organisation of his region, and especially to its reference library. This same journey furnishes glimpses of imperial curiosity at work within the wider webs of metropolitan, colonial, and international connection. More specifically, tracing Legrand’s

\(^4\) More recently, however, Legrand’s contribution been acknowledged by authoritative professional scientists — for example, by Tom Iredale and by Ron Kershaw, whose separate articles are later discussed; and still more recently, by Brian Smith.

\(^5\) He generally passed as educated, but his outward appearance seems to have become steadily shabbier as time went on. For example, as referred to elsewhere in this chapter, Legrand’s disreputable appearance was deplored by the otherwise approving James Calder in 1881 (Dally 25).
obscure colonial career as secondhand bookseller, antiquarian, and amateur conchologist provides insights into the pervasive influence of imperial vision within intellectual endeavour and cultural activities in late nineteenth-century colonial life.

Legrand’s association with the Society gave him intellectual and social opportunities, and provided free publicity for his steadily progressing publishing project. Comments and short papers by him, typically read out by influential figures such as Dr Agnew or Morton Allport, were acknowledged with respect at meetings, and published in the Society’s journal. At the same time, other more general print references to Legrand seem more condescending. This may have been in response to his apparently unusual personality and brusque manner, but it also suggests that Legrand did not measure up as a gentleman. Certainly, despite the clarity of his succinct explanations in Collections, Legrand’s written language lacks polish overall, with specific instances suggesting his limited knowledge of a range of genres. Other indicators of cultural inexperience were possibly also discernable socially. Meanwhile, the genial effusions of the Hobart Mercury present him as a Smilesian self-improver—not merely an autodidact, but a pursuer of knowledge whose aspiration and hard work would enhance the wider community. In reviewing the early draft of Legrand’s planned book of shells, the Mercury columnist ventured that “[a]lthough Conchology is not generally regarded among the higher branches of Zoology,” it could reveal “striking proofs of the wisdom and power of the great Creator,” and he noted approvingly that Legrand “had devoted a considerable portion of time, patience and perseverance to the collection of Tasmanian land shells” (“Conchology,” Mercury [Hobart] 23 Nov. 1870: 2). This article was followed next day by mention that a donation of exotic marine shells would “need to pass under the scientific manipulations of

---

6 For example, Legrand’s paper, “On the Land Shells of Tasmania” (1870) was read by Mr. Stephens to a monthly meeting of the Society (Report of the RST for the Year 1870: 82). Similarly, a later paper by Legrand, “On a New Genus of Freshwater Mollusks,” was read to members by Morton Allport in July 1871 (Monthly Notices of PPRST for 1871: 27–8).
our fellow-citizen, Mr. Legrand, to be properly classified” before going on display at the museum (Mercury [Hobart] 24 Nov. 1870: 2).

Further afield, Legrand was engaged in a working relationship with the two Sydney conchologists, Cox and Brazier. Begun by 1868, it was focussed around the production of the planned monograph on Tasmanian land shells. Legrand had the local field knowledge and the cache of previously unidentified shells, and the Sydney men were acknowledged experts as regards shell classification. It probably was an uneasy alliance from the start: all three had scientific ambitions linked to discovering and describing new shell species, and it seems from the evidence available that there were differences of temperament and work methods to be overcome, as well as issues of social class and of intellectual ownership.

Interesting background detail emerges from the three short letters written by Cox to Legrand which survive as carbon copies in one of Cox’s personal letter books, now preserved in the Mitchell Library (MLMSS 306/1). The first gives an impression of Cox’s collecting zeal, while its interesting fluctuations of authorial tone suggest that the writer, like many another contemporary, was undecided as to how to classify Legrand. Mention of the mail which went astray also is intriguing. What were the circumstances? What was being discussed? Had the unintended recipients been tempted to broach the seals, and eavesdrop? This first letter from Cox is reproduced in full, punctuated as in the original:

My dear Mr. Legrand,

The enclosed note came by this mail addressed to me which must be a mistake did you get my letter also by mistake from Mr. B[rrazier?]. The stamps enclosed are quite new I have kept one of each to know if you would sell them to me for my little boy who has a grand collection.7 I will send them to you if so wished or [indecipherable] money or shells. Can you send

7 At the time, Cox’s eldest “little boy” was aged about ten, and there were two younger boys, then aged about five and three (Teale parag. 10).
him specimens of your Tasmanian stamps he could send you good NSW for them.

Yours in haste

James C. Cox

July 12 1869 (MLMSS 306/1: 40)

Cox’s second letter perhaps may refer to a paper written for him by Legrand, in an arrangement similar to that once provided by Macgillivray, though it seems most probably referring to Legrand’s notes on the newly-discovered shells sent to Cox for official classification, or perhaps to a draft of Legrand’s article, “On the Land Shells of Tasmania,” later published in the Monthly Notices of the PPRST, June, July August 1870 (39–41). Also of interest here is Cox’s method of distributing his own published work by using it as a trade commodity. He begins:

September 12th, 1869.

My dear Mr Le Grand

I send you by this Steamer a copy of my little monograph on the Land Shells send me some shells in return for it. ⁸ I received your paper and specimens of Land Shells. I have them all ready to go to the press but will wait a little longer in case you want other species with them. They are all so far new

[. . .]. (MLMSS 306/1: 53)

Here we have evidence that Legrand by late 1870 owned a copy Cox’s own work, presumably the scientifically important Monograph of Australian Land Shells (1868). A later passage in the same letter shows that Legrand was a substantial supplier of shells to

---

⁸ Four days earlier, Cox had used the same phrase, with a more direct statement of demand within a letter to John Rainbird, his hired collector at Port Denison [Bowen, north Queensland]: “By this Steamer I send you a copy of my work on Australian Land Shells, the price of it is £1.10.00 and I will accept payment for it in shells [. . .]” (qtd. Loch, “Gentlemen and Players [Continued]” 3).
Cox. Read with hindsight, the ending to Cox’s letter presages an apparent future conflict of interests:

Have you paid any attention to the Fresh Water shells in Tasmania. How many species do you make out and their names — We want [lack?] a paper on the subject including all the Australian Colonies. (MLMSS 306/1: 53)

The last of the three surviving letters, dated 31 May 1870, addresses Legrand as “My dear Sir,” and is somewhat terser in tone. Significantly, it substantiates the fact that it was Legrand who had supplied the new Tasmanian shell specimens which Cox was to describe.

Apparently, Legrand now was applying pressure for their return, and Cox responds that he has had time only to name, but not yet to describe them. Interestingly, Cox is lending Legrand a new reference book, and adds the comment: “I made my descriptions before I got this book [but] I still like [mine] better.” (MLMSS 306/1: 143)

Perhaps further indication of Legrand’s anxiety to hasten into publication is that by June 1870, he had hand-printed a short, preliminary edition of the intended larger work. Issued as Catalogue of Tasmanian Land Shells, it eventually ran to twenty-two pages, printed single-sided, and contained a preface but no illustrations. At least two copies of the Catalogue are known to exist, and there may have been others.  

Robert Burn’s recent close reading of Legrand’s 1870 and 1871 publications finds evidence that the Catalogue was assembled in two stages (“A Hand-made Book on Tasmanian Land Shells: Reading between the Lines” 1–2). Burn makes the point that, in essence, the Catalogue reproduces Cox’s earlier descriptions of Tasmanian shells, with the insertion of a few additional comments by Cox’s references in his third letter to Legrand to descriptions made before getting his new reference book and to the naming but not yet description of the new Tasmanian shells may shed further light on the matter (Cox letter 31 May 1870).

9 Currently, at least one is held by the molluscan reference library of Museum Victoria, Melbourne (Burn letter to the author 14 Jan. 2010) and another is listed in the current British Library online catalogue, numbered as “720.h.5. (4).” A further listing which appears in the 1910 catalogue of the library of the British Museum of Natural History may refer to another copy, or to the one now included in the British Library catalogue.

10 Cox’s references in his third letter to Legrand to descriptions made before getting his new reference book and to the naming but not yet description of the new Tasmanian shells may shed further light on the matter (Cox letter 31 May 1870).
Legrand and the list of new shells still to be described (1–2). Yet the production of this book, viewed additionally from a biographical, physical, or rhetorical perspective, reveals much about the career and aspirations of William Legrand. Firstly, Cox’s active encouragement of Legrand’s project would increase its scientific and social respectability. Secondly, Legrand’s physical annexation of Cox’s descriptions (re-setting by hand each letter of every word for inclusion in the Catalogue) adds a symbolic dimension to his reproduction of the earlier work. Similarly, the fact that Legrand performed all the other printing and publishing steps required in producing the new book would heighten his sense of personal investment in it. Thirdly, Legrand probably would hope to accrue scientific and also personal kudos from even a preliminary listing of the newly-coined names for “the new Species discovered since Dr. Cox’s Monograph, and now for the first time published” (Preface, Catalogue parag. 1), especially since these were the shells Legrand had supplied. Fourthly, by adding his own comments to his selections from Cox’s earlier work, Legrand is elevating himself to the role of co-contributor and editor, rather than mere compiler. Fifthly, these same comments of Legrand’s gave evidence of his own local knowledge, potentially furthering his reputation as an authority on Tasmanian land shells. Seen in this light, Legrand’s re-issuing of Cox’s descriptions of Tasmanian shells might be read as a gesture of conchological endorsement, rather than purely deferential acknowledgement of Cox’s significant recent Monograph (1868). Finally, alongside Legrand’s undoubted desire for scientific accuracy, a triumphant and unmistakably territorial note arises from his preface to the Catalogue:

The localities to which my initials (W.L.) are appended may be depended upon, as in every instance I have either collected the specimens myself, or received them direct from the places recorded (parag. 2).
After Legrand had distributed copies of this interim work, at least one favourable review appeared in print. This was in a Launceston newspaper, and it explained that Legrand’s intention was “to extend the work, publishing supplements from time to time as materials accumulate” (“Conchology,” Cornwall Chronicle 31 July 1870: 2). By the year’s end, Legrand apparently had received copies of the two lithographed plates commissioned by Cox as illustration of the newly-named species (“Conchology,” Mercury [Hobart] 23 November 1870: 2). Whether by agreed plan or through impetuosity, he set about publishing the larger, more complete version of the ongoing work, which emerged in print the following year.

**Legrand’s book of shells**

The culmination of the scientific project on which Legrand had lavished so much time and effort appeared as an outwardly unspectacular, but nonetheless important small book, announcing itself (on cover and title page) as:

**COLLECTIONS**

**FOR A**

**MONOGRAPH**

**OF TASMANIAN LAND SHELLS,**

**BY**

**W. LEGRAND**

**ELIZABETH-STREET, HOBART TOWN, TASMANIA.**

1871.

Then, as now, regarded as the first book ever published on Tasmanian shells, it was introduced by Legrand as containing descriptions of all the currently known “shell-bearing land Mollusca indigenous to, and introduced into Tasmania” (“Preface,” Collections September 1871). The work was timely in the sense that nineteenth-century scientific
interest in antipodean flora and fauna was intensified by the knowledge that Tasmania had been geographically distinct from the Australian mainland for millions of years, and thus suggested the possibility of isolated evolution of many of its species. Yet though Legrand clearly was interested in the territorial boundaries of indigenous species, he apparently steered clear of contentious issues fanned by the release of Charles Darwin’s *The Origin of Species* (1859). The main focus of Legrand’s scientific career was on observation, acquisition, and organisation: in this, he personified the passion for collecting, classifying, and encyclopedic knowledge described in *Hunters and Collectors* as characteristic of imperial curiosity (18).

Eighty-three shell specimens were described in Legrand’s book — more than half being recorded as new discoveries. As formal descriptions for the new shells were supplied by the leading Sydney experts, Cox and John Brazier, credit for identifying the shells therefore rests with these men, obscuring the full extent of Legrand’s scientific contribution. Yet a considerable proportion of the new specimens sent to Sydney had been informally identified by Legrand, and these possibly were accompanied by notes which included suggestions as to their possible classifications. I would argue that, in addition to Legrand’s expertise in finding, examining, and researching local shell species, his personal comments published throughout *Collections* are a considerable contribution to the work as a whole, not only their quantity and detail but in the fact that they critically appraise scientific content contributed by others. R. M. Johnston, who understood the limitations but also the

---

11 Legrand’s proprietary statements about the work suggest this, as do comments in two of the surviving Cox letters, those dated 12 Sept. 1869 and 31 May 1870 (MLMSS 306/1), and also in the recording of “Legrand. M.S.S.” as the reference source for a new shell species described in *Collections*, the helix named in honour of Morton Allport (the dedication discussed in Chapter 3 of the thesis).

12 Legrand’s comment on Helix spec. 1 has been noted, and portions of other comments by him are quoted elsewhere. His printed contributions vary in length, the longest being slightly more than 200 words, a statement added to Cox’s description of Helix (Videna) sinclairi (spec. 12). Overall, Legrand’s comments tend to be cautionary, with clear attempts to add geographic precision, for example: “The claim of this species to a Tasmanian habitat rests on the authority of Mr. R. Thatcher” (Helix spec. 63); and “Cox mentions a dark variety from the N. E. coast, but I think he is in error, as this is a particularly western species” (Helix spec. 4).
importance of this pioneering work, attributed its overall authorship to the compiler, describing it later as “Mr. Legrand’s excellent monograph” (“Notes on the Distribution” 44). According to Johnston, a particular strength of the book was that it contained, in addition to the formal shell descriptions by noted experts, “notes and observations relating to distribution, variability, and affinities by Mr. Legrand himself, which are not the least valuable part of the work” (44). The published work also included a number of brief field-note comments by others besides Legrand, and these, too, were printed beneath the relevant formal shell descriptions. Legrand’s June preface, repeated in the September edition of Collections, issued a personal assurance of accuracy similar to that given in the Catalogue: “The habitats may be strictly relied on; in most instances I have either collected the shells myself, or received them direct from the places recorded” (parag. 2)

Outwardly the work was unprepossessing, utilitarian, and clearly an amateur publication. Like its forerunner, it was hand-printed by Legrand, a fact later eulogised by Tenison Woods, himself a practiced type-setter: “What gave the work a greater value was that it was for the most part privately printed by the author, the whole of the work being done by his own hand” (“On a New Revised Tasmanian Helix”, PPRST for 1876 [1877]: 180). The book’s professionally produced sections were the two plates of illustration commissioned and paid for by Cox. These were the work of the sisters, Harriet Scott and

---

13 Written in the wake of Petterd’s 1879 Monograph of the Land Shells of Tasmania, Johnston’s article presents an overview, with detailed table, of contributions by various other workers (in particular, Legrand, Petterd, Beddome, Atkinson, and Johnston) to the evolving knowledge about Tasmanian land molluscs. This is an important article because it sets out the current state of Tasmanian conchological research (as Johnston saw it) just as Legrand’s conchological was drawing to a close, and also because it shows Johnston’s belief in the worth of Petterd’s newly-published book.

14 Plate I is by Harriet Scott (1830-1907) and Plate II by Helena Forde (1832 – 1910). Lithographed on stone by the artists, the plates were printed by S. T. Leigh of Sydney.
Helena Forde, the leading Sydney providers of figures for scientific literature at that time. They produced illustrations for twenty-eight of the new shells, showing three views of each one — front, back, and life-size. It seems probable that the plates inserted in most copies of the work were monotone, although there are at least two extant copies where the illustrations are attractively hand-coloured in delicate tints, predominately of lemon or brown. The covers of the seven different copies examined are mostly of dull blue or grey paper, printed in clear, strong type. Inside, both typeface and layout are unremarkable, apart from amateurish alterations in print size, and the presence of gummed paper slips of amendment. For the later copies, Legrand reset the print blocks, incorporating many previous alterations. Each page shows the clear imprint of the hand press, a reminder of Legrand’s dogged commitment in laboriously turning out successive runs of these sheets — work undertaken in his spare time, as he also needed to earn a living.

Extant copies of Collections vary as regards content, since it appeared in two editions, one dated June 1871, and the other dated September 1871. Iredale has left a detailed description of the different versions of the book, which he was able to unravel with certainty once he had access to Legrand’s own copy, with its hand-written annotations and

---

15 Amongst their recent works were the design and execution of lithographs for Cox’s Monograph (1868) and Gerard Krefft’s important work, Snakes of Australia (1869) and later, Mammals of Australia, Illustrated by Miss Harriet Scott and Mrs. H. Forde, for the Council of Education, with a short Account of All the Species Hitherto Described, by Gerard Krefft (1871).

16 The copy examined is held in the Morris Miller Rare collection, University of Tasmania, (QL.430.4L44.1871). Another is catalogued at the Australian Museum reference collection (12676).

17 Of the seven copies viewed, two had print-patterned board covers, probably having been re-bound by owners. Alternatively, the binding may be original: Legrand for a while advertised himself as a stationer, and conceivably may have used a range of materials to hand for his covers. This seems the less likely option, however. Iredale accepted the blue paper cover as being the book’s original format (“Hand-made Book” 60; and Kershaw would seem referring to a faded copy in describing Collections as a “small paper backed booklet [. . .] provided with a grey-blue paper cover” (“Molluscan Milestone” 6).

18 The June 1871 edition listed fewer shells, and had thirty-nine pages, plus the two illustrative plates. Robert Burn’s recent paper, “A Hand-made Book on Tasmanian Land Shells: Reading between the Lines” (in manuscript 14 January 2010), provides a finely-detailed study of the content, chronology, revisions, scientific relevance, general appearance, and probable editorial considerations evident at each of the various stages of Legrand’s tortuous production of the Collections.
notes for future alterations (“A Hand-made Book on Shells” 58). The interim nature of the June 1871 edition clearly was known at the time of its publication. The September edition of Collections is the one usually cited, though Legrand later produced an additional page dated December 1874, and there exists an unbound full copy containing this later supplement: the same copy as contains the colour-tinted plates already mentioned (Morris Miller Rare Collection, University of Tasmania QL.430.4L.44.1871). Was this fuller volume the prototype for a stillborn later publication, or is it the sole survivor of a now lost third edition? Iredale thought Legrand had another edition in mind, judging by Legrand’s inked annotations and printed comments about progressing with the still-undescribed fluviatile species (60). A recent snippet of evidence shows that Iredale was partly correct, but that it was an entirely new project Legrand had in mind. Even as he was launching the first of his 1871 editions of Collections, Legrand was describing his “monograph of Tasmanian freshwater shells [as] now in course of preparation” (“Royal Society of Tasmania,” Mercury [Hobart] 19 July 1871: 2). In the same statement he also mentioned that “some time since” he had sent specimens of an unusual freshwater shell to the London expert Hanley, and that the great man had named it after him. The content of Hanley’s letter, as reported in the Society’s journal and also in the local press, stated: “One of your freshwater species is quite a novelty, it is even of generic importance [. . .]. I propose for it the name of Legrandia in honour of the discoverer.” One wonders what Cox thought of all this. If he had not already

19 Iredale says he was given this copy by the Australian naturalist and collector, Mel [Charles Melbourne] Ward (58). The copy is now held in the Australian Museum reference library.

20 Though only two copies of the 1874 page have been traced, others may exist.

21 Legrand’s June 1871 preface to Collections ends with the statement, “I have made some progress with the Fluviatile species, and hope to publish the first part in the course of the present year” (parag. 5).

22 This same information appeared later in Notices of PPRST for 1871 (1872): 27.

23 Legrand’s declaration, and the note itself, were later mentioned by Charles Hedley in “On the Value of Ancylastrum,” (Journal of Molluscan Studies 1 [1894]: 118). Yet long before this Legrand had graciously resigned the honour, explaining his discovery that the French naturalist Bourguignat had described the same
washed his hands of Legrand, the very fact of his own previously expressed interest in the
Tasmanian fluviatiles would suggest that Legrand’s mention of an independent work might
be inflammatory. Freshly-emerged evidence shows that Cox wrote again to Legrand the
following year. The clue is an empty envelope postmarked 24 February 1872 recently
exhibited online as an item of philatelic interest (Fig. 19). Though it carries no signature, my
familiarity with Cox’s handwriting allows me to attribute the authorship to him with
absolute certainty. The missing contents of this envelope could shed interesting light on
later relations between Cox and Legrand. Whatever the case, examples of the Tasmanian
fluviatile species soon became the subjects of sometimes heated exchanges amongst various
of Legrand’s conchological acquaintances.

The September 1871 edition of Collections contains forty-two pages, unnumbered,
and printed on one side only. The print run was small, and the book was not for sale, but for
private distribution. It was intended as a reference work, and as indication of the larger
project envisaged by Legrand — no doubt, in the hope of attracting further backing. Whether
consciously or not, its method of circulation bears resemblance to a relevant English
precedent — the publication by the influential conchologist, George Brettingham Sowerby,
of his Malacological and Conchological Magazine (1838), which he distributed free to
societies and private individuals deemed potentially interested in forming a London
association of similar name (Dance 187). As with the eminent Sowerby’s initiative, the

shell previously, and that he therefore had “not made use of Mr. Hanley’s name” (Legrand “Notes on a Few
Tasmanian Land and Freshwater Shells,” Journal of Conchology 2 [1879]: 95).

24 No business records belonging to Legrand survive; quite possibly none ever existed. The British Library
Integrated Catalogue online lists Legrand’s Catalogue with the statement that “only fifty copies were struck
off” (7298.d.25). It then lists the Collections as another edition of the earlier work, with the later title given in
brackets (7206.h.5. [4]). Thus, it is possible that the print number refers to the combined publication. The fact
that Collections is listed in Ferguson’s Bibliography of Australia (429) while Legrand’s Catalogue is not
seems further support for the probability that the earlier work was experimental, with few copies made, and
that more were made of the later versions intended for wider distribution.

25 “Sowerby financed [the magazine] for twelve months until it failed for lack of support” (Cleevely,
“Sowerby” parag. 6).
hopeful promotion by Legrand did not lead to expansion of the planned conchological project.

Yet despite its homespun look, its limited circulation, and the unspectacular nature of its topic species, Legrand’s privately printed colonial work was remarkably ambitious in what it attempted, and significant in what it achieved. The project can be seen as representative of the imperial vision MacKenzie describes as then permeating the study of natural history, manifesting itself in the accelerating urge to order the world of nature, through scientific specialisation, and the focus on taxonomic structures (36). True to the spirit of this imperial vision, Legrand’s project encompassed a defined and distinctive portion of the political empire (Tasmania); and aimed to record, order, and classify the range of varieties within a specific animal population existing there. Legrand emphasised the ongoing nature of this scientific exploration, prefacing his work with the explanation that “many parts” of Tasmania had “not yet been properly examined, so that it may be reasonably expected that this number [of species] will be increased.”

Viewed as a cultural artifact, his book reveals much about the pursuit of natural history in nineteenth-century Tasmania at a time of rapid change within scientific thinking, and also of significant changes within the colony’s political and cultural ties with imperial Britain. Legrand had arrived in Tasmania in the very year the colony gained self-government. Thus his fieldwork, his networking, and the preparation of his book occurred during a period of intense regional nationalism, but one also of economic depression — a time when the colony’s prized independence from Britain was sorely tested (Felmingham 421–2). These factors assuredly influenced the book’s assertions of Tasmanianess, and of colonial science having come of age, and presumably also determined the cost-cutting methods used for the work’s publication.
An interesting sidelight to Legrand’s representation of himself as Tasmanian at this time is the appearance of his name within a published list of 345 signatories declaring allegiance to a political candidate to represent their newly-formed electorate (“Central Hobart Election: To the Honorable W. R. Giblin, Attorney-General”, Mercury [Hobart] 26 August 1871: 3). This uncharacteristic example self-declaration by Legrand suggests many things. Firstly, it may have been a tactical gesture, occurring as it did mid-way between the July and September editions of Collections. Alternatively, the self-made Legrand may have been strongly committed to the economic and social changes being stated as desires of the electorate. The key messages of the electors’ published letter were that “at no time in her history did Tasmania stand so much in need of the services of men not content to travel in the old worn-out ruts,” and that the chosen representative had not only the skill and courage required for responding to changed economic conditions, but also would “not allow class interests to interfere with the adoption of a policy of even-handed justice.” Thirdly, and highly significant as regards Legrand’s published work, there appears remarkable assonance between the rhetoric of this Hobart campaign document and the tenor of the Tasmanian-ness expressed in Legrand’s book. Not only is this revealing in terms of Legrand’s representations of “self” and as being another example of his demonstrable tendency to appropriate the textual register of other writers, but it highlights yet another way in which the book itself is representative of its particular time and place.

As regards the wider significance of Collections, it drew attention to Tasmanian scientific activity, and received encouraging comment from a number of the cognoscenti to whom it was distributed; but its greatest achievement was the provision of a substantial basis for later work in the field. Soon superseded, and eventually a collectors’ item, it has remained within the literature, and is still cited occasionally. The value of Legrand’s work has been recognised by later-generation Australian scientists such as Iredale (as discussed)
and Ronald Kershaw, both of whom separately have written about Collections.26

Furthermore, in the current more ecologically-attuned era, new uses have emerged for some of the book’s content — for example, it has been used in field studies comparing current populations of snail species with sightings recorded by Legrand and other early workers (Ponder 272–4). Yet the publication of Collections proved the culmination of Legrand’s career as amateur scientist. In view of his ambitions, this must have seemed like failure, although the ongoing life of his book proves otherwise.

**Hunting, collecting, and networking**

Apart from its scientific content, Legrand’s book is informative in terms of socio-cultural and biographical detail. During the nineteenth century the gathering of objects for study and display was an accepted form of that imperial sport, hunting (Griffiths 19). This applied in conchology as in other fields of natural history, and in Tasmania, as elsewhere. Conchologists compared “bags”, including the writing of papers on their trophies; there was collaboration and discussion, and often intense debate over matters of classification.

Enthusiasts could be territorial and competitive. For a rank outsider within a predominantly gentlemanly milieu, Legrand’s publication of Collections exposed him in no small way to personal as well as scientific scrutiny, so that the backing of a socially prominent figure such as Cox probably was essential to the project’s viability. Undoubtedly, there were complex motivations (including a wish to forestall attack) behind Legrand’s overall editorial stance, which seems aiming at the display of impartiality and frankness, as well as full and comprehensive acknowledgement of others’ work.27 The prose is definite, but the tone is largely collegial, and some passages are quite discursive — a noteworthy example being the

---


27 As an example: “I have to thank Dr. Cox for descriptions, and also for the plates, which were executed under his direction and at his expense. Mr. Brazier has supplied descriptions of ten new species. Mr. Stephens, Mr. C. Gould, and other gentlemen, whose names appear in the descriptions, have supplied specimens. Mr. Morton Allport has also taken great interest in the matter, and Mr. Ronald Gunn has rendered me valuable assistance in determining the habitats of the Northern species” (“Preface,” *Collections* June 1871).
inclusion of three sides of an argument regarding the classification of one particular shell.  

In this case, however, Legrand seems intent on having the last word, since his endnotes to the book contain the statement: “Mr. Brazier’s note to neglecta, is beyond my comprehension. W.L.” (“Additions,” Collections September 1871). This comment may have still deeper significance, seen in the light of Brazier’s later waspish denigration of Legrand.  

Colonial conchology (like other branches of natural science) was imperial in its annexation of fresh territories and its exploration of natural species in the cause of scientific advancement. Occasionally, enthusiasts themselves tried a little colonising (releasing introduced species, to see how they would thrive) — a Tasmanian example described by William Petterd being the release of some aspersa “in the Scrub near Hobart Town,” by the local conchologist, Charles Edward Beddome. Petterd reported this experiment in a London journal, adding with apparent optimism, “so that in a few years [...] [the species] may be equally abundant in this island as on the mainland” (“Colonising Land Shells” 96).  

A crowning conchological triumph, however, was the naming of a new species — an achievement offering strategic advantage, as well as denoting scientific achievement. A number of shell dedications appear in Collections, and (as in other such works) these offer insights to the describers’ interests and networks. The following examples, each evidently unrelated to the shell being named, suggest differences of networking focus between the amateur conchologist with means, and the freelance professional. Cox apparently consolidates gentlemanly acquaintances in commemorating a Launceston collector as “my  

---

28 **HELIX (Pitys) neglecta.**  
29 In an article discussed later this chapter (Brazier, “Trochidae and Other Genera of Mollusca in Tasmania” 194).  
30 Beddome (1839–1898) was an English-born colonial settler, a retired lieutenant of the former Indian navy, who for many years lived a little south of Hobart at “Hillgrove” on the Browns River Road, at present day Taroona (Roberts 80).
friend, Mr. Irvine [. . .] to whom I am indebted for many valuable specimens from
Tasmania,” and closer to home, “my friend, Prof. Thompson of the University of Sydney,
our able and accomplished geologist.” 31 Several land shell dedications by Brazier printed in
Collections signal a maritime bias. He commemorates the naval explorer, George Bass;
three officers of the British imperial navy previously based in Tasmania; “Mr. G.T. Rice, of
the South Sea Island curiosity shop, Sydney”; and (understatedly, but twice) his own links
with the 1865 cruise of HMS Curacao. 32 In one newly-name shell, he seems gesturing
towards the Royal Society of Tasmania by honouring its departed founding member, “Dr.
Milligan, whose indefatigable exertions in the cause of science have made us acquainted
with many new and rare Tasmanian shells”. 33 Two shells described in Collections had been
named for Legrand, both by Cox in his Monograph. 34 Mention of this kind might have
seemed to offer immortality of sorts, whether through discovery or naming. Yet it often
happened with species and subspecies identified by the early conchologists (and indeed,
continues to happen, as techniques of identification are further refined) that shell
descriptions were later not upheld, or else names were sunk in synonymy. The careers of a
great number of the shells connected with Legrand (whether “discoveries” of his, or those

31 Both shells named and described (by Cox, for Legrand’s book) as new Tasmanian species: HELIX Irvinæ
(sp.71) and HELIX Thompsoni (sp. 73) (“Additional Index,” Collections, Sept. 1871).

32 The British naval officers commemorated were: “Captain Onslow, RN” (a member of the influential Sydney
family, the Macleays), “the late Captain King, RN” (an amateur naturalist who bequeathed his collection to
W. S. Macleay), and “my friend, Mr. William Flood, RN, formerly secretary to Sir W. Wiseman, C.B., of
H.M.S.S. Curacoæ [sic] when on the Australian Station.” The names applied to shells being described as new
in Collections are all classed as Helices: Bassi (sp. 50); Floodi (sp. 70); and also Milligani (sp. 69), discussed
below (“Additional Index,” Collections, Sept. 1871). Brazier’s reputation as a collector had earned him an
invitation to join the Curacoæ’s 1865 Pacific cruise, one of several different scientific expeditions in which he
participated. Dance singles out Brazier and Hedley as having provided significant impetus to Australian
conchology (Shell Collecting 220).

33 “Sp.6. HELIX Milligani” (“Additional Index,” Collections, Sept. 1871). Joseph Milligan, surgeon and
naturalist, had been pivotal to the successful merging of the two scientific bodies in 1848. He retired to
England in 1860, but remained an interested and loyal supporter of the Society (Hoddinott parag. 5).

34 Reprinted in Collections as Helix sp. 9 and Succinea sp. 2. Legrand may have provided the original
specimens, but from the brief notes given it seems far more likely that Masters had the shells, and may have
collected them himself in Tasmania. If so, this evidence would support the supposition of conchological
contact between Legrand and Masters prior to the publication of Cox’s 1868 Monograph.
named by others in his honour) if pursued as a topic might furnish a lengthy paper on their own.

Well before his publishing project with Cox and Brazier, Legrand had been supplying shells to collectors elsewhere, including English experts. We have it on the authority of William May that G. B. Sowerby “described seven species of *Physa*, mostly sent to him by Legrand” (“Revised Census” 65), and of Charles Hedley that “much of the Australian material described by Hanley” came from Legrand (“Necrology” 60). In terms of Legrand’s further career ambitions, it appears significant that the shells he sent to England for description happened to belong to the Tasmanian freshwater species of particular interest to Cox in 1869, and being worked on by Legrand and written about by Brazier, separately, in 1871. As indicators of imperial curiosity, these colonial conchological activities suggest important things. Firstly, they highlight the fact that during the 1860s and 1870s distinguished natural historians in distant metropolitan centres were interested in, and to a notable degree were reliant upon, specimens and observations sent to them by colonial collectors. More importantly, publications such as Cox’s and Legrand’s pioneering works demonstrate the increasing independence of Australian science, including the increasing reliance on Australian expertise.

**Legrand’s later scientific career**

For all this significance, the size of the print run for Legrand’s book is an indication of the smallness of his scientific network, including existing members and those he might have wished to interest in his work. It was within his primary network (predominantly Tasmanian, though to some extent, also Sydney-based) that he had

---


established his reputation as a conchologist. Two local conchological associates of Legrand’s were ecclesiastic gentlemen — the Anglican clergyman-naturalist, Henry Dresser Atkinson; and the Catholic missionary priest and scientific and historical writer, Julian Edmund Tenison Woods. For enthusiasts such as these, shell-hunting was not only “rational amusement,” but also reflection of the imperial urge to discover, classify, and order the world of nature within a new geographical territory. A characteristic of Legrand’s contribution seems to have been his readiness to share his knowledge of shells, and to assist fellow enthusiasts — the later prominent Tasmanian conchologist, William Petterd, being amongst those he had encouraged (Johnston, “Provisional Aid” 59; Hedley, “Presidential Address” 7; Petterd, “Contributions for a Systematic Catalogue” 82). Legrand participated in coastal shell-dredging excursions with Atkinson, and was closely involved with Tenison Woods’s studies of Tasmanian shells. As Tim Jetson points out, Atkinson’s “ability to mix with diverse characters from across the social spectrum was advantageous in learning about the new environment” (“Things of Native Worth and Beauty” 33), and it is interesting to speculate whether or not this trait had some bearing on his interactions with Legrand. In any case, genuine appreciation seems evident in the comment made by Atkinson himself many years later:

37 In addition to Dr. Cox and John Brazier, he probably had at least passing contact with the highly skilled Sydney-based collector, George Masters, who visited Hobart in 1864 (Petterd, “Contributions for a Systematic Catalogue” 68), and later sent specimens to the RST. Shells found by Masters on Mt. Wellington (three examples of *Helix*) are included in *Collections*.

38 H. D. Atkinson (1841–1821) arrived in Tasmania in 1869. He was posted to the D’Entrecasteaux or Channel Mission (October 1868), where he served until appointed to Circular Head (1877), and finally, to Evandale (1890) (Jetson 31–2).

39 The commonly-used catchword, “rational amusement”, as opposed to mere entertainment was applied to activities providing useful instruction and moral uplift (preferably both). Natural history could be seen as an ideal example, since science was “useful”, the study of God’s world was uplifting, and outdoors activity was healthy – both manly (as a form of hunting), and appropriate for ladies (as the gathering of subjects for sketching and other decorative arts) (Barber 16).

40 In later recalling these dredging activities, Atkinson states: “A Hobart blacksmith made me a very good dredge after the pattern in Woodward’s book, and this was used on every available opportunity, and with much success” (“Nomenclature of the Tasmanian Mollusca”: 3).
I should be glad to take this opportunity of acknowledging my indebtedness to Mr. W. Legrand, who kept a small bookseller’s shop in Hobart in these early collecting days. From him I received much information, for he certainly knew more about Tasmanian shells than any other man in Hobart at that time [. . .]. (“Nomenclature of the Tasmanian Mollusca,” Examiner [Launceston] 19 Nov. 1895: 3).

Tenison Woods spent almost two years working in Tasmania, from 1874 to 1876.41 Noted for his eloquence and charismatic personality, he was also highly regarded for his amateur scientific expertise: altogether, he was a much valued member of the Royal Society of Tasmania.42 Having previously written on various subjects (geology and paleontology, in particular), Tenison Woods began producing papers on Tasmanian molluscs, and whether the topic was fossil, marine, or freshwater shells, he frequently acknowledged Legrand’s wide field knowledge and his assistance in preparing lists, providing shell specimens, and allowing full access to his personal shell collection.43 Later scientific writers seem to have viewed this arrangement as one-sided: as Tenison Woods having “had a large amount of material placed in his hands by Legrand” (W. May 66), and having “described many shells from Legrand’s collection” (Hedley “Necrology” 50).44 Yet the association was of considerable benefit to Legrand, and to his biographer it seems likely that Legrand saw the gentlemanly, articulate, and highly-regarded Tenison Woods as the key to advancing his

41 Recruited by the prison-reforming Bishop Willson, he had arrived at Hobart on the Bernicia 30 Jan.1855, but soon left for South Australia, where (in 1866) he co-founded with Mary MacKillop the order of the Sisters of St Joseph. He later returned to Tasmania for a while, serving as a missionary priest between February 1874 and November 1876 (Player 249–60).

42 Long a corresponding member, he made significant social impact when able to attend meetings in person during his Tasmanian posting.

43 For example, “On some Tertiary Fossils from Table Cape”, and “On Some New Species of Tasmanian marine Shells,” read to the Society in April 1875, and “On the Freshwater Shells of Tasmania”, read in August the same year. During slightly less than two years in Tasmania, Tenison Woods contributed thirteen papers to the Society. Later, he wrote more on Tasmanian shells.

own conchological ambitions. For example, Tenison Woods declared late in 1875 that Legrand “had invited him to make a critical list of all the Australian Mollusca,” but that though “such a list [...] was a great desideratum,” he had not time to undertake it, and had chosen instead a task of smaller scale, as part of which he already had written a preparatory “monograph on the Freshwater Mollusca” (“Royal Society of Tasmania,” Mercury [Hobart] 15 Nov. 1875: 3). From surviving evidence, it is difficult to gauge the reactions of Legrand’s former Sydney associates to this project. Cox then, as later, clearly approved of Tenison Woods, and (according to the same Mercury article) recently had loaned him “a valuable type collection of Australian Marine shells,” while the conchological interchanges between Brazier and Tenison Woods appear to have been more distant.

Meanwhile, an opportunity to showcase Tasmanian scientific specimens overseas arose in the form of the United States Centennial International Exhibition of 1876. At first glance, it seems incongruous that “a collection of Tasmanian shells [...] arranged and named by Rev. Julian Woods and Mr. Le Grand [sic]” should be sent for display alongside samples of the colony’s more obviously prestigious products — for example, the exhibits of wool, grain, timber, and ores; and the photographs, books, and craft items (“The Great Exhibition,” Philadelphia Public Ledger 31 Oct. 1876, in Mercury [Hobart] 18 Jan. 1877: 3). Yet the shells had a stated commercial value, and conversely, there was expectation of scientific interest in the clearly commercial items. Many of the exhibits were to be sold, and others distributed to scientific societies, at the close of the exhibition.

This huge, carefully planned, and lavishly funded international event, the first of its kind held in America, was scheduled to last a full six months, from 10 May to 10 November 45

The shells are elsewhere described as “sent by” and once as “prepared by” Mr. R. H. Davies of Torquay (presumably the clergyman-naturalist, contributor of several papers to the RST) suggesting that the shells may have belonged to him. If so, they provide a significant example of Tenison Woods and Legrand having undertaken classifying work for a private collector. Whether accurately or not, the shells were described in the local press as beautiful and also valuable: “some similar [...] have brought almost fabulous prices in London” (“Melbourne and Philadelphia Exhibitions,” Mercury [Hobart] 2 Aug. 1875: 2).
1876. Participants from amongst the imperial powers apparently were undeterred by the fact that the exhibition was celebrating the 100th anniversary of the beginning of the American republican revolution which had freed the former colony from British sovereignty.

Philadelphia was chosen as the exhibition site because it was the city where the original Declaration of Independence was written. The exhibits from ongoing British colonies gave demonstration of empire solidarity, yet it was internal colonial politics, followed by colonial cost-cutting, which most substantially influenced the contributions from Australia. Firstly, Victoria had pushed to host a pre-emptive intercolonial exhibition, after which the combined colonial exhibits would be sent on to Philadelphia. According to the Victorian chief commissioner, Redmond Barry, this would convey “the characteristics of a national movement” (“Philadelphia Exhibition,” Argus [Melbourne] 30 March 1875: 7). Predictably, New South Wales dissociated itself entirely from this scheme. Secondly, since Tasmania and South Australia committed to the Melbourne exhibition, their display goods were included in the consignment leaving for Philadelphia on 13 December 1875 aboard the Skerryvore, an English vessel which happened to be available for charter and was engaged by the Victorian commission. The barque sailed via New Zealand, and Tasmanian anxieties were soon aroused by news that “a bottomry bond” was raised on her whilst there, and that “the captain had got drunk, and the original crew having run away a fresh lot of men had to be got” (Mercury [Hobart] 23 May 1876: 2). These fears proved well-founded. By the time the Skerryvore reached Cape Horn, Captain William Stoddart’s poor seamanship was obvious, and it soon became evident that his intention was to lose the ship. After several attempts to run her aground, he then tried to scuttle her by secretly drilling a hole in the hull

---

46 Bottomry was “a system of lending money to a ship owner for purposes of voyage on security of ship, lender losing the money if the ship is lost” (OED). Customarily, a master would take out such a bond as emergency funding during the course of a voyage, when the owners could not be contacted — for example, for urgent ship repairs. If the ship completed the voyage the loan was repaid, with substantial interest, or the ship was forfeited. If the ship was lost, the owner was discharged from debt.
below the waterline. Thanks to the physical efforts and continuing vigilance of the ship’s small crew and her two horrified passengers, the Skerryvore eventually reached New York, but many of the colonial exhibits stowed in the ship’s hold had been destroyed, or were badly water-damaged. What survived of these Tasmanian exhibits was resuscitated in time for display at Philadelphia. The shells had arrived “in sorry plight,” and later were included amongst the list of goods rated “Badly Damaged” (“Philadelphia Exhibition,” Mercury [Hobart] 10 Aug. 1876: 3); yet even they received polite acknowledgement by the reporter for the Philadelphia Public Ledger, who wrote: “Some of them are beautifully striped” (“The Great Exhibition,” Mercury [Hobart] 18 Jan. 1877: 3). Tasmanian exhibits won medals; useful scientific and commercial contacts were made; and overall, the colony chose to rate the Philadelphia venture as successful. As for Legrand, perhaps it was through his small contribution to this international display that his work became known to the wealthy Philadelphia conchologist, George Washington Tryon. Whatever the case, Legrand’s Collections (1871) afterwards achieved the distinction of being “noticed in

---

47 He then ordered the ship be slowed, which increased the rate of flow into the hold. When there was over seven feet of water below, members of the crew took it upon themselves to man the pumps. Their concerted efforts over two days stemmed the inward flow. After much prevarication, the captain disappeared below for some time, after which the ship no longer leaked. A candle later was found jammed in the hole (“The Skerryvore,” Argus [Melbourne] 24 July 1876: 6).

48 On his arrival, the captain was relieved of his duty and left for England, where he was taken into custody. Tried at the Exeter assizes, the evidence against him was judged as being substantial, but he escaped conviction through a technicality (“Attempt to Scuttle a British Ship,” Liverpool Mercury 23 May 1876: 7; “Devon Summer Assize,” Trewman’s Exeter Flying Post or Plymouth and Cornish Advertiser 19 July 1876: 8; Mercury [Hobart] 24 July 1876: 6, 18 Aug. 1876: 3; Argus [Melbourne] 22 Aug. 1876: 6). The Skerryvore incident had been reported internationally by such geographically distant papers as the New York Times (22 May 1876) and the New Zealand Grey River Argus (22 Aug. 1876: 2).

49 The Melbourne Argus reporter at the exhibition gave a detailed account of the articles lost or retrieved, prefaced by the statement: “Tasmania, which could ill-afford to part with exhibits, has suffered more from the Skerryvore [sic] , in proportion to the quantity of goods shipped, than the two sister colonies” (“Tasmania at the Philadelphia Exhibition,” Launceston Examiner 3 Aug. 1876: 3).

50 Detailed descriptions of the damage were reported in the Mercury along with other information, in a long-running column entitled “Philadelphia Exhibition” (for example, 5 Aug 1876: 2; 9 Aug, 1876: 3; 10 Aug. 1876: 3; and 17 April 1877: 2).
Volume III of the *Manual of Conchology*” (Hedley, “Necrology” 60), Tryon’s monumental publishing project, aimed at recording the mollusca of the world.51

Even so, the souvenirs of Legrand’s later years as a conchologist chart a scientific reputation in decline, despite the continuity of his part-time presence at the museum. Still, for the next few years he was regularly referred to in the Society’s journal — arranging and also donating shells, and later organising the library. Appreciation was expressed for his “valuable assistance in correcting the proofs of the Conchological Papers which have passed through the Press” (“Royal Society of Tasmania,” *Mercury* [Hobart] 30 January 1878: 3).52

These publications, in the main, if not entirely, were the Tasmanian papers written by Tenison Woods, some of them completed and sent back to Hobart after his departure. The galley-sheets still survive, compiled by Legrand and interlined with copious ink and pencil annotations thought to be Tenison Woods’s (but from the appearance, possibly also by one or two others), and firmly bound as one substantial volume, with a cover of thick, soft, unburnished leather.53 Clearly long valued, the volume remains part of the Society’s deposited archives at the Hobart campus of the University of Tasmania, catalogued under the joint names of author and editor (RoySocRare QL 428.T46).54 By the time Legrand was at work on these papers, his scientific network had dwindled significantly. He no longer had the opportunity of social interaction with Tenison Woods (who had left at the end of 1876), or with Atkinson (who was transferred to far north-west Tasmania in 1877). Then in 1878,

51 G. W. Tryon (1838–1888) was an influential figure, eventually conservator of the conchological section of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Sciences, and a prolific writer on his specialty. His *Manual* began appearing from 1879, and was continued after Tryon’s death by H. A. Pilsbury (Dance, *Shell Collecting* 186).


53 Pencilled inside on the back endpaper is the comment: “These are galley-sheets and possibly the corrections were made by Tenison-Woods himself. C. B. J. Nielsen — 19/3/1958.”

54 That is, as a work by Tenison Woods and Legrand. Presumably it was used as an ongoing reference, when some of the handwritten annotations may have been made. Evidence for this is an inked list from a later date pasted inside, each of the forty-three shells named ticked in green pencil, entitled: “Tasmanian Marine Shells from the North Coast. For the Royal Society Museum, Hobart. (From Miss. Lodder, Lonah, Leven, March/82).”
he lost a valued friend, ally, and occasional co-presenter through the sudden death of Morton Allport, a socially prominent figure, yet one who had encouraged Legrand’s scientific endeavours and probably advocated for him within the Society.

Evidence from the following year signals a breach between Legrand and his erstwhile conchological protégé, Petterd. Stung by perceived slights in an article by Petterd appearing in an English popular periodical, Legrand dashed off an aggrieved response published in the following issue of the same journal. The name of the accused is printed erroneously as “Mr. Pettes” (a mistake presumably occasioned by Legrand’s execrable handwriting, always worse when hurried), yet Legrand’s letter states with absolute clarity the accusation he places before the journal’s international readership. He protests that Petterd not only has dismissed Legrand’s Collections as a mere “catalogue”, but has wrongfully laid claim to discovering *H. vitrinaformis* on Mt Wellington, when in fact it was discovered (and at that, elsewhere) by a Mr. Longley, and that Legrand himself has the type shell (Legrand “Tasmanian Land Shells,” *Hardwicke’s Science-Gossip* 15 [1879]: 69–70). There seems more to this letter than meets the eye. Perhaps Legrand’s annoyance was kindled, in part, by the circumstance that this was the year in which Petterd launched a new monograph on Tasmanian land shells — a handsome volume, professionally printed. Yet petulant as Legrand sounds in the letter, he probably was as much incensed by Petterd’s inaccuracies as wounded by perceived slights. For example, earlier that same year he had referred amicably to Petterd within a concise and well-considered paper where,

---

55 As will be discussed, Petterd later (in 1888) formally acknowledged his early indebtedness to Legrand (82). Hedley writes of Petterd’s “boyhood ardent love for natural history” being “doubtless fostered by earlier association with William Legrand, the bookseller-naturalist, and with the Rev. J. E. Tenison-Woods” (“President’s Address” 7).

56 In Petterd’s defense, the shell in question was extensively, but not fully described in Collections. Legrand had noted that “[u]ntil the animal has been seen, it is impossible to determine this section. Its habitat was recorded simply as “Tasmania” and no collector’s name was given (*Helix* 58). This is not to say that later references in print, or in conversation, had not cleared up these discrepancies in the eight or more years since the publication of Collections.
amongst other things, he calmly signalled the synonymy of the subgenus *Limnæa legrandia*, named for himself (“Notes” 95, 96).\(^{57}\) Knowing the precise circumstances under which Legrand penned his hasty note to *Science-Gossip* could shed some light on his closely-guarded inner life.

For a while more, Legrand remained useful to the Tasmanian Royal Society, arranging and donating shells, and also rendering “able and zealous assistance [. . .] in re-arranging the books generally” (“Museum,” *PPRST 1879 1880*: 16). When wider access to the museum was introduced, Legrand “by his voluntary attendance [. . .] afforded material aid in keeping order in the upper rooms during the hours the Museum [. . .] [was] open to the public on Sundays” (“Museum,” *Report of the RST 1880 1881*: 5).\(^{58}\) One imagines him fiercely standing guard over the shell cases; though perhaps this was when he gave interested visitors the “conchological instruction” later acknowledged as appreciated by many. Late the following year, James Calder found him “making out a list of a lot of shells,” also describing him as “much employed at our museum” though “a ragamuffin looking fellow” (Letter to Sir George Grey, 27 November 1881, qtd. Dally 25). Not long after, Legrand apparently departed from the museum and retired from conchology.

For Legrand, as for countless others during the nineteenth century, the widespread interest in natural science had offered not only social advancement and intellectual stimulation, but also employment opportunities. To his credit, he seems to have recognised when he could no longer compete within the field of shell science, and yet also understood that his published monograph was of enduring worth. His cherished shell collection had long remained the tangible basis of his scientific credibility, an operational model typical of

\(^{57}\) As footnoted earlier in this chapter.

\(^{58}\) It already was open on weekdays, but the Sunday openings (from 2.30 – 5 p.m.) were an experiment intended to include working people, and later judged an unqualified success (“Royal Society of Tasmania,” *Mercury* [Hobart] 18 June 1881: 2).
imperial curiosity — the classic example being the vast collection of the famous English
conchologist, Hugh Cuming, the resource at the heart of much nineteenth-century research,
and of several prestigious works by others (Dance 1966). Le Grand seems to have made
strategic use of his own smaller, but widely respected colonial collection, besides allowing
scholarly access to it. Ongoing comments in the Society’s journal indicate a belief (current
for some time) that Le Grand intended to present all his shells to the Hobart museum, and this
raises a suspicion that such a floating treaty was another of the ways in which he finessed
his ex officio tenure. Yet eventually, his hoard (unlike Cuming’s) was not shepherded
towards a local institution, but was sold to a local private collector (the amateur
conchologist, C. E. Beddome) (Hedley, “Necrology” 60). The transaction possibly
represents personal pique, slights received, anxiety to preserve the integrity of the
collection’s original arrangement, satisfaction in uniting two significant Tasmanian
collections, financial desperation, or any combination of these. An overriding factor may
well have been that Le Grand held fears for the fate of his treasured shells, and saw Beddome
as a trustworthy custodian.

Le Grand’s sale of his collection seems an imperial gesture of a personal kind: an act
of formal abdication. His commitment to conchology had been a driving life force for many
years, a fact made tangible in his book. A striking feature of his preface to the September
1871 edition of Collections is the intensity of regional allegiance, and of Le Grand’s self-
identification with his project, both aspects seeping through the desiccated formality of his

59 In this book, Shell Collecting (1966), Dance devotes chapter five, “Prince of Shell Collectors”, to Cuming’s
work and influence.

60 My suspicion, as yet unproven, is that the sale took place very early in the 1880s. Beddome remained active
in the RST for many years, was heavily involved in later exhibitions, and published articles on Tasmanian
shells (a number appearing in the 1880s and 1890s).

61 It may be that Le Grand’s collection in substantial ways complemented Beddome’s. Most importantly,
Le Grand’s presumably contained many “type” shells from which were described new species mentioned in
Collections.
scientific prose — for example, in his description of Tasmania’s eighty-three distinct species as “a very respectable number considering its smallness.” Years later, Legrand clearly was gratified to receive an enquiry for Collections, and despite his astute commercial instincts and continuing straightened means, he responded regally:

The book you write for was not published for sale. No doubt the party who requires it is a collector, give me his address and I shall feel great pleasure in sending him a copy as complete as I can make it (Legrand, letter to Angus and Robertson, Hobart 21 Nov. 1889).

Legrand was justifiably proud of Collections, and the work has since acquired cultural value far beyond what its compiler could have envisaged. In addition to its significance as a pioneering census of Tasmanian molluscan species and distribution, it can be seen as a Lilliputian echo of the notions of territorial display underlying the phenomenon of the world exhibitions, events characterised by Werner Hofmann as “the nineteenth-century’s official visiting cards” (qtd. Griffiths 18). In principle, it was an ambitious work, emphatically Australian in its featuring of Australian expertise in terms of both taxonomy and scientific illustration. Still more, it was a clear and confident assertion of Tasmania’s place in the field of shell science. Sparingly, but strategically distributed throughout intercolonial, imperial, and international contexts, Collections inserted a Tasmanian text alongside the current reference works on conchology. But it did little to advance Legrand’s scientific career, and was soon eclipsed by the polished publication of the more widely experienced, and commercially successful Petterd: A Monograph of the Land Shells of Tasmania (1879).

62 Probably, Legrand also had an eye to the advantage of establishing his own direct contact with the anonymous private collector; assuredly, Angus and Robertson would be unlikely to divulge this trade secret. Was the collector in question the “the omnivorous David Scott Mitchell” (Tyrrell 51)? A photocopy of this letter held by the Mitchell Library at MLMSS 324/51: 329 carries the handwritten note: “Original in the National Library of Australia at MS 3338” (Hildebrand E-mail 29 July 2008). An ANL search through the papers of George Robertson (MS3338) did not locate the original (Karen Johnson E-mail 5 July 2010).

63 For more on Petterd, see the anonymous entry in Australian Dictionary of Biography <http://www.adbonline.anu.edu.au/biogs/A050486b.htm>.
decade on, R. M. Johnston (statistician, scientist, and Tasmanian public servant) seems clearly intent on setting the record straight in stating that Legrand’s Collections “afterwards formed the principal part of Mr. Petterd’s later monograph on the same subject” (“Provisional Aid” 58) — as, indeed, the title of Petterd’s book might suggest. Yet Legrand had been relegated to the cabinet of curiosities: fresher forces now held sway in the scientific field. Amongst these were younger contemporaries with wider experience and deeper knowledge, such as Brazier and Petterd; and also Alexander Morton, appointed curator of the Hobart museum in 1884. Brazier, who undoubtedly had known Morton previously, seems combining ingratiating towards the rising man with venom directed at Legrand when writing in 1886 as a corresponding member of the Society:

I am informed by the energetic curator, Mr. A Morton, that the shells in the Tasmanian Museum from Tasmania are simply Mollusk “Tasmania”, a very wide term. I presume that Mr. Legrand had the same idea that the late Mr. Cuming had, to destroy the correct locality, necessitating hunting the works up in which it was described before you could find the correct locality or the information, a rather roundabout way to get at the desired information.

(“Trochidae” 194)

These comments arouse suspicion. Firstly, as surely at least Morton must have known, other enthusiasts had worked on the museum’s shells since Legrand’s departure. Secondly, the words used by Brazier in belittling Legrand are clearly plagiarised from an 1867 article derogating Cuming’s labelling methods, published by J.E. Gray, Keeper of Zoology at the

---

64 Following in the pattern of Dr Cox’s conchological works, Legrand had published Catalogue, then Collections, but no final Monograph; while Petterd’s Monograph was not preceded by publication of either a Catalogue or Collections.

65 Morton had worked for the Australian Museum in Sydney since 1877, and retained close ties with it which “benefited the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery, particularly in terms of collection exchanges” (Huxley, “Courtier” 4). In Hobart, he ably ordered and catalogued the Society’s library, and extended and reclassified the museum (Mercer parag. 2).
British Museum. Though the fact presumably was unknown to Morton and to Brazier, Gray’s claims were debatable, and even had been vigorously disputed (Dance 169).

Currently, it is argued by the authoritative Dance that Gray’s wife did “more to reduce the scientific value of the [Cuming] collection than anyone else” when she removed the 83,000 specimens from Cuming’s filing system, glued them on to wooden tablets (a standard practice of the time), and allowed the labels be blown around outdoors, so that they later were affixed incorrectly (169–170). Finally, whether or not Legrand’s methods warranted criticism, Brazier’s attack is suggestive of old scores being settled, while the publication of his snide remarks in the Tasmanian Society’s widely-circulated journal suggests that Morton, as well as Brazier, had determined to extinguish Legrand’s reputation.

After a significant silence, there began to appear some print references to Legrand’s contributions to Tasmanian science. Petterd named a shell *Unio legrandi*, with the dedication: “I have embraced the opportunity of recording my obligation to Mr. Legrand for my early instruction in the study of shells” (“Contributions for a Systematic Catalogue”

---

66 J. E. Gray. “Notes on the Specimens of *Calyptraeidae* in Mr. Cuming's Collection.” *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* 47 (1867): 726–48. The words chosen by Brazier are remarkably similar to those previously used by Grey about Cuming. Perhaps it is significant that Brazier had published on Gray only the year before this attack on Legrand (*Proc. Linn. Soc. NSW* 1.10 [1885]: 85–94).

67 The controversy apparently has continued through to today. Interestingly, as regards Gray’s own methods of classification, his “species descriptions apparently were not well trusted by contemporary naturalists” (editorial footnote to letter by Charles Lyell 1–2 May 1856, *Darwin Correspondence Project Database* letter number 1862). Woodward jested to Darwin about Gray’s coining of superfluous new specific and generic names (letter 2 May 1856, *Darwin Correspondence Project Database* letter number 1864). Overall, however, Gray achievements were many and substantial (Cleevely, “Gray” parags. 6–10).

68 As described by R. J. Cleevely, Gray’s “depreciatory criticism of the Cuming collection of shells reflects haste and a lack of use of that collection, which was exacerbated by Mrs. Gray’s mishandling of it when relabelling specimens according to museum policy” (“Gray” parag. 9).

69 Brazier, whose own association with the Australian Museum had entered its “cliff-hanging” phase (Strachan 41), perhaps was courting Morton with a view to future employment. A report by Morton published in 1900 confirms my suspicion that he also was dismissive of Legrand. Firstly, while Tenison Woods (123) and Beddome (126) received glowing accolades in the paper, there is no mention of Legrand. Secondly, the years during which Legrand worked away at the museum’s shells are described as follows: “The Museum, three rooms of which had been built, contained a sufficient collection to justify in bringing into use the upper room, and various kind friends gave much time to the arrangement of the specimens in the best way then considered possible. One cannot speak of their labour with other than gratitude, even though the classification had been of primitive order” (Morton 122).
R. M. Johnston took up the cudgels for “our veteran Conchologist” in 1890, and through a nice irony of circumstance, this paper had to be read before the Society by Morton, acting as chairman (“Provisional Aid” 59). Soon afterwards, Beattie produced the photographic portrait of Legrand in clearly Cumingian pose (Fig. 5).

Yet apparently long before this resurgence of interest, Legrand had sold his shell collection to Beddome, and from then on had concentrated solely on his bookshop. But the shell-hunting does not end there. Eventually, Beddome’s collection moved overseas and was scattered, and today there remains interest in tracking down Legrand’s missing shell types. In the afterlife of his book, these specimens retain scientific relevance. Collections had many shortcomings (and later required a drastic whittling-down of its “very respectable number” of species) but it remains a substantial pioneering work, significant culturally as well as scientifically — an achievement reflecting imperial curiosity, and confident new nationalism. At the personal level, it represents the dedication, triumphs, and disappointments of a colonial autodidact.

Business as usual at Elizabeth Street

Considering Legrand’s investment of time and effort in compiling, printing, and distributing Collections, it seems remarkable that he continued to maintain a living through the bookshop. Scant evidence remains of these essential commercial activities beyond a few brief newspaper entries, an editorial note, and one letter. The Mercury’s commercial pages offer occasional glimpses: for example, Legrand imported a box of books from Melbourne (“Shipping Intelligence,” Mercury [Hobart] 19 August 1871: 2), and exported two others

Perhaps also of relevance here is that Legrand seems to have resumed some, though more distant engagement with the Society around this time: for example, donating an ornithological specimen (Mercury [Hobart] 10 Aug. 1891:4); and, as footnoted in Chapter 3, supplying a small picture on short-term loan (“Exhibition” Mercury [Hobart] 1 Oct. 1896: 2).

It went to his brother, Richard Henry Beddome, in England (Supreme Court AOT AD960/1/22: 374), whose collection (combined with that of his son-in-law, G.C. Leman) was sold by Leman’s widow to the dealer H. Fulton in 1935 (Trew 10; National Museum Wales Collection Sources A–L).
(“Shipping Intelligence,” Mercury [Hobart] 18 December 1872: 2). Interestingly, he advertised wishing to “purchase a set” of The British Controversialist, a wide-ranging monthly journal catering for earnest self-improvers, typically young working men (“Advertising,” Mercury [Hobart] 28 October 1873: 1; 29 October 1873: 1). Was Legrand’s quest on behalf of a ready customer, or was he the intended reader? Alternatively, was it simply that the Controversialist had ceased publication the previous year, elevating it to the status of collector’s item? Later, a very different advertisement informed readers that Legrand was one of two Hobart booksellers distributing a sixpenny title, Spiritual Bombshell, described as “an answer to Catholic Laymen, and exposure of the Romish apostasy” (“Advertising,” Mercury [Hobart] 26 March 1875: 1). One wonders what Legrand’s clerical conchological associates thought of his commercial involvement with this raucous advertising campaign, if they knew of it.

Highly respectable publicity would arise from the appearance of Legrand’s name in Baillière’s Tasmanian Gazetteer and Road Guide, a work being compiled by Robert Whitworth during 1876, the same year in which his two previous gazetteers (one for Queensland, another for South Australia) also were released. This project was of clear local significance: the Baillière gazetteers had the reputation of being “accepted by the public and by the legislature as standard works of reference,” and Tasmania stood to gain useful intercolonial and overseas publicity as a result of Whitworth’s attentions (“Tasmanian Gazetteer,” Mercury [Hobart] 28 December 1876: 2). The Tasmanian volume was released early in 1877, issued in “cloth, with map, price 15s.,” and as “half-bound morocco, with coloured map, 21s.” (“Advertisements,” Mercury [Hobart] 20 December 1876: 3). Legrand

---

72 It ceased publication in December 1872.

73 As with Baillière’s visit to Queensland, Whitworth’s visit to Tasmania was preceded by staccato press references to his literary and commercial works, and to his travels — for example, in the Hobart Mercury during 1876, “Advertisements,” 14 Jan.: 2; “Through the Fern,” 8 Jul.: 2; and “S. S. Otago,” 2 Sept.: 3.
was amongst the dozen private individuals whose assistance, along with that of government officials, was acknowledged in Whitworth’s “Editor’s Address” (4). He also may have met with Whitworth during the editor’s brief Tasmanian visits late in 1876.74

A glimpse of Legrand’s bookshop trade is provided by an old letter from a country customer. The item survives because, for some reason, it was tucked inside Legrand’s personal copy of Collections, where it remains to this day.75 The writer was an elderly ex-schoolmaster living at Petchey’s Bay. His taste apparently ran to historical fiction:

31st. July 1879

Mr. Legrand

These two works, returned, I had before. Send in their place two of “Dick’s English Novels”. Any will do except nos. 43 and 59, which I bought of you last December. Send one of W.H. Ainsworth if you have it.

J. Parker Spink76

Evidence of another book service offered by the auction-haunting Legrand appears in a surviving catalogue from “The Great Book Sale” held on 4 and 5 December 1879, where he is listed as one of four designated proxies “prepared to purchase lots on behalf of those persons who cannot attend the Sale” (William Burn and Son AOT NS1885/14 [a]).77 Perhaps some of Legrand’s own stock was amongst the goods proffered this auction, since

74 According to the Hobart Mercury, Whitworth called at Hobart en route to New Zealand (2 Sept. 1876: 2, 3), and later made another, longer visit “with the object of the compilation and production of the work” (“Tasmanian Gazetteer,” 28 Dec. 1876: 2). At the time, a Baillière office was listed in Murray Street.

75 In the Australian Museum reference library, as discussed earlier this chapter.

76 Spink (1822–1887) was staying at his brother’s farm near Petchey’s Bay. From there, he later applied for employment as a teacher in Tasmania (in June 1881), describing himself as born in Devonshire, formerly “head classical master at Brighton School”, England, and with later colonial experience “under the Victorian Board” between 1869 and 1876; but he was deemed “probably ineligible” for employment by the Tasmanian authorities, on the grounds of his advanced age, and his lack of primary school teaching experience (Education Dept. AOT ED2/1/581: 745).

77 The others listed were: Westcott, Beedham and Co.; J. Walch; and Walch; Best and Birchall.
seventeen days afterwards, he had removed from his Elizabeth Street shop and was already

**Legrand at his second bookshop (1880–1902)**

By now, the dapper figure captured in Winter’s photograph could be described by
James Calder as “a ragamuffin looking fellow” whose shop was “a good deal of a piece with
himself in matters of neatness” (qtd. Dally 25). Calder nevertheless respected Legrand’s
bibliographic knowledge and business efficiency, and wrote of him as “a very decent old
fellow,” though a driver of hard bargains (qtd. Dally 16). He airily surmised that Legrand
“must be a well-to-do man” (qtd. Dally 25), but this was far from the truth. In fact, financial
need was probably a motivating factor in Legrand’s sale of his shell collection soon after the
move to Collins Street.

A souvenir of Legrand’s life and career at this time is the much-reproduced
photograph of him standing alongside an aproned woman in the doorway of his new
premises (Fig 3). The image is emblematic of both his changed circumstances and the
continuing mystery of his personal life. Surely the woman in the photograph cannot be, as
generally assumed, Legrand’s wife, Bethia, absent from the records since April 1863?
Instead, might it be that the former Mary Barden, known acquaintance and known
housekeeper par excellence, was helping establish, or perhaps even maintain, some
semblance of order at Legrand’s new shop? Whether or not these two were related (as later
rumoured), Legrand had signed as witness to Mary’s 1874 marriage to Christopher Briggs,
and presumably was a friend of the couple, and possibly also of the young Finlaysons at

---

78 Burn’s catalogue listed Legrand’s current address as being still at Elizabeth Street.

79 Calder (1808–1882) was about seventy-three at the time; and Legrand, as far as we know, was therefore at
least eight, and perhaps even twelve years younger. Judging by other examples of Calder’s writing, his use of
the term “old” seems in general to refer (favourably) to the fact of a particular subject’s long colonial
residence.
whose home the wedding took place. Then again, might a likely contender for the role of aproned companion be another of the Finlaysons, the young widow, Sarah Lucas? Married in the same year as the Brigges, and as also her brother and her recently-widowed father, she had lost her husband in difficult circumstances only four years later, and apparently was not financially provided for. She probably was the Mrs. Lucas, laundress, listed in 1886 at 29 Argyle Street, an address just around the corner from Legrand’s new shop (Middleton and Maning 146), and she certainly was the person named as sole legatee in his Will, drawn up during the depression year of 1892 (Supreme Court AOT AD960/25: 383). The content and timing of this legal document may reflect Legrand’s response to Finlayson senior’s recent death, leaving a second wife and seven young children to be provided for ahead of Sarah. Though the full extent of Legrand’s relationship with the Finlaysons may never be known, there is sufficient evidence to suggest at least a family friendship of continuing significance.

80 On 1 Oct. 1874, Mary Barden, described as a schoolmistress and as widowed, was married to the twice-widowed Briggs, farmer, of Kingston, by Primitive Methodist rites at the Bathurst Street home of the newly-married Andrew Finlayson junior (Methodist Church in Tasmania: Hobart Circuit — Marriage Register (Primitive Methodists) AOT NS499/1/385:100). Also signing as witness was Emma Davis, a cousin of the young Mrs. Finlayson (née Sarah Rayner), daughter of Charles Davis (a successful, philanthropic, and highly respected Elizabeth Street businessman who had risen well above his convict past).

81 Sarah Lucas (1856–1931) would be aged about thirty at the time the photograph was taken. Her husband, Captain Joseph Lucas (1837–1878), member of an old Tasmanian seafaring family and master of the prestigious Hobart whaler, Emily Downing, died of accidental chlorodyne overdose aged forty-one (“Sudden Death.” Tasmanian Mail 16 Feb. 1878: 13; Supreme Court (Registrar’s Office) AOT SC195/1/59: 7930). Though evidence exists that Sarah had, and still later maintained, close ties with her father’s second family, Finlayson’s prolonged final illness, together with the prevailing economic times, would suggest his immediate dependants faced financial hardship.

82 She seems very likely to have been the Mrs. Lucas listed in 1904 as running a boarding house at 49a Patrick Street. It was a respectable address, and several well-known central city business persons lived close by. Certainly, the Sarah Lucas named as Legrand’s beneficiary ran a boarding house at Bellerive from at least 1918 until around the time of her death in 1930.

83 Finlayson died late in 1891, and Legrand’s Will was drawn up 29 Nov. 1892. Whether or not Legrand ever considered Mary Briggs (formerly Barden) or her daughter, Sarah Templeman, as potentially eligible beneficiaries remains an interesting question. These two women apparently were in fairly stable financial positions at the time.
Legrand had moved around the corner from the old Elizabeth Street shop, to the northwest-facing side of the same city block, close by the Argyle Street corner. His new shop faced the former premises of a well-remembered Hobart bookseller, the quietly respectable William Westcott, credited with having established the city’s first bookshop (in 1844, some way up Argyle Street). Westcott’s business, including its longstanding circulating library, had devolved to a nephew and been further diversified by the time Legrand settled in Collins Street. Before long, Burn and Son were auctioning off stock at the Wescott premises, with Legrand once again ready “to purchase Lots on behalf of those unable to attend” (William Burn and Son catalogue AOT NS 1885/1/22) (Fig. 18).

Meanwhile, Hobart’s major book business, J. Walch and Sons, another long-established firm, continued to flourish and expand. It carried a wide array of stock, including a few secondhand books, and also works produced by its own printing division. Overall, it was a dignified and family-oriented establishment, contrasting in every possible way with Legrand’s dim and increasingly cluttered cavern of antiquities. Yet Legrand had cornered a niche market, and remained in business at Collins Street for more than twenty-two years. As before, he occupied rented premises in an old building of varied commercial history. His shop was at the southernmost end of an L-shaped complex which followed the angle of the street corner, on part of an original allotment granted to John Ingle (Fig.14). Behind this shallow outer building, a larger complex apparently occupied the site, having one shop

---

84 An even earlier Hobart bookshop had been opened in 1836 by Samuel Tegg, but was a colonial branch of his father’s London firm. William Francis John Westcott (1814–1876) arrived at Hobart in 1841, contracted to Alexander Frazer as a coach maker, but set up as a bookseller once his contract was fulfilled (“Death of Mr. Westcott,” Mercury [Hobart] 15 July 1876: 2). His first bookshop premises are shown, in a later derelict condition, in the Beattie photograph Early Bookseller’s Shop, Hobart Town.

85 The Walch family bought Tegg’s business in 1846, rebuilt, and also expanded to additional premises. The firm imported books; it sold stationary, sporting goods, and pianos; and it published other works besides its well known almanacs (Walch 378).

86 For some time, the successful corn dealer and commission agent Alexander Gellie had business premises on this corner, and later it was a “Furniture Bazaar” opened by Henry Ikin, who also offered for hire a “superior hearse, with plumes [. . .] and a mourning coach” (Courier [Hobart] 15 July 1854: 4).
entrance part-way down Argyle Street. A private carriageway beside Legrand’s ground floor portion and straddled by one of his upstairs rooms allowed vehicle access to the inner court. Tracing Legrand’s Collins Street tenancy is complicated by changes to the street numbering and variations of interpretation within contemporary directories, but he seems to have leased two portions of the complex for a short while, though generally to have occupied only the southernmost part. By the time he and his aproned companion were photographed outside these premises, his address was firmly established as 60 Collins Street. Its immediate locality was unpretentious and commercial. For many years, the portion of the building nearest Legrand was occupied by a boot maker, while a permanent near neighbour was William Mangan, a mattress maker, whose business eventually expanded to occupy most of the complex. Next door in the other direction, and of much strategic advantage to Legrand, were two separate auction marts. As previously, Burn’s auction rooms were close by.

Despite the threadbare respectability of the 1880s Collins Street photograph, other images of Legrand taken around this time display him as a raffish shell-hunter (Fig. 4), and as a clown (Fig. 6, Fig. 8). Were these attempts to represent his many-sidedness, or was the

---

87 A later description of Legrand’s Collins Street shop suggests that upstairs, the building was two rooms deep, from front to back (Daily Telegraph [Launceston] 2 Jul. 1902: 3). No. 16 Argyle Street was apparently one entrance to the inner complex behind the buildings of the street corner façade.

88 Whether or not the carriageway was used as such in Legrand’s day is uncertain. At the time, it may have been used as a storage area, hidden away behind the large street doors visible in Fig. 3.

89 This tallies with Legrand’s listing in the 1886 Middleton and Maning directory (145), the same edition which shows Mrs. Lucas, laundress, at 29 Argyle Street (146).

90 Mangan originally worked in association with the colourful French-born Fortuné Guillois (1799–1886) but later took over at the same premises on his own account. Had Legrand’s exotic mannerisms been modelled on a Hobart acquaintance, Guillois would seem a likely candidate. He had arrived as a convict in 1819, remained frequently in trouble, and was further sentenced to Port Arthur (where, perhaps, he learnt the mattress-making); but by 1854 he was in business in Argyle Street. He left an elaborate Will, including a few bequests to members of the Mangan family, and others to various representatives of the Catholic Church in Hobart. His property was declared for probate as not exceeding £467 in value (Supreme Court AOT AD/960/1/14: 463).

91 Next door was G. S. Crouch’s mart, followed by the mart of Brent and Westbrook. Burn’s mart was only a little further along Collins Street.
intention to publicise his eccentricity? Certainly, the mystique of the cluttered bookshop and its idiosyncratic proprietor can be seen to have helped, rather than hindered, Legrand’s growing reputation as an antiquarian. In this role, as in other areas of his colonial career, there seems evidence of his sharp wits and tactical versatility. Whatever his early background, Legrand clearly was a survivor.

Just as the focus on collecting, classifying, and collating which characterised imperial inquisitiveness was the basis of Legrand’s conchology, so it appears the basis of his bookshop career. Yet though he had a quick eye for rare items, he also accommodated a vast amount of stock seen by others as well-nigh worthless. Some of this clutter probably accumulated incidentally: a contemporary anecdote tells of Legrand countering protest at his high prices with the rejoinder that he often had to purchase a quantity of rubbish at auction to get an item or two of value from the bundled lots. Still, he was innately a collector: other tales describe his apparent indifference as to whether or not he sold his books, and also his “choosiness” as regards customers ─ relinquishing willingly to one what he had refused to sell another.\(^2\)

Undoubtedly, Legrand was attached to his hoard, and territorial about it; but the enduring image of the ancient bookworm contentedly pottering amidst his wares is highly romanticised. Legrand’s career as antiquarian bookseller, like his conchology, is usefully considered in terms of the cultural and intellectual industries of imperialism, especially as regards his trade in Australiana. The collection of historical artifacts is, after all, arguably a form of the imperial sport, and furthermore acquires additional imperial overtones within a colonial setting. For various reasons, certain types of quarry sought by specialist book-hunters were in short supply in nineteenth-century Hobart, so that Legrand’s overstocked

\(^2\) The choosiness been interpreted by others as a bibliophile’s response to philistinism. Yet it may also, or alternatively, indicate defensiveness, irritability, a tendency to bear grudges; or it even may have been a canny commercial strategy. From what is currently known of Legrand, any or all would seem possible.
premises proved irresistible territory to many. The bookshop developed complex
connexions with imperial culture through the types of stock it accumulated, and the
interests and agenda of its customers. A handful of surviving contemporary accounts convey
vivid impressions of book-hunting at Legrand’s.

The least appreciative view comes from the letter of a Hobart bibliophile and
amateur historian, James Backhouse Walker, in which he describes an unnamed bookseller
identifiably Legrand (Dally 12).93 It is an informal personal communication; yet even
allowing for playful hyperbole, the rhetoric connects in interesting ways with tropes of
imperial culture.94 The metaphor of the hunt predominates, and class divisions within book-
hunting are evident. Griffiths’ premise that “the boisterous use of hunting metaphors helped
distinguish collecting, a ‘manly’ pursuit, from ‘gathering’, [. . .] a feminine task” (20) has
apparent application here, where a keen hunter seeks membership of a London-based hunt
which will save him from passive reliance on a limited and distasteful local alternative. The
writer complains that the colonies offer “a barren field to the book-hunter,” in Hobart “the
pursuit [being] almost unknown” (qtd. Dally 11). He seeks bibliographic support from a
cultural mentor in London, so as to escape the clutches of Hobart’s only “dealer in old
books, who has collected into his den a large stock in a state of utter disorder” (qtd. Dally
11). The dealer is described as both socially distasteful and a hazard to the hunter. He is a
typical “book-stall man”, dirty and grasping, knowledgeable and cunning, who demands
“the most outrageous prices for any book [. . .] you have a weakness for” (qtd. Dally 11).
The writer “has come to look upon him as [a] natural enemy” (qtd. Dally 11), and sees

93 The original letter from which Dally quotes is in the Walker papers, University of Tasmania Deposited
Archives, Morris Miller Library W9/C2/3.

94 I remain of this opinion, despite evidence that the mock-heroic may well have been commonly used amongst
Reed’s circle of friends. For example, published as a memorial to Reed is a farewell letter written by him in
October 1893 to London friends, each paragraph sustaining a separate different metaphor in parody of one of
several individual generic types. In this, Reed refers to himself in the final stage of his decline as being in
search of “the coy nymph, ‘Health’ by name, [. . .] but the wanton comes and goes” (Sime xxiii).
guidance from the London mentor as “a means of escape from the old harpy” (Walker. Letter to Talbot Baines Reed, 20 April 1883).

A more flattering portrait emerges from the series of letters written between 14 July 1881 and February 1882 by James Calder to Sir George Grey, published a century later in Bibliophile and Bibliopole. These accounts express the views of a retired servant of Empire genuinely appreciative of Legrand’s ability to track down rare and desirable historical material, though it also must be added that Calder seems anxious to present Legrand in as respectable a light as possible. The correspondence represents a specialised version of imperial hunting: archival collection. Moreover, the particular quarry sought was material relating to a politically imperial past personally and professionally relevant to both hunters. Grey, a noted bibliophile, accumulated two vast and valuable collections during his lifetime, and in this particular exercise of imperial acquisitiveness was pursuing materials relating to Tasmania’s early settlement. Calder, a keen amateur historian acting as facilitator, promptly called in Legrand. As designated supplier, Legrand played a central role in this hunt for imperial artifacts, and no doubt was disappointed that Grey took far fewer items than he could offer (Fig. 19). Calder’s invaluable letters contain his own views on a range of

---

95 Dally’s book contains a long excerpt from Walker’s letter (Dally 11–12), though not the passage quoted above which describes Legrand as a harpy.

96 In addition to Calder’s delight in the project and in his contact with an old Sandhurst contemporary, class and territorial issues are clearly significant within the letters. Grey was the younger, but had considerable seniority as regards career, social position, and wealth. The dynamics of the correspondence, and also the question of whether Grey was seeking Tasmanian materials for any specific reason, are interesting issues. There is a clearly rhetorical element to Calder’s descriptions of Legrand as of unacceptably shabby appearance but of acknowledged sagacity, and (mirroring Calder’s own response to Grey’s request) as capable of exemplary promptitude in responding to orders, locating requirements, and forwarding goods to headquarters.

97 In the letters, Calder refers a number of times to his own expertise in matters of colonial history, expanding upon his initial theme: “[O]f the details of old historical incidents, which neither West or any writer, has done more than just touch upon, I have myself published in our papers quite as much as would fill a couple of good sized volumes” (qtd. Dally 14). He included some of these papers amongst the consignment to Grey, while the Hobart bookseller, Charles Walch, also donated a rare volume (Dally 37; Kerr 228).

98 Grey ordered only nineteen of the eighty books listed by Legrand (Kerr 227; Calder, Grey Letters 58–59). Digital images of Legrand’s original lists of the books offered Grey will shortly be accessible online, along with the other pages of the Grey Letters, as part of the Sir George Grey Special Collections material currently being photographed as an Auckland Public Libraries digitisation project.
matters, together with Legrand’s itemised lists, and vividly capture the hunt for early colonial print materials at what must have seemed a critical point in time. By then, the desired items were scarce and scattered, the collectors themselves were elderly, public attitudes were changing as regards the past the purchasers recalled and wanted clearly documented, and Grey’s project offered the means of ensuring an archive for the future.

A later account of Legrand’s business dealings offers a glimpse of imperial curiosity made literal: the royal family and its entourage as hunters and collectors. In 1901, during the official Federation visit to Hobart of the Duke and Duchess of York, Legrand received socially eminent visitors, the Duke of Roxburghe and Sir Charles Cust, members of the duke’s personal staff. These “distinguished book-hunters” drawn to the wilds of the Collins Street shop reportedly were “interested in old works, papers, etc. [and] [. . .] remained in Mr. Legrand’s establishment for some time inspecting the large and interesting collection of works, and making several purchases.” (Mercury [Hobart] 9 July 1901: 2). We are left wondering as to what trophies and what impressions they took away. Naturally, the sport at Legrand’s was a minor affair compared with an earlier event, “The Royal Shooting Trip,” in reporting which the Mercury listed the types and quantities of live game shot by the individual members of the royal party (18 May 1901: 4). Yet since it is common knowledge that the royal duke devoted the sea-journey from Australia to Canada to working on his philately collection, there seems at least a possibility that Legrand’s trade stock of pre-

---

99 Calder annotated these lists, noting: “I have been obliged to take his list down to him, to get him to decypher [sic] many of his illegible words, and have written such as he meant to use, under his scrawls. I wrote in pencil in his shop, and inked them in afterwards” (Dally 20). Grey added further annotations to the lists, adding either a “W” or a stroke against titles he was willing to buy, and then returned them to Calder.

100 At the time, Grey (1812–1898) was negotiating the intended donation of his second large personal collection to provide the foundation of a free public library in Auckland, New Zealand (Kerr 205). Calder died less than a fortnight after writing the last of his letters to Grey (Dally 36).
Federation postage stamps may have been one focus of interest for the “distinguished book-hunters.”

One legacy of Tasmania’s imperial past was that large quantities of early records of the penal era and other such memorabilia were later deliberately destroyed. Some found their way, by various routes, into the hands of private collectors or of mainland institutions interested in collecting Australiana (Biskup 51). Appalling as this dispersal later would seem to many history-minded Tasmanians, it at least preserved many items which otherwise would have become landfill or been dumped mid-channel in the Derwent. Legrand’s trade in early colonial materials belongs to this era of purposeful forgetting, as do his recorded dealings with the newly-founded Sydney firm of Angus and Robertson, agents for the wealthy bibliophile, “the omnivorous David Scott Mitchell” (Biskup 51). The veteran bookseller James Tyrrell has pinpointed 1887 as the year when Mitchell focussed his collecting gaze on Australiana (121). Thereafter, “George Robertson, and later Fred Wymark, travelled many thousands of miles and searched the world for rare items for [him]” (122). These travels included at least two visits to inspect Legrand’s hoard, one made during his lifetime.

Four surviving letters written by Legrand provide glimpses of his association with the firm of Angus and Robertson, with Robertson in person, and with the Hobart-based photographer-collector, J.W. Beattie. They are also revealing about Legrand himself. The first of these, as already discussed, concerned the firm’s enquiry after a

---

101 Biskup describes one known “clean-up” of imperial records (1888–1890) during which unwanted material was sewn up in sacks and tossed overboard in the Derwent (50–51), though his article focusses primarily on later, individual profiteering through dispersals of Tasmanian archival material.

102 Tyrrell (1875–1961) was an Angus and Robertson employee at the time.

103 Beattie was actively engaged in promoting Tasmanian history at this time. A fourth letter by Legrand to Angus and Robertson, written earlier (1889) in response to an enquiry about Collections, has previously been discussed in this chapter.
copy of Collections. It was carefully worded, and Legrand’s use of pre-printed personal stationary suggests that he felt at least some degree of business confidence during the 1880s. Quite possibly, he had printed the stationary himself.  

A few years later, Legrand was writing from Brown’s River, where he was convalescing after a bout of influenza. (Was he staying at the Kingston boarding house run by the now-widowed Sarah Briggs?) Responding to a query by Angus and Robertson about an evident short order, he apologised for the omission and for the fact that it would be “2 weeks or more” before he could send on the missing item (Legrand. Letter to Messrs. Angus and Robertson, 14 May 1895 [?]). It seems that the matter of the missing stock bothered Legrand. Only five days later, he had “come up to town for a day to put [things in] shape & take the opportunity of enclosing parcel in Mr. Beattie’s” (Legrand. Letter to Mr. Robertson, 19 May 1895 [?]). He presumably travelled up by coach, a journey of twenty-two miles, and the particularly haphazard handwriting in the letter suggests not only haste, but also that he probably still was unwell. Even so, quick as ever to defend his reputation, Legrand contrives to implicate Robertson in the original error, and somewhat pointedly reminds him of having omitted to respond to an earlier book enquiry of Legrand’s. Yet alongside Legrand’s clear resolve to maintain his reputation for reliability, there is also a pleasant informality within the letter which suggests genuine rapport between these two apposite bookmen. Brief as it is, the letter provides telling details about Legrand, his business interests, and his way of expressing himself (including colloquialisms, grammatical

104 Two different fonts were used for the printed heading, which reads: “W. LEGRAND,/ 60 COLLINS STREET,/ Hobart, ……………..188.”

105 Legrand’s handwriting here is so difficult to decipher that the date recorded may well be 1893. In the opinion of the State Library of New South Wales librarian consulted, neither date (1895 or 1893) should be quoted as definite (Hildebrand E-mail to the author 29 July 2008).

106 See previous footnote as regards indecision as to the actual year of writing. If read in the context of the fourth letter (clearly dated as 1895) this and the preceding letter of dubious date form a logical sequence, suggesting 1895 as the likelier date, though not ruling out 1893.
usage, and erratic punctuation). Addressing Robertson as “Dear Sir,” he issues his mild reproach ahead of the other content:

[...] I think that you yourself was partly to blame respecting [the]
Tas[manian] fl[?] I found them under the table on the framed pictures
Together with numbers of VDL Magazines and of Walches Directory which I
Send [you] I send also a few odds & ends I picked out of a lot bought since
You was here I am off again to Coast this afternoon. I have had wretched
weather [?] before it is now fine and hope a few more days will put me on my
legs again
Had I intended to undersupply (for want of a better word) it is not likely I
should have taken a thing likely to be missed I hope you will take my
assurance that I intended nothing of the sort
I have not heard from Hull as yet
Had or have you either of the three books I asked you for
Marlowe’s Faust
Dr Morgan [?] Trigonometry
Somesechim [?] Arithmetic
Remember me to Mr. Angus & with all good wishes & apology for the
omission
I Remain
Yours very truly
W Legrand.

107 Arthur Francis Bassett Hull (1862–1945), public servant, naturalist, and possessor of significant expertise in philately, had moved from Hobart to Sydney in 1892 (Kloot parag. 6, 3). Vintage stamps were perhaps one relevant thread of interest here. According to Mackay, Hull’s “fine accumulation” of early Tasmanian stamps, together with the collections of Beddome and Petterd were purchased by Marcellus P. Castle, owner of the world’s most comprehensive collection of Australian stamps; Castle then sold his collection to Stanley Gibbons Ltd. for a record sum in October 1894 (10).
Later, a fourth letter from Legrand to Angus and Robertson shows that he now had forwarded “medals &c.,” together with “what more bulletins” he could find, and also an undisclosed manuscript, of which he wrote: “I hope this MS may turn out right I have little fears for the result” (Legrand, letter to Angus and Robertson 11 October 1895).

As reported by the Hobart *Mercury*, Legrand derived satisfaction from this aspect of his antiquarian career, and described himself as having “done a great deal of business in connection with colonial publications, old newspapers, prints, manuscripts, and magazines of all sorts, especially containing references to the earlier history of these colonies” (“A Well-known Hobartian”). Yet it seems fitting that the last of Legrand’s known surviving letters is a brief response to an enquiry about Tasmanian conchology papers from the 1870s (Legrand. Letter to Mr. Hedley, 13 November 1901).108 The letter is on thick, pale blue stationery, neatly folded. Legrand’s handwriting is significantly firmer and neater here than any of the other letters which survive. Clearly, this was a considered text, and it seems logical to assume that Legrand found pleasure in once again being consulted on matters conchological.

Suddenly, only six months later, “Legrand’s illness closed up his bookshop” (*Critic* [Hobart] 24 January 1919 NS 26/21/1: 203). The Melbourne *Argus* was quick to report that Legrand was “in a dying condition at the [Hobart] hospital, having been found lying unconscious in his shop” (26 May 1902: 6). The Launceston * Examiner*’s report of the event was clear and precise. On Sunday afternoon, 25 May:

Sub-Inspector Kemp [. . .] received information that Mr. Legrand was lying on the floor of his shop in Collins-street in an unconscious condition. Mr. Kemp immediately procured a cab and conveyed the patient to the hospital

---

108 When examined, the letter was placed loosely inside Hedley’s personal copy of *Collections*, now held in the Australian Museum reference collection.
where he was detained. [. . .]. [Next morning] it was learned that there was no improvement in his condition, and he remained in a semi-conscious state.”

(“Hospital Items,” 26 May 1902: 6)

Later, having rallied somewhat, Legrand insisted that an intruder must have overpowered him with chloroform, and that £40 was missing from the shop premises; but the official diagnosis was that he was “suffering from general break up of the constitution, he having attained the great age of 84 years” (“A Well-known Hobartian.” Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5.). While Legrand lay in hospital, there were contrasting newspapers comments about his state. The ever-sympathetic Mercury spoke of him as a continuing presence: “one of Hobart’s old, industrious and respected citizens,” still possessed of his faculties and custodian of a book collection numbering “about 80,000 volumes.” The writer expressed the earnest hope that “the remainder of the old gentleman’s declining days might be made more comfortable” (“A Well-known Hobartian” Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5). The more cynical Critic focussed with relish on the anticipated auction of Legrand’s hoard, stating that “the old book-worm” was “lying in the Hobart Hospital and it is hardly likely that he will ever emerge from that institution alive” (21 June 1902: n.pag.).

After three weeks in hospital care, Legrand was transferred to the Charitable Institution at New Town, where he died a fortnight later, on 1 July 1902. He was brought back to Hobart for burial at the Cornelian Bay general cemetery. Though the end clearly was expected, the funeral seems to have been a hurried affair. It took place the day after Legrand’s death, commencing at 2.30pm. Perfunctory advertisement of the event appeared in that same day’s paper with the advice that “friends are invited to attend”: seemingly short

109 Legrand’s death certificate records his age as being eighty-six.

110 Tasmanian Mail 5 July 1902: 30; RGD Tasmania: 683/1902.
notice to anyone not closely in touch with the progress of Legrand’s final decline (Mercury [Hobart] 2 July 1902: 1). The funeral arrangements were simple and frugal, with the Presbyterian minister John Symington Buntine officiating, and William Burn, auctioneer, as legal executor.\textsuperscript{111} Legrand was buried somewhere in the cemetery section designated “Free Scotland D,” in a reopened private grave, the exact location of which is not on record.\textsuperscript{112} For all his long, useful, and colourful Tasmanian career, he departed the Hobart community as unobtrusively as he had first joined it forty-six years earlier. In part, this was because Legrand had led an increasingly secluded life at the shop during his last years; partly, it was because admission to the charitable institution was effectively a passport to oblivion.

Yet before long, through the ongoing lives of various material objects left behind, in particular the photographs and the reminiscences of his memorialists, Legrand’s reputation was reinvigorated, and he entered into social and cultural memory as the iconic figure still recognised today. This transformation is the subject of the following chapter.

\textsuperscript{111} The recorded costs were: a cemetery charge of twenty shillings, two cabs (presumably for the official mourners) hired at a cost of sixteen shillings, and the residue of the account (£1.14.0) presumably covering the undertaker’s fee (TFHS Alex Clark and Son Accounts Books 5/323).

CHAPTER 6: Afterlives

Even before Legrand had breathed his last, local newspapers began circulating information known, believed, or rumoured about his life and career. Of the immediate contemporary responses to Legrand’s dying and death, the known written texts amount to a couple of newspaper items, an array of obituary comments, and two articles describing the auctioning of his effects. Apocryphal as some of the recorded anecdotes seem, these memorial texts are a significant component of the Legrand archive. In their ongoing public lives, they have merged with the best-known of the earlier photographic portraits to produce the elaborated version of the iconic figure culturally present today.

Other “things” associated with the historical Legrand also have afterlives: in particular, his published work on shells, and (more nebulously) speculation about his origins and actual identity, questions about the true value of his finally dispersed possessions, and lingering curiosity as to the whereabouts of his scattered shells. Busiest of all is the ongoing life of the iconic figure represented by the three popular photographic images, which continues to be used for various social and cultural purposes. Mostly, these appearances are in character with the life and career of the historical figure — for example, promoting the interests of booksellers and antiquarians, and encouraging the Tasmanian tourist trade. Yet the same iconic figure has been used differently in Christopher Koch’s novel, Out of Ireland (1999), where images and anecdotes associated with the historical Legrand have been cut loose from their original sources to perform roles of literary illusion. With only slight adaptations, they inspire a central character of the novel, and provide important elements of its setting, structure, and plot. Even so, a nice irony arises inadvertently from the novel’s reversal of one aspect of the historical Legrand’s modus operandi: whereas in life the

---

1 Uses discussed in Chapter 1.
historical figure adopted fictitious personas as cover for his “real” self, in the novel the material representations of the historical figure have been adopted to clothe a fictional one.

This final chapter of the thesis examines a varied range of the afterlives of “things” linked to Legrand’s life and career. It looks first at the chronology of events and commentary leading up to the dispersal of his long-accumulated hoard, and at a range of opinions about Legrand expressed at the time. Surviving written accounts are compared with each other and with evidence from elsewhere, and also considered in terms of various contextual factors which may have influenced them. Secondly, the chapter traces subsequent evocations of Legrand’s name, and also the travels of his personal copy of Collections. Thirdly, note is made of the literary afterlife of the iconic figure of Legrand, with discussion of the use of the associated images and anecdotes as raw material in Koch’s prize-winning historical novel. Finally, the chapter draws conclusions as to possible reasons for the ongoing widespread appeal of the iconic figure of Legrand, and for the continuing interest in the historical identity behind this enduring presence. In discussing Koch’s use of the Legrand materials, I draw on critical works by Linda Hutcheon, by Noel Henricksen, and by Jean-François Vernay. Discussion of the continuing appeal of certain representations of Legrand draws substantially on critical work by Jennifer Green-Lewis, by Donald Sassoon, and by Roland Barthes.

*The end of an era*

The sorting of Legrand’s effects for auction apparently began soon after his removal to hospital, presumably on the authority of his executor, William Burn, auctioneer. Newspaper comment about Legrand and his shop, shortly followed by the obituary tributes, appeared in the two months between 26 May and 29 July 1902. These contemporary opinions and anecdotes clearly are tempered by the personalities of the various writers as

---

well as by mores of the times. Firstly, the loyal Hobart Mercury and its subsidiary, the Tasmanian Mail, respectfully detailed Legrand’s decline and provided biographical details of credit to him. Legrand was described as “one of Hobart’s old, industrious, and respected citizens” (Mercury [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5), and as “a dealer in, and a collector of works of all kinds, old prints, manuscripts, and other literary curiosities, of which he was a very good judge, having had an excellent literary and commercial education” (Tasmanian Mail 5 July 1902: 30).³

In sharp contrast were the jocular tone and sharp focus on Legrand’s shop contents expressed in the Hobart Critic and the Launceston Daily Telegraph. As earlier mentioned, both articles very probably were composed by the Hobart-based journalist, A.W. Hume. The first appeared ten days before Legrand’s death, after the writer’s visit inside the closed-up shop. He reported that the contents would be auctioned later that year, that “an expert in the library field [had] taken upon himself the task of arranging the library and cataloguing it for sale,” and that the person in question felt it would be impossible to sort the chaotic quantity of goods within the confines of “the pokey shop” (Critic 21 June 1902, Hume Historical Records Volume 6: 220). The second article appeared in a Launceston paper on the day of Legrand’s burial. It repeated and elaborated the Critic piece, but additionally provided a graphic tour of the closed bookshop.⁴ According to the writer, even “the old man’s bedroom had all its wall-space packed with the products of the brains of various authors, some of which were buried out of sight by works of art and smoke-begrimed prints of uncertain age” (Daily Telegraph [Launceston] 2 July 1902: 3). The description seems to hint, as other writers soon went so far as to state, that Legrand’s interest in books was acquisitive and superficial rather than intellectual. These opinions may well have been based on

³ Other comments from the Mercury article were discussed in Chapter 2.

⁴ A longer extract of this Daily Telegraph article appears in Chapter 1.
observation, but may be just as much a reflection of the authorial stance taken, whether legitimate or merely a sign of the persona a given writer wished to project. What several memorial statements have in common is the air of the gentlemanly reader pronouncing upon the more lowly status of Legrand, whether alluded to as self-improver, sharp-eyed dealer, or compulsive hoarder. Yet read a century later, the dismissive passage from the Daily Telegraph cited above can evoke an image of Legrand, the voracious reader, poring over his books by candlelight. More prosaically, other information in the same article corroborates contemporary comments gleaned elsewhere about Legrand’s purchasing habits: according to an auctioneer acquaintance, he would buy a whole “lot” at auction simply to acquire a certain volume, thus accumulating vast quantities of surplus stock, mostly worthless.

These first four articles soon were followed by an array of obituary tributes, some including reproductions of Beattie’s “bookseller” photograph (Fig. 1). Many of the memorial accounts attempt to qualify the exact nature of Legrand’s bibliographic knowledge, and they also refer to his alleged former connections with literary celebrities. Six of the articles stand out as particularly informative, both as representations of Legrand and as revealing traces of authorial bias.

Firstly, the writer for the Hobart Clipper assumed a lofty literary stance, assessing Legrand’s book knowledge as “mainly from the outside. He was a connoisseur of bindings, an amateur of rare editions” (5 July 1902: n. pag.). At the same time, the writer’s mention of having heard Legrand reminiscence about literary luminaries, and the appreciative description of Legrand’s differential treatment of customers both manage to convey the impression that the memorialist himself had been a favoured visitor at the bookshop.

---

5 These anecdotal claims have been discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

6 Further details of this account are given in Chapter 2.
Next was Charles Hedley, writing for a specialised audience of fellow naturalists. He gave a short but careful summary of Legrand’s main contributions to shell science and also the information that Legrand’s shell collection had passed to Beddome (“Necrology” 60). By this time, few amongst the wider public recalled Legrand’s conchology career (which, after all, had drawn to a close two decades earlier), though the Mercury tribute had generalised vaguely that “for a great many years he [Legrand] had corresponded with learned men all over the world, especially with Professors of Universities, officials of numerous Governments, antiquarians, [and] scientists” (16 June 1902: 5).

The Sydney Bulletin presented further detail, some incorrect, and in overall irreverent, jocular style:

That musty old Hobart book-dealer, Legrand, died the other day at his gloomy shop, and a BULLETIN man sends some interesting matter about him. The ancient, by the way, attributed his fatal illness to having been chloroformed by a burglar who robbed him of £40, but this is set down as a delusion, senile decay being generally accepted as the cause of the veteran’s going off. (Bulletin 19 July 1902: 15)

There followed the obituary proper, sent by a correspondent with an apparently literary bent. Whether by accident or design, the piece adopted scientific parlance in farewelling the deceased bookseller as “Legrand of Hobart, the last perfect specimen of his type in the Australias.” It artfully differentiated the subject’s work, interests, and possessions: he had

---

7 The passage is discussed more fully in Chapter 5.

8 As discussed elsewhere, Legrand died at the New Town Charitable Institution five weeks after his collapse at the shop. His notion of having been chloroformed and robbed may be yet another reflection of Legrand’s earlier reading, since references to criminal uses of this substance were topical during his later London days (Snow, “Alleged Employment” 327) and remained a popular fiction later still. Though Legrand clearly was in error as to what rendered him unconscious, it would be interesting to know whether in fact money had gone missing from the shop.

9 As discussed in Chapter 2, the correspondent may have been the writer Frank Morton.
been “book-buyer and book-seller; but first and foremost always, book-lover,” whilst his “book-collection was mainly Bibliomania.” The obituary developed as a fulsomely sympathetic account, accepting of Legrand’s personal reminiscences about literary acquaintances and rising to flights of romantic description (perhaps in defense of the subject?) when alluding to the grimy condition of the bookseller and his hoard. Legrand had been:

a remarkable man, a man good to know in the midst of this perverse and arid generation. He was a survival of the days when men, greatly perfumed and be-ringed, unanimously bore testimony to the nastiness of cold water and the foolishness of over-ventilation. During his Tasmanian decades Legrand, immured among his mostly-rubbishy books, grew dingier and dingier. The dust of the outer world crept in, and entering into undisturbed partnership with the dust of heaped-up volumes in decay, constantly intensified the dusty murk of the place. And this same dust circled about Legrand and seasoned him, being never disturbed by moisture from without. But there was a shrewd and kindly old wayfarer beneath the grime, a strayed reveller from the wider world, a lover of light and a hater of the Philistines. (Bulletin 19 July 1902: 15)

Last to appear was the tribute by “J. L. F.” published in the Hobart Mercury, as a long feature article entitled, “Saved from the Burning: Two Old Plays.” It signals the memorialist’s literary interests and features his own friendship with the then newsworthy journalist and entrepreneur, R. S. Smythe. At the same time, it expresses appreciation of Legrand’s book knowledge and the presence of significant rare print items amongst his

---

10 The identity of J. L. F. is currently unknown, but the article gives an impression that he had lived at Grangegorman, near Dublin. Other articles written by him indicate that he began his working life as a Melbourne journalist and was associated with early members of the Yorick club founded by Marcus Clarke and others.
One passage in this article is particularly interesting as a possible precursor to Koch’s much later novelistic rendition of the iconic bookshop. In remembering Legrand, J. L. F. recalled:

the romance of book-buying in that dingy, mysterious-looking store in Collins Street, which always seemed to be out of place in a comparatively new city. It looked like an accessible Hades, where the spirits of authors, long dead and gone, congregated and talked about men and things, and received congenial visitors. (“Saved from the Burning: Two Old Plays.” *Mercury* [Hobart] 29 July 1902: 2)

**The dispersal of Legrand’s hoard**

Less than a month after Legrand’s death, the Will was proven, with Burn ratified as executor and the estate declared as not exceeding £240 in value (*Mercury* [Hobart] 29 July: 4). The sorting and sifting of Legrand’s shop goods continued, and three months passed without apparent newspaper comment about the deceased or his stock. Finally, successive newspaper advertisements announced the clearing sale. An early notice sets the scene for what was afterwards described in very different terms:

**WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY**

November 5 and 6

**EXTENSIVE SALE OF BOOKS, ENGRAVINGS, COINS, CURIOS, ETC.**

---

11 He cites in particular two old plays by the Irish romantic writer, Charles Maturin (1780–1824). He describes these volumes as exceedingly rare, claiming that much of this writer’s work was destroyed soon after his death, possibly by his “grim, Dantesque” son “offended at his father’s connection with the theatre” (parag. 3). J. L. F. also mentions that Smythe (1833–1917) recalled buying a book from the old Port Arthur library at Legrand’s shop, and regarded the bookseller as “a French-man” (parag. 1)

12 As some indication of the value of £240 in Hobart at the time, “a cottage and large block of land” at Devonshire Square, a respectable residential area, though an inconveniently steep climb from the city heart, was being advertised for sale at £200, while single return fares to England by passenger ship were being advertised at between £66 and £115 (*Mercury* [Hobart] 25 Oct. 1902: 8).
BURN AND SON

Are instructed to sell by Auction, at their mart, on WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, November 5 and 6, commencing each day at 10 o’clock sharp,

The EXTENSIVE STOCK OF BOOKS, ENGRAVINGS, COINS, ASTRONOMICAL TELESCOPE, MICROSCOPES, etc., etc., on account of the estate of the late Mr. W. Legrand, comprising in all over 1,000 lots.

On view four days before the sale.

(Mercury [Hobart] 25 October 1902: 8)

The miscellaneous items apparently were dealt with on the first day of sale, since only books, “commencing [. . .] with Lot 445,” were advertised for the second day (Mercury [Hobart] 6 November 1902: 6). Little mention seems to have been made of the non-print items offered for sale, an omission which appears significant. Were these things of less interest to those reporting, all self-represented as bookmen? Or were many of the objects not attractive to the public, chary of reminders of the colony’s darker past? Alternatively, were the miscellaneous items too speedily swept up for description, perhaps bought en masse by antiquarian dealers or collectors? Then again, it simply may be that those reporting had attended only the bookselling part of the auction. In any case, there was recent and ample evidence of Legrand’s book-trading, and scant memory of his scientific past, so that the books were an obvious central focus.

The sale aroused a fresh flurry of interest in Legrand and his hoard, and two substantial, though stylistically opposite articles about the auction were published soon after. These are biographically useful texts, giving details of the proceedings and some examples of the stock sold, and also providing a counterbalancing coda to previous, seemingly romanticised descriptions of Legrand and his shop. The first is a succinct, comprehensive, and apparently objective article by an anonymous writer for the “informed
and solid” Mercury (Roe, State of Tasmania 4). It referred to Legrand’s shop as one of Hobart’s “show places” in the tourist season, but “the despair” of serious book-hunters, and it explained the shop’s ever-increasing dimness as the result of additional shelves being run across the rooms once the wall shelves were packed. The writer saw the resultant clutter as the reason why “the impression got abroad that books of rare value were stowed away on unseen shelves, or lay buried beneath the dusty, musty heaps” (“The Late Mr. Legrand’s Books.” Mercury [Hobart] 8 November 1902: 6). Even so, the account mentioned a few seventeenth-century volumes and also colonial works as amongst the 6,000 deemed worthy of being auctioned in lots, the remaining 25,000 being sold by the case as “rubbish.”

The sale was described as “well-attended,” with spirited bidding by “representatives of two large Sydney firms [presumably Angus and Robertson and Dymock’s] for ‘Colonist’ books and pamphlets.”

On the same day, a satiric account in the Launceston Daily Telegraph gave rich, though less precise details, presenting the sale in an amusing way. The writer used a mixture of metaphors in describing the auction, likening it to the gathering of vultures to the strewn battlefield, the frenzied acquisition of books “by a sabine mode,” and a gladiatorial contest overseen from the auctioneer’s podium. He gives a colourful account of Legrand’s executor in action:

---

13 According to a later report, “the bulk of the library was bought by a general dealer in Elizabeth-street, who did well out of his speculation” (Critic 24 Nov. 1919 [AOT NS 21/26/1: 203]). It would be interesting to know if there was any connection here with the dealer who quite soon commenced business in Legrand’s vacated shop (Mercury [Hobart] 12 Feb. 1903: 5). This was William Henry Thomas Brown (ca.1837–1926), a man of varied careers, now a general agent. His advertised address, “Legrand’s, 60 Collins-street,” seems a trading on inherited ambience, and he dealt in wares somewhat reminiscent of Legrand’s establishment — for example, he was willing to buy: “Postage Stamps, Collections” (Mercury [Hobart] 27 June 1903: 2); “collections, coins, curios, etc.” (Mercury 10 July: 2); and “2nd. hand books” (Mercury [Hobart] 1 Sept. 1903: 2). In addition, these and other advertisements noted that he ran a money-lending agency.

14 According to Holroyd, “a quantity of [. . .] early Tasmanian works was picked up cheaply” by Richard Thompson, a partner in Angus and Robertson (13, 14).

15 The writer perhaps may have been A.W. Hume. Though the prose seems more restrained than in many other pieces by Hume, there is an instance of what Richard Ely describes as Hume’s “distinctive avoidance of the first-person singular ‘I’” (“Sights and Sounds of Hobart” 61).
There is a great sermon power in book sales, and in one point of view Mr. Burn, who is one of our leading and most modest litterateurs, may be considered a preacher. He had a splendid congregation to hold forth to, and his oratory at times caused a lot of guerilla warfare in the room [. . .]. It was the biggest book sale of its kind that had ever taken place down south, and Mr. Burn knew it; and if he did not ride on the whirlwind, he directed the storm. (―At the Capital,‖ Daily Telegraph 8 November 1902: 3)

The article concludes with ironic vignettes about various bidders and the ill-matched lots they won at auction, and ventures the opinion that profits from the sale ―must have tallied up a decent figure.‖

It would be satisfying to be able to round off Legrand’s commercial career with knowledge of how much, and of what benefit to Sarah Lucas were the proceeds finally distributed to her. These facts are lost to time, as also is any indication of what Legrand’s bequest might have meant to Sarah in personal terms. All that can be said is that many years later she left a carefully-compiled Will of her own, distributing a modest estate equally amongst her half-sisters, itemising and apportioning such personal treasures as her best teacups and cutlery, her china biscuit barrel, a ―large electric teapot‖, and various household pictures (Supreme Court and Sheriff’s Office AOT AD960/1/56: 422).

As we have seen, long after Legrand’s death memories of him lingered peripherally, surfacing occasionally in reminiscences about old Hobart. Later recollections which seem likely to have been written by A. W. Hume focus on the business rather than the bookseller, and also arouse the suspicion that the writer had very little, if anything, to do

---

16 She left some shares, but apparently did not own her home or other significant property. One picture mentioned was an “oil painting by Haughton Forrest,” presumably an original and, if so, probably one of the many works he produced commercially and sold locally.

17 For example, in the reminiscences of William Walker, and of G. W. Rex, as discussed in Chapter 3.
with Legrand in times gone by.\textsuperscript{18} He may even have relied partly on Winter’s much-travelled image (Fig. 2) when he wrote impressionistically, and with several inaccuracies:

A representative of the old bookstall trade was a Frenchman named Legrond [sic]. For very many years his shop stood back in a nook off Elizabeth street, and it is now about to be covered by part of the magnificent building of the AMP Society. Legrond afterwards moved into Collins street, and when he died about ten years ago, his books were put into the auctioneer’s hands and the best of them were purchased by collectors from all the States. (\textit{Critic} [Hobart] 13 October 1916. Hume, \textit{Historical Records} 2: 157)

This news apparently had not reached “Literary,” who wrote in to the \textit{Critic} probably towards the end 1918 asking what had become of Legrand and his books. Given the era and Legrand’s iconic associations with the Tasmanian past, it seems possible that the enquiry may be a reflection of what Clendinnen has called “the great sobering which followed the First World War” (10). It was A.W. Hume who responded in print (Reply to letter of “Literary,” \textit{Critic} 24 January 1919: n.p., Hume \textit{Historical Records}). His reply reiterates and slightly updates the two 1902 articles describing the bookshop interior, both of which I attribute tentatively to Hume.

\textit{The afterlife of Legrand’s copy of Collections}

Meanwhile, Legrand’s early conchological career had not been forgotten in the world of shell science, and references to his work or to shells named for him had appeared from time to time, especially in the ongoing taxonomic revisions — in particular around that

\textsuperscript{18} In the same article, Hume recalls his frequent visits “when a lad” to the shop of William Westcott, writing specifically of the era between 1862 and 1867. It was in 1867 that Hume, then aged about seventeen, went to sea for a few years (Ely “Sights and Sounds” 61). Legrand had been in business at Elizabeth Street only since some time in 1866.
time, those of the Tasmanian naturalist, William May (1921, 1923).\(^{19}\) Rare copies of
Collections still remained in circulation, one even being exhibited at a meeting of the
Malacological Society of London in 1931 (G. C. Robson 221). Yet it is Legrand’s personal
copy of this work which concerns us here. The precise map of its travels remains unclear,
but along the way it found knowledgeable friends who ensured its survival. Key ports of call
were later handwritten inside the cover of this unique copy (apparently by Mel [Charles
Purchased from D. Raymond, Syd. Aug. 20. 1946. Tom Iredale.”

The first of the listed names refers to William Lackey Williamson (ca. 1849–1931),
a well-known Tasmanian collector of historical and natural objects, who displayed them at
his private museum, the Old Curiosity Shop, long a tourist attraction at Kingston Beach
(Gardam 62–3). Legrand undoubtedly would have known Williamson: both men were
inveterate collectors, and Legrand apparently was a frequent visitor to Kingston (then
Brown’s River). Furthermore, Williamson, formerly a sailor, incorporated a substantial shell
collection amongst his display. Perhaps Legrand or someone close to him passed on to
Williamson this personal copy of the September 1871 edition of Collections. If so, it would
have been a fitting gesture. Alternatively, Williamson may have won the item at the 1902
auction, or even acquired it later. Williamson’s museum was closed shortly before his own
death, and Legrand’s book possibly was purchased by the apparently Sydney-based D.
Raymond at the dispersal sale.

Mel Ward (1903–1966), “actor, naturalist and marine collector,” who bought the
book from Raymond, was a serious collector of artefacts as well as of natural history
objects. He opened an eclectic private museum and gallery at Medlow Bath in the Blue
Mountains in 1943 (Rutledge parag. 6). Ward was a long-established friend of the English-

\(^{19}\) In particular, “A Revised Census of Tasmanian Fluviatile Mollusca” (1921) and An Illustrated Index of
Tasmanian Shells (1923). References to Legrand appear in both works.
born Australian naturalist, Tom Iredale (1880–1972), whose work he greatly admired (Ward 57–8), and to whom he gave this significant copy of Collections which finally was bequeathed to the Australian Museum in Sydney.\textsuperscript{20} The book, still retaining Legrand’s inserts of clippings and Spink’s 1879 bookshop order from Petchey’s Bay, is now held in the museum’s reference library.\textsuperscript{21}

Iredale, who had published much on land shells and knew Legrand’s texts of old, eventually wrote the short but landmark article about Collections, “A Home-made Book on Shells” (1958).\textsuperscript{22} This account gives a careful physical description of the artefact itself and lists the early review clippings pasted inside by Legrand. Iredale also mentions selected biographical information about Legrand. He quotes at length, though unreferenced, from the 1902 Bulletin obituary article, and adds other vaguely remembered (and largely inaccurate) details probably acquired through hearsay (59–61).\textsuperscript{23} Thus, whilst placing Legrand’s venerable text firmly on the bibliographic map, Iredale inadvertently has helped perpetuate myths and still-unsubstantiated anecdotes about the historical figure himself.

In 1971, the centenary of Legrand’s publication of Collections was celebrated in a brief but appreciative article, “A Molluscan Milestone”, written by the Tasmanian malacologist Ronald Kershaw (1920–2003), and published in The Tasmanian Naturalist.


\textsuperscript{21} This copy of Legrand’s Collections has been examined during my research for this study. Spink’s letter was referred to in Chapter 5 of the thesis.

\textsuperscript{22} For example, there are many references to Legrand’s name in Iredale’s three-part publication, “A Basic List of the Land Mollusca of Australia” (1937a, 1937b, 1938), and some also in “A Basic List of the Freshwater Mollusca of Australia” (1943a), these works appearing in The Australian Zoologist.

\textsuperscript{23} The quoted article (Bulletin 19 July 1902:15) has been discussed earlier this chapter. It would be helpful to know where Iredale gleaned “the vague rumour […] that he was an aristocrat and called himself Le Grand, later when he became acclimatized […] amended […] to Legrand” (58). Hull, who perhaps might have rebutted or confirmed the rumours (or, alternatively, who may have been Iredale’s original informant) had died the year before Iredale received Legrand’s copy of Collections.
The main thrust of the article is well summed-up by its title: the physical features of Legrand’s book are described and its content noted as a useful contribution along a continuum reaching from the work of early naturalists to the current time, and the “much work [. . .] [which] remains to be done” (7).

**Legrand’s literary afterlife**

By strange though unwitting coincidence, it was also in the centenary year of Legrand’s *Collections* that scholarly mention of Legrand arose in connection with a literary rather than scientific issue. This came about during a project documenting what colonial convict history Marcus Clarke had read as source material for *His Natural Life* (1874). Focus on a relevant anecdote published early in 1891 by the journalist and author Price Warung (William Astley) had led the research trail to the Grey Papers in the Auckland Public Library, and specifically to James Calder’s 1880s letters — those recording Legrand’s part in securing Tasmanian materials for Grey’s collection. The letters were a key primary source against which to measure Warung’s information, and they proved the means of debunking any suggestion that Clarke had appropriated Calder’s material. As an indirect result of this archival research, Legrand’s role as provider of historical materials gained an airing, and even some of Calder’s observations about him were quoted (Nesbitt 95; Poole 424).

Fourteen years later, the letters themselves were published, elegantly and in full, in Dally’s *Bibliophile and Bibliopole* (1985), as his personal tribute to the memory of Legrand. Dally himself was an antiquarian bookseller for many years based in Tasmania, and apparently he was long interested in Legrand. His annotated collection of the letters is an

---

24 Warung’s account of his interviewing of Sir George Grey appeared in the Sydney *Bulletin* 31 Jan. 1891 (Nesbitt 94). Warung reported statements by Grey that *His Natural Life* “may be looked upon as history,” and that the “whole of the materials on which the work is founded” were by then in the Auckland Public Library, among the manuscripts donated by Grey (Grey, qtd. Warung, qtd. Nesbitt 94). According to Warung, Grey stated that Clarke had borrowed these materials while researching the book, and that the materials themselves had been amassed over many years by James Calder on Grey’s behalf. Grey also allegedly had discussed Calder’s indignant claim that original material of his own was appropriated by Clarke (Nesbitt 94).
invaluable resource, and remains the key published work on Legrand. A later short article by John Holroyd, “The Grand Bibliopole” (1991), summarises information contained in Dally’s work and gives useful additional detail (albeit unreferenced), but makes some dubious assumptions.

Material relating to Legrand again appeared within a literary context at the release of Koch’s Out of Ireland (1999). Despite the book’s overall wider compass and the echoes of material from many and varied other sources, its indebtedness to the Legrand archive is substantial, marking it clearly as an example of Legrand’s literary afterlife. Yet in general this aspect has been overshadowed by the novel’s still more striking intertextuality with the better-known figures and stories of the Young Irelander exiles transported to Van Diemen’s Land after the failed Irish insurgency of 1848. Certainly, this factor has received considerable critical attention, along with the work’s multi-layered structure and its complex interweaving of numerous other references — for example, to classic, Christian, and Celtic culture; and to distinctive notions of place and of history. Yet to date there has been no critical analysis of the extent, nature, or significance of the book’s intertextuality with the Legrand archive. This particular aspect of the novel is the focus of the present chapter section and the of one immediately after. Throughout, the intertextuality is addressed from an archival and historical perspective relevant to the biographical study of Legrand. Koch’s novel therefore is being considered in terms of the selection, adaptation, and application of the Legrand materials, noting which items have been used, and also probing for suggestions as to what the nature and circumstances of this borrowing might be able to tell us about Legrand’s ongoing cultural presence. In view of this focus, the full range and complexity of

Koch’s tripartite 700-odd page novel is not discussed. Instead, analysis centres on relevant sections of the book, and on the references of specific interest. These begin early in Part Two (on page 216) and continue intermittently almost to the end (the last appearing on page 687).

Koch’s selection of the Legrand images and anecdotes was for use as raw material in his creation of a “fictional reality” suited to the story he had in mind. Basically, the novel follows the structural pattern of Dante’s *Inferno*, a factor analysed in fine detail in separate articles and recent monographs by Noel Henricksen and by Jean-François Vernay. The book tells the story of the exile of the classically-educated main character, a fictional Young Irelander, and purports to be the account written by the protagonist, later found in the two personal diaries he had left behind in Tasmania when he made his eventual escape. The exiled hero conceptualises the British colonial penal system as representing Hell at the extremes, which are flanked by Purgatorio in its three stages of lessening durance, with the far-distant state of Paradiso being the attainment of freedom (208–9). The plot’s Danteian structure calls for a poet-figure to guide and support the distressed pilgrim’s journey through Purgatorio; and accordingly, the iconic figure of Legrand has been borrowed for the creation of a fictional Hobart bookseller, Jacob Lenoir — ancient, scholarly, and wise; steeped in the classics and purveyor of European cultural works. The novel’s physical setting and plot require a congenial and strategically-placed refuge for the culturally-isolated and eventually fugitive protagonist. Accordingly, the well-known images of Legrand’s Elizabeth Street and Collins Street bookshops have been combined to produce Lenoir’s shop, a fictional construction situated a block away from the originals so as to back on to the Hobart Rivulet down which the hero eventually will escape.

---

26 The term “fictional reality” is much used by the New-Caledonian critic Jean-François Vernay in writing about Koch’s work, since he sees Koch’s creative ability as particularly strong in this aspect.
The novel’s major adaptation of the temporal setting of the Legrand materials is to move them to an earlier period in the nineteenth century, a calendar displacement of only a few decades, though a far greater distance in historical and societal terms. Hence we find the iconic figure of Legrand relocated from pre-Federation Tasmania so as to become embroiled with political events and historical figures of convict-era 1850. Transformed as Lenoir, he is “an eighteenth-century man” (468), self-exiled from Europe, who has lived through the birth of the French Republic, once saw Napoleon ride by in triumph (465), “and was somehow caught up in the Paris Revolution of 1830” (472).

As regards characterisation, many aspects ascribed to the novel’s bookseller figure so closely follow key images, anecdotes, and clichés associated with the historical Legrand that the source materials are clearly recognisable to anyone who knows them. Links to five written texts and four photographs are discussed here. Firstly, descriptions of the invented Lenoir’s appearance echo details present in Beattie’s “bookseller” photograph of Legrand (Fig. 1): his clothing, which “brings to mind the haphazard garments of a vagabond,” features a “dark blue pilot coat; a thick green neckerchief, loosely knotted; [and] an ancient, rusty waistcoat, once black [. . .] over which he wears a shopman’s apron with a large hole in it” (219). Similarly, Lenoir’s “Russian cap” (217, 466, 573) recalls the less well-known Beattie image of Legrand posing wearily as antiquarian and clown (Fig. 8).27 Once noted, these parallels unavoidably draw attention to further details of the fictional figure which otherwise might pass as unrelated to the famous Beattie image: the “full grey beard, and [. . .] hawklike features” (219), and the “glittering” eyes described as boldly challenging the viewer’s gaze (219).

Other characteristics given to Koch’s Lenoir also have marked similarity to known details about the historical Legrand. For example, Koch’s fictional bookseller is noted for

27 There is also a later reference to the same pilot coat (573).
his abruptness and “eccentric changes of tack” (219), and also his aura of exoticism. We read of this Lenoir that:

Few of his customers and acquaintances know anything much about his origins. He is seen as a mystery and discourages prying questions. He’s known to be French, of course — and even in this, he’s puzzling to his fellow citizens [. . .]. (465)

Elsewhere, the fictional character has been described as “certainly not English: French presumably; and perhaps Jewish” (219). Koch’s novelistic elaboration is interesting, placed alongside contemporary references to the historical Legrand. Even though the conjecture of specifically Jewish origin is absent from surviving texts by Legrand’s contemporaries, tacit allusions perhaps were being made through the symbolic presence of Ikey Solomon in the Winter photograph (Fig.2), epithetical references to Legrand as a “book-stall man,” and comparisons between Legrand’s establishment and those of London’s Seven Dials area.

Clear echoes of material from Dally’s Bibliophile and Bibliopole appear within Koch’s descriptions of the fictional bookseller, and the language in which the ideas are expressed also is close. For example, Lenoir’s manner of speech reveals “no discernable foreign accent, yet somehow it’s not quite English” (219); as a bookman, “his knowledge of his subject is extraordinary” (464); and he “issues no catalogues; employs no assistants”

---

28 Koch embellishes this image by having Lenoir address the novel’s hero as “my dear” (474, 575, 682), presumably an allusion to the French “mon cher,” but unavoidably an echo of Dickens’s representation of Fagin’s Jewish speech patterns in Oliver Twist. Interesting in view of the history of the “borrowed” Elizabeth Street shop is the long tradition of belief (traced by Goldfarb to as far back as 1838; mentioned by Levi and Bergman 217, 241; and perpetuated in examples such as the Hobart newspaper articles previously discussed) that Dickens had based his Fagin character on the real Ikey Solomon.

29 It is also possible to view these archival references as historicism (in Winter’s case) or as class-related (in the texts written by contemporaries). J.B. Walker (Daily 11), and putatively A.W. Hume (Critic 13 Oct. 1916) apply the “book-stall man” epithet; and another article also probably by Hume makes a derogatory Seven Dials comparison (Daily Telegraph 2 July 1902: 3). The relevant passages are referred to elsewhere in this chapter, and also previously.
Similarly, Lenoir’s social position is marginal: “some of the book-buying colonial gentry dislike him intensely, regarding him as a rude, shabby, grasping old bookman who forces them to pay exorbitant amounts for books that they can’t otherwise obtain” (464). Other fainter echoes of Dally’s book sound in Koch’s novel through the use of the terms “bibliophile” and “bibliopole” in referring to Lenoir (464, 466), and by reference to Lenoir having imported a copy of *Punch* (467).

Other details in *Out of Ireland* which may or may not be conscious references to archival primary texts are the information about Lenoir that “his wife died many years ago” and that “the shop is his home” (468). These at least parallel a specific archival statement about Legrand that “his wife died many years ago, and he has led a very secluded life, at the old shop, for many years” (*Mercury* [Hobart] 16 June 1902: 5).

Elements of more commonly-available historical information about Legrand are evident in the following passage referring to the novel’s fictional bookseller:

He has a worldwide reputation as a conchologist. So he corresponds [. . .] with fellow-conchologists, and with the British Museum. He has published a monograph on the land shells of Van Diemen’s Land, and wanders about the countryside and shorelines looking for his molluscs, as well as paying

---

30 These compare closely with statements by James Calder, who describes Legrand as “somewhat Frenchified in his manner, though [. . .] not a Frenchman either, for his English is not the English of a foreigner at all” (Dally 25). Calder also made the comments that Legrand’s “trade knowledge of books … is considerable” (Dally 35) and that “[he] keeps no shop assistant” (Dally 19).

31 This description closely resembles statements about Legrand made by J. B. Walker (Dally 11-12), cited in Chapters 1 and 5.

32 Fourteen copies of *Punch* were amongst Legrand’s modest and only sale (in 1871) to the Tasmanian Public Library (Dally 33).

33 While most of these details are obtainable from several contemporary sources, J. B. Walker’s letter complained that Legrand “boasts, with more or less truth, of his commissions from the British Museum & of his foreign correspondence” (Dally 11).
others to bring them to him. One that he discovered has been named after him – an honour of which he seems quite proud, and which has brought him respect at the Royal Society here. His own collection of shells is said to be one of the largest in the Australian colonies. (Out of Ireland 466)

Several of the Legrand obituaries are clearly the sources of much colourful material used in Koch’s construction of the novel’s fictional bookseller. Anecdotes and phraseology borrowed from the Clipper obituary appear with only minimal modifications in descriptions of Lenoir, and five key examples are discussed here. Koch’s Lenoir “will talk [...] for an hour at a time” with a customer he likes (463), and to such he sells books “at very reasonable rates” (464). He also has been known to withhold from a disliked customer what he later offers more cheaply to someone he prefers (464). He relates with relish that a “very mean and rather ignorant” man once sold him an Elzevir “among some other books for a song,” adding as his pièce de résistance: “When I sell it, I shall make a thousand percent profit; and I shall tell him, and it will break his heart” (221). Yet above all, Lenoir is a bibliophile: “the dust of his books is perfume to him and has settled in his soul” (579).

Other passages in the novel reveal similarly close intertextuality with the Bulletin’s tribute to Legrand. For example, the fictional bookseller has been “a friend of Leigh Hunt’s” and

---

34 The image of the conchologist’s mollusc hunting, though a logical inference, could (if required) be deduced from sources such as the RST journals, or from Collections. As a point of difference, Legrand knew and wrote of the colony as Tasmania, the name used from the 1820s, applied to the bishopric in 1842, and officially effective from 1 Jan. 1856.

35 As mentioned in earlier chapters of the thesis, various contemporary RST journals referred to Legrand’s significant shell collection, and to the naming of shells in his honour, though perhaps it is his elation at Hanley’s naming of Legrandia which is alluded to here. If so, the original event was mentioned in the Hobart Mercury (19 July 1871: 2) and in at least three contemporary scientific journals, as discussed in Chapter 5 of the thesis.

36 Whilst the novel draws heavily on the entire Clipper obituary throughout, particularly clear echoes of the obituary’s language are apparent in Koch’s retelling of this particular obituary anecdote. For example, the Clipper cites Legrand’s actual words as: “Some day before I die, I shall tell him about it, and it will just about break his heart.” Similarly, the same obituary says of Legrand that “the old man had the dust of old books in his soul. It is a dust neither infragrant, nor altogether disfiguring [. . .]” (“Obit: Legrand,” Clipper 5 July 1902: n. pag.).
“also knew Charles Lamb quite well, whom he refers to as ‘poor, gentle Lamb’” (464).37 A personal quirk of Lenoir’s is that his occasional reminiscences are “given quite impersonally, as though about someone else” (465).38 We also are told that “Lenoir is a survivor of the age of perfume, and of indifference to cleanliness and bathing” (468).39

The Daily Telegraph’s 1902 article about Legrand’s closed premises is another apparent primary source revealed by intertextual echoes. One appears in the novel’s reference to Lenoir’s chaotic stock: “people who come looking for rarities must go through his dusty book-mountains for themselves” (464).40 The other, which echoes a contemporary newspaper comment about sorting Legrand’s book hoard, appears with poetic piquancy in the remark of a policemen character about to search Lenoir’s bookshop for the escaped protagonist: “We’ll have our work cut out here. What a precious mess these books is in!” (687).41

Throughout the novel, mentions of Lenoir’s premises also reveal Koch’s familiarity with the iconic photographs of Legrand’s first and second Hobart shops. The intertextuality here is mainly with Winter’s image of 7 Elizabeth Street (Fig.2). For example, Lenoir’s fictional establishment described in the novel as:

a long, narrow little building of orange brick – single-storeyed, with an odd, hat-shaped gable front which looks quaintly Chinese. The display window on

37 While the Bulletin emphasised the Lamb connection, the Clipper’s alternative version of this alleged friendship was that Legrand “met Charles Lamb, and knew Leigh Hunt well” (5 July 1902: n. pag.). These anecdotes have been discussed in Chapter 2.

38 The relevant passage in the Bulletin obituary is: “There were few he cared to talk to, and even when facing an approved listener his reminiscences had a curiously impersonal quality” (Bulletin 19 July: 15).

39 The relevant Bulletin passage has been quoted in detail earlier in this chapter.

40 The comparable primary source passage refers to “the chaos of confusion” of Legrand’s “heterogeneous collection,” adding that “the searcher would find his time occupied for months if he set his mind on looking for some particular book” (Daily Telegraph [Launceston] 2 July 1902: 3).

41 The relevant primary source passage is, “Who ever undertakes this task will have all his work cut out for him” (Daily Telegraph [Launceston] 2 July 1902: 3).
the street, with its many little panes, is filled with shelves of books [. . .].

(217)

We read also that above this window is a sign, “very much faded and ghostly, so that the shop seems to exist in a dimension that’s neither past nor present: a shop in Limbo” (217). Other details ascribed to the fictional shop derive from the later photographic image of Legrand outside 60 Collins Street (Fig.3). These are an ornament and a lopsided blind, rendered in the novel as “a corpse-white bust of Napoleon [which] stares from under a half-lowered blind that screens the top of his head and bicorn hat” (217). From the original photograph it is not possible to discern whether or not the Collins Street bust was indeed of Napoleon, but it is symbolically important in the novel that it should be so. “Lenoir’s ghostly sign, fading above the doorway in the lane” (464) and “the bitter face of the Emperor [who] peeps out from his Limbo [. . .] from under the half-drawn blind” (465) function in the text as motifs of exile.

In addition to the novel’s clear intertextuality with the Legrand materials in depicting the fictional bookshop and bookshop proprietor, some imagined details also have been incorporated. These elaborations have relevance for a biographical study of Legrand only where they distort the originals as regards content or tone, or in places where the novelist’s reinterpretation of the originals might suggest fresh angles worth considering in terms of the biography. Apart from those already mentioned, there are other significant differences between what is known of Legrand and what is bestowed upon Koch’s creation. Firstly, the historical bookseller lacked the classical education of the fictional version: Lenoir is capable of quoting and conversing in Latin (220). More importantly, as required by demands of plot and structure, the fictional figure is presented in a sentimental and eventually heroic light: beneath his gruff and cynical exterior, he is goodness personified. Endowed with a romantic past and still mourning a long-lost wife, he places himself at peril
in order to rescue the idealistic and bereft protagonist who reminds him of his own earlier self, and whom he wants to save from making similar mistakes. Lenoir finally takes on a Messianic dimension in exhorting the protagonist to re-engage with life and to seek out a more spiritual existence than his present allegiance to nationalism and romantic illusion (682). It is these novelistic additions which most obviously conflict with what we know about the historical figure — resourceful, brave, and capable of generous feeling as Legrand appears to have been. Yet the romantic elaborations perhaps might be counted as an imaginative free translation of some elements of the archival material, in particular the Bulletin obituarist’s evocation of Legrand as “a shrewd and kindly old wayfarer beneath the grime.”

Koch’s borrowing and refashioning of the Legrand materials seems a clear example of Linda Hutcheon’s recent definition of the “process of appropriation [as] [. . .] taking possession of another’s story, and filtering it, in a sense, through one’s own sensibility, interests and talents” (18). In no way does it resemble what she describes as “salvaging”—that is, a motivation “to preserve stories that are worth knowing but will not necessarily speak to a new audience without creative ‘reanimation’” (Patricia Galloway [2004] qtd. Hutcheon 8). Even so, Koch’s “(re)interpretation and then (re)creation” (8) of the Legrand materials inadvertently is of use to the biographer as a form of conversation: Koch being the only other person who seems to have studied this particular combination of the Legrand materials in much depth. Of specific interest are Koch’s evident speculations about interior features of the Elizabeth Street shop, and his apparent sensing from the archival texts of a subversive side to the historical bookseller’s character.43

42 This particular Bulletin passage has been cited in fuller detail earlier this chapter.

43 The internal lining of “boards painted apple-green” (217) and “roll-top desk” (466) imagined by Koch would seem less likely to have been historically present in the Elizabeth Street building than the imagined use of “the long back room” as storehouse, living quarters, and space for the bookseller’s shelf collection (468), or
Legrand as literary influence

Koch’s appropriation of the Legrand materials for reuse in his novel can be seen as apt, given their usefulness in multiple ways to the story he was formulating. Their temporal relocation to suit the story also is understandable, since the historically suitable earlier Hobart bookseller, William Westcott, had been a highly respectable citizen who catered only for conservative tastes, and therefore was of no use as raw material for the required fictional character. What remains puzzling is that Koch makes no mention of either Legrand or the historical materials associated with him in the “Author’s Note” to Out of Ireland, despite the fact that he mentions the Young Irelanders and associated key resources consulted, and also family history influences on the work. He even states that the novel’s central character “was inspired in many ways by John Mitchel,” one of the Irish exiles (705), but that “[a]ll the other characters in the novel (except for the invisible Governor of Van Diemen’s Land), are invented, with no historical models” (706). It is difficult to understand what Koch means by this, given his substantial borrowings from the Legrand archive. One possibility is that he has regarded the stories and images of Legrand purely as local colour and as sources of useful plot and structural devices, rather than as constituting what he calls an “historical model.” Compounding the mystery is his recorded response in interview with the writer Sophie Masson soon after the book’s release. She displayed interest in what she described as “the old French-Jewish bookshop owner,” who had reminded her somewhat of Merlin. Koch’s reply was:

I based him on a real person [. . .] William Legrand, who had such a bookshop in nineteenth-century Hobart. He was a great eccentric: if he liked people, he would

perhaps also “the crude wooden bath-house” outside (468). Historical evidence for Legrand’s apparently ambivalent social attitudes has been discussed elsewhere in the thesis.

44 Dally characterises Westcott as having led “a quiet and blameless life, his mother a cousin of the Archbishop of Canterbury and himself the spouse of a clergyman’s daughter” (12). The Hobart bookshop of Charles Walch, another suitably early but also respectable figure, is mentioned in Koch’s novel by name and in character, and his establishment is shown as contrasting markedly with Lenoir’s.
sell books to them at a good price; if he disliked them, he overcharged them outrageously! Money wasn’t the point; it was a question of the person’s inner qualities. I found that rather attractive. (Masson 73)

Interestingly, Koch here was restating his own romantic interpretation of the Clipper anecdotes: the original text had ascribed Legrand’s responses to customers as being mostly determined by their attitudes towards him, and by his alleged contempt for cultural Philistinism (“Obit Legrand” 5 July 1902). Still, the question remains as to why Koch regards the historical Legrand as a “real person,” has based a significant character on him, has reworked primary sources about him, and yet (judging by the novel’s “Author’s Note”) apparently does not consider him as having been an “historical model.”

Since the Masson interview, two critical writers particularly interested in Koch’s literary work have briefly mentioned the novel’s borrowings from Legrand. Firstly, Noel Henricksen in his monograph, Island and Otherland: Christopher Koch and His Books (2003), states that: “Many biographical fragments partially illuminate the old bookseller who becomes […] [the protagonist’s] mentor. Much mystery remains” (315). Henricksen follows this by reproducing the Beattie “bookseller” photograph (Fig. 1) with the caption: “William Legrand, the antiquarian bookseller: a well-known Hobart identity in the 19th century. He had many rare books, and was a noted conchologist. Jacob Lenoir in Out of Ireland is partly based on him” (316). The mysteries Henricksen refers to here are essentially the symbolic references suggested by Lenoir’s name and by its repetition within the ghostly shop sign. Henricksen does not mention the Winter photograph of Legrand’s shop (Fig. 2), and from this evidence and from other comments by him it would seem that he was not aware of either the photograph’s existence or of its intertextual significance within the novel.
More recently, Jean-François Vernay in *Water from the Moon* (2007), his monographic critical study of Koch’s work, makes three fleeting references to Lenoir (166, 172, 177) and none at all to Legrand. Yet in a journal article published later that same year, he makes two general comments of particular relevance here. Firstly, in referring to *Out of Ireland* in this article, Vernay states that: “Koch — like most realists who painstakingly collect information on their topics of interest — has gone as far as to quote his various sources in his traditional author’s note, so as to validate the accuracy of his knowledge” (“C. J. Koch’s Novels” 8). Since, as we know, Koch’s “Note” to his book makes no mention of the Legrand sources, this firm statement by Vernay seems indication either that he was unaware of Koch’s extensive appropriation of information and even of turns of phrase from these archival materials, or else that he simply chose to echo the pattern of the cited authorial note. Certainly, the second critical statement in Vernay’s article of relevance to this matter clearly parallels and extrapolates from the third and sixth paragraphs of Koch’s “Note,” in stating that:

[m]any of Koch’s characters – while remaining fictional — are borrowed from actual people whose names are either inserted in the novel [. . .] or altered (like Monsieur Lenoir in *Out of Ireland*, a pseudonym for Monsieur William Legrand, a nineteenth-century Hobart bookshop owner). (“C.J. Koch’s Novels” 3–4)

Both Vernay and Henricksen, each in different ways, highlight the etymology of the fictional bookseller’s surname; but (unlike Henricksen) Vernay nowhere delves into the characterisation of Lenoir, and furthermore, his statement about the novel’s historical sources is unclear. In the comment by Vernay quoted immediately above, his reference to “characters” having been “borrowed,” and his use of the term “pseudonym” could be taken
as implying a closer correlation between the fictional and historical figures than actually is the case.

These matters of provenance are of slight importance when considering the novel as a literary work, but have considerable significance for a biographical study of William Legrand.

*Legrand’s iconic presence*

Viewed in literary terms, the fictional Lenoir is a minor though pivotal character in the novel, but the fact that Koch has chosen Legrand as the template for this character has cultural implications. Firstly, it categorises the novel as yet another example within an informal succession of imaginative responses to the same set of nineteenth-century Tasmanian photographs featuring Legrand. (To date, neither the category nor the novel’s contribution to it appear to have been discussed by others.) Secondly, this re-use of the iconic Hobart figure by a Hobart-reared author adds further to the evidence that key factors ensuring Legrand’s cultural longevity have been, and continue to be, the accessibility and familiarity of these much-reproduced old photographs, and also the strong sense of place they evoke.

Legrand’s iconic role has evolved over the years, whether influenced by changing cultural patterns or viewers’ social identities. As the obituaries show, Legrand’s antiquarian book hoard and purported associations with notable nineteenth-century literary figures meant that he could be seen as representing a colonial past linked to European cultural life, rather than to the uncomfortably recent convict days. Yet the written record of Legrand’s life had appeared mainly in 1902 newspapers. Once this ephemeral documentation had served its purposes and the papers themselves were discarded, only fading local memories and the few available photographs would remain as public links to Legrand. It was his prime publicist, J.W. Beattie, who ensured the means (through his own photography and his
lantern slide shows incorporating also the original work of others) by which Legrand’s presence endured and he posthumously became a representative figure of Old Hobart.

An early example of local responses to this iconic presence of “Hobart’s musty old book-dealer” was the founding, late in December 1939, of a second-hand bookshop registered as “Legrand.” This was a retirement initiative of Edward George Cox, member of several old local families, and a man clearly interested in books and history. Presumably, he was influenced by the well-known signage of Legrand’s former Collins Street shop (Fig. 3) when naming the business. Though probably by coincidence, the premises chosen were at 105 Macquarie Street, just around the corner from Legrand’s by now much-altered Elizabeth Street shop.45 Perhaps also there was once again an “end of an era” element in this summoning-up of old Legrand, since Cox’s firm was registered less than four weeks after Australia had formally entered World War Two. Yet the timing was hardly propitious for Cox’s commercial venture, and the business “did not succeed” (“Cox, Weymouth, and Miller Family Papers” AOT NS1640/1/59).

Another Hobart bookshop, one existing before and long after Cox’s initiative, seems at the core of enduring links between past and present interest in Legrand. This was the original Fuller’s Bookshop in Collins Street, founded in 1920 by W.E. (“Bill”) Fuller, Tasmanian-born and previously an employee of the Sydney booksellers and publishers, Angus and Robertson. According to Henricksen, Fuller acknowledged having learnt much from the veteran bookman, George Robertson (39–40), and as we know, this same Robertson had dealt with Legrand in person some decades earlier. Having established himself in Hobart, Fuller proved a notable bookman himself: a reader, writer, reviewer, and publisher, as well as bookseller. He and/or his managers clearly considered Legrand a figure of significance, since a copy of the Beattie “bookseller” photograph (Fig. 1) was hung inside

Fuller’s Collins Street store. It would be interesting to know whether this very object could have been Koch’s first introduction to William Legrand, since the youthful novelist-to-be began a short-lived but formative stint of employment at the bookshop in 1947. Again according to Henricksen, Koch’s cultural mentor at Fuller’s was the knowledgeable bookman and musician, Cedric Pearce, a manager of the bookshop (40–2), who later owned it. Currently, it is in the Hobart bookshop of a later-generation Pearce that three photographs of Legrand are included in a wall gallery of notables. One past member of the old Fuller’s Bookshop coterie was James Dally during his years in Tasmania as an antiquarian bookseller and publisher. Dally’s fascination with the Beattie “bookseller” photograph is clearly evident. He used it on the cover of a 1971 issue of his catalogue and sent a copy to the American Book Collector for use as their magazine cover that same year (Thorsen 2). He provided a high-quality photographic reproduction of the image tipped-in as frontis to each copy of his limited edition of the Calder letters (1985). He also kept a large framed copy of the same portrait on his office wall (Rogie Dally letter 12 July 2007). Dally’s eloquent tribute to Legrand, Bibliophile and Bibliopole, was produced after he had moved to Adelaide, at his own press.

46 On the other hand, Koch has recorded his later indebtedness to the Tasmanian historian Gillian Winter for her knowledgeable guidance “over [his] many years of work” on Out of Ireland, and her help in his “excavations of some strange, buried levels of [his] native city of Hobart” (“Author’s Note” 705). Elsewhere, he also pays tribute to the celebrated Tasmanian historians Peter Eldershaw and Geoffrey Stilwell, with whom he worked during his brief 1960 temporary placement at the Tasmanian Archives, describing Stilwell as “a man who has not only studied the past but has the knack of living inside it” and as having inspired Koch’s original research into his own family (“Archival Days” 231). When working on Out of Ireland, Koch surely would know of Sprod’s 1977 book of old Hobart photographs, including the same Beattie “bookseller” portrait of Legrand. Significantly, Gillian Winter (as editor), Dan Sprod (as designer), and Koch (as one essayist) were contributors to the State Library of Tasmania’s published tribute to Stilwell, Tasmanian Insights (1992).

47 The Dally catalogue referred to is number 73. A copy has not yet been located.

48 The print run of Bibliophile and Bibliopole was “limited to 200 copies, of which the first ten are special” (Dally, end paper).

49 Given Dally’s firm statement (mentioned in Chapter 1) as to the exact date the portrait was made, he possibly owned an original early copy of which he knew the provenance.
Meanwhile, in Hobart the Beattie “bookseller” portrait of Legrand (Fig. 1) apparently remained a house icon of Fuller’s. Clive Tilsley recalls that for some years, even after the business had changed hands, a picture postcard of the image was sent to customers to advise them of orders which had arrived. A superimposed speech-bubble contained the message, “So you ordered a book” (correspondence 4 July, 6 July 2007). Within the context of the present biographical study, this particular commercial use of the image marks a significant phase in the photograph’s ongoing life, one especially apt because it hinges on a form of role-play. The postcard floated the whimsy that Hobart’s nineteenth-century “musty old book-dealer” was in communication with modern-day book-buyers. The playful ventriloquism of the speech-bubble message drew much of its power from Legrand’s quizzical gaze, as preserved by the original photograph. The chosen setting (Beattie’s romanticised view of Legrand and his wares) could be calculated as appropriate for the audience (a select group of customers, those who ordered in books). Taken at face value, the postcard performed a straightforward transaction in an amusing way, but it also could be experienced by recipients as a compliment and/or further enticement. A more general effect of Fuller’s postcard distribution was that Legrand’s portrait travelled by mail to numerous households and offices, and to places near and far. In fact, this possibly was one of the most significant ways in which Legrand remained a widely-recognised, even familiar figure during the late twentieth-century.

Another Fuller’s initiative, was the launching of a new imprint label, William Legrand Publishing. The only title appearing under this name was *An Affirming Flame: Adventures in Continuing Education* (1987) by Kenneth Gethley Brooks, a wide-ranging history of adult education in Tasmania, a work still available on library shelves. Remote as the book’s topic may seem from the figure evoked by the imprint name, the distance narrows when one considers the early educational role of the Royal Society of Tasmania
and Legrand’s efforts of contribution to this. Yet there also arises the faint and no doubt unintended irony that had the opportunities to access further or more formal education described by Brooks existed in Legrand’s day, his colonial career might have developed very differently.

A notable feature of many tributes to the memory of Legrand is the gendered ideology apparent within them—a factor perhaps to be expected, given that the commemorators were journalists, print professionals, and scientists, and that these callings have been male-dominated historically. Of particular note are the later tributes to Legrand as bookman, given by men who identified the old Hobartian as one of their own. Yet career affiliations aside, the concept of Legrand as a bookman’s bookman seems probably the continuation of a historical situation. Reasoning for this proposition is that though Legrand’s Elizabeth Street shop possibly catered somewhat to the general public, it seems likely that few, if any, female customers ever crossed the threshold of the Collins Street shop, especially during the later years. By then, the antiquarian stock, squalid interior, and eccentric proprietor surely would render the shop out of bounds to respectable females, supposing any had an inclination to browse there. On the other hand, might it just be that the photograph displaying a respectable-looking housewifely woman in the shop doorway alongside a natty Legrand (Fig. 3) originally was intended to advertise the Collins Street premises as a respectable destination for readers of either sex? If so, it seems all the more interesting that the doorway detail from this particular photograph is the image currently advertising Hobart’s antiquarian bookshops to the general public.

Besides figuring in occupation-related remembrances of Legrand, all three of the best-known photographic images of him (Figs.1–3) have long been used in ways promoting both subject and settings as objects of antiquarian interest. This emphasis probably began
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50 Not that Legrand was universally valued as a bookman during his own lifetime: derogatory opinions as to his expertise have been discussed earlier.
with Beattie’s lantern-slide shows, and has continued ever since. Even when many Tasmanians were delighted to see print and architectural reminders of the colonial era being destroyed or obliterated, there were others (Beattie amongst the early advocates) who urged the importance of strengthening public interest in the state’s early history. Thus the long-departed bookseller and his shop premises became emblems of Old Hobart, relics of time and of place. At the same time, since the antiquarian imagination is neither gender- nor generation-specific, the images of Legrand acquired a wider, as well as ongoing public.

Over the years, additional influences have enabled these images to retain relevance as mementoes of time and place. One is the fact that Hobart is a city which has preserved meaningful vestiges of its earlier built environment: consequently, even a visitor can experience the Legrand photographs as an interesting dimension of a still-extant locale. Furthermore, the tangible presence of the past is not only a quality of Hobart’s visual character, but also a valuable commercial resource as regards the city’s appeal to tourists: as a result, Legrand’s ongoing links with the city and with antiquarian interests seem likely to prolong his current iconic value in the marketplace.

Apart from local factors such as these, the power of the visual medium through which Legrand is most often displayed has played a significant role in maintaining his social relevance. As Green-Lewis points out in “Victorian Afterlife,” our cultural familiarity with photography, and also photography’s emphasis on “the shared ordinariness of its human subjects” blind us to the wide gulf separating the modern viewer from the past (31). Our responses to nineteenth-century photographs are powerfully influenced by the fact that:

We can see the Victorians. Not just imaginatively, but really — or at least as really as we see anyone through the art of photography, an art invented, perfected and practiced by them [. . .]. [They] are visually real to us because they have a documentary assertiveness unavailable to persons living before
the age of the camera [. . .]. The Victorians continue to exist in the absolute
and paradoxical present of the photograph, always there yet gone forever;
both in, and out, of history; always already dead — yet still alive. (31)

Even so, close study of the Legrand photographs, including comparisons of their ongoing
lives, suggests that conventions of technology and the arts of photography are not the only
factors operational in bringing the pictured subject to life. Undoubtedly this response to the
images depends considerably on the interest, imagination, and even susceptibility of the
individual viewer. Yet even this notion does not account for the long-established preference
for three of the several available Legrand images, and for one of them in particular, nor yet
for the wide appeal of all three favourites across varied settings.

**Lasting impressions**

Roland Barthes’s reflections on photography in *Camera Lucida* (1981) offer much
that is helpful for considering the surviving visual images of Legrand, and the ongoing
appeal of some of them. Especially relevant to the almost bizarre range of expressions and
stagecraft apparent within the various “character” shots of Legrand is Barthes’ consideration
of the photographic event from the viewpoint of the conscious subject — that is, a factoring-in of what is experienced by the person aware of the camera’s presence and attempting to
assemble an intended projection of “self” (10–14). Legrand, with his evident personal mix
of ambition, insecurities, multiple agenda, ingrained self-reliance, and habits of personal
secrecy, might be expected to experience in full measure the mental, emotional, and
physical strains, including attempts to project the personally desired “self” described by
Barthes as the lot of the sitter, the “passive victim” within the photographic process. This
sitter is “neither subject nor object but a subject who feels he is becoming an object” (14),
and the end product of the discomfort will be a photographic image with little likelihood of
being representative of the sitter as a person. Acknowledging these factors, let alone the
additional obvious truth that the photographic image captures a frozen second in time rather than a representative section of the subject’s life, should be sufficient to convince the most optimistic searcher that the likelihood of finding a genuinely “authentic” representation of Legrand is well nigh impossible. Yet illogically, the hope remains. At the same time, an important aspect of this study has been to trace trends within the public “self” or “selves” presented by Legrand; and, as earlier discussed, these photographs offer an ideal medium through which to observe the various personas captured, whether by intent of sitter or photographer, or perceived by later viewers.

Perhaps the greatest hope for authenticity lies within traceable similarities found within different images of the subject. To this, a further fillip is given by the fact that personal similarities are most evident in the three now iconic images which first came to prominence when viewed by Legrand’s contemporaries. In these photographs, a lively sense of authenticity is conveyed through the recurrence of the subject’s characteristic physical stance and his bright, attentive gaze. In fact as well as in perception, the repetition of these elements does enable us to get to know Legrand a little. Over time, what seems the studied nonchalance of the once-fashionable hand-in-pocket, crossover-leg pose he has adopted in Winter’s Elizabeth Street photograph (Fig.2) and in the later anonymous Collins Street doorway picture (Fig. 3) comes eventually to signify something else. By the mid-1890s “bookseller” photograph (Fig.1), we find the elderly, stooped Legrand resting more firmly on the left leg than the right, with the one which had been draped relaxedly across the other in earlier images now placed slightly ahead of him and bearing less weight. Legrand’s favouring of the right leg appears so pronounced in another photograph apparently taken later on that same day (Fig. 8) as to suggest some degree of physical disability. This, in turn, raises the question as to whether the walking stick sported by Legrand in the earlier Collins Street photograph (Fig. 3) was perhaps an item of assistance as well as of style.
A notable feature of nearly all the surviving photographs of Legrand is his alert, direct gaze. This suggests the expression as a personal characteristic. It is most pronounced in the three favourite images (Figs.1–3) and its absence is a disturbing element in the two repellant cameo portraits (Fig. 9, Fig. 10). So direct is the gaze that Legrand seems to be making deliberate eye contact with the viewer, and this lends life to the image. It seems logical to speculate that Legrand’s “quizzical look” is a continuing attraction of the best-known photographs. Barthes is helpful in elucidating the process of such spectator engagement. Speaking of himself, he explains that sometimes an image:

- animates me, and I animate it. So that is how I must name the attraction which makes it exist: an animation. The photograph itself is in no way animated (I do not believe in “lifelike” photographs), but it animates me: this is what creates adventure. (20)

For Barthes, this “adventure” entails closer study of the image, a “reading” of it in intellectual terms such may be applied to any photographs the viewer considers thoughtworthy. Whether the “adventure” is cursory or prolonged, the viewer is “sympathetically interested in what the photograph has to say” (43). This is what Barthes refers to as the “studium.” Although here he is considering such engagement with the image by a single viewer, it seems reasonable to extrapolate that the same process may be at work on a wider scale as part of whatever makes some images resoundingly popular with large numbers of viewers, even over time.

In his book Becoming Mona Lisa (2001), the cultural historian Donald Sassoon is considering the ongoing influence of the world-famous early sixteenth-century painting by Leonardo, a far cry from the study of old photographs. Yet he discusses an element clearly germane to Barthes’s notion of the “studium” and also to the ongoing popularity of some Legrand portraits. This is the degree of interactivity possible when a pictorial work is what
is known as “open”: that is, one which in at least some respects “allows the recipient/interpreter [. . .] to determine its meaning” (12). Sassoon here is discussing the phenomenon in relation to the depiction of emotion in art, referring in particular to the enduring magnetism of the Mona Lisa. He sees the combined effects of artistry, cultural convention, publicity, and spectator imagination as influencing the viewer’s sense of the portrait’s interactivity. Applying Sassoon’s insights to the particular appeal of the three popular Legrand portraits highlights the intentionally interactive composition of each — the invitation to explore similarities and difference in the Winter image (Fig. 2), the “mystery” of the unexpected presence of Legrand’s woman companion in the Collins Street doorway (Fig. 3), and the aura of personal enigma and a vanished past evoked in the “bookseller” photograph (Fig. 1).

Yet, as Barthes describes, some photographs may contain an element which has not been sought consciously, but which takes hold of the viewer unexpectedly, and with powerful emotional force. Barthes terms this the “punctum”: something which “rises from the scene, shoots out of it like an arrow, and pierces me [the spectator]” (26). This something is what the individual spectator “add[s] to the photograph and what is nonetheless already there” (55). The experience is unique to the viewer, and not necessarily felt even by those who find a picture deeply interesting. It is the phenomenon Samuel elsewhere refers to as “an old photograph’s power to take one unawares” (374). From the slender evidence available, one may guess that at least the “bookseller” photograph of Legrand (Fig. 1) has triggered a few such darts of personal connection; yet whether so, or in what way will never be known.

In tracing the cultural significance and ongoing cultural lives of the Legrand images, the present study has explored qualities and elements present within the
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51 Sassoon makes the particularly striking point that one popular conception, the “mystery” of Mona Lisa’s smile, is a quite recent (and popular, rather than critical) attribution: the masterpiece has always drawn attention, but the notion of “[t]he mystery originated [only] in the nineteenth century” (11).
photographs, and also relevant aspects of societal context. The ideas of theorists probing the powerful impact of old images have been of substantial assistance in achieving the critical distance necessary for examining the Legrand photographs as biographical evidence. Yet valuable as this theoretical perspective is for understanding both the photographs as “things” and Legrand’s ongoing visual presence in general, Barthes’ notion of the “punctum” highlights the inadvisability of attempting to generalise any photograph’s particular hold over viewers. Not only would such deeply personal engagement vary from one individual to another, but (according to Barthes) whatever triggers the impact may be at first misdiagnosed even by the individual, while sometimes the “punctum” is felt only later, in recollection (53–4). All the same, when considering the long and active afterlives of some images of Legrand there seems reason to speculate that close personal connection of a type Barthes describes may well have occurred for individual viewers of over the years, especially in the case of the most popular Beattie “bookseller” photograph.

It is at least possible to state the source of the sudden personal connection with the same Beattie photograph which, in effect, inspired this biographical study of Legrand, and has animated this project. Initially, a combination of several aspects seems to have aroused what Barthes calls the animation of “adventure.” These were the photograph’s “documentary assertiveness” (Green-Lewis, “Victorian Afterlife” 31), its “open” composition (Sassoon 12), and the charged context within which this first, unexpected encounter took place (an old, almost Legrandian secondhand shop stumbled across by a first-time visitor to Hobart entranced by the city’s lingering traces of its colonial past). Two things which proved unforgettable about the photograph were the subject’s quizzical look and the humorous detail of his ineffectual tattered apron. On closer analysis, what emerged as having provided the actual “punctum” effect was the impression of intelligence, humour, and active amusement conveyed by Legrand’s pictured gaze. In terms of visual chemistry,
the photograph’s contribution to the viewer’s sudden, sharp awareness of “a whole life external to [the] portrait” (Barthes 57) was mainly the result of photographic timing as well as artistic planning. The historical trigger for the picture’s appeal probably was a pleasant verbal interchange between Legrand and Beattie during the photography session more than a century ago. Yet for Legrand’s modern-day biographer, the subject’s direct eye contact and his projection of a smiling self at the precise instant in time frozen by Beattie’s camera transmit a lively sensation of complicity, not only of a joke shared and still in progress, but of the spectator being included in this long moment of spontaneous levity. It was the illusion of the spectator, as well as the Victorian subject, being “both in, and out, of history” (Green-Lewis, “Victorian Afterlife” 31) which, for me, triggered the punctum effect.

Presumably, the staged humour of Legrand’s threadbare apron is the subject of our shared amusement. Or is it? Strangely, though the original spark can never be known, the captured joke retains its power to kindle rapport. It is engaging and infectious: the moment has an ongoing life of its own. Yet over the time spent on research for this study, Legrand’s enigmatically amused expression has acquired additional meanings for his biographer. The nature of the interaction has proved changeable: sometimes the gaze has seemed a playful challenging of the researcher, though at other times a cheerful gloating over perplexing research outcomes. In the end, despite the layers of freshly-retrieved information about him which has emerged, Legrand remains as much an enigma as ever in some respects. We now may know far more about his life, career, and cultural importance, but his emotions, thoughts, memories, and personal identity remain as elusive as ever
CONCLUSION

Beattie’s late-Victorian “bookseller” photograph captured Legrand for posterity. Though at least two other likenesses were taken on that same day and with similar intent, this one has set the way in which Legrand is remembered, and how he is likely to be recognised in the future. As the thesis shows, this now-iconic image is less candid than it seems, but even in this, is a fitting memorial to Legrand in many respects. The frequent return to this photograph throughout the thesis highlights the significance of Legrand’s book-dealing career and explains much about the ongoing interest in him. Even the theatricality of the image might be seen as (unintentionally) representative of Legrand and of his colonial presence, since he assumed many different roles over the years and evidently hid his original identity behind a range of various personas. Nevertheless the photograph projects an image of Legrand that we can trust to some extent. It indicates the importance to Legrand, to his community, and to later history, of the objects which he gathered, traded, and hoarded during his Hobart career. A major theme of this thesis has been that Legrand was driven by the urge to collect, and Beattie captures something of this delight and desire in and for the objects he gathered about him. The word “antiquarian” hovers over Legrand. It suggests firstly his many years of working and living amongst old books, pamphlets, manuscripts, and a miscellany of curious or outmoded items. Secondly, it suggests the nature of his own interest, and the fascination of his collection for others since. This interest seems akin to “the antiquarian imagination” described by Tom Griffiths in Hunters and Collectors: “a historical sensibility particularly attuned to the material evidence of the past, and possessing a powerful sense of place” (1). While many contemporaries saw Legrand’s shop as the repository of books and other publications linked to British and European culture, his collection increasingly focussed on material salvaged from the colonial past, and
Tasmania’s past in particular. The term “antiquarianism” has been used at times in a pejorative sense, distinguishing the amateur enthusiast knowledgeable about the past, though perhaps in a restricted or parochial way, from the academically-trained historian (Griffiths 1–2). Legrand and his hoard came in for much of this type of criticism over the years. Yet research for the thesis has found evidence of some rare works owned by Legrand, that he was a discerning collector of colonial works, and that his trade in Australiana extended beyond the already-known supply to the Grey collection in Auckland.

Other key aspects of Legrand’s Tasmanian cultural importance feature in the Beattie “bookseller” portrait. As the thesis shows, the antiquarian objects chosen for display had particular social and cultural relevance at the time, and they have remained significant, though with changing emphases over the years. It is evident that the recent interest in Victorian times and in local and national heritage has contributed to the ongoing appeal and influence of this image and to the iconic status of Legrand himself.

Yet the whimsical old bookman enshrined by Beattie’s carefully-staged genre-piece in no way fully represents the subject’s historical career. As we have seen, Legrand also collected objects of scientific interest. The discovery and study of Tasmanian molluscs was a particular passion and a further way in which his profound connection to place becomes evident. The thesis traces Legrand’s contribution to early Tasmanian science: in small ways through his long association with the Royal Society of Tasmania, more directly through his encouragement of better-known workers in the field of shell science, and expressly in his production of the Collections for a Monograph of Tasmanian Land Shells. But antiquarianism of a different sort cast its shadow over his scientific repute, and not long after his book appeared he seems to have recognised that much of the theoretical knowledge he had gained through decades of conchological study had become obsolete. Undoubtedly, it was a major disappointment to Legrand that his scientific career came to an abrupt end,
yet at least outwardly he dealt with the transition in a pragmatic way. Still, as the thesis shows, he has been proved correct in retaining his faith in the importance of his published Collections, though the value of this work is now mainly historical, bibliographical, and biographical rather than scientific.

The thesis examines another significant cultural contribution made by Legrand which even he would not have anticipated. This work is his newspaper article about Recherche Bay, which apparently brought him no accolades when it first appeared in print. As the thesis shows, the article is historically valuable, and also is culturally and biographically revealing. As with the Beattie photograph, the original text is deceptively straightforward but covertly rhetorical, and also has retained social and cultural relevance within later, very different times. Legrand’s article has made a small but rich contribution to the historical record and to the heritage value of the area it describes. It is still useful, and is another enduring example of his strong connection to place.

A detailed chronological account of Legrand’s life and career from his arrival in the colonies to his death in 1902 is the seminal achievement of this thesis. The research has uncovered a substantial amount of long-hidden material about Legrand. It also has probed apocryphal tales about him and numerous English records in order to establish a clearer picture of his possible origins and former identity. Despite the continuing absence of any material relating directly to Legrand’s inner self, pursuing him by means of every other available fragment of relevant evidence has enabled his biographer to gain sufficient knowledge of him to venture intuitive suppositions from time to time. Several lines of inquiry based on this understanding have led to fresh discoveries, in particular about Legrand’s earlier travels and about his associations with colonial contemporaries. Yet Legrand’s origins still remain unverified. Research into this matter continues, and what is
presented here brings together all the relevant evidence acquired to date and one promising line of enquiry.

It may be that Legrand’s origins will remain a mystery forever, and that analysis of what he meant to contemporaries and exploration of what he continues to mean are as far as we can go in this direction. Yet in view of the unexpected quantity, richness, and complexity of the material found during research for this thesis, there seems every chance that more of Legrand’s story will emerge over time. In particular, additional material may surface as a result of ongoing digitisation projects as well as through further research. This thesis has not explored fully some aspects emerging from material it has brought forward as preliminary findings. What is presented here is a foundational study, one which establishes all that is currently known about William Legrand. Though complete in itself, this prepares the way for ongoing research, including enquiries of a more speculative nature, hence the inclusion of some details signalled as tentative and others as apparently worthy of further investigation. Though based on long, extensive, and thorough research which has uncovered a very large quantity of previously untapped material about the biographical subject, the thesis remains in conversation with previous and with future researchers. We have not heard the last of Legrand.

Ongoing projects await. Amongst them are some promising lines of investigation suggested by object biography: in particular, attention to the agency of the objects which Legrand collected, in terms of his personal and intellectual life, his livelihood and career, and the wider society in general. In addition, more needs to be known about Legrand’s feelings towards the assorted commodities with which his commercial and domestic life was so intertwined. For example: had he gravitated to collecting these objects through personal interest; through early training, as the Mercury’s final interview suggested; through commercial necessity, the items being cheaply obtained and potentially profitable; through
seeing them as a means to social improvement; or through a combination of these factors? Then there are the previous lives of the items traded to be considered. No relevant sale catalogues exist, yet pursuing the provenance of the few books and manuscripts known to have come from Legrand could reveal more about him and about the society in general. As regards his scientific interests, examining in closer detail the range of research materials accessed by Legrand may uncover more about the intellectual life of this colonial autodidact. Investigation of the places where Legrand is known to have gone shell-hunting could shed light on his way of life, his associates, and the colonial settlement more generally. Further research into the lives of his known associates may produce greater knowledge of Legrand, and also of his social and cultural milieu.

These and other subsidiary lines of enquiry connected with this biographical study may take a long time to produce useful information. Some of them may falter at impenetrable blind ends. Yet the larger and more important research task already has been achieved by the thesis. This was to increase the existing knowledge about Legrand and to produce a scholarly biographical study encompassing his life, career, and ongoing cultural importance. The project has taken unforeseen turns of direction and uncovered unexpected quantities of significant material. Along the way, the search for Legrand has brought to light long-forgotten historical details of place and era, and also the previously-untraced stories of other past lives which intersected with Legrand’s. Above all, plentiful details of Legrand’s own story have emerged from shadows of obscurity mostly of his own making.

For whatever reason or to whatever extent Legrand reinvented himself in the colonies, he earned himself a firm and lasting presence as a Tasmanian identity. As this study has shown, he was intelligent, enquiring, adventurous, persistent, studious, courageous, intellectually honest, entrepreneurial, reliable in undertakings, and undoubtedly possessed of a dry sense of humour. He probably also was wily, evasive, opportunistic,
irascible, and prone to flashes of anger or the making of occasional hasty decisions; and he may have left behind an earlier disreputable past. Yet throughout his career as a conchologist he showed himself as committed to the advancement of scientific knowledge both in and about Tasmania, and he made valuable cultural contributions in this way. Beyond this, he established a firm and still-enduring presence as Hobart’s intriguing and oddly unclassifiable bookman: seen by some as learned and by others as pretentious; as the proprietor of an overstocked collection of mouldering print materials or as the custodian of well-hidden rare treasures. Reading Legrand’s own written works, whether about shells, Recherche Bay, or business dealings with others, throws additional light on these conflicting claims. He probably was an inconsistent mixture of most of them. Yet whatever his qualifications or motivations, Legrand’s dealing in colonial materials and also the various contemporary representations of him made an important contribution to the social history of his adopted homeland. His rediscovered life story has proved every bit as intriguing as his iconic representation, and shows him as an historical figure well worth remembering.
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The site of Legrand’s Elizabeth Street bookshop shows up clearly on this early map, as the narrow, irregularly-shaped allotment running inwards along one boundary of the upper left corner allotment. Legrand’s later Collins Street premises adjoined the offset lane forming one boundary of the opposite corner allotment (upper right).
Figure 15. Australian Mutual Provident (A. M. P.) on the S. E. Corner of Elizabeth and Collins Streets. Collection: Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery. Q1961.158. Permission of the Tasmanian Museum and Art Gallery must be obtained before any re-use of this image.

This photograph clearly dates from between 1896 and 1922, since it shows (lower right) Legrand’s old Elizabeth Street shop transformed into the Post Office Tea Rooms.
Figure 17. Poulson, Bruce. Recherche Bay: A Short History of Recherche Bay. Southport: The Management Committee of the Southport Community Centre, Southport, Tas., 2004. Reproduced here with permission.
CATALOGUE
OF
BOOKS & STATIONERY,
COMPRISING THE FOLLOWING WORKS:
History, Biography,
TRAVEL, FICTION, &c.,
ALSO A LARGE NUMBER OF
ELEGANTLY BOUND BOOKS,
suitable for
PRIZES, OR SUNDAY SCHOOL LIBRARIES,
to be sold by auction by Messrs.
BURN & SON
ON
FRIDAY, MARCH 24th, 1882,
at the residence of
MESSRS. WESTCOTT & CO.,
COLLINS STREET.
Mr. W. LEGRAND, 58, Collins Street,
will purchase Lots on behalf of those persons
who cannot attend.
HOBART:
DAVIES BROS., PRINTERS, "MERCURY OFFICE," MACQUARIE STREET.
1882.
This long-empty envelope continues life as a philatelic specimen of particular interest because of its fine postmarks and old New South Wales stamps. Its recent emergence adds to existing knowledge about the Cox-Legrand correspondence, and also raises hope that other material evidence of Legrand’s life and career has survived, and merely awaits discovery.
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I have just returned from a conchological excursion on our south coast, and have strung together a few notes on that extreme portion on our seaboard, Recherche Bay, a place little known to visitors from town. I left town on the 5th by the cutter Ripple, Capt. Domeney; we had a sharp run to Taylor’s Bay, where we dropped anchor to leave Mr. Swift and a party of quarrymen to work the quarries there. The stone is required for a Melbourne contract. We arrived at Recherche Bay on Saturday, the 7th, and spoke the Flying Childers in the Bay. I made Recherche my home, staying at Mr. Domeney’s, and I went in boats from place to place, partly by land, and partly by water. I did not have the pleasure of seeing Mrs. D., that lady being on a visit to town, the result of which was an addition to the population of Recherche.

My first trip was to South Cape Bay; myself with two friends, crossed the bay in a punt, and went as far up Cockle Creek as we could, then took the land, which is three or four miles low and swampy; but when we reached the high ground, the scrub was very thick. We examined the whole of the Bay. Among the shells found were chitons of very large size, - or, as Paddy, one of my fellow-travellers, called them, alligators, - which we tied to pieces of wrack we found there. Our dogs caught a porcupine, but being heavily laden, we left it behind. On our return to Cockle Creek, the wind had got so high that we could not cross the Bay in the punt, and had to get home by coasting it. My next trip was across the Bay to
William’s Beach. The first thing noticeable here is a vessel of from 150 to 200 tons burthen now on the stocks. The builder is Mr. Williams, and the whole of the work has been done by himself, with the assistance of a boy.

The next point on this beach is, I was about to say, the church-yard, but, as there is no church, must call it a burial ground. This is on the beach, so near to the sea, that some of the graves are covered by the sand. There are eight enclosures railed in, some of which contain several graves. There are others not railed. With one exception all the monuments are of wood, some have only initials and date. As I am now on church matters I may mention that no minister has visited the place for four years, and that the only one who has preached there for as I am informed 20 years is our late Bishop Nixon. There are whole families not christened, and at funerals the service is read by the school-master. The next point is Capt. Fisher’s, formerly a whaler, now one of the largest cabbage growers, he having about 12,000 in the ground. The manure used is principally kelp. Sharks are also used after the oil has been extracted from the livers. Capt. Fisher’s house was formerly as public house, the Lawyer’s [sic] Arms, the sign of which is so perfectly original that Capt. Fisher says he has never been able to read it. I was more successful perhaps from being more used to hieroglyphics.

My next trip was across the bay to Driscoll’s, where we left the point, then coasted it as far as Sullivan’s Point, which we crossed, to do which we had to scrub it, there being no track that we could find, after which we took the roaring beach, the scene of the wreck of the George 4th a part of which still remains. There is a monument on the bluff near
Southport Island. We returned by Southport Lagoon, a very large sheet of water, with several small islands in it, and back by track to Driscoll’s, where we again took the boat.

My next was an attempt to reach the Pigsties. I took the track as far as the Catamnan [Catamaran] river, which I crossed, but very soon lost the track. I got stuck up in the scrub; however by wandering about I contrived to pick up the track I came by and returned. Speaking of tracks, those about Recherche beat all I ever saw; in most of them the marks of the principal ones, being marked trees, are very slight, and when they pass through the cutting grass and scrub, as they often do, are very often lost. One comfort is there are so many of them that if you lose one you are sure to pick up another, which will take you somewhere, and you will be made welcome at every hut.

The principle [sic] support of the place has been sawing and splitting, but the splitters say that, with the exception of the Pigsties, all the timber within a reasonable distance is used up. Cabbages are grown to a great extent, the number now in the ground being from 140,000 to 150,000. Occasionally whales have been taken in the bay; none, however have been seen for several years. The man who gives notice of a whale receives £5 if the whale is captured, and the proceeds are divided amongst the hands employed. The people belong to the order Amphibia, and they pass as much time in boats as on shore; in fact, in winter this is the only mode of communication, the tracks then being in many places under water. The schoolmaster collects his scholars every morning except Saturday, which is a holiday, in a boat. The day I visited the school there
were twenty pupils present, six boys and fourteen girls; but this is rather under the average attendance. The state of the school in my opinion, is very creditable to the master.

All are fishermen; they catch king fish, barracouta, conger eels, a few trumpeter, besides sharks, which are, as I said before, used for manure; sting rays are also taken for their oil. One Chinaman gets his living by curing mutton fish, which go to the Melbourne markets for the Celestials in Victoria. Cabbages at Recherche are like shrimps at Gravesend, every one has his patch, large or small; the two largest growers are Mr. Caldwell, of Cockle Creek, and Captain Fisher. Nearly every one has also his boat, and, like the Irishman who left off work to carry bricks, after they have done work, they amuse themselves by catching sharks from 70 lbs. to 100 lbs. weight. This seemed to me a very close imitation of work, but, perhaps, I do not understand the matter.

A sawmill was formerly at work here, but it is now standing idle; all the machinery is removed, and there is a bullock road leading to it. This is the only road in the bay, all the others being mere tracks, partly in the bush and partly on the beach. There are two horses, about half a dozen cows, and a few pigs, but no sheep. The population is a little over a hundred, and there are a great many empty huts, which I was told were all used when the sawmill was at work. The only inference to be drawn from this is that the population has decreased. One natural production of which the supply is too great are snakes; the black snake is the most common and also the largest; it is often seen five to six feet long; the whip snake is also plentiful. I saw a large black snake in the garden close by the house, and
several others within a short distance. I was informed that the carpet and diamond snakes are also found there, but I did not see any.

On Saturday, February 20th, we were visited by the government schooner Harriet having on board Sir Valentine Fleming and Mr. Bartlett, Assistant Commissary-General; they were on a fishing excursion, and had been to Adventure Bay. Having searched all the coast, in which I found everyone ready to assist me; and especially Mr. Collis, the school-master, I prepared to return to town. For the present I must defer my intended visit to Port Davey, as I could not spare sufficient time to go around there; I intend to go direct from town. I left Recherche in the cutter Ripple on Monday afternoon, February 22nd, and arrived at Taylor’s Bay the same evening, and left there the principal part of our cargo consisting of palings, and arrived in the dock at 11 p.m., the only mishap being the breaking of our jibboom off Long Bay.

W. LEGRAND

(Weekly News [Hobart] 6 Mar. 1869: 9; Evening Mail [Hobart] 8 Mar. 1869: 3, 4)