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ABSTRACT

THE EDITOR, THE PREFACE, AND THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY EDITION:
A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC STUDY

By
Jessica M. Jost-Costanzo
December 2009

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Susan Kubica Howard

Scholarly editions became entrenched as published texts during the eighteenth century. This dissertation considers the contributions of editors to their specific editions and, ultimately, the editorial project. Forty-seven editions, some well-known and some obscure, are critically and bibliographically analyzed in four cross-referenced chapters. The first chapter deals with editions of autobiography and memoirs. The second chapter examines editions of women’s texts. Chapter three focuses on family editions (in which the editor is a family member of the author), and the fourth and final chapter addresses colonial editions. Such a study reveals that eighteenth-century editors were interested in diverse texts. Furthermore, statements by editors about editorial method, textual transmission, and historical context appear consistently in prefaces to these editions. Considering such paratextual statements further clarifies how editors emended texts and
framed texts for an eighteenth-century readership who may have been uncomfortable or 
ambivalent about the subject matter or the reputation of the author. In some instances, 
editors attempted to inspire readers to continue reading an edition by praising the virtue 
or talent of the author. In other instances, editors anticipated reader anxiety regarding a 
socially subversive edition. As a result, these editorial voices intrude in the edition in 
fascinating and occasionally troubling ways. While I was not able to exonerate these 
editors, as they more often than not provided vague information about textual 
emendations, I can unequivocally assert that editors were aware of their relationship to 
the text. They often express a sense of discomfort about changing the text of a given 
manuscript. They were also aware to varying degrees that their prefaces were a 
significant element of the edition and that their prefaces shaped a reader’s experience.
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Introduction

Editor: one who prepares the literary work of another person, or number of persons for publication, by selecting, revising, and arranging the material; also, one who prepares an edition of any literary work.
- Oxford English Dictionary

I have been very often disappointed of late Years, when upon examining the new Edition of a Classick Author, I have found above half the Volume taken up with various Readings. When I expected to meet with a Learned Note upon a doubtful Passage in a Latin Poet, I have only been informed, that such or such ancient Manuscripts for an et write an ac, or of some other notable Discovery of the like Importance. Indeed, when a different Reading gives us a different Sense, or a new Elegance in an Author, the Editor does very well in taking Notice of it; but when he only entertains us with the several ways of Spelling the same Word, and gathers together the various Blunders and Mistakes of twenty or thirty different Transcribers, they only take up the Time of the learned Reader, and puzzle the Minds of the Ignorant. I have often fancied with my self how enraged an old Latin Author would be, should he see the several Absurdities in Sense and Grammar, which are imputed to him by some or other of these various Readings.

-Joseph Addison

The Eighteenth-Century Editor and the Rise of the Edition

Scholarly editions of literary texts were published with increasing frequency over the course of the long eighteenth century. Often, editors were bequeathed manuscripts by friends or loved ones with a written plea that the text be published. Occasionally, editors offered to produce an edition in order to raise funds for the author’s family who was left

---

1 Oxford English Dictionary Online.
behind in dire financial straits. James Currie’s edition of Robert Burns’s Works was published for this reason, as was Bridget Fremantle’s, Samuel Richardson’s, and Isaac Hawkins Browne’s edition of Mary Leapor’s Poems Upon Several Occasions. Lastly, editions were also published because editors thought them to be important texts that would be valued by eighteenth-century readers. For instance, Thomas Ellwood’s autobiography, edited by Joseph Wyeth, appealed to readers for its informative account of Quakerism, and editions of the slave narratives were published by abolitionists for the purpose of promoting their cause. Whatever the case may be, the edition became entrenched as a literary genre in the eighteenth century, and readers, editors, and authors were aware of the complexities of these texts.

The editorial voice, which is apparent in editions in the form of advertisements, prefaces, biographical sketches of the author, appendices, and footnotes, was well-known to eighteenth-century readers. In fact, the edition became so prevalent that authors even incorporated editorial apparati in their novels, mimicking and co-opting the language of the edition. Daniel Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe (1719) and Moll Flanders (1722), Samuel Richardson’s Pamela (1740), Charles Johnstone’s The Pilgrim (1775), Maria Edgeworth’s Castle Rackrent (1800), and Jane Porter’s Sir Edward Seaward’s Narrative of His Shipwreck (1831) all utilize the conventions of the edition to add a distinct voice to their text. Whether in the form of a preface or footnotes, the editorial voice as novelistic tool showcases the prevalence of editions and the resulting apparati that appeared frequently in texts. For instance, in Castle Rackrent, which Susan Kubica Howard describes as a “memoir-novel bound with a strong editorial presence,” Maria Edgeworth

---

3 Susan Kubica Howard, ed., introduction to Castle Rackrent, by Maria Edgeworth (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett, 2007), xxiii.
navigates the Anglo-Irish divide by incorporating a glossary to describe culture, ritual, and terminology that might elude the English reader.

The stakes for the editor in the actual as opposed to the fictional edition, however, are higher. The editorial method in a given edition was either lauded for its thoroughness or lambasted for its inappropriate emendations or intrusiveness (see the epigraph by Joseph Addison above). It is the various methods that eighteenth-century editors employed, and in particular the statements they made in their prefaces regarding the function of their role, that is the focus of this dissertation. By examining the history of the editor, and especially by considering their commentary, the modern reader and scholar can further understand the development of editing during the era.

**Eighteenth-Century Editors: The Critical Heritage**

Discussions of English literary history sketch the rise of editorial projects in the eighteenth century. Scholars like Rene Wellek, in *The Rise of English Literary History*, trace the development of literature across the centuries. Wellek outlines the types of texts and editions that appeared in the eighteenth century. He explains that during the eighteenth century the editorial lens focuses on Medieval and Renaissance texts, collections of plays and poems, as well as English and Scottish literature. Wellek explains, “all this second-hand antiquarian knowledge is then suddenly turned to modern use.”

This discussion highlights the fact that scholarly editing truly emerges at this time. However, Wellek’s literary history, which aims to paint a grand picture of editing, is merely a nod to all that the eighteenth-century editors were able to accomplish. In trying

---

to give equal attention to all the literary periods, he only has the space to mention representative anthologies and some editions of the eighteenth century. This is not a criticism of Wellek’s scholarly endeavor; rather, this is meant to point out that his broad literary history simply cannot elucidate the scope and diversity of eighteenth-century scholarly editions.

Furthermore, discussions of literary taste during the eighteenth century are also available. Texts such as Lawrence Lipking’s *Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century England* highlight the subject of readership. Eighteenth-century readers were interested in a wide array of texts—both ancient and modern. Lipking explains, “for the first time many Englishmen thought it important that their arts should have a history and their tastes should have a guide.” The English reader was becoming savvy, and the demand for anthologies was obviously on the rise as was the demand for new editions of individual texts. Lipking’s text is crucial for understanding the development of a national literature and literary history; however, Lipking, like Wellek, places the subject of eighteenth-century editing in a broad analytical framework. Lipking is interested not only in the ordering of the literary arts but also the musical arts and fine arts. As a result, the treatment of editing in *Ordering of the Arts in Eighteenth-Century England*, while helpful, is limited.

John Brewer, like Wellek and Lipking, focuses on the rise of literary history and taste, offering important insights about print culture in his *Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth-Century*. Brewer discusses the centrality of the arts in eighteenth-century England. He notes the increase in literacy, book clubs, lending

---

libraries, printed texts, and literary criticism. It is out of this literary and cultural moment that the demand for editors, printers, publishers, and book sellers will increase dramatically. In Brewer’s third chapter, “Authors, Publishers, and the Making of Literary Culture,” he outlines how the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 allowed for more freedom of the press, but the lapse of this law also encouraged entrepreneurs in the industry to scramble for ownership of literary copyrights. The result was a bustling and competitive world of publishing. Brewer’s presentation is well-drawn and compelling. He portrays a tense business environment in which authors, publishers, and booksellers all relied on one another and manipulated one another. Brewer states, “the world of eighteenth-century publishing is best understood as an expanding maze or labyrinth, and it offered the potential author [or editor] many entrances and numerous routes to eventual publication, each full of hazards, pitfalls, and dead ends.”

There remained, especially with the rise of the Copyright Law in 1710, a heated debate about literary creativity and intellectual property. Scholarly editors not only had to reconcile their own methods with the authorial manuscript, they also had to navigate the complex world of publishing.

Discussions of the publishing and printing industries abound: historical treatments of individual publishers and certain printing houses; historical studies that highlight copyrights, libel laws, and the Licensing Act; and broad histories of publishing from the medieval period to the modern era. These studies are very helpful in terms of understanding the circuitous route that writers, as well as editors, had to follow in order to produce, print, publish, and sell a text. John P. Feather’s article, “From Censorship to Copyright: Aspects of the Government’s Role in the English Book Trade, 1695-1775,”

---

and his book, *A History of British Publishing*, both elucidate the realities of the world of eighteenth-century book production. A collection of essays by O.M. Brack, Jr., *Writers, Books, and Trade: An Eighteenth-Century English Miscellany for William B. Todd*, includes 17 chapters that discuss the production of certain texts, the contributions of a given press, as well as the process of book production. These works by Feather and Brack, along with other scholarly discussions of printing and publishing in the eighteenth century, are useful historical treatments of publishing, printing, and bookselling.\(^7\)

Another interest of modern scholars of eighteenth-century editions is collections of Shakespeare’s plays. The production of Shakespeare editions remained a consistent editorial endeavor throughout the long eighteenth century, and it certainly informed attitudes and methodology regarding editorial approaches to scholarly editions of texts by other authors. Recent scholarship pertaining to Shakespeare editions is prolific. Margreta DeGrazia’s *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus* looks at Edmond Malone’s 1790 edition of Shakespeare in particular, which, she explains, incorporates the work of previous editions but breaks from tradition by considering Shakespeare’s historical/biographical background and giving credence to earlier editions as copy-text. Colin Franklin’s *Shakespeare Domesticated* is a thorough listing of all the editions. This is particularly interesting as it puts into very clear light the evolution of the editorial treatment of and attitude toward Shakespeare’s plays. Simon

---

Jarvis, in *Scholars and Gentlemen: Shakespearean Textual Criticism and Representations of Scholarly Labor, 1725-1765*, explains that the eighteenth-century editors of Shakespeare’s works were caught between textual criticism and literary theory. By examining this tension that eighteenth-century editors faced, modern scholars can discern the development of editorial practice. In *Shakespeare, Milton and Eighteenth-Century Literary Editing: The Beginnings of Interpretive Scholarship*, Marcus Walsh asserts that editorial practices of the eighteenth century grew out of the tradition of Anglican, biblical hermeneutics and other literary and social factors. Walsh states,

> The occasions for this development, and the reasons for its timing, lie partly no doubt in social, economic, and legal histories of the book and book readers, of the profession of letters, and of property and copyright. They lie too in the history of a more general process by which English culture required and developed a sense of its own identity and its own history, and began to seek literary classics of its own.  

Walsh’s analysis explains not only the ways in which editorial method evolved but *why* it evolved in such a manner. A collection of essays edited by Joanna Gondris, *Reading Readings: Essays on Shakespeare Editing in the Eighteenth Century*, is a major step in the study of Shakespeare editions. The eighteen essays that appear in this text demonstrate diverse approaches toward the textual analysis of Shakespeare editions. In these essays, the role that editors play in constructing meaning comes to light. Editorial choices in the eighteenth century had implications in terms of representation of gender, commercial viability of an edition, and literary credibility. All in all, these texts elucidate the development of editorial treatments and also highlight how eighteenth-century editors addressed and tried to resolve issues such as copy-text, authorial intention, textual apparatus, and prolegomena. It is important to note that those scholars who have traced

---

the development of editorial technique as it pertains to the Shakespeare editions laid the foundations for the study of the rise of scholarly editing in the eighteenth century. Modern scholars such as DeGrazia, Franklin, Jarvis, Walsh, and Gondris have shown how Shakespeare editors—Rowe, Pope, Theobald, Tonson, Hanmer, Warburton, Johnson, Steevens, Stockdale, Capell, and Malone—took scholarly editing through the necessary growing pains. Furthermore, as a result of this recent scholarship, it is apparent that the eighteenth-century Shakespeare editions say much about the historical realities of editorial practice, editorial construction of meaning, print culture, and literary history. Such fruitful study begs the question, what about other types of editions?

The substantial body of scholarly editions, aside from Shakespeare editions, has not been given such extensive critical attention. However, this is not to say that important work has not been done. Barbara M. Benedict’s study, *Making the Modern Reader: Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Anthologies*, which appeared in 1996, is a thorough discussion of anthologies and miscellanies. Benedict explains,

> By analyzing the way these collections shape and are shaped by the cultural contexts in which they were produced and by explicating the kind of reading they invite, this book argues that literary anthologies mediate between individual readers and literary culture. This mediation redefines readers’ subjectivity by representing literature as art and reading as a critical activity. Anthologies sell texts of choice and the choice of texts.

As this excerpt indicates, Benedict’s text is so helpful because it considers all of the previous approaches to eighteenth-century textual studies: literary history, historical context, print production, readership, and literary theory. The schema of *Making the Modern Reader* is truly what the field of eighteenth-century textual studies needs. By more thoroughly examining the overlooked subject of editorial practices associated with

---

anthologies, Benedict’s text fills in many gaps in eighteenth-century textual studies, offering a more comprehensive picture of eighteenth-century editing. In each chapter of *Making the Modern Reader*, Benedict studies a different type of anthology, working chronologically across the eighteenth century. By considering the spectrum of anthologies produced by various editors, Benedict provides a more complex portrait of editorial method. Furthermore, Benedict provides useful scholarly apparati, a chronological listing of anthologies, and a lengthy bibliography.

George Justice and Margaret J.M. Ezell have also contributed important scholarship on editing in the eighteenth century. George Justice’s *The Manufacturers of Literature: Writing and the Literary Marketplace in Eighteenth-Century England*, and especially his chapter entitled “Robert Dodsley’s *Collection of Poems by Several Hands*, the ‘Modern Classic,’ and Literary Value,” is an informative text for the study of editions. In this third chapter, Justice notes that Dodsley’s anthology was a clever exercise in marketing. Justice explains,

> The interpenetration of taste and profit creates a notion of literary value functioning in terms of consumption, and it comes to dominate practices of writing, publishing, and reading in eighteenth-century Britain. The construction of literary value can be revealed in the way Dodsley’s *Collection* promotes its poems as “modern classics”; in particular, its elevation of Alexander Pope as authorial genius represents a vast shift in eighteenth-century understandings of Literature.10

In short, Dodsley’s editorial and marketing maneuvers shape meaning in the edition. For instance, the inclusion of Thomas Gray’s poetry in the *Collection* gives literary credence to the edition, but it also shapes Gray’s reputation as “gentleman author.”11 Margaret J.M. Ezell has contributed numerous texts and articles on the subject of scholarly editions
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11 Ibid., 122.
in the eighteenth century. Her texts *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print*, *Writing Women’s Literary History*, and *The Patriarch’s Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family* are terrific studies of eighteenth-century print culture and gender. Ezell’s chapter in George Justice’s and Nathan Tinker’s *Women’s Writing and the Circulation of Ideas: Manuscript Publication in England, 1550-1800*, entitled “The posthumous publication of women’s manuscripts and the history of authorship,” is an extremely enlightening study of posthumous publications. Ezell states, “In posthumous editions, collections of verse or prose by both men and women which were printed only after the author’s death, the structure and apparatus—called by some the paratexts—as well as the volume’s contents, can make suggestive revelations concerning the text’s previous existence as part of a social literary practice.” Ezell’s observation that much can be gleaned from a posthumous edition about social and literary context is very much in line with the parameters of this project.

Keeping in mind the literature reviewed above, this dissertation hopes to add another perspective to the discourse on eighteenth-century editions. Scholars like Benedict, Justice, and Ezell have each elaborated in important ways on the editorial work taking place in this literary era. Despite all of the great scholarly work that has been accomplished, I still felt that the editorial voice could be elaborated upon. For instance, what did editors say about their own work? What sort of apparatus did editors favor? Were there trends in editorial method? In response to these questions, I embarked on a dissertation project in which I examine editorial apparati, with a particular interest in
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editorial prefaces, for it is here that extensive commentary by editors takes place. I decided on an annotated bibliography of forty-seven editions in four categories. I elaborate on my methodology and rationale below.

Methodology

This dissertation reveals an inherent challenge in textual studies: specificity. On the one hand, the goal of this study is to work with numerous eighteenth-century scholarly editions, locating how editors implemented various strategies in order to locate their editorial aims within certain literary and cultural contexts. This aspect of the project is necessarily more broad as it seeks to identify patterns, connections, and methods across the eighteenth-century editorial project. On the other hand, textual scholarship must be specific. Textual scholars must go directly to the text(s) for answers. Ultimately, this dissertation is an attempt to bridge the gap. By delving into eighteenth-century scholarly editions, with an eye for editorial prefaces in particular, editorial and historical patterns emerge. In their prefaces, a wealth of information is available regarding the context of any given text. This activity is in line with Jerome McGann’s textual theory, which involves keeping in mind textual as well as broader social considerations. He states in A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism that his ideas are based on a “socialized concept of authorship and textual authority.”¹³ McGann’s work, well-established in the field of textual studies, continues to inspire textual scholars to look to texts and to history.

Interestingly, I did not originally intend to focus specifically on editorial prefaces. To be honest, as the saying goes, “necessity is the mother of invention,” and this project

---

is no exception. Time, money, and photo duplication policies dictated my focus on prefaces. First and foremost, I was working with forty-seven editions, which is an incredible amount of text to work with. Second, photocopy fees for rare books are often one dollar per page or more, which was expensive considering I had to photocopy information contained in forty-seven editions. Third, I was only permitted to copy twenty-five pages per text in those rare books I found at the Folger Library, which meant I had to be picky about what I could copy. Lastly, I also had in mind that I did not want to contribute any overdue wear and tear to rare books. Copying numerous pages from any given text would certainly contribute to their deterioration, especially to some of the more fragile texts. In short, the texts dictated the direction of my study. I kept in mind my aim of finding trends in multiple scholarly editions across the long eighteenth century, as well as remaining true to the specificity of textual studies, and the end result is a dialogue of sorts among eighteenth-century editors, authors, and readers that takes place in forty-seven prefaces, which reveals the goals, concerns, and historical situation of these editors.

This project evolved through four significant stages. First, I had to determine what texts to include in this study and how to categorize them. Second, considerable time was required to locate first editions. Third, each edition had to be annotated. Fourth, each category of editions was considered and analyzed critically. This analysis involved determining similar themes among editions in each genre. The end result is a dissertation that examines numerous eighteenth-century editions, provides research in the form of four chapters of annotated bibliography, and includes critical/scholarly chapter introductions.
The first stage of this dissertation involved casting a wide net to find out what scholarly editions were produced in the eighteenth-century. For this task, I began with literary chronologies, in particular Michael Cox’s *Oxford Chronology of English Literature* and Samuel J. Rogal’s *Chronological Outline of British Literature*. These texts not only list literary texts sequentially, they also categorize texts using concise terms to indicate various genres (i.e. edition, collected works, non-fiction, drama, essays, etc.). This categorization by genre was most useful as it allowed me to make a fairly complete list of eighteenth-century scholarly editions from 1660-1835. Furthermore, relying on two chronologies assured a more accurate list.\(^\text{14}\) Once I had a complete list of editions, I had to make the hard decisions of categorizing those texts.

I had a hypothesis that there would most likely be threads or themes that appeared regularly throughout the list of editions. To make my task simpler I ruled out editions of Shakespeare’s works—as noted above, considerable work has already been done on eighteenth-century editions of the Bard’s plays and poems. Having perused Barbara Benedict’s work, *Cultural Mediation in Early Modern Anthologies*, I found her treatment of anthologies and collected works to be especially useful, and I chose to leave that realm of scholarship in her capable hands. I should also note that collected works are often multi-volume editions, which would be unruly for this type of study. Since I had ruled out collected works, I should point out that collections of letters fall into that category. Benedict does not focus on collected letters, and this genre of text warrants more study.

\(^{14}\) I am indebted to the work of Cox and Rogal, which is extensive, thorough, and invaluable. However, I should point out that a few texts were overlooked in the category of edition. For instance, Cox does not indicate that Richard Lovell Edgeworth’s *Memoirs* was edited by his daughter, Maria. This is most likely due to the fact that Maria Edgeworth is not given credit as editor in the first volume of the edition; she is only credited on the title page as authoring the second volume. Consequently, I realized that this particular text and a few others were, in fact, editions during the course of my research.
With the remaining inventory of texts I looked for themes that appeared with some regularity, and I found four categories that were published fairly consistently throughout the long eighteenth century: autobiography/memoirs, editions of texts by women, family editions, and colonial texts. I was not only comfortable but pleased with these categories. Their regular publication supported the fact that they were, indeed, a viable category of text. However, what interested me most was their obvious relevance to eighteenth-century history. Through them, I could certainly learn more about eighteenth-century editorial methods; more importantly, I could ascertain what mattered to these editors who worked in a specific cultural context.

The second stage of this dissertation involved the seemingly simple task of locating these editions. I searched first at the university libraries in Pittsburgh and had some luck with facsimile editions. Ultimately, however, I decided to rely on the Library of Congress. Their extensive collection of texts available in their main reading room and their rare books collection allowed me to find a large number of editions in a reasonable amount of time. I spent about fifteen days researching their amazing collection. I also spent two days at the Folger Library in Washington, D.C., which allowed me to find some texts not housed at the Library of Congress.

This type of archival research involves travel, takes considerable time, and is quite expensive. I highlight this here in my introduction because it is an important consideration. I was fortunate enough to attend a university that was a reasonable place for this kind of research.
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15 My first category originally included autobiography, memoirs, and biography. However, I omitted biographies during the course of study for the sake of time and space. Biography is a very distinct category of text and would require another chapter, which was unreasonable for the scale of this particular project. Editions of biography, like collected letters, are another category of text that should be studied more thoroughly. Furthermore, my fourth category, colonial texts, had previously included travel texts, like Sir Joshua Reynolds’s Works that included his excursion to the continent. I pared this chapter down to travel accounts of colonial territories in order to produce a more theoretically unified discussion.

16 AMS Press is particularly helpful in this regard.
distance from Washington, D.C.; furthermore, I have family that live in the D.C. metropolitan area. Lastly, Duquesne University’s English Department’s archival research grant contributed to travel and photo duplication costs for my work at the Folger Library. These factors defrayed costs and, ultimately, made this study feasible.

As this project progressed, an increasing number of scanned texts became available online. The Internet Archive is an astounding resource that makes available an innumerable number of scanned texts to researchers. Google Books also adds to their collection on a regular basis. Old books that are out of copyright are generally free for download in PDF format on both of these websites. In fact, this sort of project will become more possible and cheaper as hard-to-find texts will eventually become largely available online. Actually, I discovered that when I searched regularly, an edition that was not initially available online eventually appeared on the Internet Archive or Google Books weeks or months later. The ever-growing virtual library will allow for more projects that consider numerous texts or hard-to-find editions.

After locating all of the editions I needed to commence my study, I embarked on the process of annotating each text, keeping in mind the commentary, method, and apparati utilized by the editor of each edition. Each annotation is intended to give the reader a sense of the content and flow of the prefatory material that the editor has included in his or her edition. In other words, my bibliography contains elements of annotated bibliography, as well as descriptive bibliography, but it stops short of a complete analysis of variations and corruptions in the edition. The annotations provide

17 In An Introduction to Bibliographical and Textual Studies, third edition (New York: Modern Language Association, 1999), 8-10, William Proctor Williams and Craig S. Abbott explain that annotated bibliography contains “abstracts, summaries, or descriptions [of] works,” and descriptive bibliography
summary of editorial commentary and relevant scholarship to aid researchers who would like to do more work on any of these editions.

I cannot emphasize enough how useful certain sources were for this type of work on textual history. Leslie Stephen’s and Sidney Lee’s *Dictionary of National Biography* is an important source, containing biography, history, and textual scholarship. Furthermore, the Dictionary of Literary Biography series provides essential information about authors and editors. The literary databases that I found most useful for locating relevant research on the editions were the Modern Language Association International Bibliography, the Annual Bibliography of Language and Literature, Jstor, Project Muse, and the Periodical Archive. Lastly, the Twayne English Author series often, though not always, focuses on the contributions of an editor to a given author’s literary work.

The fourth and final stage of this dissertation involved considering each category of edition. In chapter one, I note the editorial commentary on privacy, history, and the individual in editions of autobiography and memoirs. In chapter two, I elaborate on how editors are caught between the need to conform to conventions of femininity even while they promote the aesthetic, intellectual, and moral value of their editions of texts by women. Chapter three is a discussion of family texts in which I illustrate how editors assert the value of familial love and family editions. Lastly, in the fourth chapter, I address how the complexity of colonial texts confound editors in that they simultaneously conform to the ideals of the eighteenth-century colonial project and express anxiety about the implications of imperialism.

“seeks to describe accurately the object produced by the process and all variations caused by alterations in the process.”
Working through these four stages of research and interpretation clarified for me the difficult role eighteenth-century editors filled. They were bringing rich, complex, and compelling texts to an eighteenth-century readership that longed for such editions (as evidenced by numerous printings); however, these editions also pushed readers to rethink eighteenth-century notions of the individual, the woman author, family, and imperialism. In short, these editors had their work cut out for them. The editions included in this study often fall short of modern editorial standards, but the texts are also often impressive. Most importantly, these editors brought key texts to readers, which responded to and shaped their ideas about the world they lived in. Looking at numerous editions, with a specific focus on prefatory statements, is a scholarly method that provides a new and different perspective on the editorial work being done in the eighteenth century. It is my hope that this new and compelling body of information and analysis invites more scholarship.

**Rationale**

As I write this dissertation a fascinating art exhibition is on display at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (MFA). The exhibition features three sixteenth-century Italian painters and is entitled “Titian, Tintoretto, Veronese: Rivals in Renaissance Venice.” The theme of the exhibition has to do with how these painters influenced the work of one another with a special focus on new discoveries unearthed by the conservators. The parameters of the exhibit and the methodology employed to research the paintings serve as a useful analogy for this dissertation.
The MFA press release states that “together, the three artists defined a Venetian style characterized by loose technique, rich coloring, and often pastoral or sensual subject matter.” One of the major theoretical threads in this exhibit is how these artists inspired and challenged one another. For instance, all three artists painted a version of “Supper at Emmaus.” Each version borrows from and improves upon the last. The MFA clarifies that “Juxtapositions of related works contribute new scholarship to the discussion of these artists and the influence they had upon one another” (1). What is useful for this dissertation about this artistic dialogue is how it acts as a metaphor for the scope of this project on numerous eighteenth-century editions. The scholarship of multiple artists at the MFA yielded new and interesting results, and the same holds true for the forty-seven editions discussed in this dissertation. As Peter D. McDonald states, book history or textual studies “has put the radical situatedness of texts as material and institutional forms, at the center of historical inquiry.” Looking at the editorial statements in a broader fashion clarifies the historical and literary concerns of the eighteenth-century editorial project. In short, the editions included in this study, when considered together, provide a rich historical picture of scholarly editing.

The MFA exhibition also provides a useful metaphor for this study because of the research methodology employed by the conservators. The MFA examined a painting by each of the artists using x-radiography and infrared reflectography. In laymen’s terms, they looked beneath the surface layer of paint. Below the paint that is visible to the viewer lies another story for each of the works. The artists had all made revisions, each
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of which changed the image, style, or tone of the painting. Focusing on these new details adds a great deal for scholars to consider. What is striking is the researchers’ interest in comparing tangible details underneath the paint to the visible work of art. Their attention to these other details adds to the meaning of the painting. It gives the works of art more back story.

The analysis of the paintings is not unlike the relationship of literary manuscript to published text, or editorial front matter to main text of an edition. It is about examining peripheral text (or paint) to broaden the context. In other words, the practice by conservators acts as a loose metaphor for the literary study of paratext, a term coined by French theorist Gérard Genette. By paratext, Genette means distinct textual matter that accompanies the primary text: title page, table of contents, preface, introduction, or notes. Genette states, “Thus the paratext is for us the means by which a text makes a book of itself and proposes itself as such to its readers, and more generally to the public.” Further, the paratext is a separate text: “An element of paratext, at least if it consists in a materialized message, necessarily has a positioning, which one can situate in relationship to that of the text itself: around the text, in the space of the same volume, like the title or the preface, and sometimes inserted into the interstices of the text, like the titles of chapters or certain notes . . .” Genette’s discussion of paratext is especially relevant to my discussion because he asserts that paratext warrants equal scholarly attention. In short, the paratext has significance for readers. Genette clarifies,

21 Ibid., 263-264. Genette also uses the term “peritext” to distinguish more specifically the accompanying text that appears in the volume of text. He uses the term “epitext” to denote accompanying text that appears outside the volume, such as reviews, interviews, etc. For the purposes of this dissertation, I am most concerned with “peritext.”
“the pragmatic status of a paratextual element is defined by the characteristics of its communicatory instance or situation: nature of the addressee, degree of authority and responsibility of the first, illocutionary force of his message . . .”

In the case of these editorial prefaces, these editors, who have worked closely with the manuscript of a given edition, who often are a close friend or relation of the author, and who have finances or reputation at stake in the success of the edition, display for readers a tone of “authority and responsibility.” Genette describes this in greater detail when he states, “Any paratextual message for which the author and/or the editor assumes responsibility which he cannot escape is official.”

This gets at the fact that editors’ names usually appear on the title page—they are tied to the text. Because of this official nature of paratext, it has “illocutionary force.”

The paratext must be given equal weight when considering the text as a whole, but the paratext is always subordinate to the primary text. Genette states, “no matter what aesthetic or ideological pretensions (‘fine title,’ preface-manifesto), no matter what coquetry, no matter what paradoxical inversion the author puts into it, a paratextual element is always subordinate to ‘its’ text, and this functionality determines the essentials of its aspect and its existence.”

Like the conservators, who reconsidered the meaning of the Venetian paintings, paratext is subordinate to the primary text, but it also has the power to shift the meaning of that text.

So what to do with the theoretical significance of the term paratext? It comes down to the point that the prefatory commentary by editors makes a difference. For
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22 Ibid., 266.
23 Ibid., 267.
24 Ibid., 268.
25 Ibid., 269.
instance, if readers are not convinced of the piety and virtue of Elizabeth Singer Rowe prior to picking up an edition of her work by Isaac Watts or Theophilus Rowe, the prefaces to both editions will certainly play a part in convincing them. As Michael Shoenfeldt recently articulated in an article describing his experience of reviewing seventy-eight books for an academic project, “I found that it is in fact very hard not to begin making up one’s mind about a book by the end of the introduction.” The same holds true for these prefaces. These editors gave considerable textual space to describing the author, the edition, and eighteenth-century culture. As Marie Maclean explains, “The verbal frame, or paratext, may enhance the text, it may define it, it may contrast with it, it may distance it, or it may be so disguised as to seem to form a part of it.” Furthermore, footnotes added by editors intrude on the text in both helpful and harmful ways. Scholars largely contend that Thomas Pringle’s footnotes in his edition of Mary Prince’s slave narrative overwhelm the text. The paratext of a given edition has sway in terms of the overall significance of the text. Like the conservators at the MFA, highlighting new and important details in the painting, shining a light on the paratext reveals a multitude of influential eighteenth-century editorial voices.

Considered as a whole, the paratextual contributions of eighteenth-century editors as presented here lend much to understanding the rise and development of editorial methods in the era. In “What is the History of Books?”, which appeared in Kenneth Carpenter’s 1983 anthology *Books and Society in History* and is still frequently cited, Robert Darnton asserts that the study of book history must maintain a picture of the

whole process, a process he labels “the communication circuit.”

He encourages scholars to remember all participants in the “circuit”: authors, publishers, printers, suppliers, shippers, booksellers, binders, and readers. This study builds upon the “circuit” by fleshing out the contributions of scholarly editors. Their prefaces say much about eighteenth-century print culture, revealing the trepidation of some editors to intrude upon a text, and the unapologetic emendation and suppression of text by other editors. These editors were keenly aware how their editorial approach changed the meaning of a work. Most importantly, they realized they were taking part in a dialogue about the important concerns, whether literary or historical, of the eighteenth century. The chapter introductions and the annotated bibliographies that follow this general introduction illustrate the attitudes and methods of these editors, adding much to modern notions of eighteenth-century textual history.

---

Chapter 1


The modern scholarly conundrum about categorizing different types of personal narratives highlights the complexity of the genres. Sidonie Smith’s and Julia Watson’s *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives* offers some clarification regarding the term “autobiography”: “Privileged as the definitive achievement of a mode of life narrative, ‘autobiography’ celebrates the autonomous individual and the universalizing life story.”¹ In contrast, memoirs, while focusing on the individual, tend to be more aware of the external or social world. Margaret Bottrall’s definition is quite clear; she describes memoirs as a “life-story based on verifiable facts.”² This chapter examines both autobiographies and memoirs. For the sake of this study, I default first and foremost to the term utilized by the author or editor of the edition. Where the terminology is not clear, I employ the two terms as defined above where appropriate. I realize that my use of the terminology may not please all scholars of “life narrative” (the umbrella term used by Smith and Watson for texts that “include many
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kinds of self-referential writing, including autobiography”\(^3\)) whose complex theoretical discussions of terminology move beyond the scope of this dissertation project. However, these theoretical discussions certainly inform this study in that these editions, and their editorial prefaces in particular, reveal much about the multi-faceted nature of life narrative.

The unique function of this chapter is to clarify how eighteenth-century editors of autobiographies and memoirs approached and handled their editions of life narrative—no simple task to say the least. These editors continually grappled with difficult questions. First, how should an editor present a personal text to the reading public? Second, how should an editor respond to historical commentary taking place in such an edition? Third, should an editor comment on the personal journey of the author? Many of these editors have been critiqued by modern scholars as unsuccessful in resolving one or more of the above questions. However, the genre of personal narrative was still relatively new in the eighteenth century. Furthermore, these editors, even if they utilized faulty editorial methods (such as suppressing portions of manuscript), were almost all aware of the difficult literary situation in which they found themselves. Many of the editors at least acknowledge suppression of text, or express discomfort regarding the privacy of the text, or qualify the historical statements that appear in the text. These editors had an awareness of the possibilities and limitations of the genres of autobiography and memoirs, and they did their best to remain true to the manuscript while upholding eighteenth-century social and literary conventions.

The three subheadings for this chapter: “Private Texts/Public Texts,” “Memoirs as Historical Chronicle,” and “Individual Experience” represent consistent themes in

\(^3\) Smith and Watson, *Reading Autobiography*, 3.
eighteenth-century editions of autobiography and memoirs and were the product of careful re-reading of my annotations of these texts. I was pleased to learn upon reviewing scholarship that these themes are the primary concerns of modern scholars of the genres of autobiography and memoirs as well. These scholars, too, highlight how autobiographical texts are personal narratives that are located in historical context and elucidate the inner-life of the author.

Private Texts/Public Texts

The editions featured in this chapter are particularly concerned with the tension between these often private autobiographies or memoirs and their public reception. As a result, these editors reveal a desire to remain loyal to the author’s text and to their reputation. However, these editors frequently make statements about the necessity of making an edition available to eighteenth-century readers, whether for the purpose of entertainment, posterity, history, or literary merit. Smith and Watson make clear that the reading public was enthralled with all forms of life narrative:

The eighteenth century saw an explosion in both the kinds and the sheer numbers of life narratives. New reading publics emerged with the rise in literacy, the expansion of print media, and the increased circulation of texts, goods, and people between Europe and the American colonies, and within both Europe and the colonies. In effect, there was a democratization of the institution of life writing. More and more people—merchants, criminals, middle-class women, ex-slaves—turned to life narratives as a means to know themselves and position themselves within the social world.4

The demand for editions of autobiography and memoirs was on the rise. Editors of life narratives worked to fulfill the public demand and produce an edition of an individual life story. Donald Greene explains that “Johnson knew as well as Joyce that the inner life of

4 Smith and Watson, Reading Autobiography, 97.
the individual is made up of such states of consciousness in which one is aware of certain phenomena and not others, and that a valid account of that inner life must record them.”

In other words, autobiographies and memoirs are unique texts that warrant particular attention and respect because they reveal the “inner life” of the author.

These editors must be appreciated for publishing life narratives that might otherwise have been relegated to the trash bin. Their editorial approaches to autobiographies and memoirs, which are sometimes effective and sometimes flawed, say much about eighteenth-century history. The tension between these texts as private and public texts points to various eighteenth-century ideals, such as privacy, decorum, and reputation. These editorial prefaces offer terrific insights into how these editors grappled with these difficult conventions, providing unique perspective on the development of the genres of autobiography and memoirs, as well as the social norms of the era.

Some of these editors give precedence to the private nature of life narrative, or at the very least they express discomfort regarding emending the private text of an author when editing his or her autobiographical narrative. For instance, Maria Edgeworth’s role as editor of her father’s memoirs (1820) was extremely difficult for her. She expresses a sense of anxiety in her preface regarding portraying the father she loved and admired accurately as a result of her editorial emendations and her biographical contributions to the edition. Edgeworth explains in her preface that “In repeated attempts, I felt how little capable I was of fulfilling the trust reposed in me; but I persevered” (iii). Scholars have done a nice job of more fully elucidating the difficulty she experienced in terms of preparing a private memoirs for publication, which I highlight in my annotation to this
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edition. She was very protective of her father’s reputation and her family name, but she felt compelled to honor her father’s wishes that the manuscript be completed and published.

In other instances, editors felt the pressure from family, friends, or other loved ones to represent the author or text in a particular light. In a number of cases, editors were taken to task because certain passages of text were deemed indecorous for public readership. In the case of Thomas Holcroft’s memoirs (1816), there was a span of six years between the completion of the edition and publication as William Hazlitt, the editor, wrangled with William Godwin over certain portions of text that featured Mary Wollstonecraft’s relationship with Gilbert Imlay. Ultimately, Hazlitt gave way, much of the objectionable text was suppressed, and the sanctity of privacy was upheld. Another example of this type of fallout is Jonathan Swift’s edition of William Temple’s Memoirs: Part III (1709). Swift does not indicate a breach of privacy in his preface to the edition. In fact, Swift makes clear in the preface that he waited to publish the edition because certain passages “might give Offence to several who were still alive” (2) and that Temple’s memoirs tend to be more of a political/social chronicle “. . . of what pass’d in [Temple’s] publick Employments Abroad” (2). Perhaps, if there had been a more delicate statement regarding the private nature of the text or a suppression of certain passages, he might have avoided the written altercation with Temple’s sister, Lady Giffard. Nonetheless, a quarrel ensued because Swift retained some passages that critiqued individuals associated with Lady Giffard. She called the authenticity of the copy-text into question in order to diffuse any social awkwardness of hurt feelings resulting from the inclusion of the more personal passages. Swift eloquently defended
his role as editor, but the damage was done. Swift’s private relationship with Temple’s descendents was irreparably damaged, illustrating what a fine line these editors had to walk between the private and the public.

Other editors of these autobiographical editions realize the dichotomy of public versus private, but their prefaces do not display a marked discomfort about this fact. Lord Holland’s preface to Horace Walpole’s Memoirs of the Last Ten Years of the Reign of George II (1822) does not exhibit an anxiety about publication. Holland says, “. . . it seems impossible that any thing short of a positive injunction to commit his Memoires to the press could have conveyed a stronger indication of the intention and desire of the Author, that at some future period after his decease this his favourite labour should be committed to the public” (xii). So much time elapsed between the completion of the manuscript and Holland’s edition that no one would have been concerned about personal criticisms or objectionable passages contained in the text. In short, there was no need to change the names to protect the innocent since the persons alluded to in the text were largely deceased. In fact, Walpole intended that much time should elapse before the text could be available to readers as he kept the manuscript under lock and key; it was only to be opened on the twenty-fifth birthday of his heir. For this reason, Holland reveals no tone of discomfort about his editorial role. He is executing the author’s wish, and he is also not offending readers.

In the example of Amelia Heber’s edition of her husband’s autobiographical narrative of his tenure as bishop of India (1828), she expresses in her preface that she is quite proud to present the somewhat private narrative to the public. In fact, she even adds her own journal observations in the form of footnotes throughout the edition, which adds
another dimension of private text. She does concede that the omission of some especially private passages was essential, but her husband certainly intended to publish the narrative, and she is not shy about communicating this to the reader. She asserts, “. . . he never lost sight of his high calling, nor suffered any circumstance to interfere with the object for which he left his native land” (vi). This lack of tension between the public and private in Heber’s preface serves a particular function. The Hebers were participating in the project of Anglican mission work, and the edition continues the outreach they started while in India. By unabashedly telling her husband’s story and sharing her own experiences abroad, Amelia Heber can continue the missionary project by promoting that sort of experience for English readers. Conflating the public and private through an edition of travel memoirs was required for this goal. Nonetheless, Heber’s preface is an interesting example of how some of these editors are not concerned about a private text being made available to readership at large.

Other prefaces of editions of memoirs or autobiography demonstrate an especially complex treatment of the public versus the private: they realize the tension and use it to construct meaning in their editions. For instance, Mary Robinson’s memoirs (1801), edited by her daughter, Mary Robinson, the younger, were published to influence her mother’s legacy:

If there are any who, after having attentively perused it, call in question the propriety of this publication, they are requested to recollect the solemn injunction of a dying parent, and the promise pledged by a child in circumstances so awful and affecting. That many reasons might be advanced in favour of the suppression of these pages, the editor is not insensible: but, added to the sacred obligation imposed upon her, it is impossible that she can feel indifferent to the vindication of a being so beloved, and ever to be lamented, whose real character was little known, and who, in various instances, was the victim of calumny and misrepresentation (i-ii).
The editor alludes to the private Mary Robinson in the preface to shift her very public persona. The same holds true for Maria Edgeworth’s edition of her father’s memoirs. She emphasizes his caring attributes as a parent in order to soften how he was perceived by the public. In these examples, editors are relying on the private in order to sculpt the public perception of an author and/or an edition.

Perhaps the most compelling example of this tension between public and private is the famous diary of Samuel Pepys (1825). Horace Walpole may have kept his memoirs under lock and key, but Pepys went one step further. He wrote his diary using a cipher system in order to maintain privacy. This situation illustrates that the autobiographical text is certainly the most tricky in terms of this private/public dichotomy. Interestingly, the diary was not published for over one hundred years, so the editor, Lord Braybrooke, was not caught in the tension between private and public in that he did not have worry about protecting the reputations of the persons described in the diary. Furthermore, Pepys kept the diary bound with his official papers, so he must have imagined they would reach the public some day, which diffuses some of the anxiety for readers of the diary regarding intruding on a private text. Nonetheless, in the preface the editor makes the reader aware of the coded manuscript, which certainly creates an awareness that the diary was a private text. Braybrooke’s task, then, was to convince readers that it was appropriate for them to read a private text. The success of the edition would indicate that he succeeded.

Considered as a whole, these prefaces to editions of autobiography and memoirs reveal an editorial puzzle. How can an editor share a private text with the reading public? In general, these editors tend to address the problem head on. They mention that some
passages have been suppressed to protect the privacy of individuals mentioned in the text.

More often, however, these editors insist on the importance of these autobiographies and the need for publication. Much of the material in these editions may represent the “inner life” of the author, and this personal experience, editors insist in their prefaces, benefits the eighteenth-century reader.

Memoirs/Historical Chronicle

At numerous points in these prefaces, editors point to the value of an edition as a historical text. They generally highlight how autobiographies and memoirs are useful in shedding light or providing context regarding historical eras, episodes, or movements.

Smith and Watson provide some nice background on the distinction between history and autobiography/memoirs:

Sometimes people read autobiographical narratives as historical documents, a source of evidence for the analysis of historical movements or events or persons. From this perspective, autobiographical narrating and history writing might seem synonymous. Although it can be read as a history of the writing/speaking subject, however, life narrative cannot be reduced to or understood only as a historical record. While autobiographical narratives may contain “facts,” they are not factual history about a particular time, person, or event. Rather they offer subjective “truth” rather than “fact.”

I would argue that the eighteenth-century editors of autobiography and memoirs understood the distinction. In fact, they often make claims that the first person, subjective narrative is an important historical account as it offers a particular view of history. Furthermore, these editors realize the autobiographical text, just like history, is not concrete. The autobiography may result in a shift in historical discourse by adding historical commentary. Likewise, the autobiography may also reflect historical change.

---

6 Smith and Watson, Reading Autobiography, 10.
For instance, as the emphasis on the individual becomes more marked in the eighteenth century, autobiographers seem to share more of their personal experience in their life narratives. William C. Spengemann explains that scholars “must view autobiography historically, not as one thing that writers have done again and again, but as the pattern described by the various things they have done in response to changing ideas about the nature of the self, the ways in which the self may be apprehended, and the proper methods of reporting those apprehensions.” Just as these editors are aware of the relationship between the life narrative and history, these editors are often aware that they are dealing with a particular text of autobiography or memoirs, which relates to a particular social or political context.

Henry Wharton’s preface to William Laud’s autobiographical account (1695) of his imprisonment in the Tower of London highlights how the edition is meant to re-examine Laud’s experience and re-frame how history has judged him. Furthermore, Wharton asserts that his work as editor has been more judicious than the previous editor. Wharton claims, “Yet notwithstanding so vile and corrupt an Edition of it [by the original editor, William Prynne], all those who have wrote any thing of this Excellent Prelate, have been forced to make use of it; not being able to gain the sight of the Original, nor perhaps so much as suspecting any such fraud in the Edition of it” (ii). In making such a statement, he seems to be claiming that his edition of Laud’s text, which includes the prefatory material, can contribute to literary, political, or social history. In other words, how an editor deals with a text matters. Wharton’s preface to the edition of Laud’s text, which appears quite early in the long eighteenth century, is very aware of how Laud’s
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account and his own editorial voice can re-construct meaning. In this instance, the edition is a helpful account that examines religious tension in the Anglican church in the seventeenth century.

Thomas Ellwood’s memoirs (1714), too, examine religion in the long eighteenth century. In this example, Ellwood’s memoirs focus on his experience as a Quaker. The editor, Joseph Wyeth, a life long-friend of Ellwood’s, sympathizes with the persecution and difficulty Ellwood endured as a result of his choice to become a Quaker. Wyeth explains this quite clearly:

And this preserving, by Publication, is the rather to be done, when themselves do leave behind them, in Writing, an Account of their Lives, and of the signal Mercies of God to them therein: For from such Accounts, may best be gathered, by the Reader, the Man’s particular State, Exercise and Growth in the Work of Restoration, out of the Fall and Degeneracy: And, in the Reading thereof, be not only excited to Bless the Name of the Lord, on his behalf; but also gain some direction from the Path, so fairly tract out, and ground of Hope; that by being Faithful, they may likewise attain to the same good Experience (a2-a3).

This edition, then, provides a personal account of a religious movement that was in many ways misunderstood by eighteenth-century readers. *The Oxford Companion to British History* states, “[Quakers’] refusal to pay tithes, insistence upon addressing everyone as thou, refusal to doff hats to authority, and the extravagant behaviour of some of their members, shocked a hierarchical society, and they were fiercely persecuted before and after the Restoration.”

Ellwood’s life narrative allowed readers to re-consider the culture and ritual associated with Quakerism.

The next two texts I would like to mention are life narratives by very public figures. To some degree their memoirs do not introduce new historical facts; rather, their accounts, not unlike Ellwood’s, lend a more personal and detailed account of a given
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historical moment. Stephen Wren, the younger, edited the Wren family documents, *Parentalia* (1750), with the intent of providing for readers the personal narratives of his celebrated relatives. The bulk of the edition is made up of the memoirs of Christopher Wren, the famous architect, and Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely. Similar to Mary Robinson’s memoirs, the editor of *Parentalia* adds to the historical discourse pertaining to the Wren family by producing an edition of their memoirs, which showcase their personal experience. Stephen Wren states, “. . . their Memory seems intitled to a kind Reception from the Public, and to their Candour I leave this Monument erected to it, without expatiating into any further Commendations on the Matter or Manner; as any Encomiums, however just, may be exceptionable in a Descendant, though authorized by many eminent Examples . . .” (iv). The edition of the Wren documents are at once subjective memoirs and historical monument. Horace Walpole’s *Memoirs of the Reign of the Last Ten Years of George II*, edited by Lord Holland, operates in much the same way. It provides essential commentary on the history associated with the second Hanoverian King of England. In fact, R. W. Ketton-Cremer asserts that Walpole’s memoirs fill in many historical gaps: “[The memoirs] contain accounts of transactions that would otherwise be lost, facts and details that would be otherwise unrecorded.”⁹ These memoirs, then, can be essential historical chronicles. Returning to the scholarship of Smith and Watson, as well as Bottrall, these texts contain some important “verifiable facts”; more importantly, they expose a historical “truth.”

Lastly, the diaries of Samuel Pepys and John Evelyn (1818) are important documents in that they provide historical context with their focus on the minutiae of day-
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to-day life in seventeenth-century England. William Bray, the editor of Evelyn’s diary, explains,

... though these papers may not be of importance enough to appear in the pages of an Historian of the Kingdom, they may in some particulars set even such an one right; and though the notices are short, they, as to persons, give some hints to Biographers, or at least may gratify the curiosity of those who are inquisitive after the mode in which their ancestors conducted business, or passed their time. It is hoped that such will not be altogether disappointed (vi).

Pepys’s editor, Lord Braybrooke, also makes a claim about the importance of historical details. He states,

The general details may also, in some instances, even in their abridged form, be considered as too minute; nor is it an easy task, in an undertaking of this sort to please every body’s taste: my principal study in making the selection, however, has been to omit nothing of public interest; and to introduce, at the same time, a great variety of other topics, less important, perhaps, but tending in some degree to illustrate the manners and habits of the age (vii).

The benefit of these editions is that they offer important details or their authors’ daily experience. These diaries are personal chronicles of two individuals’ lives and works as they navigated the historical reality of the eighteenth century. Interestingly, in the case of Pepys and Evelyn, much of the information they provide could be considered verifiable fact; for this reason, their diaries, more so than other editions, resemble historical chronicle.

Individual Experience

Many of these autobiographical accounts illustrate the eighteenth-century focus on the individual. The daily trials and tribulations of the authors of these autobiographies held an increasing interest for eighteenth-century readers as the era progressed. For their own edification, readers could learn from the experience of the autobiographer or diarist.
Michael Mascuch’s *Origins of the Individualist Self: Autobiography and Self-Identity in England, 1591-1791* is particularly valuable to this discussion. Mascuch explains that Marxism provides some reasoning for this shift toward the self: “Marx described the period roughly between 1500 and 1700 as witnessing a revolution from feudalism to capitalism in Europe, which entailed a change in the status of the person in society, from being subject to the collective totality to being individually alienated from it.”¹⁰ There are also shifts in religion and the social order that shape ideas of the self. For instance, Mascuch, relying on the scholarship of Louis Dumont, states, “. . . the transformation of the person from a universal being into the individual was largely complete with the institution of Calvinist theocracy in the sixteenth century.”¹¹ Turning to social theorist Norbert Elias, Mascuch expounds on a larger social shift: “the rise of centralized and urbanized state societies caused the separation and encapsulation of persons in all of their relations to each other, giving rise to the concept of the human subject as the individual.”¹² One other factor to consider in terms of the increasing interest in the individual throughout the eighteenth century is empiricism. The ideas of John Locke played out in the literary landscape as is evidenced in the increase in published life narratives. Leo Damrosch asserts that “[autobiographies and memoirs] represent the difficulty of representing a world independent of themselves, a heterogeneous order of reality which is stubbornly independent of the mind, and of which they are trying to make sense.”¹³ Whether the major reason for the shift is economic, religious, social, or
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¹¹ Ibid., 17.
¹² Ibid.
philosophical, these editions highlight that the individual life journey was increasingly
important to eighteenth-century editors and readers.

Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury’s autobiography (1764) was not taken entirely
seriously by its editor, Horace Walpole. He thought Cherbury was amusing, and he was
drawn to the text for reasons of entertainment more so than serious scholarship.
Nonetheless, the autobiography of Cherbury is a very personal account of his life
experiences. He reveals those endeavours he is most proud of and those he might be
ashamed of. It is meant to hold life lessons for his heirs. As I outline in my annotation to
the edition, Herbert’s autobiography is about self-realization and the search for truth.
Even Walpole concedes in his preface that “His Lordship’s observations are new and
acute . . .” and “. . . his discourse on the Reformation very wise . . .” (vi). This account
of a particular individual’s reflections on his life journey embodies the shift toward the
self inspired by eighteenth-century philosophy, literature, and culture. Walpole’s
mocking tone regarding Cherbury’s narrative is certainly evident; nonetheless, at
numerous points in his preface Walpole appreciates Cherbury’s efforts as autobiographer.

Ukawsaw Gronniosaw’s autobiography (1770) is another example of a text that
presents the story of one man as he works through various challenges and epiphanies in
his life. Gronniosaw’s narrative focuses on his experience as a slave. However,
Gronniosaw’s text falls into the category of spiritual autobiography as a result of his
focus on his conversion to Christianity. M.H. Abrams defines spiritual autobiography as
an account of “the author’s anguished mental crisis, and a recovery and conversion in
which he discovers his Christian identity and religious vocation.”

Walter Shirley, the editor of the edition, states,

His long and perilous journey to the coast of Guinea, where he was sold for a slave, and so brought into a Christian land; shall we consider this as the alone effect of a curious and inquisitive disposition? Shall we, in accounting for it refer to nothing higher than mere chance & accidental circumstances? Whatever Infidels & Deists may think, I trust the Christian reader will easily discern an all-wise and omnipotent appointment and direction in these movements.

Shirley conveys to readers the value of the life narrative; Gronniosaw’s account is an autobiographical journey of spiritual conversion and self-realization. Furthermore, as Gronniosaw’s account is also a slave narrative, this conversion does much to assuage eighteenth-century readers’ guilt over slavery; I discuss this further in the annotation to the edition.

Mary Prince’s narrative, edited by Thomas Pringle, is another important slave narrative that features the painful experiences of Prince’s life as a slave in Antigua. Pringle has been critiqued by modern scholars for intruding on Prince’s story with numerous footnotes and a lengthy editorial supplement. In light of the fact that this edition is a life narrative, Pringle’s over-involvement becomes even more troublesome. Autobiographies or memoirs, even more than the other categories of text analyzed in this dissertation, belong to their author—it is after all his or her “inner life.” If the reader is to understand the particular experience of the author, the editor of autobiography must be especially careful when crafting an edition. He states toward the end of his supplement to the edition: “The case of Mary Prince is by no means a singular one; many of the same kind are daily occurring: and even if the case were singular, it would still loudly call for the interference of legislature” (40). Here Pringle calls for the emancipation of slaves,
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but he also makes the point that Prince’s experience is not necessarily singular. Unlike most of these editors, he does not emphasize how her personal story provides commentary on the problem of slavery. For this reason, among others, Pringle’s editorial work has not held up under critical scrutiny as well as other editions.

Patricia Meyer Spacks’s critical work *Imagining a Self: Autobiography and Novel in Eighteenth-Century England* points to the pervasiveness of this interest in life stories. She discusses how the genre of autobiography and the novel intersect. She begins her study with the following statement: “Autobiographies affirm identity. The autobiographer, attesting his [or her] existence by the fact of his [or her] writing, lives through his [or her] explanations, tacit or explicit, of how he [or she] came to be the person he [or she] is.”15 In examining these editions it becomes apparent that editors, too, take part in constructing the autobiographical self. Whether in their prefatory material, footnotes, or suppression of passages, these editors contribute to the author’s narrative.

The following annotated bibliography includes twenty editions, which are listed chronologically from 1681 through 1831.

Annotated Bibliography


---

Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Prior to the title page a portrait of Capt. Robert Knox is included. This portrait appears inside a lovely illustration of an ornate frame. Below this frame hangs a tapestry with a drawing of the island of Ceylon. There are also numerous maps and diagrams of Ceylon included in the body of the edition.

2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.

3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: detailed table of contents with section titles, chapter headings, and descriptions of chapters included in edition.

4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: Two dedications are included in the edition—both written by Robert Knox and included by Hooke in this edition. Both of the dedications are in honor of the East-India Company. The dedication that appears first was written after the edition was sent to the printers, and appears prior to the preface. The dedication that appears second was written upon the completion of the account by Knox, and it follows the editorial preface. In the second dedication, Knox explains that he wrote his account of his captivity and travels because his friends and acquaintances found them valuable, and he felt compelled to illustrate how divine providence saved him during his travels (note this interesting connection to Robinson Crusoe). Furthermore, Knox asserts that “I have writ nothing but either what I am assured by my own personal Knowledge to be true.”

5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: The first words that appear in this edition are two advertisements by individuals who read and approve of Knox’s travel account. The first advertisement is by Robert Blackbourne, Secretary of the East-India Company in 1681. The second advertisement is by Christopher Wren. Each of these advertisements uses the word “integrity.” These testimonials lend credence to the text by Knox and, as a result, the edition by Hooke. Also, there is a five page preface by Hooke, which I will describe in detail below.

6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: Hooke has not written a biographical account to be included in the edition, and he has included no autobiography by Knox—aside from the autobiographical nature of the travel account that makes up the edition.

7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: After the table of contents, Hooke includes a section entitled “Errata” in which he outlines the editorial emendations. These errors are the major mistakes Hooke found in the text as he explains that his corrections are “besides divers Mispointings, and other Literal Mistakes of smaller moment.”

8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume divided into four parts, which describe Knox’s experience on the Island of Ceylon.

9) FOOTNOTES: Thorough and frequent notes appear in the margins throughout the body of the text.

10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
Hooke begins his editorial preface by explaining the importance of preserving accounts of “the Parts of the World” (first page of preface.). Hugh Cahill states,

Robert Knox’s *An Historical Relation of the Island of Ceylon* was the first detailed account of the natural history, religion, language, social life and customs of [modern day] Sri Lanka and its people in the English language. Robert Hooke, in the preface wrote that if you read Knox’s book “you will find yourself taken captive indeed, but used more kindly by the author than he himself was by the natives.” Indeed, the book still captivates the reader today, not only for its vivid descriptions of life in seventeenth century Ceylon but also because of the remarkable tale of Knox’s capture, imprisonment and eventual escape from the island after nineteen years as a prisoner.¹⁶

Lisa Jardine explains that Hooke, a renowned scientist and member of the Royal Society, was a friend of Knox’s, and he was enthralled by the details of Knox’s journey. She says, “Hooke, fascinated by the tales Knox had to tell, which Knox had begun writing down during his return voyage from captivity, encouraged him to publish his experiences. He probably contributed substantially to the narrative itself, whose reflections often sound uncannily like Hooke’s own.”¹⁷ Hooke’s passion for this account of Ceylon is evident in his preface.

He refers to accounts that have been lost to time and the need to save and to present new accounts to the reading public. He then lays out five causes for the void in terms of travel literature. First, “Seamen and Travellers” (first page of preface) have not been given proper instruction on the subject of record keeping and journaling. Second,
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Hooke ascribes the lack of travel literature to “the want of some Publick Incouragement for such as shall perform such Instructions” (second page of preface). Third, travel literature is an analysis of the “other” places of the world, and travelers need instruction regarding collection of artifacts and the crafting of historical accounts (second page of preface). In this instance, although prior to the inception of anthropology as a field, Hooke seems to be making a claim for the need for instructors of anthropology; English travelers and explorers would benefit from knowing how to write ethnography. Fourth, more travel accounts need to be published. Hooke explains that currently “many small Tracts are lost after Printing, as well as many that are never Printed” (second page of preface). Fifth, Hooke encourages translations of “Voyages and Accounts of Countries” (second page of preface). In so doing, he highlights the need for editors and translators to get involved in promoting a richer English catalog of travel texts. Hooke states, “There being many such in other Countries hardly ever heard of in England” (second page of preface). The involvement of editors, translators, and publishers could create an abundance of these texts for seventeenth- and eighteenth-century readers.

Hooke explains that the Royal Society of London is taking part in promoting this sort of literature. However, Hooke insists that there are a considerable number of accounts that individuals may be reticent to publish. He explains that some travelers are insecure about writing their own travel logs, other explorers are not exceptional writers, and “others delay to do it so long till they have forgotten what they intended” (third page of preface). In his preface, Hooke encourages those who have experienced life in diverse cultures to write a history of their journeys. He asks those who have written travel accounts to put aside modesty and publish their writings. He refers to accounts of
Greenland, Barbados, the Summer Islands, and Virginia that have been successful and useful texts. At this point in the preface, it becomes increasingly clear that Hooke is not only enthusiastic about Knox’s text, he is enthusiastic about travel literature in general.

Hooke then explains the value of Robert Knox’s account of the Island of Ceylon. He claims that Knox could have provided more information, but he lauds Knox for what he did accomplish in the text that makes up the edition. Hooke explains that

The Statesman, Divine, Physitian, Lawyer, Merchant, Mechanick, Husbandman, may select something for their Entertainment. The Philosopher and Historian much more. I believe at least all that love Truth will be pleas’d; for from that little Conversation I had with him I conceive him to be no ways prejudiced or byassed by Interest, affection, or hatred, fear or hopes, or the vain-glory of telling Strange Things, so as to make him swarve from the truth of Matter of Fact: And for his opportunity of being informed, any one may satisfie himself when he understands his almost 20 years Abode and Converse among them. His Skill in the Language and Customs of the People, his way of Employment in Travelling and Trading over all parts of the Kingdom . . . (fourth page of preface).

In the above passage, Hooke reiterates the idea of truth and fact. He assures readers that the account of Ceylon penned by Knox is true and credible. In 1681, he would obviously not have been aware of the theoretical discourse required to deconstruct Knox’s ethnographical approach or his bias. However, he alludes to the inherent difficulty of observing another culture when he uses terms like “prejudice,” “bias,” “interest,” or “fear.” From the perspective of autobiographical scholarship, Hooke seems to be displaying an awareness of subjective truth versus objective truth. Knox’s account of his experience in Ceylon is his individual truth. Consequently, the editor of the colonial edition is in a difficult and unique situation. He or she must introduce for the reader an ethnographical account of a culture that he or she has not necessarily experienced. By modern standards, this is a troublesome task. By eighteenth-century standards, as
evidenced by Hooke’s call for more such editions, this would not necessarily have raised any red flags.

Lastly, Hooke provides some insight into some of the details and observations that readers will encounter in the edition. Knox’s *Historical Relation of the Island of Ceylon* describes:

- The mountains of the island.
- The cities and towns.
- The country.
- Husbandry.
- Flora and fauna.
- Animal life.
- Insects.
- The available “commodities” (fifth page of preface).
- The structure of governance.
- The economy.
- The leadership.
- The military and war.
- The inhabitants.
- Their religious practices.
- Their houses.
- Their “Conversation and Entertainment” (fifth page of preface).
- Housewifery.
- Furniture.
- The manner of dress.
- Children, marriage, and family.
- Language and learning.
- The legal system.
- Their “Magick & Jugling” (fifth page of preface).
- Common illnesses, as well as “Death, and manner of Burial” (fifth and sixth pages of preface).

Aside from all of these details, Knox also described his own experience. Unlike the modern ethnographer who attempts to absent himself or herself from the description of a given culture, this early account includes Knox’s journey to and from the island, as well as his life and captivity there. In this short, approximately five-page preface, Hooke goes
to great lengths to construct for the reader how truthful and effective Knox’s text is in its description of Ceylon.

The question the reader is left with at the end of the preface is why such a fervent sales pitch for Knox’s chronicle of Ceylon and accounts like them? It seems to come down to an interesting juxtaposition of the Royal Society and the East India Company. Jardine explains, “Hooke and Knox evidently intended the book to attract the attention and support of both the Royal Society and of the East India Company (whose service Knox was anxious to re-enter, following his release).”\(^{18}\) The friendship and the edition were mutually beneficial to both Hooke and Knox: Knox re-kindled his association with the East India Company, and Hooke promoted exploration on behalf of the Royal Society. Jardine is very clear about Hooke’s motivation as editor of the edition: “Hooke quickly realised how useful this meticulously detailed information could be to the Royal Society as part of its investigations into peoples, cultures, and trades. In January 1681, Hooke made his first presentation to the Royal Society of material derived from Knox and his travels.”\(^{19}\) Upon Knox’s next voyage to Vietnam and Java, which was commissioned by the East India Company, Hooke and Knox set up a plan for the “collection of exotic curiosities.”\(^{20}\) The edition was, then, a success in many ways. The popular text bolstered the Royal Society, the East India Company, and the careers of Hooke and Knox.\(^{21}\) It also validated colonial literature as an important national and even scientific endeavor.


\(^{19}\) Ibid., 275.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 279.

\(^{21}\) Stephen and Lee’s *Dictionary of National Biography* (vol. 11, 30) lists numerous editions and translations of Hooke’s edition of Knox’s text.
In these colonial texts, more so than in the other categories of editions featured in this dissertation, the editorial motivations are often more specific. Travel logs often have a specific goal. For instance, slave narratives are often political texts published by anti-slavery campaigners. Furthermore, George Vancouver’s account of his excursion to Canada was the result of a commission by the crown of England. Likewise, Hooke’s edition, as it was co-opted by the Royal Society, of Knox’s text was part of a movement to promote colonial expansion, exploration, and study.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Frontispiece of William Laud.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Detailed table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: Lengthy editorial preface included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by the editor, Henry Wharton, included.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of diary/memoirs.
9) FOOTNOTES: Marginal notes appear in the text for clarification.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: Relevant letters, pamphlets, and historical accounts are appended to the text.
13) INDEX: No index included.
14) SIZE: Folio.
Henry Wharton begins his preface by providing a detailed account of how Arch-Bishop Laud’s diary and other papers found their way into the hands of William Prynne, Laud’s first editor. It is a fascinating narrative, which sets an authoritative tone from the start. For instance, Wharton explains, “As soon as Prynne was possessed of the Arch-Bishop’s Papers, he set himself with eager Malice to make use of them to his Defamation, and to prove the charge of Popery and abetting Arbitrary Government, by the Publication of many of them” (i). Wharton’s tone is sensational, and the narrative paints William Laud in a sympathetic light. Furthermore, Wharton suggests that Laud’s *History*, as it was published by William Prynne, was “altered, mangled, corrupted and glossed in a most shameful manner” (ii). Wharton laments the fact that Prynne’s troublesome edition has been the only resource for those interested in studying or learning about the history of Archbishop Laud. It is for this reason that he put forth a new and complete edition of William Laud’s *History*. Wharton forcefully asserts that “The True and Faithful Publication of it, which I have made from the Original, now in my Hands, will not only supply the defect of what the Arch-Bishop intended in the words before related, but never effected; but will also undeniably assert his Innocence from those greater Accusations formerly brought against him, and will farther clear him from many later Aspersions of lesser moment” (ii-iii) In short, Wharton can right two wrongs. First he can publish a credible edition of the text. Second, he can recoup Laud’s reputation.

Next, Wharton presents a lengthy account of the history of conflict between Laud and Prynne, as well as the animosity between Laud and other religious of his day. He refers to Bishop Hacket’s *Life of Arch-Bishop Williams* as another incomplete and unjust
treatment of Laud. Wharton concedes that Laud’s and Prynne’s relationship was contentious and petty, but he continues to stand by the character of Laud and the need for Laud’s voice in theological debates.

On page iv of the preface, Wharton shifts topics; he explains that the edition he is presenting is important for the sake of history. He states, “the entire Publication of this Diary, contributes very much to Illustrate the History of those Times; and that both it, and the following History, discover many Secrets (before unknown) in Matters of Church and State, and correct many Errours, commonly taken up and received in Relation to either” (iv). At which point, Wharton returns to the discussion of Prynne. He insists that Prynne falsely asserts that both King James and King Charles intended to re-introduce Catholicism as the religion of England, and they both intended to use William Laud “as their chief Instrument in that bad Design” (v). Prynne had promised to publish a more thorough account of Laud’s trial, but Wharton explains that he never lived up to that promise. He only published the brief accounts that level serious charges against Laud.

Wharton says, “That the most Reverend Author [Laud] wrote this History for the publick Vindication of himself, cannot be doubted” (vi). Like so many other memoirs, Wharton edits this text to honor the wishes of the author. He explains that Laud would most likely have preferred that it be published in Latin, but Wharton explains that for the sake of his vindication English is more effective.

Interestingly, Prynne kept all of William Laud’s papers until his death. It was after Prynne’s death that Laud’s accounts became available to Archbishop Sheldon and then Archbishop Sancroft, the Dean of St. Paul’s and Wharton’s “patron [who] gave him
much literary work.” Furthermore, other accounts by Laud were found in the library at St. John’s College in Oxford. All of these papers were collected, and ultimately they became the property of Sancroft after Archbishop Sheldon passed away. As the dean realized that he, too, was dying, he summoned Henry Wharton to his bedside. Wharton then describes his meeting with the Dean of St. Paul’s:

He was then pleased to acquaint me with his Design; related to me, how the History with the other Papers of Arch-Bishop Laud came into his Hands, how he had often prepared himself for the perfection of this Edition, and was at last hindered by his present Sickness. In fine, he laid his Commands upon me, to perfect what he had begun, and to Publish the History, as soon as might be; and then immediately caused to be delivered to me the Original and Copy of the History, with the Diary, and all other Papers of Arch-Bishop Laud, or his own, relating to them, which then lay upon or about his Scrutoire, or could be found in his study (ix).

In fact, Wharton made a number of return trips to the Sancroft’s study (before and after his death) to find other papers that might pertain to William Laud. He was somewhat lucky, finding some of what he needed. Those papers that he did not find, he searched for elsewhere, and these documents can be found at the end of Laud’s History in the appendix Wharton provides.

Toward the end of the preface, Wharton provides a helpful and thorough discussion of his approach as editor. I have created a list of his considerations below:

- “I set myself to perfect the Edition of this History” (x).
- He transcribed, adjoined, and collated all the text (accounts, letters, pamphlets).
- He “added what Observations I thought necessary, in the Margin” (x).
- He “Religiously retained the Author’s own words and expressions throughout” (x).
- He has “only amended the orthography (which both in Original and Copy was monstrously vitious)” (x).
- He “inserted some words where the Sense was imperfect” (x).
- He “retained all my late Lord Arch-Bishop Sancroft’s Observations” (x).

---

Wharton’s meticulous approach to this edition is meant to be a tribute to William Laud, whom he describes as having “the noblest, the most Zealous, and most sincere Intentions therein, toward Re-establishing the Beauty, the Honour, and the Force of Religion, in that part of the Catholick Church (the Church of England) to the Service of which I have entirely devoted my Life, my Labours, and my Fortunes” (xi). Wharton obviously crosses into dangerous territory with statements like “perfect the Edition,” “added what Observations,” or “inserted some words.” He reveals his attitude toward freely emending copy-text where he considers it necessary or important. Nonetheless, he still considers his edition to be more authoritative than the previous.

William Laud started and ended his career as a contentious theologian. *The Cambridge Biographical Dictionary* explains that “Laud’s task was to raise the Church of England to its rightful position as a branch of the Church Catholic, to root out Calvinism in England and Presbyterianism in Scotland.”23 This autobiographical edition is particularly interesting as its textual history and the dialogue in the editorial preface reveals its historical and theological role. After Laud was imprisoned in the tower in 1641 for treason for his supposed sympathies with Rome, his diary manuscript was used against him: “. . . it was not until 31 May 1643 that an order was issued to Prynne and others to seize on his letters and papers in the expectations of finding evidence against him, an opportunity which Prynne used to publish a garbled edition of the private diary of the archbishop.”24 Wharton’s task of editing Laud’s text, while a commission from his mentor and another literary project in a long career of authorship and editing, is also a

strong statement about autobiography and editing in the eighteenth century. M. H. Abrams describes the eighteenth century as “the age of the emergence of the full-scale biography, and also of the theory of biography as a special literary genre.” Wharton’s preface lends a sense of importance to this genre in that he used the autobiography to take part in a religious and historical debate. In so doing, he recouped Laud’s tarnished name, and he clarified church history. In fact, Wharton’s edition contributed to the larger project of reconsidering Archbishop Laud’s contributions: “Under these influences [Wharton’s work and the scholarship of others], a very sympathetic re-examination of his opinions has produced almost a complete reversal of judgment . . .” As a result, this edition is an early example of autobiography as valuable historical commentary.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustrations included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: An “Epistle Dedicatory” from Brian Fairfax to Thomas Fairfax (The son of the author) is included in edition.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: No preface or advertisement is included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by Brian Fairfax, the editor, is included in the edition. There are short references to different aspects of Thomas Fairfax’s life in the dedication.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of memoirs by Thomas Fairfax
9) FOOTNOTES: No footnotes included.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.

Brian Fairfax’s dedication to the current Lord Fairfax (son of the Thomas Lord Fairfax, the author) is important in that it relates specifically his reasoning for presenting a scholarly edition of Thomas Fairfax’s memoirs. It has come to his attention that other unauthorized (emphasis mine) copies are somehow circulating, and Brian Fairfax describes these copies as “imperfect” (iii). This other corrupt edition of Fairfax’s memoirs are to be published imminently, and Brian Fairfax does not trust the representation and treatment of the copy-text in this other edition. In short, Fairfax’s memoirs as presented by Brian Fairfax are the true edition of the memoirs. Interestingly, his relationship to the author lends credibility to this claim in that he has access to the Fairfax library and estate papers. Brian Fairfax explains that the edition is “now printed from the original, written in his own hand, and left in your study at Denton in Yorkshire” (i-ii). In the introduction to the third chapter, I provide some more detail about the textual transmission of Thomas Fairfax’s Short Memorials. It is true that there are two original manuscripts in Thomas Fairfax’s handwriting, and there is one manuscript in Brian Fairfax’s handwriting. In other words, Brian Fairfax’s worries about another copy were probably well-founded because there were numerous manuscript copies available that could have resulted in another edition. The implication of this textual history is that Brian Fairfax feels his copy is the authentic edition, and he is undermining ahead of time any claims of authenticity that the “other” editor may make. Ironically, his

anxiety was unfounded. Other than Brian Fairfax’s edition, another edition was not published until 1776.\textsuperscript{28}

It is also important to note that the editor displays an attitude of esteem and respect for Thomas Fairfax. Brian Fairfax is, after all, his brother. He is publishing this edition out of a sense of duty and love. While he indicates that the memoirs are important for their historical commentary, the memoirs seem to be most important to Brian Fairfax because of familial pride. He states toward the end of the dedication:

I shall now say no more of him, but, that, so long as unfeigned Piety towards God, invincible Courage, joined with wonderful modesty, and exceeding good nature; justice and charity to all men in his private life; and an ingenuous acknowledgment of his publick error, with hearty endeavours to make reparation, as soon as he was convinced of it; shall be esteemed in the world: so long shall the name of my Lord Fairfax be honoured by good men, and be in perpetual remembrance (ix-x).

Lord Fairfax, especially as he was known to his family, was considered a good man. Brian Fairfax’s edition pays homage to this personal and family legacy.


Included in Edition:

1) \textbf{ILLUSTRATION:} No illustration included.
2) \textbf{TITLE PAGE:} Title page included.
3) \textbf{TABLE OF CONTENTS:} No table of contents included.
4) \textbf{ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:} No acknowledgement or dedication included.
5) \textbf{EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:} Editorial preface by Jonathan Swift.
6) \textbf{BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND:} No biographical background provided by the editor.

\textsuperscript{28} Ibid.
Upon the death of Sir William Temple, Jonathan Swift was bequeathed 100 pounds as well as the “trust and profit of publishing [Temple’s] posthumous writings.” Swift makes clear that he waited to publish the text by Temple in deference to individuals whose names or reputations may have been tarnished by the Memoirs. However, Swift insists that enough time has passed, which is evidenced by the fact that he does not know many of the names in Temple’s text, and he does not remember a lot of the history related to it. Furthermore, Swift indicates that a number of individuals are praised throughout the text. This, too, justifies bringing the text to the public.

Swift then defends Temple on two counts. First, Swift justifies Temple’s use of French words and expressions in the Memoirs. He states, “‘Tis to the French (if I mistake not) we chiefly owe that manner of Writing; and Sir William Temple is not only the first, but I think the only English man (at least of any Consequence) who ever attempted it” (2). Temple, who spent so many years abroad would understandably rely on French

---

expressions. Second, he clarifies that Temple does not focus too much on his own experience. Swift matter-of-factly asserts that Temple “was in chief Confidence with the King his Master” (3). In other words, the function of the text is to relate Temple’s important political role, and personal observations are key to understanding his role. However, this criticism of Temple’s “personal” memoirs may also reflect the fact that eighteenth-century readers were adjusting to the more personal and extemporaneous format of the biography or autobiography. It is significant, then, that Swift defends the relevance of the autobiography as a useful literary genre.

Lastly, Swift clearly explains why the Memoirs are given the title of “Part III.” He explains that there was a first part, but this portion of the text was burned by Temple. The second part of the text was published by Temple, and Swift is making the final installment of Temple’s account available to eighteenth-century readers after Temple’s death.

Interestingly, Swift offers no extensive praise of Temple, which is interesting as Temple was an important figure in Swift’s life. Many scholars even refer to Temple as a sort of father figure to Swift. Furthermore, Swift does not go into detail about the text of the memoirs, which are “a documentary of [Temple’s] own experiences in the foreign service of King Charles II.”

Scholars look to the falling out between the Temple family and Swift to explain his less personal preface. The quarrel between Swift and Temple’s sister, Lady Giffard, regarding the publication of the memoirs, was apparently the reason for the tension. Anne Cline Kelly succinctly explains the interaction between Swift and Giffard:

Temple’s sister, Lady Martha Temple Giffard, who had been in the Temple household since the death of her husband one month after their marriage in 1662, publicly attacked Swift for publishing the memoirs without proper authority and without an authentic copy text. She evidently wanted to distance herself from the volume because it criticized certain prominent people of her acquaintance. After Lady Giffard refused to give him her copy of the memoirs, Swift used the copy in his possession.  

Swift did not take the accusation lightly, and he defended his role as editor:

Your Ladyship says, if ever they were designed to be printed, it must have been from the original. Nothing of his, ever printed in my time, was from the original. The first Memoirs was from my copy; so were the second Miscellanea; so was the introduction to the English History; so was every volume of Letters. They were all copied from the originals by Sir William Temple’s direction, and corrected all along by his orders; and it was the same with these last Memoirs; so that whatever he printed, since I had the honour to know him, was an unfaithful copy of it, were it to be tried by the original. . . Your nephews say the printed copy [of the Memoirs, Part Three] differs from the original in forty places as to words and manners of expression. I believe it may be a hundred. . . These Memoirs were printed by a correct copy, exactly after the same manner as the author’s other works were. He told me a dozen times upon asking him, that it was his intention they should be printed after his death, but never fixed anything about the time. The corrections were all his own, ordering me to correct in my copy as I read it, as he always did.

Swift’s defense is particularly effective, especially for its honesty regarding the number of possible corruptions that were introduced between the original manuscript and Swift’s copy. The quarrel, unfortunately, had a lasting impact: “Swift defended himself successfully, but was alienated from the family. His hopes of preferment vanished, and he long afterwards declared that he owed no obligation to Temple, at ‘whose death he was’ as far ‘to seek as ever.’” Swift’s tone after the publication of the memoirs points to a particular difficulty when considering editions of memoirs: these texts are personal. They include events, episodes, names, and places that are particular and that possibly

---

implicate people in ways that might be uncomfortable. This was obviously the case in this example. The Temple family, and Lady Giffard in particular, struggled with the personal nature of the memoirs. Swift, as editor, reveals this tension between public and private texts.

Jospeh Wyeth, ed. *The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood. Or, An Account of his Birth, Education, &c. With Divers Observations on his Life and Manners when a Youth: And how he came to be Convinced of the Truth; with his many Sufferings and Services for the same. Also Several Other Remarkable Passages and Occurrences.* Written by his own hand. To which is added, a supplement By J. W. By Thomas Ellwood. London: J. Sowle, 1714.

Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustrations included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No complete table of contents included. Prior to the text of the memoirs, there is a list of “Papers in this Book,” which seems to be a list of documents that appear at various points in the memoirs. For instance, on page 259, “A Congratulation” appears in the edition.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: The editor, Joseph Wyeth, has not dedicated the edition to anyone.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: A five page preface by Joseph Wyeth is included. Interestingly, however, he includes numerous “testimonies” on the character of Thomas Ellwood. These testimonials could be considered advertisements included at the behest of the editor, and below is a list of these tributes to the author:
   • “George Bowles his Testimony concerning Thomas Ellwood.”
   • “A Testimony from the Monthly-Meeting at Hunger-Hill, the Seventh Day of the Fourth Month, 1713. Concerning our Dear and Well-beloved Friend and Brother in the Truth, Thomas Ellwood, Deceased.”
   • “A TESTIMONY from the Womens-Meeting, Concerning Thomas Ellwood.”
   • “Concerning our Dear Friend Thomas Ellwood, of Hunger-Hill.”
   • Richard Vivers his Testimony Concerning Thomas Ellwood.”
Josephy Wyeth “was for twenty years a friend of Thomas Ellwood . . .” His affection for his friend is apparent in his preface to the edition of his works—a preface he begins with flare. The tone of the preface is that of a sermon that is meant to inspire readers to emulate the compassion of the author:

Gather up the Fragments that remain, that nothing be Lost, John 6.12. Was the direction of our Saviour to his Disciples, after he had fed the multitude. Which may well and usefully be applied, to the Collecting and Preserving the Accounts of the Lives of God Men: Men who in their Day, have been eminently useful in those stations of Life, wherein God, by his good Providence, hath placed them. And this preserving, by Publication, is the rather to be done, when themselves do leave behind them, in Writing, an Account of their Lives, and of the signal Mercies of God to them therein: For from such Accounts, may best be gathered, by the Reader, the Man’s particular State, Exercise and Growth in the Work of Restoration, out of the Fall and Degeneracy: And, in the Reading thereof, be not only exiting to Bless the Name of the Lord, on his behalf; but also gain some direction from the Path, so fairly tract out, and ground of Hope; that by being Faithful, they may likewise attain to the same good Experience (a2-a3).
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Wyeth asserts that memoirs of “good men” need to be published in order to set an example for the reader—an example of faith and benevolence. I find this to be a compelling but largely typical explanation by an editor as to why he or she chose to edit a particular text. Basically, Wyeth claims that Ellwood’s memoirs are worth it for the reader both spiritually and socially. Ellwood’s text(s) are “useful labours and Services” that he penned to ascertain “truth” (a3). The remainder of Wyeth’s preface pays tribute to the laudatory character and writings of Ellwood.

The testimonials that Joseph Wyeth includes in the edition (listed above) add to the credibility of his claim that Thomas Ellwood was an honest and spiritually pure man. The individuals and communities that pay tribute to Ellwood lend an understanding of his character. It is important to note that these lengthy advertisements appear prior to the text of Ellwood’s memoirs. In other words, the reader will already have constructed an idea of the man and memoirs before even beginning to read Ellwood’s narrative.

To Milton scholars Thomas Ellwood has particular significance. Albert Labriola explains that “One story of the composition of Paradise Regained derives from Thomas Ellwood, a Quaker who read to the blind Milton and was tutored by him. Ellwood recounts that Milton gave him the manuscript of Paradise Lost for examination, and, upon returning it to the poet, who was then residing at Chalfont St. Giles, he commented, ‘Thou hast said much of Paradise lost, but what hast thou to say of Paradise found?’”35 However, Ellwood’s personal History is important for a number of other reasons. First, Wyeth’s edition of Ellwood’s text provides insight into eighteenth-century Quakerism. Ellwood converted to Quakerism in 1659, he protested the oppression of Quakers, and he
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wrote extensively on the political viewpoint of Quakers in England. His memoirs, then, provide a unique opportunity to learn about their cultural situation, and eighteenth-century readers were interested. To that end, Ellwood grounds his autobiography in religious language: “The autobiography, which includes many hymns and religious verses, has been reprinted many times.” Second, Ellwood’s narrative is a compelling autobiographical account of his personal spiritual journey. He alienated his father as a result of his conversion, and he spent considerable time in jail for his religious beliefs, but his religious devotion never wavered. Such a narrative, which is supplemented with letters that clarify Ellwood’s experience, provides the reader with a first hand view of Quakerism. Lastly, as the quote above indicates, the autobiography was successful. Six editions had been printed by 1855. This autobiography, which does not receive much scholarly attention, was appreciated by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century readers, showcasing that spiritual autobiographies had traction during the era.

Stephen Wren, the Younger, ed. *Parentalia: or Memories of the Family of the Wrens; Viz. of Mathew Bishop of Ely, Christopher Dean of Windsor, &c. But Chiefly of Sir Christopher Wren, Late Surveyor-General of the Royal Buildings, President of the Royal Society, &c. &c. By the Wren Family.* London: T. Osborn (Gray’s-Inn) and R. Dodsley (Pall-Mall), 1750.

Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Frontispiece of Christopher Wren and numerous illustrations, architectural renderings, and portraits throughout the text.
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36 Stephen and Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 6, 723.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
Stephen Wren begins his editorial preface by explaining his motivation for presenting this edition that was originally compiled by his father, Christopher Wren, the Younger:

A respect for the Memory of worthy Ancestors, and a Desire of communicating useful Knowledge to the Public, were the Motives which prompted my Father to compile this Work, partly biographical, and partly scientifical, a Work honourable to the deceased, as placing their Virtues in a fair Light, and perpetuating their Composures; tending likewise to the Advancement of Literature, not only by their Treatises and Letters, but by their Example; a strong Incentive, as it shews what unbounded Acquisitions are to be obtained by Study and Speculation (iii).

As this well-worded opening paragraph indicates Stephen Wren’s edition is at once a tribute to family, as well as a treatise on science, literature, and art. The edition was
published for the purpose of educating the public about the Wrens’ contributions to their fields.

Subsequently, Stephen Wren indicates that he takes it upon himself to publish the lavish edition in order to “[prevent] a spurious Counterfeit” (iv). In other words, Stephen Wren displays an anxiety about an unauthorized edition of this text. In addition, the editor will deem the edition a success if it only “clears its Charges” (iv-v). He is not concerned about profit. This statement regarding the possible profits garnered from publication works in two ways. First, this claim about money seems to give credibility to his role as editor. Second, The statement also indicates that the Wren family is not in need of money. His motivation for publishing the book is for “the Glory of God, and the Good of Mankind” (iv).

Stephen Wren pays homage to Arthur Onslow, Speaker of the House of Commons, as he also does in his dedication, and he then ends his preface with a quotation from Robert Cotton, which elaborates on “Memory and Works of virtuous men” (v). This is once more a tribute to the endeavors of the Wren family.

The “Introduction to the Family of the Wrens” immediately follows the editor’s preface. In this introduction, Stephen Wren outlines the genealogy of the Wren family. It is a rather detailed description of names, mottos, homes, cemeteries, and other places associated with the family. This family was at the center of English history. They obviously had a long and storied association with science, art, literature, and royalty. This introduction frames the family in such a way that the reader cannot help but be impressed with the name of Wren.
In terms of what this edition contributes to the body of texts that provide insight into notions of family in the eighteenth century, it is important to mention the lavishness of the edition. The large folio edition with detailed leather binding and exquisite architectural renderings is extremely impressive. The text itself frames the Wren family in a striking light. The reader is immediately aware that this family memoirs is significant in terms of English national and literary history.

I should go one step farther, too, to note that the reader will also pick up on the charity of the Wren family as well. Matthew Wren’s contributions as bishop and Christopher Wren’s achievements as architect, scientist, and planner evidence lives lived for the public good. Harkening back to some key words from the opening paragraph of the editorial preface, Stephen Wren insists that the Wrens have advanced “literature,” “study,” and “speculation,” but it is important to note that they were upstanding, moral individuals as well.39

It is important to note as well that Parentalia is primarily an edition of Christopher Wren’s memoirs and achievements, but considerable space is given to Matthew Wren’s (Bishop of Ely) memoirs as well. The documents were compiled by Christopher Wren (the younger—son of Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Paul’s Cathedral), and edited and published by Stephen Wren. Christopher Wren, the elder, took part in the rebuilding of London after the Great Fire. His stamp on London was extensive:

In 1669 he was appointed surveyor-general and was chosen architect for the new St. Paul’s (1675-1710) and for more than 50 other churches in place of those destroyed by the Great Fire. Other works by him were the Royal Exchange, Custom House, Temple Bar, the College of Physicians, Greenwich Observatory,

39 Christopher Wren’s “amiability,” “integrity,” and “faith” are discussed in Stephen’s and Lee’s Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 21, 1010.
Chelsea Hospital, the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, Hampton Court, Greenwich Hospital, Buckingham House, Marlborough House, and the western towers and north transept of Westminster Abbey. In 1684 he was appointed comptroller of the works at Windsor Castle, and in 1698 surveyor-general of Westminster Abbey. He was buried in St. Paul’s, where his monument reads *Si Monumentum requires, circumspice* (if you seek a monument, look around you).40

Most of the above-mentioned projects are discussed in Wren’s accounts in *Parentalia*, which highlights how the edition becomes an essential record of London architectural and social history. Christopher Wren’s architectural contributions are a reflection of the early enlightenment era. John Morrill explains, “There was, however, a stark contrast between the intensity and devotional emphasis of early Stuart churches and chapels such as the one at Peterhouse Cambridge, and the coolness [*sic*], light, rationalist air of Wren’s London churches.”41

The papers of Matthew Wren, too, are important historical documents. Matthew Wren, Bishop of Ely, was closely associated with Arch-Bishop William Laud, and both men were at odds with William Prynne for their strong stance against Puritanism. *The Dictionary of National Biography* describes Wren’s experience as Bishop of Norwich, which sheds light on his stance:

> At Norwich he succeeded a prelate, Richard Corbet [q.v.], who had never shown any love for puritans, and had taken proceedings against them. Yet Laud, at his visitation (1635), found the diocese “much out of order,” and expected Wren to “take care of it.” Wren’s visitation articles (1636, 4to) are an expansion of those for Hereford. The British Museum copy (5155, c.20) has an appendix of twenty-eight “particular orders” in manuscript. The public mind was soon excited against Wren by William Prynne . . . 42

Ultimately, Matthew Wren, like William Laud, would spend considerable time in the Tower of London for his religious stance. His religious commitment elevated him to
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40 Magnus Magnusson, ed., *Cambridge Biographical Dictionary*, 1584
great status but finally relegated him to persecution. His experience, which showcases the conflict between religion and politics during the Stuart era, is contained in *Parentalia*, highlighting once more the usefulness of the edition as historical chronicle.

Lisa Jardine’s biography of Christopher Wren, the elder, sheds some helpful background on the edition as well. She states, “*Parentalia* is the richest compilation of Wren-related materials we have. It also carries the clear marks of Sir Christopher Wren’s retrospective view of his own life, at its very close. *Parentalia*, in other words, may be treated both as a compilation of edited documentary evidence and as a skeletal autobiography.”

Jardine does an impressive job of weaving textual history into her biography of Wren. Her awareness of the carefully assembled nature of the edition is important as well. She explains, “To the extent that *Parentalia* is a self-conscious construction—a carefully crafted version of the great man in which he himself participated—it tells us a great deal about how Wren and the Wren family wished posterity to remember him.”

The paratext, omissions, and emendations are meant to “show Wren senior in the best possible light.” The impressive edition and the centrality of the text for Wren scholars indicate that the edition succeeded on many levels.

**Horace Walpole, ed. The Life of Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Written by Himself.** By Edward Herbert, Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Twickenham: Strawberry-Hill, 1764.
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44 Ibid., 479.
46 For this annotation, I used the 1770 edition, which was also published in London by J. Dodsley. I located this edition at the Folger Library.
Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Frontispiece entitled “Edward Lord Herbert of Chirbury.”
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: Dedication from Horace Walpole, the editor, “To the Most Noble Henry Arthur Herbert, Earl of Powis, Viscount Ludlow, Lord Herbert of Chirbury, Baron Powis and Ludlow, and Treasurer of His Majesty’s Household.”
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: Editorial advertisement included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by the editor is included.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of memoirs by Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury.
9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes by Walpole included.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included.
13) INDEX: No index included.
14) SIZE: Quarto.

The dedication from Horace Walpole to Henry Arthur Herbert, descendent of Edward Herbert, serves to praise this man who relinquished the copy-text of Edward Herbert’s Life for the purpose of the edition. Furthermore, Walpole indicates that the family of Herbert should be honored by this scholarly edition. However, Herbert scholars point out that Walpole might not have been sincere in his wish to honor the legacy of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury. W. P. Ker clarifies that “The Autobiography was edited by Horace Walpole in a spirit of mischief. ‘I was resolved the world should not think I admired it seriously, though there are really fine passages in it,
and good sense too. I drew up an equivocal preface in which you will discover my opinion.”

In the editorial advertisement, which is approximately six pages in length, Walpole goes into greater detail but occasionally conveys a tone of ridicule. He laments the loss of Herbert’s writing to history: “what has happened to many other great men, has been his fate too” (second page of advertisement). He expects, too, that the reader will be surprised at the richness of Herbert’s memoirs. Walpole states, “I will anticipate the Reader’s suprize, tho’ it shall be but in a word: to his astonishment he will find, that the history of Don Quixote was the Life of Plato” (second page of advertisement). He praises Herbert as an impressive soldier, knight, public minister, writer, and philosopher. However, on the fourth page of the advertisement he makes an interesting and significant statement. Walpole indicates that Herbert’s “excesses and errors” do not detract from his contributions to English history, and it is here that his ironic tone is most apparent (fourth page of advertisement). Eugene D. Hill states that in this editorial advertisement “Walpole is making gestures to placate the author’s descendants, but it is clear where his interest in the book lies. It is in the ‘excesses and errors’ of the author. As Rossi notes, Walpole views Herbert as a conceited fool whose extravagances furnish an endless source of amusement.” In fact, Walpole’s response to Herbert’s autobiography is now well-known to Herbert scholars. Hill describes Walpole’s reaction:

Walpole was a specialist in chronicling and collecting the eccentric—not least in the lives and writings of the English nobility. His letters tell the story of his finding Herbert’s unpublished manuscript at the home of a noble lady. Soon he was reading it aloud to assuage the grief of another (recently widowed) noble

lady. “Gray and I read it to amuse her. We could not get on for laughing and screaming. I begged to have it in print.”

This is certainly a unique editorial stance. The editors that are included in this dissertation are on the whole sincere in their praise and admiration for the author. Walpole’s attitude is distinct in its mocking tone toward the author and the text; however, this tone reveals the power an editor of a scholarly edition wields. Hill says, “Walpole’s biased view has set the tone of critical comment on the autobiography up to the present—for admirers and disparagers alike. Most of the essays devoted to Lord Herbert pick up the comparison with the supposedly feckless Spanish Don.” Walpole’s ironic tone regarding the autobiography, which is apparent in the editorial advertisement and confirmed in his letters, undermined at least for a time the historical and philosophical discussion that is taking place in Herbert’s autobiography.

Despite the early critical consensus that resulted from Walpole’s edition and that largely dismissed Cherbury’s autobiography, modern scholars have returned to the work of Cherbury and come up with a general appreciation for his autobiography. R. I. Aaron asserts that “To-day the Autobiography is certainly still amusing and entertaining; but the laughter of Walpole and his age now sounds a little shallow. The best edition of the work is undoubtedly that of Sir Sidney Lee (1886), and what Lee shows in his masterly introduction is that Herbert’s life and character are highly significant.” Other scholars agree. Hill states, “The autobiography tells a comic story with wry self-directed humor. The Herbert who writes is not the same man as the Herbert whose acts are described. After all, the book ends with the decision to publish De Veritate. All the events

49 Ibid., 104.
50 Ibid., 105.
recounted in the *Life* take place, so to speak, *ante veritatem*: before the coming truth.”  

Hill’s reference to what is considered Herbert’s greatest work, *De Veritate*, is helpful. He is suggesting that Herbert is using his autobiographical narrative to clarify a philosophical argument: “*De Veritate* was designed to establish instructed reason as the safest guide in a search for truth.” In so doing, R.D. Bedford explains, “[Herbert’s] pragmatic and political motives in writing *De Veritate* may be discerned: he wanted to contribute to the unification and pacification of European religious diversity and its attendant wars and persecutions.” This is not a small philosophical undertaking, and it certainly flies in the face of Walpole’s laughter. Cherbury’s narrative about his personal experience as a noble and a knight, as he reveals in his autobiography, are about his growth as an individual. These private epiphanies inform his public philosophy, which centers on discerning truth. This text, then, showcases the value of the autobiography in that the private is not only relevant to the public, but it informs his other written works in important ways.

Interestingly, Cherbury’s autobiography begins with a statement that reveals how he intended his personal story should be useful specifically for his ancestors. He states,

> I do believe that if all my ancestors had set down their lives in writing, and left them to posterity, many documents necessary to be known of those who both participate of their natural inclinations and humours must in all probability run a not much different course, might have been given for their instruction; and certainly it will be found much better for men to guide themselves by such observations as their father, grandfather, and great grand-father might have delivered to them, than by those vulgar rules and examples, which cannot in all points so exactly agree unto them. Therefore whether their life were private, and
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52 Hill, Edward, Lord Herbert, 108.
55 Hill, Edward, Lord Herbert, 112.
contained only precepts necessary to treat with their children, servants, tenants, kinsmen, and neighbours, or employed abroad in the university, or study of the law, or in the court, or in the camp, their heirs might have benefited themselves more by them than by any else; for which reason I have thought fit to relate to my posterity those passages of my life, which I conceive may best declare me, and me most useful to them (1-2).

According to its author, his autobiography, then, while not secreted away like Pepys’s diary, does have a particular and more private value for the Herbert family. Walpole picks up on the author’s statement, as the private and public function of the autobiography appears in the editorial advertisement. Walpole says,

[Cherbury’s] Descendants, not blind to his faults, but thro’ them conducting the reader to his virtues, desire the world to make this candid observation with them, “That there must have been a wonderfull fund of internal virtue, of strong resolution and manly philosophy, which in an age of such mistaken and barbarous gallantry, of such absurd usages and false glory, cou’d enable Lord Herbert to seek fame better founded, and cou’d make him reflect that there might be a more desirable kind of glory than that of a romantic duelist” (third page of advertisement).

In other words, Cherbury’s narrative provides helpful life lessons and cautionary tales for the Herbert family in particular, but also for the reading public.

Walpole then explains how “the MS was in great danger of being lost to the World” (fourth page of advertisement). He describes how each of the duplicate copies, which were not in the best condition, were finally found on two of the Herbert family’s estates. The manuscript when compiled was incomplete. Walpole left the spelling in tact, but he corrected some “obvious mistakes” (fifth page of advertisement). Also, he added some notes where necessary for clarification. Ironically, Walpole’s impulse to print this edition for its entertainment value resulted in him saving an important autobiographical and philosophical text. He may have been amused by Cherbury’s personal narrative, but he took seriously his job as editor. Modern scholars are grateful.

Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustration included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: The author, Gronniosaw, dedicates his account to the Countess of Huntingdon.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: The editor, Walter Shirley, includes a three page preface to the edition.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by Shirley is included in the edition.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of autobiography by Gronniosaw.
9) FOOTNOTES: Limited footnotes included in the text.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included.
13) INDEX: No index included.
14) SIZE: Duodecimo.

Shirley’s editorial preface begins, “this account of the life and spiritual experience of James Albert, was taken from his own mouth, and committed to paper by the elegant pen of a young Lady of the town of Leominster, for her own private satisfaction, and without any intention, at first, that it should be made public” (3). This is a strong statement by the editor that the text is first and foremost an account by the author. There are no descriptions of emendations made to Gronniosaw’s manuscript, and Shirley
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56 This annotation is based on a 1774 edition, which was printed in Newport, Rhode Island by S. Southwick. Henry Louis Gates, Jr., in “James Gronniosaw and the Trope of the Talking Book,” in *Studies in Autobiography*, edited by James Olney (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1988), 57, notes that the title changes in the 1774 edition. Gates explains, “While the 1770 edition bears as its subtitle the fact that Gronniosaw ‘related’ this tale ‘himself,’ the 1774 edition, ‘reprinted’ at Newport, Rhode Island, claims that his narrative was ‘written by himself.’”
describes the edition as largely Gronniosaw’s account written with the help of an amanuensis. He portrays the edition as unchanged and uncorrupted from the manuscript. Vincent Carretta asserts that “in 1809 the ‘young LADY’ was identified, probably incorrectly, as Hannah More.” To this day, the identity of the amanuensis remains unclear.

The remainder of the preface speaks to the religious conversion of Gronniosaw, an emancipated slave. In terms of the motivation for publishing this edition, the editor points, albeit indirectly, to the need for literature that discusses the experience of a slave and the need for religious faith. He states,

Now, it appears from the experience of this remarkable person, that God does not save without the knowledge of the truth; but, with respect to those whom he hath foreknown, though born under every outward disadvantage, and in the regions of the grossest darkness and ignorance, he most amazingly acts upon, and influences, their minds, and in the course of wisely and most wonderfully appointed providence, he brings them to the means of spiritual information, gradually opens to their view the light of his truth, and gives them full possession of enjoyment of the inestimable blessings of his gospel (3-4).

Helena Woodard provides helpful commentary regarding Shirley’s discussion of Gronniosaw’s Christian conversion. On the one hand, she explains that Shirley derives a sense of comfort from Gronniosaw’s spiritual journey in that the narrative focuses on subservience. Woodard explains that “. . . Gronniosaw believed that he had created his own predicament as a consequence of his own sins and personal behavior and that he therefore deserved any cruelty that befell him.” In other words, Gronniosaw’s narrative reveals a resignation and acceptance on the part of its author. Gronniosaw’s conversion

---

allows for some degree of contentment in the face of suffering. Woodard’s scholarship affirms this theme: “... what Reverend Shirley does not divulge in the narrative’s preface to the reader, is that the journey ‘out of darkness into ... marvelous light’ was not intended for spiritual enlightenment, but for a period of enslavement and a life of poverty and suffering in a faraway land.”\(^{59}\) This is evident in the preface when Shirley says, “God has put singular honor upon [Gronniosaw] in the exercise of his faith and patience, which, in the most distressing and pitiable trials and calamities, have been found to the praise and glory of God” (4).

On the other hand, Woodward brings up an interesting discussion of the baptism of slaves that highlights Shirley’s edition of Gronniosaw’s narrative as more subversive. She asserts that “Ironically, a slave who sought to be baptized in England was sometimes viewed as more threatening than one who sought to become literate, because baptism was thought to encourage enslaved blacks to seek freedom and to prevent free blacks from being reenslaved.”\(^{60}\) Gronniosaw’s religious conversion, which is the central focus of the preface and the narrative, is the first step toward baptism. In this regard, Shirley’s editorial role allows for the publication of a text that challenges the prevalent anxiety toward the baptism and emancipation of slaves and former slaves. From this perspective, the edition has a stronger abolitionist stance.

Gronniosaw’s autobiographical account also says much about reading, writing, and authorship. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. explains Gronniosaw’s inability to find his own voice in texts that were read to him: “The book had no voice for Gronniosaw, the book—or perhaps the very concept of ‘book’—constituted a silent primary text, a text, however,

\(^{59}\) Ibid., 32.  
\(^{60}\) Ibid., 40.
in which the black man found no echo of his own voice.” This void motivates Gronniosaw to author his own text. Gates states, “The text refuses to speak to Gronniosaw, so some forty-five years later, Gronniosaw ‘writes’ a text that ‘speaks’ his face into existence among the authors and texts of the western tradition.” This “trope of the talking book” is complicated by the fact that the authorship of Gronniosaw’s text involved an amanuensis, and the publication of the edition involved an editor, Walter Shirley, who while not necessarily as obtrusive as Thomas Pringle in his role as editor of Mary Prince’s narrative, certainly plays a part in constructing meaning in the edition.

Shirley’s preface is only three pages, and his footnotes are not frequent or extensive, but he does frame the text as a spiritual autobiography. Furthermore, Shirley tends to discuss the cruelty of slavery in vague terms. Shirley briefly alludes to Gronniosaw’s enslavement, but he does not provide details of the conditions in the West Indies or later in England: “His long and perilous journey to the coast of Guinea, where he was sold for a slave, and so brought into a Christian land . . .” (4). Note that Shirley refers to Gronniosaw’s place of enslavement as merely a “Christian land,” which has a positive connotation. He does not allude to the cruelty of slavery that exists in that “Christian land.” While the narrative may be Gronniosaw’s account as related to an amanuensis, Shirley certainly takes part in shaping Gronniosaw’s “existence” in its ultimate textual format; his paratextual constructions are at points subversive and at points in line with the socio-cultural conventions of the era.

Gronniosaw’s slave narrative, which tackles head on this difficult convergence of race and religion, was, interestingly, sought after by eighteenth-century readers. Carretta
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says, “By 1800 the *Narrative* had appeared in at least ten editions in England and America, as well as in a Welsh translation (1779) and serial publication in the *American Moral and Sentimental Magazine* in New York.”


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustrations included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: The edition is dedicated to those who are “generous advocate[s] and benevolent protector[s] of the publick welfare” (v). Wyndham labels such a person a “patriot” (v).
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: A nine page editorial preface is included.
6) BIOGRAHICAL BACKGROUND: No biographical background is included.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No separate section on variants or editorial emendations is included, although some mention of the treatment of the manuscript is included on page xi of the editorial preface.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of Doddington’s diary comprises the edition.
9) FOOTNOTES: Margin notes clarifying dates appear throughout the edition.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included in the edition.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included in the edition.
12) APPENDIX: An appendix is included: extra text of memoirs of Dodington’s early years.
13) INDEX: No index is included.
14) SIZE: Octavo.

Wyndham begins his editorial preface by explaining how he came into possession of Dodington’s (aka Lord Melcombe’s) diary. Wyndham’s ownership of the diary is the
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result of Dodington’s last will and testament. Dodington bequeathed “his whole property, (a few legacies excepted), to his cousin, the late Thomas Wyndham of Hammersmith” (vii). When Thomas Wyndham died, he in turn left the Dodington diary and other papers to Henry Penruddocke Wyndham, the editor, which included Dodington’s request that he not “print or publish any of them, but those that are proper to be made publick” (vii-viii). Interestingly, Wyndham was not loyal to the author’s request.

Wyndham then expresses an anxiety about publishing the diary as Dodington is not esteemed as the most politically honorable man in English history. Burns famously critiques him in “With George Bubb Dodington,” which was included in Parleyings with Certain People of Importance in Their Day:

Ah, George Bubb Dodington Lord Melcombe,—no, Yours was the wrong way!—always understand, Supposing that permissibly you planned How statesmanship—your trade—in outward show Might figure as inspired by simple zeal For serving country, king, and commonweal, (Though service tire to death the body, tease The soul from out an o’ertasked patriot-drudge) And yet should prove zeal’s outward show agrees In all respects—right reason being judge— With inward care that, while the statesman spends Body and soul thus freely fro the sake Of public good, his private welfare take No harm by such devotedness.64

This poem highlights Dodington’s opportunism. His political loyalties vacillated depending on who was in power, showcasing his skill in navigating the eighteenth-
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century political landscape. For instance, he supported George II when it suited him, and he supported the Prince of Wales when it was in his own best interest.65

Interestingly, Wyndham does not see his task as editor as redeeming the legacy or reputation of Dodington. Wyndham explains, “I am aware that, in treating the character of my Author thus freely, I shall appear as a very extraordinary Editor, the practice of whom has generally been, to prefer flattery to truth, and partiality to justice” (x). Wyndham stakes a claim on credibility by insisting that his edition casts Dodington in a truthful light—not in a singularly good light. John Carswell is grateful that Wyndham chose to produce a more thorough and less politically careful edition:

The Diary which records the last decade of this career is peculiarly valuable, for it is the log-book of an experienced political navigator, who kept no secrets from himself. Its crowd of characters—urbanized aristocrats and country gentry, local politicians like the Tuckers of Weymouth, major politicians like Henry Fox, and minor ones like Oswald, rub against the seamier and grimier men, the Paul Whiteheads, Ralphs, and Thompsons, to make up a complete cross-section of the political champ de manœuvre.66

This edition is an interesting example of how the author’s wish for privacy is overlooked by an editor. Nonetheless, historians are grateful for the more complete accounting in Wyndham’s edition.

Wyndham then explains that his editorial approach has been to present Dodington’s diary with as few emendations as possible: “every part of it was carefully copied from rough drafts” (xi). In fact, he goes so far as to ultimately conclude that Dodington would have approved of the publishing of the diary and of Wyndham’s editorial stance, even though Wyndham overlooks the author’s request to omit certain,
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possibly scandalous passages. Wyndham defends his editorial decision to include the bulk of the manuscript in the edition: “I conclude, that Lord Melcombe wrote for the public, and that he intended his Diary should, in a future season, be produced to light: it is also manifest, that his Lordship meant it as an apology for his political conduct, and that he could not write it merely for amusement, or solely for his own retrospection, or for the private perusal only of his heirs” (xi). Wyndham hopes that the miscues and the positive contributions of Lord Melcombe will act as a cautionary tale to those “who are in pursuit of power” (xiii). The editor explains further, “the diary may even animate those gentlemen to the love of true patriotism, and, probably, instruct them to be more attentive to the measures of Administration, than to the parties which form it” (xiii). Wyndham hopes his edition of Dodington’s diary will become an important document with didactic implications for politicians, which is evident in his dedication “To that man, whenever he may appear, who, blessed with a soul superior to all lucrative and ambitious views, will dare to stand forth the generous advocate and benevolent protector of the publick welfare . . .” (v).

At the end of the preface, Wyndham does make the following rather vague claim: “I think it necessary to observe, that I have not published the Diary quite entire, as it would be no entertainment to the reader to be informed, who daily dined with his Lordship, or whom he met at the tables of other people. Such and some other trivial particulars I have omitted, but I have been careful not to alter any part of the original writing” (xiv). This is intriguing because Wyndham insists he does not alter the text; however, he briefly alludes to the omission of certain personal or injurious passages that appear in the diary manuscript. This is yet another example of an eighteenth-century
editor who makes a strong statement about remaining true to the author’s text but also mentions in passing that emendations were made and text was suppressed.


Included in Edition:
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2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included for all seven volumes.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Table of contents included in each of the seven volumes.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No dedication or acknowledgment appears in any of the seven volumes.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: John Lord Sheffield includes prefatory comments in volume one and volume three.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: There is no biography by the editor included in any of the seven volumes.
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11) GLOSSARY: No glossary is included.
12) APPENDIX: An appendix is included in volume two of the edition.
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Sheffield begins his preface in the first volume by discussing his concern about his role as editor. As a close friend of Gibbon, how can he be impartial and not overly sentimental? Sheffield does not indicate how he has resolved this conundrum. He only
explains that other friends have talked him out of his concern about bias and subjectivity. He also showed these other friends the texts that are included in the edition, and his editorial decisions were reportedly met with a high degree of approval from those he conferred with.

Then, Sheffield explains what is included in the seven volumes of the edition of Gibbon’s miscellaneous works. He describes the memoirs as “the most important part” (iv). Sheffield is worried about publishing the memoirs because Gibbon himself displayed an anxiety about the public reading his account. However, Sheffield feels the public deserves to see such a fine text, and he regrets that Gibbon did not document the last twenty years of his life in his memoirs. Sheffield also added to the memoirs by including various letters. It is the editor’s hope that the letters will fill in some of the gaps in the memoirs. In these comments, Sheffield displays a pride about his friendship with Gibbon, and he also expresses the merits of Gibbon’s writing and the goodness of the man himself. This preface is certainly tributary at a number of points.

Subsequently, Sheffield explains the inclusion of several more texts into the miscellaneous works:

- “Extraits raisonnees de mes Lectures,“
- Observations, & Pieces detaches sur differens sujets.”
- “Essai sur l’Etude de la Litterature,”
- Criticism on the Sixth Bok of Virgil.
- Vindication of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Chapters of His History, in answer to Mr. Davis and others.
- “Reponse a l’Expose de la Cour d France.”

These works are mentioned by Gibbon in his memoirs, and Sheffield considers them to be important and scholarly works.
Lastly, the following works—not mentioned or published by Gibbon previously—are also included in the miscellaneous works. Sheffield insists that they warrant “notice” (x).

- “Outlines of the History of the World.”
- A Dissertation, which he had shown to a few friends, on that curious subject, “L’Homme au Masque de Fer.”
- “The Antiquities of the House of Brunswick.”
- “An Address” (Gibbon was working on this text prior to his death).

Sheffield outlines these texts, but he does not go into great detail about their merits or his reasoning for including them in the edition.

However, it was the memoirs that obviously held the greatest interest for Sheffield, and he ends his preface by returning to the subject of the memoirs. Sheffield states,

> In the collection of writings which I am now sending to the press, there is no article that will so much engage the public attention as the Memoirs. I will therefore close all I mean to say as their Editor, by assuring the Reader, that, although I have in some measure newly arranged those interesting Papers, by forming one regular narrative from the Six different sketches, I have nevertheless adhered with scrupulous fidelity to the very words of their Author; and I use the letter S. to mark such notes of my own, as it seemed necessary to add (xi).

This is an interesting and important distinction. Sheffield separates his notes clearly from the notes and commentary by Gibbon. He also clearly wants to feature/highlight the memoirs most likely because they were first published in this collected works.

Sheffield’s editorial treatment of Gibbon’s memoirs has been given considerable scholarly attention. Much of this critical analysis focuses on the six manuscript versions of the autobiography. Each of these versions of the text is strikingly different. Even the title changes. The first draft, known as draft A, was entitled “Memoirs of My Own Life,” draft B was entitled “My Own Life,” and draft C was labeled “Memoirs of the Life and
Writing of Edward Gibbon,” and so on. Barrett John Mandel reminds readers that “One is so accustomed to hearing Edward Gibbon praised as a great autobiographer and his published memoirs as ‘a triumph of literary art,’ that it is sometimes easy to forget that Gibbon never produced an autobiography which satisfied him and that his efforts to produce one resulted in six separate drafts, detached notes, and minor despair.”  It turns out that Sheffield cut and pasted the six drafts to create one autobiography. Marjorie C. Hill states that

critics and scholars have united in paying tribute to the tact and skill with which Sheffield performed his task; at the same time, however, they have expressed amazement and dismay at the editorial liberties he exercised in composing the narrative, which has become a classic of its kind. For comparison of the six sketches with the Autobiography reveals emendations of phrasing, suppression of parts of sentences, whole sentences, and sections, as well as transposition of parts of one sketch into the body of another.

Hill further asserts that Sheffield considered it his role as editor to make such emendations: “The editor’s task, as Sheffield saw it, was not that of the modern scholar, concerned with the establishment, restoration, and publication of authentic texts; it was rather the office of the author’s assistant, who must compile, according to his own lights and those of his time, the most perfect biography possible from the tentative and unfinished work.” The memoirs, as it appears for the first time in this edition of Gibbon’s collected works, is the result of this editorial approach.

Scholarship by John H. Pearson and Patricia B. Craddock reveal what is lost in Sheffield’s method of collation. These scholars focus on how Gibbon developed as an autobiographer with each new and updated manuscript. Pearson says,

69 Ibid., 441.
The conflicting goals of the public figure and the private man led Gibbon to retrace again and again his steps through the self-history. In five years Gibbon rewrote his memoirs meticulously six times, making formal changes that indicate the increasing awareness of the possibilities and requirements of the autobiographic genre. Thus the six drafts afford us an unusual opportunity, for we can determine the process of Gibbon’s development for better or worse, as an historian of the self by gauging the autobiographer’s reaction to each successive formal and substantive representation of himself as those reactions are manifested in the alterations and emendations he made. In addition, because the six drafts are in effect six distinct treatments (including selection and repression of material), they offer valuable insights to the relation between autobiographic intention and form.  

In other words, a study of the six manuscript versions as opposed to Sheffield’s cut and pasted edition yields much more information about the struggle Gibbon goes through to present his private experience to the public. Craddock also develops this discussion of the six manuscript versions in her landmark biography of Gibbon. She states, “Even in [the] last, best draft, Gibbon seems to have remained somewhat ambivalent about the autobiographical process.” She goes on to say that Gibbon’s life was cut short before he could produce a draft he was truly pleased with: “. . . even though his work on the memoirs had not finally satisfied him, his intention of remaking his account of his life to include emotion as well as thought, past and present in dialogue, was ultimately abandoned only because of his death.” Craddock also asserts the pre-eminence of the sixth and final version of the autobiography, which is a critical departure. The Literature Online biography explains that

Craddock’s (1982,1989) is the best modern study of Gibbon’s life and intellectual growth. Unlike previous biographers, who have all relied on the fifth draft of Gibbon’s Memoirs, Craddock uses the sixth, written “on a new plan, one that had room for his human inconsistencies and irrelevancies.” The first volume studies

---
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the “prehistory of the historian.” Her volumes make pioneering use of manuscript material and are fundamental to the Gibbon student.\textsuperscript{73}

Craddock’s “pioneering” work illustrates that returning to the manuscript can yield much information about the context of the printed text. Sheffield’s effort to produce a coherent single autobiography has been rendered unsuccessful by modern scholars, but his efforts also contributed to these modern studies in that his edition put the autobiography on the literary map.

The final phrase of the preface indicates that the edition is published in honor of his dear friend, Edward Gibbon. In the case of this particular edition, the editor and author were lifelong friends. Sheffield’s compilation of Gibbon’s numerous autobiographical manuscripts was a labor of love. This is not a family edition, but this is an instance in which the bonds of friendship are very apparent. Interestingly, in a short preface that appears in volume three of the edition, Sheffield explains that the works in this particular volume were written when Gibbon was a young man. Sheffield seems to be qualifying these works as immature, buffering them from criticism. This is interesting as he seems to be acting protectively as editor. This protective tone is apparent in a number of editions, and Sheffield’s role as friend and editor may also have been a factor in his alteration of the six manuscript versions of Gibbon’s diary. He was protecting his friend from the reading public.

\textbf{John Vancouver, ed.} \textit{A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and Round the World; in Which the Coast of North-West America Has Been Carefully Examined and Accurately Surveyed. Undertaken by his Majesty’s Command, Principally With a}

**View to Ascertain the Existence of Any Navigable Communication Between the North Pacific and North Atlantic Oceans; and Performed in the Years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794, and 1795, in the Discovery Sloop of War, and Armed Tender Chatham, Under the Command of Captain George Vancouver.** 3 vols. By George Vancouver.

**London: G.G. & J. Robinson, and J. Edwards, 1798.**

Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** Plates throughout the three volumes: maps, surveys, illustrations, and charts. There is a list of these plates included in the beginning of the first volume. Bern Anderson’s biography of Vancouver provides useful background on the engravings that appear throughout the edition:

   With the Admiralty’s approval Vancouver engaged some of the finest engravers in England to prepare the plates for the work, and the results are among the best illustrations in any eighteenth-century account of a voyage. Among the engravers were John Landseer, father of the painter Edwin Landseer, James Fittler, James Heath, and Benjamin T. Pouncy, all well known. Other equally expert cartographic engravers made the plates for the navigational charts and views. The scenic engravings were made from sketches done on the voyage by members of the expedition. Most of the sketches were by John Sykes, master’s mate in the *Discovery*, and by Thomas Hedington, midshipman in the *Chatham* and the youngest member of the expedition, only fifteen years old at the start of the voyage.⁷⁴

2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page included.

3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** Table of Contents included in all three volumes.

4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** John Vancouver dedicated the edition “To the King.”

5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:** The editor, John Vancouver, includes a two page editorial advertisement, which I have described below.

6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND:** There is no separate biography of George Vancouver written by the editor; however, John Vancouver in his editorial advertisement gives some biographical background of George Vancouver’s experience abroad and his later life experience.
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By way of background on the voyage, in 1789 George Vancouver became captain of the *Discovery* to head a scientific expedition to the northern Pacific Ocean at the behest of the English government. Vancouver would unsuccessfully try to locate a northwest passage between the Pacific and Hudson Bay. Also on Vancouver’s to do list was to resolve the tension between England and Spain as to who had the rights to the Nootka Sound, an inlet on the eastern shore of what is known today as Vancouver Island. Janet R. Fireman explains that Vancouver and Juan Francisco de la Bodega Y Quadra, the commissioner from Madrid, were unsuccessful in reaching a diplomatic solution and deferred the matter to their superiors in government. Ultimately, both European countries left the sound: “three years later, European negotiators had resolved that the removal would be joint: Britain and Spain both withdrew from permanent occupation and sovereignty over Nootka Sound.”

This edition of George Vancouver’s travel logs is significant in terms of the body of colonial literature produced during the eighteenth century. First and foremost,
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mapping uncharted territory was a central part of the eighteenth-century Colonial project. M. L. Benjamin explains that George Vancouver “failed to achieve his two principal objectives—the cession of Nootka Sound by Spain, and the discovery of a navigable passage—but his charting of the Canadian and Alaskan coasts were of a standard comparable to Cook’s.” The legacy of Vancouver’s efforts remains today; the geography of the northwest bears his stamp: Mt. Rainier, Mt. Baker, and obviously, the city of Vancouver. Vancouver’s work as cartographer is still considered impressive. George Godwin notes,

Others, curious to test his work, have sailed the entire length of the Pacific continental seaboard, from Southern California to Alaska, using Vancouver’s celebrated Great Chart. They found it nearly everywhere reliable. Yet few long coasts are more convoluted and island-studded. Only here and there were inaccuracies and serious omissions remarked. For example, he failed to mark the mouth of the Fraser River in what is now British Columbia; and he also missed the Columbia. But such defects admitted, Vancouver’s Great Chart is probably the most remarkable feat in eighteenth-century hydrography; and it remains a great chart even by modern standards of scientific exactitude.

The table of contents in each of the volumes frequently lists section headings that reflect Vancouver’s detail in charting the coast of the north pacific, headings such as “Astronomical and nautical observations.”

Also significant is that fact that Vancouver played a pivotal role in England’s colonial expansion. Herman J. Deutsch asserts that “Vancouver, charged with official diplomatic business and most solicitous among the English to safeguard the king’s sovereignty, acknowledged that commercial considerations had in large part prompted his
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assignment.” Vancouver’s mapping paved the way for the presence of the East India Company and other entrepreneurial entities to gain a stronghold in the region for the sake of trade. Various resources, but especially sea otter pelts, drew the attention of traders and buyers from around the globe. B.M. Gough asserts, “By 1790 [the first year of the *Discovery*’s journey] the profits of the sea otter had placed the Nootka sound and the Gulf of Alaska securely on the maps of the world and enlarged western understanding of the North Pacific Ocean and littoral.” Vancouver’s journey, and the resulting narrative, reveal the complex factors of colonial development in the region. Furthermore, Vancouver provides information regarding the native Americans and native Canadians that he encountered on his journey. Junius Rochester quotes Edmond S. Meany’s *Vancouver’s Discovery of the Puget Sound*, “[Vancouver’s] observations of the soil, the climate, the trees, flowers, and birds are surprising when one remembers the newness of all to members of the party. Especially valuable and interesting are the recorded observations of the natives. Their houses, canoes, weapons, clothing, food, and language, all were commented upon in a way that will always prove of help to the student of these aboriginal peoples.”

John Vancouver, brother of the author and editor of the edition, begins his dedication to King George by expressing gratitude for encouraging his brother, George Vancouver, to travel across the Pacific Ocean. John Vancouver’s dedication begins,

YOUR MAJESTY having been graciously pleased to permit my late brother CAPTAIN GEORGE VANCOUVER, to present to YOUR MAJESTY the Narrative of his labours during the execution or your commands in the Pacific
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Ocean, I presume to hope, that, since it has pleased the Divine Providence to withdraw him from YOUR MAJESTY’S service, and from the society of his friends, before he could avail himself of that condescension, YOUR MAJESTY will, with the same benignity, vouchsafe to accept it from my hands, in discharge of the melancholy duty which has devolved upon me by that unfortunate event.

In short, it is John Vancouver’s duty as English citizen and loyal brother to edit the travel account of his late brother, George Vancouver. Bern Anderson states, “the Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean and round the World was published in 1798 in three quarto volumes of six books, with a separate atlas. That it was received with keen interest is indicated by the long reviews that greeted its publication.” The reviews were mixed, but the edition was impressive. Referring once again to Anderson’s biography, he states, “The Voyage of Discovery is a fitting monument to the officers and men who accomplished the voyage itself. There are 1,440 pages in the original edition.”

In the “Advertisement from the Editor,” John Vancouver makes an interesting opening statement when he claims,

As a considerable delay has necessarily taken place in the publication of this work, in consequence of the decease of the late Captain Vancouver, it becomes an absolute necessity to give an accurate account of the state of the work at the period when [George Vancouver’s] last fatal indisposition rendered him incapable of attending anymore to business; lest the melancholy event which has retarded its completion should tend to affect its authenticity in the public opinion (first paragraph of advertisement).

The editor is first and foremost concerned with providing an “accurate account” of the copy-text that George Vancouver left behind as a result of his untimely demise. He is obviously concerned at how readers may perceive a delay in the publication of the edition. Perhaps, he worries that the reader will think he has emended the text or taken liberties as an editor. By providing an accurate account of the “state of the work,” he

84 Ibid., 226.
85 Ibid., 227.
makes a claim about his honesty as editor. In the subsequent paragraph, the editor outlines how the author had been involved with the printer for a considerable time and completed much of the edition. John Vancouver felt it was his role to follow through with the work that George Vancouver had begun. By referring to the death of his brother as a “melancholy event,” John Vancouver makes an emotional appeal to the reader as well, reminding them that he has edited and completed the edition out of his sense of filial love. John Vancouver’s claim is largely valid as well. Bern Anderson clarifies that “Unlike the accounts of Cook’s voyages, which were edited by others, this was written by the captain himself, with assistance from his brother. The original manuscript of the Voyage of Discovery, which confirms this, was located by George Godwin among the unindexed manuscripts in the British Museum.” The editor, then, worked closely with George Vancouver during the preparation of the manuscript and after his death.

However, John Vancouver did emend the manuscript. For instance, there were some notes that seemed too important for an editor to overlook. He states, “as some of the notes, which he made upon the spot, are of too valuable a nature to be entirely lost, I shall venture to subjoin them to the History of the Voyage, as nearly as possible in his own words, without attempting any such arrangement of them, as might tend to diminish their authenticity, or bring into doubt that scrupulous veracity from which Captain Vancouver never departed” (second page of advertisement). I find this statement to be important, too, in that it indicates that numerous additions were indeed inserted by the editor. He does not explain specifically the system or approach he used when making emendations or textual additions; however, his claim of trying to be true to the manuscript seems to be foundational to his editorial approach.
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Finally, the editor “laments” the job he has had of changing, paring down, and adding to George Vancouver’s text. He has been as true to his brother’s words as possible, and it is for his brother he took on the task as editor. This is significant as the impetus to finish the work is strong. As the *Dictionary of National Biography* indicates,

[George] Vancouver, who had been advanced to post rank on 28 Aug. 1794, now devoted himself to preparing his journals for publication. This occupied the whole of his time. He had corrected the proofs of all but the few last pages, when he died at Petersham, on 10 May 1798. The work was finished off by his brother John, assisted by Captain Puget, who had sailed from England as a lieutenant of the Discovery, and had succeeded Broughton in command of the Chatham. It was published a few months after the author’s death . . . 87

John Vancouver’s role as editor, then, may have been clearer than that of the other editors featured in this bibliography because his brother had “mapped” out the general style, organization, and layout of the edition. John Vancouver’s job was to produce a finished product. The tone in the dedication and the advertisement indicates a certain level of pride in the achievement, both in his brother’s narrative and his work as editor.

John Vancouver’s role as brother and editor ensured that this influential text, half a million words in length, made it to the publishing house. 88 Numerous editions of the narrative would follow, as well as German, Swedish, French, and Russian translations.


Included in Edition:

The first lines of the editorial advertisement are a strong statement: “The editor of these volumes is but too well aware, that the world will be little disposed to sympathize with an unprotected and persecuted woman, whose history, while it exhibits a series of calamities, wants even the recommendation of novelty. Yet there are some feeling hearts and candid minds to whom she dares appeal” (i). Mary Robinson (the younger), in other words, is completely aware of the scandal associated with her mother, and she frames the edition of memoirs she is presenting to readers as her “sacred obligation” (ii). As Laura L. Runge explains, “Before one picks up the Memoirs, or at least before one begins to read Mary Robinson’s own account of herself, the reader is aware of the fact of her adultery. The circulation of scandal made such knowledge available to her
contemporaries.” It becomes important, then, that the editor insists that the persona of her mother is renowned, but her “real character was little known” (ii). Note Robinson’s emphasis on the word “real.” She feels that her mother has been mischaracterized and that the following text will do much to redeem the legacy of her mother’s fallen reputation. The Memoirs, then, are more an account of Mary Robinson’s life as wife and mother, as opposed to celebrity, mistress, and actress.

The final paragraph of the advertisement is a dedication from the editor to her mother: “Dear sainted PARENT!—You are now obeyed. If when we meet again, before the throne of our Creator, when the sorrows of this life shall be past, to receive, the award of that BEING who judgeth all hearts—if, then, by one approving smile, you inform me that I have FULFILLED MY DUTY, I shall have my reward” (iii). It is up to the reader, then, to proceed through these pages and consider the life and sorrows of Mary Robinson, the elder. The reader, too, will stand “before the throng of our Creator,” and such a reminder may caution him or her to make a hasty judgment about the author. The editor frames the exercise of reading these Memoirs as almost a moral obligation, so she encourages the reader to be fair and impartial. Furthermore, she frames the edition as a loving gesture from a child to a parent. The reader’s sense of family may compel him or her to read on despite the ill repute of Mary Robinson’s personal history. For this reason, the editorial advertisement is brief but effective.

Much has been written about Mary Robinson’s life and writing. In particular, her Memoirs have become the focus of much scholarly attention. The focus of these discussions center on whether or not Robinson successfully reshapes her identity in the

---

text. Does she move beyond the popular representation of actress or adulteress? Laura Runge’s work is an interesting contribution to this debate. Runge explains that Robinson uses the anti-adultery campaign of the late eighteenth century as a frame for her own autobiographical narrative. Robinson addresses “gallantry” in polite society as a trap for women as it is a behavior that projects safety for women; unfortunately, Robinson asserts that it is actually a behavior responsible for the seduction and fall of women. Runge illustrates how pointedly the Memoirs are aiming to reconstruct Robinson’s public persona.  

Mary Robinson (the younger) brought this literary project to fruition as a tribute to her mother: “[Robinson’s] Memoirs, principally autobiographical but in part due to her daughter, appeared, [in] 1801.” Just as some of the other editors of family editions aim to place their loved one or family name in the limelight for the sake of posterity, Mary Robinson, the younger, also has posterity in mind. In this instance, she is working against scandal. She and her mother both understand what is at stake. Linda H. Peterson explains this beautifully: “. . . in editing her mother’s life, Maria [as she was also known] Robinson effects what the Memoirs only hint: that a safe, culturally viable myth of female artistry could be created by shifting the narrative focus from romantic to domestic love.”

This life narrative is meant for the public realm; the editor does not express concern about releasing a private document for public readership. In fact, both the author and the editor use the genre of autobiography to influence public perception. As Laura
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Engel explains, “[Sarah] Siddons’s and Robinson’s memoirs, both published posthumously, can be read as specific musings on how each actress wanted to be remembered after her death, and as detailed records of how they ideally imagined themselves during their lifetime.”\textsuperscript{93} In this instance, the author lived a very public life, and so her memoirs serve to continue the “dialogue” that took place with eighteenth-century audiences and to re-cast her image for posterity by appealing to nineteenth-century readers. Engel claims, “One of the elements that characterizes the actress’s memoirs is this attempt to provide the reader with an individual character that is separate from the roles she has performed on-stage. Inherent in such a project is the complicated fact that the actress is going public with what she promises to be private information.”\textsuperscript{94} This reversal highlights the editor as influential in framing this very private information.

The success of this textual creation is evident in Runge’s assertion that readers will have previous knowledge of Mary Robinson’s history of scandal prior to picking up the \textit{Memoirs}. If they don’t have an awareness of the scandal when they pick up the text, they will have a sense of it by the time they read the autobiographical account because Mary Robinson’s (the younger) editorial advertisement alludes to her mother’s reputation. If they read beyond the editorial advertisement, the editor was successful in laying the first stones in the project of rebuilding her mother’s image.

\textbf{Richard Wright, ed.} \textit{An Account of the Life of Dr Samuel Johnson, From His Birth to His Eleventh Year, Written by Himself. To Which Are added, Original Letters to Dr Samuel Johnson, by Miss Hill Boothby: From the MSS Preserved by the Doctor; and}

\textsuperscript{93} Laura Engel, “Fashioning Celebrity,” (Book in Progress, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 2009), 10.
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 26.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustrations included in the edition.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included in the edition.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No Table of Contents included in the edition.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included in the edition.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: Editorial preface included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biographical background by the editor is included in the edition.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants, errors, or emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of Samuel Johnson’s autobiography with letters between Johnson and Miss Hill Boothby attached.
9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes included in the edition.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included in the edition.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included in the edition.
12) APPENDIX: Letters between Johnson and Miss Hill Boothby, “Prayers and Meditations” by Johnson upon Miss Boothby’s death, as well as Miss Boothby’s epitaph are appendices at the end of the edition.
13) INDEX: No index included in the edition.
14) SIZE: Sextodecimo.

In the preface to the edition, the editor, Richard Wright, begins with an account of the transmission of Johnson’s autobiographical text. He does so by quoting a passage from Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*:

The consideration of the numerous papers of which he was possessed seems to have struck Johnson’s mind with a sudden anxiety; and, as they were in great confusion, it is much to be lamented that he had not intrusted some faithful and discreet person with the care and selection of them; instead of which, he, in a precipitate manner, burnt masses of them, as I should apprehend, with little regard to discrimination . . . Two very valuable articles, I am sure, we have lost; which were two quarto volumes, containing a full, fair, and most particular account of his own life, from his earliest recollection (iii-iv).
Wright indicates that the account of Johnson’s first eleven years was saved from the flames. This narrative, then, due to the fact that it has survived and been published points to the value of scholarly editing. As I have mentioned in other annotations, the exercise of preserving important documents becomes painfully clear in this particular editorial preface. The image of Dr. Johnson burning innumerable pages of his own writing is tragic to say the least. Reader suddenly become grateful for the thirty-two pages of autobiography they are about to read. In terms of textual transmission, Wright purchased the manuscript for the edition from Francis Barber, Johnson’s servant. This cements Wright’s image as textual savior and proves the manuscript is authoritative as he establishes textual provenance.

Robert DeMaria, Jr. provides helpful background information regarding Johnson’s decision to destroy his autobiographical writing. DeMaria states,

Johnson’s parents did not crush his spirit, but they were parents, and he was naturally stern in defence of himself; as a result, Johnson felt pain in later life when he remembered his pugnacity, especially with his mother. The depth of this pain and the precise reasons for it would be more comprehensible had Johnson not destroyed shortly before his death the notebooks containing most of his remembrances and confessions about his early life. That fact that he did destroy them suggests that his pain and remorse were deep.  

His decision to destroy his diaries could also be explained in his now well-documented bouts with melancholy. DeMaria continues, ‘‘Diseases of body’ and ‘disorders of mind’ plagued Johnson most of his life, and his relief from them was only intermittent. He once contemplated writing a ‘history of [his] melancholy,’ but even at the thought of it, he noted, ‘I know not whether it may not too much disturb me.’’  

This biographical work by DeMaria further highlights how this manuscript was almost lost to oblivion.

---
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In 1806, a review of the autobiography appeared in the *Edinburgh Review*, and it is clearly an unfavorable review. Barber, the servant of Johnson who withheld the manuscript from the fire, and Richard Wright himself are taken to task for intruding on the privacy of Samuel Johnson’s autobiographical musings:

And thus, by the combination of all these accessories, the breach of trust, which was, perhaps, venial in Barber, has become the means of once more holding up his master to laughter. We say, to laughter; for when the world reads the wretched trifles so carefully recorded in this fragment of biography, they will laugh at Johnson’s expence, without reflecting that the absurdity of the production consists entirely in its publicity, and that they alone are answerable for it, who have combined to bring it forward, contrary to the will of the author.97

This review highlights the persistent theme of private versus public in autobiographical editions. The reviewer here finds it a breech of privacy and decency that Samuel Johnson’s reflections on his childhood have been published for nineteenth-century readers.

Modern scholars, of course, appreciate the autobiography. Donald Greene refers to it as a “poignant small fragment of an autobiography.”98 Greene also explains that “The best biographer of Johnson turns out to be Johnson himself: although only a tiny fragment has survived of the autobiography he began to write in middle life, its method is one the modern psychologist must applaud, with its Proustian (and Wordsworthian) particularity about the memories that impressed themselves on his childish mind, and the bare simplicity of the style.”99 Unlike Gibbon, Johnson seems to be a natural when it comes to the genre of autobiography. Perhaps his experience as a biographer made the

97 Review of *An account of the Life of Dr Samuel Johnson, From his Birth to his Eleventh Year, Written by Himself. To which are added, original letters to Dr Samuel Johnson, by Miss Hill Boothby: from the MSS preserved by the doctor; and now in the possession of Richard Wright*, by Samuel Johnson, *Edinburgh Review* 7.14 (January 1806): 436.
transition to personal historian seamless. Philip Davis says, “We need to understand the terms of Johnson’s relation to himself. Unlike Boswell, Johnson did not believe in singularity or explicitly personal autobiography. Instead he kept memory repressed as a power behind his writing and thinking.” Johnson is here again lauded for his skill as autobiographer. These recent comments interestingly reflect Johnson’s reasonable approach to writing autobiography—an ability to balance the dichotomy between the two realms of the public and the private.

Lastly, Wright outlines the relationship between Miss Hill Boothby and Dr. Johnson. Wright characterizes the letters as having a great value to Dr. Johnson. The letters were found in order with numbers and dates. Wright chooses to include these letters as testimony of a valuable friendship. The end of the volume includes Johnson’s “Prayers and Meditations,” which were written upon Miss Boothby’s death—a touching statement to say the least. Johnson prays, “I return thee thanks for the good example of Hill Boothby, whom thou hast now taken away; and implore thy grace, that I may improve the opportunity of instruction which thou hast afforded me, by the knowledge of her life, and by the sense of her death” (141). The epitaph of Hill Boothby, which is the last entry of the volume is no less touching. The reason for his sentimental feelings are explained by Greene: “Johnson could write with the most intense and tender feeling, as to his mother on her deathbed, or to Hill Boothby, a pious and learned young lady with whom he was more than a little in love . . .” The text becomes as much a tribute to Dr. Johnson as it does to his friendship with Hill Boothby.

101 Donald Greene, Samuel Johnson, 22.
Wright does not go into great detail in terms of his editorial method. However, he does indicate that “the contents of [the autobiography] are here given with fidelity and exactness” (v). Furthermore, Wright ends his preface by inviting the reader to peruse the manuscript of the autobiography: “The original MSS. are deposited in the Museum of Antiquities and Natural Curiosities, belonging to the Editor; which is open to the inspection of the publick” (viii). This is the only instance in any of the prefaces discussed in this dissertation in which the editor provides such detailed information and an invitation to the reader to compare the published text to the original manuscript. This is certainly a unique case of transparency on the part of the editor.

**William Hazlitt, ed. *Memoirs of the Late Thomas Holcroft, Written by himself and Continued to the Time of his Death from his Diary, Notes, and Other Papers*. 3 vols.**


Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION**: No illustration included.
2) **TITLE PAGE**: Title page included.
3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS**: No table of contents included.
4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION**: No dedication included.
5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT**: Editorial statement appears in the form of a five page “Advertisement.”
6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND**: No biography provided by Hazlitt.
7) **NOTE ON THE TEXT**: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) **SCHOLARLY EDITION**: Holcroft’s memoirs make up 175 pages of the first volume. Hazlitt continues the memoirs to the end of the first volume and completes the memoirs in a second and third volume.
9) **FOOTNOTES**: No footnotes included.
10) **ENDNOTES**: No endnotes included.
11) **GLOSSARY**: No glossary included.
12) **APPENDIX**: Letters, journals, misc. papers, and Hazlitt’s conversations with Holcroft’s friends and relations appear in volume three.
13) **INDEX**: No index included.
14) **SIZE**: Sextodecimo.
Holcroft was a contemporary of William Godwin, yet he was long relegated to a position of relative scholarly insignificance. Jerry C. Beasley explains,

Hazlitt’s edition of the Memoirs appeared in 1816 to keep Holcroft’s memory alive, and the work was reprinted in 1852. Charles Kegan Paul’s William Godwin: His Friends and Contemporaries (1876) helped to revive interest in the late-eighteenth-century political radicals during the high Victorian period, generally so unreceptive to their ideas. The name of Holcroft, though little known in the hundred years following his death, was fortunately not forgotten altogether. In the twentieth century, partly—but only partly—because of his association with his greater contemporary Godwin, Holcroft the formidable thinker, and most of all Holcroft the gifted storyteller, has become the subject of the kind of inquiry and balanced admiration he has always merited but never enjoyed since the height of his fame and influence during the late 1780s and early 1790s.\(^{102}\)

Holcroft’s political affiliations may have been responsible for obscurity in the years following his death, but his political leanings are also responsible for his twentieth-century revival. *The Dictionary of National Biography* provides some succinct background on Holcroft’s political leanings:

Though opposed to the use of force, Holcroft ardently embraced the principles of the French revolution, and in November 1792 became a member of the “Society for Constitutional Information.” In company with Thomas Hardy (1752-1832) [q.v.] and ten others Holcroft was indicted for high treason. On 6 Oct. 1794 the Middlesex grand jury returned a true bill against him, and on the next day, having voluntarily surrendered himself at Hicks’s Hall, he was committed to Newgate, where he remained until 1 Dec. following, when, in consequence of Hardy’s acquittal, he was brought up to the Old Bailey, and discharged without a trial.\(^{103}\)

The life and memoirs of Holcroft evoke varied responses from scholars. *The Cambridge Biographical Dictionary* characterizes the memoirs as “entertaining.”\(^ {104}\) Herschel Baker claims that Hazlitt’s edition is “patchy and confused,” but it also “retains a certain

---


interest.”¹⁰⁵ There is, then, a sense of appreciation as well as skepticism of this particular edition of autobiography.

Holcroft’s legacy is, interestingly, tied to Hazlitt’s edition of his memoirs. This is a particularly useful example of how the editor of an edition of autobiography plays a significant role in constructing the persona of the author; furthermore, these editors are caught in the dichotomy of public versus private. In the bibliographical note of the 1902 edition of *The Collected Works of William Hazlitt*, the editors, Waller and Glover, explain that “It will be seen that a delay of six years took place between the date of Hazlitt’s *Advertisement* and the publication of the volumes. Mr. W.C. Hazlitt writes: ‘These *Memoirs* were never, in spite of all the lapse of time, completely printed; only three volumes out of four were printed.’ Every endeavour to find this fourth volume has failed.”¹⁰⁶ The delay in publication and possibly the missing volume point to Hazlitt’s precarious position as an editor who is bringing to the public an inherently private text: a diary. The delay had to do with certain objectionable passages. Baker clarifies:

Godwin was particularly upset. Losing his philosophic calm, he told Holcroft’s widow that since Hazlitt’s assignment had been to put together a biography and a selection from the letters there was “not the least imagination” that he would use the diary except as a source for facts and dates. To print it verbatim was unthinkable. “It is one thing for a man to write a journal,” he asserted, “and another for that journal to be given to the public.” Many eminent persons (like Dr. Parr and Mrs. Siddons) would surely take offense; others might regard its publication actionable; and as for Godwin himself, he would not care to have Mary Wollstonecraft’s “private transactions” with her first lover (Gilbert Imlay) aired.¹⁰⁷

Godwin even attempted to take on an editorial role in doing away with questionable portions of the autobiography, and this fact, as well as the previous passage by Baker,

highlights the unique challenge for these editors of autobiography. Ultimately, Hazlitt and Godwin buried the hatchet, and the text was published after six years of squabbling. Baker says, “It will be noticed that no editor is named [Hazlitt’s name does not appear on the title page of the edition; however, he is given credit at the end of the advertisement]. The fact that the offensive diary was included suggests that Godwin, after all, had not revised the manuscript himself; but since certain racy spots that he had singled out for disapproval were apparently deleted it would seem that Hazlitt had yielded to at least some of his objections.” Ultimately, in this instance, the domain and sanctity of privacy was upheld.

I should mention that Hazlitt’s editorial “Advertisement” is extremely brief—just short of five pages in length. To begin this editorial statement, Hazlitt describes the life and character of Holcroft as unique and lively. Hazlitt explains that as Holcroft was dying he asked his doctors to prolong his life by at least six months so that he could finish his memoirs. Holcroft worked through pain and suffering in order to write the memoirs of his first fifteen years. Hazlitt lauds the fortitude of Holcroft in completing even this much, and Hazlitt explains that “this account is given literally to the public” (vii). This phrase points to the fact that Hazlitt did not greatly emend this account; however, Hazlitt offers no specifics as far as if it was changed even if slightly. Nonetheless, emendations were certainly made to the manuscript, as evidenced by the previous discussion of the compromise struck between Hazlitt and Godwin as well as the missing fourth volume.

The remainder of Holcroft’s memoirs were completed by Hazlitt, and this biographical portion of the edition is followed by a compilation of documents put
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together by Hazlitt in the form of an appendix: letters, journals, misc. documents, printed works, and conversations with friends and relations of Holcroft.


Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION**: Frontispiece included in each of the five volumes:
   - Volume one: Portrait of John Evelyn.
   - Volume two: Portrait of Mary Evelyn, his wife.
   - Volume three: Image of Rural Scene.
   - Volume five: Image of a courtly hall.

2) **TITLE PAGE**: Title page included in all five volumes.

3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS**: No table of contents included.

4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION**: “To John Evelyn, Esq. of Wotton in Surrey.” Bray clarifies that John Evelyn, the author, was “a relative of your immediate ancestor” (iii).

5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT**: Editorial preface included in the first volume.

6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND**: A brief, thirty-page biographical treatment of Evelyn’s life appears after the preface and prior to the memoirs.

7) **NOTE ON THE TEXT**: No notes on variants and editorial emendations.

8) **SCHOLARLY EDITION**: Five volumes of the diary by Evelyn, as well as additional correspondence.

9) **FOOTNOTES**: Extensive footnotes.
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\(^{109}\) This annotation is based on the 1827 edition published in London by H. Colburn in five volumes. I found the first volume of the 1827 edition on Google Books. I found volumes two through five on the Internet Archive. This edition is slightly different from the 1818-19 first edition, which was two quarto volumes.
Bray begins with a dedication to John Evelyn, Esq., descendent of the author of the memoirs. However, in this dedication, Bray really pays tribute to the late Lady Evelyn. He talks about the care with which she maintained the estate, grounds, and library of the Evelyn family. Bray insists that by seeing the publication of Evelyn’s diary to its fruition, the process of which was begun by Lady Evelyn before her untimely death, he is insuring the “posterity” of the distinguished Evelyn family.

In the beginning of Bray’s preface, he promotes himself as a knowledgeable and competent editor by showcasing his expertise regarding the manuscript. He states, “The Journal is written by [Evelyn] in a very small, close hand, in a quarto volume, containing 700 pages, which commences in 1641 and is continued to the end of 1697, and from thence is carried on in smaller book till within about three weeks of his death, which happened 27 Feb. 1705-6, in the 86th year of his age” (vi). Bray frames himself as an editor who is aware of his copy-text and the physical properties of that text. Subsequently, he explains that he is also an editor who is “fully diffident of his competence to make a proper selection, and is even aware that many things will be found in its pages which, in the opinion of some, and not injudicious, Critics, may appear too unimportant to meet the public eye: but it has been thought that some information, at least some amusement, would be furnished by the publication” (vi). Bray assures the reader that his editorial decisions are credible and thoughtful, but in so doing he also
reveals an anxiety about the fact that Evelyn’s diary may not be considered significant 
literarily or historically. He insists that a diary such as Evelyn’s is not necessarily the 
stuff of great history; however, it may serve to fill in the details of English history. He 
indirectly asserts the importance of Evelyn’s memoirs when he states, “though these 
papers may not be of importance enough to appear in the pages of an Historian of the 
Kingdom, they may in some particulars set even such an one right” (vi).

At the end of the first section of the preface, Bray acknowledges scholars who 
helped him with researching corrections and notes: James Bindley and Mr. Upcott. Bray 
does not get into the specifics as to why certain textual changes were decided upon or if 
he employed a general methodology to emendations while working on Evelyn’s text. E. 
S. de Beer, editor of the 1955 edition of Evelyn’s diary, explains that “The diary was first 
published in 1818, partly as an exemplary biography, partly for its historical interest. 
About half the text was printed; the rendering is poor, words and sentences being 
frequently changed.” True to eighteenth-century editorial method, Bray obviously 
took liberties with the text. As Jeanne K. Welcher notes, citing de Beer, the suppression 
of passages or changes in the original edition were “[prompted] by such varied 
considerations as ‘lack of interest, privacy, indelicacy, unintelligibility’ or by the desire 
‘to shorten [passages] or to improve their style.’” Welcher gives credit to de Beer for 
creating the first edition of the diary that is true to the manuscript.

Bray then provides approximately thirty pages of biographical background, which 
comprises the remainder of the editorial preface. He discusses the open-minded attitude
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of Evelyn toward people of all religious and social backgrounds. He discusses Evelyn’s interaction with the important men of his day:

Mr Evelyn lived in the busy and important times of King Charles I. Oliver Cromwell, King Charles II. and King William, and he early accustomed himself to note such things as occurred which he thought worthy of remembrance. He was known to, and had much personal intercourse with, the Kings Charles II. and James II; and was in habits of great intimacy with many of the Ministers of those two Monarchs, and with many of the eminent men of those days, as well as amongst the Clergy and the Laity (ix).

*The Dictionary of National Biography* describes Evelyn’s affiliation to the powerbrokers of his era:

Evelyn as a hearty royalist, although it must be confessed that his zeal had been tempered by caution, was in favour after the Restoration, and was frequently at court. He was soon disgusted by the profligacy of the courtiers. He confided many forebodings to Pepys. He took no part in political intrigues, but held some minor offices.112

In short, Evelyn was involved in politics, but he seemed to play it smart. His participation in the political maneuverings of his day contributes to the historical value of his diary reflections.

Bray then describes Evelyn’s involvement in various facets of English life in the eighteenth century. He describes Evelyn’s education, family background, and employment, which involved numerous prestigious state appointments and commissions, such as commissioner for reforming the buildings, commissioner for the repair of St. Paul’s Cathedral, Commissioner of Plantations, to name a few. Bray is also sure to list the publications written by John Evelyn, as well as the importance of his reflections on travel. This edition of autobiography is interesting in that the author was a very public figure. His diary, while a private document, provides insight regarding his experience in Stuart politics and society. For this reason, the editor does not seem to exhibit an anxiety

---

about presenting this diary to the public; this could also have to do with the fact that many years have passed since Evelyn’s death. As a result, Bray does not necessarily feel the pressure to protect the names of those mentioned in the diary.

Scholars since Bray have mentioned the incredible wealth of historical information to be found in the diary. Welcher states:

Evelyn had an acute sense of what was remarkable in an event or scene, and many of his notations are of innovations. He records the advent of sedan chairs; coffee, tea, and jacolatte (chocolate); the King-pine (pineapple); tobacco; public libraries; new branches of the service (grenadiers and dragoons); aristocratic ladies’ painting their faces; stories of witchcraft from New England. He mentions the first divorce case at Westminster since Henry VIII; an experiment of printing a profile by means of “a large dark box,” an early form of the camera; the introduction of such frivolities as ice skates and of violin accomplishment at church services; and the restoration of the communion table and rail.¹¹³

Like Samuel Pepys, Evelyn was an important diarist and historical chronicler. *Encyclopædia Britannica* says of his achievement: “His *Diary*, begun when he was eleven years old and first published in 1818 (ed. E.S. de Beer, 6 vol., 1955), was written for himself alone but with relatively little about himself in it. It ranges from bald memoranda to elaborate set pieces. With its descriptions of places and events, characters of contemporaries, and many reports of sermons, it bears witness to more than 50 years of English life and, as such, is of great historical value.”¹¹⁴ Evelyn’s autobiography, then, highlights how a life narrative can present historical facts and subjective truth.

Lastly, Bray provides favorable commentary on Evelyn that is found in prestigious biographical reference books. For instance, Dr. Campbell and Horace Walpole both describe the fine character of John Evelyn. In so doing, Bray affirms his praise of John Evelyn as a writer and a man. Like Evelyn who looked to the world

---

around him as a source for his autobiography, Bray looks to other scholars for credible information.
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4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** No acknowledgment or dedication included.
5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:** Editorial preface entitled “To the Reader” included after the title page in the second volume.
6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND:** The entire second volume is Maria Edgeworth’s completion of her father’s memoirs.
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Interestingly, the editor of this edition, Richard Lovell Edgeworth’s daughter, Maria Edgeworth, does not contribute any prefatory material or commentary to the first volume of this two volume edition. She provides a preface, biography, and appendices to
the second volume. I find this to be an interesting editorial decision. The first volume of memoirs by her father remains solely his so to speak, which is reasonable in that the portion of his memoirs that he completed is lengthy and fills a separate volume. However, it is only the second volume, which is a “conclusion” of his memoirs by Maria Edgeworth that acknowledges her role as editor of both volumes.

The editorial decision by Edgeworth to only receive credit as editor in the second volume remains vague. One could conjecture that her understandably emotional response after her father’s death made her editorial task difficult. For this reason she may have wanted to minimize her role and receive credit only for her completion of her father’s memoirs, which makes up the second volume. Marilyn Butler’s landmark biography explains that “The idea that someone other than herself should be given the Memoirs was unthinkable, yet immediately after his death she was scarcely in a condition to begin work on any book. She begged her father’s friend and executor, Francis Beaufort, to give her his moral support in her decision to delay publication.”115 Once she began work on the edition, her grief still plagued her: “Even though she was determined to make as few changes as possible, the task of editing imposed a strain on her.”116 The fact that she wanted to avoid changing the manuscript version of the memoirs points to her desire to clearly indicate in the edition what portion of the memoirs was the product of his pen.

However, there are occasional footnotes in the first volume that indicate editorial intrusions in the text. Butler asserts that she tried to make as few emendations as possible, but that she was in a difficult position.117 She asserts, “By now even Maria recognized that her father had made enemies, and she had an inkling of what a hostile

116 Ibid., 404.
117 Ibid.
reviewer of the *Memoirs* might say . . .”\(^{118}\). This required emendation and suppression of certain passages in the first volume of the memoirs, and this editorial process was difficult. It seems Maria Edgeworth struggled in her role as editor of a family edition. She was most likely torn between remaining true to the private experience of her father’s life while also trying to portray her father in a positive light for the reading public. Butler states,

> Therefore in her text she went out of her way to emphasize that her father’s Latinate written style and his manner in public did not agree with the warm personality that he showed to his family. As for [his] controversial marriage to Elizabeth Sneyd, no tact in presentation could be too great; one of the few cuts Maria made in her father’s text in fact came in this part of the narrative. The discrepancies between her description of his role in politics, and the views he had actually expressed at the time, have already been noted. She took great care to represent his political activities as orthodox and constitutional, and while omitting any description of his true opinions on such tendentious subjects as the French Revolution, stressed his later disapproval of Bonaparte.\(^ {119}\)

This tension between the public and the private could also have contributed to the absence of Maria Edgeworth’s editorial preface in the first volume of the edition. In light of the fact that she did alter the text, she may have wanted to assure readers that the first volume was the true persona of her father, even though that persona had been to some degree constructed as a result of her editorial method.

The second volume is an impressive conclusion to this edition. Maria Edgeworth begins with a preface that outlines her role as editor. She indicates in the first sentence of the preface that “no fact, opinion, or sentiment in the preceding memoirs has been altered by the editor.” Also, in this first paragraph she does acknowledge some intrusions into the text in her practice as editor: “. . . some verbal corrections, some changes, merely of arrangement, have been made; and a few passages have been omitted, which could only

\(^{118}\) Ibid., 406.

\(^{119}\) Ibid.
be interesting to the family of the writer” (i). The editor omits text from the edition in order to conceal more private family material. This is different from Matthew Montagu’s approach in which he chose to include the bulk of his aunt’s letters; in this instance, Maria Edgeworth opts for privacy.

Maria Edgeworth goes on to explain why she was chosen to finish the memoirs: “Excepting a few passages, he never shewed, even to his own family, what he had written of this account of his life; and when he was urged by them to continue it, he used to say that ‘he would leave the rest to be finished by his daughter Maria’” (ii). The weight of this responsibility was to a certain degree a burden to Maria Edgeworth. She feels she is “unprepared and unequal” to the task (iii). This is a persistent theme throughout family editions. Family editors, and Maria Edgeworth is no exception, consistently ask how they can produce a thorough edition and a loving statement about family? However, she is persistent and manages to finish the task. It is her way of repaying her father for the love, happiness, and education that he provided her.

The editor alleviates any doubts the reader may have that the memoirs will turn into a “panegyric instead of an impartial life and character” (iv). She is very aware of the distinction between public and private, and she plans on producing a biography of her father that is appropriate for the reading public. To that end, she elaborates on the subject matter of her biography: she will provide specifics on his character as he ages, his “mode of life” (vi), his inventions, his scientific study, his literary contributions, his philanthropy, and his educational philosophy. Richard Lovell Edgeworth was, after all, a man who contributed much to science through his inventions, education through his
published theories, and politics through his advocacy of Catholic emancipation.\textsuperscript{120}

Bernard Canavan explains the significance of Richard Lovell Edgeworth’s work and legacy:

If there was a single theme running through Lovell’s active and elegantly described life, it was the desire to shape and control existence, rather than merely record it. The controlling urge is there in his search for new methods of transport and communication, new types of carriages, new means of telegraphic signaling—perhaps a subliminal desire to overcome the wooded isolation of his Irish childhood. It can be found, too, in his search for a kind of education that might liberate children from the dead hand of dogma and tradition. The self-created individual with mastery of their world is the hero of these Memoirs.\textsuperscript{121}

It is this man that Maria Edgeworth pays tribute to in her extensive addition to her father’s autobiographical narrative.

The second volume of this edition, which constitutes the bulk of the work done by Maria Edgeworth is over 500 pages in length. Her biography is thorough, including footnotes and letters. Her appendices are also extremely useful. Below is a complete list of the helpful material the editor appends to this edition:

1) “Sketch of a Plan of an Elementary School for the Lower Classes in Ireland.”
2) “Extract from the Appendix to the Third Report of the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland.”
3) “From the Appendix to the Fourteenth Report of the Commissioners of the Board of Education in Ireland.”
5) “Extract from Mr. W. B.’s Letter to Mr. E. Respecting a Telegraph in India, Referred to in Chapter XVIII, vol. ii, p. 373.”
6) Various works of poetry by Richard Lovell Edgeworth.
7) “List of Essays of Mr. Edgeworth’s, Which Have Appeared in Different Periodial Publications.”

\textsuperscript{120} Richard Lovell Edgeworth published two widely read books on educational theories. He wrote Practical Education with Maria Edgeworth in 1798, and he published Professional Education in 1808. Magnus Magnusson, ed., Cambridge Biographical Dictionary (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990), 462.
Maria Edgeworth is a thorough biographer. Her appendix truly resembles that of a modern scholarly edition. The extracts from the various reports provide interesting context regarding her father’s contributions to education and politics in Ireland.

Joanne Shattock claims that Maria Edgeworth “was distraught by her father’s death in 1817, but prepared his *Memoirs* for publication in 1820.”

The laudatory statements she makes in the preface, the extensive biography she crafts, and the thoughtful appendix round out her father’s memoirs; but they also illustrate Maria Edgeworth’s desire to do “justice to the memory of my father” (iii). The question that still interests modern scholars is did she succeed? Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace states,

> Yet all of Maria’s devotion did not save her father from his most hostile critics; in a curious way her sentimental testimony fed their worst suspicions about Richard’s overbearing character. What the nineteenth century daughter could not forestall, the twentieth-century biographer could not prevent either, and readers remain uneasy about the extent of Richard’s paternal “interference” in his daughter’s career. Even now the debate continues: was the effect of Richard’s influence on his daughter primarily prohibitive or productive?

There is no denying the fact that this edition produced stress for Maria Edgeworth. In fact, Butler describes how she traveled to the continent in 1820 to avoid the critical reception that would inevitably result from the publication of the memoirs. If Richard Lovell Edgeworth was overbearing during his lifetime, providing feedback for Maria’s writing and even changing or adding language to her texts, he may have still had some sway over her from the grave in that she remained a devoted daughter. Maria Edgeworth

---

123 Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace, *Their Fathers’ Daughters: Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth, and Patricarchal Complicity* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1991), 95-96. The twentieth-century biographer that Wallace refers to in this passage is Marilyn Butler. Wallace questions Butler’s assertion that Maria Edgeworth was successful in recouping her father’s reputation with her edition of his memoirs.
124 Butler, *Maria Edgeworth*, 407. Butler also clarifies that reviews of the memoirs were mixed.
wanted to please the critics, readers, and her father. In this instance it seems that she largely succeeded. She produced a memoirs that honored her father, assuaged detractors of her father’s legacy, and on the whole impressed the critics.
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1) **ILLUSTRATION:** Frontispiece included in each of the two volumes. Also, illustrations of important political figures appear prior to each chapter.

- **Volume one** frontispiece: “The Author, leaning on a globe of the world, between Heraclitus and Democritus, presents his book to the latter. In the landscape is a view of the Author’s villa at Strawberry-Hill, near Twickenham, where the Memoires were chiefly written. At bottom is the date of the year, with emblems, and the Author’s arms and motto. The ivy over the mantle, that is lifted up and discovers a mask and caduceus, imply that time and history reveal what has been concealed. By Mr. Bentley.”
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- Illustration that faces page 207: “ARCHIBALD, DUKE of ARGYLE: By Mr. Müntz.—A mantle of Scot palid, ducal coronet, broad-sword, scotch firr, and foreign plants, globes, compasses, and books. By Mr. Bentley.”

- Illustration that faces page 257: “By Mr. Müntz.—Faction and her Hydra asleep on a bed of poppies. The horse, his supporter. By Mr. Bentley.”

- Illustration that faces page 367: “Justice, or Law, extinguishing Hymen’s torch, who is fettered, depressed, his chaplet on the ground, and the wall of a prison behind him: alluding to the Marriage-act. Above him the Chancellor’s mace and seal; and behind Justice a money-chest, with her scales crammed into it. By Mr. Bentley.”
- **Volume two** frontispiece: “HEAD of KING GEORGE the SECOND, taken from a picture in water-colours by Deacon, in Mr. Walpole’s collection: On one side is a view of St. James’s house; on the other, the gate in St. James’s Park that leads into the garden of Carleton-House. By Mr. Bentley.”

- Illustration that faces page 1: “Mr. FOX: Shield of his arms and of Lenox, whose daughter he married. On one side a view of Holland-House. In a corner a pen and gauntlet, to imply the Test and Contest, papers written for and against him. By Mr. Bentley.”

- Illustration that faces page 111: “The DUKE of BEDFORD: His arms, motto, cap of the garter; money and cornucopia, to denote his riches. By Mr. Bentley.”

- Illustration that faces page 271: “Mr. MURRAY: By Mr Müntz.—A head of Janus, looking two ways, and subscribed George and James, to hint at the doubtfullness of his politics. Thistles, for his country; an eagle, for his eloquence; the motto of Vernon, whose heir he was. By Mr. Bentley.”

- Illustration to face page 339: “DUKE of NEWCASTLE: By Mr. Müntz.—A peacock, his supporter and emblem of vanity, grasping Jove’s thunderbolt; a Standish Castor and Pollux, signifying him and Mr. Pelham, Pollux’s star not appearing, as set; letters unopened. By MR. Bentley.”

- Illustration to face page 409: “Mr. PITT: By Mr. Müntz.—The caduceus, cap of liberty, cornucopia, and the cornet’s cuerdon. Demosthenes and Cicero reading, with astonishment, the Duchess of Marlborough’s will and legacy of 10,000 [pounds]. To Mr. Pitt, and seeming to say, ‘We never got any thing like this by our eloquence!’ By Mr. Bentley.”
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The opening paragraphs of Lord Holland’s preface tell a fascinating tale of how he came to receive the Walpole’s manuscript. Interestingly, Walpole kept the manuscript under lock and key, and he instructed the executors of his estate to deliver his manuscript to a certain Earl of Waldegrave upon his 25th birthday. Walpole obviously did not want the memoirs published for some time, and this is a very strong statement about how powerful the written word can be. In order to leave the players unscathed in print and reputation, Walpole actually kept his manuscript hidden and secured. Holland explains this quite clearly: “ten years have elapsed since that period, and more than sixty years since the last of the historical events he commemorates in this work. No man is now alive whose character is the subject of praise or censure in these Memoirs” (vii). Walpole’s strategy worked in that the manuscript did not make its way to the press for years to come.

Holland then explains that Walpole’s postscript to the memoirs indicates his desire that the text be published and displays an anxiety about condemning certain persons for their role in historical events. Holland quotes Walpole: “‘I sit down,’ he says, ‘to resume a task, for which I fear Posterity will condemn the Author, at the same time that they feel their curiosity gratified’” (ix). Holland tackles head on Walpole’s concurrent anxiety, bias, and attempt at objectivity, and he provides numerous quotes from Walpole’s postscript to lend credibility to Walpole as an autobiographer and historian. Each of these quotes is a statement by Walpole about his involvement in the
social and political scenes of his day, and his desire to portray an accurate portrait of the era of George II.

Holland also provides a useful description of the manuscript of Walpole’s memoirs. He explains the details quite thoroughly:

The whole of the Memoirs now published have been written over twice, and the early part three times. The first sketches or foul copies of the work are in his own hand-writing; then follows what he calls the corrected and transcribed copy, which is also written by himself; and this third or last copy, extending to the end of 1755, is written by his secretary or amanuensis, Mr. Kirkgate, with some corrections by himself, and the notes on the blank pages, opposite to the fair copy, entirely in his own hand. This last copy was bound into two regular volumes, with etchings from designs furnished by Bentley and Muntz, to serve as a frontispiece to the whole work, and as head-pieces for each chapter, explanations of which were subjoined at the end (xiii).

To say the least, Walpole left little work for Holland in terms of recovering and deciphering the manuscript and related notes. Walpole seemed quite clear about what he would prefer in terms of the appearance and format of the text.

Subsequently, Holland provides some biographical background about Walpole. Holland discusses Walpole’s complex and multi-faceted life: his family history (including the persecution of his father in the House of Commons), his own experience in the House of Commons, and his friendships with important people of his day. Walpole’s involvement in politics makes his memoirs all the more significant. Holland explains, “The intimacy which the Author enjoyed with many of the chief personages of the times, and what he calls, ‘his propensity to faction,’ made him acquainted with the most secret intrigues and negotiations of parties; and where his resentments did not cloud his judgment, his indifference to the common objects of ambition rendered him an impartial spectator of their quarrels and accommodations” (xxiii). Holland time and again insists that Walpole’s memoirs contribute to a thorough understanding of parliamentary history.
as a result of his thorough discussion of numerous legislative issues, important politicians, and major events. Walpole’s occasional exaggeration of character due to friendship or animosity, according to Holland, does not detract from the memoirs.

Nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars agree that the memoirs are significant. For instance, Martin Kallich alludes to the importance of the memoirs: “Not meant for publication in his lifetime, these journals are a vast repository of important information about the politics of the period, about Walpole, about the ideas he cherished . . .”.¹²⁵ John Brooke, in his introduction to The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole’s Memoirs, states, “Walpole’s memoirs are important for two reasons: for what they tell us of the political events of his time, and for what they tell us of himself. To appreciate his account of events, we must understand his feelings and the part they led him to take in politics. Walpole’s account is highly subjective, and he himself is the central figure in his memoirs.”¹²⁶ Both Kallich and Brooke emphasize that the memoirs are about eighteenth-century history, but they are also a personal memoirs of Walpole’s experience. This edition is fascinating for this very reason. Walpole knew he was blending the public and private; that is why he did not have these reflections published during his own lifetime. Kallich goes so far as to explain that for the sake of posterity, Walpole knew how important it was to merge the realm of the personal and the political: “In sum, he was fascinated by the clash of personalities, to him the essence of politics; and so he thought of history as a drama performed by ‘the chief actors’ (II, 333), whose highly personal

affinities and antagonisms provided the motives for action.”¹²⁷ From this perspective, the memoirs can be a most effective historical text.

George Egerton describes the political memoirs by using the term “polygenre”—it borrows from many genres. He states, “Moreover, the parameters marking political memoir off from other genres or types of writing often appear indistinct, as it appropriates autobiography, biography, diary, history, political science, journalism, and pamphleteering, to name but its nearest literary neighbors.”¹²⁸ Walpole brought into focus the political maneuvering of his day by borrowing from various genres. The result scholars argue is a flawed yet fascinating text. R. W. Ketton-Cremer states, “In the Memoirs [Walpole] was partial, he was ill-natured, he was capricious and changeable in his judgments. But as historical records these writings remain invaluable. They contain accounts of transactions which would otherwise be hopelessly obscure, reports of debates which would otherwise be lost, facts and details otherwise unrecorded.”¹²⁹ The fact that political memoirs fall into this category of “polygenre,” then, contributes to their complexity and value to scholars.

Lord Holland is unapologetic about editing a text that is both personal and political; however, he was sure to include Walpole’s conciliatory postscript prior to the text of the memoirs. Furthermore, Walpole wrote the memoirs with publication in mind. Holland explains that Walpole’s text was “ultimately destined for the public” (ix). For this reason, Holland unabashedly touts the merits of publication:

The account of parliamentary debates in these Memoires would alone be a valuable addition to our history. No one is ignorant, that from the fall of Sir

¹²⁷ Kallich, Horace Walpole, 43.
Robert Walpole to the American War, our reports of the proceedings of Parliament are more barren and unsatisfactory than at any period since the reign of James the First. For the last ten years of George the Second, Mr. Walpole has supplied that deficiency in a manner equally entertaining and instructive (xxvii).

The result was a resounding success as the text saw numerous editions throughout the nineteenth century.

Finally, Holland provides some information about his treatment of Walpole’s text. He has added editorial notes using the letter “E.” It is important to note that if Holland corrects grammar or spelling he places that word or phrase in brackets. Walpole’s spelling was unusual, and Holland corrects it where it may confuse the reader. Holland also makes note of the fact that some “coarse expressions” (xxviii) and one “indelicate” story have been omitted to protect the reader. Also, names of ladies have been changed or annotated so as to protect privacy and reputation.
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• Illustration to face the subsequent page: “Pedigree of the Impington Branch of the PEPYS Family.”
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2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page in both volumes.
3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** General table of contents for both volumes appears in the first volume of the edition. A detailed table of contents appears prior to the correspondence, which lists specific correspondents and contents of the appendix.
4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** No acknowledgments or dedication included.
5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:** Braybrooke’s editorial preface appears in the first volume.
6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND:** Braybrooke provides a thirty-page biography of Pepys.
As this bibliography progresses to the later stages of the long eighteenth century, the editors do seem to give more attention to the manuscript in their prefaces. In fact, that is the first subject that Lord Braybrooke addresses in his preface. He begins, “In submitting the following pages to the Public, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to explain by what circumstances the materials from which the Work has been compiled were placed at my disposal.” It turns out that Lord Braybrooke’s brother, Lord Grenville, was the master of Magdalene College, Cambridge, and “under [Grenville’s] auspices the MS. was deciphered by Mr. John Smith, with a view to its publication” (v). Robert Latham states,
In the belief that another diary, by a contemporary and friend of [John] Evelyn, would prove equally interesting, the Braybrookes commissioned an undergraduate of St. John’s College, John Smith, to undertake a transcription. Smith was given a key to the shorthand worked out by Lord Grenville, who had learned shorthand as a law student, and was set to work. He completed his mammoth task in some three years, and, considering that it was a pioneer effort, made a remarkably successful attempt at a faithful rendering.

It was also at Grenville’s request that Lord Braybrooke undertook the task of editing Pepys’s diary.

Braybrooke addresses his approach to editing the diary, and most importantly, he discusses editorial emendations. He explains, “As [Pepys] was in the habit of recording the most trifling occurrences of his life, it became absolutely necessary to curtail the MS. materially, and in many instances to condense the matter; but the greatest care has been taken to preserve the original meaning, without making a single addition, excepting where, from the short hand being defective, some alteration appeared absolutely necessary” (vi). Braybrooke reveals the fact that numerous changes were, indeed, made to the manuscript. Nonetheless, he clarifies that his “principal study in making the selection, however, has been to omit nothing of public interest; and to introduce, at the same time, a great variety of other topics, less important, perhaps, but tending in some degree to illustrate the manners and habits of the age” (vii). Scholars have since criticized Braybrooke for the extensive omissions in the first edition. Latham states,

As someone has rather unfairly remarked, [Braybrooke’s editorial method] was the most severe operation on Pepys since his bladder stones were removed in 1658. But the sheer length of the diary—about a million-and-a-quarter words—made drastic reductions necessary if it were to be published at all, especially since the plan (as with Evelyn) was to include a selection of the diarist’s correspondence. Moreover some of the omitted passages were considered—quite rightly—to be unprintable on legal ground because of their indelicacy; other—

---

much more numerous and lengthy—were omitted on the less convincing ground
that Braybrooke thought the reader would find them “tedious.”

There is no getting around the fact that by modern standards Braybrooke’s editorial
efforts fall short. However, the first edition of the diary was a triumph, and it is this
success that garnered scholarly interest in the diary and in the textual history of the
shorthand manuscript. In other words, the modern reader must laud Braybrooke, as well
as Grenville and Smith, for their efforts in bringing this text to readers for the first time.
Due to their original and extensive work on Pepys’s diary, scholars have had much text to
work with and respond to. As a result, omissions and emendations have been corrected
in later editions. H. B. Wheatley’s 1890s edition was the first to include most of the
omitted text.

Despite the omissions, it is evident in this preface that Braybrooke realizes the
value of Pepys’s diary. He considers it a true picture of the Restoration era.

Furthermore, Pepys’s ability to be candid due to his use of short hand, which afforded
him a sense of confidentiality, allows him to reveal more than an author who intends a
text for publication. E. Pearlman offers some useful insight regarding Pepys’s system of
journaling:

The diary was kept in a shorthand code based on Thomas Shelton’s well-known
Short Writing (1626, twenty-one subsequent editions before 1710). The system
provided Pepys with the security which allowed him to write frankly and without
fear of discovery. Pepys did not advertise the existence of his diary. He records
mentioning it only to “the lieutenant of the Swiftsure” and to Coventry, and there
is no reason to believe that during his lifetime it was ever glimpsed by any eyes
other than his own. Erotic passages were kept in a macaronic cryptograph which,
although not especially difficult to decipher, provided further protection from
intrusion. But Pepys seems to have intended to bequeath the diary to posterity. It

---
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was carefully bound in six volumes, each labeled, “IOVRNAL,” and displayed publicly among the collections he willed to Magdalene College.  

This diary is the only instance in this chapter in which the manuscript is shorthand, and the above passage by Pearlman helps to clarify the significance of this fact. Pepys maintained a truly candid daily diary entry because the cipher system he used provided privacy. However, the fact that he had posterity in mind is interesting. Most likely, he intended the diary should reach the public, just not during his own lifetime. In this regard, he would not injure anyone with his honest assessments because the manuscript would not be made available to readers for years to come. Pepys’s shorthand code embodies the tension between private and public experienced by the diarist. Interestingly, unlike some of the other editors in this chapter, Braybrooke can comfortably undertake the task of editing the edition because so much time had elapsed between Pepys’s death in 1703 and the publication of the diary in 1825.

Lord Braybrooke’s footnotes are the next topic for consideration in his preface. He explains that these notes are meant to clarify passages, provide biographical information, and elaborate on various references by Pepys. They are especially important given the fact that Pepys’s diary is renowned for its detail. As Ivan E. Taylor asserts,  

The *Diary* is a great book, moreover, because it tells the scholar, the historian, the antiquarian, and the curious reader what England was in the middle years of the seventeenth century. It would be wise, indeed, for the historian of social custom, or religion and church, of the theater, or of the English language to study the *Diary*; for on almost every page is a living account of what seventeenth-century people did for a livelihood, how they entertained themselves and were entertained, how they preached and listened to sermons, how they talked, and even the curse words they used. Pepys, like Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Bunyan, is England’s historian.  

---


Braybrooke’s notes are meant to help the reader navigate all of the rich and complex history contained in the diary.

Other materials that appear in the edition were based on original manuscripts by Pepys found in a Dr. Bandinel’s collection, as well as correspondence that was discovered by Mr. Upcott in the collection of Mr. Samuel Pepys Cockerell, a descendent of Pepys. These letters, which make up a considerable portion of the second volume of the edition were a useful addition to the 1825 memoirs.

There are no formal acknowledgments or dedication in the edition, but the end of the preface includes Braybrooke’s notes of gratitude for many who were involved with the project: Samuel Pepys Cockerell, Esq. (for providing manuscripts and portraits that were included in the edition); Dr. Bandinel, Dr. Bliss, and Mr. Lawrence (for their assistance at the Bodleian Library); Mr. William Upcott of the London Institution (for his “good offices” (xi)); the Rev. John Smith (for his excellent work in deciphering Pepys’s short hand); and his brother, George Neville (for his support of the project).

Lastly, Braybrooke includes a paragraph that assures readers that his biography of Pepys, which immediately follows the editorial preface, is based on various credible biographical studies of Pepys. Braybrooke’s “Life of Pepys” begins with the genealogies of the Pepys family and the Impington Branch of the Pepys family. They are impressive charts that showcase Braybrooke as a thorough biographer. Subsequently, Braybrooke provides the essential chronology and details of Pepys’s life:

1) His mother, Margaret, and his father, John.
2) His brothers and sisters.
3) His youth and education “in or near [London]” (xvi).
4) His career at Cambridge.
5) His marriage to Elizabeth St. Michel in October of 1655.
6) His association with his cousin, Sir Edward Montagu, “to whose good
offices at this period, and continued friendship, he owed and gratefully acknowledged his subsequent advancement” (xvii).
7) His accompaniment of Sir Edward on his journey to the Sound
8) His appointment, under Sir George Downing, in the Office of the Exchequer.
9) His first diary entries are made while journeying with his cousin.
10) His appointment in 1660 to the position of Clerk of the Acts of the Navy.
11) His professional capability and resulting success.
12) His “love of pleasure” and “interest in the scenes of dissipation which surrounded him” (xviii).
13) His appreciation for theatre and amusement.
14) His ability to balance leisure and work.
15) His involvement in the Dutch war of 1664.
16) His response to the Plague of 1665.
17) His appointment to Secretary to the Commissioners for managing the affairs of Tangier.
18) His appointment to the position of Surveyor-general of the Victualling Department.
19) His role during the great fire of London in 1666.
20) His successful defense of the Officers of the Admiralty during Parliamentary inquiry in 1668.
21) His membership in the House of Commons, but his minimal role in that capacity.
22) His abandonment of the diary in 1669 due to his failing eyesight (although he never lost his sight).
23) His tour through France and Holland with his wife after nine years of dedicated service to the King.
24) His grief resulting from the loss of his wife [ADD A DATE HERE].
25) His experience during the Popish Plot in 1673: “The charge against Pepys [by Shaftesbury] was a heavy one [Catholic leanings and the murder of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey]—that of hypocrisy and dissimulation in matters of religion: it is sufficiently refuted by this view of the principles and conduct of him who was the chief instigator. As well as the chief witness in the case; but with respect to the religion of Pepys, these volumes supply conclusive information. He was educated in the pure and reformed faith of the Church of England” (xxv).
26) His appointment to the post of Secretary for the affairs of the Navy in 1673 by the Duke of York.
27) His imprisonment in the Tower of London for treason and Catholic leanings in 1678—more false charges.
28) His exoneration and return to public service in 1683.
29) His inclusion in the “expedition for demolishing Tangiers” (xxviii).
30) His continuance in the role of Secretary to the Admiralty throughout Charles II’s reign.
31) His successful tenure with the Navy.
32) His retirement after the accession of William and Mary.
33) His continued advice to the Navy even in his retirement.
34) His role in returning Christ’s Hospital “to its pristine purity” (xxxiii).
35) His appointment to president of the Royal Society in 1684.
36) His friendship with John Evelyn.
37) His collection of naval relics in his retirement.
38) His kindness and generosity to his family throughout his life.
39) His further retirement to the home of his friend, William Hewer, in Clapham.
40) His death in 1703.
41) His continued participation throughout his life in the Church of England.

Braybrooke begins to wind down his biographical treatment of Pepys by returning to the subject of religion. In so doing, he assures readers that the rumors that Pepys was a Catholic were just that—rumors. Subsequently, Braybrooke includes two letters that pay tribute to Pepys after his death: Mr. Jackson to Mr. Evelyn and Dr. Hickes to Dr. Charlett. These letters honor Pepys and showcase his association with the Church of England.

Then, Braybrooke discusses Pepys’s last will and testament. He explains that Pepys “died, in fact, in very reduced circumstances; nor could it be otherwise, since he never received any pension or remuneration for his long official labours . . .” (xl). Pepys’s will reveals a sense of anxiety about disappointing his family by not leaving behind a large enough estate. Sadly, Braybrooke says, “no stone, however humble, marks the spot within St. Olave’s church in which his remains were deposited; the vault is, however, probably contiguous to the monument erected by him to his wife, still to be seen” (xl-xli).134 Pepys’s participation in the central events of the late seventeenth

---

134 Stephen and Lee, in the Dictionary of National Biography, vol. 15, 807, explain that Elizabeth Pepys died in 1669, over thirty years before her husband’s death, and that she “was buried at St. Olave’s Church, Hart Street, where Pepys erected a monument to her memory.” Braybrooke’s statement regarding how the monument has “still to be seen” is vague at best. What is significant here are the reduced circumstances in which Pepys found himself at the end of his life. The simple arrangements for his burial reflect his situation.
century, which is affirmed in his diary, are a striking contrast to his reduced circumstances at the end of his life in 1703.

The final paragraphs of the biography reflect on the greatness of Pepys. The first of these paragraphs is taken from Collier’s Dictionary, and this passage pays tribute to Pepys’s exceptional career, personal generosity, support of the arts, and passion for life. The second of these final paragraphs explains that “In 1677 Mr. Pepys was Master of the Clothesworkers’ Company, and presented them with a richly chased silver cup, still in their possession, called the “Loving Cup,” which is constantly used at all their public festivals; of which the annexed engraving is an accurate representation” (xlii). This final anecdote and the engraving that appears beneath the text reiterate for the reader Pepys’s contributions to England. His life as it was showcased in his diary, like the silver cup in the engraving, shone brightly.
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The dedication by Amelia Heber to C. Watkin Williams Wynn, which appears after the title page in the first volume, is a heartfelt thanks for her husband’s “nomination to the Bishopric of Calcutta” (iii), as well as a tribute to the friendship between the two men.

Following the dedication, Amelia Heber includes a substantial editorial preface, which opens with a statement about the need to make known to readers the experience (both the rewards and challenges) her husband had as Bishop of India. Also, she makes clear that the narrative is a combination of Reginald Heber’s diary and correspondence with her, as well as with his friends.

On the second page of the preface, she explains that she retained many passages that pertain to family life and express familial affection. She states, “some allowance should be made for the feelings of one whose pride it now is, as it was her happiness, to

135 Stephens and Lee, in the Dictionary of National Biography (vol. 9, 356), indicate that another edition was published in 1828 that was three octavo volumes. This annotation is based on the two volume quarto edition of 1828.
have possessed the undivided affections of a heart whose qualities she so well knew and so fondly valued” (vi-vii). In other words, her decisions, as far as emendation or suppression of certain passages, were informed by her affection for the writer, and she reveals the fact that she is comfortable retaining portions of text that might have been deemed private. This certainly highlights the unique situation of the family editor as she can decide what passages are appropriate for the public.

Subsequently, Amelia Heber shares her own gratitude as well as the gratitude of her husband regarding the hospitality they enjoyed during their stay in India. She says, the Editor begs to be allowed to express her gratitude for the great and invariable kindness received by her husband and herself during their residence in India. For the active furtherance of his views in the promotion of Christianity, for the deference paid to his wishes, for the hospitality, friendship, and respect which he met with from his Clergy and from all the military and civil servants of the Company, in whatever part of the country his Visitations led him, as well as the King’s Government in Ceylon, she can now but offer her own heartfelt thanks (vii-viii).

It is interesting to note that her tone when reflecting on their experience in India is quite positive. She primarily focuses on individuals (whether involved in business, religion, or government) from Great Britain who reside in India; she does not mention at length an appreciation for the people of India. However, her gracious remarks that refer to hospitality and friendship might also include the people of India. Furthermore, when she ends her preface by paying tribute to her husband’s good character, at this point she mentions that the “British in India” as well as “the natives of that country” all share a great degree of admiration for her husband, and this is obviously a point of pride. She thanks Mr. Wynn again, as well as a number of other individuals who helped her to produce the edition.
It is important to note that Amelia Heber also adds portions of her own journal of their travels in India occasionally to the text. These journal passages by the editor are included as footnotes, and labeled as “Extract from Editor’s Journal.” This is significant in that it adds to the value of this edition as a family edition. The narrative is primarily that of Reginald Heber, but the reader is regularly made aware of the experience of his wife, the editor, Amelia Heber. This also shows the diligence of Amelia Heber in compiling the journal; not only did she organize and collate the manuscript of her husband, but she also considered where her own journal entries may have been pertinent.

The virtue of Bishop Heber was well known in Great Britain. In fact, the *Edinburgh Review*, in its review of the *Narrative*, states,

```
We have no Bishops on our establishment [in Scotland]; and have been accustomed to think that we are better without them. But if we could persuade ourselves that bishops in general were at all like Bishop Heber, we should tremble for our Presbyterian orthodoxy, and feel not only veneration, but something very like envy, for a communion which could number many such men among its ministers.”
```

Amelia Heber’s edition furthers the reputation of her husband as fair and just by producing an edition that highlights Reginald Heber’s success in working with the church, missionaries, governments, and the people of India.

This account of Heber’s life and experiences in India is almost overwhelming in its scope. The two volumes amount to over 1,000 pages of observations about the experience of the English in India during the early nineteenth century. The *Dictionary of National Biography* states,

---

In 1812 [Heber] was made a prebendary of St. Asaph, at the request of his father-in-law, the dean. In 1815 he was appointed Bampton lecturer at Oxford, and in 1822 preacher at Lincoln’s Inn, and at the close of the same year, through the instrumentality of his friend C.W.W. Wynn, he was offered the vacant see of Calcutta, which after much hesitation and two refusals he at last accepted. British India then formed one huge diocese with three archdeaconries, one in each of the three provinces. During his short tenure of this vast see Heber made his mark in various ways. He completed a great work, the main credit of which is due to his predecessor, Bishop Middleton, the erection and full establishment of Bishop’s College, Calcutta. He succeeded with some difficulty in putting upon a right footing the relationship between the missionaries sent out by the Church Missionary Society and their diocesan. He travelled indefatigably through all parts of his unwieldy diocese, not only performing diligently his Episcopal duties, but also healing the differences and cheering the hearts and strengthening the hands of Christian workers wherever he went.\footnote{137}

Heber may have been reticent to participate in the Anglican missionary efforts in India, but once installed as Bishop, he had considerable success in his challenging role as Bishop. His narrative highlights the convergence of colonialism and theology in the eighteenth century as the East India Company attained an economic, political, and cultural stronghold.\footnote{138} In fact, William C. Barnhart would go so far as to say that the role of the Anglican church in India was multi-faceted and caught up in that colonial stronghold. He explains that “... according to Reginald Heber, second Anglican bishop of Calcutta, Britain’s commercial success, overseas discoveries, and great empire, were indications of her special mission to promote the gospel, and because they were blessed with such an empire, the public was urged to ‘sanctify’ their political privileges by supporting foreign mission.”\footnote{139} In other words, narratives like Heber’s worked in two ways. First, these texts assured eighteenth-century readers that the work of missionaries in colonial territories was divinely inspired. Second, such editions reached out to citizens


on British soil by garnering financial support for missions and promoting the Anglican Church’s efforts at home and abroad. Barnhart clarifies further, “Missionary work was portrayed as essential to the moral cleansing of the nation and would complement scientific and commercial advances . . .”

This autobiographical travel narrative sheds light on the complexities of Britain’s involvement in India.
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Pringle makes clear in his preface that the narrative was Mary Prince’s idea, the text is comprised of her narrative related to an amanuensis, and the changes to the text

---
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were made only for the sake of correcting grammar and removing repetitious language. The text was fact-checked by Mr. Joseph Phillips (a former resident of Antigua and acquaintance of Mary Prince). Lastly, only a few names were changed in the edition: “the names of all the persons mentioned by the narrator have been printed in full, except those of Capt. I _____ and his wife, and that of Mr. D _____, to whom conduct of peculiar atrocity is ascribed” (iii).

In the final paragraph of the preface, Pringle assures the reader that the Anti-Slavery Society, of which he was secretary, was not associated with the edition. Pringle as editor is operating in a “private capacity” (iv). Pringle frames himself more as an objective editor than an abolitionist. This is somewhat effective in terms of presenting Prince’s narrative as factual and objective as opposed to politically motivated.

Pringle’s supplement to the edition relates the amazing challenge of working to attain freedom for Mary upon her arrival in London. Furthermore, Pringle’s supplement includes numerous letters, particularly from Mr. Wood (Prince’s owner while enslaved on Antigua), which illustrate clearly the depravity of Mr. Wood and the difficult experience Prince had while she was his slave. At the time the edition was published, Prince was still not free. The supplement ends with a lament for the reality of slavery. Pringle writes, “Our boasted liberty is the dream of imagination” (40). Pringle’s edition

In his 1996 text, Social Movements and Cultural Change: The First Abolition Campaign Revisited (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 90-91, Leo D’Anjou provides helpful background on the eighteenth-century abolitionist movement. He states, “The antislavery movement originated mainly in religious circles, attacked the institution of slavery above all as a case of (im)morality, employed print as a means to educate people, and used all kinds of empirical data in a great many tracts and pamphlets.” This movement benefited from the cultural climate of the eighteenth century: “The suitability of print for the antislavery cause was, moreover, enhanced by the effect of the Enlightenment on literature.” Pringle’s role as editor of Pringle’s narrative obviously has relevance to the abolitionist cause; nonetheless, for rhetorical purposes he distances himself from the political movement.
of Mary Prince’s narrative and his supplement are most definitely political statements that support in strong terms the abolition of slavery.

However, modern textual critics have done some very important work analyzing Pringle’s role in the production of this text. This work has yielded some fascinating results. For instance, Barbara Baumgartner explains that “Thomas Pringle, Prince’s editor, appears to compete with Prince for control over her story and its meaning.”

Baumgartner attributes Pringle’s domination over the narrative to the textual apparati he includes in the edition:

. . . the extent of the material accompanying Prince’s narrative is unusual and excessive. In addition to his preface, which introduces Prince’s life, Pringle writes and attaches an explanatory “supplement” to Prince’s history, which is nearly as long as Prince’s narrative (thirty pages compared to Prince’s thirty-eight pages). Moreover, Pringle floods Prince’s text with his own explanatory footnotes (eighteen in all). Finally, Pringle includes as “a convenient supplement to the history of Mary Prince” (F 121; G 239) a short two-page account of a young African boy named Louis Asa-Asa. Thus Prince’s text is repeatedly compressed from below by intrusive footnotes, and her narrative itself is sandwiched between white and black male-authored texts, as if a black woman’s story is inadequate on its own and needs the authority of a white man and the company of a black male’s tale to make it complete.

Baumgartner’s scholarship is a strong and appropriate response to Pringle’s presence in the text. Interestingly, like Godwin, Pringle makes his intrusions very apparent to the reader: he labels his changes and comments by using footnotes, and he adds an editorial supplement. On the one hand, this is a step forward in terms of editorial method; on the other hand, his painful intrusions are all the more obvious to the modern reader.

Baumgartner also provides some helpful commentary about the collaborative nature of this text since Mary Prince related her narrative to an amanuensis, known in the text as

---
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Miss S—. On the whole, Baumgartner assumes the relationship between the two women to be more collaborative than that of Mary Prince and Thomas Pringle; however, the social situation of this text remains troublesome in every regard. Baumgartner clarifies, 

Thus, Pringle’s more assertive relationship with Prince, an association between a white man and a black woman, makes sense within the social context of early 19th-century England. It is equally important, however, to acknowledge that Miss S—’s relationship with Prince, despite their common gender, would probably be influenced by the racial attitudes of 19th-century abolitionists who, while they deeply believed in the evils of slavery, still presumed the superiority of whites.144

There is no textual evidence I could locate in order that establishes the identity of Miss S—, or the specific dynamic between the author and amanuensis. Nonetheless, Baumgartner’s conjecture regarding the relationship is still interesting and relevant because the text is partially the legacy of Miss S—. Baumgartner’s article is helpful because it shines a light on the difficulties of this particular authorial situation and the flaws of Pringle’s resulting editorial decisions.

Kremena Todorova, like Baumgartner, helpfully elucidates the complexity of Mary Prince’s narrative in social and historical terms. She states, “Prince’s narrative acquires authority through various generic strategies at the same time that it loses power through Pringle’s editorial interventions.”145 However, Todorova focuses on the function of Pringle’s footnotes. She explains that providing proof of the veracity of the narrative “appears to be the main concern for its editor.”146 In fact, Todorova explains that the practice of extensive fact-checking and the need to focus on details is a frequent attribute of anti-slavery writing. What is so fascinating is that this obsessive focus on particulars and proof, which should lend credibility to the text, ironically undermines it. Todorova
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states, “the editor’s compulsion for empirical facts silences the authentic voice of the West Indian at the same time that it authorizes it.”

It is important to consider the intrusive nature of Pringle’s footnotes because it reminds the reader to be aware of the social and constructed nature of these editions. Todorova delves into other details of the narrative and the nineteenth-century controversy that arose from its publication, such as why Pringle chose to refer to the author as Mary Prince (her paternal name) as opposed to Mary James (her married name). However, her focus on the footnotes is particularly useful in that it highlights her major argument: Thomas Pringle’s effort to present Mary Prince’s authentic narrative was well-intentioned, but his editorial method continually undermined that authenticity.

This edition concludes three chapters in this dissertation: chapter one, which looks at editions of autobiography, chapter two that discusses editions of texts by women, and chapter four, which focuses on colonial editions. It is an appropriate text to end with in that it shows how much editors changed over the course of the eighteenth century. Thomas Pringle throws back the curtain and allows the reader to clearly see his textual intrusions. His preface, footnotes, and supplement, while an attempt to lend credibility to Mary Prince’s narrative, in actuality complicate the edition. Ironically, while early editors have something to learn from Pringle as far as his editorial transparency is concerned, Pringle showcases the dangers of taking on important and socially controversial editions. Paving the way for these texts is no easy task, and on the one hand, modern readers must appreciate Pringle’s editorial efforts in that he brought a valuable text to the reading public. However, his lack of success by modern standards is more accurately an editorial cautionary tale.

---
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Chapter 2

Textual Gender: Representations of Women in Eighteenth-Century Editorial Prefaces

The eighteenth-century discourse on women’s education and women writers has been thoroughly addressed by feminist scholars of eighteenth-century literature. The subject remains a source of interest and critical dialogue as the early feminist texts continue to inspire inquiry. For the sake of this study, this literary discussion regarding women and authorship is especially relevant as the editors of editions of texts by eighteenth-century women were caught up in the debate. They are torn between promoting the education and the written works of women, and assuaging their critics. Hence, the editorial prefaces in editions of texts by women illustrate the situation of the woman writer in the eighteenth century. The editors of these editions, both male and female, address the inherent tensions experienced by these women writers. As a result, the reader of these prefaces is consistently reminded of how these authors are exceptional wives, doting mothers, modest women, and talented writers. These editors navigate this complex formula of the eighteenth-century intellectual woman at times with ease and at times with difficulty. Whatever the case may be, these editorial prefaces are fascinating examples of eighteenth-century feminism and eighteenth-century expectations of women.
Intellectual Women

Before I delve into the commentary taking place in these editorial prefaces, some context may prove useful. I will start early in the long eighteenth-century by focusing on Mary Astell’s *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*, which was first published in 1696. In this now famous work, Astell implores eighteenth-century women to put aside vanity and focus on their inner selves, their education. Astell understands, however, how women are caught in a cultural conundrum. She states, “When [a woman] sees the vain and the gay, making Parade in the World and attended with the Courtship and admiration of all about them, no wonder that her tender Eyes are dazzled with the Pageantry; and wanting Judgement to pass a due Estimate on them and their Admirers, longs to be such a fine and celebrated thing as they!”\(^1\) Nonetheless, throughout the *Proposal* she beseeches her contemporaries to pursue more meaningful intellectual pursuits. She claims, “Your Glass will not do you half so much service as a serious reflection on your own Minds.”\(^2\)

Ultimately, Astell argues for a separate educational facility for women, but for the purposes of this dissertation, her overarching goal is more important, which is her acknowledgement that the cultural climate does not inspire women to cultivate their minds and that this can be remedied by more academic opportunities for women.

Response to Astell’s ideas varied. Patricia Springbord explains that “For her pains Astell was pilloried on the stage, lampooned in the press, and publicly debated by some of the

---


2 Ibid., 52.
greatest wits of the land.” The response to Astell is particularly fascinating in that it highlights the eighteenth-century desire to discuss education for women but also a simultaneous discomfort with that discussion. In fact, Daniel Defoe, in his response to Astell’s *Proposal*, makes this tension very clear:

I know ’tis dangerous to make Public Appearances of the Sex; they are not either to be confin’d or expos’d; the first will disagree with their Inclinations, and the last with their Reputations; and therefore it is somewhat difficult; and I doubt that a Method proposed by an ingenious Lady, in a little book called, *Advice to the Ladies*, wou’d be found impracticable.

The difficulty Defoe refers to is apparent in the editorial prefaces to these editions of texts by women. These editors are concurrently impressed and uncomfortable with the texts they are editing, and this tension persists in the prefaces that appear throughout the eighteenth century.

In 1792, Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* was published. Almost one hundred years after Astell’s *Proposal*, Wollstonecraft must still argue for an improved approach to education for women. She claims in the introduction to the *Rights of Woman*:

The conduct and manners of women, in fact, evidently prove that their minds are not in a healthy state; for, like the flowers which are planted in too rich a soil, strength and usefulness are sacrificed to beauty; and the flaunting leaves, after having pleased a fastidious eye, fade, disregarded on the stalk, long before the season when they ought to have arrived at maturity.—One cause of this barren blooming I attribute to a false system of education, gathered from books written on this subject by men who, considering females rather as women then human creatures, have been more anxious to make them alluring mistresses then affectionate wives and rational mothers; and the understanding of the sex has been so bubbled by this specious homage, that the civilized women of the present

---


century, with a few exceptions, are only anxious to inspire love, when they ought to cherish a nobler ambition, and by their abilities and virtues exact respect.\footnote{Mary Wollstonecraft, \textit{A Vindication of the Rights of Woman}, edited by Carol H. Poston, second edition (New York: Norton, 1988), 7.}

This passage is lengthy, but it is a succinct statement of Wollstonecraft’s concerns and hopes, and it provides a useful context to the debate on women and education in the late eighteenth century. Like Astell, Wollstonecraft makes a strong claim about the intellectual development of women, but she also navigates the expectations for women in interesting ways. She states, “Connected with man as daughters, wives, and mothers, their moral character may be estimated by their manner of fulfilling those simple duties; but the end, the grand end of their exertions should be to unfold their own faculties and acquire the dignity of conscious virtue.”\footnote{Ibid., 26.} Unlike Astell, who supports a separate educational institution for women, Wollstonecraft strikes a delicate balance. She tries to work within the current cultural situation while promoting change: “Let it not be concluded that I wish to invert the order of things; I have already granted, that, from the constitution of their bodies, men seem to be designed by Providence to attain a greater degree of virtue. I speak collectively of the whole sex; but I see not the shadow of a reason to conclude that their virtues should differ in respect to their nature.”\footnote{Ibid., 26.} R.M. Janes explains that most of the initial reviews of Wollstonecraft’s text were favorable: “When the \textit{Rights of Woman} first appeared in 1792, reviewers and readers alike agreed with its recommendations for reform in women’s education.”\footnote{R.M. Janes, “On the Reception of Mary Wollstonecraft’s \textit{Vindication of the Rights of Woman},” in \textit{A Vindication of the Rights of Woman}, edited by Carol H. Poston, second edition (New York: Norton, 1988), 302.} However, Janes goes on to explain that something changed between 1792 and 1798: “The shift in the treatment of feminist works between 1792 and 1798 indicates the continuing approbation of improved
education for women and the solidifying opposition to works that seemed to threaten the established relations between the sexes."⁹ In other words, the idea of the intellectual woman was acceptable, as long as the dynamic between men and women did not change. This is a significant cultural bind, and the editors of editions of women’s texts exhibit an anxiety as a result. Their prefaces and biographies introduce accomplished female authors, but the editors continually reassure their readers that the authors have not upset the gender balance through their writing. It is for this reason that they frequently provide background regarding the authors as wives, mothers, and paragons of modesty, while they highlight their talents as writers.

**Exceptional Wives**

There are two important commentaries regarding women authors as wives that take place in these prefaces. First, two of these editions were edited by the authors’ husbands: Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Maria* (1798) was edited by her husband, William Godwin, and Ann Radcliffe’s *Gaston de Blondville* (1826) was edited by William Radcliffe. In these editions, the husbands/editors reveal their love for their wives while also intruding into the text in interesting ways, revealing the eighteenth-century marriage dynamic. Second, throughout these editions, the theme of marital love is elaborated upon in prefaces and biographical sketches of the authors. In these instances, women authors are lauded for their devotion to their husbands. In both prefatory discourses, a tension is on display between the author’s role as wife and her success as author.

---

⁹ Ibid., 307.
The editorial situation of *Maria* (1798) by Wollstonecraft is developed at length in the annotation of that text, which appears in the bibliography of this chapter. However, it is worth mentioning here for the sake of this chapter introduction the obvious affection Godwin had for his wife. He does not state it directly, but he comments at numerous points in his preface how beloved Wollstonecraft was in her lifetime. He begins his preface, “The public are here presented with the last literary attempt of an author, whose fame has been uncommonly extensive, and whose talents have probably been most admired, by the persons by whom talents are estimated with the greatest accuracy and discrimination” (v). The reader gets the sense that Godwin is certainly one of the author’s admirers. He commends her for her written works, which indicates his support and love for her. Such statements reaffirms the eighteenth-century reader’s ideal of marriage as foundational to familial and societal stability. Wollstonecraft was a woman author and a feminist, but she was also a wife. Her role as wife makes the eighteenth-century reader considerably more comfortable as it acts as a balance to the “radical” activities of writing and feminism. Godwin also explains how “it was necessary for the editor, in some places, to connect the more finished parts with the pages of an older copy, and a line or two in addition sometimes appeared requisite for that purpose” (vii). Godwin has been reprimanded by modern scholars for his textual intrusion into his edition of *Maria*, especially for his supplement in which he “finishes” the novel. However, his intrusion into the text highlights how these editors are in many ways constructing a persona of women authors. These prefaces, biographical sketches, footnotes, and appendices, like Godwin’s supplement, are often attempts to water down the text. In some instances, these editorial intrusions accentuate the author as wife as
opposed to accomplished author. In the case of Godwin, most scholars agree his changes to the text render her feminist commentary less effective.

In another case, the reader sees a very different picture of an author/wife as presented by an editor who happens to be her husband. William Radcliffe published a posthumous edition of Ann Radcliffe’s *Gaston de Blondville* (1826). Unlike Godwin, he is in many ways an unobtrusive editor. His name does not appear on the title page, and it does not appear in his brief, one-paragraph preface. The preface does not make clear the extent of the emendations William Radcliffe made to the manuscript. He does not take it upon himself to change or add to the novel as extensively as Godwin (or at least he does not provide extensive commentary regarding emendations). He constructs his wife’s persona in a different way. Instead of focusing on the text, he includes a lengthy memoirs of his wife by T.N. Talfourd. This biographical portrait re-frames Ann Radcliffe as a loving wife, who enjoyed traveling, writing, and the company of friends. Talfourd demystifies this renowned author of gothic horror into a non-threatening and accessible woman by eighteenth-century standards.

Both Godwin and Radcliffe participate in the project of shaping editions of texts by their wives. Their editorial approach raises flags by modern editorial standards, but their efforts to present their wives’ works in a more “palatable” light ensured the publication of these important works. As Margaret J.M. Ezell explains, “... the posthumously printed text, through mimicking the manuscript voice of the living woman,
enables the reader to appreciate the quality of the woman writer’s virtues, intellectual as well as spiritual.”

In other editions by women, the editor may not be the husband of the author, but the editor frequently mentions the marriage of the author. In these references to marital love, the editors make statements about how these women authors were devoted wives. For instance, in the edition *Devout Exercises of the Heart* (1737) Isaac Watts describes Elizabeth Rowe’s marriage in spiritual terms: “That happy Pair had Souls so near a-kin to each other, that they persever’d in uncommon Amity and mutual Satisfaction, so long as Providence favour’d him with Life. ’Tis sufficiently evident then, that in these Meditations there is no secret panting after a mortal Love in the Language of Devotion and Piety” (xi). Watts assures readers that Rowe’s passionate language is grounded in her spiritual marriage to Thomas Rowe. In another instance, Thomas Birch alludes to the marital devotion of Catharine Cockburn in the edition of her *Works* (1751). He explains that she put her writing aside for years in the interest of “attending upon the duties of a wife and a mother” (xxxv). Furthermore, Birch clarifies the centrality of marriage in Cockburn’s life when he claims that “the loss of her husband, on the 4th of January, 1749, in the 71st year of his age, was a severe shock to her; and she did not long survive him, dying on the 11th of May, 1749, in her 71st year; after having long supported a painful disorder, with a resignation to the divine will, which had been the governing principle of her whole life, and her support under the various trials of it” (xlvi). Birch, too, emphasizes the connection between Cockburn’s marriage and spirituality. This is an

---


11 A number of these women authors did not marry.
effective approach for an eighteenth-century preface to the works of a woman playwright and philosopher. Cockburn, as a result, is portrayed as less of an academic and writer when she is framed in terms of the feminine and the spiritual. In a third example, Lucy Aikin’s edition of Anna Laetitia Barbauld’s *Works* (1825) includes a memoirs that elaborates on the Barbaulds’ marriage. In fact, Aikin goes so far as to include a lengthy excerpt from her aunt’s biography of her husband, Rochemont Barbauld, which showcases their marital devotion even in times of difficulty. Like Birch and Watts, Aikin emphasizes Barbauld’s experience as loyal wife, which clarifies her persona as steadfast wife for eighteenth-century readers.

So what is the significance of this emphasis on marital love? Jane Spencer in her helpful study of relationships in the world of literature, both literal and metaphorical, explains that “Nobody doubted that women belonged in the family. It was as daughters and sisters, wives and mothers, that they were understood to find their meaning. This has so shaped public acknowledgement of women that it is no surprise to find literary women being celebrated in relation to their kin.”

Perhaps, then, the editors of these texts by women are simply reinforcing this feminine connection to the family. However, William Stafford takes it one step farther: “it has been argued that the idealization of the ‘sentimental family’ of the eighteenth century, of the companionate marriage, provided a new rationale for the subordination of women, the old ones having broken down.”

---


this light, editors may be focusing on marital love in order to uphold eighteenth-century patriarchy.\textsuperscript{14} Returning to Spencer, she may, in turn, clarify this even further:

Paradoxically, the most womanly and therefore admirable female writer was understood to be the one who most acutely felt a sense of conflict between being a woman and being a poet. The insult likely to be thrown openly at the female poet in the seventeenth century—that she could not be both a virtuous woman and a poet—had, by the Romantic period, become for many women a strong internalized notion, so that even as they were publicly praised precisely for bringing together womanliness and poetry, they expressed fundamental doubts about the happiness of the combination.\textsuperscript{15}

The “fundamental doubts” experienced by women writers of the eighteenth century were at times voiced and at times reinforced by their editors. Spencer’s conceptualization of an internalized anxiety about being a woman and author is especially useful for this discussion. These editors, through their consistent mention of marriage, remind readers that these women authors have not forgotten to strike a balance in their lives between authorship and marriage.

**Doting Mothers**

The prefaces featured in this chapter also frequently allude to these women authors as mothers. Background information regarding parenting is often pertinent to any biographical treatment of an author; nonetheless, the discussion of mothering in these prefaces also seems to act as a counterbalance to these women’s intellectual pursuits. A particularly interesting facet of this theme of mothering found in these prefaces is the fact that many of these authors are not necessarily biological mothers. In the case of Anna

---

\textsuperscript{14} This is an interesting discussion in light of studies focusing on eighteenth-century families, which I address in the third chapter of this dissertation. These recent studies suggest a more affectionate model of the family existed in the eighteenth century. Stafford’s quote indicates a sort of eighteenth-century feminist backlash in which a new sort of patriarchy emerges despite a move away from the previous family system in which the father is perceived as king of the family.

\textsuperscript{15} Spencer, *Literary Relations*, 196.
Laetitia Barbauld, she was an adoptive mother as well as a “mother” to her students. In other instances, these authors are characterized as mothers to family members, such as siblings, nieces, or nephews. Jane Spencer once again provides some helpful insight: “It was a different aspect of motherhood that did most to authorize female writing: motherhood as social role rather than bodily capacity.”16 These prefacers express clearly how these writers act as mothers, how this component of their lives affects their persona, and most importantly how their texts reflect this maternal tone.

In terms of biological mothers, I will focus here on Catharine Cockburn and Mary Robinson. In the example of Cockburn, her editor, Thomas Birch, highlights not only her devotion as wife, which I address in the previous section, but also her devotion to her children. Birch clarifies Cockburn’s devotion to her children when he includes a letter she wrote to Alexander Pope in 1738, a letter she never sent, which provides her rationale for giving up writing in order to focus on parenting: “Being married in 1708, I bid adieu to the muses, and so wholly gave myself up to the cares of a family, and the education of my children, that I scarce knew, whether there was any such thing as books, plays, or poems stirring in Great Britain” (xl). This is not the only mention in this preface of Cockburn’s decision to put aside writing for the sake of raising her children, which illustrates Birch’s interest in how Cockburn’s priority remained first and foremost mothering.

Mary Robinson (the younger) published an edition of her mother’s Memoirs in 1801. This is the only instance of a daughter editing a text by a biological mother, which makes the text particularly relevant to this discussion. As I outline in the annotation to this edition, Robinson (the younger) is a devoted daughter, and this is evident in her

16 Ibid., 76.
advertisement to the edition. Despite or, more accurately, because of her mother’s reputation as actress and association with scandal, Robinson (the younger) focuses on the loving relationship she had with her mother. She states, “If a Daughter has erred in fulfilling the desire of the most affectionate and tender Mother, she must appeal from the severity of the criticism, and the malevolence of prejudice, to a higher tribunal!—The sympathies of nature will plead in her excuse” (page three of the advertisement). Mary Robinson’s (the elder) reputation as former mistress to the Prince of Wales, as well as fallen actress, should be forgiven in light of her experience as loving mother, according to her daughter. Here again, the theme of mothering is used to persuade readers. The editor’s decision to focus on the mother-daughter relationship, while acknowledging scandal and reputation, is a fascinating attempt to provide balance to the author’s persona.

Lucy Aikin highlights Anna Laetitia Barbauld’s role as an adoptive mother. Aikin says, “The union of Mr. And Mrs. Barbauld proved unfruitful, and they sought to fill the void, of which in the midst of their busy avocations they were still sensible, by the adoption of a son out of the family of Dr. Aikin” (xxviii). Aikin further explains that “They received the child when somewhat under two years of age, and [his] education became thenceforth a leading object of Mrs. Barbauld’s attention” (xxviii-xxix). The fact that Barbauld raises and educates her own adopted child is particularly relevant to her numerous books on the education of children, and Aikin’s decision to mention this connection is effective. It lends credibility and shifts Barbauld’s motivation for writing books about the education of children from the realm of effective authorship to parental passion. Barbauld, however, was also a teacher for most of her life. In this capacity, she
is also described as a mother to her students. One of her students, who Aikin quotes, describes Barbauld as the “mother of his mind” (xxv). This is one instance of a woman author being characterized by her mothering in her “social role.”

Lastly, other women writers are appreciated for their role as aunt. Elizabeth Carter’s nephew, Montagu Pennington, wrote her memoirs and edited her poetry in an edition published in 1807 as a tribute to her influence on his life. He explains in his preface that

He was tempted, however, to undertake [the memoirs and edition], not so much from the desire of Mrs. Carter’s friends, (though that was in several instances strongly expressed) as from his own wish that a just and true account should appear of one to who he was so nearly and affectionately attached, and whose life was so exemplary, as well as amiable. In this respect, and in this alone, scarcely any other person was equally well qualified, as he had resided with her for so large a portion of his life, and was left in possession of all her papers” (second page of preface).

Pennington’s preface is a mere two pages, and it is significant that he emphasizes Carter’s mothering role in these first pages of the memoirs and edition. Matthew Montagu, another Bluestocking nephew, likewise pays tribute to his aunt, Elizabeth Montagu, in his four volume edition of her letters (1809). In both of these instances nephews are appreciative of the love and support they received from their aunts, but they also seem to be re-framing the image of them not just as influential Bluestockings but as loving mother figures.

Returning to Wollstonecraft’s ideas in the *Rights of Woman*, she states, “Besides, the woman who strengthens her body and exercises her mind will, by managing her family and practicing various virtues, become the friend, and not the humble dependent

---

17 Jane Spencer, *Literary Relation*, 76.
of her husband.”18 Wollstonecraft, as mentioned previously, did not intend to upset the social order. Moira Ferguson and Janet Todd further clarify, “With education suitable for their class, women would, in Wollstonecraft’s view, be able to support themselves adequately or fulfill themselves in their traditional role of wife and mother.”19 The editors of these texts regularly focus on these women authors as mothers. On the one hand, this reinforces a more comfortable balance between the sexes as these women assume a more traditional role. On the other hand, this discussion of mothering has a grander implication: Spencer claims that “By the end of the eighteenth century, motherly duty could be fairly widely accepted as the basis for women’s involvement in the moral care of the nation.”20 The dissemination of editions of texts by women is, in essence, a kind of literary mothering, which resolves for the eighteenth-century reader the tension between women and authorship.

**Modest Women**

It is nearly a given in these prefaces that editors mention the modesty or humility of the author, and these traits are often linked to spirituality. The use of these terms reflects the frequency with which they are mentioned in conduct books throughout the eighteenth century. In short, modesty mattered. John Gregory states in 1774 that “One of the chief beauties in a female character, is that modest reserve, that retiring delicacy,

---

20 Spencer, *Literary Relations*, 76.
which avoids the public eye, and is disconcerted even at the gaze of admiration.”  
Later in the century (1792), Clara Reeve laments immodesty in women:

How often do we see the young girls come from those schools, full of pride, 
vanity, and self-consequence!—ignorant of the duties and virtues of domestic life, 
insolent to their inferiors, proud and saucy to their equals, impertinent to their 
parents; without that sweet modesty and delicacy of mind and manners, which are 
the surest guards of female virtue, and the best omens of their future characters as 
wives, mothers, and mistresses of families; and which nothing can compensate for 
the want of.  

In other words, a more retiring disposition is appropriate.  On the other hand, pursuits 
such as authorship for an eighteenth-century woman fall into the category of vanity, not 
reserve.  As a result, these editors must construct these authors as virtuous and humble, 
which is an attempt to counter the fact that their writing appears in print.  As a result, 
these editors make strong claims about the author’s virtue, modesty, or piety.  I will 
elaborate on prefatory statements about Elizabeth Singer Rowe, Mary Leapor, Susanna 
Harrison, and Frances Maria Cowper to illustrate these claims. 

In the annotations of Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s two texts (the first two entries in 
the bibliography for this chapter), I highlight the hagiographical tone both of her editors 
taken in their prefatory commentary.  In his preface to Rowe’s *Devout Exercises of the 
Heart*, Isaac Watts states, “She sometimes confesses her Folly and her Guilt in the Sight 
of God, in the most affecting Language of a deep Humiliation.  ’Tis with a pathetick 
sensibility of her Weakness, and in the strongest language of Self-deficiency, she bewails 
her Offences against the Creator and Redeemer” (ix).  And Theophilius Rowe, the editor 
of her *Miscellaneous Works* (1739), insists that “A common goodness cannot expect to

---

be taken notice of in this public manner, and an eminent one will not. The persons most
deserving this distinction, will be the least apt to think so of themselves . . .” (iii).
Elizabeth Rowe certainly passes the piety and modesty test according to both of her
editors. They assert that her virtue and humility actually make her a better devotional
poet, which is an effective appeal to eighteenth-century readers.

Mary Leapor, too, is framed as a humble woman. The editor of the edition of her
posthumously published Poems Upon Several Occasions (1751), Isaac Hawkins Browne
(the elder), who is most likely the editor of the first volume of the edition, presents a poet
who is guided by a sense of virtue. He states, “She was courteous and obliging to all,
cheerful, good-natured, and contented in the Station of Life in which Providence had
placed her” (second page of “To the Reader”). Note here Browne mentions Leapor’s
sense of “station.” This trait of humility makes her more acceptable to readers. Another
laboring-class poet, Susanna Harrison, is also noted for her virtue and modesty. John
Conder explains in the preface to her Songs in the Night (1780), “But, such is her
modesty, [her poems] would never have appeared to the world in her lifetime, if it had
not been that some months ago she thought she was actually in dying circumstances; she
therefore committed them to the care of the Editor, charging him to let none see them till
after her decease” (iv). The edition was published prior to her death, but unfortunately,
Harrison passed away only four years after the first edition of Songs in the Night. She
was only thirty-two years old. The volume met with considerable success—it was
reprinted numerous times for years after her death.23 The quote above indicates that
Harrison struggled with her poems becoming available to readers. The need to uphold

the feminine virtue of modesty was pervasive, and this becomes painfully evident due to the frequent reference to it by both editors and authors of these editions.

Perhaps the winner in this category of feminine reserve (on the part of women authors) is Frances Maria Cowper. William Cowper, her cousin, edited the edition of her Poems on Various Occasions (1792), and his advertisement reveals her anxiety about overstepping the bounds of propriety: “The writer of the following Poems thinks it necessary to apologize to the public for obtruding upon them a Work of this nature, particularly at a period when productions of the highest merit are daily pressing forward to engage their attention” (iii). Frances Maria Cowper goes so far as to apologize for her poetry, which is quite remarkable, and William Cowper makes sure to include this sentiment in his prefatory commentary. This is interesting as even Wollstonecraft, who was a champion of the trait of modesty, believed it could be taken too far. She explains in the Rights of Woman that “Modesty, in the latter signification of the term, is, that soberness of mind which teaches a man not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think, and should be distinguished from humility, because humility is a kind of self-abasement.”24 Granted, William Cowper could be exaggerating his cousin’s humility for rhetorical purposes; however, Frances Maria Cowper’s apology for her poetry is certainly more “self-abasement” than tasteful modesty. In fact, I would argue that many of the claims of humility and modesty that appear in these prefaces and biographies fall into this same category; these editors are often on the brink of an apologetic tone for the fact that these women authors have produced exceptional texts that are worthy of publication.

---

24 Wollstonecraft, Rights of Woman, 122. Note that Wollstonecraft’s use of the term “man” here seems to be universal in terms of the discussion of gender; she is referring to both men and women.
Talented Writers

The previous sections of this chapter introduction highlight how these women writers and editors work to conform to eighteenth-century notions of femininity. This section, however, teases out of these editorial prefaces the theme of talent. All of these editors appropriately extol these authors for their beautiful verse, effective prose, or astounding intellect. It is this facet of these prefaces that is the most significant because by praising these authors, editors carved out a greater niche for other women writers. It was a political move that fostered change in terms of how eighteenth-century readers perceived women authors. Vivien Jones explains that

Writing was one career which even a fairly conventional education opened up for women. But to write, or at least to publish, was for the eighteenth-century woman a transgressive act. Though the gendering of mental qualities associated femininity with imagination and creativity, publishing exposed an essentially private activity to the public gaze, blurring the conduct-book delineation of separate spheres. The effect, even according to sympathetic contemporary commentators, was a troubling confusion of gender roles . . .

These editors, even while they conform to certain modes of femininity, take part in the “transgressive act” of editing a text by a woman. Without their participation in the production of the text, the project might never reach fruition, and these editors, while appropriately critiqued, are also to be appreciated.

For instance, Isaac Watts describes Elizabeth Rowe’s poetry as “the excellent fruits of her pen” (6). Thomas Birch claims that Catharine Cockburn “raised our ideas of women’s intellectual powers” (i). Sir Walter Scott, in his preface to Anna Seward’s Poetical Works (1811), describes her as a “highly-accomplished author” (xxxix). These editors do, then, at times, unabashedly make a claim about the skills of the woman

25 Vivien Jones, ed., Women in the Eighteenth Century: Constructions of Femininity (London: Routledge, 1990), 140. Vivien Jones’s other anthology Women and Literature in Britain 1700-1800 includes a number of useful essays that address eighteenth-century constructions of femininity and women authors.
author. It is this type of claim that makes the prefatory material to these editions so interesting and important. These editors do not simply construct these texts in ways that conform to eighteenth-century values, they also showcase how these texts are unique and transformative.

What is most significant about these claims regarding the ability of these women authors is how they counter balance the prolific claims of virtue and modesty. The result is an obvious tension in these prefaces. Are the editors downplaying female ambition and intellect while also promoting it? I would argue “yes” on both counts. Nowhere is this tension more apparent than in Memoirs of the Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Carter, with a New Edition of Her Poems. This text, edited by Montagu Pennington, displays this inherent tension. Pennington describes how Elizabeth Carter tended toward modesty: “It was always irksome and painful to her to be held up to view herself as an object of curiosity, and to have persons introduced to her on account of her literary reputation” (301). Pennington’s use of the word “painful” here is especially revealing as it shows just how difficult it was for his aunt to live with the eighteenth-century norm of feminine modesty. Conversely, Carter also loved her literary pursuits and the resulting success: “She was much inclined to believe, that women had not their proper station in society, and that their mental powers were not rated sufficiently high” (303). It must have been a great satisfaction for Carter to successfully navigate the literary world. Furthermore, Carter was a proponent of women writers and scholars. She even ensured the posthumous publication of her friend Catharine Talbot’s Works. Elizabeth Carter’s life, text, and legacy reflect the challenges and rewards of authorship for eighteenth-century women, and their editors.
The annotated bibliography below includes eighteen editions of texts by women. The bibliographical entries appear in chronological order from 1737 to 1831.

**Annotated Bibliography: Editions by Women**


Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION**: No illustration included.
2) **TITLE PAGE**: Title page included.
3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS**: Table of contents included at the end of the volume. This is the only edition that places the contents after the text of the edition.
4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION**: “To an intimate Friend of Mrs. Rowe” from Isaac Watts. This friend is lauded for her loyalty and kindness to Mrs. Rowe, her generosity in turning Mrs. Rowe’s manuscript over to the editor, and her Christian virtues.
5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT**: Editorial preface by Isaac Watts. Also, the letter from Mrs. Rowe to Dr. Watts, which she enclosed when she sent him the manuscript, is included in the edition. As Rowe is on death’s door, she hands her manuscript over to Dr. Watts. She places her trust in him as editor.

---

26 Margaret J.M. Ezell discusses two other editions by women in her article. “The posthumous publication of women’s manuscripts and the history of authorship” : Anne Killigrew’s *Poems by Mrs. Killigrew* (1686), edited by her father, as well as Mary Monck’s *Marinda. Poems and Translations upon several Occasions* (1716), edited by her father, Richard Molesworth, the first Viscount Molesworth. These two texts were not labeled as editions in Michael Cox’s *Oxford Chronology of English Literature* or Samuel J. Rogal’s *Chronological Outline of British Literature*, which were the foundational resources for this project in terms of locating editions. These were texts by women, which would have made them relevant to this chapter, and they were both edited by their fathers, which would have placed these texts in my third chapter that focuses on family editions.

27 Note that this annotation is based on the 1742 fourth edition, which was published by Rogers and Fowle for J. Blanchard in Boston. However, the preface in the 1742 edition is missing the first couple of pages. The dedication and preface in the 1791 edition (published by T. Dobson in Philadelphia in 1791) match the 1742 edition. I used the 1742 edition to locate all of the above information, but I used the 1791 edition to fill in the missing pages from the preface.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biographical background by the editor is included.

7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.

8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of religious reflections by Mrs. Rowe.

9) FOOTNOTES: There is only one footnote in the entire edition. It appears on page 136 and clarifies Rowe’s breakdown of a given text into separate sections.

10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes.

11) GLOSSARY: No glossary.

12) APPENDIX: No appendix.

13) INDEX: No index.

14) SIZE: Sextodecimo.

Madeleine Forell Marshall, a scholar who has published extensively on Rowe’s poetry, explains, “Ultimately, the challenge of teaching obscure, uncanonical poetry [like Rowe’s] is the complex challenge of scholarship itself.”

Keeping in mind this challenge of studying the uncanonized, Isaac Watts, friend of Elizabeth Singer Rowe and editor of this edition, provides valuable information in his preface for Rowe scholars to consider.

Watts points out that Rowe is an exceptional devotional writer. He begins his preface, “The admirable Author of these devotional papers has been in high esteem among the ingenious and the polite, since so many excellent fruits of her pen, both in verse and prose, have appeared in public” (6). Watts’s praise of Rowe is unwavering throughout the preface. He mentions her “pious and heavenly temper” (6), “heavenly character” (7), and “great modesty” (7). He begins, then, by emphasizing her religious devotion. Nonetheless, he also characterizes Rowe as a talented writer. He explains, “As her virtues were sublime, so her genious was bright and sparkling, and the vivacity of her

---

imagination had a tincture of the Muse almost from her childhood” (8). Her abilities as a
writer *and* her spiritual devotion make her an extraordinary devotional poet.

After these initial laudatory comments, Watts includes an interesting aside. He
states, “Yet she is conscious of her frailties too: she sometimes confesses her folly and
her guilt in the sight of God, in the most affecting language of a deep humiliation” (9).
Like so many of these editions in which the author is a woman, the editor must make
mention of the humility of the writer. Such is the case here where Watts assures his
readers that Rowe is both a talented writer and a humble woman. This point is hammered
home at various points throughout the remainder of the preface: “It should be
remembered also, there is nothing to be found here which rises above our ideas: Here are
none of those absurd and incomprehensible phrases, which amuse the ear with sounding
vanity, and hold reason in sovereign contempt . . .” (11). Watts assures readers that
Rowe’s poetry is accessible and appropriate. The verse does not venture into those
realms that would be inappropriate for a woman poet: vanity and passion.

Watts provides minimal background on Rowe’s life. He describes her marriage
as a loving union of two kindred souls. He describes her involvement in the social circles
of her day: “She often conversed freely with the gay and great, and was in high esteem
among persons of rank and honour” (13). He also indicates that as she aged, she
withdrew from society, but she was not a recluse. She still interacted with friends and
loved ones.

He also conjectures that these poems that Rowe entrusted to him are a
combination of her early and later poems. He explains, “From the different appearance
of the paper and ink in some of these pieces, as well as from the early transcripts of
several among her friends, it is evident that they were written in her younger days; others are of a much later original” (15). Watts insists that he did not have a role in the order of the meditations. He received the manuscript from Mrs. Rowe, through a friend, in a certain order. He was true to that order. He explains, “I have placed these papers all as I found them pinned up in a Wrapping-paper, tho’ ’tis evident, from plain Circumstances, this is not the Order in which they were written, nor is that of any great Importance” (16). Nonetheless, this statement is a sort of pledge to readers that the edition is credible—the poems appear in the order that Rowe herself would have chosen.

A detailed explanation of emendations appears in Watts’s preface. He portrays himself as a respectful and objective editor. However, the headings and section breaks in the text can be attributed to the “Publisher” (17). I find this to be an interesting choice of word. Did the publisher make the decision or did the publisher rely on Watts’s judgment in terms of the placement of these headings and the division of the text? Scholarship does not point to an answer, but this question highlights an editorial blind spot on the part of Watts. Also, Watts concedes that at various points a sentence or idea was completed by him. He does not indicate in the preface where this occurs in the text, and he does not indicate via a footnote or endnote where these emendations are made. He states, “Here and there, a too venturous flight is little moderated. Sometimes, a meditation or a sentence is completed, which seemed very imperfect; or a short line or two inserted, to introduce the sense, where the language seemed too abrupt, or the meaning too obscure.” (17). This statement highlights how Watts employs an unsystematic approach to emendating the edition, which is certainly problematic by modern standards.
Furthermore, his claim that some of Rowe’s language can be characterized as “too venturous a flight” is telling in terms of Rowe’s ideas of women and spirituality. Did he stumble upon language that seemed to him to be passionate as opposed to pious? Watts’s preface frames Rowe as talented and pious, a characterization that is comfortable for eighteenth-century readers, and the editor also concedes that he emendates the text to maintain this persona. Sharon Achinstein explains that “Watts revealed the anxiety felt about the possible double register of female spirituality: perhaps her writing was merely a spiritualization of erotic feelings.”

His editorial emendations are an attempt to undo the passionate language in the text. Achinstein asserts that for the eighteenth-century reader, “Spiritual longing and sexual longing often intersect in discourses of devotion.”

Rowe’s poetry certainly contains this element of longing.

However, Watts’s construction of a pious Rowe is a success as she became one of the most read poets of her day, thanks in large part to this edition and Theophilus Rowe’s edition, *Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe* (1739).

Marlene Hansen states,

The myth of the pious Mrs. Rowe rose like a phoenix from the tomb of the mortal woman. A torrent of commemorative and hagiographic writings streamed from the pens of a mourning nation, giving her posthumous life a textual product. In reality, these tell more about the ontological needs of their authors than about the lady who is their ostensible subject: England apparently needed a female writer who was completely pure, chaste, and devoted, a woman who was all soul, her body merely its vessel during the trials of this life, and found Mrs. Rowe the most fitting repository for this image.

Hansen focuses on the persona of Mrs. Rowe as a construction, and her conclusion is quite compelling after reading Isaac Watts’s preface. It is fair to say that Elizabeth Rowe

---

was a spiritual and prayerful woman; however, the preface, like Theophilus Rowe’s, borders on hagiography, and the modern reader cannot ignore the worshipful tone.

Watts hopes that the readers of the edition are moved by Rowe’s devotional exercises. He states, “I hope all serious Readers may find something here, which, thro’ the Aids of the Blessed Spirit, may raise them above their usual Pitch, may give a new Spring to their religious Pleasures and their immortal Hopes, and thereby render their Lives more holy and heavenly” (20). Watts is obviously moved by Rowe’s work, and he sincerely hopes the reader has this same experience. Biographical information on the relationship between Watts and Rowe helps to clarify his interest in the success of her poetry. First, Watts, like Matthew Prior, was in love with Rowe. Sharon Achinstein explains that “It was on the day following Watts’s marriage proposal to Elizabeth Singer that Philomela [Rowe’s pseudonym] consented to marry another.” Despite Rowe’s rejection of Watts’s proposal, they remained close friends. In fact, Marshall claims, “Isaac Watts was, more than Prior, a kindred spirit.” Their relationship, like their poetry, began with an element of passion, which evolved into religious devotion. In this regard, Watts, “London’s leading Dissenting minister” and a famous hymn writer, is an appropriate prefacer. As a fellow dissenter, hymn writer, and devotional poet, Watts can certainly bring a scholarly appreciation to Rowe’s poetry. Marshall explains, “Watts provides useful critical guidance to the proper reading of Rowe’s poetry, early and late [ . . . ] His preface explains the conventions of devotional verse, including that of divine

---

32 Interestingly, the biographical material I found on Watts does not elaborate in great detail on their relationship. Biographical works that focus on Rowe, however, do provide some useful information.
33 Sharon Achinstein, “Romance of the Spirit,” 413.
love, which he had used in his own early poetry . . .”

In short, Watts’s praise of Rowe, while it is constructed, excessive, and hagiographical, also reflects an appreciation for their shared experience as devotional poet. The success of Rowe’s poetry is not unrelated to Watts’s own success.

Theophilus Rowe, ed. *The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe. The Greater Part now first published, by her Order, from her Original Manuscripts, by Mr. Theophilus Rowe. To which are added, Poems on Several Occasions, by Mr Thomas Rowe. And to the whole is prefix’d, An Account of the Lives and Writings of the Authors*. 2 Vols. By Elizabeth Rowe. London: R. Hett and R. Dodsley, 1739.

Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** Frontispiece of Elizabeth Singer Rowe with a lavish border appears in the first volume. No frontispiece appears in the second volume.

2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page included in both volumes.

3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** Table of contents included in both volumes.

4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** No acknowledgment or dedication included.

5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:** No editorial preface included. However, prefatory poems in honor of Elizabeth Singer Rowe are included:

   • “To Mrs. Elizabeth Singer. On Her Divine Poems” by I. Watts.
   • “To Mrs. Rowe. On Her Excellent Poems” by Henry Grove.
   • “To Mrs. Rowe. After Her Recovery from Small-Pox” by Joseph Standen.
   • “To Mrs. Rowe. On Her Excellent Poems” by anonymous.
   • “To Mrs. Rowe. Occasion’d by Her Husband Presenting Me with Moliere’s Works” by Tho. Amory.
   • “Verses to the Memory of Mrs. Rowe. By a Friend” by anonymous.
   • “On the Death of Mrs. Rowe” by Elizabeth Carter.

---

As Theophilus Rowe, the brother-in-law of the writer and editor of the edition, does not provide a preface, I focus on his biography of Elizabeth Singer Rowe for this annotation. It is a lengthy, almost 100 page, biography, and he begins it with a flourish.

The following passage appears on the second page:

But, surely, the truly-wise, the virtuous, persons equally eminent for great and good qualities, for their extraordinary accomplishments, and the use they made of them, to the honour of the supreme Being, and the benefit of mankind, these ought not to be swept away into forgetfulness with the common rubbish of the species. While their reward is with God in the regions of immortality, the world is concern’d, not more out of gratitude to those that have been such benefactors to it, than for its own sake, to perpetuate their memory, if possible, to all posterity, for the service of the example, which hath a strangely animating and attractive force, where it meets with any latent seeds of goodness and ingenuity in the tempers of men. The care with which they shunn’d the applause they merited, is an additional reason why they should be drawn out of their lov’d obscurity, after they have left our world; especially, as there is no danger now of offending their modesty, or awakening their pride; who, if they know ought of what is done here below, are too well satisfied with the honour that cometh from God to need the concurring suffrage of such diminitive beings as we are to complete their happiness. All that they can be suppos’d to rejoice in is, that their usefulness, not that their fame, survives them (ii-iii).
I find this passage to be a compelling statement regarding an edition by a woman; furthermore, this text is a family edition. Theophilus Rowe is publishing this collection of poems not only for their literary value, but more importantly for their moral value and “usefulness” for prayer and reflection. In fact, Madeleine Forell Marshall notes that Elizabeth Rowe “was the sole survivor of her family and a childless widow who had suffered the deaths of siblings, parents, and husband.”37  Rowe’s life and writing, then, makes a very strong statement about familial loyalty, loss, and fortitude. Her prose work dealing with her husband’s death, entitled Friendship in Death, was “vastly popular.”38  Elizabeth Rowe was obviously admired as a stalwart and spiritual woman.

The editor presents Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s life as an exercise in “virtue and piety” (iv). The biography is thorough, focusing on Rowe’s family, upbringing, husband (Thomas), marriage, writing, and spirituality. Like other family editions, this one certainly begins with a loving tribute to a writer that inspired many in the eighteenth-century to reflect on spirituality, love, family, and mortality. Like Isaac Watts’s preface to Rowe’s Devout Exercises of the Heart, Theophilus Rowe’s preface praises the unceasingly pious Rowe. Perhaps, it is for this reason that Margaret Maison describes Theophilus Rowe’s biography of his sister-in-law as “hagiographical.”39  For instance, he is very descriptive about her early tendency toward spirituality: “... with a prudent and pious education, the felicity of her natural disposition, under the heavenly influence, conspir’d; for though she had an unusual sprightliness in her temper, which held out to the last, yet she was at the same time blest with a turn of mind to noble and elevated

---

38 Ibid.
subjects, that gave her a high relish for the pleasures of devotion” (xi). Furthermore, like Watts, Rowe addresses Rowe’s virtue by asserting her successful suppression of passion:

Tho’ many of these poems are of the religious kind, and all of them consistent with the strictest regard to the rules of virtue; yet some things in them gave her no little uneasiness in advanced life. To a mind that had so entirely subdued its passions, or devoted them to the honour of its maker, and endued with the tenderest moral sense, what she could not absolutely approve, appear’d unpardonable; and, not satisfied to have done nothing that injur’d the sacred cause of virtue, she was displeas’d with her self for having writ any thing that did not directly promote it. How were it to be wish’d, that none of our celebrated poets had any thing worse to answer for than the harmless gayeties of a youthful muse, for which too they had aton’d by more serious and instructive compositions; or, that after all the guilt they had conracted, by corrupting the manners of the age with their loose productions, they were conscious but of half the remorse the virtuous Philomela felt, for what no ingenious reader will impute as a reproach to her memory (xvii).

Theophilus Rowe does not indicate that he emended the manuscript to “subdu[e] its passions”; rather, he addresses Elizabeth Rowe’s remorse regarding her more passionate poetry. Her pious persona increases with this image of her self-reproach.

This edition of her verse continued to inspire readers through numerous editions. In fact, Margaret Maison describes this edition, as well as Isaac Watts’s Devout Exercises of the Heart as “bestsellers.”

Numerous editions of Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe were published: “These volumes were reissued in 1749, 1750 (with “History of Joseph”), 1756, and 1772.” Theophilus Rowe’s biography appears in all of these editions, reaffirming the theme of familial devotion and feminine virtue.

---

40 Maison, “Elizabeth Rowe,” 583.

Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustration included in either of the two volumes.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included in volume one and volume two.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Table of contents included in volume one and volume two.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: There is no acknowledgment or dedication in volume one or volume two. Also, there are lengthy subscriber lists in both volumes.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: A preface “To the Reader” is included in the first volume. A letter “To John * * * * *, Esq.” appears prior to the table of contents in the second volume of the edition. This letter is most likely by Bridget Fremantle.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: There is no biographical background provided by the editor(s).
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: There is no commentary on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: Two volumes of poetry by Mary Leapor.
9) FOOTNOTES: No footnotes included in the edition.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included in the edition.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included in the edition.
12) APPENDIX: There are some letters by Mary Leapor at the end of the second volume. I am considering this material to be an appendix even though it is not specifically designated as such.
13) INDEX: There is no index included in the edition.
14) SIZE: Octavo.

Mary Leapor, a laboring-class poet, had only one text published, and it is this two volume collection of poetry. The tragedy of this collection is that it was published posthumously after her untimely death from measles at the age of twenty-four. The chronology of events that led up to publication unfolds in the following manner.\(^{42}\) First, Mary Leapor received no formal education, but she was an avid reader and writer as a young woman. She had copies of poetry by Dryden and Pope, and she had no

---

background in the classics. She was always writing even though she always had to work, whether as housekeeper for her father or as cook-maid in an upper class home. It was through her friendship with Bridget Fremantle that publication was first discussed. Fremantle thought that the quality of her poetry warranted publication, and she encouraged Leapor to publish via subscription. Fremantle organized the effort. The subscribers were lined up, and although Fremantle moved forward with publication, Leapor would not see her poetry in print as she died in 1746.

The identity and role of the editor of this two volume edition are not easy to discern as no credit appears on the title page. Joanne Shattock attributes the “To the Reader” preface in the first volume to Bridget Fremantle, and it would certainly make sense that such a close friend of Leapor would have compiled the subscribers and edited that first volume. However, no one has made the definitive claim that Fremantle assumed the role of editor. In short, the editor of the first volume remains a bit of a mystery: it is possible that it is Bridget Fremantle or Isaac Hawkins Browne. Joanne Shattock claims that Samuel Richardson and Isaac Hawkins Browne (the elder) acted as editors to the second volume of the edition, and Michael Cox in *The Oxford Chronology of English Literature* also attributes the editing of the second volume of this edition to both Isaac Hawkins Browne and Samuel Richardson. However, Richard Greene indicates that only Isaac Hawkins Browne filled the role of editor. Greene explains that “The second volume, according to Duncombe, was edited by Isaac Hawkins Browne, a poet and sometime Member of Parliament. Betty Rizzo believes it is possible that he edited both volumes. The lack of information on this point makes it difficult to judge the

accuracy of the printed text.” Greene specifies that at the very least Richardson was the printer of the second volume:

The reception of Leapor’s work was sufficiently warm for a second volume to be considered. Samuel Richardson, though not a subscriber to the first volume, had taken an interest in Leapor, who was in his eyes perhaps a more tragic Pamela. As a printer Richardson was notably successful. As he became more independent of booksellers he began to choose works for publication which suited his own taste. He took an active interest in women writers, and at different times published works by Sarah Fielding, Charlotte Lennox, Susanna Centlivre, Eliza Haywood, Elizabeth Carter, and Mary Barber, among others.

The editorial work for the second volume, then, was performed solely by Isaac Hawkins Browne (the elder), or Browne and Samuel Richardson worked together as editors. The fact that Samuel Richardson agreed to become involved with this edition by a working-class woman poet is relevant. He was active and successful in the printing business. The Oxford Companion to English Literature states, “All his working life he was extremely industrious, and his business prospered and expanded steadily. Like all printers of his time, he combined printing and publishing, producing books, journals, advertisement posters, and much more miscellaneous work.” He would have considered Leapor’s poetry most for its literary merit and marketability.

In the preface to the first volume, “To the Reader,” the editor points out that the edition is being published for the benefit of the author’s father. The lengthy subscriber list makes it clear that there is considerable interest in Leapor’s poetry. The editor

---

46 Ibid., 26.
48 Notable subscribers to the first volume are Stephen Duck, Bridget Fremantle, and numerous members of the aristocracy. Isaac Hawkins Browne, Colley Cibber, and Samuel Richardson appear on the subscriber list of the second volume.
hopes that the edition lives up to the generosity of the subscribers, as the money from the publication could be quite helpful to Leapor’s father.

Subsequently, the editor hints at that typical self-consciousness regarding treatment of the copy-text:

The short account which has been given of Mrs. Leapor, with the Proposals for a Subscription, it is hop’d, will sufficiently apologize for the Defects that shall be found in this collection. Had she lived to correct and finish these first Productions of a young unassisted Genius, certainly they would be greatly improved, tho’, as they now appear in their native simplicity, they cannot but afford an agreeable Entertainment to the Reader (1st page of dedication).

I find the phrase “native simplicity” to be quite interesting. On the one hand, the editor seems to indicate that there is something pristine and wonderful about this text by a working class poet. On the other hand, the editor seems to point to the fact that an edition by a traditional poet may be considered more literary. In other words, they seem to be lauding Leapor’s poetry while very cautiously distancing themselves from it. The inherent tension here is embodied in what Greene describes as “primitivism”: “The primitive poet was thought to compose directly from nature, hence spontaneously, artlessly, and without forethought either of design or audience. The primitive poet was therefore unencumbered by tradition or textuality. Such a talent was already complete and could undergo no education or development.”

The primitive poet held a certain fascination for readers of the eighteenth century. Greene continues, “...it became possible through claims of natural genius for labouring-class poets to command the interest of readers and critics of a higher class.” The editor’s decision to mention the “native simplicity” of the writer, thus, speaks to the appeal of the primitive poet with an

---

49 Greene, *Mary Leapor*, 158.
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eighteenth-century readership and an upper-class subscriber list, which this edition
certainly has.

Following the previous statement, the editor lauds the virtue and talent of Leapor
as a person and as a poet: “her conduct and behaviour entirely corresponded with those
virtues and pious Sentiments which are conspicuous in her poems” (2nd and final page of
dedication). This comment fulfills the obligatory mention of Leapor’s humility. The
editor insists that while Mrs. Leapor lived in obscurity, her greatness will live on in her
poems. However, they can make this claim about her talent as a poet because the readers
have already been assured of this working-class woman poet’s virtue and humility.

The letter that serves as preface in the second volume seems to be written by
Bridget Fremantle, as it is a first hand account of her friendship with Leapor. It is not
entirely clear who the letter is from, as no credit is given, and who the letter is addressed
to is also uncertain, as the salutation is simply addressed “To John * * * * *, Esq.” I
think it is important that the editor(s) chose to include this letter. First, Fremantle
affectionately reflects on her friendship with Leapor, which is an effective emotional
appeal, but it is also a helpful reminder that without assistance Leapor’s poetry might
never have been published. Second, Fremantle mentions time and again the financial
situation of Mary Leapor. In other words, her poetry is all the more impressive
considering she was not formally educated.

Fremantle reflects on the correspondence she maintained with Leapor: “I was so
far from thinking it a Condescension to cultivate an Acquaintance with a Person in her
Station, that I rather esteem’d it an Honour to be call’d a Friend to one in whom there
appear’d such a true Greatness of Soul as with me far outweigh’d all the Advantages of
Birth and Fortune” (xxi-xxii). The fact that Fremantle asserts that it was not a condescension to befriend Leapor is to a certain degree a condescension. However, there is also sincerity here when she refers to Leapor as a true friend.

Also, Fremantle explains that Leapor has been “accused of stealing from other Authors; but I believe very unjustly” (xxiii). The author of this letter defends her strenuously. She insists,

I, that was so well acquainted with her Way of Thinking, dare venture to answer for her, that it proceeded from the Impression the Reading those Passages some time before happen’d to make upon her Mind, without her remembering from whence they came; and therefore she can no more be reckon’d a Plagiary on that Account, than a Person could justly be accused of being a Thief, for making use of a Shilling or two of another’s Money that happen’d to be mix’d with his own, without his knowing it (xxiv).

This defense of Leapor continues for quite some time. This fact also highlights why the letter was included. It is an attempt to exonerate Leapor from any claims of plagiarism.

It is also noteworthy that the second volume was not as successful as the first volume. Greene explains its lackluster reception: “The simplest reason for the disappointing subscription is that the novelty of a kitchen-maid poet had dissipated in the four years since the first subscription, especially among the gentry around Brackley who might now observe Philip Leapor enjoying the fruits of the first volume. Yet in some quarters the second volume confirmed the poet’s reputation.”

Lastly, this letter laments the death of Leapor at such a young age, and a letter by Leapor is included in which Leapor implores her patron to look after her father by trying to procure funds through some sort of edition of her poetry. Fremantle indicates that she was true to Leapor’s request. She contacts Leapor’s father, gets some biographical

51 Ibid., 29.
background from him, and compiles a list of Leapor’s poems in order to facilitate Leapor’s wish. She ends the letter in the following manner:

I think it is now high time to apologize for this long letter: But as I was resolved to send the best Account I could, I hope, Sir, you will excuse me. It is not for me to pretend to do Justice to the Memory of Mrs. LEAPOR; but if you think any of the little Incidents I have mention’d will be useful to the Gentlemen who have so kindly form’d that Design, and give them a true idea of her, I shall be much pleased (xxxi).

This letter is important in that it gives background information, contributes more to the poet’s virtuous persona, and defends the credibility of the poet. Furthermore, it highlights the friendship between Fremantle and Leapor. The friendship and support of Fremantle were largely responsible for the publication of the edition.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Frontispiece is a portrait of Catharine Cockburn.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Table of contents included in both volumes.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: No preface or advertisement included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: 48 page biography by the editor, Thomas Birch.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: Two volumes of Cockburn’s prose and drama.
9) FOOTNOTES: Limited footnotes clarifying names and other information.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix.
The *Dictionary of National Biography* addresses Thomas Birch’s skill as biographer: “His biographies were held in such high esteem that his memoirs of Chillingworth, Mrs. Cockburn, Cudworth, Du Fresnoy, Greaves, Rev. James Hervey, Milton, and Raleigh were prefixed to editions of their works, which appeared between 1742 and 1753.” It is fitting then that there is no editorial preface but, rather, a biography of the author in Birch’s edition of Cockburn’s works. Furthermore, his editorial approach is evident in various remarks in his biographical sketch of her. In the opening paragraph, Birch informs the reader that understanding the experience of the writer “casts light upon their works” (i). This comment by Birch indicates that the scholarly editor should embellish the edition with helpful biographical information.

In this first paragraph Birch points out that his edition of Cockburn’s work is important because she is a woman writer who “raised our ideas of [women’s] intellectual powers, by an example of the greatest extent of understanding and correctness of judgment, united to all the vivacity of imagination” (i-ii). This statement reveals Birch’s admiration for Cockburn as a woman writer—a feminist editorial statement to say the least. Birch also frames Cockburn’s writings as important to literary, historical, and philosophical discourse in a way that transcends gender. He explains that her works are “a study of real philosophy, and a theology truly worthy of human [emphasis mine] nature, and its all-perfect author” (ii). He strongly asserts that Cockburn’s work merits attention for various fields of study.

---

In the pages that follow, Birch provides a thorough biography of Cockburn’s life. Birch describes her parents, siblings, upbringing, and education, and he then moves into a history of her works. He outlines her early success as a playwright by describing her contributions to drama, both comedies and tragedies. Birch supplements this discussion of her plays by incorporating letters and reviews by her contemporaries, as well as quotes from dedications of her plays. Cockburn’s talent is amplified by Birch’s decision to include two letters from William Congreve that express appreciation for a dedication Cockburn wrote in honor of Congreve and commentary on character development and plot in one of her plays. In the dedication of another play, *The Unhappy Penitent*, Cockburn comments on the treatment of passion in drama. She refers to Shakespeare, Dryden, Otway, and Lee. Note that by referring to such pre-eminent dramatists, Cockburn unabashedly participates in a discourse with them. It is significant, however, that Birch paraphrases Cockburn: “the most that can, in her opinion, be allowed [is] that passion is to be the noblest frailty of the mind; but it is a frailty, and becomes a vice, when cherished as an exalted virtue” (xiii). This is an interesting characterization in light of these editions by women. Birch does break new ground when he says that Cockburn considered passion to be “noble”; however, he also makes sure that the reader understands that Cockburn also considered passion to be a “frailty.” The fact that Birch chooses to paraphrase Cockburn highlights his careful framing of this discussion of passion. As a woman playwright, Cockburn, and by default Birch, must not overemphasize the theme of passion in drama.

Subsequently, Birch focuses on Cockburn’s “Defence of Mr. Locke’s *Essay of Human Understanding*.” Cockburn published this defense anonymously in May of 1702.
Birch explains that Cockburn’s identity as writer of this defense was quickly realized. He also includes letters from E. Burnet and John Locke lauding Cockburn for her participation in the important discourse on Locke’s “Essay of Human Understanding” in which Cockburn strenuously argues for the veracity of Locke’s theories. E. Burnet states that “I confess I cannot but repeat what I ever think, and have generally found, so sure a mark of a good judgment, modesty, and freedom from affectation, which is alone a beauty, but when accompanied with other excellencies, makes them much more valuable, and the want of them makes wit and knowledge itself disagreeable” (xviii). With good reason, Locke’s letter is full of praise and gratitude. He says, “Give me leave therefore to assure you, that as the rest of the world take notice of the strength and clearness of your reasoning, so I cannot but be extremely sensible, that it was employed in my defence” (xx). Locke’s praise of Cockburn was prolific. As The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy explains, “. . . he presented Cockburn with a substantial gift of money and books in appreciation.”

Birch spends considerable time discussing Cockburn’s religious ideas: her Catholic faith, subsequent doubt of that faith, and her conversion to the Church of England. At this point, Birch describes the historical and biographical situation in which A Discourse Concerning a Guide in Controversies; in Two Letters: Written to one of the Church of Rome, By a Person Lately Converted from That Communion was written and published. In this pamphlet, Cockburn does not shy away from the contentious religious discussions of her day. Catherine M. Rodriguez explains,

Although raised Anglican, Trotter converted to Catholicism at a young age and continued in the Roman Catholic Church until 1707. Trotter’s own spiritual conflict

---

gave impetus to [A Discourse Concerning a Guide in Controversies], in which she discusses the problem of denominational Christianity. Trotter’s primary contention with the Roman Catholic Church centers around the belief in the infallibility of the church to underpin the authority of Christianity and the Scriptures.54

Birch describes the difficulties Cockburn endured in determining whether or not to stay in the Catholic Church. Birch states,

In the latter end of that year [1706], or the beginning of the following, her doubts about the Romish religion, which she has so many years professed, having led her to a thorough examination of the grounds of it, by consulting the best books on both sides of the question, and advising with men of the best judgment, the result of it was a conviction of the falseness of the pretensions of that church, and a return to that of England, to which she had adhered during the rest of her life (xxix-xxx).

Birch must walk a fine line in describing Cockburn’s religious conversion. He is, after all, in the midst of a biography of a woman playwright and moral philosopher, and he would want to avoid alienation of eighteenth-century readers. Furthermore, he does not want to portray Cockburn as an individual who vacillates morally or philosophically. He frames Cockburn as a woman who struggles with the decision and decides on moral grounds to leave the Catholic Church. In so doing, Birch can maintain her persona as a capable moral philosopher and a virtuous woman writer.

Birch places background information regarding Catharine Trotter’s marriage to Mr. Cockburn and their family life together in the latter pages of the biography. He explains, “Mrs. Cockburn, after her marriage, was intirely diverted from her studies for many years, by attending upon the duties of a wife and a mother, and by the ordinary cares of an increasing family, and the additional ones arising from the reduced circumstances of her husband” (xxxv). In this segment of the biography, Birch emphasizes Cockburn’s moral virtue in choosing to focus on marriage. Birch says, “And

as piety was the ground of their mutual affection, so their chief view in their union was the improvement of themselves in that great principle of all religious and moral excellence, and the assistance of each other in the duties flowing from it’” (xxxiii). Birch does not express a sense of regret that Cockburn gave up writing for the sake of her marriage and family; in fact, he lauds her for it. Interestingly, however, he does not elaborate on Cockburn’s experience as a mother. Toward the end of the biography he indicates that she and her husband were survived by “one son, who is Clerk of the Cheque at Chatham, and two daughters” (xlvi).^55

Ultimately, she could not stay out of the discourse on Locke’s ideas or moral philosophy. Later in life, she published her numerous letters in response to Dr. Holdsworth, who was a detractor of Locke’s philosophy. She also published Remarks upon some Writers in the Controversy concerning the Foundation of moral Duty and moral Obligation as well as The History of the Works of the Learned. At this point, Birch includes a letter to Alexander Pope that Cockburn never sent. The letter is important in that it once again shows Cockburn’s interest in the literary discourse of her day. In this letter, she expresses appreciation for the wit, reason, and moral perspective that Pope’s works provide.

Birch concludes the biography by explaining how Cockburn wanted to collect her texts in a complete edition, but she did not have the time or wherewithal in light of her husband’s death and her own decline. He effectively explains the importance of the collection of her works that he is currently presenting:

But her abilities as a writer, and the merit of her works, will not have full justice done them, without a due attention to the peculiar circumstances, in which they

^55 Birch may have been wrong here. Joanne Shattock states that “They had two sons and one daughter.” From The Oxford Guide to British Women Writers, 434.
were produced; her early youth, when she wrote some; her very advanced age, and ill state of health, when she drew up others; the uneasy situation of her fortune, during the whole course of her life; and an interval of near twenty years, in the vigor of it, spent in the cares of family, without the least leisure for reading or contemplation: After which, with a mind so long diverted and encumbered, resuming her studies, she instantly recovered its intire powers, and in the hours of relaxation from her domestic employments pursued, to their utmost limits, some of the deepest inquiries, of which the human mind is capable (xlviii).

Birch ends his biography on this impressive note. He reiterates in this passage the challenges of being a woman writer in the eighteenth-century, and he reinforces the high quality of Cockburn’s contributions to eighteenth-century literature, philosophy, and theology.

Birch certainly provides a lengthy biography that elaborates on many facets of Cockburn’s interesting and complex life. However, modern scholars are not entirely impressed with his edition of her works. Sophia B. Blaydes is adamant about Birch’s failure as a scholarly editor:

Shifts in taste may justify Trotter’s literary oblivion, but it just may be that Thomas Birch unwittingly hastened it. A minister and historian, Birch published a two volume edition of Trotter’s work (1751) that emphasized her life after 1706. To Birch Trotter brought honor to her sex by “a genius equal to most . . . in the study of a real philosophy, and a theology worthy of human nature, and its all-perfect author.” As evidence, he printed 916 pages of Trotter’s philosophical and religious works, leaving 115 pages for a play and some poems.56

Blaydes, with good reason, takes exception to Birch’s inclusion of only one of Cockburn’s plays, The Fatal Friendship. She laments Birch’s omission of Agnes de Castro, Love at a Loss, and The Unhappy Penitent. Furthermore, the fact that Cockburn’s epistolary novel, Olinda’s Adventures, does not appear in the edition, Blaydes considers to be a particularly grave oversight on Birch’s part. One can only conjecture as to Birch’s reason(s) for not including all of her works. Perhaps, like other

editors, he was more comfortable with Cockburn’s philosophical and religious texts. The themes of love, marriage, and passion, so prevalent in eighteenth-century drama, which also holds true for Cockburn’s plays, did not fit the persona he created of her in his biography.

In Birch’s defense, the title of the edition uses the word “works,” not the phrase “complete works.” Furthermore, the title lists the contents of the edition as *Works of Mrs. Catharine Cockburn, Theological, Moral, Dramatic, and Poetical*; in other words, Birch may have been most interested in her religious and philosophical texts, which is evidenced in the order in which the works appear in the edition. Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that the most anthologized of Cockburn’s plays is *The Fatal Friendship*, which is the only play that appears in this edition. These early editors, then, had significant sway in terms of the legacy of these authors. Birch constructs a persona of Cockburn as an effective theologian and philosopher, and he overlooks her contributions to drama and poetry. Nonetheless, he published a collected works of a writer that might otherwise have been relegated to complete obscurity.


Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** No illustration included.
2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page included.
3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** Table of contents included.
4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** No acknowledgment or dedication included.

---

57 Note that my annotation for this edition is based on the 1781 edition of this text, which was printed in London by J. Tonson, J. Hodges, J. Wren, and A. Millar.
Stephen and Lee explain that “Of singularly retiring disposition Reed wrote little. His vocation was mainly that of commentator or editor, and almost all his publications were issued anonymously. He would prefer, he wrote in 1778, to stand in the pillory rather than put his name to a book.”58 This is most certainly the case for his edition of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s *Poetical Works*. There is no dedication, preface, advertisement, and no biography. In fact, his name does not appear on the title page. This is most certainly one of the more unique editorial approaches included in this study.

Reed does include some interesting footnotes throughout the edition. On the whole these footnotes provide literary and historical commentary on a given poem or the experience of the poet. There are two lengthy footnotes. In the first, he provides limited background on the squabble between Montagu and Alexander Pope in a three page footnote to “Verses Addressed to the Imitator of the First Satire of the Second Book of Horace.” Reed suggests that Pope’s “The First Satire of the Second Book of Horace,” and in particular two lines from the poem, “which were supposed to point at Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, under the name Sappho” (63-64), was the cause of the famous falling

---

out. Interestingly, Reed does not state definitively that the “Satire” by Pope or Montagu’s poetic response were the root cause; rather, Reed explains that the cause of the quarrel is “not easy, at the distance of time, to discover” (64) and that the blame “must be left to the reader’s determination” (65). Reed does not condemn or condone Pope’s or Montagu’s role. True to his unobtrusive nature, he tries to stay out of the famous disagreement and just provide the basic details. In the second lengthy footnote, he relates for the reader the historical narrative that is the subject matter for Montagu’s “Epistle from Arthur Grey, the Footman.” Reed explains, “This man was footman to a gentleman, whose daughter, a married lady, he attempted to ravish” (83). The poem was significant and unique, Carol Barash asserts, in that it was “written in the voice of a working-class man who has been accused of raping his employer’s sister, [and] transforms the speaker into a romantic hero denied access to his love because of his class.” Reed’s footnote provides background on the crime and the trial.

For the sake of this particular chapter on editions by women it is difficult to find editorial commentary by Reed in which he constructs the persona or the poetry of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu in a certain light due to her gender. However, the fact that he tries to represent her fairly in his footnote that clarifies the argument between Montagu and Pope is, to a certain degree, a defense of Montagu. The fact that the other lengthy footnote is a description of a violent crime against a woman may also have significance in feminist terms. Considered as a whole, Reed allows the poetry by Montagu to speak for itself. Mary Comfort provides a helpful characterization of Montagu’s poetic voice: “[Montagu’s] poetry, essays, and letters show her concerns as a feminist and as a

---

Reed’s decision as editor seems to be to stay out of the way and let readers experience Montagu’s poetry. Interestingly, this may have been in line with the wishes of Montagu herself. Carol Barash explains that

[Montagu] seems indirectly to have allowed some of her later satires into print, and she had a strong sense of possessing the verses she had written. According to Spence, when Pope attempted to edit one of her poems, she told him, “no, Pope, no touching, for then whatever is good for any thing will pass for yours, and the rest for mine.” And in her copy of Pope’s Eloisa to Abelard (1720), she wrote “mine” in the margin beside a couplet she believed he had stolen from her. There were numerous similar episodes in the long and fierce battle between Montagu and Pope.

Reed’s unobtrusive approach to editing is appropriate for this edition in that he allows Montagu to “possess” her own poetry.

**John Conder, ed. *Songs in the Night; By a Young Woman Under heavy Afflictions.*


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustration included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included. Title page includes an epigraph: “‘Who giveth Songs in the Night.’—Job xxxv 10.”
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: “Table of First Lines” included in edition.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included in edition.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: Editorial preface included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography included.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of devotional poetry/hymns.
9) FOOTNOTES: Two footnotes included (pages 182 and 184).
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included in edition.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included in edition.

---

61 Carol Barash, “Lady Mary Wortley Montagu,” 149.
62 For this annotation Note that I use the 1807 edition, the second American edition, published by Stephen G. Ustick in Burlington, New Jersey.
12) APPENDIX: A supplement entitled “A Remarkable Scene in the Author’s Life” appears at the end of the volume. I am not sure if this appeared in the first edition.

13) INDEX: No index included in edition.

14) SIZE: Sextodecimo.

John Conder, the editor of this edition, begins his preface with a description of Harrison’s humility: “Suffice it to say of this Publication, that the AUTHOR of it is a very obscure young woman, and quite destitute of the advantages of education, as under great bodily affliction” (iii). Condor makes clear in the first sentence of his preface that Harrison was a laboring-class poet. As the Dictionary of National Biography explains, Harrison was a “Religious poetess, probably born at Ipswich in 1752, of poor parents, entered domestic service when sixteen. Four years after [she began working] illness permanently invalided her.” However, Condor is not only interested in communicating to the reader Harrison’s modest station in life. He also reveals in his preface that Harrison is a virtuous and faithful woman. He explains that

But GOD, who is rich in mercy, was pleased, in love to her soul, at the beginning of the affliction, marvellously to manifest himself unto her; and has been instructing her from that time in the things pertaining to his kingdom and the righteousness thereof, as the following poetic performance, which are printed from the author’s own hand writing (who, by the way, LEARNT HERSELF to write), do in some measure witness (iii).

Like most of these women writers, Harrison is framed as a devout woman. Like Rowe’s biographers and prefacers, Conder, too, takes a hagiographical tone when discussing the author of this edition.

Paula Backscheider describes the devotional nature of Harrison’s poetry. First, Harrison was motivated by scripture. These poems “describ[e] the love and joy she

---

Second, Harrison was very interested in Christian community. However, she does not critique that community in the way that Rowe or Barbauld might. As Backscheider explains, “Rowe and Barbauld represent the end points of an unbroken line of Nonconformist women poets who used religious verse fearlessly for social and political protest.” Most of Harrison’s poems focus on the joy of religious community. Third, Harrison’s poetry, like other devotional verse, often focuses on recuperation from her affliction. Ultimately, then, Harrison’s poems do not deal explicitly with gender; she is more interested in the fortitude she gains from these devotional poetic meditations. For instance, this devotional tone is apparent in the fifth stanza of Hymn CVII: “How sweet the pastures where I rove! / How rich the fruits of Jesu’s love! / Here would my soul for ever stay, / No more, my Shepherd, let me stray.” Backscheider explains how Harrison “heightens the mood” in her hymns to allow for spiritual reflection, and that worshipful tone is definitely evident in the previous lines.

It is also astounding that an under studied poet such as Harrison met with great success in terms of readership. By 1823, a fifteenth edition of Songs in the Night was published. As is so often the case, poetry by women, and devotional poetry by women in particular, which was published and read prolifically in the eighteenth century, became obscure due to a lack of scholarly interest.

---

65 Ibid., 147.

Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustration included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Table of contents included. William Cowper includes an epigraph on the title page: “And sighs shall sooner fail than cause to sigh. Young’s Night Thoughts.”
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: One page Advertisement included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biographical background by the editor appears in the edition.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants, errors, or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of poetry by Frances Maria Cowper.
9) FOOTNOTES: No footnotes included.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included.
13) INDEX: No index included.
14) SIZE: Duodecimo.

William Cowper reveals Frances Maria Cowper’s anxiety about publishing her poetry in the first paragraph of the editorial Advertisement. He states, “The writer of the following Poems thinks it necessary to apologize to the public for obtruding upon them a Work of this nature, particularly at a period when productions of the highest merit are daily pressing forward to engage their attention” (iii). This introductory statement frames the author as a humble and even self-effacing woman poet. Furthermore, Frances Maria Cowper is motivated to write and share her poetry out of a sense of piety. William Cowper explains this motivation on the part of the poet: “These Poems are the genuine

67 Note that this annotation is based on the 1793 edition published in Philadelphia by William Young.
fruits of retirement and leisure; and were occasioned by such a series of adverse events, as led the Author to a peculiar habit of contemplating the ways of an all-wise, over-ruling Providence, and to the experience of that solid happiness in the present life, which often begins where worldly prosperity ends” (iv). Interestingly, this description of the poet’s humility and spirituality highlights the editor’s successful effort to construct the poet and, hence, the poetry as virtuous. Frances Maria Cowper, like so many of these women authors and poets, is portrayed first and foremost as highly moral. Immediately after this advertisement, the table of contents appears, followed by the poetry. The reader gets to subsequently and immediately experience the spiritual poetry after the brief introductory advertisement. William Cowper provides his succinct commentary, and he then allows the poetry to speak for itself. For example, Frances Maria Cowper’s poem, entitled “Prayer,” in which she prays for grace, faith, and forgiveness is a moving meditation. For instance, in line three she states, “Enrich my heart with grace divine.” Her poems are spiritual, but they are not simple devotional verses. In “Written in Sickness,” she reminds the reader of the difficulty of physical pain, and she inspires the reader by reflecting on her faith: “Freely I to God resign / Whatever is accounted mine; / Seeking only to be blest / In his love’s eternal rest. / Oh the bliss of pains that tend / Right toward so sweet an end!” (1-6). These poems are devotional, meditative, and powerful. They certainly deserve more scholarly attention.

Unfortunately, there is little to no background information available on Frances Maria Cowper. The entry for “William Cowper” in The Reference Guide to English Literature lists Original Poems by a Lady as an edited text. However, there is no information on Frances Maria Cowper as writer, William Cowper’s role as editor, or
background on the collection of poems in *The Cambridge Biographical Dictionary, The Dictionary of National Biography, The Dictionary of Literary Biography, The Oxford Guide to British Women Writers, British Women Writers: A Critical Reference Guide, The Reference Guide to English Literature, The Oxford Companion to English Literature, MLA International Bibliography*, or *American Bibliography of American Language and Literature*. Ultimately, I decided to do some sleuthing on-line and found a 1911 resource entitled *The Hymns and Hymn Writers of the Church*. In this resource, there is a small biographical notice on Frances Maria Cowper: “COWPER, FRANCES MARIA, was born in England in 1727; and died in 1797. She was the wife of Major Cowper, a sister of the Rev. Martin Madan and a cousin, through her mother, of William Cowper, the poet. Her poems, *Original Poems on Various Occasions, by a Lady* were published in 1792.” Keeping in mind the theme of family in terms of scholarly editing, what is important for this edition may just be how little information there is on Frances Maria Cowper. As the above information indicates, she was William Cowper’s cousin, and he obviously revised her poetry for publication as the title page of the edition indicates. However, there is no commentary about the extent of the revisions, and there is no research that has been done on the textual history of this edition. The collection of poetry, reminiscent of Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s verse, is very devotional in nature. Poems like “Free Grace,” “The Consolation,” “The Christian’s View of Pleasure,” and “The Soul’s Farewell to Earth, and Approaches to Heaven” are poetic exercises in faith and piety. Frances Maria Cowper may have relied on her cousin’s renown to help market

---

68 Thank goodness for Google Books, which is becoming an increasingly helpful resource.
these spiritual and meditative poems. Interestingly, over the course of history, the book seems to have been placed more in his column of achievements than hers.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustration included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No Table of Contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: There is a preface by William Godwin and a preface by Mary Wollstonecraft.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by the editor is included.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: There are no notes on variants, errors, or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of Wollstonecraft’s unfinished novel.
9) FOOTNOTES: Minimal footnotes are used to clarify facts about the text.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: Conclusion of the novel that was written by the editor.
13) INDEX: No index included.
14) SIZE: Duodecimo.

Godwin begins his editorial preface by asserting that a work by a writer as important as Mary Wollstonecraft deserves to be published for the sake of eighteenth-century readers: “there is a sentiment, very dear to minds of taste and imagination, that finds a melancholy delight in contemplating these unfinished productions of genius, these sketches of what, if they had been filled up in a manner adequate to the writer’s conception, would perhaps have given a new impulse to the manners of the world” (v-vi).

---

70 Note that for this annotation I used the 1799 edition published in Philadelphia by James Carey.
In other words, readers may reconcile the loss of a talent like Wollstonecraft by contemplating her final work—the text that occupied her imagination immediately before her death. This very reality is supported by the second section of the editorial preface as Godwin confirms that Wollstonecraft was avidly working on the manuscript, and she was dedicated to the narrative that would become *Maria*.

Although there is no section entitled “Note on the Text,” Godwin does provide some interesting information regarding how he handled the incomplete manuscript. First, he indicates that he had to complete some passages and connect other portions of the manuscript to make them cohesive in terms of the plot of the novel. Also, he indicates in the text where he has added text by placing these lines in brackets. This is especially important because Godwin is acknowledging how important it is for editors to indicate where they have emended or updated a text—this is an unusual practice by eighteenth-century standards. Godwin states, “Wherever such a liberty has been taken, the additional phrases will be found inclosed in brackets; it being the editor’s most earnest desire, to intrude nothing of himself into the work, but to give to the public the words, as well as ideas, of the real author” (vii). Although Godwin’s voice is undeniably present in this edition of Wollstonecraft’s novel, it is significant that Godwin takes steps to try to minimize the impact of his intrusion into the text.

Godwin then includes snippets, or “hints” as he calls them, of Wollstonecraft’s preface. He is not entirely clear about this, but I think what he is trying to explain is that the author’s preface, as it appears in the edition, is made up of notes that suggest what she would have written in her preface had she been able to see the project through to its fruition. This preface is an extremely short (one and one-half pages) and rather
fragmented text. Some paragraphs are merely one sentence or phrase such as, “the sentiments I have embodied” (x). Another paragraph may scratch the surface of what Wollstonecraft may have been trying to achieve in terms of character development and theme. She states, “in the invention of the story, this view restrained my fancy; and the history ought rather to be considered, as of woman, than of an individual” (x). Lastly, Godwin includes in the authorial preface a letter that Wollstonecraft sent to a friend. This letter indicates that the novel is concerned with the institution of marriage, the pitfalls of love, and the “wrongs of woman” in marriage and love during the eighteenth century.

Lastly, Godwin’s role as editor becomes particularly interesting in that he takes it upon himself to try to finish the novel. Using Wollstonecraft’s notes and what he knew of the novel and her attitude toward it, Godwin pieces together a possible conclusion. He divides the conclusion into numbered sections. He also uses quotation marks to indicate Wollstonecraft’s text and brackets to indicate editorial intrusions into the text. Also, footnotes are used to clarify some portions of text by Wollstonecraft that may be vague because they are in draft form. Ultimately, Godwin believes he has been true to Wollstonecraft’s vision. He states,

It was particularly the design of the author, in the present instance, to make her story subordinate to a great moral purpose, that ‘of exhibiting the misery and oppression, peculiar to women, that arise out of the partial laws and customs of society,—This view, restrained her fancy.’* It was necessary for her, to place in a striking point of view, evils that are too frequently overlooked, and to drag into light those details of oppression, of which the grosser and more insensible part of mankind make little account (232).

*See Author’s Preface.

In this final excerpt of Godwin’s conclusion to Wollstonecraft’s Maria we see an editor who acknowledges his role in completing and publishing the text and an editor who works very hard to make the edition about Mary Wollstonecraft.
While Godwin certainly makes efforts to be clear about his editorial role, modern scholars and critics rightfully challenge Godwin’s intrusion into the text. For instance, Daniel O’Quinn states,

Godwin’s attempts to smooth out the plot re-orient Maria and effectively disable Wollstonecraft’s performative critique of the ideology of sentimental fiction. If Wollstonecraft’s resistance to literature constitutes a historically specific critique of what she sees as egregious development in bourgeois self-stylization, then Godwin’s interventions in Maria are no less of an index of the difficulties of class consolidation.\textsuperscript{71}

Tilottama Rajan also takes issue with Godwin’s editorial approach: “Moreover, while the Wrongs is unfinished, its editing fragments it further. Godwin reconstructed the text from at least two manuscript states, and informs us that it was revised ‘several’ times . . . ”\textsuperscript{72} Reflecting on the previous two observations by modern critics, Godwin is characterized as an editor who took liberties with the manuscript and, to a certain degree, did not understand the nuances of the novel. Furthermore, Mitzi Myers explains, “Maria is flawed, yet its very roughness shows to advantage Wollstonecraft’s delicate auctorial balancing act, her coalition of ‘female Werter’ and rational reformer.”\textsuperscript{73} The novel, modern scholars seems to be saying time again, did not need to be finished. It should have been left in its more pristine unfinished state.

When examined through a feminist lens, however, Godwin’s editorial role becomes further complicated. Gerard Goggin explains that “Godwin’s textual strategies reinforce his powerful role as mentor. Godwin’s editorial maneuvers are nonetheless at odds with a different possible reading of Wollstonecraft’s own political and aesthetic project in Wrongs of Woman, namely, that of representing women differently by finding

\textsuperscript{71} Daniel O’Quinn, “Wollstonecraft, Godwin, and the Resistance to Literature,” ELH 64.3 (Fall 1997): 761.
new conventions in which to plot their utter imprisonment in the tyrannical institution of marriage.”

Godwin’s editorial work in the “Editor’s Preface,” “Author’s Preface,” and “Conclusion by the Editor,” are, as Goggin explains, “liminal maneuvers,” which undermine the feminist commentary taking place in the novel and patronize Wollstonecraft.

However, the eighteenth-century urge to improve a literary text is well-documented. Pope famously took it upon himself to rewrite Shakespeare’s plays correctly through his use of right reason and judgment. Pope states in his preface to his edition of Shakespeare that “it is impossible to repair the Injuries already done [to Shakespeare’s plays]; too much time has elaps’d, and the materials are too few. In what I have done I have rather given a proof of my willingness and desire, than of my ability, to do him justice.” Conceivably, the endeavor of editing a text by a family member, either memoirs, collection of poetry, or novel, could prove even more difficult. Whether out of love, family loyalty, or pride, these family editors may feel especially attentive to correcting errors, as well as particularly compelled to emend the text. In short, these texts matter to them more than a text might matter to a typical editor, which is significant in that editors who are not related to the author are also very invested in their editorial enterprise.

Eighteenth-century readers took issue with Godwin’s treatment of Wollstonecraft in Maria, as well as in his Memoirs of her. Elise Knapp notes that “Many readers were

---


75 Ibid., from the title.

offended by Godwin’s frankness, judging the revelation of her affairs and her suicidal tendencies indecorous. Twentieth-century readers, however, find the book an invaluable source of information and interpretation.\textsuperscript{77} All in all, Godwin’s voice intrudes on the legacy and texts of Wollstonecraft; this intrusion is understandably and simultaneously met with appreciation and disapproval.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 91.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Portrait of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu is included prior to the title page of the first volume
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page is included
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No table of contents included (although a brief list of headings without page numbers appears at the beginning of each volume)
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included in the edition
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: The editor includes a three page Advertisement.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: Dallaway wrote a 115 page “Memoirs of the Right Honourable Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, by the

Editor.” The first 105 pages are the story of her life, and the final ten pages focus specifically on Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s talent as a writer.

7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: there is no separate portion of text dedicated to variants and editorial emendations; however, at the end of the memoirs, Dallaway explains his treatment of the copy-text and his stance on emendation.

8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: five volumes of letters, poems, and essays
9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes appear throughout the five volumes
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included
13) INDEX: Index to the entire edition appears at the end of the fifth volume
14) SIZE: Sextodecimo

To begin, Dallaway’s first statement appears in the Advertisement. In this section, Dallaway outlines how “no single production, either in prose or verse, already printed and attributed to Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, had ever received the sanction of herself, or her representatives” (iii). Isobel Grundy confirms this in the introduction to Montagu’s Selected Letters:

When she transcribed her letters written on the embassy of Turkey, she distributed them among nine identified and some anonymous recipients; her notes name another sixteen people she wrote to during this time (ranging from her father and younger sister to Mademoiselle von Schulenburg and the Duchess of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel), whose names she did not display in her privately circulated travel book.78

Dallaway assures the reader that out of respect to Montagu, he is only including letters, essays, and poems that he has received from Montagu’s grandson, the Marquis of Bute. This seems to be a statement of respect toward Montagu’s wishes, as well as the wishes of her descendents. This is also an acknowledgment that numerous manuscript copies of Montagu’s works had been circulating for years. Carol Barash explains, “After years of her poems being sneaked into print a few at a time, without her knowledge of their

publication, she was outraged to discover that they had been sloppily edited and some of them attributed to others when they appeared in Dodsley’s *Collection of Poems by Several Hands* in 1748.”

The remainder of the Advertisement lauds Lord Bute and Montagu. Dallaway describes Bute’s contribution as important because he “permit[s] access to the stores of literary amusement, which have descended to him from one of the most accomplished of her sex, in any age or country” (iv). He then compares Montagu to Rochefoucault and Sevigné.

Isobel Grundy’s extensive biography of Montagu does not laud Dallaway for his effort as editor of the edition, especially his connection to Lord Bute. Below is a lengthy excerpt from Grundy’s biography that is printed at length here as it so fully describes the context of publication:

In 1803 James Dallaway brought out his bumbling edition of her *Works*, with much fanfare about its endorsement by her family. The first Marquess of Bute (the grandson who had missed out on Wortley’s fortune) had in fact enlisted Dallaway after facing down a publication scheme of the printing entrepreneur Richard Phillips: a scheme born when Phillips was offered 200 letters purloined by a crooked lawyer after Wortley’s death. Bute exchanged less objectionable letters, for Dallaway to use, against the purloined ones, which he burned. (Their most scandalous tidbits concerned Edward.) He tried to persuade his cousins the erskines to burn the letters to Lady Mary in their possession. He rejected a proposal from Sir James Steuart’s son that they might join forces to publish the letters they each owned: Steuart went ahead on his own in 1818 with Lady Mary’s letters to his parents. John Francis Erskine, in whom the attainted Mar title was soon to be restored, acted much like his cousin Bute in turning down a proposal from the publisher Constable to print Lady Mary’s letters to her sister. By 1826 Lady Louisa Stuart, who had not been consulted in 1803, was planning on an improved edition.

Despite the honest efforts that her family put into the edition of 1837 and the professional skill of W. Moy Thomas in 1861, no halfway decent edition of Montagu’s writing appeared before those of Robert Halsband, more than a century later on.

---


It is difficult to ascertain what is more concerning in the above passage: the fact that numerous letters by Montagu were destroyed, or the fact that the quality of the edition was affected by the shameless squabbling of family and individuals in the industry who hoped for financial gain. Grundy’s passage illustrates that Dallaway’s claim of credibility should be considered carefully; the letters he received from Lord Bute were far from a complete sampling.

In Dallaway’s memoirs of Montague, which take up a considerable space in volume one of the edition, he spends over one hundred pages outlining the life and times of Montagu:

1) Background on her parents.
2) Details of family life.
3) Her schooling.
4) Her friends.
5) Her marriage to Edward Wortley Montagu.
6) Their journey to and experience in Turkey.
7) Textual history of Lady Mary’s manuscripts.
8) A mention of the small pox inoculation given to her son in Turkey.
9) Lady Mary’s friendship with Alexander Pope and their famous quarrel (numerous letters between them—some transcribed and some reproductions are included in the memoirs).
10) Lady Mary’s investment in and knowledge of the South Seas Scheme.
11) Background on Lady Mary’s pivotal role in bringing the small pox inoculation to England.
12) Lady Mary in eighteenth-century English society.
13) Dallaway includes her correspondence with the literary greats of the eighteenth century, such as Edward Young and Henry Fielding.
14) Her experience on the continent as her health declined.
15) There is no description of her children or her experience as mother.

It is significant that Dallaway does not spend considerable time focusing on Montagu as virtuous wife and mother. This makes these memoirs and the treatment of the author unique in the category of editions of texts by women. As opposed to focusing on
Montagu’s domestic virtue, he focuses on her travels, her talent as writer, and her place in literary society.

Montagu’s travels, and especially her letters from her tenure in Turkey, warrant specific focus, as they are given attention in Dallaway’s biography; they are relevant to her correspondence, which appears in all five volumes of the edition; and they placed her on the literary map. Mary Comfort states, “In 1712 [Lady Mary Wortley Montagu] eloped with Edward Wortley Montagu, appointed Ambassador Extraordinary to the Court of Turkey in 1716. Journeying with her husband to Constantinople, M. began to write the letters that would establish her reputation as an author.”

Edward Wortley Montagu, caught in the web of diplomatic complexities that defined the region at the moment, met with little success in his capacity as ambassador. His wife, on the other hand, immersed herself in the culture and in letter writing. Elizabeth Joyce says, “She learned Turkish, explored Constantinople in disguise, used the advantage of gender to penetrate the exotic mysteries of the seraglio, and was sufficiently impressed by the practice of inoculation against smallpox to have the operation carried out on her little son and to campaign for its introduction in England.”

Her efforts led to the introduction of the inoculation in England. Her letters expressed how engaged she was with the experience. Isobel Grundy characterizes the tone in her letters:

She regaled Pope with the more literary aspects of her recent journey, and with the love-life of Turkish women, and Conti with theological and cultural analysis gleaned from Achmet-Beg. For Lady Bristol she contrasted English and Turkish styles in politics (implying that Hanoverian rule was best) and in fabrics. She wrote about ‘Small pox’ both to her father, who was a friend of Dr. Garth, and to court friends (as Sir Hans Sloane later recorded). This was her first report on

---

inoculation. She had found it practiced by both the local cultures, Turkish and Greek; and she probably found it not by chance but because she was looking. She was primed both by personal experience and by intellectual contact as an Enlightenment researcher.\textsuperscript{83}

Her letters, then, reflect her interaction with Turkish culture and her attitude toward that culture as she narrates her experience to her friends and family in England.

Scholars seem to struggle with the convergence of themes of gender and colonialism in Montagu’s letters from Turkey. Teresa Heffernan’s “Feminism Against the East/West Divide: Lady Mary’s Turkish Embassy Letters” provides some useful critical history. Heffernan explains that some scholars focus on the gendered aspect of the letters and find that they “resist the standard of orientalist tropes.”\textsuperscript{84} Other scholars have concluded that Lady Mary’s letters reveal “complicity between orientalism and Western feminism.”\textsuperscript{85} Heffernan examines the letters with a focus on the commentary on Islam. She ultimately argues that “Lady Mary challenges this particular orientalist narrative.”\textsuperscript{86} But it is a concession by Heffernan that is most interesting and effective. She states,

As these debates in the scholarship suggest, it would be reductive either to dismiss Lady Mary’s text as irredeemably orientalist or to herald it as unquestionably feminist. The complicated nexus of her personal life, her role as public figure, her blue-blood allegiances, the intellectual circle she traveled in, and race and class biases complicate any attempts to endorse her as a perfect cultural ambassador, bridging the divide between Eastern and Western women.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{83} Isobel Grundy, \textit{Lady Mary Wortley Montagu}, 144.
\textsuperscript{84} Teresa Heffernan, “Feminism Against the East/West Divide: Lady Mary Turkish Embassy Letters,” \textit{Eighteenth-Century Studies} 33, no. 2 (2000): 201.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., 202.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 203.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 202.
These letters were intriguing for eighteenth-century readers because of the “complicated nexus” they embodied. Modern scholars have clarified the colonial discourse in the letters, but they have certainly not resolved the complexities.

The final ten pages of Dallaway’s biography are especially important in clarifying his editorial stance. In these final pages, Dallaway includes commentary on her letters to Tobias Smollet and Lord Orford; in this commentary he recognizes the wit and excellence of Montagu’s writing. Dallaway then asserts that were it not for the “mean conduct of Pope” (119), referring to their now infamous literary and social squabble, Montagu’s work might have achieved greater renown. Subsequently, Dallaway explains that Montagu’s prose and poetry are preeminent in the category of writing by women. In other words, Dallaway seems to be saying that because Montagu is a woman her work did not achieve the greatness that it should have—a commentary about the exclusion of women from literary canon. Ultimately, he claims that her writing remained consistently excellent throughout her life: “as she advanced to a certain degree of longevity, the same mind, vigorous and replete with the stores of experience, both in life and literature, maintains its original powers” (122).

Lastly, Dallaway explains his stance toward editorial emendation. He explains that “respecting her letters, as they are now given to the public, the Editor thinks it necessary to add, that having considered how extremely unsettled orthography was, at the period when they were written, he has ventured, in certain instances, to accommodate that of Lady M.W. Montagu to modern usage” (123). This is a strong statement about modernizing copy-text to say the least. However, at the same time, Dallaway explains that he “scrupulously retained” idioms and peculiar phrases by Montagu (123). He insists
that “Lady Mary’s genuine thoughts are best cloathed in her own language; and that all attempts to improve it would tend to destroy the character of her style, and discredit the authenticity of this publication” (124). It is on this note that Dallaway ends his biography. I think it is safe to say Dallaway modernized copy-text but that he tried to stay true to the original text by Montagu. Like other editors of the era, he does not implement a system prior to or in the text that highlights his emendations.
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This text is technically Montagu Pennington’s memoirs of his aunt. However, half of the volume consists of those memoirs, and the other half is comprised of a new edition of Elizabeth Carter’s works. As a result, this text can be treated as an edition, the only exception being that the biographical material is extremely lengthy.

Prior to considering the memoirs, Montagu Pennington begins with a preface, which is quite brief—only four paragraphs. In the preface, Pennington makes the point that he wrote the memoirs of Carter because of her virtuous character: “it is still however his hope, that the work may not be wholly useless; and that the contemplation of so much piety, virtue, and learning, may be attended with better effects than the gratification of mere curiosity; that her precepts and example may serve to rouse the indolent, while they confirm and strengthen the good” (final page of preface). This is in line with other prefaces to editions by women authors in that Pennington immediately refers to moral virtue. This is a claim that showcases his familial pride for his aunt’s character, and it also puts readers at ease in terms of reading a text by a woman. This theme continues in Pennington’s memoirs: “Her character was truly feminine, however strong the powers of her mind might be . . .” (104).
This edition is over 650 pages, including memoirs (by Pennington), poetry, and prose. The memoirs are almost 350 pages—an extensive tribute to the author. Pennington states, “It may be useful, as well as amusing, to be made acquainted with the private lives of those who are publicly known only by their writings; and though they may even be devoid of incident, to see how far their writing and their lives agree with each other; to correct our own conduct by theirs; to copy their virtues, and avoid their errors” (2). This attitude informs the memoirs of Carter that follows. Pennington provides details about

1) Carter’s parents.
2) Her family life as a child.
3) Her education by her father.
4) Her passion and perseverance for learning.
5) The family’s financial losses as a result of the South Seas Bubble.
6) Her success at the “feminine accomplishments” (7) of needlework and music.
7) Publication of her first poems before she was twenty years old.
8) Revered by English society for her talent as a writer: “. . . the fame of her learning, then so rare among women . . .” (32).
9) Her dedication to learning other languages: Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, German, and Portuguese.
10) Her study of the sciences, geography, and religion, astronomy, mathematics, and history.
11) Her religious devotion and piety: “As her piety developed early, so it travelled with her through her life” (15).
12) Her cheerful disposition and love of amusement: “. . . no one delighted more than she did in pleasantry, wit, and lively conversation. She was no stern and rigid monitor, for her religion was in her heart, and not in her countenance . . .” (314).
13) Her decision not to marry, despite a number of worthy offers.
14) Her friendships with Mr. Cave, Dr. Johnson (a friendship that lasted for years), Catharine Talbot, Dr. Secker, Dr. Hayter (first Bishop of Norwich), Samuel Richardson, Sir George Oxenden, Elizabeth Montagu, Sir George Lyttelton, William Pultney (Earl of Bath), Dr. Douglas (Bishop of Salisbury), Mrs. Vesey, the Countess of Holderness, Miss Isabella Sutton, Lady Dartrey, Lord Cremonne, Mrs. D’Arblay, Dr. Burney, Charlotte Finch, and Horace Walpole (two letters from Walpole are included), to name a few.
15) Her success as a translator, especially her famous translation of Epictetus (Pennington describes Carter’s writing process, the incorporation of footnotes, the decision to include an introduction to the translation, the printing process, and the reception of the work).


17) Her devotion to family throughout her life.

18) Her daily routines in Deal and London.

19) Her role in educating her youngest brother (this would be her half brother, as he was Dr. Carter’s son by his second wife).

20) *Poems on Several Occasions*, published in 1762.

21) Her financial freedom as a result of her literary success (this allowed her to procure an apartment and live in London each winter). This would later be supplemented by annuities from William Pultney’s children and Elizabeth Montagu.

22) Her experience traveling the continent with Mr. And Mrs. Montagu, as well as Lord Bath (Pennington includes numerous letters to Miss Talbot detailing this journey).

23) Her generosity to friends, family, and neighbors.

24) The death of her friend, Miss Talbot, in 1772 and her role in publishing Miss Talbot’s works.

25) The death of her father in 1774.

26) Her literary persona: “it was always irksome and painful to her to be held up to view herself as an object of curiosity, and to have persons introduced to her on account of her literary reputation” (301). However, Pennington contends that “it is proper also to mention that a great part of her most intimate friends, though not professed authors, were of a literary turn” (313).

27) Her loyalty to the House of Hanover, as well as the Anglican Church.

28) Her opinion regarding the education of women. Pennington states, “She was much inclined to believe, that women had not their proper station in society, and that their mental powers were not rated sufficiently high” (303).

29) Her trip to Paris in 1782 at 65 years of age (to accompany Miss Pulteney as she prepared to enter the convent).

30) Her travels through England with her friend, Miss Sharpe.

31) How she enjoyed Bluestocking parties, and the friendships that developed as a result of this association. She also attended two other regular gatherings, one at Mrs. Herries’s home and another at Mrs. Hunter’s residence.

32) Her volunteer work on behalf of the poor.

33) Her association with the royal family.

34) The death of her friend, Elizabeth Montagu in 1800.

35) The decline of Carter’s health and her death in 1806.
The relationship between Elizabeth Carter and the editor.

Her funeral, epitaph, and the inscription of the monument erected in her honor at Deal.

Montagu Pennington, Elizabeth Carter’s nephew, expresses throughout this lengthy memoirs affection and admiration for his aunt. He states,

If [Carter’s] purified spirit could look down upon this world, still partaking of moral feelings, it would find no cause for displeasure in this volume. Few persons indeed can know opinions better than the author of it. He always lived with her upon the most affectionate and confidential terms. He had the advantage of being partly educated by her, and of residing a great deal with her at all periods of his life; and for some years previous to his marriage, entirely. After that time he lived very near her, and was happily enabled still more effectually by that connection to smooth the path of her increasing infirmities, and to add to the comforts of her declining years (336).

These reflections showcase the relationship between the editor and author as resembling to a certain degree the relationship of mother and son. Stephen and Lee explain that “for nearly twenty years, beginning about 1788, he resided at Deal with his aunt, in a house which she left to him.”

Carter was obviously an important part of Pennington’s education, upbringing, and adult life. Likewise, Pennington seems to have been a caretaker to his aunt in the twilight of her life. This relationship is important in terms of family editions in that it showcases how essential these family ties can be.

Following the memoirs, Pennington affixes an editorial advertisement prior to the poetry in the volume in which he discusses the inclusion of certain poems. First, he explains that the poems “are all corrected from the author’s manuscripts” (6) with minor notes added. Second, poems from Cave’s edition of 1768 may seem “deficient” in comparison to Mrs. Carter’s other poems because these were written when she was very young (less than 20). Lastly, poems that have never appeared in print were included only if Mrs. Carter had not indicated in manuscript form to omit them. Concerning these

---

never before published poems, the editor “exercise[d] his own discretion concerning them” (7). Aside from this short commentary, Pennington has included no other editorial remarks in the second volume.

Regarding emendations to the text, Judith Hawley provides some helpful insights. She begins her introduction to the second volume of *Bluestocking Feminism: Writings of the Bluestocking Circle, 1738-1785*, which is dedicated to Carter’s work, with some commentary on the relationship between Montagu Pennington and his aunt:

> Our knowledge of the life and works of Elizabeth Carter—poet, translator, essayist, Greek scholar, letter writer and prominent Bluestocking—owes a great deal to the labours of her nephew, the Reverend Montagu Pennington. He bore an enduring reminder of his aunt’s friendships in being named for his godmother, Elizabeth Montagu, and, by preparing Carter’s works for publication he performed a generous act of homage to his aunt and her circle, to whom he felt indebted for his education and advantages. However, like those other worthy nephews, Matthew Montagu and James-Edward Austen-Leigh, in memorializing his aunt, he also embalmed her reputation and insulated her to some extent from further scrutiny. 

Hawley is concerned about how Pennington’s lengthy memoirs of his aunt and his editorial method in compiling her works has shaped her legacy. She continues,

> “Furthermore, his editorial hand is very much in evidence throughout—cutting, pasting, ‘improving,’ and concealing even as he reveals his aunt to his audience.”

Hawley also indicates that the Carter manuscripts have been lost to history, so there is no way to do comparative textual scholarship between the original manuscript and the edition.

However, there are some marks by Pennington that give modern scholars a sense of his editorial approach. The question for modern scholars has become, “Given that our access to many of Carter’s texts is restricted by Pennington’s gate-keeping editorship,

---
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and that our view of them might be restricted by our own modern tendency to privilege the socially and sexually subversive over social and religious conservatism, how can we do justice to the range of achievements and concerns of Carter and the other Bluestockings? Hawley re-casts Carter’s persona, poetry, and prose as much less conservative than Pennington asserts by returning to the texts of her letters, translations, and verse, as well as letters sent to Carter. Keeping in mind Pennington’s penchant for editorial “gate-keeping” is an essential consideration for scholarship of Carter’s works. Hawley consistently reminds readers that biographical material seems to be lacking in her letters most likely because of Pennington’s emendations.

Carter’s translation of Epictetus won her many accolades and fame. Sylvia Harcstark Myers explains that

A twentieth-century translator and bibliographer of Epictetus, W. A. Oldfather, in 1927 called Elizabeth Carter’s translation “a very respectable performance under any conditions, but for her sex and period truly remarkable” (Oldfather, 15). For her contemporary readers and reviewers Elizabeth Carter’s sex had also been important. Pennington claimed that some people could not believe she had done the work; they attributed it to her father or the Bishop (Carter, Memoirs, i. 212).

In short, in the eighteenth century Carter’s translation was a resounding success, transcending expectations, whether gender or literary. Carter realized the challenges that faced women writers of the eighteenth century, and she was probably not surprised by the curiosity of the reading public regarding a woman translator. Carter was uncomfortable throughout her life with the idea of fame and literary success. Jennifer Wallace clarifies the historical circumstance of Carter’s unease: “Carter’s classical learning, then, needs to be understood in the context of the eighteenth-century debate about the exemplary and

---
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polite qualities of women.” Carter was, as a result, in a bind. She was backed into a corner because of her passion for the masculine pursuit of classical translation and the resulting public exposure of her printed translation. Wallace asserts that the focus on virtue in her poetry and translations was an attempt to mollify her anxiety about her role as woman writer. For this reason, too, she frequently shunned life in the literary limelight.

The space between the rock and the hard place where Carter found herself informed her translations and her verse. It also informed her friendships. She had a lasting friendships with the literary men of her day, such as Dr. Johnson and Walpole; however, she was particularly interested in fostering friendships with women writers. In fact, Pennington goes so far as to state, “Another cause which prevented Mrs. Carter from cultivating the society of men of letters in general so much as might have been expected, was also a prejudice, though of a different kind. This was her extreme partiality for writers of her own sex” (303). Carter found texts by women to be generally under appreciated, so she took on the task of appreciating these texts. Her role in the Bluestocking Circle affirms this role. On the whole, however, the tension between virtue and talent persisted throughout her writing career. Carter was an important literary figure, and Pennington’s edition, with all its merits and flaws, reveals the challenges faced by eighteenth-century women authors.

---
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W. Powell Jones provides a useful commentary about the celebrity status experienced by Elizabeth Montagu: “Elizabeth Montagu was vain of her prowess as collector of celebrities, hostess extraordinary, and female savant. But there were other sides to her nature that appear only from consecutive reading of her numerous unpublished letters.”\(^96\) Jones goes on to explain that her letters reveal her “hopes and fears,” and he highlights her keen insights about the socio-cultural realities of eighteenth-

\(^95\) Note that this annotation is based on the AMS Press 1974 facsimile edition of this text.

century London, as well as her commentary about the literary and political personalities who frequented her bluestocking parties. She was a successful, talented, and multifaceted woman, and her letters are an important historical and literary contribution.

The critical discussion of the textual history of the letters reinforces the value of the letters. Jones explains that Matthew Montagu, Elizabeth Montagu’s nephew, heir, executor, and editor, “By requests to her friends still living, [was] able to assemble the majority of her letters to publish four small volumes of letters to 1761, edited with the usual changes to that period.” It has now been clarified that the first two volumes were published in 1809, and the third and fourth volumes were issued in 1813. Since that time, more letters have been collected and published with Matthew Montagu’s original compilation: Emily J. Climenson published an edition in 1906, and Reginald Blunt published an edition in 1923. The collection has swelled to include 3,500 letters that are now housed at the Huntington Library. The list of correspondents included in the collection is astounding: Fanny Boscawen, Elizabeth Vesey, William Wilberforce, Edmund Burke, David Garrick, Samuel Johnson, Hannah More, Joshua Reynolds, Laurence Sterne, and Horace Walpole, to name a few.

Matthew Montagu’s role as editor has been criticized by modern scholars. For instance, Robertson states that “the editorial work fell far short of modern standards and the chronological arrangement (since Montagu seldom fully dated her correspondence) was highly questionable.” Interestingly, the Huntington Library finished cataloguing

97 Ibid., 86.
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100 Ibid., 21.
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102 Ibid., 22.
the letters in their appropriate chronological order in 1952, a date that highlights the
difficulty of the task and the challenge to the original and early editors of Montagu’s
famous letters. However, Matthew Montagu’s willingness to publish the letters despite
the complexity in terms of their chronology, in addition to his efforts at collecting letters
from Elizabeth Montagu’s correspondents, highlight his enormously important role as
editor. He may have fallen short, as so many of the eighteenth-century editors do, of
twenty-first century standards; however, his efforts cannot be overlooked.

The title page of this edition appears with the following basic information about
the editor: the text was simply “published by Matthew Montagu, Esq. M.P., Her Nephew
and Executor.” It would seem that as heir and executor of his Aunt’s estate, Matthew
Montagu has taken the time and effort to publish her letters per her request; however, he
does not include lengthy prefatory statements about his role as editor. There is no
editorial preface to this edition. There are helpful but only occasional footnotes
throughout the edition. Lastly, there is no end matter tacked onto the final volume: no
glossary, no appendix, and no index.

Matthew Montagu’s contribution is evident because he included footnotes and
added a brief biographical treatment of his aunt’s life. In this biography, he frames Mrs.
Montagu as a wealthy woman, a scholar, and a lively and accomplished writer. He
outlines her family history, education, travels, and positive disposition. Matthew
Montagu insists that in order to understand her intellectual passion, it is of the utmost
importance that he includes the letters of Mrs. Montagu’s young life. He states, her early
letters “abound with vivacity and girlish playfulness” (8). Furthermore, he qualifies,
“But not withstanding the embarrassment I feel from the wish of producing nothing
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which may cast a less favourable light upon her disposition, or hurt the feelings of the families connected with the individuals mentioned, I am induced to give extracts from this early correspondence, as they will most naturally exhibit the progress of her mind” (8). Montagu lets the reader know that his editorial method involves including his aunt’s letters as opposed to excluding what might be considered unseemly. His statement is important as it indicates the collection is thorough and mollifies those who might not approve of the completeness of the collection. It suggests editorial credibility in a scholarly sense, but it also indicates his desire to present a complete compilation of his aunt’s letters, which reveals his family loyalty.

After Matthew Montagu’s short biography, Elizabeth Montagu’s correspondence begins. The editor presents a positive picture of Mrs. Montagu, and all in all he does not try to characterize the letters before the reader is able to read them first hand. Montagu remains throughout the front matter and footnotes a fairly unobtrusive editor. It is interesting that Montagu, unlike Godwin, whose edition of Wollstonecraft’s Maria I annotated previously, does not indicate in-text where he has added or removed a letter, or where he has emended the letters. Modern scholars, however, have critiqued his overly protective decisions regarding what letters to include and what letters to exclude from the edition. Elizabeth Eger appreciates the fact that Matthew Montagu included his aunt’s letters from her youth, but she clarifies that

Soon after [Elizabeth Montagu’s] death, her nephew published a selection of her letters written between 1734 and 1761. Comparison between his selection and the original manuscripts reveals Matthew Montagu’s editorial policy to be rather cautious in the face of his aunt’s more passionate epistles to Elizabeth Carter. He also omits details regarding her income and her relationship to her husband which might be of interest to today’s reader.  

Jane Magrath confirms Matthew Montagu’s guiding editorial principle of suppressing passages that revealed too much passion by discussing the exclusion of one letter in particular. She states,

In the Huntington Library’s Montagu Collection, there is a letter from Montagu to Carter that is breathtaking in its intensity and vulnerability and in the power of the bodily metaphor so vividly described. Not surprisingly, this letter is not published in Matthew Montagu’s collection of his aunt’s letters, nor is it mentioned in Emily Climenson’s edition. It is perhaps surprising that Matthew preserved this letter at all or that sections of it did not fall victim to his censoring pen—the brown ink that makes it impossible to read certain words and sentences in a number of the other letters.¹⁰⁵

Magrath goes on to explain that the suppression of “. . . this letter, with its eroticism and its maternity, in which breast milk represents the complex relationship between Montagu and Carter,” Highlights Matthew Montagu’s editorial approach.

Regarding Matthew Montagu’s relationship with his aunt, Carolyn Woodward explains, “Shortly after [Edward Montagu’s] death in 1775, [Elizabeth Montagu] adopted her young nephew Matthew Robinson (later Montagu) as her heir, who after her death became custodian of her correspondence, bringing out collections of her letters in 1809 and 1813.”¹⁰⁶ The Dictionary of National Biography provides a bit more information: “A nephew, Matthew—son of her brother, Morris Robinson, of the six clerks’ office, who died in 1777—she brought up and amply provided for. He was her constant companion after her husband’s death, taking her own surname of Montagu 3 June 1776.”¹⁰⁷ Considering the death of her only son in infancy in 1744, the death of her

mother in 1746, the death of her second brother in 1747, and the death of her husband, Edward, in 1775, Elizabeth Montagu’s closeness with her nephew is understandable. Matthew Montagu’s laudatory biographical sketch and his thoroughness in compiling her letters point to his admiration for his influential bluestocking aunt.  
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Scott’s preface begins with the sentiment that Anna Seward’s life is worth reading because of her contributions to the world of poetry; learning about such a great poet “can

---

109 The Library of Congress first edition used for this annotation was missing a page prior to the frontispiece, so there could have been another illustration.
neither be tedious nor uninstructive” (iii). Scott then moves into a detailed description of

Seward’s life:

1) Family history.
2) Education: classics and poetry.
3) Growing up in Eyam—moved to Lichfield.
4) Association with Dr. Darwin.
5) Suppression of poetical abilities by parents.
6) Continued efforts to write poetry.
7) Death of her sister, Sarah Seward.
8) Relationship with parents.
9) Lichfield society: literary and intellectual circle.
10) Friendship and encouragement of Lady Miller.
11) Publishing poetry.
12) Other friendships.
13) Death of mother.
14) Care of father—death of father.
15) Publication of novel, Louisa.
16) Publication of sonnets—1799.
17) Publication of biographies: Life of Dr. Darwin and History of Mr. Day.
18) Friendship with Robert Southey.

Scott’s biography is thorough and thoughtful. He presents a knowledgeable, kind, accomplished poetess in this “Biographical Preface.”

The remainder of the preface, the final fifteen pages, focuses on Seward’s skill as a poet. He explains,

Miss Seward in practice trained and attached to that school of picturesque and florid description, of lofty metaphor and bold personification, of a diction which inversion and the use of compound epithets rendered as remote as possible from the tone of ordinary language, which was introduced, or at least rendered fashionable, by Darwin, but which was too remote from common life, and natural expression, to retain its popularity. Yet her taste, though perhaps over-dazzled by the splendour which she adopted in her own compositions, readily admitted the claims of Pope, Collins, Gray, Mason, and of all those bards who have condescended to add the graces of style and expression to poetical thought and imagery (xxv-xxvi).
Her tendency toward sensibility in her verse is apparent and gently derided in her good-humored fifth sonnet, which was dedicated “to a friend, who thinks sensibility a misfortune”:

Ah, thankless!, canst thou envy him who gains
   The Stoic’s cold and indurate repose?
   Thou! With thy lively sense of bliss and woe!—
   From a false balance of life’s joys and pains
Thou deem’st him happy.—Plac’d ’mid fairest plains,
   Where full the river down the valley flows,
   As wisely might’st thou wish thy home had rose
On the parch’d surface of unwater’d plains,
For that, when long the heavy rains descend,
   Bursts over guardian banks their whelming tide!—
Seldom the wild and wasteful flood extends,
   But, spreading plenty, verdure, beauty wide,
   The cool translucent stream perpetual bends,
   And laughs the vale as the bright waters glide.  

Scholar Jennifer Kelly implores the reader of Seward’s poetry to not only focus on the sentimental and overlook the feminist and social commentary that often takes place in her poetry. Kelly states,

Anna Seward is best known for her elegiac poetry and perhaps as a result she has often been relegated to the position of minor poet of sensibility and generally ignored. Yet late eighteenth-century sentimental literature, of the literature of Sensibility, was also a literature of social criticism. This literature was often used covertly by women to express their feminism. They invested the social critic, male or female, with emotional responsiveness to indicate sensibility to social injustice, while at the same time appearing to stay within the bounds of what was acceptably feminine.

Kelly points out Seward’s subversive commentary on American independence, slavery, and empire, among other more politically inspired themes. Scott mentions in his biographical preface, Seward’s elegy on the death of Captain Cook, which at once is a

110 As I did not copy this sonnet while I was working at the Library of Congress, I reproduced this Sonnet from Bluestocking Feminism: Writings of the Bluestocking Circle, 1738-1785, vol. 4, Anna Seward, edited by Jennifer Kelly (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1999), 187.
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critique of English imperialism and a lament for Cook’s widow’s loss. The fact that Scott mentions this poem in particular possibly points to his awareness of Seward as a keen social observer and critic.

At the very least, Scott appreciates Seward’s verse. Furthermore, Scott is impressed with her contributions to literary debates about poetry and literature. Interestingly, after discussing for a number of pages Seward’s ability as poet and critic, Scott claims he must end his own assessment of Seward’s work in order to allow readers to formulate their own views (xxviii). However, by this point, Scott has already constructed Seward as able poet and literary critic.

Scott then explains how Seward collected her poetry for publication beginning in 1807. She had put her collected works in manuscript form and prepped them for the press; however, publication was impossible in light of Miss Seward’s rapidly declining health and ultimate death in 1809. She bequeathed her collected poetry to Sir Walter Scott for publication. Scott includes Seward’s letter to Scott explaining her decision and her gratitude (xxxiii-xxxvii). She gives explicit instructions about the collected poems in this letter. She explains her corrections and notes; she describes the order of the edition; she requests that Scott include a selection of poetry by her father, her own various “juvenile letters,” her sermons, and her letters. Scott certainly would have been an appropriate and experienced editor. He had edited an anthology, Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border, in 1802 and Dryden’s Works in 1808.

Scott explains that he has followed the wishes of Seward. He did not, however, include her prose works or her imitation of Telemachus. He also only included letters that preserved her fine character and the character of others. He was very sensitive about
the feelings of Seward’s friends and family. Scott ends the preface with a laudatory tone toward Miss Seward, calling her “an amiable and highly-accomplished author” (xxxix). He vows earlier in the preface that “it is not the purpose of this slight sketch either to enter into the merits of Miss Seward’s poetry, or to descend minutely into personal character” (xxviii), and he is largely true to his word. He does not include lengthy commentary and evidence of Seward’s virtue; rather, he details in a more matter-of-fact tone the chronology of Seward’s life and works. This makes this discussion unique when compared to the other prefaces to works by eighteenth-century women writers.

In terms of the significance of this three volume edition, Anna Seward’s career as poetess was not necessarily preordained. Her parents initially frowned on her interest in literature. Scott explains in his biographical preface, “[Seward’s] mother, though an affectionate parent, and an excellent woman, possessed no taste for her daughter’s favourite amusements; and even Mr Seward withdrew his countenance from them, probably under the apprehension that his continued encouragement might produce in his daughter that dreaded phænomenon, a learned lady” (vii). Seward would luckily return to poetry as an adult.

Seward remains a compelling eighteenth-century feminist, and studying her poetry and letters reveals the complexities of feminism during the era. Anna Meigon helpfully elucidates Seward’s perspective: “She expressed notably radical views on marriage and politics, and she is known for her criticism of conduct books that lauded marriage above all else, for her opposition to empire and slavery, and for her support of American independence.”112 Interestingly, she did not always support women writers.

Joanne Shattock states, “[Seward] was a vigorous promoter of young writers, as well as an outspoken critic of many of her female contemporaries.”\textsuperscript{113} Duncan Wu also notes Seward’s role as critic: “The ‘Swan of Lichfield’ was a formidable critic of other writers; besides Johnson, she criticized Hannah More and Charlotte Smith, and made clear her disdain for supporters of the French Revolution.”\textsuperscript{114} Sir Walter Scott does not overtly highlight the feminist concerns of Seward in his biography of her, but he certainly defends her ability as poet and critic, which to a certain degree indicates support of her more radical views.
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Archibald Constable, editor of this edition, was the renowned publisher based in Edinburgh, who was a business partner of Sir Walter Scott:

He drifted into publishing, bought the *Scots Magazine* in 1801, and was chosen as publisher of the *Edinburgh Review* (1802). For his flair and respect for editorial independence he is regarded as the first modern publisher. He published for all the leading men of the time, and his quick appreciation of Scott became the envy of the book trade. In 1812 he purchased the copyright of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. But in 1826 came the financial crash which ruined Constable and plunged Scott heavily into debt. Nevertheless he was incorrigibly innovative and lunched (1827) Constable’s *Miscellany*, a series of volumes on literature, art, and science, moderately priced to encourage sales among the common man; but he died before he could capitalize on its success.\(^{115}\)

Considering the illustrious career of Constable is important in terms of Anna Seward’s *Letters*. He chose to publish this extensive edition at the height of his career—a tribute to her success as poet and literary figure. He could rely on Seward’s fame as a poet; however, Seward’s poetry had its detractors and admirers. Joanne Shattock explains that “Her work was criticized for sentimentality, affectation, and obscurity, but her admirers included Wordsworth and Scott.”\(^{116}\) However, public opinion regarding her poetry aside, Constable banked on the “eminent persons” (x) featured in the letters. Seward’s literary prominence ensured the success of the edition.


This is an extensive collection of letters by Anna Seward—there are 507 letters in all six volumes of the edition. These letters provide background on Seward’s life experience and also are important in that the list of her correspondents is impressive: William Hayley, James Boswell, Dr. Erasmus Darwin, Honoria Sneyd (wife of Richard Lovell Edgeworth), Theophilus Swift, and Sir Walter Scott, among others. Interestingly, Seward had actually asked Walter Scott to publish the collection of letters; however, “he declined ‘on principle,’ because he had ‘a particular aversion to perpetuating that sort of gossip.’ The matter was therefore left in the hands of Constable, who published in 1811 the letters written between 1784 and 1807 in six volumes.”

Constable provides a seven-page advertisement in the first volume of the edition.

Constable begins the advertisement with Anna Seward’s letter that requests he publish her correspondence. He prefaces the letter as follows: “The following letter, which was found among Miss Seward’s papers after her death, will account sufficiently for the present Publication, and renders it unnecessary for the Editor either to enter into any explanation of his motives for undertaking it, or to offer any apology for its appearance” (v). In the letter Seward asks that Constable publish the letters in twelve quarto volumes, which would be released two volumes per year. Constable obviously chose a slightly different route here in that the edition was released in its entirety in 1811, and it was six octavo volumes. Margaret Ashmun explains that Constable’s reversal of Seward’s wishes on this account was problematic: “Miss Seward’s reason for wishing some time to elapse before the appearance of her later letters was, Southey says, the belief that certain persons of whom she wrote would have passed away before her

---

comments on them were revealed.” Also, Seward asked Constable to “by no means to follow the late absurd custom of classing letters to separate correspondents, but suffer them to succeed each other in the order of time, as you find them transcribed” (vi). Constable did honor this format.

The remainder of the advertisement is a tribute to Seward. Constable begins by lauding her talent as a poet and a prose writer: “the reader, it is presumed, cannot fail to be struck with the many intellectual and moral excellencies which [the letters] display” (vii). This quote is interesting in that Constable continuously vacillates between praise of Seward’s talent and admiration for her character. Like other editors, although in contrast to Scott’s approach in editing her poems, he aims to strike a balance in terms of Seward’s persona as a woman and a writer, providing more subjective, personal commentary about Seward. For instance, he states, “In her critical remarks especially, Miss Seward will always be found generous and instructive” (viii); however, he also makes clear that Seward was a dutiful daughter and friend.

Constable also alludes to Miss Seward’s “celebrity” in his advertisement. He promises the reader that “there are accordingly interspersed throughout these volumes many interesting anecdotes of eminent persons, which will probably be not the least attractive part of the Work” (ix-x). Constable does not apologize for or downplay Seward’s literary success and fame. He was most likely aware that her fame could contribute to the success of the edition.

Lastly, Constable explains that he did chose to omit some letters that might be considered inappropriate by some “living individuals” (x). In other words, he makes the

---

118 Margaret Ashmun, *The Singing Swan: An Account of Anna Seward and Her Acquaintance with Dr. Johnson, Boswell, & Others of Their Time* (New York: Greenwood, 1931), 272.
decision that some of the letters are not appropriate for general readership in that they are too private. He also omits “some minute critical discussions” (x) as he considered them too lengthy. Ultimately, he insists that aside from these minor omissions, he has been true to Miss Seward’s wishes and the letters as they appeared in the manuscript he received from her.

Ashmun takes Constable to task as well for his emendations and omissions in the edition of Seward’s *Letters*. She states,

Southey thought Constable unfair in deleting passages at will from Miss Seward’s manuscripts. “By not printing the whole which she designed for publication,” he said, “he has given some of her hastiest and most violent expressions, which pass now for her settled judgment, because the letters in which they were qualified or retracted do not appear.” Southey wrote with the indignation of one to whom manuscripts and literary remains were sacred. There was probably a good deal of truth in what he said. Constable should not have accepted the bequest unless he could live up to its conditions.119

Ashmun’s scholarship dates itself a bit here. Her observations from 1931, while astute, reveal a tone that would be in line with literary scholarship prior to the rise of textual scholarship at the middle of the twentieth century. She rightly critiques Constable’s editorial policy of emendation and suppression of manuscript text, yet she is wary about committing wholly to that textual perspective. Nonetheless, what is significant about Ashmun’s observations is her commentary about Constable’s methodology. She provides a distinction for the modern reader: Constable praises Seward’s prose in his prefatory material, but he emended and suppressed that prose in his role as editor. As is the case in the majority of these eighteenth-century editions, the editor can breath life into a text and also undermine that text. It is a delicate balancing act. Constable, like his

counterparts, has succeeded in many ways with his edition of Seward’s letters, but he, too, falls short.
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Lucy Aikin’s memoirs of Anna Laetitia Barbauld are a lengthy and thorough tribute, beginning in the year of Barbauld’s birth, 1743. Aikin provides extensive information regarding Barbauld’s family, education, friendships, and childhood. In these
early pages of Aikin’s memoirs, Barbauld is characterized as reserved, intellectually rigorous, and amiable.

Subsequently, Aikin outlines Barbauld’s literary career, which began with her first volume of poems in 1771. Barbauld’s marriage to the Rev. Barbauld sidetracked her literary career somewhat as social and political circumstances (the Rev. Barbauld was a dissenter) dictated they open a school for young ladies. It is at this point that Lucy Aikin is clear about Barbauld’s rather inconsistent feminist viewpoint, a perspective that Aikin herself did not agree with. Barbauld opened a school for young women, but she felt that education should be appropriate and not as thorough as that required for young men.

Aikin includes a very telling quote from Barbauld, which reveals this philosophy:

“Perhaps you may think, that having myself stepped out of the bounds of female reserve in becoming an author, it is with an ill grace I offer these sentiments: but though this circumstance may destroy the grace, it does not the justice of the remark; and I am full well convinced that to have a too great fondness for books is little favourable to the happiness of a woman” (xix). Aikin includes numerous passages by Barbauld that make clear her philosophy of education for young women. The school operated by the Barbaulds ultimately took part in educating young women and young men—Mrs. Barbauld took an active role in educating all of the students.

In the next portion of the memoirs, Aikin describes Barbauld’s role as adoptive mother and teacher. Aikin does not elaborate at length about Barbauld’s experience as mother, but the brief treatment of the subject is revealing. Aikin states,

---

The union of Mr. And Mrs. Barbauld proved unfruitful, and they sought to fill the void, of which in the midst of their busy avocations they were still sensible, by the adoption of a son out of the family of Dr. Aikin. Several particulars relative to this subject will be found in the letters of Mrs. Barbauld to her brother:—it is sufficient here to mention, that they received the child when somewhat under two years of age, and that his education became thenceforth a leading object of Mrs. Barbauld’s attention. For the use of her little Charles she composed those Early Lessons which have justly gained for her the reverence and love of both parents and children; a work which may safely be asserted to have formed an æra in the art of early instruction, and to stand yet unrivaled amid numberless imitations (xxix).

Barbauld’s role as mother, according to Aikin, has much to do with her success as writer of instructive texts for children. Furthermore, since Aikin begins her memoirs with “Anna Laetitia Barbauld, a name long dear to the admirers of genius and the lovers of virtue,” she bolsters that claim by touching on the centrality of motherhood when it comes to Barbauld’s virtue.

At various points as school teacher and parent, Barbauld publish prose or verse works. She produced a volume of devotional pieces; wrote a hymn book for children; published her famous poem, “Epistle to William Wilberforce,” denouncing slavery; contributed to her husband’s book for children with some poetry of her own; and argued in various critical essays, both political and literary.

Upon the death of the Rev. Barbauld, Aikin describes the fact that Mrs. Barbauld certainly grieved. Joanne Shattock explains the decline of Rochemont Barbauld: “Her husband’s condition worsened, and after several acts of violence against her he was eventually placed in an institution, where he was found drowned in 1808. Although deeply affected by the tragedy, she turned her entire energies to her work.”121 Barbauld published her husband’s memoirs, and she then occupied herself with the renowned collection entitled *British Novelists*. Also, she published her contentious poem, “1811,”

after the death of her husband. Aikin spends considerable time describing this poem.

Finally, Aikin describes Barbauld’s retirement in later life. The loss of family and friends continued to contribute to Barbauld’s own decline. Anna Laetitia Barbauld died on March 9th, 1825 (the year the edition is published).

Pages 59 to 72 of the memoir “offer some account of the contents of the present volumes” (lix):

1) Those poems are included that Barbauld herself wanted in her complete works. In other words, some readers may think the collection incomplete; Barbauld would think otherwise.

2) The poems are included in the volume in chronological order. Aikin explains that this lends a historical chronology for the reader and a sense of the Author’s development literarily.

3) The collection of letters in the volume “contains a selection from the private correspondence of Mrs. Barbauld” (lxv).

4) Some of the prose has been previously printed, and other pieces of prose appear for the first time in this edition. Many of these prose pieces are acknowledged by many to be exemplary pieces of writing.

5) Also included in the edition are devotional writings. Aikin acknowledges that this portion of the text may be contentious as it gets at the strife between religious sects, but she also insists that it is eloquent and important.

6) Also included in the collected works are three Pamphlets, which Aikin insists are not relegated to their historical context; they remain, in her estimation, relevant.

7) Barbauld never intended that letters were to be read by the public at large. These letters were not kept by Mrs. Barbauld, but they have been collected by the editor from various correspondents of Mrs. Barbauld. Aikin hopes that the publication of these letters “will not be considered a trespass either against the living or the dead” (lxxi). In other words, they are meant to honor Mrs. Barbauld’s memory, not to impinge upon Mrs. Barbauld’s wishes or the wishes of her correspondents.

8) Aikin also mentions that a forthcoming edition of Mrs. Barbauld’s works “for the instruction and amusement of young persons, especially females, [will] appear in a separate form about the close of the present year [1825]” (lxxii).

The edition presented by Lucy Aikin is not the complete works but, rather, the collected works of Mrs. Barbauld. The final thirteen pages of the memoirs that are outlined above
are important in that they outline the editorial decisions that Aikin made: what works were to be included, the order the works were to be laid out, and the reason that certain works were excluded. This is one of the lengthier explanations of editorial method.

The thorough biography of the author by the editor should come as no surprise. Lucy Aikin was an accomplished and renowned biographer. Elise Knapp explains that Aikin’s “Memoirs of the Court of Queen Elizabeth was an immediate success, going into eight editions by 1869.” Also, Memoirs of the Court of King James the First also met with success. These two biographies, published respectively in 1818 and 1822, preceded Aikin’s edition of Barbauld’s works by only a few years. It was with the death of her father and her aunt that Aikin turned her energies toward family biography. Her talent as biographer translated well to familial homage. Knapp explains her success at bringing the life and works of her family members to the public by quoting a biographer of Aikin:

Philip Hemery Le Breton, the husband of Aikin’s niece, evaluated the biographies of Dr. Aikin and Barbauld in his introduction to Lucy Aikin’s memoirs and letters (1864): “Both may be regarded as works of filial piety; for her aunt shared with her father in the reverence and affection with which she regarded the union of virtue and talent. The cast of her own mind fitted her better for sympathizing with the strong practical sense, the liberal views of her father, than with the sensibility and poetical elegance of her aunt.”

Aikin uses her talent as thorough biographer and editor, as well as her affections as loyal niece, when writing her aunt’s biography and compiling her works. As Knapp explains, “Lucy Aikin was the first woman biographer in England to base her writing on the

---
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extensive research in original documents.” This method is apparent in Barbauld’s works. She honors her aunt by creating a thorough edition and memoirs.

Furthermore, Aikin’s success as biographer most certainly had something to do with the academic family that inspired her. Knapp describes the Aikins as a “family of educators.” Also, Schnorrenberg and Shaw explain that Aikin “knew intimately the works of her aunt Mrs. Barbauld . . .” In short, Barbauld’s literary success was significant. Susan Kubica Howard outlines Barbauld’s achievements as critic and biographer: “Given the fact that during the eighteenth century literary criticism by women often went unrecognized or was openly discouraged, Barbauld’s efforts in this area were groundbreaking.” Her editions of William Collins’s poetry and Richardson’s letters were well-received by reviewers, and her fifty volume *British Novelists* was considered impressive then, as it is now. Howard explains that “[Barbauld’s] own editorial, critical, and biographical work shows her to have been discriminating, candid, decisive, and just.” Aikin’s drive to produce an exhaustive biography and credible edition may have been fueled by her family’s participation in the eighteenth-century editorial project. Lucy Aikin may have disagreed with her aunt’s world view on issues of feminism, but she definitely seems to value the task of producing an edition. To a certain degree Aikin praises her aunt by writing a sincere biography, but she also does so by emulating her role as editor. This is a family connection that has not been touched upon yet. Most of these family editions focus on getting the words of the

---
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author to the public for the sake of a loved one; it is about erecting a monument. For Aikin, her own editorial voice also immortalizes her aunt’s important role in British literary history. Barbauld paved the way for Aikin, and Aikin continued the literary legacy. This idea is solidified in that the text was well-received, and a second edition was published in Great Britain and The United States in 1826.\footnote{Caroline Franklin, ed., introduction to The Works of Anna Laetitia Barbauld (London: Routledge/Thoemmes, 1996), xx.}

\textit{Lucy Aikin, ed. A Legacy for Young Ladies, Consisting of Miscellaneous Pieces, in Prose and Verse, By the Late Mrs. Barbauld. By Anna Laetitia Barbauld. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown & Green. 1826.}\footnote{Note that I used a printed copy of the digital edition transcribed by Brown University’s Women Writers Project for this annotation. This edition was transcribed from the second edition of 1826. This edition is extremely difficult to locate; as a result, this is the only transcribed copy of an edition that I rely on in this dissertation.}
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Lucy Aikin’s editorial preface is brief (one page in length following the title page) but informative. It is four concise paragraphs each of which conveys Barbauld’s talents in different terms. In the first paragraph, Barbauld is characterized as “one of the best friends of youth.” She offers instruction to infants, children of all ages, young ladies, and even parents. Next, Aikin explains that Barbauld’s writing transcends gender as “many young persons of both sexes partook, during the course of her long life, of the benefit of her personal instruction.” In the third paragraph, background information on the copy-text is outlined by Aikin: “These pieces were found among her papers by the members of her own family.” In other words, Aikin asserts the credibility of the manuscript on which her edition is based. Furthermore, in this paragraph, Aikin manages to laud Barbauld once more. She explains that the pieces included in the edition “are of a light and elegant cast, adapted to exercise the ingenuity and amuse the fancy while they refine the taste.” In the fourth and final paragraph, Aikin describes her point of view as editor. She explains that some of the works included in the edition Barbauld may not have considered complete. However, Aikin as editor feels it would have been a “presumption” of her to try to update or change the text. Aikin projects the utmost confidence in the reception of the edition. In fact, she concludes her preface by challenging the reader to compare this edition with other works by Barbauld.

In short, this preface makes a strong editorial statement. Aikin insists that the text should stand as it is (despite the incomplete pieces), asserts the veracity of the copy-text, addresses the reception of the text, and praises the author of the edition. She very efficiently covers her bases.
This edition is a work of prose and poetry specifically geared toward young women. Barbauld and Aikin shared an interest in literature for young people. Linda Turzynski explains that “Like her celebrated aunt, Anna Laetitia Barbauld, Lucy Aikin felt a strong interest in providing accessible and suitable books for children.”\(^{132}\) Barbauld, the University of Pennsylvania’s Digital Library explains, “drew heavily on her experience with children in her writing: publishing *Devotional Pieces* (1775) and *Hymns in Prose for Children* (1781), as well as several books on the education of small children. The Hymns are notable for their use of the natural world as a focus for awareness and celebration of God. Barbauld’s stated intent is to encourage the child to love and praise God, through his creation.”\(^{133}\) Her works for children became renowned. Leslie Haynesworth states that these works “continued to be staples of the children’s canon throughout the nineteenth century.”\(^{134}\) They were, then, valued for their didactic value. This moral framework would be the foundation for Aikin’s own works for children. Turzynski clarifies, “. . . Aikin is fully aware of the advantages of education and the role the home and parents should play in the proper rearing of their young.”\(^{135}\) It is fitting, then, that Aikin, the successful writer, biographer, and editor, would issue not only her aunt’s collected works, but also a collection of her poetry and prose for young women. This is another intersection of the two women’s literary interests, and it is another sort of tribute to her aunt that Aikin publishes this edition.


\(^{135}\) Turzynski, “Lucy Aikin,” 5.
Barbauld is often considered troubling by twenty-first century feminist standards. She seems to confound modern scholars. William McCarthy and Elizabeth Kraft helpfully clarify that “Barbauld always preferred an ideal of partnership between men and women to the thought of contention between them . . .”\(^\text{136}\) This ideal tends to render Barbauld’s statements about women’s rights in the eighteenth century as complicated, or even troublesome, by the standards of twenty-first century feminism. Aikin, however, was a more outwardly spoken champion of women’s rights. Elise Knapp notes that “At a time when serious education for women was a controversial issue, even in her own family, [Aikin] argued for equality of education for the sexes.”\(^\text{137}\) This is an important, albeit confusing, aspect of this edition. While Barbauld’s works tended to downplay rigorous education for young women in particular, Aikin’s attitude toward literature for young girls would have been quite different. In this regard, Aikin may be attempting to re-frame Barbauld as more feminist than she actually was. This edition, in other words, could fly in the face of Barbauld’s wishes. However, perhaps the comment in the preface, in which Aikin states that “Many persons of both sexes partook, during the course of her long life, of the benefit of [Barbauld’s] personal instruction,” offers some clarification. Aikin may have been a proponent of a more overt stance on rigorous education for young girls, but she seems to appreciate Barbauld’s more subdued method of appropriate education for young men and young women.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustration included in the edition.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included in both volumes.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Table of contents included in both volumes.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included in the edition.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: There is a brief one paragraph statement by the editor at the end of the memoir.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No note on the text included in the edition.
9) FOOTNOTES: No footnotes included in the edition.
10) ENDNOTES: Endnotes are included that clarify names, phrases, etc.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included in the edition.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included in the edition.
13) INDEX: No index included in the edition.
14) SIZE: Octavo.

William Radcliffe, Ann Radcliffe’s husband, acted as editor of this text. The English Department at the City University of New York offers an online biography of Ann Radcliffe, and this biography makes clear that William Radcliffe did, indeed, edit *Gaston de Blondville*. This is significant because the edition does not give him credit for this role.\(^{139}\) I have to assume that this is the way he wanted it. The novel was published shortly after Ann Racliffe’s death, and I assume that the novel was offered to the public as a eulogy of sorts. The only statement by William Radcliffe appears after the memoirs by Thomas Noon Talfourd. He states:

\(^{138}\) Note that I base this annotation on a facsimile edition printed by Arno Press out of New York in 1972.
The Editor of the present Publication, who is not the Writer of the preceding Memoir, is aware, that it would be unbecoming for him to say more of Works, written by one so dear to him, than may be necessary to give the Public an early assurance of their authenticity; and that fact, he apprehends, will be sufficiently proved by the distribution, which he has resolved to make, of the whole purchase-money of the copy-right. Every part of that produce will be paid, as it shall accrue to him, to some public charitable institution in England. The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, and Sir Walter Stirling, Bart. in consideration of the utility of this purpose, allow him the honour of saying, that they will audit his account of that distribution (132).

William Radcliffe is concerned first and foremost that his wife’s manuscript is received favorably and considered to be truly a work of fiction by her. As editor, he must take on some of the responsibility of the success of the novel, and living up to her reputation was no easy feat. Sir Walter Scott states, “She led the way in a peculiar style of composition, affecting powerfully the mind of the reader, which has since been attempted by many, but in which no one has attained the excellences of the original inventor.”

Interestingly, her self-imposed exile from writing and celebrity for years before her death possibly reveals this pressure to reproduce her success. The Literature Online biography of Radcliffe states, “Whatever the truth of Radcliffe’s retreat from the literary world, it is clear that she was a solitary person who cherished her privacy. Her husband in a later obituary, also acknowledged her sensitivity towards unfavourable reviews of her work.”

In William Radcliffe’s brief prefatory statement quoted above, his protective tone is still apparent. He wants to make Radcliffe’s novel available to the public, but he seems to fear a critical response. It is an interesting position that he makes painfully clear in his editorial statement.

---

Regarding T.N. Talfourd’s memoirs of Ann Radcliffe, I should point out that it is lengthy, and it aims to answer the question of the writer’s reclusive life. The memoirs begins,

The life of Mrs. Radcliffe is a pleasing phenomenon in the literature of her time. During a period, in which the spirit of personality has extended its influence, till it has rendered the habits and conversation of authors almost as public as their compositions, she confined herself, with delicate apprehensiveness, to the circle of domestic duties and pleasures. Known only by her works, her name was felt as a spell by her readers. Among the thousands, whose life-blood curdled beneath her terrors, many little suspected, that the potent enchantress was still an inhabitant of this “bright and breathing world” (3).

The memoirs, then, fill in the gaps for the reading public. There was no “horror” in the life of Ann Radcliffe that kept her from being a public person. The memoirs makes clear that she was a very humble, modest, down-to-earth individual who enjoyed the financial freedom that her inheritance and literary success afforded, but she appreciated her privacy even more.

Talfourd then provides the major chronology of Ann Radcliffe’s life after which he provides significant details from her travel logs—journals she kept while vacationing with her husband. These travel accounts make up about eighty pages of the memoirs, and it seems most likely that William Radcliffe shared the travel journals with Talfourd. These journals are a tribute to the joyful life that Ann Radcliffe lived, but they are also a tribute to her marriage to William Radcliffe. These accounts ensure that the public remembers Ann Racliffe as a masterful writer, but they also reveal to eighteenth-century readers the wonderful woman that he remembers. It is as though he is letting readers in on their experience as a couple.

After the travel journal portion of the memoirs, Talfourd provides background on the various novels that Radcliffe produced as well as the skill required to write a novel
that incorporates the supernatural, and he offers final thoughts on the edition of *Gaston de Blondville*. In regard to Ann Radcliffe’s gothic art, Talfourd asserts that the writer must have an understanding of human nature and the ability to “[describe] and [picture] scenes” (117). In regard to the edition of *Gaston de Blondville*, Talfourd states, “Of the tale and the poems now first presented to the world, it would scarcely become us particularly to speak. The verses, scattered though all the romances, are so inartificially introduced, that they have little chance of being estimated by an impatient reader; but, when examined, they will be found replete with felicitous expression and with rich though indistinct imagery” (131). This fine work, according to Talfourd, she never felt compelled to publish. He explains that “In Romance, she probably felt that she had done enough” (89).

This edition of a novel that Radcliffe wrote, kept, and never destroyed was finally given to the public posthumously by her husband. Walter Scott’s memoirs of Ann Radcliffe, which was written in 1834, prior to the publication of *Gaston de Blondville*, indicates his eager anticipation of the novel. Scott states, “We have been given to understand, we trust from good authority, that a posthumous work of Mrs. Radcliffe’s is likely soon to make its appearance. Come when it will, and contain almost what it may, it must be an acquisition to the public of no common interest.”

William Radcliffe was certainly aware of the reading public’s enthusiasm for his wife’s novels—an enthusiasm he shared. Martha Satz asserts that William Radcliffe “strongly encouraged his wife in her writing, enthusiastically reading the manuscripts of her novels and travel diary as she

---

produced them.” William Radcliffe’s passion for his wife’s novels may have compelled him to publish the novel. However, Satz also points out “the disgust [Ann Radcliffe] felt for her imitators.” William Radcliffe most likely felt unable to destroy the manuscript of *Gaston de Blondville*, and by publishing the edition himself, he would have some control over how the text was presented to the public. This is another instance of a family editor exerting control over a loved one’s manuscript. Furthermore, he felt compelled to publish the novel in a timely manner as he was getting older. It is significant that this anxiety appears fairly consistently in these prefaces of family editions.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 135.

---
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Chapter 3

Textual Kinship: Constructing the Family in Eighteenth-Century Scholarly Editions

The history of the family in eighteenth-century England was forever changed by Lawrence Stone’s groundbreaking *Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (1977). In his study, Stone asserts that the family evolved in drastic and important ways in the eighteenth century. He explains that the era sees the rise of individualism while the idea of the patriarchal/authoritarian family becomes a vestige of the past.¹ Individualism, according to Stone, has significance in terms of the family in that it allows for a move away from the father of the household as metaphorical king. He states, “The practical need to remodel the political theory of state power in the late seventeenth century thus brought with it a severe modification of theories about patriarchal power.”² This shift is an embodiment of eighteenth-century enlightenment ideals such as “freedom of action and inner belief,” “the thirst for happiness,” and “an antipathy to cruelty.”³ Throughout his discussion, Stone uses the term “warm” to describe the growth of affection between family members. For instance, he explains that “warm relationships [were] generally

---

² Ibid., 240.
³ Ibid., 229-237.
limited” in the seventeenth century. However, in the eighteenth century, families move away from patriarchal authority, they embrace respect for the individual and self-expression, and they become more affectionate.

Stone’s history of the eighteenth-century family, while influential, has remained controversial. Thirty years later, the question of what kind of familial shift occurred in the eighteenth century, if any shift at all, is still enthusiastically debated. The studies that respond to the theories of Lawrence Stone are numerous. Naomi Tadmor provides a truly helpful critical history in the introduction of her *Family and Friends in Eighteenth-Century England: Household, Kinship, and Patronage*. She labels those who disagree with Stone as ascribing to the idea of “continuity” as opposed to the idea of major change in the family dynamic during the eighteenth century:

> On the other side of the historiographical field, there merged a powerful school that emphasized continuity in familial structures and familial sentiments. Works by Laslett, Macfarlane, Wrigley, Schofield, Wrightson, Levine, Pollock, and Houlbrooke, for example, all emphasise in various ways the enduring characteristics of the English family, complemented by enduring patterns of family sentiments.

By “continuity” Tadmor does not mean fixed; she uses the term to indicate a slow, continuous shift in family systems. These historians and literary scholars see family affection as gaining traction gradually. In particular, Ralph Houlbrooke, mentioned above by Tadmor, states that

> In England, the seventeenth century brought a shift of power from the monarchy, the relaxation of tension after the period of religious conflict, and the rise of toleration and skepticism, all allegedly reflected within the families of the wealthy and educated in a gradual growth of individual freedom and a new respect for

---

4 Ibid., 268.
personal preference. Spontaneous affection began to replace instilled obedience as the main cohesive force within the elementary family.\(^6\)

Note here, Houlbrooke highlights the warmness of family relations during the seventeenth century, and he notes a more measured change, whereas Stone would place that shift solidly in the eighteenth century, and he sees it as radical and sudden. Su Fang Ng also takes exception to Stone’s idea of the eighteenth-century change in familial sentiment. Ng forcefully argues against Stone’s “underlying assumption . . . that the family [in the seventeenth century] was rigidly hierarchical,”\(^7\) dispelling Stone’s thesis throughout his text and arguing for a more enduring sense of familial affection over the course of English history, and during the seventeenth century in particular.

Furthermore, Ng asserts that patriarchy is an attitude that endures but also evolves over the course of early modern English history. Patriarchy has not vanished, but it is changing. He states, “Like kingly authority, paternal authority cannot be taken for granted.”\(^8\) In the seventeenth-century, as in the eighteenth century, kingly authority is questioned. Consequently, paternal authority, too, is questioned and shifting, not unlike family affection.

The question becomes, how can scholars move forward with discussions of family in the eighteenth century without tripping over this tension between continuity and change? Tadmor asserts that “the ‘continuity’ school has emerged triumphant,”\(^9\) and recent texts support her claim. For example, Andrea Herrera states, “The gradually shifting practices and perceptions regarding courtship and the institutions of marriage and

\(^8\) Ng, *Literature and the Politics of Family*, 16.
the family can be traced in literature as well as in life.”10 It is interesting to note the use of the term “gradual” in this passage. As opposed to the more sweeping change model outlined by Stone, Herrera seems to be moving toward the idea of gradual change in family relationships. Jeffrey Forgeng’s 2007 study, *Daily Life in Stuart England*, mentions the patriarchal tone of the family throughout the Restoration. He claims, “Officially, marital relations were firmly hierarchical, with the husband standing in the position of feudal superior to his wife.”11 However, just a few pages later, Forgeng contends that “Nonetheless, as in the political domain, there were signs that some people were questioning the validity of that hierarchy: during the 1650s there were already some calls for equality of the sexes, although such views were widely regarded as dangerously radical.”12 Stone’s model of more drastic change has been replaced with an emphasis on change with a slower curve, so to speak. Stone’s ideas have been tested for over thirty years, and the result has rendered his conclusions relatively obsolete. However, the value of his famous 1977 study still endures. Recent scholarship has responded to and clarified the historical discussion he started.

It is at this point that I want to introduce the texts that I discuss and annotate in this chapter. These family editions, and their editorial prefaces and advertisements in particular, are important to this discussion of the patriarchal family versus the affectionate family in that they offer a specific perspective. Editors of family editions are unstudied voices that offer extensive commentary about eighteenth-century family relationships. Family editions included in this study, which span from 1699 to 1834, all

mention familial fondness, illustrating an increasing need to voice affirmatively the bonds of family. However, the editions in this chapter also occasionally indicate the pressures of being connected to a certain family lineage—an echo of that traditional patriarchal family structure. In other words, these texts offer unique insight into this dialectic of eighteenth-century family relations.

Interestingly, these editors all share similar concerns and goals. They are involved in a unique and challenging editorial role—producing a scholarly edition of a work by an author who is a family member. Furthermore, all of these family editors participate in the exercise of framing the text (or the persona of the author) in a positive light. This editorial situation creates unique opportunities as well as particular challenges. Keeping in mind the tension between the family as authoritarian versus affectionate, these editors are occasionally caught in that conflict. As a result, in their prefaces and advertisements these editors consistently voice anxieties and objectives pertaining to their editorial situation: 1) an anxiety regarding the authenticity of their edition, 2) a clarity about the didactic value of a given family edition, 3) a concern about the reputation of the author, 4) a certainty in terms of the usefulness of a text, and 5) a need to memorialize a loved one. Some editions take part in all five of these activities, and others may only take part in one. However, on the whole, most of these editors will utilize two to three of these editorial approaches. In so doing, these editorial statements reveal much about eighteenth-century familial love and lineage.

Some of these editions are renowned, and other editions are so understudied that the author’s names yield no results in the MLA International Bibliography or the American Bibliography of English Language and Literature. The goal of this chapter,
then, is to highlight these texts, both the lesser- and well-known, as an important sub-genre of scholarly editions. Despite the concerns and the numerous challenges in producing a family edition, these editors persevere in their task of editing manuscripts that contribute much to the body of literature in the era. Considered as a whole, these editions prove useful in understanding the methods and perspectives of eighteenth-century editors, as well as eighteenth-century perspectives on family.

The Authentic Edition

In the first text found in the annotated bibliography for this chapter, Short Memorials of Thomas Lord Fairfax (1699), the family editor reveals an anxiety about other, unauthorized versions of the text. Brian Fairfax, the editor and brother of the author, explains in the dedication that “some imperfect [copies of the manuscript] are got into other hands” (iii). Fairfax is most upset by the fact that this other editor does not think highly of the author, Thomas Fairfax. Interestingly, another edition of Thomas Fairfax’s Short Memorials was not published until 1776, according to Clements Markham’s Life of Fairfax. However, Markham does indicate that there are three manuscript copies. Two of these manuscripts were preserved at Leeds Castle, and one of these is in Brian Fairfax’s handwriting. The third manuscript copy was returned to the Fairfax family in 1760; its inscription is vague at best: “Presented by Sir Peter Thompson to the Hon. Robert Fairfax, 1760. MS. Bought at Mr. Granger’s sale on January 22, 1733. The undoubted handwriting of Sir Thomas Fairfax. Mr. Brian Fairfax

---
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wanted it much, but Sir Peter could not then make up his mind to part with it. The Brian Fairfax here mentioned was the son of the Brian who published the Memorials in 1699.  Perhaps Brian Fairfax’s comment about an “imperfect” manuscript reveals his anxiety about publishing his manuscript version of the text. This anxiety could be well founded as Markham explains that Brian Fairfax removed considerable portions of text from the manuscript. This could also be an attempt by Brian Fairfax to undermine the fuller version of text if he thought certain passages were inappropriate or too inflammatory. Brian Fairfax then goes on to say that “Nor can [Thomas Fairfax’s] reputation thereby suffer with any who were acquainted with his person” (iv). In this statement, Brian Fairfax is asserting the primary benefit of a family edition. He knew the writer and has access to a more authoritative manuscript. As a result, the family editor can voice confidence in the authenticity of the manuscript. These editors are normally given or bequeathed the manuscripts. Furthermore, they may also spend considerable energy adding to these manuscripts by perusing the official papers of the author, or they may also collect additional materials from other family members or friends of the author. In promoting their connection to the author, they enhance the familial link.

Stephen Wren’s edition, Parentalia, also alludes to the problem of textual authenticity. He states in his preface that one of his motives for editing the volume is “. . . the Prevention of a spurious Counterfeit, which would have been an Imposition on the Publick, and an Injury to the honoured subjects of these Papers; such a one having been in Agitation” (iv). Wren, like Brian Fairfax, feels the need to edit and make public the
family manuscript over which he has control, and he feels compelled to do so in a timely fashion. In so doing, he can manage how his family name and legacy are framed.

For Eugenia Stanhope, the issue of authenticity works somewhat differently when it comes to her father-in-law’s *Letters Written by the Late Right Honourable Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield*, which she edited and published in 1774. Eugenia Stanhope married into the Stanhope family, and her marriage to Philip Stanhope (the younger) was a well-kept secret, even from her late husband’s father. After the death of her husband, her father-in-law learned of their secret marriage, but he graciously accepted his daughter-in-law and grandsons (Eugenia and Philip Stanhope had two sons).

Ultimately, Philip Dormer Stanhope maintained a relationship with his son’s widow and children. But the nature of Philip and Eugenia’s marriage and the fact that she married into the Stanhope family, rather than being born into it, places her in a tenuous position as family editor. She must forcefully assert her credibility, which she certainly does. She states, “What I can, and do ascertain is, the Authenticity of this Publication; which comprises not a single line, that is not the late Earl of Chesterfield’s” (v). The Stanhope family tried to prevent the publication of the edition, but Eugenia Stanhope’s claim of authenticity prevailed.

William Radcliffe, too, addresses this idea of manuscript authenticity. In his one paragraph editorial statement in his edition of his wife’s (Ann Radcliffe) *Gaston de Blondville* (1826), he assures readers of the authenticity of the text. He proves this credibility by indicating he will receive no profits from publication: “Every part of that produce will be paid, as it shall accrue him, to some public charitable institution in

---

19 Ibid., 922.
England” (132). The primary function of his brief statement, which follows the lengthy biography in the edition, is to assert authenticity. Implicit in the statement is the fact that the manuscript must, indeed, be authentic; his primary motive for publishing a counterfeit novel would be monetary. Interestingly, the validity of the claim is solidified merely when one considers the date of publication. As I elaborate in the annotation of this edition, Ann Radcliffe never intended to publish the novel, and William Radcliffe was very protective of his wife’s writing. Aside from paying tribute to his wife’s memory, it seems more possible that credibility was the central motivation for the editor. He wanted to make sure he had control over the manuscript and the resulting edition. It is also reasonable to assume that as he aged, he feared the text might fall into other, less protective hands. For the sake of authenticity, he published this novel that was composed and tucked away by his wife in 1802, 24 years prior to the release of the edition. Like Cassandra Austen, who, as Valerie Grosvenor Myer explains, “had the foresight to keep Jane’s letters but in old age looked them over and burned most of them,” William Radcliffe responded to this anxiety of how to handle a manuscript left behind by a loved one. Thankfully, he decided to produce an edition that he could justify as authorized as opposed to destroying the manuscript.

Not all of these editors make a direct claim about textual authority in their prefaces or advertisements. For instance, Matthew Montagu in his biography of his aunt, Elizabeth Montagu, which appears in Letters of Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu (1809-13), makes a statement about including her early letters: “But not withstanding the embarrassment I feel from the wish of producing nothing which may cast a less

favourable light upon her disposition, or hurt the feelings of the families connected with
the individuals mentioned, I am induced to give extracts from this early correspondence,
as they will most naturally exhibit the progress of her mind” (8). Matthew Montagu does
not state that the inclusion of these letters speaks to the credibility of the edition, but it is
definitely implied. In such a statement, he makes clear that the letters are complete and
that he has even placed the authenticity of the edition above possibly offending readers.

George Crabbe, the younger, also indirectly alludes to the authenticity of his
father’s Collected Works (1834) when he describes his reasoning behind including his
father’s “juvenile” poems and maintaining the “Posthumous Tales” in the condition his
father left them—he wants the collection to be complete and to reflect his father’s work.
This editorial statement leaves the reader with the sense that George Crabbe, the younger,
had access to all of his father’s manuscripts, and he wished to be true to those
manuscripts in the edition.

The family editor has a much easier job than a typical editor when it comes to
asserting textual authenticity. These editors most often had access to materials,
connections with the author’s literary colleagues, a vested monetary interest, and most
importantly an emotional claim in asserting authenticity. The familial affection becomes
clear when these editors forcefully argue for their authentic bond with these writers.

**The Virtuous Author**

It is nearly a given in every one of these family editions that the editor declares
the moral virtue of the author. These claims are, at once, bolstered by the personal
relationship between editor and author, as well as undermined by that relationship, as the
editor is obviously biased. Nonetheless, the claims of moral virtue are a consistent theme in these editorial prefaces, and they are successful emotional appeals to the reader in that they reveal, once again, the warmth the editor feels for the author. There is a gendered aspect to this notion of the virtuous author in that women authors are framed as especially virtuous, and I develop this theme in the previous chapter on editions of texts by women. However, this fascination with the virtue of the author also transcends gender to a certain degree as all of these authors are lauded for their integrity.

A number of these texts are devotional in nature, and thus, a statement about morality is especially relevant in these instances. Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s *Miscellaneous Works* (1739) features numerous devotional pieces, so when the editor, Theophilus Rowe (Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s brother-in-law), states that “... the truly-wise, the virtuous, persons equally eminent for great and good qualities, for their extraordinary accomplishments, and the use they made of them, to the honour of the supreme Being, and the benefit of mankind, these ought not to be swept away into forgetfulness with the common rubbish of the species” (ii), he is highlighting the content of the edition and the character of the writer, and he is promising a certain kind of experience for the reader. Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s personal virtue is the inspiration for the edition, and her character suggests the piety of her work and, thereby, ensures the suitability of the edition for certain audiences—in particular, the young female reader. Furthermore, Frances Maria Cowper’s *Original Poems on Various Occasions* (1793) also receives praise from the editor, William Cowper, for the moral lessons contained in the verse. Likewise, Reginald Heber’s two volumes of sermons (1829 and 1830) are published for their didactic worth. Although Heber’s wife, Amelia, who edited both volumes, does not
make a direct claim about the spiritually edifying nature of the sermons, the virtue of Reginald Heber was renowned, and the volume prominently features the titles, occasions, and locations of each sermon, which reminds the reader that Heber was taking part in discussions of important spiritual and moral issues on a regular basis.

Other editions do not necessarily deal explicitly with notions of faith or spirituality, but these writers are frequently constructed by editors as highly virtuous persons to be emulated by readers. For example, the Wren family was considered virtuous for their public service. In the preface to *Poems Upon Various Subjects* (1768), Isaac Hawkins Browne (the elder) is described by his son as having “. . . a Heart anxious for the Publick good” (third page of preface). Maria Edgeworth describes her father as kind, loving, and supportive. His virtue, she explains, is the primary factor that motivates her to finish his *Memoirs* (1820).

Sylvana Tomaselli states, the eighteenth century was “a period rich in deliberations on the true nature of virtue [. . . ],” and the family edition consistently asserts the value of a virtuous life. The family bonds showcased in these editions are a strong statement about the eighteenth-century family as central to virtue at work in the world. In other words, compassion drives these authors and editors, and they connect human kindness to their family experience.

**The Controversial Author**

Some of these family editors have their work cut out for them in terms of portraying the author of an edition in a positive light. There is, occasionally, a defensive
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tone about the reputation of the writer in these types of editions. Or there is occasionally a strong statement about the worthiness of a writer that has been wronged in the court of public opinion. There is also, conversely, an instance or two in this category of edition in which the editor capitalizes on an individual with an immensely favourable reputation.

Benjamin Hoadly was a very controversial figure in the eighteenth century. As I outline in my annotation of his *Works* (1773), edited by his son, John Hoadly, Benjamin Hoadly was a powerful bishop who advocated forcefully for universal religious conformity.\(^{23}\) This view, of course, won him many friends but also many enemies. As a result, John Hoadly’s choices as editor narrow because he must consider disparate viewpoints about his father. In the edition, he includes a biography that provides a thorough treatment of his father’s life and includes commentary from proponents of conformity as well as dissenters. In short, John Hoadly acknowledges his father’s role in this heated religious debate, and he aims to diffuse detractors of his father’s legacy by including important testimony from all camps praising his father’s name. The approach is effective because as editor he comes across as less emotional and more objective, which allows him to reach out to all readers.

Mary Robinson’s *Memoirs* (1801) are well-known and frequently studied. The subject of this scholarship centers more often than not on Robinson’s reputation, her public persona. The scandal Robinson endured, resulting from her infamous affair with the Prince of Wales and other well-known men of her day, plagued her throughout her life. As a result of her mother’s notoriety, her daughter, Mary Robinson (the younger), faced an exceptionally difficult task in editing her mother’s *Memoirs*. Robinson (the

younger) tackles the issue of her mother’s reputation directly in the advertisement to the edition. Like John Hoadly, she does not dance around the subject but acknowledges it. She begins, “The editor of these volumes is but too well aware, that the world will be little disposed to sympathize with an unprotected and persecuted woman . . .” (i). The Memoirs that follow famously showcase Mary Robinson’s (the elder) private experience. The editor insists that her mother’s “real” identity was a great contrast to her public persona (ii). The function of the edition, and the editorial advertisement in particular, is to begin to chip away at the scandal and in so doing polish Mary Robinson’s (the elder) tarnished reputation. Eighteenth-century and twenty-first century readers vary in how successful they feel the edition is in re-presenting this fallen celebrity. However, the editor’s approach in addressing the scandal was probably as successful a strategy as possible at persuading readers. As Mary Robinson’s daughter, she can certainly voice her familial love and, consequently, gain significant ground in terms of her emotional plea.

Charles James Fox’s History of the Early Part of the Reign of James the Second (1808) was edited by Lord Holland (Fox’s nephew). Fox was a prominent, gregarious, and contentious politician in his day. His History focuses on the Glorious Revolution of 1688, and it did not meet with great success—few copies were sold. Nonetheless, Lord Holland makes sure to paint Fox as a thorough and objective historian, which is important because of Fox’s participation in political history. Holland addresses Fox’s painstaking fact-gathering and fact-checking. By the time the reader finishes the preface, he or she will most likely have a sense of confidence in Fox’s ability as historian. As this

example illustrates, the reputation of the author precedes the edition, and the editors of these family editions must address that reputation. In most cases, the editors are champions for the authors, celebrating their text, their lives, and the importance of the edition, along with their familial bond.

There are other editions in this category that operate on the other end of the spectrum in terms of reputation. Editions of texts by Elizabeth Montagu, Ann Radcliffe, and Mary Wollstonecraft were more likely to meet with success because of their largely favorable reputations. Elizabeth Montagu’s famous role as leader of the Bluestocking Circle provides a useful springboard for the editor of her *Letters* (1809-13), Matthew Montagu (her nephew). Matthew Montagu informs the reader that he has collected letters from his aunt’s friends and colleagues, and he also includes letters from her youth in the edition. The reader can learn more about the public and private life of this eighteenth-century celebrity, and Matthew Montagu capitalizes on this fact by reiterating for the reader in his biography that he will be including additional letters. This is a prime example of how reputation can work in the editor’s favor. In another instance, Ann Radcliffe’s *Gaston de Blondville* (1826), edited by her husband, William Radcliffe, also relies on the author’s literary reputation. When it was published in 1826, it had been almost twenty-five years since eighteenth-century readers had seen a novel by this beloved writer. The famous author’s seclusion and the popularity of her gothic novels are certainly an impetus for the posthumous publication of *Gaston de Blondville*. The memoirs of Radcliffe that appear in the edition, which were written by Thomas Noon Talfourd, reference her skill in the gothic genre. The inclusion of such a statement indicates that the biographer, and by default the editor, relied to a certain degree on
reputation in publishing the edition of the novel. Lastly, in another example of a husband as editor, William Godwin introduces his edition of Mary Wollstonecraft’s *Maria* (1799) by referring to her reputation as writer and intellectual. In the opening lines of his preface, Godwin describes Mary Wollstonecraft as “talented,” “most admired,” and “a genius” (v). The challenge for Godwin is acknowledging his editorial emendations of a text by such a well-known writer. Some readers take exception to Godwin’s changes and additions to the text. To a certain degree, this is the situation the editor must face when working with the text of a famous author. In short, the reputation of a writer can be a blessing and/or a curse.

Beatrice Gottlieb explains that “In general, however, one of the differences between the less fortunate and the more fortunate was that the latter had rich and powerful relatives. They could be failures in their own endeavors, but if they belonged to a successful family, even if to a distant branch of it, they had a safety net.”25 These editors, then, rely to a certain degree on their family tree or ancestry. In the family edition, the editor and the author are tied together as individuals; there is a move toward self-expression because the editor cannot rely entirely on the reputation of the author, and often the reputation of the author is not always enough. As Gottlieb explains, “If bearing a proud name still means something, it used to mean much more.”26 These family editions highlight the remnant of patriarchy and the move toward individualism.

---

The Useful Edition

Most of these editors, as I discussed previously, assert the moral value of these family editions. However, a number of these editors also highlight the pragmatic nature of some of these texts. These editions may provide instruction for the reader, they may offer spiritual advice, they may present suggestions for effective parenting, or they may include important historical information. Featuring this theme of usefulness in a preface is a display of familial pride about the accomplishments and contributions, whether literary, political, historical, or ideological, of the author.

In his biography of Elizabeth Singer Rowe, featured in her *Works* (1739), Theophilus Rowe asserts the spiritual value of his sister-in-law’s poetry. He places Elizabeth Singer Rowe in the category of truly great writer. He claims, “all that [she] can be suppos’d to rejoice in is, that [her] usefulness, not that [her] fame, survives [her]” (iii). Elizabeth Singer Rowe’s piety, devotion, and prayerfulness, as exemplified in her poetry, are a “useful” model and exercise for the reader. Stephen Wren’s edition of the Wren family manuscripts, *Parentalia* (1750), is another significant example of a useful edition. His preface opens with the following phrase: “A Respect for the Memory of worthy Ancestors, and a Desire of communicating useful Knowledge to the Public, were the Motives which prompted my father to compile this Work, partly biographical, and partly scientifical . . .” (iii). Perusing the contents of the volume reveals political documents (journals, letters, speeches, and reports), scientific treatises, mathematical studies, philosophical works, and architectural renderings and proposals. The volume is useful in that it contains such an extensive amount of material that is so obviously relevant to English history. Likewise, Eugenia Stanhope outlines the usefulness of her father-in-
law’s (Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield) *Letters* published in 1774. This edition features a father’s letters to his son. Eugenia Stanhope, in her dedication to Lord North states, “I hope your Lordship’s approbation of a work, written by the late Earl of Chesterfield, on so important a subject as Education, will not fail to secure that of the Public: and I shall then feel myself happily in the assured merit of ushering into the world so useful a performance” (i-ii). In this edition, the editor feels the pedagogical approach of her father-in-law has great value for eighteenth-century readers. The editor subsequently indicates in the Advertisement that Philip Dormer Stanhope’s letters touch on many subjects: religion, science, “dead languages,” “ancient authors,” and “human actions” (iv). All of these epistolary lessons are supposed to be especially helpful for fathers.

The previous paragraph describes three “useful editions.” However, those are certainly not the only examples. Barbauld’s *Legacy for Young Ladies* (1826), edited by Lucy Aikin, and Reginald Heber’s *Sermons Preached in England* (1829) and *Sermons Preached in India* (1830), edited by Amelia Heber, also fall into this category. All of these editions take part in didacticism. Barbauld’s *Legacy for Young Ladies* is a collection of instructive works for young women. Heber’s *Sermons* are also didactic, but in a much broader sense. His sermons include exegesis, guides for Christians, and theological discussions.

In the above mentioned editions, the editors are more explicitly interested in the practical information that they can share with the reading public, and most of these editions were quite successful. Editions of Elizabeth Rowe’s *Works* and Philip Dormer
Stanhope’s *Letters* went through numerous editions.\(^27\) A second edition of Anna Laetitia Barbauld’s *Legacy for Young Ladies*, edited by Lucy Aikin, was published in 1826.\(^28\) The frequency of these editions shows that eighteenth-century readers were interested in useful texts that contained information about spirituality, pedagogy, and history. These family editors contributed much to literary and academic discourse by ensuring the publication of these texts.

**The Memorial Text**

Every single one of these editions pays tribute to the author. These editors universally place at least a sentence or two, and often considerably more than that, in their prefatory material that honors the memory of their loved one. These accolades are generally sincere and moving statements that highlight the nature of these family editions. In fact, this facet of these family editions is the most prevalent and most important. More than any other function, these texts are meant to pay homage. For instance, Brian Fairfax honors his brother, Thomas Fairfax, “. . . so long shall the name of my Lord Fairfax be honoured by good men, and be in perpetual remembrance” (x). Similarly, John Hoadly lauds his father, Benjamin Hoadly: “. . . he added to the Name of Scholar those far superior, of a *good Man*, a *good Subject*, and a *true Lover of his Country*” (vii). Maria Edgeworth reveals the centrality of memorializing her father through the edition of his *Memoirs*: “. . . I could not relinquish the hope of doing justice to the memory of my father; of the father who educated me; to whom, under Providence, I owe all of good or happiness I have enjoyed in life” (iv). Some editors state their goal

---

\(^{27}\) Stephen and Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 17, 339; and vol. 18, 922.

of memorializing their loved one more directly than others. However, even if the tribute is subtle, it is nearly always apparent. Amelia Heber’s minimal prefatory material in her editions of her husband’s *Sermons Preached in England* and *Sermons Preached in India* still manages an appreciative and loving tone. In other words, honoring the author seems to be the central editorial concern in these editions. This is particularly interesting as it places an emphasis on familial love while it also reveals a desire to pay tribute to familial ancestry, a vestige of the patriarchal family structure.

To illustrate this point more thoroughly, I will focus on *Poems on Several Occasions* (1748) by Thomas Warton, the elder (edited by his son, Joseph Warton). This edition on the surface seems like a simple collection of poems. However, twentieth-century scholarship brought to light the fact that a number of the poems are not by Thomas Warton. In fact, his sons, Joseph Warton, who edited the collection, and Thomas Warton, the younger, both contributed poems to the edition—probably more than 19 poems, David Fairer points out. As I outline in the annotation for this edition, the Warton brothers most likely included forgeries for two reasons. First, the Warton’s were in financial trouble after the death of their father. By increasing the number of poems, the volume would be more marketable. Second, according to Joseph A. Vance, Joseph Warton wanted to “enhance the literary reputation of his father.”

By incorporating some new poems, the volume would be appreciated by a contemporary reading public. Ultimately, Joseph Warton’s approach is a bit of an editing nightmare. However, it is interesting to think about this situation a little differently—in terms of family. When the

---

editor changed the edition for marketing purposes, it was for the financial benefit of the Warton family, and When Joseph Warton enhanced the poetic reputation of his father, it was for the sake of erecting a literary monument to him. This particular editorial situation is helpful in that it reveals the complexities of the family edition as memorial.

The edition as literary memorial to a loved one also underscores the fact that many of these family editions were published posthumously. These editors were often presenting these texts to readers as a eulogy of sorts. As R. Clifton Spargo states, “. . . almost every literary work of mourning develops a dialectic between those who are outside (those, for example who have mourned inadequately) and the mourner who is truly dedicated to the memory of the other she laments.”

In this light, Joseph and Thomas Warton’s need to inflate their father’s literary reputation posthumously makes more sense. Memorializing a family member through a scholarly edition, then, can often become a literary exercise of mourning publicly. This is certainly an example of how these editors seek to reinforce family ties.

Considered as a whole, the prefaces of these family editions praise the author and, by extension, express familial affection. Furthermore, these editors are in a truly unique editorial situation in that they are to some extent entwined in the narratives, poems, and memoirs. Their familial voice becomes a part of the text, revealing family pride in the traditional patrilineal sense, as well as love for family.

The following bibliography features twenty-three annotations of the family editions discussed above. These annotations are arranged chronologically, beginning in 1699, and ending in 1834.

Annotated Bibliography: Family Editions


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 51.

Theophilus Rowe, ed. *The Miscellaneous Works in Prose and Verse of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe. The Greater Part now first published, by her Order, from her Original Manuscripts, by Mr. Theophilus Rowe. To which are added, Poems on Several Occasions, by Mr. Thomas Rowe. And to the whole is prefix’d, An Account of the Lives and Writings of the Authors.* 2 Vols. By Elizabeth Rowe. London: R. Hett and R. Dodsley, 1739.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 165.

---

32 I also wanted to include Christopher Smart’s *Poems of the Late Christopher Smart*, edited by Francis Newbey and his nephew Christopher Hunter; however, I could only locate a copy of the second of the two volumes, which did not contain any editorial commentary. Lastly, I also hoped to include the five volumes from Jonathan Swift’s *Works* that were edited by his cousin, Deane Swift (volumes fifteen and sixteen added in 1765, as well as volumes twenty-one through twenty-three added in 1767. The numbering of the volumes corresponds with other volumes edited by Hawkesworth, as outlined by Stephen and Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 19, 226). These volumes, too, were difficult to locate. There are no editions at Library of Congress or the Folger Library, and there are no digital copies to be found on-line. Despite the omission of these two editions, this bibliography of family editions presents a representative picture of the editorial concerns and methods of family editors.
Joseph Warton, ed. *Poems on Several Occasions. By the Reverend Thomas Warton, Batchelor of Divinity, Late Vicar of Basingstoke in Hampshire, and sometime Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. By Thomas Warton, the Elder.*

London: R. Manby and H.S. Cox, 1748.33

Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** No illustrations included in edition.
2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page included. There is a brief epigraph on the title page from Horace: “Nec Lusisse Pudeat.”34
3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** No table of contents included.
4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** Joseph Warton dedicates the edition “To the Right Honourable Fulwar Craven, Lord Craven, Baron of Hampstead Marshall.” He considers the edition of his father’s poems as a memorial to the friendship Craven had with his deceased father.
5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:** There is no editorial preface or advertisement. There is, however, a substantial list of subscribers (15 pages in length).
6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND:** There is no biographical background or history provided by the editor.
7) **NOTE ON THE TEXT:** No notes on variants or editorial emendation. There is a list on page 228 (last page of the edition): “Errors of the Press.” This list explains a mere seven errors found by the editor.
8) **SCHOLARLY EDITION:** One volume of poems by Thomas Warton (although numerous poems have since been attributed to Thomas Warton, the younger, as well as Joseph Warton—both sons of Thomas Warton, the elder).
9) **FOOTNOTES:** No footnotes included.
10) **ENDNOTES:** No endnotes included.
11) **GLOSSARY:** No glossary included.
12) **APPENDIX:** At the end of the edition, Joseph Warton includes two poems (1) “Ode on the Death of the Author. By a Lady” by J.W., who is Joseph Warton’s daughter Jane, and (2) “Ode on the Death of the Author” by Joseph Warton himself.
13) **INDEX:** No index included.
14) **SIZE:** Octavo.

---

33 Note that this annotation is based on a facsimile edition published by The Facsimile Text Society (New York) in 1930.
34 “The shame is not in having sported.” This translation can be found in J.K. Hoyt’s and Anna L. Ward’s *The Cyclopædia of Practical Quotations, English and Latin* (New York: I.K. Funk, 1882), 540.
When considering this edition in light of its editorial statement about family in the eighteenth century, it is more important to consider what Joseph Warton does not reveal in his preface to this edition of his father’s poetry. In short, in recent years it has become common knowledge that this volume of poetry contains a number of poems by Thomas Warton, the elder; however, the volume also contains at least nineteen poems written by Joseph Warton (the editor) and his brother, Thomas Warton, the younger, which are attributed to their father, Thomas Warton, the elder.35 Joseph Warton does not mention the inclusion of nineteen poems that were added after his father’s death.

Warton scholars often attribute the inclusion of poetic forgeries in this volume to the family’s dire financial situation. The additional poetry would make the volume more attractive for subscribers and, hence, garner more sales. In all honesty, the approach worked, as the list of subscribers in the 1748 edition spans fifteen pages. However, John Vance explains that finances were not the only driving factor: “Joseph Warton’s motives for the deception were both financial and filial: he needed to offer a substantial and attractive volume for sale, and he wished to enhance the literary reputation of his father.”36 It seems that Joseph Warton, ever the literary critic, felt that improving on his father’s poems was warranted. David Fairer states, “Joseph must have realized that many of the poems he had collected would greatly benefit from his own revision, and that the volume would be made longer and more varied if he and Thomas included pieces of their own.”37

---

35 David Fairer, “Joseph Warton,” 263.
At the middle of the twentieth century scholars became interested in this volume anew. They began to consider Thomas Warton (the elder) as the preeminent “preromantic” poet. It turns out that those poems in this 1748 edition that embodied this preromantic spirit were actually those of Thomas Warton’s (the elder) sons. It seems that Joseph Warton, as editor, guided this edition so that the Augustan poems by his father were updated and interspersed with more modern and compelling poems for a 1748 readership. So in terms of the forgeries by Joseph and Thomas Warton (the younger), they may seem at first to be a rather callous dismissal of their father’s poetry. However, to a certain degree, the brothers Warton actually reinvigorated their father’s poetic reputation.

In light of David Fairer’s discovery in 1975 of the true textual history of this edition (Christina le Prevost added to the discovery by adding at least five more poems attributed to the younger Wartons in addition to the ten or more that Fairer originally discovered), the ramifications in terms of the editor’s role are at first glimpse rather disturbing. Not only did Joseph Warton emend the manuscript, he did so without any editorial statement about the extent of the changes to the text. However, Joseph Warton presented an edition that would be more in line with a contemporary audience and an edition that would, as a result, memorialize his father. Fairer explains that Joseph and Thomas Warton, the younger, “sustained an affectionately close relationship throughout their lives, shared many of the same friends, and helped each other in a variety of critical

---

and poetic projects.” It is safe to say that this familial closeness plays out in the 1748 edition of their father’s *Poems on Several Occasions*. The final poem of the volume, entitled “Ode on the Death of the Author,” is by Joseph Warton. It is the one poem that he takes credit for in the edition. In line 7, Joseph Warton’s editorial perspective is made most apparent: “Fond wilt thou be his Name to praise.” In the end, Joseph and Thomas Warton were loving sons who hoped to preserve their father’s memory through their editorial efforts on his behalf.

**Stephen Wren, the Younger, ed. *Parentalia: or Memories of the Family of the Wrens; Viz. of Mathew Bishop of Ely, Christopher Dean of Windsor, &c. But Chiefly of Sir Christopher Wren, Late Surveyor-General of the Royal Buildings, President of the Royal Society, &c. &c. By the Wren Family*. London: T. Osborn (Gray’s-Inn) and R. Dodsley (Pall-Mall), 1750.**

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 60.

**Isaac Hawkins Browne, the Younger, ed. *Poems Upon Various Subjects, Latin and English. By the Late Isaac Hawkins Browne, Esq; Published by His Son*. By Isaac Hawkins Browne, the Elder. London: J. Nourse and C. Marsh. 1768.**

Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustration included in the edition.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Two page table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: A sonnet by Thomas Edwards appears prior to the Table of Contents. This poem acts as a dedication to Isaac Hawkins Browne, the Elder.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: A preface entitled “To the

---

40 David Fairer, “Joseph Warton,” 262.
This edition does not utilize extensive editorial apparatus to elaborate on the poetry of Isaac Hawkins Browne, the elder. The editor, Isaac Hawkins Browne, the younger (son of the author), feels his father’s poetry is worthy to stand on its own. The editor states in his brief preface, “To the Reader,” that “The following is a Collection of Poems, written by my Father at different periods of his life. Those, which have been before printed, have been generally admired; and, I hope, the few, now published for the first time, will meet with as favourable a reception” (first page of preface). The editor does mention a few of the poems that seem to be considered the stand out pieces of the work and that have met with favorable feedback from critics and readers. For instance, the editor explains, “The Pipe of Tobacco was written in imitation of Cibber, Ambrose Phillips, Thomson, Young, Pope, and Swift” (second page of preface). Notice how the son places the writing of his father in a realm with the preeminent poets of the eighteenth century—a not-so-subtle statement about what this editor thinks of the poetry included in the edition, or at the very least he is being smart about marketing his father’s poetry.

Lastly, the editor states that he will not provide biographical background on his father’s life—there is no need. He states, “It will not be necessary for me to enlarge upon the
Character of the Author. His merit is well known; and these Poems will be an ample, and, I hope, a lasting testimony, not only of an extensive and improved Genius, but of a Reason employed upon the noblest Subjects, and a Heart anxious for the Publick Good” (third and final page of preface). In conclusion, Isaac Hawkins Browne, the younger, feels his father’s poetry needs to be published because it is worthy of the public’s attention in that the poetry makes an important moral statement.

The lack of biographical information included in the edition, however, warrants further discussion. The *Dictionary of National Biography* states, “In 1768 [Browne, the younger] edited his father’s poems in two editions [one for close friends and relatives, the other for the general public], the best of which, with plates by Sterne, was not for sale. This edition, it may be presumed, contained the memoir of his father, which he is said to have issued with his works; in any case there is no memoir in the edition offered to the public, which is the only one generally accessible . . .” In terms of the convergence of family and scholarly editing, this is particularly interesting in that Browne (the younger) presents one text to those individuals who are given a private edition and another text to the public. Perhaps, the son wanted his father to be remembered more for his poetry than for his life. This is the only instance among the forty-seven editions that receive attention in this project in which there were two different versions of an edition—at least two versions that were sanctioned by the author or editor via a publisher or printer. In the edition that was sold in Calcutta, Amelia Heber included a separate advertisement in her }

---

42 In the case of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, her poetry and letters were distributed to various friends and other recipients prior to their official publication, and Carol Barash explains that this resulted in her works, often emended, making their way to print in formats she did not approve of. Coterie writing in general ran the risk of being reproduced and emended. For further research, I would start with Barbara Kiefer Lewalski’s *Writing Women in Jacobean England* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993).
edition of her husband’s *Sermons Preached in India*. However, this was not entirely different edition. It was merely an extra page that was prefixed to the edition sold abroad. In other words, Isaac Hawkins Browne’s (the younger) decision to create two separate editions was unique.

Once again referring to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, it seems that Browne, the elder may have had his character flaws: “Browne had little aptitude for professional or public life, but he was a man of lively talents and varied accomplishments.” For instance, he studied law, but he never practiced, and he is remembered for enjoying wine. However, some of Browne’s poems were well received. “Design and Beauty,” “A Pipe of Tobacco,” and his Latin poem, “De Animi Immortalitate” were quite well-known to readers of the mid-eighteenth century. These poems are featured prominently in this posthumous edition that aims to reinvent the poet through a new focus on his poetry.


**W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1773.**

Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** Frontispiece of Benjamin Hoadly, with the inscription “Veritas et Patria” (truth and native land).

2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page included for each of the three volumes.

3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** Table of contents included in each of the volumes.

4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** John Hoadly, the editor, dedicates the edition “To the King.” Also, an ode to Benjamin Hoadly

---

appears in the beginning of the second volume.

5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: No editorial preface included.

6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: John Hoadly’s contribution to *Biographia Britannica*, which focuses on Benjamin Hoadly’s life, is included and updated by Hoadly for this edition.

7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: A section entitled “Errata” appears prior to the table of contents in volume one and offers corrections to spelling and grammar in all three volumes.

8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: Three volumes of text by Benjamin Hoadly.

9) FOOTNOTES: No footnotes included.

10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.

11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.

12) APPENDIX: No labeled appendix appears in the first volume. However, tables of scripture appear prior to the table of contents.

13) INDEX: Index to all three volumes appears in the beginning of the first volume.

14) SIZE: Folio.

After the frontispiece, the reader immediately encounters John Hoadly’s (editor and son of Benjamin Hoadly) dedication to the King. In this dedication, the editor lauds Benjamin Hoadly’s contribution as writer, British subject, scholar, philosopher, theologian, father, and husband. He states toward the end of the dedication, “Thus, as a Champion for Truth, Religion, and Liberty, he hath layed the greatest Obligations on his Countrymen, as *Men, Christians, and Britons*, and particularly on the *Royal Protestant House*, of which Your Majesty is the Support and Ornament: whose foundations are established on the solid Principles he defends, and on them only” (iii). Hoadly hopes that his father’s legacy as Anglican Bishop pleases the king and pays tribute to the King.

Subsequently, the editor includes his “Article HOADLY,” which had been a contribution to the Supplement to the *Biographia Britannica*. The editor explains that he “hath rather preferred reprinting the same *Article* here (with what little alterations have since occurred) than to take upon him the invidious and suspected Task of composing *The Life of a Father*: of which as the same facts must necessarily be the foundation;
consequently the Parade of such a Composition, however well executed, will be considered as speaking more in Favour of the Living, than the Dead” (v). Hoadly would rather his biographical treatment of his father’s life come across as a tribute rather than a eulogy—an understandable point of view. The tone of this passage almost reads as if it is with great difficulty that the editor compiles this edition. I sense as I read through these introductory comments to his “Article HOADLY” that he is still grieving for his father.

After this explanation, the editor lists the various tributes, dedications, and letters to his father that he is going to include in the edition prior to moving into the reprint of the “Article HOADLY.” This is particularly interesting, as Benjamin Hoadly was a controversial figure in his day. He was a strong supporter of church conformity. As a result, in “Article HOADLY,” John Hoadly explains why he includes some letters by dissenters:

[the reader] will find two Dedications to the Bishop; Pieces, in which few People expect to see the most exact Truth religiously observed. They will be disappointed; the former consisting of Historical Facts, the latter of well-deserved Panegyrick: the first the Voice of Dissenters, in Gratitude for his Defence of our common religious and civil Liberties; though He had been a strenuous Defender of the Church of England, in every Quarter where he thought it defensible; and the last that of an obliged Friend, speaking the honest Dictates of his Heart to his Patron; which He alone thought too high an Encomium (vii).

Edwin Bingham highlights the controversial nature of Benjamin Hoadly by focusing on his early writing. He states, “In the controversy over conformity, Hoadly’s belief in the feasibility of a comprehension encouraged him to work from the other end in an attempt to convert moderate Dissenters to constant conformity.” In fact, Bingham goes so far as to say that Hoadly’s participation in the conformity debate was contentious: “whether by unconscious implication or direct design, the effect was to elevate the position of the

---

Whigs at the expense of the Tories.” However, Hoadly did not believe the King, Queen, or Church had a divine right. Kenneth O. Morgan explains that “Benjamin Hoadly, who held three Bishoprics [ultimately, Hoadly held four bishoprics] in succession [denied] the divine nature both of his office and of the Church itself.” It is easy to see why Hoadly was such a controversial figure: he advocated for conformity in pieces like “Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-Jurors both in Church and State,” but he also argued for human individuality and “self defense” in treatises such as his “Essay on the Origin of Civil Government.” It is evident that the name of Benjamin Hoadly was met with praise and condemnation in the eighteenth century: “Probably no divine of the church of England has been more violently attacked than Hoadly. As the prominent and aggressive leader of the extreme latitudinarian party in church and state he naturally attracted all the strongest assaults of the tory and high church parties.”

All in all, “Article HOADLY” is a lengthy treatment of Benjamin Hoadly’s life. He discusses the chronology, controversy, and writings of his father. In light of the heated criticism that his father often received and frequently spurred on, it would be an obviously difficult task to pen an even-handed biography. John Hoadly addresses the controversies in his biography, but he does not fall into the trap of taking up the torch too vehemently. The tone of the biography, which is laden with detail, is straightforward and matter-of-fact. Also, there are substantial footnotes added to the biographical sketch in

45 Ibid.
48 Ibid., 914.
which he adds lengthy quotations from his father’s works to round out the biography since its first appearance in the *Biographia Britannica*.

However, it is in the dedication that we see the filial affection of the son for the father. It is here that John Hoadly sings his father’s praises and defends his father’s record as Bishop and politician:

> By the Bishop’s seizing every proper Opportunity to defend the Cause of Truth, Virtue, and Religion in general, and of our happy Constitution in particular, in whatever Quarter attacked; by his asserting and vindicating on the most interesting Occasions, and against the greatest Names, (and that at once with the Temper of a Christian, and the Good-manners of a Gentleman) the Rights of the Throne and those of Englishmen, he added to the Name of Scholar those far superior, of a good Man, a good Subject, and a true Lover of his Country” (vii).

It is with statements such as these that John Hoadly aims to preserve, moreso than his family name, the name of Benjamin Hoadly.

**Mrs. Eugenia Stanhope, ed. *Letters Written by the Late Right Honourable Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield to His Son, Philip Stanhope, Esq; Late Envoy Extraordinary at the Court of Dresden: Together With Several Other Pieces on Various Subjects*. 2 vols. By Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th earl of Chesterfield. London: J. Dodsley, 1774.**

Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** Frontispiece of Philip Dormer Stanhope in the first volume.
2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page in each of the two volumes.
3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** No Table of Contents included in edition.
4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** The edition is dedicated “To the Right Honorourable The Lord North, First Lord Commissioner of the Treasury, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter” from Mrs. Eugenia Stanhope.
The editorial advertisement explains the “scope” (iii) of the edition, which is a collection of letters from a father to his son aimed at educating his son in the ways of the world. Mrs. Stanhope, the author’s daughter-in-law and editor of the edition, describes her husband’s epistolary education by his father as follows (this breakdown appears on page iv of the first volume):

1) The letters are meant to establish a “firm foundation in good Principles and sound Religion.”
2) The letters are also meant to give his son “a perfect knowledge of the dead Languages, and all the different branches of solid learning.”
3) The letters should also provide insight into the sciences.
4) Ultimately, Stanhope wants his son to gain a general “knowledge of mankind.”

Mrs. Stanhope insists that the value of these letters will be appreciated universally. She states, “I flatter myself, they will be read with general satisfaction” (iv). Like other editions, this collection of letters was edited and published for its didactic value. She consistently stresses throughout the advertisement the value of her father-in-law’s approach in educating his son properly.

On the subsequent pages, Mrs. Stanhope pays tribute to the Earl of Chesterfield’s attributes, and she also asserts the purity of the text. She states, “What I can, and do
ascertain is, the Authenticity of this Publication; which comprises not a single line, that is not the late Earl of Chesterfield’s” (v). Lastly, Mrs. Stanhope discusses some facets of the text. She explains that repetitions remain in the text as they were part of her husband’s system of education; they are not errors in the text.

Eugenia Stanhope also makes an interesting comment about her role as a female editor. She states,

I beg leave to add, that if the following work proves of as much utility to the Youth of these Kingdoms, as the Letters were to the person for whose immediate instruction they were written, my utmost wishes will be gratified; and I shall esteem myself happy in reflecting, that, though a woman, I have had the most real of all satisfactions,—that of being of some use to my Country (vii).

Her depreciating comment about her gender, while troubling to a modern reader, may be an attempt to diffuse any criticism regarding the fact that she is a woman editor. Women certainly played a role in the world of editing and publishing, but just as with women authors, women editors had to navigate carefully how they portrayed themselves. So, while she is to a certain degree putting forth a self-effacing persona here, she is a woman who is taking on the daunting scholarly task of editing.

At this point, it is important to mention something about the family commentary that can be teased out of the editorial advertisement, the edition as a whole, and the family history. This is a collection of letters that was written by the renowned Earl of Chesterfield to his illegitimate son, and it was edited by his son’s wife. This is an interesting textual/family dynamic to say the least. The Earl of Chesterfield took much time and care in the upbringing of his son. His instructive letters were prolific. It was a tragic blow when Philip Stanhope died early as the Earl of Chesterfield had high hopes for his son, which his letters make clear. Adding to the grief for the Earl of Chesterfield
was the fact that unbeknownst to him his son “had married a woman by no means in
keeping with his plans for him.” This revelation about his son’s life proved to be ironic
because the Earl of Chesterfield “believed that man was influenced more by appearance
than by reality.” Chesterfield, a man renowned for his courtly and parliamentary
experience, his worldly manners, his ability to persuade, and his experience associating
with the elite, prided himself on knowing how the world worked. When Chesterfield
learned the truth, it must have pained him to learn he was deceived by appearances. It is
important to note, however, that “Chesterfield treated his unlooked-for daughter-in-law
and his two grandsons warmly, generously, and without complaint.”

Approximately one year after Chesterfield’s demise, Eugenia Stanhope, Philip
Stanhope’s widow prepared his manuscript for publication. She first approached Edward
Gibbon and Horace Walpole—both turned down the manuscript. However, she finally
found a publisher: “She sold [the letters] to Dodsley for 1,500. The earl’s surviving
representatives vainly endeavoured to stop the publication by applying for an
injunction.” Outwardly, it seems that Eugenia Stanhope published the letters from her
father-in-law to her husband for monetary gain. The success of the publication certainly
paid off; by 1800 eleven editions had been issued. However, the kindness and charity
on the part of Chesterfield toward his two grandsons could have had something to do
with her favorable representation of him in her editorial advertisement. She was repaying
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him for his kindness. Furthermore, the Chesterfield’s relatives may not have wished to deprive Eugenia Stanhope of monetary compensation; rather, they may have been uncomfortable with the letters reaching the public. Sidney Gullick, Jr., quotes the *London Chronicle*: “When the news of this publication [the Letters] reached the ears of the executors, they were alarmed because the contained some free opinions of the men and manners of the present age.”

However, there is another way of looking at the family dynamic. Gullick describes the Earl of Chesterfield’s charity in another light altogether. He claims,

> Each grandson, upon the attainment of his majority, was to have for life an annuity of the same amount [one hundred pounds], and also, from a sum of ten thousand pounds to be laid out immediately upon Chesterfield’s death, half of the principal and accrued compound interest. This was generous of Chesterfield, so far as the boys were concerned, but is was so placed that Mrs. Stanhope could touch none of it, unless her sons chose, and that not before they should become of age.”

In other words, Eugenia Stanhope’s praise of her father-in-law could be merely a rhetorical device to promote the sale of editions and her own income as she was overlooked in her father-in-law’s will. Gullick’s claim, while fascinating, is largely speculation in that it is just as possible that Eugenia Stanhope may not have expected any income from her father-in-law.

As far as family editions go, this particular text is important and fascinating. It says a lot about how families are perceived privately and publicly. By reading the Earl of Chesterfield’s letters, the reader is keenly aware of the affection between the father and son. However, Philip Stanhope’s secret marriage to Eugenia does raise questions about the closeness of his relationship with his father. Perhaps a parent-child relationship

---
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maintained through correspondence did not foster a true kinship. In terms of the relationship between Chesterfield, his daughter-in-law, and grandsons, there must be a bit more conjecture. In the entry on Chesterfield in *Bentley’s Miscellany*, there is some useful insight in this regard: “[Chesterfield] adopted the heir to his title [his godson], but he could not secure the allegiance of a son; and he died in the year 1773, almost an octogenarian, with little to soothe the misery of the death-bed.”\(^\text{57}\) Perhaps, Chesterfield’s grief and his inclusion of his son’s children in his will highlight his familial loyalty, and Eugenia Stanhope’s edition of his letters highlights her familial connection. It is also possible, however, that she co-opts the language of familial love in her prefatory material for her own financial gain. Whatever the case may be, and there is much speculation in this regard, both the Earl of Chesterfield and Eugenia Stanhope lost much and gained much through their family connections.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 188.

**John Vancouver, ed.** *A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and Round the World; in Which the Coast of North-West America Has Been Carefully Examined and Accurately Surveyed. Undertaken by his Majesty’s Command, Principally With a View to Ascertain the Existence of Any Navigable Communication Between the North*

---


\(^{58}\) Note that this annotation is based on the 1793 edition published in Philadelphia by William Young.
Pacific and North Atlantic Oceans; and Performed in the Years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794, and 1795, in the Discovery Sloop of War, and Armed Tender Chatham, Under the Command of Captain George Vancouver. 3 vols. By George Vancouver.
The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 84.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 191.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 91.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 203.

59 Note that for this annotation I used the 1799 edition published in Philadelphia by James Carey.

Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** Frontispiece is a sketch of a bust of Charles James Fox with a verse passage by Richard Fitzpatrick printed beneath it: “A Patriot’s even course he steered/ Mid Faction’s wildest storms unmoved/ By all who marked his course, revered/ By all who knew his heart, beloved.”

2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page included.

3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** Contents included for each of two chapters in the volume.

4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** No acknowledgment or dedication included.

5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:** A preface entitled “To the Reader” included at the beginning of the volume.

6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND:** No separate biography by the editor, Lord Holland.

7) **NOTE ON THE TEXT:** There are no separate notes on variants or editorial emendations included in the edition.

8) **SCHOLARLY EDITION:** One volume of history by Charles James Fox (divided into two chapters).

9) **FOOTNOTES:** There are margin notes providing information such as dates, etc.

10) **ENDNOTES:** No endnotes included.

11) **GLOSSARY:** No glossary included.

12) **APPENDIX:** A four-part appendix is included. The material in each of these four appendices is correspondence and historical documents.

13) **INDEX:** No index included.

14) **SIZE:** Octavo.

J.R. Dinwiddy’s *Radicalism and Reform in Britain, 1780-1850* provides some useful background when considering this edition: “[Charles James Fox’s] *History of the Early Part of the Reign of James the Second* is a fragment of what might have been a much larger work; it was published posthumously with a preface by his nephew Lord
Holland, in 1808. Although it was given a mixed reception by the critics, it was regarded for several decades as something of a classic.”⁶⁰ Dinwiddy goes on to explain that

The character of Fox’s History may be further illuminated by a study of the reaction it produced. Despite the fame of the author, no great impact should have been expected from a historical fragment dealing with a very short and not especially significant period. Its reception by the public was certainly less enthusiastic than Miller had hoped, and he barely covered his expenses. However the book did provoke much discussion and controversy among critics and scholars.⁶¹

This background information by Dinwiddy is useful because it highlights the controversy associated with the author, but it also highlights the fact that this is a family edition. Fox was a powerful, and flawed, Whig statesman as well as a celebrity, and it makes sense that an edition by such a renowned figure could be met with praise and criticism.

Tillyard explains, “Charles James Fox, the politician and the most famous public figure of the second half of the century, became instantly celebrated when he first appeared in the House of Commons following his election at the age of nineteen in 1768. His blue wigs, red shoes, extravagant gambling, determined womanizing, brilliant speeches and overwhelming charm were the stuff of speculation and gossip for decades.”⁶² It would certainly have been an intimidating task to bring the manuscript of such a celebrity to the public.

Lord Holland, Charles Fox’s nephew, opens the preface, “To the Reader,” by explaining that Fox’s history is incomplete. Even so, Holland asserts that Fox’s text is an important historical work and warrants publication. Holland then discusses on the first two pages of the Preface the task that is set before him as editor:

---

⁶¹ Ibid., 23.
I find these goals to be more specific than most editorial statements in the eighteenth century. Holland wants to provide biographical background, historical background, and textual history. This is a very modern editorial attitude. He aims to provide the historical context in which the edition was produced—Jerome McGann would be proud.

As a former Member of Parliament and player in English history, Fox was drawn to history. He settled on contributing to historical scholarship by focusing on the events of 1688. As Holland explains, Fox found these events to be important. The glorious revolution was “cheering and animating,” Holland intimates (iv). Furthermore, the events needed historical commentary. In other words, as Holland explains, “the choice of that period was recommended by yet higher considerations; the desire of rescuing from misrepresentation, the most glorious transaction of our history; the opportunity of instructing his countrymen in the real nature of their Constitution; and the hope of impressing on mankind those lessons applicable to all times, which are to be drawn from that memorable occurrence” (v). Holland explains his uncle’s text is an exercise in historical clarification and didactic discourse. Fox’s History, according to the editor, illustrates the notion that individuals and governments learn from history.

About ten pages into the preface Holland explains that Charles Fox continued to write the History beyond the events of 1688, but his effort was continually interrupted by other intellectual pursuits. This observation certainly contributes to an understanding of the flow of the narrative or a shift in narrative tone. If Fox was continually putting the manuscript down and picking it up a later date, the narrative or margin notes may seem
fragmented at points. Holland made a wise decision in providing this background information about disjointed portions of narrative in that he prepares the reader, which ultimately will make them more forgiving of the imperfect *History*.

Holland also describes Charles Fox as a fastidious historian. He provides the following quote by Fox to back up this point: “I believe I am too scrupulous both about language and facts; though with respect to the latter, it is hardly possible. It is astonishing how many facts one finds related, for which there is no authority whatever” (xii). Holland then describes the great lengths that Fox took to procure documents and see research through to its ultimate conclusion. Fox was, in short, a historian who believed in fact-checking. Holland also includes some correspondence to the Earl of Lauderdale (xiii) and to Malcom Laing (xv) that illustrates how ambitious Fox was about gathering details and facts regarding English history. Also, Fox transcribed historical documents that were relevant to his discussion of James II while he was in Paris (refer to page xxvii). Throughout this discourse, Holland is cementing Fox’s credibility as historian.

Late in the preface (page xviii to be exact), Holland shifts the discussion from Fox as researcher to the nature of Fox’s manuscript. Holland explains that the history is thorough considering it was not entirely finished: “The consequence would be, that some passages, which, according to modern taste, must be called peculiarities, might, with superficial critics, pass for defects which he had overlooked, or imperfections which he intended to correct” (xviii). Also, Fox believed in writing history as a “story” (xxix). He did not break his history into thematic chapters or theoretical digressions. Holland
believes that the public needs to understand this particular approach to writing history—an approach that could be met with criticism.

Holland also explains that Fox preferred to write in a simple and direct style. His tone and diction, then, appear to be rather conversational. This aspect of the edition, Holland insists, should not be considered a ramification of the incomplete nature of the manuscript. In other words, the peculiarities of phrase and the colloquialisms are simply Fox’s style, and Holland remains true to this style in his edition.

Interestingly, Holland calls to the reader’s attention the fact that Charles Fox had an amanuensis. His wife transcribed his notes and wrote down portions of text that he would dictate to her. He would correct and revise notes before he turned them over to his wife for transcription. Finally, Mr. Fox would inspect the transcription of his wife. This is useful information and an instance when an editor pulls the curtain back for the reader to fully understand the edition. By letting the reader know that Fox relied on an amanuensis to produce the manuscript, Holland participates in full disclosure. As editorial practice develops across the long eighteenth century, these editors seem to get increasingly specific about the context of the edition.

Toward the end of the preface, Holland pays tribute to Mr. Laing for assisting him with the “division of the paragraphs, the annexing of marginal notes and references, the selection of Appendix, and the superintendance of the press” (xxxiv), and he also explains that the Appendix includes important correspondence and other information.

The final paragraphs are a sort of tribute to Fox and the usual display of anxiety regarding releasing the edition to the public. As editor, Holland hopes he has done Fox an honor in his decisions regarding format, emendations, etc. Holland has not written a
biographical account of Fox because he is so well known that it is not necessary, others have done a better job, and it is not the task at hand. Holland hopes the edition of Fox’s history is homage enough for Fox’s family and friends.

There is also a post-script to the preface in which a letter by Charles Fox to Mr. Heywood about Lord Shaftesbury is included. This letter shows Fox’s fairness toward Shaftesbury, a very contentious figure in his day. Holland, even in this final instance, attempts to frame Fox as a fair politician and objective historian.

Just prior to the post-script, Lord Holland reveals his anxiety about editing and preparing Fox’s manuscript for publication. He also indicates that the edition is meant to act as memorial: “Those who admired Mr. Fox in publick, and those who loved him in private, must naturally feel desirous that some memorial should be preserved of the great and good qualities of his head and heart” (xxxv). The majority of the preface is a thorough and matter-of-fact discussion of the edition. It is only at the end of the preface that Holland reveals his sense of loss regarding his uncle’s death and a sense of appreciation for him as friend and politician.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 211.

---

63 Note that this annotation is based on the AMS Press 1974 facsimile edition of this text.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 109.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 226.

Lucy Aikin, ed. *A Legacy for Young Ladies, Consisting of Miscellaneous Pieces, in Prose and Verse, By the Late Mrs. Barbauld*. By Anna Laetitia Barbauld. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown & Green. 1826. 64

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 232.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter two, page 236.

64 Note that I used a printed copy of the digital edition transcribed by Brown University’s Women Writers Project for this annotation. This edition was transcribed from the second edition of 1826. This edition is extremely difficult to locate; as a result, this is the only transcribed copy of an edition that I rely on in this dissertation.

65 Note that I base this annotation on a facsimile edition printed by Arno Press out of New York in 1972.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 130.


Included in edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustrations included in edition.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: The edition is dedicated to Sir Robert Harry Inglis, Bart. M.P.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: There is an extremely brief one page preface by the editor.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by the editor included in the edition.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume that includes nineteen sermons by Reginald Heber.
9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes are included; they clarify scriptural allusions in the text.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included.
13) INDEX: No index included.
14) SIZE: Octavo.

In terms of editorial commentary, this edition, unlike Amelia Heber’s edition of her husband’s *Narrative of a Journey Through India,* has little to offer. The editor
includes an exceptionally short preface of two short paragraphs. As they are so brief, I will reproduce the two paragraphs here in their entirety:

Several of the sermons now offered to the public were prepared by their Author for publication, and the remainder are considered as so far fitted for the press, as to be entitled to admission in the same series.
This volume will shortly be followed by a distinct work, containing sermons preached in India; and the Editor hopes, at some future period, to print a selection from the parochial sermons preached by her husband at Hodnet.

Amelia Heber was true to her word. *Sermons Preached in India* was also published in 1829. Furthermore, she published a biography of her husband and a collection of his poetry in 1841. In terms of the significance of this text as a family edition, it reaffirms Amelia Heber’s desire to bring to eighteenth-century readers her husband’s ideals of virtue and goodwill. Felicia Hemans, in “To the Memory of Heber,” helps to clarify the esteem with which Reginald Heber was held in his day:

If it be sad to speak of treasures gone,  
Of sainted genius called too soon away,  
Of light from this world taken, while it shone  
Yet kindling onward to the perfect day—  
How shall our grief, if mournful these things be,  
Flow forth, O thou of many gifts! For thee?  
Hath not thy voice been here amongst us heard?  
And that deep soul of gentleness and power,  
Have we not felt its breath in every word,  
Wont from thy lips, as Hermon’s dew, to shower?  
Yes! In our hearts thy fervent thoughts have burned—  
Of heaven they were, and thither have returned.66

Hemans was not the only prominent writer in the long eighteenth century to appreciate the sermons and service of Reginald Heber. Sir Walter Scott remembered him fondly.67

Robert Southey, while he did not rank his poetry as pre-eminent, certainly appreciated

Heber’s verse. The various editions of Heber’s sermons, journals, poetry, and hymns were, in short, welcomed by the readers of the day. The fact that Heber died young, after visiting a school in India during his tenure as Bishop of Calcutta, possibly added to the public desire to grieve and understand this well-respected man that was lost prematurely.

The fact that there is limited editorial commentary, then, seems appropriate in light of the litany of editions of various works by Heber. In a span of ten years, Amelia Heber released four extensive editions of her husband’s writing. There was not necessarily a need for a tribute in this edition, as she pays tribute to her husband extensively in his biography as well as the preface in his *Narrative of a Journey Through India*. She also pays tribute to her husband by showcasing nineteen of his sermons in this edition. These sermons focus on diverse spiritual issues: Sermon I is entitled “Time and Eternity,” Sermon IV is entitled “On the Existence and Influence of Evil Spirits,” Sermon VI elaborates on the “Character of Moses,” Sermon IX discusses “The Extension of Christ’s Kingdom,” Sermon XII is entitled “The Duties of the Ministry,” and Sermon XVI addresses “The Fear of Death.” As this representative list indicates, Heber touched upon issues of religion that were both personal and social in nature, and his sermons resonated with eighteenth-century readers.

Lastly, Amelia Heber does include a dedication in this edition to Robert Harry Inglis. This dedication honors Inglis for his support of Amelia Heber in her role as editor: “I dedicate this volume, as a token of gratitude for the affection shown to my husband’s memory, by the kind and judicious assistance he has afforded me in the

---

publication of his works.” In fact, Inglis would issue his own edition of Heber’s sermons in 1837. This is yet another instance of family members honoring the value of friendships. This is not the first dedication in honor of a dear friend of a lost loved one.


Included in edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Frontispiece is an “accurate drawing” (as Amelia Heber explains in her preface) of the Church of St. George in Madras, India.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included.
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: Table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: The edition is dedicated to Sir Charles Edward Grey.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT: There is a one page preface by the editor.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by the editor included in the edition.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume that includes seventeen sermons by Reginald Heber, as well as a “Valedictory Address” in honor of Reginald Heber’s departure for India, Heber’s response to that address, and “A Charge, Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Calcutta.”
9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes are included; they clarify scriptural allusions in the text.
10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included.
13) INDEX: No index included.
14) SIZE: Octavo.

Amelia Heber dedicates this edition to the “Hon. Sir Charles Edward Grey, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Bengal.” The reason for this dedication is
due to Grey’s “sympathy and kindness in the hour of sorrow.” Amelia is alluding to the early and sudden death of her husband, and the support of friends in India. This edition, like all of her other editions of her husband’s writing, is a memorial after the tragedy of her husband’s early death.

However, this edition is particularly interesting as it gives eighteenth-century readers access to those sermons the Bishop preached while in India from 1822 until his death in 1826. The editor describes in her preface that “At the request of the Clergy of one of the Presidencies,—a request with which the editor has much gratification in complying—she has printed all the sermons preached within its limits, naming, both in the present volume and in that lately published, the station at which each was delivered.” Like the sermons preached in England, the subject matter of these sermons is diverse. Some of the sermons focus on scripture, Christ, or morality, such as “Preaching of St. John the Baptist,” “Character of Christ and his Religion,” or “The Christian’s Treatment on Earth.” Other sermons provide fascinating commentary on England’s role in the colonial project. Sermons like “Labourers in the Vineyard” and “The Conversion of the Heathen” reveal the missionary zeal of the Anglican Church as it became increasingly involved in colonial territories. The following excerpt from “The Conversion of the Heathen” is especially useful in this regard:

It may require no mighty measure of faith to believe that “the Lord is not slack as men count slackness;” that the word which hath gone forth from His mouth shall in no wise return unto Him empty; and that He who hath thus far conquered will go on to fresh conquests still; till the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of God and His Christ; till His Church, afflicted first and militant still, shall become universal, and at length triumphant; and till the material world itself shall make way for a nobler and happier creation, and a great voice shall be heard

of much people in Heaven, saying, “Alleluja, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.” (185-186).

The above quote is but one passage from one sermon by Reginald Heber from this edition of sermons, but such a passage gives readers a glimpse of how Heber inspired Christians in India. His use of terms and phrases like “conquest,” “militant,” “universal,” “triumphant,” “material world,” “omnipotent,” and “reigneth” highlight Heber’s belief that English empire was a divinely sanctioned endeavor.70

Also, there was a separate advertisement that was prefixed to the edition printed and sold in Calcutta. As it is not lengthy, I have reproduced the advertisement below:

The Right Reverend Author, after holding his visitation at Madras, delayed the publication of his charge till the completion of his extensive journey to the south should have enabled him to speak, from personal observation, of the actual state of the several missions in the diocese. In the course of his laborious visitation of the several provinces of Upper, Central, and Western India, and subsequently of the Island of Ceylon, his attention had been anxiously directed to these inquiries; and the last weeks of his invaluable life were devoted to the minute and careful survey of the more cultivated fields of missionary labour in the Peninsula. And though, amongst the many circumstances which render the untimely loss of such a man a source of universal sorrow to the Church of India, this may well have been overlooked; it is yet no slight subject of regret to the Christian world, that he whose mind was most capable of appreciating those important labours, whose opportunities were most favourable for observing them, and whose high and sacred dignity gave weight and authority to his testimony, should not have been spared to record more minutely the scenes of infant Christianity which he had himself witnessed, and to communicate to the hearts of others the impressions of delight and gratitude which they had left upon his own.

Amelia Heber also seems to be making an emotional appeal to the members of the Church of India. She reminds them of the effort and compassion of her husband while he worked in India. She could also be appealing to those in the southern region of the country to ensure them that just prior to her husband’s death he was working in that area.

These are very specific statements addressed to readers in the colonial zone of India, which explains the separate advertisement.

It is also notable that the editor includes “The Valedictory Address of the Society for the Promoting Christian Knowledge” in honor of Heber’s departure for India, as well as Heber’s response to this address. Also, Amelia Heber incorporates “A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Calcutta.” These pieces appear first in the volume, and this is significant in that the editor frames these addresses as particularly relevant to India.


Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION**: Each volume has a different frontispiece, and each volume has a different illustration on the title page. These images all represent important people, scenes, and places in Crabbe’s life.
2) **TITLE PAGE**: A title page is included for each of the eight volumes.
3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS**: Each volume contains a detailed table of contents.
4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION**: A dedication to the Rev. W. L. Bowles, Canon of Salisbury, friend of George Crabbe (the elder), appears in the first volume. A dedication to Samuel Rogers appears in the eighth (final) volume.
5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT**: There is a preface by George Crabbe (the younger) that appears in volume one. Editorial advertisements appear in the second, fourth, fifth, and eighth volumes of the edition.
6) **BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND**: The entire first volume is a biography by Crabbe’s son, the editor of the edition.
7) **NOTE ON THE TEXT**: No note on the text is included.
8) **SCHOLARLY EDITION**: One volume of biography by George Crabbe, the younger. The remainder of the eight volume edition is poetry and letters by George Crabbe, the elder.
9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes appear throughout all volumes of the edition. In the first volume the footnotes allow the editor to elaborate with more specific information when necessary. In the remaining volumes, the footnotes elaborate and clarify sections of text by Crabbe (the elder).

10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.

11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.

12) APPENDIX: Appendix of “juvenile” poems by Crabbe appears in the second volume.

13) INDEX: No index included.

14) SIZE: Sextodecimo.

The editor’s preface in the first volume is succinct, but it is a helpful introductory statement by Crabbe’s son. The editor begins the preface with humility: “The success of some recent biographical works, evidently written by unpractised hands, suggested to me the possibility that my recollections of my father might be received with favour by the public” (vii). He makes clear with this statement that he is not necessarily an experienced writer, so his biography of his father, which constitutes the first volume of the edition, should be received with this fact in mind. However, this statement also allows for a sort of sincerity. The quality of the biography becomes less important than the sincerity of the writer and his motivation for writing it. Crabbe (the younger) subsequently explains that he turned the biography over to a number of individuals for review, alleviating some of the reader’s doubts. Furthermore, in this preface Crabbe (the younger) clarifies that a number of incidents and passages were contributed by reputable writers and friends of Crabbe (the elder): Mr. Moore, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Lockhart, Mrs. Joanna Baillie, Mr. Duncan, and Mr. Clark, among others (which are not listed). Lastly, the editor pays tribute to those who contributed letters to the collection, including Sir Walter Scott, as well as a friend who assisted with the correction and arrangement of the edition, who is “high in the scale of literary distinction” (vii). This mystery proofreader/copy editor is not named, but ending with this note of thanks reiterates the time, effort, and care that
Crabbe (the younger) put into this edition. He may not have been an experienced biographer or scholarly editor, but he certainly seems to have expended much labor in producing this text, and he definitely subjected the final product to scholarly scrutiny.

In terms of the biography by the editor, it is certainly extensive. He begins with Crabbe’s heritage and birth and ends with his death. In between he elaborates on Crabbe’s career, spiritual life, home life, travels, home, and even his hobbies and interests. He takes the reader through the ups and downs (which were many) of his father’s life. George Crabbe, the elder, and his wife, Sarah, lost five of their seven children, which had an obvious impact on their family experience. Crabbe’s virtue and fortitude are honored in the biography. The editor ends with his father’s epitaph:

The Rev. George Crabbe, LL.B.,
Who died February the third, 1832,
In the seventy-eighth year of his age, and the Nineteenth of his services as rector
Of his parish.
Born in humble life, he made himself what he was.
By the force of his genius,
He broke through the obscurity of his birth
Yet never ceased to feel for the Less fortunate;
Entering (as his works can testify) into
The sorrows and deprivations
Of the poorest of his parishioners;
And so discharging the duties of his station as a Minister and magistrate,
As to acquire the respect and esteem Of all his neighbours.
As a writer, he is well described by a great Contemporary as “Nature’s sternest painter, yet her best.”

The editor is paying tribute to his father’s accomplishments and suffering by ending with this moving tribute.
In the second volume, the editor includes an advertisement that explains that the prefaces that appear in the volume, which are attached to various works, are by his father. Furthermore, Crabbe (the younger) explains that the original draft of the poem, “The Library,” is included in the edition; he has used brackets in-text to highlight alternate versions of the poem. Lastly, the editor explains that the inspiration for the inclusion of the early, or “juvenile” (vi), poems by Crabbe comes from Scott’s collected works. It is the editor’s hope that their inclusion will highlight his early talent as well as his development as a writer. These early poems are also meant to highlight the good character of Crabbe (the elder).

The editorial advertisement in the fourth volume indicates that some original poems, never before published are included in the edition. These poems were “recently found among Mr. Crabbe’s note-books, or supplied by the kind attention of his friends.” The editor points out that they may not be his best work, but they are certainly worthy of praise and publication. The editor justifies the inclusion of some of these poems. For instance, he explains, “[‘The World of Dreams’], though it may not, perhaps, have received the last polish which the Author could have given it, appears to the Editor so characteristic of his genius, that it could not be omitted without injustice to his memory.” This access to previously unpublished poetry by the writer increases the credibility of the editor and the edition; furthermore, the additional poems add to the marketability of the edition.

An incredibly brief one sentence advertisement appears in the fifth volume. This statement seems to justify the organization of the volume. The editor explains that various occasional poems have been placed between “Tales” and “Tales of the Hall.”
This contributes to the sense of chronology of the poetry. This, too, lends credibility to the editor in that he has done his homework in determining the correct order of the poetry in the edition.

The eighth and final volume of the edition is a collection of “Posthumous Tales.” The advertisement to this edition clarifies that these poems are not to be considered polished by the writer. The editor does point out that his father did mention in a letter that these last poems were ready for press; however, the executors of George Crabbe’s estate felt that the poems were in need of finishing touches. The editor goes on to explain, however, that a number of eminent writers had, indeed, viewed the poems and reviewed them fairly positively. For this reason, the editor has included them in the volume as they were at the time of his father’s death. The editor reveals a slight anxiety about releasing these poems, but he has high hopes that readers will appreciate them.

George Crabbe (the younger) brings to nineteenth-century readers his father’s poetry with its Augustan flair and its commentary on rural life. David R. Anderson states, “On the whole, Crabbe was regarded favorably as a poet by his contemporaries, though he was seen as in many ways outside the mainstream of English poetry because of his persistent use of the heroic couplet, his reliance on descriptive detail, and his reticence as a commentator.”71 The nineteenth-century had its defenders and detractors when it came to Crabbe’s poetry; however, his work remained widely read. T. Bareham asserts that Crabbe “had the admiration of both liberal and conservative critics, and commanded

an enormous readership.”

This edition is geared toward fans and critics of Crabbe’s work.

Interestingly, Crabbe (the elder) burned lengthy manuscripts that he chose not to publish, a great loss for readers and scholars. Luckily, Crabbe, the younger, presents an extensive eight volume edition of his father’s remaining complete works of poetry for the sake of his father’s legacy.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: No illustrations included.
2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included. There is an epigraph on the title page by Ariosto: “Vattene in Pace, Alma Beata e Bella.”
3) TABLE OF CONTENTS: No table of contents included.
4) ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION: No acknowledgment or dedication included.
5) EDITORIAL PREFACE/ACKNOWLEDGMENT: Preface by Henry Hallam included.
6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: No biography by the editor included, but the preface includes some biographical information.
7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: One volume of verse and prose.
9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes included in the text (brief notes).
10) ENDNOTES: Endnotes also included (long notes).
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: No appendix included.
13) INDEX: No index included.

---

73 Anderson quotes the editor’s description of his father burning manuscripts: “I can well remember more than one grand incineration not in the chimney, for the bulk of paper to be consumed would have endangered the house—but in the open air—and with what glee his children vied in assisting him, stirring up the fire, and bringing him fresh loads of the fuel as fast as their little legs would enable them.” Anderson, “George Crabbe,” 141-42.
74 Valerie Finucci translates this phrase in her text *The Lady Vanishes: Subjectivity and Representation in Castiglione and Ariosto* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1992), 175: “Depart in peace, then, beautiful, blessed spirit.”
14) SIZE: Octavo.

The first paragraph of the preface is a brief statement about the editor’s role in the edition. He states, “Yet it is a pious, though at the same time, a very painful office, incumbent on the Editor, to furnish a few notices of a life as remarkable for the early splendour of genius, and for uniform moral excellence, as that of any one who has fallen under his observation; especially as some there must probably be, who will read these pages with little previous knowledge of him to whom they relate” (iii). The editor, for obvious reason, feels compelled to say something about the writer, his son, but there also seems to be a note of anxiety about providing a preface to his son’s works. I find this to be a unique and interesting opening. The fact that Henry Hallam feels that relating his son’s experience to readers is a difficult task is unique. Most family editors are boldly issuing a scholarly edition so that others may be able to take part in remembering that individual. In this instance, the editor feels a sense of discomfort.

Nonetheless, the editor subsequently moves into the biography of the author. He provides information about the birth, education, travels, writing, and death of his son. Interestingly, the editor is very modest about the abilities of his son. He explains, “The Latin poetry of an Etonian is generally reckoned at that School, the chief test of his literary talent. That of Arthur was good without being excellent; he never wanted depth of thought, or truth of feeling [ . . . ]” (vi). Throughout the preface he vacillates between admiration and pride about his son’s accomplishments and a tone of disappointment about his son’s lacklustre abilities. For instance, he lauds his sense of justice and his grasp of ideas, but he expresses regret that his son never mastered mathematics and could
not remember specific names and dates in the study of history. Perhaps, the editor
downplays his son’s talents in an effort to portray himself as an objective biographer.

At this point in the preface, the editor includes a letter from a friend of A. H.
Hallam, who was a classmate at Cambridge. The letter has the tone of a eulogy. It is a
sad and beautiful tribute from a dear friend who is obviously grieving. Subsequently, the
editor includes a letter from a childhood friend. This letter, too, is quite sincere and
moving.

Towards the end of the preface, the editor describes the author’s life after his
graduation from Cambridge. He describes Arthur Henry Hallam as someone who was
interested in pursuing a career in law, continued to write prose and verse, began to
translate texts from Italian, and studied the history of philosophy. The editor and father
expresses the difficulty of losing his young son so suddenly. He died unexpectedly from
“a weakness of the cerebral vessels” that allowed “a sudden rush of blood to the head”
(xxxiv-xxxv). It is at this point, that the flood gates open, so to speak, and the editor
reveals his feelings of affection and loss: “More ought perhaps to be said—but it is very
difficult to proceed. From the earliest years of this extraordinary young man his
premature abilities were not more conspicuous than an almost faultless disposition,
sustained by a more calm self-command than has often been witnessed in that season of
life” (xxxv-xxxvi).

Lastly, the editor provides some brief comments on the works that appear in the
collection. He indicates that the poetry, which was originally printed in 1830, was going
to be published along with Tennyson’s poetry. Tennyson, of course, famously pays
tribute to A. H. Hallam in “In Memoriam.” Frances Butler Thwing quotes Tennyson on
the life of his friend: “Arthur Henry Hallam was twenty-two years old when he died. Many conjectures have been made as to what he would have become had fate spared him. Tennyson said: ‘He would have been known, if he had lived, as a great man, but not as a great poet; he was as near as perfection as mortal man could be.’”75 Interestingly, this is how Hallam’s father discusses his son as well. He was not necessarily a remarkable poet or scholar, but he was an extraordinary man. I find it interesting that the legacy of Hallam is not only true to Tennyson’s statement, but the legacy is also remarkably like Henry Hallam’s biographical treatment of his son in the preface to this edition. Jack Kolb, however, presents a different picture of Hallam as a writer. He asserts: “. . . the body of Hallam’s writings offers only a promise—though a substantial promise—of what he might have achieved.”76

With a publication date of 1834, it is apparent that this chapter is moving away from the long eighteenth century and into the Victorian era. The fact that Hallam and Tennyson were peers, of course, confirms this fact. I am pushing the boundary of the long eighteenth century because I feel that this edition is so unique. It is the only family edition considered in this dissertation in which a parent is editing the manuscript of a child. For this reason, I think it is a fitting end to this chapter in that it shows that the family edition appears in many different forms. Children memorialize their parents, nieces and nephews edit works by their aunts or uncles, and spouses pay tribute to their partners in these family editions. It is only fitting, then, that a parent’s tribute to a child rounds out the chapter.

Chapter 4

Textual Journeys: Prefatory Commentary in Eighteenth-Century Colonial Editions

This chapter is considerably shorter than the previous because these colonial editions were published later in the eighteenth century. These texts were produced as a result of colonial expansion and an increase in travel and exploration by the people of Great Britain. Paul Langford explains, “In some ways the most striking changes of the period concerned Britain’s role overseas, especially the new awareness of empire which inevitably succeeded the Seven Years War [1756-1763].”\(^1\) After pouring through eighteenth-century history books, it becomes apparent to me that the development of the English colonial project was not *an* important factor; it was *the* most important factor in English culture and politics in the eighteenth century. Colonial texts reflect colonial policy, and these texts also influenced English attitudes toward colonialism—in all its complexity.

Roy Bridges in his contribution to *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing* states, “Trade, diplomacy, missionary endeavour, and scientific exploration [contributed] to the British expansion and each produced its own travel writing.”\(^2\) Travelers were

---

compelled to share their experiences via a text on the subject, and English readers were fascinated. Bridges claims, “the popularity of travel writing in the lending libraries which sprang up during the later eighteenth century confirms the widening interest as does the emergence of periodicals in which travels became a frequent subject.” These travel accounts were most often travel journals, and they reflected the adventurous spirit of the age. However, travel texts also exhibited an anxiety about the consequences of British expansion and imperialism. Bridges asserts, “Nevertheless, as the century proceeded, there was a growing army of authentic travelers who strove to write with precision about the wider world and with some concern for perceived British interests.”

Casey Blanton also addresses the challenges that eighteenth-century travel writers faced when documenting their encounter with a foreign culture. Blanton says, “What travel books are ‘about’ is the interplay between the observer and observed, between a traveler’s own philosophical biases and preconceptions and the tests those ideas and prejudices endure as a result of the journey.” Ultimately, some of these travel writers are more successful than others at dispensing with preconceptions.

This chapter, though, is not only interested in the prejudices of the travel writer; this chapter is most concerned with how eighteenth-century editors of scholarly editions handled travel texts. Studying an edition of travel literature, then, involves an examination of the complex amalgam of author, text, and editor. This author/text/editor dynamic is significant when considering colonial editions because in most instances the editor did not share the author’s experience in a given “contact zone,” to borrow Mary Louise Pratt’s phrase. By “contact zone,” Pratt means “social spaces where disparate

---

3 Ibid., 56.
4 Ibid., 57.
cultures meet.”6 Pratt poses an interesting research question about these texts that emerge from “contact zones.” She asks, “How has travel and exploration writing produced ‘the rest of the world’ for European readerships at particular points in Europe’s expansionist trajectory?”7 Due to the multi-faceted formula of author/text/editor that makes up a colonial edition, this chapter adds to Pratt’s question by asking how have editors, although removed from the contact zone, further produced “the rest of the world” for eighteenth-century readers? I found the answer in the prefaces to the editions that I annotate in this chapter, but Simon Gikandi’s Maps of Englishness provides some helpful language for describing the function and flaws of editorial involvement in colonial literature.

In his fascinating text, Gikandi makes an interesting distinction. On the one hand, relying on Homi Bhabha’s theory of “subversive mimicry,” Gikandi claims, “one of the most fascinating aspects of colonial rule was its uncanny generation of narratives that refused to fit into the hierarchies of colonial government and rule, narratives that dislocated the colonial project itself or called its central assumption into question.”8 On the other hand, Gikandi asserts that colonial narratives “still functioned within the epistemology established by the dominant culture of colonialism.”9 In short, these texts reveal a tension between the two cultures—that of the colonized and the colonizer. These editors, too, are trapped in that tension. More so than editors of autobiography, women’s texts, or family editions, these editors are most unsuccessful when it comes to resolving the textual tension. Most often they defer to modes of discourse and conventions of the

---

7 Ibid., 5.
9 Ibid.
dominant English culture. Their editorial efforts are often intended to introduce English
readers to a colonial culture, yet these efforts tend to be undermined by their
preconceptions regarding that foreign culture.

To provide some background on how these editors treat the inherent complexity
in editions of colonial narratives, I have identified three key themes: commerce,
curiosities, and captivity. An examination of editorial prefaces highlights the tension
between colonial convention and subversion, which is acted out in these editions through
editorial commentary on the above mentioned themes.

Commerce

As early as 1681, Robert Hooke, editor of Robert Knox’s *Historical Relation of
the Island of Ceylon, in the East-Indies*, was promoting colonial texts as important for the
commercial pursuits of the English. He states,

’Tis much to be wondred that we should to this Day want a good History of most
of our *West Indian* Plantations. *Ligon* has done well for the *Barbadoes*, and
somewhat has been done for the *Summer Islands, Virginia*, &c. But how far are
all these short even of the knowledge of these and other places of the *West Indies*,
which may be obtain’d from divers knowing Planters now Residing in *London*?
And how easie were it to obtain what is Defective from some Ingenious Persons
now Resident upon the Places, if some way were found to gratifie them for their
Performances? However till such be found, ’tis to be hoped that the kind
Acceptance only the Publick shall give to this present Work, may excite several
other Ingenious, and knowing Men to follow this Generous Example of Captain
*Knox* . . . (third page of preface)

Here Hooke acknowledges the usefulness of travel accounts of the West Indies. Implicit
to the above commentary is the fact that accounts such as Knox’s are helpful for travelers
and merchants involved in the eighteenth-century colonial project. This is further
evidenced by the fact that Knox himself was promoted by the East India Company after
the publication of his narrative. Hooke was involved in the edition on behalf of the Royal Society, and he was convinced that the promotion of exploration benefited science and industry. I outline in further detail in the annotation to this edition Knox’s and Hooke’s connections to the East India Company and the Royal Society.

George Vancouver’s *Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and Round the World* (1798), edited by his brother John, is another example of a colonial edition that promotes the economic success of England in its colonial investments. The dedication “To the King” from the editor is the first page of text that the reader encounters after the title page of the edition. The editor states, “YOUR MAJESTY having been graciously pleased to permit my late brother CAPTAIN GEORGE VANCOUVER, to present to YOUR MAJESTY the narrative of his labours during the execution of your commands in the Pacific Ocean . . .” From the outset, then, the reader is aware that the narrative relates the experience of an explorer who was commissioned by the King. Vancouver was sent to the northern Pacific to regain control of the Nootka Sound (an inlet on the eastern side of modern day Vancouver Island) from the Spanish and find a northwest passage.

Vancouver failed on both counts, but his narrative and cartographic work would benefit traders and merchants for years to come. David Mackay discusses the significance of Vancouver’s journey:

> The main focus of eighteenth-century exploration was on the Pacific, and, to a lesser extent, the Arctic. To some degree the Pacific represented the last great unknown—a vast expanse only tentatively penetrated by the European world before 1700. It also contained the possibility of holding the last great unclaimed land mass—the elusive southern continent—and the possibility of an open sea route through to China. These two great objects, along with commercial and strategic motives, were behind the majority of eighteenth-century voyages in the Pacific from Roggeveen (1659-1729) to Vancouver.\(^\text{10}\)

---

John Vancouver does not go into detail about the narrative or its implications for eighteenth-century colonial discourse in his prefatory commentary, but he mentions that as editor he was responsible for seeing the project through to publication, acknowledging indirectly that the editor plays a key role in getting travel narratives to eighteenth-century readers.

Furthermore, in the case of this travel edition, John Vancouver traveled with his brother on the journey to navigate and map the northern Pacific. This is unique in terms of these editors of colonial editions. John Vancouver illustrates that he did change the text after his brother’s death even though the edition was largely prepared for the press. These changes would be considered less egregious in terms of constructing meaning in a colonial edition in that John Vancouver shared the experience with his brother in the “contact zone.” It is still troubling that he does not provide a detailed description of where these changes were made; nonetheless, he may have corrected inaccuracies based on mutual experience on the expedition.

Amelia Heber, in her edition of her husband’s *Narrative of a Journey Through India* (1828), is proud of her husband’s text and his work in India during his tenure as Bishop. As I discuss in greater detail in the annotation to the edition, English missionaries such as Heber were motivated by what they felt was a divine sanction of English empire. The Bishop and the merchant worked in consort for the sake of England and God. As Amelia Heber states in her preface,

For the active furtherance of his views in the promotion of Christianity, for the deference paid to his wishes, for the hospitality, friendship, and respect which he met with from his Clergy and from all the military and civil servants of the [East India] Company, in whatever part of the country his Visitations led him, as well
as from the King’s Government in Ceylon, she can now but offer her own heartfelt thanks (vii).

The association of the Anglican church and English commercial interests regarding colonial expansion is apparent in the above passage. Heber does not express a tone of anxiety regarding the colonial project in which she and her husband participated because the work of her husband in India was on behalf of the Anglican Church and England’s national, scientific, and commercial interests.

In the three examples cited above, the pre-eminence of English interests comes to the fore. These editors all allude to the economic benefits of colonial expansion in which their editions play a key part. With this particular theme, the implication for the colonized is not the central concern; rather, the promotion of colonial development is fundamental.

**Curiosities**

Knox’s *Historical Relation of the Island of Ceylon* is a useful place to start when considering editorial commentary regarding colonial “contact zones” as spaces rife with collectibles and curiosities. Hooke’s edition of Knox’s text is full of detailed descriptions of the life and habits of the people of Ceylon, as well as descriptions of natural resources. For instance, some of the chapter headings are “Of their Fruits and Trees,” “Of their Birds, Fish, Serpents, and Commodities,” and “Of His [the King’s] Revenues and Treasures.” What is most interesting here is Knox’s use of the term “commodity”; all that is described by him could be of scientific or commercial use by the English colonial project. The editor, Robert Hooke, goes so far as to say that Knox should have included more description of the environs and resources of Ceylon. He states, “He could have
enrich’t [the text] with a more particular Description of many of their curious Plants, Fruits, Birds, Fishes, Insects, Minerals, Stones; and told you many more of the Medicinal and other uses of them in Trades and Manufactures” (fourth page of preface). For Hooke, who hopes others will follow in Knox’s footsteps by producing travel accounts of other “contact zones,” he encourages travel narratives that are exhaustive in their descriptions of commodities and collectibles.

More than a century later this interest in the minute details of colonial spaces has not waned. This is plainly evident in Lady Mary Wortley Montagu’s *Turkish Embassy Letters*, which are featured in an edition of her *Works* (1803) that were edited by James Dallaway, as well as James Currie’s edition of Robert Burns’s *Works* (1800). These editions, while displaying the attitude of English colonial dominance, also reveal an appreciation for the culture of the colonized.

Montagu’s letters detail the modes of life for the English and the Turkish in Constantinople. Interestingly, Montagu’s descriptions in her letters often lean more toward appreciation for as opposed to commodification of the people and environment in the “contact zone” of Turkey. Isobel Grundy describes Montagu’s experience: “Turkey at this date was very far from being a third-world power (in today’s usage); nor was it an ‘empty’ space ripe for colonization. It was an imperial nation ‘in full power and pride’—and, Lady Mary decided, one of the finest countries in the world.” Montagu describes her daily life with flare, and this certainly includes reports of all that is curious and collectible in Turkey: clothing, architecture, natural wonders, etc. Dallaway asserts that Montagu’s observations are truthful and fair. He ensures readers that they are getting a true glimpse of Turkish life that is not influenced by English prejudice. He states in his

biography of Montagu, which appears after the preface in the edition, “Of the accuracy of her local descriptions, and of the justness of the portrait in which she has delineated European and Turkish manners, the Editor has had the good fortune to form a comparative opinion, and to bear the fullest testimony of their general truth” (25). This is not to say that a euro-centric bias does not reveal itself in the text, especially since her letters were intended for an English audience. The success of Montagu’s letters speaks to the insatiable interest of eighteenth-century readers in all things colonial.

James Currie’s edition of Burns’s *Works* obviously is not a colonial edition in the strictest sense, especially since the Union of England and Scotland in 1707. However, Currie’s inclusion of prefatory commentary on “The Character and Condition of the Scottish Peasantry” highlights a disconnect between Scotland and England. The result is an edition that treats Scotland like a “contact zone.” Currie feels compelled to elaborate, particularly for English readers of Scotland’s famous poet, the unique cultural heritage of the people of Scotland. Currie states, “It seems proper therefore to write the memoirs of his life, not with the view of their being read by Scotchmen only, but also by natives of England, and of other countries where the English language is spoken or understood” (2).

---

12 *The Oxford Companion to British History*, edited by John Cannon (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2002), 943, provides some useful background on the Act of Union, which united England and Scotland:

The unitary state of Great Britain was established on 12 May 1707 with Anne as queen, and the succession guaranteed in the house of Hanover. The Scottish Parliament was abolished, and Scottish representation in the British parliament consisted of 45 MPs and 16 representative peers (the numbers based on the respective sizes of the two economies). Free trade between North Britain (Scotland) and South Britain (England) was established, and England’s colonies were open to the Scots on an equal footing. The Scots retained their own legal system (though the House of Lords soon established its position as the highest court of appeal from the Scottish courts), as well as their own Privy Council (this, however, was abolished in 1708). The established churches were to remain the same: Anglican in England and Presbyterian in Scotland.

The Union did not settle the problem of mistrust between the two nations, and though England secured immediately the succession and thus her northern frontier (one of her main objectives), Scotland’s chief expectation of economic benefit was several decades in coming. The final paragraph is particularly significant because it indicates that initially the Union was only equitable in name, not in actuality. It is for this reason that Currie’s edition of Burns’s *Works* can still be considered a colonial text.
Furthermore, Currie hopes to refute any notions that the people of Scotland are uncouth, principally in the eyes of the English. He asserts,

A slight acquaintance with the peasantry of Scotland, will serve to convince an unprejudiced observer that they possess a degree of intelligence not generally found among the same class of men in the other countries of Europe. In the very humblest condition of the Scottish peasants every one can read, and most persons are more or less skilled in writing and arithmetic; and under the disguise of their uncouth appearance, and of their peculiar manners and dialect, a stranger will discover that they possess a curiosity, and have obtained a degree of information corresponding to these acquirements (3-4).

Currie reveals an interest and appreciation for the colonial “zone” of Scotland. This is not to say that his comments on the Scottish peasantry do not intermittently undermine his goal, for his comments do at times treat the Scottish peasantry like curiosities. Nonetheless, James Currie, who hailed from Scotland himself, tries to provide a “truer” rendering of the Scottish people.

Captivity

The final theme that editors of colonial editions address in their prefatory commentary is that of captivity—of particular interest for this theme is the slave narrative. In 1681, Robert Hooke’s edition of Knox’s experience in Ceylon included his captivity narrative. Knox was an Englishman who was imprisoned for nineteen years by the governance of Ceylon. However, in terms of colonial editions, editors became increasingly interested, not only in narratives that displayed a fear of an English man or woman being held captive in a foreign land, but narratives that reveal a disdain for English captivity of slaves.

Philip Gould explains that “The slave narrative first emerged during the 1770s and 1780s in the context [of] transatlantic religious movements which shaped the genre’s
publication history, as well as its major themes and narrative designs." In making such a statement he is alluding to the fascinating correlation between author, editor, abolition movement, print industry, and reader. Of particular interest to this study is the dynamic between the white editor and the author of the slave narrative. The editors featured in this type of colonial edition were associated with the abolitionist movement, whether formally or informally. Their contributions were significant in that they facilitated the publication of these important texts. Gould explains,

[abolitionist] organizations significantly generated a great deal of antislavery literature: books, pamphlets, epistles, institutional reports and proceedings, published sermons and orations, as well as a lot of visual and iconic materials meant to sentimentalize the plight of African slaves. Composed largely, though not exclusively, of Quakers and humanitarians, these groups helped to form a kind of transatlantic print culture, which overlapped with those of evangelicalism, political radicalism, and popular culture.

Their goal of publishing the personal narratives of slaves for the sake of abolition was, on the one hand, quite successful. Gould asserts that “the rising popularity of the slave narrative was due as much to the changing conditions of print capitalism as to the rising tide of abolitionist sentiment.” However, while loyal to the abolition movement, these editors were often quick to forsake the text of the author. Kerry Sinanan states that “often abolitionist writing could be as racist as proslavery writing, offering negative images of black people as ignorant and morally underdeveloped.” Sinanan helpfully elucidates this by discussing Frederick Douglass’s dissatisfaction regarding abolitionist intrusions into texts by slaves:

14 Ibid., 16.
15 Ibid., 23.
In his second narrative, *My Bondage and My Freedom*, Frederick Douglass describes his frustration at being used by abolitionists to repeat his story “month after month”: “‘Give us the facts,’ said Collins, ‘we will take care of the philosophy.’” Douglass was clearly reacting against the implication that slaves may not be capable of making the necessary sophisticated antislavery arguments and was aware that the abolitionist drive to secure its political aims often reduced the slaves themselves to mere tellers of stories.\(^{17}\)

In light of these theoretical discussions, the problem moves into clearer focus. These editors, while promoting the important message of the abolitionist movement, were simultaneously re-constructing slave narratives in troublesome ways. Beth A. McCoy, relying on Gérard Genette’s term “paratext,” states,

> The paratext crafted by white prefacers and editors, however, reduces fugitive author to fugitive reporter, a construction that accommodates Thomas Jefferson’s distasteful declaration that ‘never yet could I find a black had uttered a thought above the level of plain narration.’ In this way serving neither the text nor its author, the paratext serves something else: an indirect white supremacy, different from the brutality against which white abolitionists fought but one that interferes with the fugitive writer’s authorial primacy nonetheless.\(^{18}\)

This tendency to promote slave narratives as important texts while simultaneously undermining them occurs consistently in the three early slave narratives featured in this chapter.

Walter Shirley’s edition of Ukawsaw Gronniosaw’s *Narrative of the Most Remarkable Particulars in the Life of James Albert Ukawsaw Gronniosaw* (1770) does not have a lengthy preface. In this regard, the editor is not overly invasive in the edition. Nonetheless, he does not elaborate in detail regarding how the text evolved from Gronniosaw’s narration to an amanuensis to a manuscript, or how he changed the manuscript for the purposes of publication. The reader cannot ascertain how much of the narrative itself was constructed by the editor. Furthermore, Shirley’s statement in the

\(^{17}\) Ibid.

preface to the autobiography comments fairly extensively on Gronniosaw’s religious conversion, but he does not comment on the evils of slavery in overt terms. I elaborate in my annotation how this focus on Gronniosaw’s conversion can be construed as condoning or subverting the situation of the slave. Yet this does not change the fact that Shirley’s preface is certainly not emphasizing the ills of slavery, which is a significant omission for an editorial preface of a slave narrative. He shifts the reader’s focus from a narrative of slavery and emancipation to a narrative of spiritual conversion.19

Twelve years later, Frances Crewe edited Ignatius Sancho’s posthumous *Letters* (1782). Interestingly, the paratextual situation here is even more complex as Crewe included her own editorial preface as well as a biography of Sancho by Joseph Jekyll. The preface is extremely brief, and it is merely a statement clarifying that the letters are indeed by Ignatius Sancho and that he had never intended them to be published. Such a claim lends credibility to the authenticity of the letters. However, the biography is important in that it fills in the gaps between the correspondence, and it reminds readers that Sancho was a slave living in England. However, in the biography, Sancho’s ability as a letter writer is critiqued. Jekyll states, “Of a Negro, a Butler, and a Grocer, there are but slender anecdotes to animate the page of the biographer; but it has been held necessary to give some sketch of the very singular man, whose letters, with all their imperfections on their head, are now offered to the public” (xii). With this statement and similar ones that follow, Jekyll voices that which frustrated Frederick Douglass: the slave narrative is unsophisticated and unpolished and requires clarification by an abolitionist

editor/biographer. Here again, the preface and the biography simultaneously work against slavery and use negative statements toward the author of the slave narrative.

Lastly, Thomas Pringle, editor of Mary Prince’s *History* (1831), was a member of the Anti-Slavery Society, which highlights his connection to the abolitionist movement. Like other abolitionist editors, Pringle both asserts the value of Prince’s narrative and undermines her *History*. In the opening paragraph of his preface, Pringle assures readers that

> It was written out fully, with all the narrator’s repetitions and prolixities, and afterwards pruned into its present shape; retaining, as far as was practicable, Mary’s exact expressions and peculiar phraseology. No fact of importance has been omitted, and not a single circumstance or sentiment has been added. It is essentially her own, without any redundancies and gross grammatical errors, so as to render it clearly intelligible (iii).

This passage is so helpful in that it showcases how Pringle is concurrently asserting the authority of Prince’s own voice in the text and revealing how he has also re-constructed that voice. The scholarship of Barbara Baumgartner, whose work I more fully address in the annotation to this edition, elaborates on the extensive preface, footnotes, and supplement by the editor, Pringle, which change the meaning of the text.

The slave narratives also highlight the changing and increasingly complex world of the eighteenth century. Geographical boundaries were expanding, and textual boundaries were being broken and reformulated. The editors of the slave narratives did their best to bring important editions to eighteenth-century readers, yet they could not transcend the tension between dominant conventions and subversive narrative.

The following bibliography features annotations of nine editions. These annotations are chronological from 1681 to 1831.
Annotated Bibliography


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 39.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 71.


Included in Edition:

1) ILLUSTRATION: Frontispiece included in both volumes. The image in the first volume is an etching of Ignatius Sancho. The image in the second volume portrays a woman in a garden holding the letters of Ignatius Sancho.

2) TITLE PAGE: Title page included for both volumes.

---

20 This annotation is based on a 1774 edition, which was printed in Newport, Rhode Island by S. Southwick. Henry Louis Gates, Jr., in “James Gronniosaw and the Trope of the Talking Book,” in *Studies in Autobiography*, edited by James Olney (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1988), 57, clarifies that the title changes in the 1774 edition. Gates explains, “While the 1770 edition bears as its subtitle the fact that Gronniosaw ‘related’ this tale ‘himself,’ the 1774 edition, ‘reprinted’ at Newport, Rhode Island, claims that his narrative was ‘written by himself.’”
As in other editions, the editor, Frances Crewe, includes a statement asserting the veracity and credibility of the edition of letters that she is presenting to readers. She states,

The Editor of these Letters thinks proper to obviate an objection, which she finds has already been suggested, that they were originally written with a view to publication. She declares, therefore, that no such idea was ever expressed by Mr. Sancho; and that not a single letter is here printed from any duplicate preserved by himself, but all have been collected from the various friends to whom they were addressed. Her motives for laying them before the publick were, the desire of showing that an untutored African may possess abilities equal to an European; and the still superior motive, of wishing to serve his worthy family. And she is happy in thus publicly acknowledging she has not found the world inattentive to the voice of obscure merit (i-ii).

This statement underscores the historical context of the British slave trade, but it also highlights Crewe’s attitude about her work as editor. First of all, it is significant that she
is a female editor; taking on an editorial role for an important text with other 1,200
subscribers is laudable. Furthermore, she asserts that her voice has not intruded on the
text; rather, she is an objective compiler of the letters and documents written by Sancho.\footnote{The travel diary of Crewe, An English Lady in Paris: The Diary of Frances Anne Crewe, 1786, edited by Michael Allen (St. Leonards, UK: Oxford-Stockley, 2006), does mention Crewe’s relationship with Sancho.}
As I have read in the prefaces by so many of these eighteenth-century editors, Crewe
realizes her role in constructing the text and, by default, constructing meaning. In fact,
her statement that denies her role in constructing meaning in the edition ironically
confirms that role. She has already framed the text in a certain light in her short
statement.

Furthermore, this is an important slave account as it occurs close to home.
Crewe’s concerns about claims that Sancho’s letters are false makes more sense in light
of the fact that the letters make commentaries and observations about people in England.
She may be taking a defensive tone, anticipating criticism from individuals mentioned in
the letters.

In terms of Sancho’s and Crewe’s relationship as author and editor, more work
could be done in this regard to fill in the gaps to further clarify the context of publication.
Much scholarship has been accomplished on the epistolary form and the experience of
Sancho as presented in his letters, but there is not an abundance of scholarship on the
history of publication of this text. Ellis provides some useful background: “The
collection was published in 1782 as The Letters of the Late Ignatius Sancho, An African,
in two volumes, with a brief biography by Joseph Jekyll, published by a prestigious group
of booksellers under John Nicholls. It was the first substantial volume published in English by a man of African descent.”

Furthermore, Ellis clarifies that

Although the sequence of events is unclear, the letters were presumably gathered from friends, although Sancho may have kept copies of some or all of them. The tenor of the prefatory material implies that the project of publishing the letters should be located within the emergent agitation against the slave trade, through the volume’s eloquent contribution to the contested question of African “arts and learning” in contemporary discourse.

Crewe’s efforts made possible this publication by an African author. The subscriber list, as well as the success of the edition (Sancho’s letters saw a fifth edition in 1803), highlight the interest and demand for these kinds of texts.

After her short statement about her role as editor, a biographical segment attributed to Joseph Jekyll provides background on Sancho’s experience. Sancho’s story is unique in that he was born on a slave ship, and he lost his parents at a very young age. The rest of his life experience is just as intriguing. What is particularly compelling about his story is the fact that he was a slave living in England. He was sent to live with three maiden ladies when he was two years of age but, ultimately, became the butler for a Duchess until her death. Afterwards he finds himself in servitude to the Chaplain at Montagu-House. Finally, Sancho marries and opens a grocery, which affords him a comfortable existence for the remainder of his life. Sancho was, throughout his life, largely successful. Gretchen Holbrook Gerzina explains that “At no point did Sancho ever forget that his unusual social position came with great responsibilities. As quite possibly the only middle-class, well-connected, and highly literate black man in all of Britain, his very visible existence could and did affect how thousands of people in that

23 Ibid.
24 Ibid., 202.
country viewed Africans and slavery.” Sancho’s life was at once emblematic of an African man’s experience in England in the eighteenth century as well as unique.

Jekyll ends his biography by asserting Sancho’s talent as an epistolary author. This observation allows him to make the political observation about racism and slavery in the eighteenth century. He explains, “he who could penetrate the interior of Africa, might not improbably discover negro arts and polity, which could bear little analogy to the ignorance and grossness of slaves in the sugar-islands, expatriated in infancy, and brutalized under the whip and the task-master” (xv). Jekyll wants to make clear that the voice in the letters—a compelling prose voice—reflects the innate literary ability of Sancho and, hence, other slaves were they not shattered by the institution of slavery.

I mentioned earlier that a considerable amount of scholarship has been published on Sancho’s letters. Gerzina says, “In the 1960s and 1970s, as Sancho’s letters came back into light, he was faulted for being overly patriotic, sentimental, and for assimilating into white British society. In recent years, however, a new appreciation of his unique position has developed.” This recent scholarship focuses on Sancho’s letters as complex and political. Felicity A. Nussbaum, who elaborates on gender in Equiano’s narrative and Sancho’s letters, realizes the higher purpose in Sancho’s letters,

The conquering British, he suggests, taught the natives of the East and West Indies bad behavior, not the opposite. He urges racial intermixture on Christian principles: “Blessed expiation of the Son of the most high God—who died for the sins of all—all—Jew, Turk, Infidel, Heretic;—fair—fallow—brown—tawney—black—and you—and I—and every son and daughter of Adam” (93), and he wants to knit the British empire together.

---

27 Ibid.
Markman Ellis, too, appreciates the effectiveness of Sancho’s prose, highlighting the important connection between Sancho’s epistolary style and Lawrence Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*. Ellis explains that “In Sancho’s case, the choice of Sterne as his literary model was little less than scandalous, and, in its own way, a disturbing, even subversive genre.”

According to Ellis, Sancho successfully utilizes a “high culture” form of writing, which served to unsettle eighteenth-century readers. In this way, Ellis states, “Sancho’s deployment of Sterne’s style translates a literary infelicity into a political scandal, because Sterne’s style celebrates Sancho’s exceptional status.”

Scholars, then, are unanimously changing their tune when it comes to this edition of letters. They are increasingly focusing on Sancho’s subversive tone and his complex treatment of race in eighteenth-century England.

**John Vancouver, ed.** *A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean, and Round the World; in Which the Coast of North-West America Has Been Carefully Examined and Accurately Surveyed. Undertaken by his Majesty’s Command, Principally With a View to Ascertain the Existence of Any Navigable Communication Between the North Pacific and North Atlantic Oceans; and Performed in the Years 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794, and 1795, in the Discovery Sloop of War, and Armed Tender Chatham, Under the Command of Captain George Vancouver*. 3 vols. By George Vancouver. London: G.G. & J. Robinson, and J. Edwards, 1798.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 84.

---

30 Ibid., 211.
31 Ibid.

Included in Edition:

1) **ILLUSTRATION:** Frontispiece in the first volume is a portrait of Robert Burns with an ornate illustration surrounding portrait. This illustrated frame features a drape and garland around the image of burns. Beneath the portrait is a rake, a scythe, a scroll, and a pipe. Small illustrations appear on the title page in each of the four volumes:
   - **Volume one:** Image of a shield and branch. The shield has a title: “Wood Notes Wild. There is beneath the title inscription on the shield: “Better A Wee Rush than Nae Bield.”
   - **Volume two:** Image of a ring and thistle plant.
   - **Volume three:** Image of a plow, a beehive, wheat, and a page that is presumably poetry entitled “The Mountain Daisy.”
   - **Volume four:** A branch, a horn, a lute, and a Scottish tartan.

2) **TITLE PAGE:** Title page included in all four volumes.

3) **TABLE OF CONTENTS:** Table of contents included in the beginning of each volume.

4) **ACKNOWLEDGMENT/DEDICATION:** In volume one, Currie dedicates the four volume edition to Captain Graham Moore, who first introduced Currie to the works of Burns. In volume three, Currie includes a dedication from Robert Burns to “Noblemen and Gentlemen of the Caledonian Hunt.”

5) **EDITORIAL PREFACE/ADVERTISEMENT:** Currie’s prefatory remarks appear in volume one and are entitled “Prefatory Remarks on the Character and Condition of the Scottish Peasantry.” Currie also includes an advertisement in volume one that highlights how the edition of Burns’s works is meant to support Burns’s family after his death, and he includes

---

\(^3\) This annotation is based on the 1801 second edition, which is a reprint of the first edition. Leith Davis explains that “Two thousand copies of the first edition of Currie’s *Works of Robert Burns* (1800) were printed, costing £1 11s. 6d. for the set. The popularity of the works is evident from the fact that three more printings in Britain alone were needed within the next three years. A total of £1,300 was raised for Mrs. Burns, and Currie notes with satisfaction that all Burns’s surviving sons had been provided with jobs.” From “James Currie” in *Eighteenth-Century Literary Biographers*, Dictionary of Literary Biography, vol. 142, edited by Steven Serafin (Detroit: Gale, 1994), 67.
an advertisement in volume two. Also, there is an editorial preface in
volume four that addresses Thomson’s effort in compiling and presenting
his correspondence with Burns.

6) BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND: A “Life of Robert Burns” appears
in volume one, which is a compilation of Currie’s reflections, Burns’s own
narrative, and contributions by others who were associated with Robert
Burns.

7) NOTE ON THE TEXT: No notes on variants or editorial emendations.
Currie does include, however, literary criticism about Burns’s poetry.
Furthermore, commentary on the omission of “unfit” passages appears in
the advertisement of the second volume. In this same advertisement,
Currie makes a statement about emendations, which he insists is not an
effort to correct “habitual modes of expression of the poet” (iv); rather, the
approach to emendation has to do with “careless effusions” by Burns (iv).

8) SCHOLARLY EDITION: Volume one includes editorial preface,
biographical background, literary criticism, memoirs, tributes, and
appendices; volume two contains letters and miscellaneous poetry; volume
three includes poems by Burns; and, finally, volume four contains Burns’s
correspondence with George Thomson and unpublished poetry.

9) FOOTNOTES: Footnotes are included throughout the edition for
clarification on various points.

10) ENDNOTES: No endnotes included.
11) GLOSSARY: No glossary included.
12) APPENDIX: Appendices in volume one and volume three.
13) INDEX: An index to the poetry in volume one appears after the table of
contents.
14) SIZE: Octavo.

Currie makes it clear in his dedication that he took on the task of editing Burns’s
works because he met the poet and was impressed by him. Furthermore, Currie and
Burns had a mutual friend, John Syme, who implored Currie to take on the job. Currie
explains that it was a challenge and a pleasure to edit Burns’s work. He hopes the edition
will bring joy to the reader and financial security to the Burns family.

The prefatory remarks by Currie in volume one are fascinating as they are “On the
Character and Condition of the Scottish Peasantry.” As a result these remarks place the
edition in a very specific light—Burns’s works becomes a text about the historical,
geographical, and cultural context of Scotland. He explains, “it seems proper therefore to
write the memoirs of his life, not with the view of their being read by Scotchmen only, but also by natives of England, and of other countries where the English language is spoken or understood” (2). Later, Currie insists that the peasantry of Scotland are unique: “a slight acquaintance with the peasantry of Scotland, will serve to convince an unprejudiced observer that they possess a degree of intelligence not generally found among the same class of men in the other countries of Europe” (3). Currie then provides background on the condition of the poor, the church, the education, the music and dancing, the rites of marriage, the industry, the pride, the art, and the poverty of the people of Scotland. The specifics regarding Scottish life were of interest to the English. Johnson’s *Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* was published in 1775, and Boswell’s *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides* appeared in 1785. Peter Levi, in his introduction to his joint edition of the works explains how both men felt about traveling in Scotland: “Scotland in 1773 was still a relatively wild place; it was romantic, and [Johnson and Boswell] both rejoiced in it.” Their enthusiasm reflected and fueled English interest in all things Scottish. Levi continues,

British travel writing was already established by 1773, and the great county histories were already appearing. Johnson had read Sacheverell on the Isle of Man, and the Elizabethan Sir John Davies on the state of Ireland, which suggested questions of Scotland. Not only Dovedale and the Peak, celebrated by Hobbes and Cotton, but the lake district was already famous through Thomas Gray’s *Journal in the Lake* (1769), and Scotland itself had already revealed the sublime, the picturesque and the romantic in a high degree in the watercolours of Paul Sandby.

Currie’s edition of Burns’s *Works*, then, fits into a tradition of travel writing dedicated to the people and environs of Scotland. Furthermore, Currie knew he had a market for such travel writing.

---

On page twenty-five of the preface, Currie moves into a discussion of the Union between Scotland and England. He explains that the Scots’ “manners and dialect are undergoing a rapid change.” With this in mind, it is all the more important for the Scottish heritage, as emblematized by Burns’s poetry, to be remembered and appreciated. This scholarly edition, then, is a cultural archive. Burns’s poetry, like his countrymen and women, exhibits a pride about the Scottish heritage. His poetry, Currie explains, “displays, and as it were embalms, the peculiar manners of his country; and it may be considered a monument not to his name only, but to the expiring genius of an ancient and once independent nation” (30). Furthermore, the edition, according to Currie, is not an historical archive meant only for the benefit of the Scottish people. Currie intended a wide readership, and his prefatory remarks are meant to invite the reader to experience Scottish culture via his edition of Burns’s poetry. The prefatory remarks on the Scottish peasantry as well as the edition as a whole are intended to be a statement of Scottish nationalism: “This, it must be confessed is a very strong and general sentiment among the natives of Scotland, differing however in its character, according to the character of the different minds in which it is found; in some appearing a selfish prejudice, in others, a generous affection” (26). This tone of Scottish pride is evident throughout the prefatory remarks.

In the “Life of Burns,” Currie compiles information from various sources to put together a picture of Burns’s life. The beginning of the memoirs are Burns’s own words. His journal reflections and letters are included in quotation marks, distinguishing them from Currie’s opening remarks. Burns’s text runs for about 20 pages of the biography. Subsequently, Gilbert Burns’s (Robert’s brother) thoughts and reflections are included as
well as other contributors. Davis claims that Currie attempted to frame Burns in a
specific manner in his portion of the “Life”: “Currie paints a picture of Burns as a rustic
genius who encountered much hardship in life. Letters from Burns’s tutor, his friends,
and his brother, Gilbert, are included to give the likeness of the real man. One of Currie’s
major concerns is to emphasize the extraordinary sensibility of Burns.”34 However, the
portion of the “Life” that has received the most criticism has been Currie’s biographical
portrait of Burns. Ian McIntyre states, “[Currie] has been blamed for saying both too
much and too little, for paying undue attention to Burns’s frailties but also for being
mealy-mouthed about them. About the man and the poet alike Currie has many admiring
things to say, but for readers avid for unrestrained panegyric that has never been enough,
and there are passages which even today make them stir indignantly.”35 Currie’s focus
on Burns’s abuse of alcohol is, in particular, troubling for many critics of his editorial and
biographical approach to the edition. Davis states, “Burns’s own weakness for alcohol,
Currie suggests, finally caused his death. Currie’s final assessment of Burns provides an
indication of what Lamb described as Currie’s inclusion of ‘pathological and medical
discussion.’”36 Perhaps, Currie’s career as a physician compelled him to focus on this
aspect of Burns’s life. However, Ian McIntyre insists that, “[Currie] never forgot that he
was engaged, not in a dilettante literary exercise, but in an attempt to swell the
subscription for Burns’s widow and children; he recognized that there were
constraints.”37 It is for this reason that he may have tried to dial back his comments about
alcoholism later in the biography. Burns’s brother, and even William Wordsworth,

37 Ibid., 411.
would become involved in editions published after 1815 in an attempt to recoup Burns’s reputation.

In volume two, Currie presents a new and different advertisement in which he expresses anxiety about reception of the scholarly edition of Burns’s poetry. Furthermore, he explains his editorial method and approach to the text. First, the source material for the edition comes from various sources. Second, some of Burns’s manuscripts are “chaotic” (iii). Third, emendations were made when the author’s manuscript indicated a change, correction, or enlargement of an idea. Fourth, corrections to grammar were made at various parts of the edition with a mind to not alter the “habitual modes of expression of the poet” (iv). Currie outlines that emendations are certainly made; however, he does not outline how these emendations are highlighted in the text, or if they are consistently pointed out by footnotes. Currie’s prefatory remarks are, interestingly, a forthright commentary on his editorial practice. Nonetheless, like most editors of the era, he does not outline the specifics regarding emendation.

Currie’s approach with the manuscript, like his biography of Burns, has also been raked over the critical coals. Davis explains that “Currie has been blamed by other critics for his distortions of Burns’s manuscripts. His adjustments of Burns’s writing reflect his own sensitivity about bawdiness and political radicalness.” Peter T. Murphy asserts that “Currie’s excisions in the letters were legion, often descending to very small alterations of phrases whose offense is now entirely invisible; Currie’s biography, the famous part of his production, was equally fastidious, and he also left out many poems

---

that he considered indecent.” 39 This edition is one instance in which considerable work has been done in terms of comparison between the manuscript and the edition. Currie’s faults as editor have, as a result, been largely uncovered. However, the legacy of the editor is evident here, as Currie’s imprint endures. Davis laments this fact when he cites McGuirk: “More recent assessments of Currie have focused on his influence in forming the canon of Burns criticism. Carol McGuirk observes that ‘virtually every moralizing posture and mythic obliquity in the critical heritage’ of Burns originated in Currie’s edition of the works.” 40 The contributions of the editor, then, continues to play an important role in terms of how the text and the author are portrayed. Currie, then, an editor who attempted to create an enduring and positive portrait of Burns and his homeland of Scotland, continues to be a factor in negative conceptions of the poet’s life, work, and cultural heritage.

Lastly, in volume four the editor explains that the correspondence between Burns and George Thomson, which makes up the majority of this final volume, was put together by Thomson himself. The preface to this final volume acts as a tribute to Thomson’s effort in this regard. Currie explains that Thomson’s work is included “with little addition or variation” (vii).


39 Peter T. Murphy, Poetry as an Occupation and an Art in Britain, 1760-1830 (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), 92.

The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 130.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter three, page 290.


The annotation for this edition appears in chapter one, page 135.
Afterword

This bibliographic project involved locating exciting eighteenth-century editions and cataloguing, annotating, and critically assessing their prefaces. It is my hope that literary scholars will find my work useful in that it focuses on an understudied aspect of eighteenth-century literary and textual studies: the eighteenth-century editor. It is also my intention that textual scholars use this study as a spring board for further work on these texts, especially the lesser-known editions.

Editions of canonical texts featured in this project, like Pepys’s Diary and Wollstonecraft’s Maria (canonical by modern standards), have obviously received more scholarly attention. The annotations to these editions bear this out in that the criticism that focuses on these important works is obviously more extensive. However, other texts, like John Conder’s edition of Susanna Harrison’s Songs in the Night or William Cowper’s edition of Frances Maria Cowper’s Original Poems, warrant much more consideration. I encourage scholars to locate manuscripts and other papers associated with these texts. The Dictionary of Literary Biography series and the Dictionary of National Biography are helpful starting points as they provide detailed information about where various literary collections are housed.

There are other manuscript and paper collections that may not be so easy to find. For instance, in May of 2009 Eve M. Kahn, in the “Antiques” section of The New York Times, announced the auction of 483 lots of Paula Peyraud’s extensive collection of
female Georgian correspondence. Kahn explains that “[Peyraud] started gathering
female Georgian writers’ correspondence, books and portraits in the 1960s. [She]
allowed in just a few men’s works, including letters that Samuel Johnson and Horace
Walpole wrote to the Burneys and Thrales.”¹ This impressive collection, the fruition
of one woman’s passionate interest and resourcefulness, was private, but Kahn quotes Tom
Lamb, Bloomsbury’s International Head of Books and Manuscripts, as lauding Peyraud
for apprising the scholarly community about her collection: “she was very good about
keeping institutions and scholars aware of what she had.”² This private collection, then,
remained largely available to scholars. Scholars just needed to be persistent with their
research in order to find documents in Peyraud’s collection. Keeping this particular
account in mind, and also the fact that this dissertation stops short of manuscript analysis,
I implore scholars to follow the paper trail, to seek out the important textual documents,
and to examine the manuscripts and papers associated with the more obscure texts
featured in this study.

The Peyraud collection also highlights the fact that there is always more to
discover and more to examine. In the future, papers that pertain to well-known texts,
which are currently unavailable to researchers, may become more accessible, whether in
traditional print format or electronically. An auction, not unlike that of Peyraud’s
valuable collection, may feature papers in a private collection that was hitherto unknown
by scholars. Those papers may prove to be important to the body of research that is
relevant to obscure texts and canonical texts alike. Those editions that have held the
attention of scholars over the years are always ripe for continued scholarship. For

² Ibid.
instance, the six manuscripts of Edward Gibbon’s autobiography are still being discussed today, just as they were thirty years ago. As further analysis of these various manuscripts continues, and other relevant papers are examined in greater detail, scholars contribute new and important information to the field of Gibbon studies. In another instance, Elizabeth Montagu’s letters, which were only completely catalogued in the mid-twentieth century, still invite further investigation.

These editors were often compelling—and often flawed—contributors to the production of a text. Nonetheless, their role was essential in ensuring that important editions were available to eighteenth-century readers, and consequently, these texts continue to be obtainable to modern scholars of literature and history. It is worth noting that George Crabbe (the elder) destroyed extensive amounts of his own writing. His son, however, “saved” his father’s other writings that survived the fire by publishing an edition of his father’s poems. The example of Crabbe is not isolated. Other texts might have been lost without the resourcefulness and ambition of these editors. Ultimately, these editors protected important texts from oblivion by providing editions of life narrative, women’s texts, family texts, and colonial texts. This project showcases the determination of these editors to add significant editions to the world of eighteenth-century print culture.
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