Annotator as Ordinary Reader

Accuracy, Relevance, and Editorial Method

Michael Edson

ABSTRACT

Like the notes in many eighteenth- and nineteenth-century editions of English poetry, William Tooke's explanatory annotations to the Poetical Works of Charles Churchill (1804) have been dismissed as inaccurate and irrelevant. Yet in drawing the bulk of his notes from newspapers and other popular print ephemera of Churchill's lifetime (1732–64), Tooke (1777–1863) reveals both how Churchill fashioned his satires to appeal to periodical readers and how Churchill's popularity depended on such readers seeking false or exaggerated rumors of celebrity scandal. In addition, by devaluing accuracy, authenticity, and relevance in their own selection of sources, Tooke's notes raise questions about the place of accuracy and relevance in modern explanatory editing, suggesting that the emphasis on accuracy can sometimes lead to historically inaccurate readings.

INADEQUATE SEEMS TOO MILD A WORD TO DESCRIBE HOW MODERN editors regard the printed notes in early poetry editions. Of William Warburton's 1751 *Works of Alexander Pope*, Frederick Bateson observes, "the irrelevance and the verbosity" of the notes "must be read to be believed" (1951, xvi). Though infamous, Warburton's notes are far from the only editorial explanations from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to offend. Zachary Grey's 1744 explanatory notes to Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* are "informative", John Wilders admits, but Grey "could seldom resist the temptation to comment, even when he had little of relevance to say" (BUTLER 1967, lx). Regarding the annotations to Thomas Evans's 1779 *Works of Matthew Prior*, H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears also waver: some notes are "valuable and many wildly erroneous" (1971, xlvi). John Baird and Charles Ryskamp dismiss the apparatus to John S. Memes' 1832 *Poems of William Cowper* as "a fountain of error" (1995, xxiv). Worst of all, Alfred Milnes' 1881–83 notes to *Hudibras* ignore "indecent passages" (BUTLER 1967, lxi). Laments about the ills of annotation are hardly specific to the decades between 1700 and 1900, but they are common with regard to poetry editions. Modern editors agree: though sporadically helpful, early

annotators guess at vague references, censor obscene ones, and supply both flawed and irrelevant information.

The low reputation of early note-makers reflects their neglect for two eighteenth-century concepts now central to modern annotation: authenticity and intentionality. Authenticity, or the notion that the contextual information or explanations supplied by commentators must be “tested by documents and records” (DE GRAZIA 1991, 5) rather than tradition or hearsay, emerges in editions such as Edmond Malone’s 1790 Shakespeare and Thomas Percy’s *Reliques* (GROOM 1999, 36–37, 85–86). Typically, the documents considered most authentic were, and to a great extent continue to be today, what I will call “author-proximate” materials: an author’s personal papers, including letters and diaries, as well as accounts by the author’s associates. But editorial techniques varied widely (SEARY 1990; ERSKINE-HILL 1995; McLANE 2010) and as modern discontent with early annotation implies, Malone and Percy were exceptions to dominant trends even as they augured the future. Consistent with their eclectic approach to textual matters, early editors, in the cases when they gave documentation, often drew on oral and printed sources of dubious authority.

Intentionality, the other idea central to modern annotation, also dates from the eighteenth century. As Marcus Walsh argues, intention-oriented editing, both the pursuit of what “authors intended to mean” and the faith that materials “close in time” to the author are most relevant for recovering that intention, emerged after 1700 (1997, 2, 26).¹ This view was well-established by the time of the *Donaldson v. Becket* copyright decision of 1774, which recognized the author as textual owner. For Walsh, early editors understood intention along the lines of the “verbal intention” described by the hermeneuticist E. D. Hirsch: through “probability judgments” based on authentic contextual documents, accidental “significances” could be pared away to reveal a text’s “meaning”, i.e., the author’s intention, which for Hirsch is also to say the accurate or correct reading (1967). Even if Hirsch’s theory is now largely discredited (FISH 1980; MAYNARD 2009), there is little disputing the idea that annotation, in the eighteenth century and certainly by the time most of our still-standard editions appeared in the mid- to late-twentieth century, involved the recreation of intention, even in the distributed form recognized by “social editing” (MCGANN 1983; MCKENZIE 1986). Yet, as the above dismissals again imply, not all early annotators embraced intentionality, which is closely linked to ideas

1. For a discussion of the “authorial orientation” in editing, see SHILLINGSBURG 1986.

of accuracy and relevance in modern explicatory editing. The superiority of the notes in modern editions therefore reflects those editions' superior sources, sources often deemed reliable and relevant on account of their proximity to the author.

The focus of the present essay, William Tooke's *Poetical Works of Charles Churchill*, earns the same dismissal as other early editions. Started in the 1790s while Tooke (1777–1863) was training as a solicitor, published anonymously in 1804, and expanded in 1844, the *Poetical Works* is the first fully annotated edition of the poetry of Churchill (1732–64), the libertine poet-journalist and friend of the politician John Wilkes. Tooke's annotation has met with censure. In the 1956 Clarendon edition of Churchill, Douglas Grant bemoans Tooke's marginal identifications of Churchill's satiric allusions as "wrong or, at the best, inaccurate" (GRANT 1956, vi). Adam Rounce has also characterized Tooke's notes as "prolix and inaccurate" (ROUNCE 2003, xxxii). The perception of such problems is magnified because Tooke's footnotes, occupying about half of every page, cannot be ignored (fig. 1). As early as 1845, the reviewer John Forster lists the shoddy notes and declares Tooke "a bad annotator" (46, 49). But since most of the notes Forster cites were added in 1844, his criticisms do not entirely apply to the first edition.² Even so, Tooke's 1804 apparatus is deeply flawed. In a characteristic gaffe, one of Tooke's notes to Churchill's anti-theatrical satire *The Rosciad* (1761) conflates Thomas Davies, the biographer, with Thomas Davis, the actor (TOOKE 1804, 1:23–24n). Such an error reflects Tooke's apparent disregard for accuracy, a nonchalance traceable to his source selection. Tooke draws information primarily from papers and pamphlets rather than from the author-proximate documents favored by most annotators today.

Tooke's apparatus demands attention insofar as it offends modern editorial orthodoxy. His flawed notes, like their unreliable sources, reflect "public notoriety", Tooke's self-described criterion for gauging what information readers of the 1760s possessed and how they identified Churchill's satiric allusions. In taking a reader-focused approach at odds with the author-oriented rationales guiding most modern annotators, Tooke raises interesting questions, not least about the reception of *The Rosciad* and *The Ghost* (1762–63), two poems aimed at a broad audience without specialized political knowledge.³ In treating the information that readers brought

2. Of the eleven errors and inconsistencies that Forster identifies (1845, 47–49), only four appear in the 1804 edition.

3. Dublin reprints of *The Rosciad* sold for 3d. Political satires such as *The Prophecy of Famine* (1763) sold for 2s 6d and were not cheaply reprinted until the copyright lapsed in 1779.

Figure 1. [William Tooke, ed.] *The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill, with Explanatory Notes; and An Authentic Account of his Life*, 2 vols. (London: C. and R. Baldwin, 1804), 2:214–215.

to Churchill's poems as shaped by vagaries of print circulation beyond authorial control, Tooke presents allusive satire as a mode of publicity, an extension of a print-driven scandal culture energized by the mid-century expansion of the press in England. To what extent Tooke consciously aims for this presentation is unclear, but his notes nonetheless offer insight into reading practices: Churchill's contemporaries used the veiled references in his satires to revisit scandalous tales from the popular press. Awareness of this reception is diminished in modern annotated editions drawing information from mainly author-proximate sources, information deemed reliable precisely because it has been spared the same public circulation that qualifies anecdotes for explanation in Tooke's edition. One of the unexpected virtues of the 1804 *Poetical Works*, then, is how it calls into question the editorial allegiance to intentionalist ideas of accuracy and relevance, a questioning that can be extended to annotation across many genres and

times. Tooke suggests not merely the appeal of the false and irrelevant for readers in an age of printed scandal. He also implies that, while early annotations may not meet today's standards of facticity, they nonetheless yield insights into past habits of reading, insights often more historically accurate than what can be gleaned from modern editions.

Tooke's 1804 Apparatus

A quick perusal of Tooke's notes appears to confirm their deficiency. With regard to the following lines in Churchill's 1763 *Epistle to William Hogarth*, Tooke identifies the "injur'd son" as alluding to a Thomas Potter: "Whilst Fathers, by relentless passion led, / Doom worthy injur'd sons to beg their bread, / Merely with ill-got, ill-sav'd wealth to grace, / An alien, abject, poor, proud, upstart race" (1:166 [lines 195–98] and n).⁴ In fact, Potter, a friend of both Churchill and Wilkes, was not dispossessed; rather, it was Thomas's older brother John Potter who lost his inheritance after marrying a servant in 1741. Thus Douglas Grant, editor of the standard edition of Churchill's poetry, glosses the "injur'd son" as a reference to Edward Montagu, the son of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (1956, 521n) who was disinherited in 1761.⁵ Tooke's note apparently reflects his awareness of Churchill's efforts after 1763 to wound his enemy William Warburton by hinting in print of an affair between Thomas and Warburton's wife, Gertrude (see NICHOL 2000; ROUNCE 2005). Even so, the superiority of Grant's explanation rests on its greater accuracy, which is to say, on its better reflecting the poet's likely intention. As the brother-in-law of John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute, the Prime Minister in 1761 and target of Churchill's political satires, Montagu and his recent fate would have interested the poet more than John Potter's long-ago disinheritance.

Accuracy aside, the relevance of much of the information Tooke offers is also doubtful. Take, for instance, the following explanation of Churchill's slighting allusion to Thomas Arne:

Thomas Augustine Arne, an English musician, and brother to Mrs. Cibber, was born in 1710. He had his education at Eton, and was afterwards articled to an attorney; but music had more charms for him than law. . . .

4. All quotations of Churchill's poetry are from the text of Tooke's 1804 edition.
5. "Potter, Thomas (1718?–1759)", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (hereafter ODNB); "Potter, John (1673/4–1747)", ODNB. John Potter the son does not have an ODNB entry, but his father's ODNB entry mentions the son's marriage.

His opera of Artaxerxes still ranks among the first of English compositions. . . . His unbounded attachment to the fair sex contributed to keep him always poor. He died in 1778 of a spasm in the lungs. (1:48n)

Had Churchill satirized Arne's romantic escapades or health in *The Rosciad*, this note might pass. But Churchill mocks Arne's musical abilities ("Tommy Arne . . . whose only merit's to compile" [line 48, lines 713–14]), making Tooke's comments about sex and death irrelevant. Such is true even considering Churchill's later reference to Charlotte Brent, Arne's student and rumored mistress, where the focus again falls on Arne's ineptitude, now as vocal instructor: "Let him reverse kind Nature's first decrees, / And teach ev'n Brent a method not to please" (lines 719–20). Grant's note on Arne is quite different: "Thomas Augustine Arne (1710–78) was introduced into *The Rosciad* because his opera *Artaxerxes* . . . was so popular that the plays at Drury Lane were scarcely patronized" (1956, 470n). By focusing on Churchill's likely motives for satirizing Arne, and by giving only as much context as seems merited by the text, Grant uses Churchill's presumed intentions to limit the note's content. No similar brake is applied to Tooke's runaway explanation.

Tooke's dubious notes clash with his modern-sounding rationale for annotation. "The difficulty experienced by the Editor in understanding many of [Churchill's] allusions", Tooke explains in his preface, "gave rise to the present work" (1:1). Whether this "difficulty" was real or an excuse for a young solicitor's venturing into print, Tooke eschews the aesthetic brand of editing involving the accumulation of "beauties" and classical parallels in favor of a historicist approach. His apparent sense that annotation should supply context familiar to an author's early readers and thereby facilitate later comprehension anticipates modern rationales. As Martin Battestin stated in 1981, annotation means "reconstruct[ing] what a passage meant to the author and his first readers", including the provision of "information about specific persons, places, and events once known to the author's contemporaries" (20, 8). Even if more recent editors regard the idea of notes enabling moderns to read as if contemporaries with skepticism, today's continued confidence in annotation's ability to foster understanding by providing "information which would have been available to well-informed [past] readers" (DRYDEN 1995, xxii) is anticipated by Tooke.

The familiarity of Tooke's rationale ends there, however. Instead of recovering the common knowledge held by well-informed readers past, Tooke supplies information with "public notoriety" (1:2). His notes "elucidate only the particulars in the public conduct of persons censured by

the satirist, and . . . abstain from all notice of their private vices” (1:4). Public notoriety dictates Tooke’s source selection. If annotation aims to explain allusions only to widely publicized happenings, then the popular press offers the best guide to explanation. While using some unspecified manuscripts provided by Churchill’s publisher, William Flexney, Tooke draws the bulk of his notes from “magazines, pamphlets, and newspapers” of Churchill’s lifetime (1:5), including, presumably, the *London Chronicle*, *Lloyd’s Evening Post*, and the *Public Advertiser*. To gauge who and what achieved “notoriety”, Tooke applies a further standard of “concurrent testimonies”, identifying only satiric allusions to persons and events reported in multiple papers. Making a probability judgment of a different kind than Hirsch, Tooke appears to estimate what allusions would be identifiable and how they would be identified in the 1760s based on the extent to which the targets of such allusions were covered in the press. Writing in the wake of Malone’s Shakespeare, Tooke readily admits that his sources lack “an impression of authenticity” (1:5), and he rejects the apocryphal story of the young Churchill peddling cider for its inauthenticity, for its being a circumstance of which the manuscripts “make no mention” (1:x–xin). But he otherwise ignores the claims of authenticity and, what is the same both now and then, of intentionality. Though he never denies a desire to recover the intended targets of Churchill’s allusions, Tooke’s preference for published, secondhand accounts over unpublished, primary sources by the poet and his associates nonetheless implies that his annotations may not always supply intended meanings.

The apparent defectiveness of Tooke’s notes also reflects his disregard for accurate, author-proximate sources. The irrelevancies about Arne, together with Tooke’s misidentification of Churchill’s “injur’d son” as Thomas Potter, can be attributed to Tooke’s reliance on periodicals. The erroneous note in the 1844 edition attached to the following lines from *The Rosciad* seems to have a similar origin: “Ross . . . / Was fast asleep at dear Statira’s feet; / Statira, with her hero to agree, / Stood on her feet as fast asleep as he” (lines 629–32). Tooke’s note identifies Statira as the actress “Mrs. Palmer, the daughter of Mrs. [Hannah] Pritchard” (1844, 1:64n), and though he cites no source, his stated rationale for annotation suggests that the identification derives from notices in the papers. Grant disagrees, identifying Statira as either Sarah Ward or George Anne Bellamy, both of whom played Statira opposite David Ross in Nathaniel Lee’s *The Rival Queens* during the 1750s and 60s (1956, 468n). Grant rarely admits the possibility of multiple allusion, so his offering Bellamy as a second option signals hesitancy about the Ward identification for the same reason perhaps that he

suspects Tooke's accuracy more generally. Where the Ward identification comes from the newspapers, Bellamy derives from the *Records* (1832) of John Taylor, the drama critic.⁶ Here and elsewhere, Grant privileges documents by Churchill's intimates or, as with Taylor, accounts by contemporaries with insider knowledge, over widely-selling papers and pamphlets.⁷ Grant's identification of Statira is superior to that of Tooke, as it both derives from an authentic source and, through that claim to genuineness, is held better to reflect Churchill's likely intention.

"Note-orious" Vices: Annotating Satire for an Age of Scandal

Whatever the errors it allows, Tooke's reliance on newspapers proves salutary in one respect. By flanking his poetry with notes drawn from newsprint, Tooke locates Churchill amid one of the key developments in mid eighteenth-century England: the rise of an industrialized press circulating information on a mass scale. Over the century the number of newspapers in England doubled, with forty-five new journals appearing between 1745 and 1760 alone. By 1775, the circulation of daily and tri-weekly papers spiked to roughly 2,500 per issue, the actual readership proving even larger on account of sharing and reading aloud (HARRIS 2009, 422). To what extent this context for Churchill is an accident of Tooke's source selection is unclear; Tooke declines to explicate imitations of "preceding writers" (1:4), so he at least appears eager to assimilate Churchill to print contemporaneity. In any case, Churchill invited this treatment. The poet's contributions to England's print-fueled information culture, namely his essays for John Wilkes's journal, *The North Briton* (1762–63), are well known. Lance Bertelsen links Churchill's "associative" poetics, including his digressions and juxtapositions, to the journalism of his friends, George Colman and Bonnell Thornton (1986, 107–19, 150–60). Churchill's *The Ghost*, inspired by the media frenzy around the Cock Lane Ghost hoax and trial (1762–63), exemplifies these tactics, the digressive poem mimicking the confluences of the many-columned eighteenth-century paper.

6. Grant attributes the Ward identification to Robert Lowe, who cites the *Publick Advertiser* (March 18, 1761) identifying Ward as Statira (1891, 32n3).
7. Of Grant's 134 notes to *The Rosciad*, less than thirty (22 percent) feature information from periodicals. Of the 250 notes to *The Ghost*, approximately thirty (13 percent) offer information from periodicals.

Churchill's revisions also bear the mark of the press. Of the nine editions of *The Rosciad*, five were enlarged (the second, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth), with most of the added lines alluding to recent events. Mindful of the ephemerality of the news, of the "obsolescence of the newspaper on the morrow of its printing" (ANDERSON 1991, 35), Churchill seemingly sought to sustain his appeal among newsreaders by repeating news items. The seventh edition of *The Rosciad* (1763), for example, adds allusions to London plays from autumn 1762, including this jibe at the actor John Jackson: "List to that voice—did ever Discord hear / Sounds so well fitted to her untun'd ear?" (lines 429–30). Echoing remarks on Jackson in the *Theatrical Review* of January 1763 ("Account of New Performers", 37–38), the poem mimics the papers, serving as a regularly-updating outlet for theatrical gossip. Added to the fifth edition months after the 1761 premier of Arne's oratorio *Judith* (pace Grant, not *Artaxerxes*), Churchill's above-mentioned slighting of Arne likewise appears to capitalize on the media attention surrounding the opening performance.⁸ This updating tactic reaches its height in *The Ghost*. While Books 1 and 2 appeared at the start of the Cock Lane scandal, Books 3 (October 1762) and 4 (November 1763) follow the papers and cover the trial of the hoaxers. The third edition of Book 1 (1763) also adds an allusion to Wilkes' duel with William, Earl Talbot in October 1762, an event provoking printed rumors.⁹ By linking Churchill to the world of popular print, Tooke's notes confirm the implication of the poet's own practice: verse satire and periodicals mutually reinforced. No surprise, then, that Churchill's poetic debut—*The Rosciad*—satirized actors, the darlings of the eighteenth-century news cycle.

Central to Churchill's method was the traffic in gossip enabled by the diffusion of cheap print. Although the official advent of "scandal culture" in England dates to the arrival in 1769 of the *Town and Country Magazine* (TILLYARD 2005), the print-mediated pursuit of the disgraces of the rich and powerful arose much earlier if the space devoted in newspapers to bankruptcies and duels is evidence. Satire, too, had long traded in scandal (KNIGHT 2004, 229; ZWICKER 2014), but never on this scale. Where earlier satirists could not trust readers beyond the bounds of court or coterie

8. As the fifth edition appeared prior to the premier of *Artaxerxes* on February 2, 1762 (the only 1762 edition of *The Rosciad* is the sixth), the allusion would be to *Judith* (see GILMAN 2013, 338).

9. Examples include "A Speech of Falstaff", *St. James's Chronicle* (October 9–12, 1762) and the broadside poem, *B[agsho]t H[eat]h: or, The Modern Duel* (London, 1762).

to know the latest gossip, Churchill could assume a broad familiarity on account of an expanding media system. Confidence in both the availability of gossip and the public appetite for salacious revelations led Churchill to include the latest rumors in his verse. The collapsing of personal life into poetry, the “scandalous celebrity” of later poets such as Lord Byron (TUIITE 2007, 78), was present for Churchill as early as *Night* (1761) and intensified in the poems written after Churchill’s scandalous elopement with the teenage Elizabeth Carr in 1763. In *The Rosciad* and *The Ghost*, however, the primary appeal derives from allusions to the scandals of others. As Rounce states, Churchill’s satires are a “record of the artistic and political scandals of the time” (2003, rear cover); and *The Rosciad* specifically doubles as a “gossip column” (HAMMOND 2006, 383). So clear to contemporaries was the focus on scurrilities that one reviewer of *The Duellist* (1764), a poem alluding to Wilkes’s 1763 duel with Samuel Martin, refused to offer excerpts from Book 3 as to not “propagate scandal” by reprinting them (Review of *The Duellist* 1763, 538).

Churchill’s proximity to scandal culture goes a way toward explaining Tooke’s approach to annotation. Early in his preface, Tooke implicitly contrasts his annotative procedure with that of T. J. Mathias’s verse satire, *The Pursuits of Literature*. Featuring copious notes detailing unknown and in many cases likely invented affairs, Mathias’s poem scandalized the *beau monde* when it appeared in 1794. “Unlike . . . satirists of *note-orious* memory”, i.e., Mathias, Tooke identifies allusions only to actual, well-publicized scandals (1:2n). Tooke’s pun, “*note-orious*”, validates his reliance on periodicals by proposing the natural affinity of notes and gossip, his notes appearing inoffensive through the juxtaposition with Mathias’s slanderous annotations. Meanwhile, the comparison links Churchill’s popularity to that of Mathias’s poem, the latter’s appeal reflecting “the scandal . . . which [it] contain[s]” (*Impartial Strictures* 1798, 12). By stressing Churchill’s immersion in scandal, Tooke licenses his own rehashing of sordid anecdotes.

Tooke’s source selection for his notes confirms what the reviewer of *The Duellist* implies: Churchill’s allusive satires propagated scandal—though, as we will see, they did so differently than the papers. Tooke’s “public notoriety” rationale reinforces this view, despite the tenuousness of his apparent supporting belief that “public” failings can be divided from “private” vices. While the public/private distinction had evolved a material-spatial basis by the mid-1700s, both Churchill and the press blurred such distinctions, referring to domestic scandals to imply the unsuitability of persons for public office (CLARK 2004, 19–52). As Tooke’s stress on “concurrent testimonies”

reveals, public notoriety proves a function less of place than of circulation. “Public” business at Parliament counted as “private” if ignored by the press, while duels, debts, and other domestic scrapes were “public” information if enough papers reported them. Whether an allusion to a “private” trespass merits a note depends on publicity—hence why Tooke immediately reneges on his promise to “abstain” from detailing “private vices”. Rather, his notes will “elucidate only the particulars [of] public conduct . . . except in some instances too notorious not to call for direct animadversion” (1:4). His notes are rarely admonitory, so the resort to “animadversion” enlists moral indignation to shelter Tooke from the potential charge of bowing to the whims of publicity.

In the absence of surviving accounts of reading Churchill, Tooke’s notes imply how early audiences experienced the poet’s work. By imitating the function and periodicity of the papers, Churchill invited readers to apply periodical reading practices, to read for gossip. The shifting demands on satire famously observed by Henry Fielding in 1748—readers ask “not, as formerly, What is the Subject? . . . But, who is abused?” (1975, 212)—imply the spread of scandal-seeking habits. Churchill’s allusions resist the “prompt verifiability” (BENJAMIN 1969, 89) of the papers, and this initial illegibility drove their appeal. As Jennifer Snead observes of Pope’s *Dunciad*—a poem also updated in later versions to reflect breaking literary news—allusions enlist readers as participants in meaning-making (2010, 198–200). At times Churchill may initiate rumors. *The Duellist* speculates that Martin was part of a conspiracy to assassinate Wilkes (CHURCHILL 2003, 108–09). *The Times* (1764) alleges sexual crimes against George Sackville Germain, 1st Viscount Sackville (at line 494) that have not been independently verified—Sackville was not “renowned for sexual irregularity” (CHURCHILL 1997, 179)—so the poet may traffic in fake news there, too. Typically, however, Churchill spreads gossip less by creating new stories than by giving readers occasions to recycle what they already knew from the papers. Marginal jottings reveal readers who enjoyed drawing on their stock of gossip to identify Churchill’s semi-suppressed names (fig. 2).

False Notes: Audience in Modern Editions

So far we have seen how Tooke’s notes connect Churchill to his readers, the poet cagily adjusting his satires to the vogue for scandal and relying on the papers to do it. But by working from periodicals, Tooke also draws a crucial distinction between authorial intention and reader experience.

Figure 2. Charles Churchill, *The Rosciad*, 3rd ed. (London: W. Flexney, 1761), 2. The Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

In this, Tooke differs from later editors, who, as Battestin implies when declaring the annotator's task to be the retrieval of "what a passage meant to the author *and* his first readers" (italics mine), treat authors and readers as more or less identical. Grant, who never openly endorses a rationale like Battestin's, relies on author-proximate materials and therefore also assumes at some level Churchill's "first readers" to be ideal readers, having the same knowledge as the poet and identifying his allusions as intended. Even when the annotator's job is framed differently, as the supplying of the "once-shared 'linguist and literary expertise'" of a historical era, the drawing of notes from the author's papers or other insider accounts continues to imply that "informed" readers shared the author's knowledge (SMALL and WALSH 1991, 8). Such an assumption contradicts historical evidence. If Churchill's friend Wilkes could complain from France in 1764 about "obscurities" in the poet's "late pieces", then it is doubtful to think readers lacking ties to the poet identified all of his allusions, or at least identified all of them as intended (WEATHERLY 1954, 89). Churchill's readers could identify some allusions and guess at others, to be sure; the poet was famous for naming names in his poetry, and he would not have been successful if the identities of many of his targets were obscure. Yet readers also no doubt lacked the knowledge to identify, or to identify correctly, less obvious references. This is not just because past readers lacked those editions, such as Wilkes's *Correspondence*, available to scholars today, but because allusion itself often aims at a "coterie audience of the author's acquaintance" (ABRAMS 1993, 8). As Tooke's drawing on the same papers informing early encounters with Churchill's poems should remind us, reception and intention differ. Readers in the 1760s drew information from other kinds of sources than scholars and therefore sometimes identified allusions differently. To annotate using authentic sources, far from recreating what Churchill's readers knew or what a passage meant to them, often substitutes the author's knowledge for that of his or her first readers. Editors have every right to supply the identifications that authors intended, but to imply that first or early readers knew what authors knew and read in ways consistent with authorial preferences is misleading.

One scholar who has recognized the problematic relation of author and reader in modern editing is Ian Small. In his essay, "The Editor as Annotator as Ideal Reader", Small challenges the assumption that authors and readers possessed more or less identical knowledge. Far from universally intelligible, all texts include some references that many "first readers", however defined, could neither identify nor recognize as allusions. Readers comprise many sub-communities with knowledges specific to their class,

gender, and location. Mindful of the inability of the conventional print edition to address this huge range of actual or potential information stores, Small recommends “intended audience” as a more workable guide to annotation (1991, 203–04).

The problem with Small’s alternative is that it simply admits what was always already true: that the recovery of the meanings assigned by past readers to texts has been limited to meanings that authors were thought to have also intended. Though expedient for editors constrained by cost and space, this scheme will disappoint scholars in search of historical reading experiences. One can object that to ask editors to recover past reading experiences is to confuse editing with book or reception history; as Peter Shillingsburg argues, “the purpose of editing is not to replicate the past”, including the many ways past readers interacted with texts (SHILLINGSBURG 2017, 44). But when annotators claim to supply meanings assigned to texts by “first readers”, or even when they claim to recover once-shared cultural knowledge, they already veer into reception history. And since annotation appears to have *always* involved implicit claims about the nature of interactions with texts in the past, one is justified in wishing that Small’s solution was more committed to the recovery of actual reading practices. Beyond underrating the challenge of identifying the intended readership, Small trades the editor’s ideal reader for the author’s ideal reader. To avoid confusing author with reader, annotators must bend to an author’s implicit or explicit judgments about the knowledge that audiences possessed. This approach neglects how authors can both misidentify audiences and over-rate audience competence. Notes framed according to Small’s system would therefore neglect one key question of interest to reading historians: what did actual readers know?

Accidentally perhaps, Tooke’s apparatus addresses this question of knowledge and, in so doing, shows the peril of explanatory notes that conflate authors and readers. Instead of viewing reader knowledge as identical to author knowledge, or for practical purposes treating texts as un-annotatable without limiting that knowledge to authorial projections, Tooke seeks to recover actual reader knowledge by tracing it to its source: the news. Churchill’s “first readers” drew their information from a body of cheap print increasingly transcending class and location. So pamphlets and papers offer the best guides to what most readers knew. Contrasted with Tooke’s approach, the modern privileging of *uncirculated* texts as sources for “shared” knowledge now looks suspect. Tooke’s reliance on “concurrent testimonies” also hints how the range of potential reader knowledges might be constrained without recourse to intention. Granted, Tooke

omits to state how many “concurrent testimonies” make for a “note-orious” anecdote, raising doubts about how representative his notes are of actual popular knowledge. Nor is it clear if Tooke’s use of the papers reflects a principled position, or simply a response to the unavailability of alternative sources. Yet, if these ambiguities dissuade annotators today from adopting his approach, they do not reduce the efficacy of Tooke’s method in revealing faulty assumptions in modern approaches to annotation.

Revisiting the reference to the “injur’d son” in the *Epistle to Hogarth* illustrates the potential for modern notes to mislead about past reading experiences. Even if Churchill could imagine alluding to John to re-activate rumors of John’s brother’s tryst with Gertrude, Churchill did not fall out with Warburton until November 1763, making a reference to either Potter brother in the preceding June unlikely. Grant is probably right that Churchill intended Montagu. But for “first readers” lacking Churchill’s interest in Bute, and also lacking the copy of Horace Walpole’s letters that Grant has, would Montagu have jumped to mind?¹⁰ Even if Montagu was better known than John Potter, which is certain, the mass of Churchill’s readers would have been no more likely to supply Montagu’s name than that of one of the other divested sons who were newspaper fodder in the 1760s. The reasons for this are twofold. First, the allusion is in fact to “injur’d sons”, the plural inviting readers to either interpret the phrase as a generalization or to connect it to multiple “sons”, possibly none of them Montagu. Grant’s preference for single over plural identifications obscures how many of Churchill’s allusions may have elicited multiple names, something here that the use of the plural encourages. Second, the obituaries in the main London papers largely ignore the younger Montagu’s fate, one declaring that the elder Montagu’s fortune would in fact “devolve” on his son (*Lloyd’s Evening Post* 1761). In brief, nothing suggests that Montagu’s ill fortune was sufficiently publicized to shape the reading of the allusion to the exclusion of all alternatives. If Tooke’s note on “injur’d sons” fails to convince, it is not for ignoring intention. It founders on Tooke’s own criterion of “concurrent testimonies”: nothing proves that John’s 1741 fate was adequately circulated in 1763 to make part of the information readers brought to the poem.

10. Grant does not cite his source of this identification. However, since one of Grant’s preferred sources is *The Letters of Horace Walpole* (1903–1905), and since Walpole also notes Montagu’s smaller-than-expected inheritance (1960, 472–73), we can infer that Grant draws on Walpole.

Modern editions also mislead about whether readers even had the knowledge to assign identities to some allusions. In Grant's note to one passage from Churchill's *The Times* (1764), "H——" is identified as Thomas Hervey, who in 1744 secretly wed his mistress Anne Coghlan and later denied the marriage (551n): "Trust not to rakes—alas! 'tis all pretence— / They take up raking only as a fence / 'Gainst common fame—place H—— in thy view" (lines 483–85). Tooke ignores "H——", one of many allusions ignored in his remarks to this poem, omissions seen by some as proof of Tooke's prudishness (LAVIER 1933, 1:xi). But when identifying "Foote" in line 396 of *The Rosciad*, Tooke broaches the sodomy charge brought against the actor Samuel Foote: "An imputation too gross to be recorded was thrown out against his character" (29n). Publicity, not prudery, constrains Tooke. The allusive targets in *The Times* seem to have been deemed as insufficiently notorious in 1764 to be identified, a conclusion that Tooke's possible failure to trace them in his research would support. Male sodomy was seen as heinous, so Foote's trial received press coverage, making it noteworthy. Hervey's whoring, less offensive for being commonplace and safely heterosexual, did not receive equal attention and did not merit noting. Even if Tooke misjudges Hervey's fame or allows moral disgust to interfere, his sensitivity to the vagaries of reader knowledge diverges from Grant's across-the-board explication. By identifying both Foote (464n) and Hervey, Grant implies that they were equally identifiable in the 1760s. But the source of Grant's identification of "H——", manuscript marginalia by Wilkes, says little about Hervey's fame beyond Churchill's social circle. By contrast, Tooke's approach hints that not all allusions were equally intelligible in the past: while readers knew enough to recognize "Foote" (or "F——", as the early editions print it), they likely lacked the knowledge to identify "H——" consistently.

Accuracy as Historical Inaccuracy

By suggesting that modern explanatory annotation can sometimes distort perceptions of how readers interacted with allusions, Tooke raises a larger question: how historically accurate are modern ideals of accuracy and relevancy in annotation? Not very, it appears. Not only did earlier readers not have access to the same kinds of information as scholars today, but they also did not especially care whether that information was accurate. Annotators tend to overlook how both the value and meaning of terms such as "accuracy" and "factual" are historically contingent, and how early

readers, as well as past editors annotating for them, may have been less scrupulous. When Tooke proposes probable identifications based on what he judges to have been public information in the 1760s, his unconcern for the accuracy of his information and sources parallels that of Churchill's audiences. Eighteenth-century papers were not known for their trustworthiness. Indeed, in a scandal culture, accuracy carries little esteem; as we realize from our own tumultuous media moment, far from confirming what the public knows, truthfulness in a context where the false, sensational, and politically opportune trumps the factual may hinder a story from circulating sufficiently as to shape public knowledge. Under such conditions, the most probable identifications for allusions may be unintended and incorrect ones. As we have seen, Churchill was not above tempting his readers to embrace falsehoods. Tooke may at times better capture the interpretations of Churchill's audience than Grant *because* the information Tooke gives is exaggerated or wrong.

To admit that being wrong can sometimes be right historically is not to accept relativism, which is to say, to accept an approach to annotation in which no identification for an allusion, however wrong or private, can be excluded.¹¹ Let us return to the identity of Statira. From *The London Stage* we know that Ross slept, as Churchill jokes, at the feet of two different Statiras: Bellamy and Ward.¹² Tooke's choice for Statira, Mrs. Palmer, played the role at Drury Lane in 1764–65 alongside William Powell. But for readers without such a resource and, more important, without the modern scholarly incentives to square Statira with the correct leading man, she could have been identified as Bellamy, Ward, Palmer, or maybe all three. Some "early" readers may have even recalled Maria Nossiter, who played Statira in 1757, or Isabella Mattocks, who had the role in 1767.¹³ Marginalia in a copy of the eighth edition of *The Rosciad* confirms that someone other than Tooke also identified Statira as Palmer (fig. 3). Palmer would not be the accurate identification by modern standards, but in accepting

11. For intentionalist editing as a defense against relativism, see HOWARD-HILL 1998.

12. For the performances involving Ward, see STONE 1962, pt. 4, 2:782, 847, 924, 954, 1058, and 1105. For the performances involving Bellamy, see STONE 1962, pt. 4, 2:695.

13. For Maria Isabella Nossiter playing Statira opposite Spranger Barry at Covent Garden in 1757, see "For the Benefit of Miss Nossiter", 1757; for Isabella Mattocks playing Statira opposite William Smith at Convent Garden in March 1767, see STONE 1962, pt. 4, 2:1230.

Figure 3. Charles Churchill, *The Rosciad*, 8th ed. (London: W. Flexney, 1763), 30. EC75 C4756 761rh, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

the likelihood of some readers identifying Statira as Palmer doesn't mean all possible readings of Statira are equally valid. By Tooke's rule of "concurrent testimonies", Nossiter, Mattocks, and whatever private associations the name "Statira" might also have raised for readers in the 1760s would be

excluded. Tooke's trading of intention for public knowledge based on circulation as the basis for determining both what allusions receive notes and what those notes contain hardly leads into the abyss of relativism.

The question of Statira's identity also brings us back to the related problem of relevance in annotation. As Felicity Nussbaum observes, *The Rival Queens* produced many "lurid tidbits" for the papers, including the rumor that Bellamy, while playing Statira in 1756, was stabbed offstage by the actress Peg Woffington (2010, 78). Given the culture of scandal in England, one might speculate, contra Tooke, that more of Churchill's readers identified Statira as Bellamy than the other actresses because of Bellamy's irrelevant associations. Bellamy's supposed injury, together with her liaison with the politician John Calcraft and struggles with debt, made her a tabloid constant.¹⁴ Either way, the example of Bellamy points to an additional function for Churchill's allusions, a function reflected in the supposed proximity of Tooke's notes. In a recent article challenging the idea that allusions and gutted names helped satirists avoid legal reprisal, Andrew Bricker argues for such elements as instead stirring curiosity and "invit[ing] readers to be part of the construction of a scandal" (2014, 900). This is true, though I would add that textual gaps do more than permit readers to invent scandal by supplying names for the deeds described. The built-in vagueness of allusion also gives readers considerable room to revisit other scandals associated with the name or names assigned to a passage. In other words, interpretation changes in a gossip-mad marketplace: "information about the personal lives of people involved in important events substitutes for . . . the events themselves" (SPACKS 1985, 67). Allusions permit readers to recall excesses unrelated to the immediate context of the reference, including, for instance, in Statira's case, Bellamy's debts and affairs. Tooke's meandering note on Arne's sexual predilections likewise imitates or embodies this play of association. To dismiss Tooke and other early annotators for commenting "when they have little of relevance to say", then, ignores how they, similar to the readers whose experiences they recover or represent, embraced the modern standard of relevance no more than that of accuracy. Irrelevant associations proved central to their reading experience.

The appeal of scandal was no less intense in the 1790s, when Tooke began to annotate Churchill. Reviewers of the 1804 *Poetical Works* appear to have ignored, tolerated, or enjoyed the irrelevancies of Tooke's notes, irrelevancies that only emerged as blemishes with the second edition of

14. "Bellamy, George Anne (1731?–1788)", ODNB.

1844.¹⁵ Similarities abound between Tooke's presentation of Churchill and the gossipy satires of Tooke's own era, including Charles Pigott's *The Jockey Club* (1793), as well as such compendia of theatrical bon mots as *Harris's List of Covent-Garden Ladies* (1757–95) and Joseph Haslewood's *Secret History of the Green Room* (2nd ed., 1792). But if Tooke's contemporaries shared Churchill's readers' interests they did not possess the same stock of titillating anecdotes. Thus, some of Tooke's irrelevant notes appear to reflect his attempts to update old scandals for new generations. Among the many possible examples of such updating is Tooke's handling of Churchill's reference to the actor Richard Yates in *The Rosciad* (lines 345–46):

[Yates] died suddenly . . . he was rich, and the disposition of his property being forcibly contested on the spot by his heir at law Thomas Yates, a lieutenant in the navy, a scuffle ensued between him and the friends of Miss Jones, the comedian's housekeeper and principal legatee, in which the former was unfortunately killed. At a trial at the Old Bailey . . . the jury brought in a verdict of manslaughter. (1:26–27n)

Such lurid inconsequentialities give Tooke's notes a news-reporting feel; trials and contested wills were staples of periodical gossip. In seeking to pique the interest of later readers, Tooke yokes Churchill's allusion to a more recent scandal, supporting the idea of audiences in 1761 and 1804 alike as using allusions to recall infamies only tenuously linked to the hinted-at persons.¹⁶ Tooke also courts anachronism for similar reasons in his aforementioned note on Foote, as the sodomy charge against Foote only surfaced in 1776, years after Churchill's death. From his gossipy notes one might even infer that Tooke's own desire to participate in scandal culture inspired his edition.

If Tooke's notes are products of the 1790s, their value lies mainly in their approximating reading practices from the 1760s. A final proof of this emerges through a comparison of Tooke's printed notes with Thomas Gray's 1764 marginalia in his copy of Churchill's *Poems* (1763). A classically-educated poet, Gray is far from an "ordinary" reader by any definition. But in

15. Of the seven reviews of the 1804 edition that I have seen, only the *British Critic* questions the notes: "some [facts] may be erroneously stated" (Review of *The Poetical Works* 1805, 174).

16. For evidence of widespread interest in the trial, see the pamphlet, *The Trial of Miss Jones, and Messrs. Sellers and Footney, for the Murder of Mr. Thomas Yates* (London: A. Macpherson, 1796).

lacking ties to Churchill, Gray shares that reader's ignorance of intention; and since Gray annotated the poems for personal amusement, his notes presumably show better than Tooke's later, published remarks how actual readers interacted with Churchill's allusions. One is struck by the needlessness of many of Gray's handwritten notes. About Churchill's reference to "Sterne" in line 62 of *The Rosciad*, for example, Gray writes: "LAWRENCE [sic] STERNE Author of 'Tr. Shandy'" (GOSSE 1918, 164). So gratuitous an explication confirms allusions as offering readers a game of identifying names, even obvious ones. Gray also reveals Tooke's gossipy remarks to be quite representative of reading at the time. As Table 1 shows, Gray's marginal notes on William Smith and Ross rehearse the actors' respective marriages and affairs, exceeding even Tooke in gossipy detail. By contrast, Grant's accounts of Smith and Ross from authentic sources miss the point. Tooke, not Grant, better approximates the eighteenth-century experience of reading Churchill's satire.

Coda: Annotation and Histories of Reading

"If we are to understand Churchill's popularity", writes David Twombly in 2005, we must recover his poetry's "historical specificity" by "bury[ing] ourselves in footnotes" (108). To this end, Twombly calls for "a new, more thorough edition" of Churchill (106n54). This would be a bad idea even putting aside the fact that piling up new, dense notes is unlikely to spur a renaissance in the study of Churchill or of any poet. If composed according to modern concepts of accuracy and relevance, such added notes would provide scant insight into what brought readers to Churchill beyond what is already clear from Grant's 1956 comments. As Tooke emphasizes, Churchill's popularity in 1760s England had much less to do with the provision of accurate and relevant identifications than we might expect. As a node or relay in a network of commodified gossip, Churchill's satires transmitted both gossip and the affect, the lure and disgust, such scandalous anecdotes inspired. By identifying allusions, readers confirmed themselves *au courant*, showing others that they were "in the know". The larger goal was social belongingness: "to keep up with the vogue information of culture is to maintain one's ties to . . . others who are doing their part to keep up as well" (KAUFER and CARLEY 1993, 67). In this context, the accuracy of an identification perhaps mattered less than one's ability to supply some, indeed any, name. Bellamy, Palmer, or Ward; Montagu or Potter; Hervey or someone else—as long as a *referent* could be supplied the *accurate ref-*

Table 1. Comparison of Thomas Gray's, William Tooke's, and Douglas Grant's Annotations.

Churchill's Allusion	Gray's Note	Tooke's Note	Grant's Note
William Smith in <i>The Rosciad</i> , ll. 627–29	"SMITH turned Player but at Tonbridge married M ^{rs} Courtenay, a Widow Lady sister to the Earl of Sandwich. he had a good person but was a poor Actor" (Gosse 1918, 168)	"He married a woman of fortune, and retired from the stage in the year 1788. . . ." (1804, 41n)	Quotes a description of Smith from the <i>Theatrical Biography</i> of 1772 (1956, 468n)
David Ross in <i>The Rosciad</i> , ll. 629–32	"Ross, was kept by Fanny Murray, a famous Woman of the Town . . ." (Gosse 1918, 168)	" . . . [Ross's] defects were evidently owing to his love of ease and fondness for social pleasure . . ." (1804, 41n)	Quotes a description of Ross from the <i>Theatrical Examiner</i> of 1757 (1956, 468n)

erent was unimportant. Many of Churchill's allusions had to be accurate in order to stir curiosity, gain reader trust, and make the occasional false innuendos look true, but no similar constraint governed readers. Given that Churchill's appeal depended, even in ways that the poet was not fully aware, on the agency of readers eager to display their mastery of gossip, little would be gained by adding more annotations keyed to intentionalist notions of accuracy and relevance.

Adding traditional notes would also aggravate longstanding misperceptions of Churchill's satire. Tooke's connecting Churchill to scandal culture exonerates mid-to-late century satirists from the lingering charge that their highly personal poetry represents a decline from the general satire of Pope (see WILKINSON 1952; LOCKWOOD 1979). While the increased directness of satire after the middle of the century is very real, Tooke reveals this personalization as exaggerated through blanket annotation. Where Tooke allows that past readers may have been unable to identify obscure allusions ("H——"), and opens the possibility that even some of the allusions he does annotate ("injur'd sons") may have been regarded as generalizations rather than allusions, Grant annotates everything, even for the sake of consistency references that he cannot identify. Hence Grant attaches 134 notes to *The Rosciad* compared to Tooke's eighty; modern readers walk away thinking of Churchill's poetry as more personal than it is. Nor is the quantity of notes alone to blame. In supplying only the single, most plausible referent in his notes, Grant obscures how many of Churchill's allusions can elicit multiple identifications and thereby achieve a kind of generality similar to that of Pope's satire. Recovering the "historical specificity" of mid- and late-century satires supposedly likewise focused on "individuals instead of their [public] actions" (DYER 1997, 103) including poems by Churchill, William Gifford, and John Wolcot, requires not adding more notes but rather reading beyond the notes already there.

As unique as Tooke is in his presentation of Churchill's satires, more unique is how this framing challenges methodological assumptions in explicatory editing. Beside Grant's edition, Tooke's apparatus shows the potential for commentaries guided by concepts of accuracy and relevance to distort understandings of how past readerships interacted with texts. Bellamy's affair with Calcraft, Potter's rumored tryst with Gertrude Warburton, and Arne's supposed affair with Brent—all these anecdotes go largely unmentioned by Grant, who presumably regards them as false or irrelevant, notwithstanding that such stories probably loomed large in the

minds of readers.¹⁷ In arguing that modern annotation can distort views of past reading, I intend to imply neither that notes impose on scholars nor that we would be better off working from unannotated texts, as has been argued by proponents of “un-editing” in Renaissance studies (MARCUS 1996). Notes do not stop scholars from asking whatever questions they want about reception, as the existence of the present essay confirms. In showing that Tooke’s often inaccurate notes are at times more historically accurate than they seem, I also do not recommend that his approach be adopted today. Tooke’s method, even if suitable to gossipy satire, would be problematic for other editorial ventures where it would be impossible to gloss allusions according to relative and utter obscurity. Tooke’s value lies instead in his revealing how modern editorial ideas of authenticity and intentionality may block or undercut histories of reading. If Tooke’s circulation-based rationale has anything to show practicing annotators, it is strictly the possibility of finding useful ways to annotate without conflating readers with authors or intended audiences, a possibility that grows daily as annotated editions migrate from the cramped printed page to spacious digital platforms.

The implications of Tooke’s rationale for histories of reading extends well beyond the Enlightenment. Annotated editions already play a role in reception studies: analysts of highly topical texts must often depend on explanatory notes, even if these notes more reflect author-intended meanings than reader-created ones. So why not extend this role? Historians of reading often lament the dearth of accounts of reading habits from the past.¹⁸ In lieu of such accounts, we might adopt explanatory notes from earlier eras as proxy measurements. Precisely because they seem so inadequate by modern standards, the notes in early editions offer clues to non-specialist reading habits in the past. Unlike Malone or the other scholar-editors on whom past histories of early editing have focused, reader-editors such as Tooke (solicitor), Thomas Evans (bookseller), and John Mason Good (surgeon), editors with limited schooling and little access to authorita-

17. Grant identifies Brent (470n) but ignores the rumored affair. Grant refers to the rumor of Potter fathering Warburton’s son Ralph (533n) only in a note to *The Duellist*, but Warburton is also mentioned in *The Ghost*, *The Candidate* (1764), and the *Dedication to the Sermons* (1765).

18. As William G. Rowland observes, “we simply do not know and cannot find out what most readers of the past thought about a particular book” (1996, ix).

tive documents, more closely resemble ordinary readers than professional editors.¹⁹ Tooke is a reader of rare dedication, to be sure, but the gossiping quality of his notes, together with his eccentric sources, nonetheless reflects vogues of his time. Indeed, Tooke's published annotations likely started out as reading notes aimed to assuage his personal difficulties in reading Churchill. More than rogues or blunderers, early annotators should be seen to approach texts like other ordinary readers. By trading Small's "annotator as ideal reader" for a concept of "annotator as ordinary reader", we promise to gain new sources of information about past reading. Further, we stand to realize how gossip and innuendo sell poetry, a process that deserves to be more "note-orious".

Works Cited

- ABRAMS, M. H. 1993. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- "Account of New Performers". 1763. *Theatrical Review; or the Annals of the Drama* (January): 36–40.
- ANDERSON, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised ed. London: Verso.
- BATTESTIN, Martin C. 1981. "A Rationale of Literary Annotation: The Example of Fielding's Novels". *Studies in Bibliography* 34: 1–22.
- BENJAMIN, Walter. 1969. "The Storyteller: Reflections on the Works of Nikolai Leskov". In *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, trans. Harry Zohn, 83–109. New York: Schocken.
- BERTELSEN, Lance. 1986. *The Nonsense Club: Literature and Popular Culture 1749–1764*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- BRICKER, Andrew Benjamin. 2014. "Libel and Satire: The Problem of Naming". *ELH* 81 (3): 889–921.
- BUTLER, Samuel. 1967. *Hudibras*. Ed. John Wilders. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- CHURCHILL, Charles. 1804. *The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill, with Explanatory Notes; and An Authentic Account of his Life*. [Ed. William Tooke.] 2 vols. London: C. and R. Baldwin.
- . 1844. *The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill. With Copious Notes, and a Life of the Author*. Ed. W. Tooke. 3 vols. London: William Pickering.

19. Thomas Evans, the annotator of Matthew Prior's *Works* (1779), had little formal training in editing. See "Evans, Thomas (1742–1784)", ODNB. The translator and annotator of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* (1805), John Mason Good was a surgeon and did not attend University. See "Good, John Mason (1764–1827)", ODNB.

- . 1891. *The Rosciad and The Apology*. Ed. Robert W. Lowe. London: Lawrence and Bullen.
- . 1933. *Poems of Charles Churchill*. Ed. James Laver. 2 vols. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- . 1956. *The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill*. Ed. Douglas Grant. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1997. *Selected Poems of Thomas Gray, Charles Churchill, and William Cowper*. Ed. Katherine Turner. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- . 2003. *Charles Churchill: Selected Poetry*. Ed. Adam Rounce. Nottingham, UK: Trent.
- CLARK, Anna. 2004. *Scandal: The Sexual Politics of the British Constitution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- COWPER, William. 1995. *The Poems of William Cowper*. Ed. John D. Baird and Charles Ryskamp. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- DE GRAZIA, Margreta. 1991. *Shakespeare Verbatim: The Reproduction of Authenticity and the 1790 Apparatus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- DRYDEN, John. 1995. *The Poems of John Dryden*. Ed. Paul Hammond. Vol. 1. The Longman Annotated English Poets. London: Longman.
- DYER, Gary. 1997. *British Satire and the Politics of Style, 1789–1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ERSKINE-HILL, Howard. 1995. "On Historical Commentary: The Example of Milton and Dryden". In *Presenting Poetry: Composition, Publication, Reception: Essays in Honour of Ian Jack*, edited by Howard Erskine-Hill and Richard A. McCabe, 52–74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FIELDING, Henry. 1975. *The Jacobite's Journal and Related Writings*. Ed. W. B. Coley. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FISH, Stanley. 1980. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [FORSTER, JOHN]. 1845. Review of *The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill. With Copious Notes, and a Life of the Author*. *Edinburgh Review* 81 (163): 46–88.
- "For the Benefit of Miss Nossiter". 1757. *Public Advertiser* 6976 (March 5): page 1, column 2.
- GILMAN, Todd. 2013. *The Theatre Career of Thomas Arne*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- GOSSE, Edmund. 1918. "Gray's Notes on Churchill". *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom* 36: 161–79.
- GROOM, Nick. 1999. *The Making of Percy's Reliques*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- HAMMOND, Brean. 2006. "Verse Satire". In *A Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*. Ed. Christine Gerrard. 369–85. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- HARRIS, Michael. 2009. "London Newspapers". In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, vol. 5, 1695–1830, edited by Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner. 413–33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HIRSCH, E. D. 1967. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- HOWARD-HILL, T. H. 1998. "The Dangers of Editing, or, the Death of the Editor". In *The Editorial Gaze: Mediating Texts in Literature and the Arts*, edited by Paul Eggert and Margaret Sankey, 51–66. London: Routledge.
- IMPARTIAL STRICTURES on the Poem Called "The Pursuits of Literature". 1798. London: Printed for J. Bell.
- KAUFER, David S. and Kathleen M. CARLEY. 1993. *Communication at a Distance: The Influence of Print on Sociocultural Organization and Change*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- KNIGHT, Charles A. 2004. *The Literature of Satire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LOCKWOOD, Thomas. 1979. *Post-Augustan Satire: Charles Churchill and Satirical Poetry, 1750–1800*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- LLOYD'S *Evening Post and British Chronicle*. 1761. 550 (January 21–23): page 77, column 2.
- MARCUS, Leah S. 1996. *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton*. London: Routledge.
- MAYNARD, John. 2009. *Literary Intention, Literary Interpretation, and Readers*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview.
- MCGANN, Jerome J. 1983. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MCKENZIE, D. F. 1986. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. London: British Library.
- MCLANE, Maureen N. 2010. "Mediating Antiquarians in Britain, 1760–1830: The Invention of Oral Tradition; or, Close Reading before Coleridge". In *This is Enlightenment*, edited by Clifford Siskin and William Warner, 247–64. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- NICHOL, Donald W. 2000. "Slander, Scandal, & Satire". *Times Literary Supplement* 28 (January), 14–15.
- NUSSBAUM, Felicity. 2010. *Rival Queens: Actresses, Performance, and the Eighteenth-Century British Theatre*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- POPE, Alexander. 1951. *Epistle to Several Persons*. Ed. F. W. Bateson. Vol. 3b of *The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope*, ed. John Butt et al. London: Methuen.
- PRIOR, Matthew. 1971. *The Literary Works of Matthew Prior*. Ed. H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears. 2nd ed. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Review of *The Duellist. A Poem in Three Books*. 1763. *Monthly Review* 29 (December): 531–38.
- Review of *The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill*. 1805. *British Critic* 25 (February): 171–75.
- ROUNCE, Adam. 2005. "'A Clamour Too Loud to be Distinct': William Warburton's Literary Squabbles", *Age of Johnson* 16: 199–217.
- ROWLAND, William G. 1996. *Literature and the Marketplace: Romantic Writers and their Audiences in Great Britain and the United States*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

- SEARY, Peter. 1990. *Lewis Theobald and the Editing of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- SHILLINGSBURG, Peter L. 1986. *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- . 2017. *Textuality and Knowledge: Essays*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- SMALL, Ian and March WALSH, ed. 1991. *The Theory and Practice of Text-Editing: Essay in Honour of James T. Boulton*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SNEAD, Jennifer. 2010. "Epic for an Information Age: Pope's 1743 *Dunciad* in Four Books and the Theater Licensing Act". *ELH* 77 (1): 195–216.
- SPACKS, Patricia Meyer. 1985. *Gossip*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- STONE, George Winchester, ed. 1962. *The London Stage: 1660–1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces*. Part 4: 1747–1776. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- TILLYARD, Stella. 2005. "Celebrity in 18th-Century London". *History Today* 55 (6): 20–27.
- TUITE, Clara. 2007. "Tainted Love and Romantic Literary Celebrity". *ELH* 74 (1): 59–88.
- TWOMBLY, David J. 2005. "The Revenant Charles Churchill: A Haunting of Literary History". *Studies in Philology* 102 (1): 83–109.
- WALPOLE, Horace. 1960. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*. Ed. W. S. Lewis. Vol. 21. New Haven: CT: Yale University Press.
- WALSH, Marcus. 1997. *Shakespeare, Milton, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Editing: The Beginnings of Interpretative Scholarship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WEATHERLY, Edward H., ed. 1954. *The Correspondence of John Wilkes and Charles Churchill*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- WILKINSON, Andrew M. 1952. "The Decline of English Verse Satire in the Middle Years of the Eighteenth Century". *RES*, ns 3, 11: 222–33.
- ZWICKER, Steven N. 2014. "Why Are They Saying These Terrible Things about John Dryden? The Uses of Gossip and Scandal". *Essays in Criticism* 64 (2): 158–79.