

Notes on a (currently) lost pamphlet by Samuel Paterson

Amongst the rarest eighteenth-century printed works with a connection to Laurence Sterne is a one-penny, 46-page pamphlet put together by the bookseller, auctioneer, travel writer and essayist Samuel Paterson (1728-1802). The pamphlet was published in London early in 1769 and was a piece of indignant public jostling in the world of authorship and literary reviewing with a long title that laid out who Paterson saw as his allies and antagonists:

An Appeal to the Candid and Spirited Authors of the Critical Review, against Ignorance, Malevolence and Detraction: With lively Portraits of two notorious Phantoms in the Republic of Letters; namely, The Gentleman Journalist, and The Political Register. By Coriat Junior.

Paterson was responding in this work to reviews of a whimsical travelogue entitled *Another Traveller!* which he had written following a book-buying trip to the Netherlands. He had adopted the name of 'Coriat Junior' for his travels – a pseudonym that looked back to Thomas Coryate (c. 1577-1617), the author of *Coryats Crudities Hastily gobled up in five Moneths travells in France, Savoy, Italy [etc.]* (1611) – and his first volume, containing two parts, was published towards the end of 1768.¹ Reviewers in the *Monthly Review* and the *Political Register*, with differing views of its quality, had both deemed it to be an imitation of Sterne's *A Sentimental Journey* which had appeared in February that year, and there are indeed similarities between the two works.² Both works have pseudonymous traveller-narrators who tend to focus on minutiae and on the emotional aspects of the experience of displacement. The narratives also share a fragmentary quality, as well as self-conscious advertisements of their own eccentricity. Sterne's Yorick declares that his 'travels and observations will be altogether of a different cast from any of my fore-runners' (*ASJ*, 15), while Paterson's Coriat has a chapter '*In which the Traveller begs Leave to proceed in his own Way*'.³ There are also some specific details and encounters which can seem to connect the two works, such as Coriat's meeting with 'a reverend hoary-headed monk, with standing tears of tenderest compassion' which shows similarities to Sterne's account of Yorick meeting Father Lorenzo with his 'few scatter'd white hairs upon his temples' in Calais (*ASJ*, 7).⁴

The reviewers' sensing of an intertextual relation was understandable, then, but Paterson was upset by the suggestion of such indebtedness. He freely admitted to finding inspiration in *Tristram Shandy*; indeed, in the preface to *Another Traveller!* he had expressed admiration for 'that reverend joker the facetious Mr. S –' and the 'somewhat of a sort of an itinerary' that Sterne had

given in *Tristram Shandy's* seventh volume. He furthermore promoted his own offering to his readers as 'a couple of *Shandean* duodecimos'.⁵ But he firmly denied being an imitator of Yorick, maintaining that he had authored *Another Traveller!* prior to the publication of *A Sentimental Journey*, even though his own work was actually published almost nine months after Sterne's. It was this that he was seeking to prove in the pamphlet, which presented his case that most of the actual writing of *Another Traveller!* preceded the publication of Sterne's work but business matters delayed completion and publication of the travelogue. As support for his claim that he was more than a copyist, the pamphlet included affidavits from his booksellers, printer and stationers who could vouch for his chronology of events.

The pamphlet could not be more rare. The *English Short Title Catalogue* lists only one known extant copy held by Glasgow University Library, and this copy has not been digitized. Given the uniqueness of the Glasgow copy, the original purpose of this contribution to the *Shandean* was to present an edited text of the pamphlet, together with an introduction and annotations. What better way to honour the achievement of Peter de Voogd in this *festschrift* issue, the thinking went, than to add to one of the most valuable strands of his journal's work since its foundation: the project of reprinting and thereby preserving the content of rarities with a connection to Sterne and making that content more widely available to present and future readers. Consider, dear reader, how you could now be reading the rarest of pamphlets – complete with scholarly bells and whistles – and consider how enriched life could be for that one extended moment. That this is not happening is due to the fact that, to cut a long story short, the good people of Glasgow University Library have lost the pamphlet. (Some forceful expletives have been deleted from an earlier version of that sentence.) Having corresponded with the library with a view to editing it for publication here, I can report that in November 2021 the pamphlet underwent a conservation assessment to determine whether digitization would be possible (it was judged to be too fragile). At the end of 2021, it was returned to the library's Archives & Special Collections department but it was apparently mis-shelved and has consequently been classified as missing.⁶

The loss is, as Tristram might term it, a 'small accident' (*TS*, 3. 8. 196) – one to be lamented but endured. Glasgow has suffered worse losses – two devastating fires that destroyed much of the unique Charles Rennie Mackintosh School of Art come to mind. On the Lady Bracknell scale, the burning of the School of Art on two occasions may well 'look like carelessness'; the single and smaller loss of the pamphlet may 'be regarded as a misfortune', but as we bear that misfortune – and hope that the work is one day found – it is worth both recording what we can know of the pamphlet in its absence and considering why it is worthy of note.

Traces of the pamphlet in reviews

Some evidence of the nature and content of the pamphlet is still available to us because it was itself reviewed and, in the process, not only described but also quoted quite extensively, which was common practice in the reviewing magazines at the time. The *Monthly Review* responded to it in February 1769, showing surprise that Paterson had objected to their earlier review of *Another Traveller!*, since they had actually acclaimed his travelogue and expressed a hope that further instalments would follow.⁷ That earlier review had placed *Another Traveller!* in the wake of *A Sentimental Journey* but had deemed 'Mr. Coriat' to be a truly accomplished inheritor of Yorick's mode of literary travel. In the response to Paterson's pamphlet, the *Monthly's* reviewer accepts Paterson's claims not to have been influenced by *A Sentimental Journey*, but counters with the observation that even if Sterne's last work was not available to Paterson, the seventh volume of *Tristram Shandy* most certainly was – having been published in 1765 – and that this offered a model of eccentric travel writing which is surely discernible in *Another Traveller!*. In the absence of the pamphlet itself, it is worth quoting the review in full:

This pamphlet affords a striking proof, that vanity, or the lust of praise, is insatiable. We have bestowed great commendation on the Author, but we have not, it seems, allotted him enough. Though we gave him (too partially, as some of our Readers think) the preference to Sterne, in certain respects, yet, because in others, we entered an exception in favour of that admired Original, Mr. Coriat has lost a little of his good humour.—I am not well pleased, says he, with such confused criticism, such damning praise, as the following—“We do not think the present traveller (Coriat junior) equal to Yorick, in any respect, *except in the solidity of his judgment, the chastity of his pen, and the moral cast of his observations*”

But the resentment of this Gentleman is like that of a wayward child—pleas'd and peevish in the same breath; for in the next sentence, after thus chewing and ejecting the foregoing passage from our Review, he immediately subjoins,—‘That's enough! Gentlemen! Coriat junior is *thoroughly satisfied*; and answers—you are heartily welcome to sacrifice all the rest to the *manes* of matchless Yorick.’

Now what can we say to such a contradictory mortal, who is *not well pleased*, and yet *thoroughly satisfied*, at the same time, and with the same thing?—Dear Sir! have you not a monkey or a kitten to play with? Go—try to divert your spleen, and chase away this froward humour.

But the chagrin of this Writer is chiefly excited by his having been number'd among the imitators of Sterne. To prove, however, that this idea of his work is erroneous, he

produces the testimony of his *Booksellers*, his *Printer*, and his *Stationers*; from whose declarations it appears, that Mr. Coriat's Travels were in the press above half a year before Yorick's Sentimental Journey appeared; and that the former were actually printed off three or four months before the latter was published. But this state of facts, we apprehend, will but ill support our Author's claim to originality; which must depend upon internal evidence at last, however unwilling he may be to rest his cause upon that issue.—Did not Mr. Sterne give the public very ample specimens of his *peculiar manner of travelling*, in his later Volumes of Tristram Shandy, published long enough before either the *Sentimental Journey*, or Mr. Coriat's performance? and will Messrs. Johnson, Payne and Cadell, Booksellers, Thomas Jones, Printer, and Wright and Gill, Stationers, answer for their Author's having never seen those specimens? And will they undertake to convince the public, whatever Critics and Reviewers may say to the contrary, that there are no marks of imitation of the *former Traveller*, in *another Traveller*?—The *last* point, indeed, they may perhaps dispute with us; and possibly, too, they will be in the right: We do not pretend to infallibility:—"But what the D— would this Coriat be at?" (said an arch acquaintance of our's, on perusing his *Appeal*) "he may make himself very easy about the Similitude: Who but your wise worships would ever have thought of it!"⁸

This review is valuable, in part, for providing a glimpse of Paterson's tone in the pamphlet. The quoted exclamations with their sense of dramatic dialogue – 'That's enough! Gentlemen!' – intimate that there may have been a touch of whimsy mixed into Paterson's more earnest project of laying out the chronology of events and thereby deflating the accusations of unoriginality. Paterson was still writing as 'Coriat Junior' in his complaint, resulting in a pamphlet which, on the basis of these traces, seems to have channelled genuine indignation through a semi-ludic literary voice. Some readers may indeed have reflected upon how, in the very act of denying a Sternean influence, Paterson was engaging in exactly the type of play with literary masks that Sterne had enjoyed when, both on the page and in society, he took on the identity of Tristram or Yorick.

The *Monthly's* review is also useful for its listing of Paterson's supporters from within the book trade. The names of the booksellers Johnson, Payne and Cadell can be gleaned from the title-page of *Another Traveller!*, but here we learn the name of the printer who was willing to vouch for Paterson's version of events. We also learn that the paper for the volume was provided by the esteemed stationers Thomas Wright and William Gill. Wright and Gill were brothers-in-law, with premises near London Bridge; they were respected, civic-minded businessmen, with Wright later becoming the Master of the Stationers' Company, Sheriff of the City of London and Lord Mayor of

London.⁹ Statements from figures with such standing in the world would clearly have helped to inject credibility into Paterson's protest, while the willingness of his supporters to make their names known provided a contrast to the general anonymity that was retained by those working in the business of reviewing.

It was not until November of 1769 that the *Critical Review* published a response to Paterson's pamphlet, by which time a third part of *Another Traveller!* had been published.¹⁰ The *Critical Review* had assessed *Another Traveller!* enthusiastically in its November 1768 issue, pointing out the influence of *Tristram Shandy* but not suggesting that Paterson had used *A Sentimental Journey* as a model. The thrust of that review explains, of course, the first phrase of the pamphlet's title: *An Appeal to the Candid and Spirited Authors of the Critical Review*. The *Critical Review's* notice of the pamphlet is taken up mostly with quotation from one of Paterson's champions, and again it may be worth quoting in full:

We have delayed reviewing this little pamphlet for obvious reasons, which may be gathered from the title-page; and we should have entirely omitted it, had not the publication of a third volume of Coriat called upon us to declare, that his performance is an original, and that he owes nothing to the last printed volume of Yorick's Sentimental Journey.

This we think is unanswerably proved by the subjoined affidavits of creditable booksellers and printers, and by them subscribed, one of which, for its curious texture, we shall here exhibit.

'Whereas certain envious and evil-minded men, stiling themselves Critics, have falsly, unwittingly, cruelly, and maliciously asserted, that the painful peregrinations and original remarks, of our trusty and well beloved author, Mr. Coriat Junior, are no other than barefaced imitations of a late inimitable, and justly admired pilgrim, now in Elysium, once known among men, and for ever to be remembered by the name of Mr. Yorick, his Sentimental Journey.

We foreseeing the fatal consequence of such false, unwitting, cruel, and malicious assertion, as well to the said Coriat Junior his future fame, as present emolument, do here protest, upon our honour! and are ready to confirm the same, by the most solemn testimony; that the work of the said Coriat Junior, entitled *Another Traveller!* is so far from being a copy, or imitation of the aforesaid Sentimental Journey of the aforesaid inimitable Yorick, that it was several months antecedent to the said Sentimental Journey of the said Yorick, in our hands, and in the hands of the printer—And further, That the said Travels of the said Coriat Junior, beginning with the title-page and preface, were put to press in the

month of August, 1767—that the whole of the first part, as now published, was printed off before the middle of October of the same year—that it was the full intention of the author to publish in the following month of November (from which however he was hindered by multifarious business, and diverted by sundry avocations)—and that some sheets of his said work, *as yet unpublished*, to be comprised in his third part, are actually printed, and have been so, ever since Michaelmas 1767.’¹¹

The value of this review lies in the magazine’s repetition of its view of Paterson’s originality and, with the quoted affidavit, in its provision of details of the chronology of the production of parts of *Another Traveller!*. Assuming the trustworthiness of Paterson’s supporter, the dates allow a narrative of the temporally intertwined yet separate composition and production processes of *A Sentimental Journey* and *Another Traveller!* to be established. They form, in fact, a timeline which not only ‘exonerates’ Paterson, but also invites critical reflection on the idea of Sterne as a truly exceptional ‘original’. Ideas of singularity and innovativeness have long adhered to Sterne – from his early success with *Tristram Shandy* to the present day – but the fact that he and Paterson could independently produce works deemed so similar that one was seen to be an imitation of the other is suggestive of the power of a shared culture to influence authors in similar ways, however exceptional a position within that culture one of those authors already had and would retain.

A chronology of the births of *A Sentimental Journey* and *Another Traveller!*

The following presents the key dates given in the quoted affidavit augmented with other relevant information:

1765 (January): *Tristram Shandy* VII and VIII published, including Sterne’s first extended travel narrative.

1766 (late): Paterson travels to the Netherlands to buy books (in the ‘latter End’ of the year according to *Another Traveller!’s* title page).

1767 (7 January): Paterson holds an auction of books, including purchases from the Netherlands.

1767 (early months and onwards): Sterne gathers subscriptions for his planned new work (LY, 267-68).

1767 (June): Sterne begins writing *A Sentimental Journey* in earnest.

1767 (August): *Another Traveller!* ‘put to press’.

1767 (Michaelmas, i.e. September): 'some sheets' of the third part of *Another Traveller!* printed by this time.

1767 (mid October): 'the whole of the first part' of *Another Traveller!* printed.

1767 (November): Planned publication of *Another Traveller!* delayed by Paterson's 'multifarious business'.

1768 (17 February): *A Sentimental Journey* published.

1768 (early November): Volume I (containing 2 parts) of *Another Traveller!* published (advertised in *St. James's Chronicle*, 5-8 November); dated 1767 on the title page.

1769 (October): Third part of *Another Traveller!* published, including 'some sheets' printed two years earlier.

Assembling the dates of these events underlines Paterson's main point that *Another Traveller!*'s composition largely predated that of *A Sentimental Journey*. Complicating the case, it also makes clear that, on his return from the Netherlands, Paterson would almost certainly have become aware that Sterne was working on a new project and that it was a travel work. Paterson was not a subscriber to any of Sterne's works, but as a London-based worker within the book trade who admired *Tristram Shandy*, word of Sterne's gathering of subscriptions in all probability reached him. The content of *Another Traveller!* also reveals that at some point during Paterson's composition process he heard that there was a new work by Sterne in the offing. A late chapter in Volume I, Part II actually makes a point of this in a playful, self-reflexive scene: Paterson has his narrator receive a visit from his bookseller, Joseph Johnson, who complains to Coriat that he has failed to deliver his work and has thereby breached his contract. The delay is particularly regrettable, Johnson points out, because of what he has just seen advertised in the *St. James's Chronicle*: 'Speedily will be published – *A sentimental journey, by Mr. Yorick*'. Coriat's response shows little concern: 'Good! – I am heartily glad of it! – for then we shall have something worth reading! ... Another Traveller will still be read! – There is room enough in this big world for him and me too ... Mr. Yorick will be read for his wit – I must be heard for my cause'.¹² There is both playfulness and care in Paterson's representation of the competition: reworking a famous passage from *Tristram Shandy* (Uncle Toby telling a fly that the world 'is wide enough to hold both thee and me' [TS, 2.12.131]) to suggest the capaciousness of the literary market, he again acknowledges his admiration for Sterne's first fiction, but he does this within a scene which publicly declares his ignorance of the follow-up work, whilst also welcoming its imminent arrival. It may seem unlikely that a work which explicitly mentions another work was written without knowledge of the content of that other work, but there is, in fact,

nothing within the scene – or within the chronology of events – that truly undermines Paterson’s point that he had not *read* Sterne’s new work before he wrote his own.

The validity of Paterson’s case

Paterson’s claims have not always been trusted. The librarian and erstwhile doyen of Sterneana studies, J. C. T. Oates, regarded *Another Traveller!* as an imitation of *A Sentimental Journey* and, without serious probing of the matter, he found Paterson, in his response to his reviewers, duplicitous and ‘curiously anxious to deny’ his source.¹³ Oates’s view seems to be based on a supposition that Paterson must have been lying because Sterne was obviously a head and shoulders above his contemporaries in terms of literary talent and so Paterson must have been an imitator; it is conjecture driven by an unquestioned sense of a clear division between canonical authors and their supposedly lesser followers. His mistrust has been echoed by the few subsequent critics who have considered Paterson’s work,¹⁴ but there is actually little that should cause doubt to be cast on his case. I have argued as much in another essay – a study of critical agendas within scholarship on literary afterlives – and presented a number of reasons not to doubt Paterson. Without repeating the full argument here, the basic points are: the chronology stands up to scrutiny; Paterson had no reason to lie and was renowned for being an upstanding and moral man (he was indeed dubbed ‘Honest Sam Paterson’); his six supporters had no reason to lie on his behalf, and would have been discredited if they were found to have done so; the *Monthly Review* accepted his case when it was presented in the pamphlet; the *Critical Review* continued to accept the idea of Paterson’s literary performance as ‘an original’.¹⁵ What is not considered in that other essay is possible evidence of an interrupted printing process presented by *Another Traveller!* as a material object, but given the shortage of ‘exhibits’ in the case – not least following the straying of the single copy of the pamphlet – such evidence is worth brief examination.¹⁶

Material suggestions of the validity of Paterson’s case

The first edition of *Another Traveller!* does not display obvious signs of having been printed in stages. The paper and the typesetting are consistent throughout Parts I and II of Volume I and also the instalment that followed in October 1769. Given that the three parts were all produced by the same printer (Thomas Jones) using paper supplied by the same stationers (Thomas Wright and William Gill), such consistency is not at all surprising. However, if Paterson and Jones collaborated in such a way that Jones concluded a phase of printing ending at a chapter break in Paterson’s text – a hypothesis, but not an unreasonable one – then the first edition does show indications of the interrupted printing process. The work is comprised of sheets folded into quires of twelve leaves.

After the first quire of Part I of Volume I, each of the quires (with signatures B to H) begins midway through a chapter. Part II of Volume I then begins with quire I. The following three quires (K, L and M) begin midway through chapters, but between quires M and N there is a chapter break (at p. 289 with the start of Ch. XXVIII). Thereafter the quires (O to U) begin midway through chapters. In other words, there is just one sheet of print which includes a last page ending with a chapter ending. With printing in phases, for both author and printer it could be fiddly in the moment but convenient for the future to conclude the final printed sheet of an incomplete book with a finished chapter. If that happened, then the sheets up to M would be those which, to quote the *Critical Review* quoting the affidavit in the pamphlet, 'were put to press in the month of August, 1767 ... [and] printed off before the middle of October of the same year' whilst the remainder were printed later. This is also consistent with the content of the work, since it is towards the end of Part 2 of Volume I that Paterson includes the scene in which Johnson the bookseller visits Coriat Junior and informs him, with reference to a newspaper advertisement, of the looming publication of *A Sentimental Journey* (pp. 442-43, within quire T) – that is text which almost certainly would not have been written and printed in the summer of 1767, even though Paterson was probably aware of Sterne's new project and very possibly its title.

Regarding the point in the affidavit that 'some sheets of his said work, *as yet unpublished*, to be comprised in his third part, are actually printed, and have been so, ever since Michaelmas 1767', the same conjecture about the printing process may be applied to reveal an interruption. Following the paratext of the third part (that is, Part I of Volume II, which would remain a solitary part), the first chapter begins at the start of quire B. Of the nine quires that follow, two, in fact, begin at the beginning of a chapter: D (at p. 49) and H (at p. 145). Either of these points could be where the break in production came, with the former perhaps being more likely since three sheets fits the idea of 'some sheets' better than all of those up to that H (more than half of the part).

The significance of Paterson's pamphlet and implications of accepting his case

Re-examining Paterson's case based on the material provided in the two reviews of the pamphlet allows for a correction of Oates's view of Paterson as a mendacious copyist and provides us with a corrected basis for reading *Another Traveller!* and for considering its intertextual relations. It suggests that we should treat the work as inspired by *Tristram Shandy* and possibly by knowledge that Sterne was himself writing a travelogue, but not as an opportunistic work of imitation by a would-be Yorick. What is perhaps most thought provoking for Sternians here is the fact that *Another Traveller!* could be mistaken for an imitation of *A Sentimental Journey* by early reviewers without actually being one. Sterne envisaged *A Sentimental Journey* as 'something new, quite out of

the beaten track' (*Letters*, 536), yet at the same time as he was working on it another author – one inspired by his earlier writing – was pursuing a project that would result in something with sufficient similarities to *A Sentimental Journey* that it appeared imitative. Paterson, it seems, had also left the beaten track and he and Sterne had found comparable territory – they were two 'originals' walking on similar ground.¹⁷

It may be, in fact, that the issue of originality – of being seen to be original, as the *Critical Review* judged Paterson – is the prime point of interest in the lost pamphlet. The 1760s is, of course, renowned as a decade in which issues of literary imitation and originality were hotly debated – with Edward Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759) being perhaps the best-known contribution to the discussion. For Paterson, the idea of being deemed other than original was so painful, it seems, that he went to the trouble of producing and arranging the publication of a 46-page riposte, burdening six busy professionals within the print trade with the task of supporting him. The effort of that enterprise alone is a sign of the value that was invested in the idea of originality in Paterson's time. But the issue was complicated and being 'original' did not mean working without literary models or sources of inspiration – this is not the 'inspired creative genius' model of originality that was emerging at the time and would become intimately associated with Romanticism. Paterson was open about his admiration of Sterne; indeed, he later came to underline it even more firmly. When a new edition of *Another Traveller!* was published in 1782 the title-page announced that the whole was '*written in the Manner and Stile of the Late Mr. Laurence Sterne*'.¹⁸ If Paterson's pamphlet is ever found, it will be interesting to see exactly what type of intervention into these questions of originality it was putting forth.

¹ Samuel Paterson, *Another Traveller! Or Cursory Remarks and Tritical Observations Made Upon A Journey Through Part of the Netherlands In the latter End of the Year 1766 By Coriat Junior* (Joseph Johnson, J. Payne and T. Cadell, 1767). The disparity between the given date and actual publication date is addressed in the discussion that follows.

² *Monthly Review*, 39 (December 1768), 434-48; *Political Register, and Impartial Review of New Books*, 3 (December 1768), 384. It could easily be assumed that 'The Gentleman Journalist' in Paterson's title refers to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, but the context of the argument in which the pamphlet played a part shows that it refers to the *Monthly Review*.

³ Paterson, *Another Traveller!*, 30.

⁴ Paterson, *Another Traveller!*, 357.

⁵ Paterson, *Another Traveller!*, vi and viii.

⁶ Due to the loss, I have not seen the pamphlet myself; efforts to see it when it was not lost were undone by the Covid 19 pandemic.

⁷ *Monthly Review*, 39 (December 1768), 434-48.

⁸ *Monthly Review*, 40 (February 1769), 166-167.

⁹ Information about Wright is derived from the website of Bell House in Dulwich, which was built for him in the 1760s: <https://www.bellhouse.co.uk/wright-family> (accessed 25 May 2022).

¹⁰ The third part was advertised in the 26-28 October issue of the *St. James's Chronicle*. It was advertised here as the third 'volume', but it was actually the second volume in what is an eccentrically divided work, with the first volume comprised of two parts (both of them easily of volume length, but without separate pagination).

¹¹ *Critical Review*, 28 (November 1769), 387-8.

¹² Paterson, *Another Traveller!*, 443.

¹³ J. C. T. Oates, *Shandyism and Sentiment, 1760-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge Bibliographical Society, 1968), 15. It does not appear that Oates consulted Paterson's pamphlet; his awareness of Paterson's case probably derived from the reviews of the pamphlet presented here.

¹⁴ See, particularly, Katherine S. H. Turner, 'At the Boundaries of Fiction: Samuel Paterson's *Another Traveller!*', in Alvaro Ribeiro, SJ and James G. Basker (eds), *Tradition in Transition: Women Writers, Marginal Texts, and the Eighteenth-Century Canon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 144-160 (147).

¹⁵ Paul Goring, 'Authorial authority and the mapping of an -ana', forthcoming in a special issue of *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*.

¹⁶ The remarks that follow are based on inspection of the British Library's two copies of the first edition: 156.c5 and 1049.e.28.

¹⁷ For further discussion of this, see the forthcoming article cited above.

¹⁸ This edition was rebranded with a new title: *An Entertaining Journey to the Netherlands*.