

BULLETIN
OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH
THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL
LIBRARIES

- The specialist periodical for all concerned in the bibliography and library provision of religion and philosophy.
- 16 pages three times a year.
- Recent articles include: Theology at the B.L.L.D., Uniform headings for liturgical works, Information retrieval in New Testament studies.
- Regular notes on Libraries, societies and reference books in the field.
- Abstracted in *Library and Information Science Abstracts*.

The Bulletin of ABTAPL is edited by
John V. Howard, New College Library, Edinburgh.

Subscriptions £2.00 (\$6.00) to
Leonard H Elston, Belsize Library, Antrim Grove,
London NW3 4XN.

The Bibliothek

A SCOTTISH JOURNAL
OF BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ALLIED TOPICS

Edited by
DOUGLAS S. MACK

Volume 9 : 1978 : Numbers 2 & 3

*Published from The National Library of Scotland by the Scottish Group of the University,
College and Research Section of the Library Association*

The Bibliothek

A SCOTTISH JOURNAL
OF BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ALLIED TOPICS
ISSN: 0006-193X

Contents

The letters of Robert Foulis to James Beattie, by Robert Hay Carnie 33
A chronological bibliography of works on R. B. Cunninghame Graham (1852-1936), by John Walker 47
An early humanist edition of Aristotle at St Andrews, by Euan K. Cameron 65
Reviews
A. W. Pollard & G. R. Redgrave: A short-title catalogue 1475-1640, second edition, reviewed by Robert Donaldson 72
Kenneth Curry: Sir Walter Scott's <i>Edinburgh Annual Register</i> , reviewed by Alan Bell 74
Kenneth C. Fraser: A bibliography of the Scottish National Movement, reviewed by James Kidd 76
Norma E. S. Armstrong: <i>Local collections in Scotland</i> , reviewed by David Angus 77
Contributors to this number 80

On the cover is an enlargement of the 'pelican' device used by the seventeenth-century Edinburgh printer, John Wreittoun.

THE BIBLIOTHECK is issued by the Scottish Group of the University, College and Research Section of the Library Association. It is a journal of articles and notes on bibliography and related subjects embodying original material based on manuscripts or printed books of Scottish interest or association. Provisional checklists and other classes of work in progress may be included, as well as queries that do not require immediate answer. THE BIBLIOTHECK is the organ of the Group but its pages are open to librarians outside the Group and to all bibliographers and other research workers. Three numbers are issued annually. An annual Supplement contains a bibliography of books, reviews, essays and articles in the field of Scottish literature published during the preceding year. The first of these Supplements (published 1970) relates to material which appeared in 1969.

Contributions and editorial correspondence should be addressed to The Editor, THE BIBLIOTHECK, University Library, Stirling FK9 4LA, Scotland. Subscriptions and business correspondence should be addressed to The Secretary, THE BIBLIOTHECK, The National Library of Scotland, George IV Bridge, Edinburgh EH1 1EW. Cheques, etc., should be made payable to THE BIBLIOTHECK.

The annual subscription is £5.00 for subscribers in Great Britain and the Commonwealth (£4.20 for a personal subscription by a member of a library staff) and £12.50 for other subscribers. Back numbers may be purchased for £1.80 or \$3.00. The annual Supplement is supplied to subscribers; single copies may be purchased for £1.50 or \$4.00. An index to volumes 1-5 is also available (complete sets of back numbers of THE BIBLIOTHECK and its Supplement may be obtained from the publishers).

© The Publishers and the C

Tight Binding

The letters of Robert Foulis to James Beattie

Robert Hay Carnie

DAVID MURRAY published in 1917 a small collection of letters from Robert Foulis to various correspondents.¹ Philip Gaskell printed parts of the correspondence of James Boswell and Robert Foulis as an appendix to his splendid bibliography of the Foulis Press,² and the present writer presented in this journal in 1972, some letters illustrative of the later career of Andrew Foulis the younger.³ Despite these efforts a complaint made by Murray sixty years ago is still basically true. Students of the Scottish book-trade have extensive knowledge of the books printed and published by Foulis; books which indicate very clearly the superior printing skills of the house of Foulis and the desire of that firm to promote within Scotland the study of classical and English literature, but we have scanty and incomplete information about the biographies and personalities of the key members of the Foulis family. An edition of all the surviving letters is a desideratum but is probably still some way off.

The six Foulis-Beattie letters printed below were not used by Sir William Forbes in his standard *Account of the life and writings of James Beattie, LL.D.*,⁴ a work which is largely based on Beattie's letters to his many correspondents. Margaret Forbes quotes a few passages from the Foulis-Beattie letters in her biography,⁵ but it was inevitable, in a biography of Beattie, that her emphasis should be on the Aberdeen philosopher and not on the Glasgow printer. The few minor points of detail which can be added to the printing history of such well-known works as the Foulis Press editions of Gray, Milton and Mason are not the chief value of these letters. Their value lies rather in the delightful cameos in which we see, e.g. Robert Foulis's pride in the productions of his own press expressed in his generous gifts to Gray,⁶ or the pleasing picture of the scholar-printer whiling away the weary hours travelling in a coach from London to Glasgow by reading Gray's poems out loud to the mysterious Scottish lady, Margaret Hepburn,⁷ or in listening to Foulis

learnedly discoursing with Beattie on the vexed problem of the use of marks of elision in the printing of Milton's blank verse.⁸ We become aware of Foulis's ability to quote Plutarch on the false pride of school-master-pedants, and of his orthodox, if rather naive, belief that for the scepticism of Joseph Priestley to be despised, it needed only to be known.⁹ The reader will also be attracted by the direct, non-pretentious, prose style of the letters, a style which patently reflects the generous, open-minded and non-mercantile nature of their author, Robert Foulis.

Only one letter of Beattie's side of the correspondence seems to have survived. This is his reply to Foulis's letter of May 10, 1770 (Letter 5). It has already been printed by W. J. Duncan in his *Notices and documents illustrative of the literary history of Glasgow*, Glasgow: Maitland Club, 1831. As neither this volume, nor the 1886 reprint by T. D. Morison of Glasgow, is easily available, I have appended the Beattie-Foulis letter of June 20, 1770 as Letter 7.

All six Foulis letters are in the Beattie collection at the University of Aberdeen.¹⁰ They all carry Robert Foulis's autograph signature, but five of the letters are in one clerk's hand, and the sixth in another. They were presumably transcribed by unidentified employees of the Foulis brothers. The letters are produced *verbatim*. Any editorial interpolations are enclosed in brackets.

Letter 1. Robert Foulis to James Beattie

Dear Sir,

I had the favour of yours of the 31st Decr. I am very sensible of your friendship; and of the honour you have done us in applying to Mr Gray¹¹ in our favour, and in so effectual a manner as to obtain his permission for our printing his Poems; And beg, that the first time you write to Mr Gray, you would assure him of our most grateful acknowledgements, and that we have a just sense of the honour done us, not merely from the reputation of Mr Gray with people of taste in every rank, but also from the experience we ourselves have had of the power of his sentiments and descriptions striking the mind, & awakening the soul: Sentiments that are at once simple & sublime.

Early in the year 1753, when at London,¹² I was very desirous of having

the pleasure of seeing Mr Gray, and narrowly miss'd seeing him when he visited Miss Hepburn¹³ who much admir'd his writings. In her return to Scotland, in the intervals of conversation, it was our only entertainment on the road, to read them in the 4to edition. And as it was my province to be the reader, I have them still very much impress'd on my mind; particularly that on Eton, And above all, The Elegy wrote in a Country Church-yard. The sublime & pathetic Poem on the Welch Bards was not then publish'd.¹⁴ As to Mr Dodsley's printing them at the same time, it is no disagreeable circumstance.¹⁵ Especially, as he knows they are likeways to be printed in Scotland. This may produce useful emulation without envy.

I am

Dear Sir

With esteem, affection and gratitude

Your most obedient servant

Robert Foulis

Glasgow 6th Janry. 1768.

Cover. To Mr James Beattie Professor of Moral Philosophy¹⁶ in the Marischall College Aberdeen.

Letter 2. Robert Foulis to James Beattie

Dear Sir,

I received this day Mr Gray's Poems with the notes, fairly transcribed;¹⁷ for which, in the mean-time, I return you my sincere and most hearty thanks; And also for your attention in informing me so completely both with respect to Mr Gray's opinion and your own concerning the manner of printing, which almost universally falls in with my own opinion; Only, the distance between the lines, as you propose, is too great, and would hurt the beauty. The distance I propose will be rather a little more than the distance between the lines of the Homer we printed here in folio.¹⁸ I have some doubts if the writing paper you mean will be broad enough for the length of the line; but I shall know this tomorrow. As soon as a proper paper is fixt on the printing will soon be begun and finished. We

shall smooth the paper for some copies, without making it shine so as to reflect the light too sharply.¹⁹ The poems in imitation of the Norse & Welch are very fine,²⁰ and must be acceptable to people of taste. I shall do myself the honour to write to Mr Gray. What you have heard of Miss Hepburn's death is but too true. I shall give you the trouble of a Letter as soon as I can send you a specimen of the manner of printing. My most respectful compliments to Mrs Beattie.²¹ I am

Dear Sir
With great respect & esteem
Your most humble & obedient Servant
Robert Foulis

Glasgow March 3d 1768.

Cover. To Mr James Beattie Professor of Philosophy in the Marischal College Aberdeen.

Letter 3. Robert Foulis to James Beattie

Dear Sir,

We have a just sense of our obligations to you for procuring Mr Gray's permission to print his Poems, and it is exceedingly pleasant to us that we have been able to execute them in such a manner as to give satisfaction to him²² and to you. As we had more at heart doing justice to their merit than procuring profit, we printed no more copies than what we thought we would be able to sell in our own Shop, being aware likewise that our correspondent in London would be unwilling to receive them on account of interfering with Mr Dodsley; So we sent none to London, but one Copy which we put into a Commission we were honour'd with for the King's Library, and about 25 Copies to Cambridge.²³ We can, however, from the agreeable reception they met with at Glasgow, afford a little present for Mr Gray, which shall be either a Copy of our folio edition of Homer,²⁴ or a set of our edition of the Greek Historians in 29 volumes,²⁵ as you shall judge most proper, or most agreeable to him. This we do not

mean as any suitable return, but as a small testimony of our respect & gratitude. As we ly at a distance from opulent encouragers, the constant expence of our various engagements calls for constant returns for all our little commerce produces, which is indeed almost intirely confined to the sale of our own produce. As an instance of this, we have sent your account discharged to Mr Angus²⁶ for the 12 copies of Mr Gray's Poems you ordered, and for which encouragement we also beg you would accept of our thanks.

You will find by the inclos'd Proposal that Mr Gray's Poems are like to give rise to an edition of Milton;²⁷ not a numerous one, but attended with such encouragement as will render the risk small, and I hope, will be executed in such a manner as not to disappoint the expectation of the encouragers.

Mr Gray's advancement²⁸ gives great satisfaction to every body of taste or letters here. The choice does no less honour to his Majesty than to Mr Gray. I am, for myself and brother,

Dear Sir,
your very much obliged and most humble servant
Robert Foulis

Glasgow March 25th 1769.

Cover. To Mr James Beattie Professor of Philosophy in the Mareschal College, Aberdeen.

Letter 4. Robert Foulis to James Beattie

Sir,

I had the pleasure of yours of April 24th, for which I return you my most hearty thanks, both on my Brother's account & my own. We are both highly sensible of the friendship it discovers.

The number proposed for encouraging an edition of Milton's Paradise Lost in fol. is within less than 20 of being complete. We are obliged to you and the Mareschal College for their subscription. The Homer is still unpaid, but it is our own fault, in not having called for it. There was also

a copy of the Iliad sent to the late Principal Pollock's²⁹ order, in the same circumstance.

I am glad you lik'd so well the two prints³⁰ I had the pleasure of sending you. The inaccuracies you complain of are just; but the faults belong to the Masters after whom the Engravings are done, and they are now become so venerable in their characters, that any attempt of an Engraver to mend them, would be taken very ill; And indeed it would be no easy matter to mend the Joseph.³¹ The Drawing has the same indistinctness in the Picture after which it is done; and if the Engraver had rendered it more distinct, it would have advanced, almost in a line, with the foreground figures. The dissatisfaction arising from the indistinctness unaccounted for wou'd have been prevented if Raphael had introduced any object between the foreground figures & Joseph to give an idea of distance. The thumb of the Magdalen³² is likewise a faithful copy of the Original, as well as the Tree: But these kinds of faults are known marks of Coreggio [sic], as well as his beauties; And if an Engraver or Copyist attempted to mend them, altho' he should succeed, he would get no thanks, but give an occasion to his being suspected, even where he copied faithfully.

With regard to the little presents from Mr Gray, I will send you what you direct, whether he gives you an answer about it, or not.

Your sentiments with regard to the choice of Editor we ought to follow in Milton agrees with our own. We have been looking into Newton's Milton³³ with that view. He has certainly taken more pains than any other Editor of Milton; And however small importance many variations may be, it is safer to follow one able than many guides, which are apt to cause inconsistencies unless the greatest deliberation is used. I could wish you had been a little more explicit in the length you would have us to go in the banishing of abbreviations: It would certainly be more classical to have none. There is the same reason for printing Virgil with abbreviations; since a person without an ear, or ignorant of quantity, may mistake. Would you recommend replacing all the vowels, or only some in particular cases? If only some, can you give me any fixt rule founded on nature that can be justify'd, & uniformly observed without any inconsistency? Mr Newton has restored some vowels, & at the same time kept the apostrophe to warn the reader that they are not to be pronounced. He has also added the same apostrophe to many syllables unabbreviated in the former editions; because he finds by the number of syllables that they

must have intended to be mute by the Author. A remarkable instance of this we have where he apostrophizes the letter y in glory.³⁴

One reason would make one wish to banish the Abbreviations; that Readers becoming familiar with them in Poetry, are thereby induced to use them in Prose; which undoubtedly hurts the beauty of language to the eye, & its harmony to the ear. If you restore all the Vowels, and mark each with an apostrophe, will not many readers, unaccustomed to that kind of direction, be more puzzled by it than if there were no apostrophe at all, but the whole left to their judgment and ear? The apostrophes taking the space of a letter make always a disagreeable hiatus in the word, even when the vowel is kept in. I believe I have fallen on a means of remedying that. I have spoke to Dr Wilson³⁵ to get the apostrophes cast on the same body with the vowels themselves, a little to one side, so that the hiatus will be intirely prevented.

I shall reckon myself very much obliged to you for your decision, both with respect to vowels and apostrophes, and I am,

Sir

With very great regard and respect

Your very much obliged & most humble servant

Robert Foulis

Glasgow, June 13. 1769.

Cover. To Mr James Beattie Professor of Philosphy in the Mareschal College, Aberdeen.

Letter 5. Robert Foulis to James Beattie

Dear Sir,

This day we have sent off by the Aberdeen Carrier, Wm Wardrop,³⁶ the Books mention'd above, with your copy of Milton on the foolscap paper.³⁷ The Book would have been finish'd at least 2 months sooner, if the paper-mercht, to whom we trusted had not brought home the second kind of Demy writing paper in place of the best, which occasion'd a long

delay, as there was none of the best to be had but by writing. When you have leisure to glance over the *Paradise Lost*, as now printed, you will find that we have profited from your hints; and even in cases where you were doubtful, we have banished the apostrophes. I was so much convinced of their little utility that I would have banished them altogether, if I had not been restrain'd by my Brother's prudence, who has kept them in the cases you recommended at the end of the line, & in some very few others. It is many years since we banished them from prose when we were at liberty. I once thought of taking notice of this little alteration in printing poetry; but, upon reflection, it appeared more prudent to leave the Public to follow their own judgment. without any previous intimation. In the copies delivered here, nobody has taken notice that there are fewer apostrophes than ordinary; But if it had been taken notice of in a preface, with whatever strength of reason it had been justify'd, we should certainly have had different opinions, & some disputes. Every body that reflects must consider the mere number of syllables which may be either short or long as a very equivocal standard of Versification. Time may certainly, the true standard. I am not sure but in our printing of Greek verse, we go too far in mincing many words which were perhaps wrote full by the Authors themselves, and have only been minced in the manner they are by Schoolmasters, such as told Alcibiades that he corrected Homer, to who Alcibiades replied that since he could correct Homer he needed not to confine himself to boys, for he was fit to teach men.³⁸

I should have troubled you with a much longer Letter, but I am obliged to stop short lest I lose the post. I have seen this day a Book advertised, which I long to read, and shall write to you after I have read it. Yours

Robert Foulis

Glasgow May 10th 1770

Cover. Not seen.

Letter 6. Robert Foulis to James Beattie

Dear Sir,

When I look on the date of your letter, I am fully sensible how much reason I have to be ashamed of my own sloth, in letting it prevail so far, as to cause me to neglect a duty which ought not to be dispensed with; but, as the extenuation of this fault would require to[o] much writing, I shall not trouble you with them at present.

I hoped every week to have sent you a specimen of the manner in which we propose to print Mr. Mason's Poems;³⁹ we propose the type of Milton, and the same paper and size, and not to exceed 300 copies; nor to throw them upon the public faster than they are wanted; in the meantime we have printed a small edition upon the new letter to go along with the 40 volumes of English Poets;⁴⁰ which number we have hitherto kept up, though we have been obliged to print several of them oftener than once; and we are sensible that the merit of Mr. Mason's Poems, and their reputation, will make them acceptable to our encouragers, which are many more on this article than we have been accustomed to. We have indeed got rivals at Edinburgh,⁴¹ who are persons of great activity, but we do not find, hitherto, that they have done us much harm; and if the public continue their favour, the collection will become still more extensive.

We have arguments for every canto of Spencer's Fairy Queen in manuscript, which make an excellent and concise commentary; they were wrote by a great admirer of Spencer, who had studied him much, and wrote a Poem, entitled the Squire of Dames, in Spencer's style;⁴² we propose to add Spencer with these arguments to our collection. But there are two works that require great attention, which we are bound to prefer to our own undertakings; one is a book on the Customs by Mr. Burrows,⁴³ consisting chiefly of calculations, which makes two volumes in folio, the first of which is ending, the second, being chiefly index and common printing, will give little trouble competently; the other is near a conclusion, and is printed entirely at the expense of Lord Stanhope,⁴⁴ and contains the principal mathematical works Mr Simson⁴⁵ has left: his Lordship is to make presents of the whole impression.

We want to show our gratitude to Mr. Mason by making some presents of books of our printing, and would wish to do this properly by avoiding

things that he has already and by choicing such as would be agreeable to him; if you can assist us in this matter it will oblige us much.

Mr. Richardson⁴⁶ made this summer a jaunt to York for his health; and on that occasion desired that I would write to Mr. Mason along with him; I took that opportunity of acknowledging to him the receipt of your letter, and returning him thanks for the contents. I have since had the favour of a letter from Mr. Mason, with a copy of the last edition of his poems.⁴⁷ I read with great pleasure the first book of his Poem on Gardens,⁴⁸ and think it a noble specimen of genius and taste: Before I had received his letter I guessed that he would not choose to have this joined with his other poems, and therefore followed his own edition.

The other day Mr. Creech⁴⁹ bookseller was here, said you was writing an answer to Mr Priestley:⁵⁰ I am of opinion that you will much better preserve your dignity, and mortify him by not answering. He appears to me a very self-conceited and insolent fellow; and I am persuaded will appear more so if ever I should read his book. A writer that says such provoking things must excite resentment, and occasion sharp strokes in return; you have already been warmed in the cause of religion;⁵¹ and I should wish that the public would find, that you are not easily moved on a lesser occasion.—In the little preface Dr. Priestley sent, addressed to Dr. Reid,⁵² there is a wonderful encomium upon a book of Hartley's,⁵³ which I have never read, but by the accounts I have heard of it must be hypothetical, and ridiculously whimsical; a selection of passages from this book put together and Mr. Priestley's encomium at their head, I should think would expose him, though they were not accompanied with a single reflection. This is the light things appear in to me, though I am very far from being sure that I am right.

We have let Virgil sleep for a time,⁵⁴ because the commercial state of the country was attended with a great diminution of bookselling, but we hope to set it agoing soon.

Mr Trail,⁵⁵ who takes the trouble of this, can acquaint you with the state of things here.

I am, Sir, with the most cordial regard
Your much obliged
And most humble servant
Robert Foulis

Glasgow Oct. 25. 1774

Cover. To Dr. Beattie Aberdeen.

Letter 7. James Beattie to Robert Foulis

Dear Sir,

I have received your letter of the 10th of May, and about a fortnight after, the Books came to hand. The Milton is wonderfully fine. It is indeed the most magnificent Book I have ever seen, and seems to be perfectly correct. I am very happy to see that the hints I propos'd relating to Apostrophes have attained your approbation. The omission of those unnecessary characters has a very good effect on the eye, and will, I am convinced, give general satisfaction. I hope you will soon set about the Virgil in the same form. My former hints have been so well received, that I may possibly hazard a few on this subject also. I would not wish to see either the Culex or the Civis in this projected Edition, being thoroughly convinced that they are not by Virgil but by some much later hand. They are besides altogether unworthy of the Mantuan bard. I could offer many arguments in proof of this opinion, but I flatter myself that they will not be necessary. The Bucolics, Georgics, and Aeneid are in my judgment the whole of Virgil's works now extant.⁵⁶ I have two curious and, I believe, rare editions of this author: the first by Daniel Heinsius printed by Elzevir in 1636, and the other by his son Nicholas Heinsius printed by Elzevir in the year 1676.⁵⁷ The last is by much the better, and is generally acknowledged to be the very best edition of Virgil. If you cannot find it elsewhere, my copy is at your service. There are some various readings from the Medicean, and other manuscripts, which are of consequence, and therefore ought not to be omitted in a correct edition of Virgil. In regard to these I have some written notes by me, which might probably be of some use. If you think so, I shall very readily communicate them. By the bearer, Professor Trail, I have sent payment of your account, viz. two guineas for Homer,—four and sixpence for Epictetus, Anacreon and Cebes,—a guinea for Milton,—Two pounds thirteen shillings for the Greek Historians,—and thirteen shillings for my copy of Milton on small paper, which you forgot to put into the account,—in all £6: 13: 6.⁵⁸ I am much obliged to you for the concern you show about my Essay,⁵⁹ and am very curious to know your opinion of it, and shall be very happy if it obtains your approbation. The greatest merit of it is, that it was written with a good design. It will offend many, but may I hope be of use to

some; nay, if I am not misinformed, it has been so already. It was not without long consideration that I ventured it abroad in its present form. There is a boldness in many of the reflections, which after much thinking I thought it best not to alter,—though I hear it has given much offence to many of the Literati of your country. I have hardly time to add, that I truly am, Dear Sir, Your most obedient Humble Servt.

J. Beattie

Aberdeen, 20th June, 1770.

¹ In the *Scottish Historical Review*, January and April, 1917. Reprinted as a separate publication the same year. David Murray, *Some letters of Robert Foulis*, Glasgow: Maclehose, 1917. 74pp. Hereinafter referred to as *Murray*.

² Philip Gaskell, *A bibliography of the Foulis Press*, London: Hart-Davis, 1964, pp. 396-400. Hereinafter referred to as *Gaskell*.

³ R. H. Carnie, 'Andrew Foulis the Younger: some illustrative letters', *The Bibliothek*, VI (4), 93-104.

⁴ Edinburgh & London: Constable, Creech, Longman, Cadell & Davies, Murray, 2 vols, 1806.

⁵ Margaret Forbes, *Beattie and his friends*, London: Constable, 1904. Hereinafter referred to as *Forbes*.

⁶ Letter 3.

⁷ Letter 1.

⁸ Letters 4 and 5.

⁹ Letter 6.

¹⁰ I am grateful to the Keeper of the Manuscripts, Aberdeen University, for providing photocopies, and to the university for permission to publish.

¹¹ The most readable short account of the genesis of the Foulis edition of *Poems by Mr Gray* is that in R. W. Ketton-Cremer, *Thomas Gray a biography*, Cambridge: University Press, 1955, pp. 222-26.

¹² Robert Foulis made a tour of Europe after the death of his wife, Elizabeth Moor in 1750. He set out in 1751 and visited Holland and France and reached London in February, 1753. See *Murray*, pp. 16-31.

¹³ Margaret Hepburn, daughter of George Hepburn of Monkridge, near Haddington. This reference indicates that Thomas Gray met Margaret Hepburn in London in 1753, and provides a useful footnote to the account of the lady in *Correspondence of Thomas Gray*, ed. P. Toynbee & L. Whibley, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 3 vols, 1935. Hereinafter referred to as *Toynbee & Whibley*. The footnote on Miss Hepburn is in *Toynbee & Whibley*, p. 514.

¹⁴ Walpole first published *The Bard* and *The Progress of Poesy* at Strawberry Hill in 1757.

¹⁵ Dodsley's two editions appeared in 1768. See *Toynbee & Whibley*, p. 1048.

¹⁶ Beattie became Professor of Moral Philosophy at Aberdeen in 1760 when Alexander Gerard moved to the Chair of Divinity. See *Forbes*, p.16.

¹⁷ See Beattie's letter to Gray, 16 February, 1768. *Toynbee & Whibley*, pp. 1010-12.

¹⁸ Foulis refers to his own folio edition of Homer, 1756-8. See *Gaskell*, item no. 319.

¹⁹ Gaskell makes no reference, in his account of this work, to any copies being given this treatment. *Gaskell*, item no. 475.

²⁰ Foulis is referring to the previously unpublished poems in the volume: 'The fatal sisters'; 'The descent of Odin' and 'The triumphs of Owen'. Beattie shared Foulis's admiration for these new pieces. See his letter to Gray. *Toynbee & Whibley*, p. 1011.

²¹ Beattie had married Mary Dun in June 1767.

²² Gray wrote to Beattie, 31 October, 1768: 'It is indeed a most beautiful edition, and must certainly do credit to Mr. Foulis and me, but I fear it will be no other advantage to him, as Dodsley has contrived to glut the town already with two editions beforehand, one of 1500, & the other of 750, both indeed far inferior to that of Glasgow, but sold at half the price.' *Toynbee & Whibley*, p. 1048.

²³ Presumably sent to the Cambridge bookseller, Thomas Merrill. Gray received two copies from Foulis. One was sent directly and the other *via* Merrill. See *Toynbee & Whibley*, p. 1048.

²⁴ Gray chose the Homer and commented on Foulis's generosity in his letter to Beattie, July 16, 1769. *Toynbee & Whibley*, p. 1071.

²⁵ Foulis refers generically here to the various editions of the Greek historians that he had published down through the years. They were not, as far as I know, ever issued with any kind of series title-page.

²⁶ Alexander Angus, bookseller and publisher in Aberdeen, 1744-1802.

²⁷ The 1770 folio *Paradise Lost* was published by subscription. Gray subscribed for two large-paper copies. *Toynbee & Whibley*, p. 1072. A full description of the book can be found in *Gaskell*, item no. 510.

²⁸ The reference is to Gray's appointment to the professorship of Modern History. See R. W. Ketton-Cremer, *Thomas Gray a biography*, pp. 229-33.

²⁹ Robert Pollock (1709-1759), Professor of Divinity at Aberdeen from 1745. Appointed Principal in 1757.

³⁰ A standard account of Foulis's Academy of Arts is that in James Maclehose, *The Glasgow University Press, 1638-1931; with some notes on Scottish printing in the last three hundred years*, Glasgow University Press, 1931, pp. 183-191. The prints in question were products of the Academy.

³¹ It is not easy to decide which engraving after Raphael this refers to, as the Academy of Arts did a number of these copies.

³² 'A Magdalen reading, after Coreggio'. See W. J. Duncan, *Notices and documents*, p. 94.

³³ Thomas Newton (1704-82). The most recent edition of *Paradise Lost*, edited by Newton previous to the date of this letter, appeared in 1763.

³⁴ Beattie's views on prosody, which clearly affected the practice of the house of Foulis in printing Milton's verse, are spelt out in chapter 4 of his *Dissertations moral and critical*, London: Strahan & Cadell, 1783. 'The theory of language', pp. 274-93. Beattie's strongest criticism of the use of the apostrophe to indicate elision in printing verse comes on p. 280.

³⁵ Alexander Wilson, typefounder and professor of astronomy (1714-86). See Philip Gaskell, 'The early work of the Foulis Press and the Wilson Foundry', *The Library*, VII (2), 98-102.

- ³⁶ William Wardrop, carrier, is not to be found in the extant Glasgow directories for the period. He is probably the same man as the William Wardrop, Ship Bank, listed in Tait's *Glasgow Directory, 1783*.
- ³⁷ Beattie apparently ordered the issue on the variant foolscap paper. For details of this issue, see *Gaskell*, item no. 510.
- ³⁸ This anecdote about the pedantic schoolmaster can be found in Plutarch's *Lives*, Alcibiades VII, 1.
- ³⁹ Foulis's plan to print a folio edition of Mason in the same size and type as the 1770 *Paradise Lost* does not seem to have come to fruition. No such edition, or any proposal for such an edition, is listed by *Gaskell*.
- ⁴⁰ The 'small edition upon the new letter to go along with the 40 volumes of English poets' is the 12mo edition of Mason listed by *Gaskell* as item no. 568. It used a refurbished Wilson type—Brevier Roman 2—in which some changes were made c. 1774. Compare *Gaskell*, p. 33.
- ⁴¹ This is presumably a reference to the collection called *The British Poets* issued in Edinburgh in 1773 in 44 8vo volumes, said to be editorially supervised by Hugh Blair.
- ⁴² Foulis had intended to issue, in 1766, proposals to publish Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, (*Gaskell*, p. 462). It is clear from this letter that no edition had appeared by 1774, and no Foulis edition ever appeared, as far as I know. The death of Andrew Foulis, the elder, in September, 1775 brought this, and other enterprises, to a stop. The arguments by the author of *The Squire of Dames* are by Moses Mendez, (d. 1758) whose Spenserian imitation was published in volume 4 of Dodsley's *Collection of Poems*.
- ⁴³ Edward Burrow, *A New and Compleat Book of Rates*, *Gaskell*, item no. 563.
- ⁴⁴ Philip, second Earl Stanhope (1717-1786).
- ⁴⁵ *Gaskell*, item no. 600.
- ⁴⁶ William Richardson (1743-1814), professor of Humanity, University of Glasgow.
- ⁴⁷ Philip Gaskell, *The first editions of William Mason*, Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1951, is the most reliable bibliographical guide to Mason.
- ⁴⁸ The first public edition of the first book of *The English Garden* appeared in 1772.
- ⁴⁹ William Creech (1745-1815), the prominent Edinburgh bookseller and publisher of the 1787 Edinburgh edition of Burns.
- ⁵⁰ Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), chemist and philosopher. There is an extended account of his differences with Beattie in Sir W. Forbes, *An account of the life and writings of James Beattie, LL.D.*, I, pp. 355, 370-73.
- ⁵¹ Foulis refers here to Beattie's well known response to David Hume, the *Essay on the nature and immutability of truth*, London, 1770. Beattie was to take the advice of Foulis and other friends and did not publish his reply to Priestley. See *Forbes*, pp. 111, 122.
- ⁵² Thomas Reid (1710-96), Scottish Philosopher, also attacked J. Priestley.
- ⁵³ David Hartley (1707-57), associationist philosopher. Priestley published an edition of Hartley's work on the association of ideas in 1775.
- ⁵⁴ The Foulis Press folio Virgil did not appear until 1778. *Gaskell*, item no. 639.
- ⁵⁵ It is clear from Beattie's letter in 1770 (letter 7) that the intermediary was Robert Trail (1720-75), Professor of Divinity, University of Glasgow from October, 1761.
- ⁵⁶ Compare the Foulis editions listed in *Gaskell*, item nos. 360 & 639.
- ⁵⁷ See A. Willems, *Les Elzeviers*, Brussels, 1880, item nos. 450, 1324. Willems says of the latter: 'C'est la dernière et la meilleure des éditions de ce format données par les Elzeviers d'Amsterdam.' The Foulis Press edition of 1778 was based on Burmann.
- ⁵⁸ Compare *Gaskell*, item nos. 43, 47, 319, 451, 500, 510.
- ⁵⁹ The famous *Essay on Truth*.

A chronological bibliography of works on R. B. Cunninghame Graham (1852-1936)

John Walker

CUNNINGHAME GRAHAM was a man of many parts. He was deeply involved in the fields of literature, history, politics and travel—not only of Britain, but of Europe, the Americas and Africa. As a result, his name crops up in several spheres of the literature of different languages.

There have been a few checklists of different aspects of the writings of Graham (see the items of Chaundy, Gallo, Watts and West below), but no published bibliography of works on Graham. Although Gallo's Spanish monograph lists a few works of criticism on Graham in the bibliography, this section is, however, very slight. The present bibliography is meant to fill the gap, and to create at least a point of departure for future Graham studies which can be updated periodically. It is also a tribute to Don Roberto, and an attempt to rehabilitate a sadly neglected writer.

I have limited this bibliography to articles, books and theses on Graham and his work, omitting book reviews, radio broadcasts, poems, newspaper reports, obituaries and other miscellaneous pieces which, although collected and valuable, are outside the scope of this particular study. Within the framework of the limitations, however, the list is up-to-date and complete. I have adopted the chronological sequence which demonstrates the evolution of criticism on Graham, indicating the later points of view which develop or challenge earlier opinions. I am indebted to Dr W. R. Aitken for his suggestion as to this format. In citing pagination for the various entries, I have followed the *MLA Style Sheet* (2nd ed. 1970).

I am grateful to my friends and fellow Grahamophiles, Dr Cedric Watts and Dr Laurence Davies, for their encouragement and suggestions. Their own valuable contribution to Graham studies is attested to by the items bearing their names listed in the bibliography below. I am also indebted to Mr W. Wright, Special Collections, Baker Library,