Continued Continuations of Complete Histories: Tobias Smollett and the Work of History

Journal Item

Continued continuations of complete histories: Tobias Smollett and the work of history

ABSTRACT: Tobias Smollett wrote one of the best-selling historical works of the eighteenth century: the *Complete History of England* and *Continuation*. This work has been both neglected and misunderstood. By exploring the idea of 'continuation' – both as a form of publication and a narrative technique – this article seeks to recover the kind of work in which Smollett saw himself as engaged. To do so, it considers some connections with David Hume's *History of England*. It suggests that, unlike Hume, Smollett attempted to sustain a media event – one that was supported by his work as both critic and translator. It is this that should be understood as Smollett's work of history.

KEYWORDS: Tobias Smollett, David Hume, history, mediation, translation, serialization, Enlightenment

In a pamphlet of 1767, George Canning, observes how Tobias Smollett was famous for 'His stories, Histories, and continued continuations of His Complete histories'.[1] This description was meant to be ridiculous but there is, in fact, no absurdity in it. What Canning has unintentionally described is the work of history – a work, which, this article will suggest, Smollett's historical writing aims to disclose. In describing Smollett's work this way, I am trying to avoid privileging the content of his historical writing above the 'work' that allows it to appear.[2] To do so would be to obscure the true nature of Smollett's writing, which was always, as Canning acknowledges, a form of 'continuation'. Smollett's work of history was, as we shall see, both a set of completed volumes and an open-ended literary event.

To say that Smollett's historical writing is defined by 'continuation' requires some qualification. The first thing to say is that his work was not, as the bookseller Thomas Cadell later implied, on the title pages of *The History of England from the Revolution to the Death of George the Second* (1785), 'Designed as a Continuation of Mr. Hume's History'. Cadell might have argued that he was only referring to the 'Paper, Print, and Portraits';[3] however, the suggestion that Smollett wrote a continuation to David Hume's *The History of England* (1754–62) still influences readers today.[4] Cadell's edition, prepared after both of its authors were dead, thus not only damaged Smollett's reputation but also misrepresented the kind of historical writing engaged in by Hume (who had resisted calls to continue his own history, claiming, on one occasion, to be 'too old, too fat, too lazy, and too rich' to do so).[5] Such a view, which presents Smollett as a similar but lesser writer to Hume, was perpetuated in other combined editions of their work. The preface to *The History of England, from the Revolution to the end of the American War and Peace of Versailles in 1783*, for example, published by Robert Campbell in Philadelphia in 1796–8 as a continuation of Hume's *History*, justifies the inclusion of four volumes by Smollett by noting, with appropriate ambivalence, that 'the works of Dr. Smollett possess an uncommon degree of genius and spirit, nor perhaps was there any person more fit to write a Continuation of Mr. Hume's History'.[6] What readers of the editions of Cadell and Campbell actually received, however, was a small part of Smollett's own *A Complete History of England, from the Descent of Julius Caesar, to the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle. Containing the Transactions of One Thousand Eight Hundred and Three Years* (1757–8) and most or all of his *Continuation of the Complete History of England* (1760–5). The repackaging of Smollett's historical work did not stop there: it was included in new continuations of Hume's *History* well into the nineteenth century.[7] Because Smollett's writing began to take on the form of a (relatively diminishing) number of volumes in a (growing) multi-author work, the true nature of his historical work – the true nature of his work of continuation, we might say – was gradually obscured.

In this article, I intend to recover the kind of work in which Smollett understood himself to be engaged. In this respect, Cadell's awkward bringing together of volumes by Hume and Smollett in 1785 is not entirely unhelpful. It

reflects the origins of their work in competing, bookseller projects of the 1750s – and as projects by Scottish writers in England. In bringing Smollett's name together with Hume's, Cadell's edition suggests another perspective on Smollett that has been lost: Smollett was working in the same intellectual context as Hume and other Scottish writers, such as William Robertson, Adam Ferguson, and Edward Gibbon, whose 'philosophical' histories are now regarded as the achievements of the period.[8] Hume himself would not have doubted this: he described his own, somewhat uncomfortable, position as 'near the historical summit of Parnassus, immediately under Dr Smollett'.[9] We might be inclined to read such words as ironic. But the spectacular sales of Smollett's *Complete History*, which at its height might have reached 10,000 numbers per week, should give us pause. Smollett, who worked hard to maintain connections with Edinburgh and Glasgow, also laboured to disclose his own comprehensive historical work. This work took the form of a media event – in the sense of an event, like the Enlightenment itself, [10] self-consciously positioned in a history of mediation.

This article will first chart the publication of Smollett's *Complete History* and *Continuation*. It will then go on to explore how the idea of continuation is present in Smollett's attempts to write narrative history. In doing so, it contributes to discussions about the kind of 'literariness' that helps shape historical writing, partly by drawing into question the concept of 'literariness' itself.[11] As a work of writing, rather than a work of 'literature', what is important about Smollett's *History* is an attempt to keep on going.[12] It thus appears as the very work of eighteenth-century, journalistic print culture. This does not mean that we should accord Smollett's *History* some lesser status than the so-called 'philosophical' volumes that were to (subsequently) precede it. Smollett's work might be seen, instead, to create the 'interpretive community' which writers like Hume intended to engage.[13] For Smollett, such a work of history was endless – something that is tellingly disclosed by his complaints about the physical exhaustion of undertaking it.

I. The publication of Smollett's *Complete History of England* and *Continuation*

At the end of the *Plan of a Complete History of England* (published as a four-page pamphlet in January 1757), a table shows the 'Prices of the different Histories of England'.[14] This table reveals to potential purchasers that Smollett's *Complete History*, at this stage planned for three quarto volumes, is cheaper than histories by Rapin and Tindal, Guthrie and Ralph, and Carte. (When Smollett later 'extended his plan to a fourth volume', it was offered for free to purchasers of the first three volumes.)[15] But the table also reveals two further selling points: Smollett's *Complete History* is the shortest (the others comprise either four or five folio volumes) and extends the furthest (Carte, it is noted, reaches 1654; Guthrie and Ralph reach William III; Rapin and Tindal make it to George I). The *Plan* makes much of these two points, observing the ways that Smollett intends to 'retrench the superfluities of his predecessors' before concluding:

> On the whole, this work is formed upon a plan which was the result of the most mature deliberation; and has one advantage over all other Histories of England; namely, that of being brought home to our own times and observation, from the earliest age of our historical credit to the last treaty of Aix la Chapelle.

The emphasis on history being 'brought home' to the present time justifies the addition of further volumes to Smollett's *Complete History*: in a prefatory note to the *Continuation*, Smollett writes how this 'will be favourably received, and indeed required by his readers, as a completion of the original plan'.[16] That the plan is marked by 'mature deliberation' is perhaps also meant to set it apart from another history then in the making. The first volume of Hume's *History*, '*Containing the Reigns of James I and Charles I*' was published in 1754 (in Edinburgh); his second volume '*Containing the Commonwealth, and the Reigns of Charles II and James II*' was published 1757 (in London) – the same year as Smollett's first three volumes. Smollett was contracted to write the *Complete History of England* in this interval and it is likely that the project was part of the 'Conspiracy of Booksellers' Hume identified as blocking his initial sales in London.[17] After Hume published his next two volumes *The History of England, Under the House of Tudor* in 1759, Smollett commented in the *Critical Review*:

> The reasons which have induced him [Hume] to reverse the order of history in his publications are not very material to his readers. Tacitus, it appears, wrote his History before the Annals; and it is probable, that these writers have fallen into this piece of irregularity, by the same accident, their having written the history of a later period before they thought of undertaking that of the former.[18]

Although Smollett clearly admires Hume's work, he no doubt thought that this 'piece of irregularity' revealed the plan for his own *Complete History* to be of more 'mature deliberation'. It is what prompts Smollett to further explain that Hume's *previous* volumes 'are a *continuation* of his present subject' [my emphasis]. Smollett's historical work is not encumbered by such temporal difficulties. By the time Hume reaches his final volumes, *The History of England, From the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Accession of Henry VII*, in 1762, Smollett has brought his work completely up to date in the fourth volume of his *Continuation*. Thus whilst Hume's readers might look for a conclusion at the end of what became his second volume (and, in fact, Hume does offer here a conclusion of sorts),[19] Smollett's readers did not have to draw parallels, as they did for Hume, with their 'present conduct': they could read about it directly.

The first three (quarto) volumes of Smollett's *Complete History* were published in April 1757 and the fourth in January 1758.[20] From March 1758, it was also offered in weekly numbers. The proposals for publishing Smollett's *History* in 'One Hundred and Ten Six-penny Numbers' (published in January) assures the public 'that there shall not be the least Interruption in the Publication, as the whole Work is almost entirely printed off'.[21] Even as a 'complete' history, then, the project demanded to be understood in terms of continuation. Publishing history in instalments was not new: Nicolas Tindal's translation and then continuation of Paul de Rapin Thoras's *Histoire d' Angleterre* was successfully published in monthly numbers in the 1720s and 30s. As R.M. Wiles notes, in his account of serial publishing in the early eighteenth century, this made little difference to the end product since books were usually bought unbound.[22] Smollett's *Complete History* was thus reset as octavo pages and

printed, for the most part, without reference to the structure that the numbers might have suggested. Smollett was involved in some light revision (which he might have completed in September 1758):[23] this seems to have meant removing the chapter headings and numbered sections of the quarto edition (usually by incorporating them into margins of the octavo edition) and breaking the text into eleven volumes. The only time that a weekly number imposed itself into the structure of the text is in the *Continuation of the Complete History*. This began publishing in weekly instalments in May 1760 (the weekly publication of the *Complete History* had come to an end in April).[24] Although the *Continuation* began as a weekly publication (before being offered for sale as volumes), it seems to have become fortnightly in September 1760.[25] When the *Continuation* reached Number 33, in October 1761, it drew to a close, effectively mid-way through the fourth volume. Number 33 marked the end of the reign of George II (who died in October 1760); numbers 34 to 40 of the *Continuation*, providing an account of the period from October 1760 to February 1762, seem to have been published between February and August 1762.[26] Smollett's writing at this point was running up against the present – meaning, no doubt, that the promise of 'not … the least interruption' became harder to manage. A fifth volume, with the option to purchase it as weekly numbers, concluded the project in September 1765.[27] Smollett's *Complete History* and *Continuation* thus had a remarkable and (more or less) continuous weekly publication for over four years. According to the *Public Advertiser* (on 23 December 1758), over 10,000 copies per week were being sold; in 1762, another advertisement refers to the sale of 15,000 copies since 1758, 'a Circumstance unknown in any other Age or Country'.[28] What Smollett had paradoxically achieved for his 'complete' history was, to borrow a phrase from a study of the effects of serialization on the novel, 'a rolling state of incompleteness'.[29] Certainly, Hume's *History,* published across the very same years – and limited by its pre-defined endpoint of 1688 – could not claim to have achieved that.

If Hume's *History* did not achieve a state of 'continuation', this was nevertheless accomplished for him after his death. Thomas Cadell's 1782 edition was published in weekly instalments and, as we have noted, aimed to continue

Hume's *History* with parts of Smollett's *Complete History* and *Continuation*. Cadell put it this way:

> In order to form a complete HISTORY of ENGLAND from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Death of George the Second, the Proprietors intend to publish, immediately after Mr. HUME's History is completed, in Weekly Numbers, Dr. SMOLLETT's History from the Revolution to the Death of George the Second; and that the Paper, Print, and Portraits shall in every respect correspond with the above Work.[30]

Although Smollett is presented as continuing Hume, it is Hume's text that has been repackaged to bring it into line with Smollett's. One of the selling points of Smollett's weekly numbers had been the inclusion of 'Plates, and Heads of Monarchs and illustrious Persons, which will be delivered to the Purchasers without any further Expence' (a list of 167 engravings was included in the proposals).[31] Although Hume had resisted including illustrations ('I do not imagine,' he wrote, 'because these Ornaments have help'd off the Sale of Smollets History, that mine would be the better for them'),[32] Cadell's edition included them. Another combined edition, Cooke's 'Pocket Edition' of 1793, draws attention to the way that Smollett's attempt to reduce the 'enormous bulk and prolixity of every other English history' was imposed on Hume's work: it advertised 'a *beautiful new Burgeois Type*, purposely calculated to comprise a great Quantity of Matter in a small Compass' and claimed to remove the 'useless Blanks before and after the Chapters, introduced in former Editions of Hume, to enlarge them to an unnecessary and voluminous extent'.[33] What these later editions reveal is not so much the way that Smollett's work came to be seen as a continuation of Hume's but the way that Hume's *History* is re-shaped by the work of continuation. For the Philadelphia bookseller Robert Campbell, publishing his combined edition in 1790s, it is certain that 'Had Dr. Smollett lived, he no doubt would have continued his work to the present time' (the chief defect of Hume's History, he notes, was that he chose not to continue it).[34] Campbell employs what he calls 'others' to do Smollett's work – and although they endeavour, he says, to 'follow Hume', they end up in Smollett's impossible

position of attempting 'to write with accuracy a history of recent events, the secret causes of which can only be developed at an after-period'. What is thus disclosed by Campbell's edition (in which Smollett's text occupies an anomalous four volumes),[35] is what Smollett laid claim to from the very beginning: the present-time event of writing history itself.

II. History as continuation

Just as the proposals for the weekly printing of *Complete History* promised that 'there shall not be the least Interruption in the Publication', so Smollett claimed that his method of writing history would not lead to any interruption in the narrative. As Smollett puts it in his 'Plan':

> The author has avoided all useless disquisitions, which serve only to swell the size of the volume, interrupt the thread of the narrative, and perplex the reader. His purpose was to compile an history, not to compose a dissertation.[36]

For Smollett, writing history was a process of 'compilation' not 'composition'. As compilation, it achieved a state of continuation: the continuation of the reader's present-time attention to the work. In other words, compilation (rather than composition) contributed to an effect of immediacy. Smollett elaborates on this further in a review of Hume's Stuart volumes, published around the same time as the 'Plan', in which he describes the effects of the 'rage of reflecting' amongst 'all the later compilers' of history:

> Histories are metamorphosed into dissertations; the chain of events is broken, the reader's attention diffused; and his judgement anticipated: peculiar incidents that distinguish the complexion of the times, and form the features of the most remarkable individuals, are overlooked and omitted, and all character distorted into grotesque figures made up of conceit and antithesis.[37]

When a history becomes a dissertation, it is not just the experience of the reader that is disturbed. In addition, the text is seen to draw attention to itself as a text (as 'grotesque figures made up of conceit and antithesis'). Compilation is thus presented as a superior method of writing history – one that, paradoxically, maintains the 'chain of events' but does not draw attention to itself as a method of doing so. This is meant to be one of the chief selling points of Smollett's *History* – that it is an improved form of the mediation of history – and one that distinguishes it from the kind of writing in which Hume was engaged. (Although Smollett considers Hume's reflections to be 'for the most part, just, tho' sometimes superfluous', his view is, nevertheless, that 'Mr. Hume's genius shines more in speculation than in description'.)[38] Smollett thus notes how the structure of his work, divided into books, parts, chapters, sections, and paragraphs, creates 'proper pauses for the attention' (rather than anticipating or diffusing it).[39] He also signals how he has used footnotes to preserve the experience of continuity in the text:

> All obscure allusions are explained in notes at the bottom of the page; together with the genealogical deduction of every prince's posterity and marriages, reputed portents, detached events, and private anecdotes; which, tho' tending to elucidate the story, would, if inserted in the context, disunite the chain of incidents, and spoil the uniformity of the execution.[40]

A further way in which Smollett sought to avoid 'dissertation' in his work seems to have been through the use of what might be called 'beacon' words. In the review of Smollett's first three volumes, published in the *Critical Review* before the publication of the fourth, the reviewer notes how Smollett's 'reflections' are 'pertinent, though very scarce, and often conveyed in a single word of the narration'.[41] He gives this example:

> For example, page 174, speaking of some persons that were executed for high-treason, he says, 'These sacrifices being made to justice, and *perhaps* to faction and revenge'. Here the word

> *perhaps* stands as a beacon to the reader, and absolutely directs his reflection.

The reviewer also notes how other words stand as 'beacons': for example, Smollett describes the duke of Lancaster's claim to the crown as 'ridiculous' and an order issued by Henry V at Agincourt to be 'inhuman'. Reflection is thus revealed to be present in Smollett's *History* – but in a form that supports it as both a work of compilation and continuation.

In finding new ways to incorporate 'reflection' into history (either through footnotes, 'beacons', or 'proper pauses'), Smollett was showing how he had improved upon the work of others. The improvement might be characterized as an increase in 'immediacy'– that is to say, Smollett's intentions were partly to remove traces of mediation. Of course, in doing so, Smollett drew attention to the way his own work was mediated (and thus caught himself in the double logic of remediation).[42] Smollett's review of Hume's Stuart volumes is helpful in showing some of the ways in which Smollett might have worked with (or remediated) other texts. For example, Smollett suggests this correction to Hume's sentence: 'And any attempt of the parliament, by new acts, to give the superiority to presbyterianism, *had been* (instead of *would have been*) sufficient to involve again the nation in blood and confusion'.[43] This is an example of what Smollett calls a 'Scotticism' – and which Hume seems to have removed in later volumes (according to Smollett's review of the Tudor volumes, he had 'produced a work so much the more agreeable to sound taste').[44] Smollett also identifies places where Hume's language becomes less transparent (or, as he puts it, 'inflated or affected'): Hume, Smollett writes, is 'superstitiously fond of the word *fanaticism*, and indeed singular in the interpretation therof'.[45] Furthermore, Smollett shows how he sought to cut down the prolixity of other historical writing:

> Page 119, speaking of the quakers, he [Hume] says, 'Instead of that affected adulation introduced into modern tongues, of speaking to individuals as if they were a multitude; they returned to the simplicity of ancient languages; and *thou* and *thee* were the only expressions, which,

> on any consideration, they could be brought to employ.' –– Instead of this long diffuse period, he might have expressed his meaning in a few words. *They used the simple appellatives* thou *and* thee *even to persons of the most distinguished rank.*[46]

This sentence is an example of the way that Smollett worked to 'retrench the superfluities of his predecessors'. Another example might be Smollett's account of the debate over Prince Charles's visit to Spain in 1623 – this time in Smollett's *Complete History* itself:

> The prince insisted upon his promise; the marquis upbraided him with breach of faith: Sir Francis Cottington, being consulted, confirmed all the king's fears: James broke out into a passion of tears and lamentation, exclaiming he was undone, and that he should lose baby Charles. Buckingham chid, reviled, and threatened Cottington for his presuming to give his advice in affairs of state; and the king, rather than disoblige his favourite, renewed his consent to the journey.[47]

For Hume, closely following Clarendon, these events fill three pages. Smollett's highly abbreviated style is what the *Critical Review* had in mind when it referred to his *Complete History* as a 'round firm, compacted clue of composition' (which could be unwound).[48] It has probably come about, in this instance, by scanning across Hume's work – something that provides the context for the otherwise incongruous phrase, 'baby Charles'.[49] Although Hume is cited four times in the margins of Smollett's *Complete History* (along with, for example, Burnet, Rapin, and Ralph), it is likely that his work was used a lot more.[50] It is therefore possible to see how – in the case of Hume's seventeenth-century volumes, in particular – Smollett was engaged in the remediation of previous historical work (not unlike, for example, the way Cooke's 'pocket edition' was later to cut out Hume's superfluous blank pages).[51]

Another aspect of historical writing that Smollett aimed to improve upon (and which similarly involved working to reduce interruptions caused by overly

reflective, affected, lengthy or, simply, Scottish text) was the drawing of characters. The risk here was that characters could become 'distorted into grotesque figures made up of conceit and antithesis' (as noted in the quotation from the *Critical Review* above). The reviewer of Smollett's *Complete History* also describes how important historical characters can be reduced to trivial textual features: 'The characters of princes, as drawn by other English historians, are generally abridgements of the events in which they had been concerned, and look more like the contents of a chapter than the features of a disposition'.[52] In drawing characters, Smollett thus aimed to draw attention away from the words used to do so. Notably, Hume had attempted something similar. When he turned to writing the characters of the Stuarts – and 'presumed to shed', as he put it, 'a generous tear' for them – he was moving, we might say, beyond their existence as purely formal elements (or, to see it another way, as constructions in a narrowly Whig version of history).[53] Hume's 'sentimental techniques' were picked up by other historians, including Smollett, in portrayals of characters such as Charles I, James II or Mary Queen of Scots (in whose case, Smollett seems to have influenced Hume).[54] Even so, his description of Charles I would probably have been seen by Smollett as an example of literary 'conceit and antithesis': Hume, for example, writes how Charles's 'dignity was exempted from pride, his humanity from weakness, his bravery from rashness, his temperance from austerity, his frugality from avarice';[55] Smollett, in contrast, writes how Charles 'was merciful, modest, chaste, temperate, religious, personally brave'.[56] For Smollett, the drawing of character presented another opportunity to use 'beacon' words: the reader, for example, might be prompted to reflect on William the Conqueror ('a prince of great courage, capacity and ambition, politic, cruel, vindictive, and rapacious') or Edward I ('His constitution was robust; his strength and dexterity *perhaps* unequalled in his kingdom' [my emphasis]).[57] When the *Complete History* was published in weekly numbers, such points of reflection were accompanied by an additional non-textual feature: the 167 'Plates, and Heads of Monarchs and illustrious Persons', advertised as being drawn by the best engravers of the day.[58] These engravings, which were complemented by maps, fold-out scenes (such as 'The Landing of Julius Caesar'),

and then by another series of portraits and maps in the *Continuation*, were a further step in Smollett's remediation of historical work.

When the first four volumes of the *Continuation* were published in a second edition in 1763, Smollett joined his own gallery of 'illustrious persons'. His frontispiece portrait (probably the first of its kind for any Scottish Enlightenment author) provided a model that was followed, unwillingly, by Hume a few years later – though Hume continued to resist further illustrations.[59] In Smollett's case, the inclusion of his portrait revealed his place in in an extended – and ongoing –community of historical figures. It also balanced his obvious omission from the account of how 'Genius in writing spontaneously arose' in the reign of George II – an account that closes the first three numbers of the fourth volume (in October 1761, before a short break in publication).[60] Smollett's 'Recapulation of the principal events of his reign' observes how 'the field of history and biography was cultivated by many writers of ability' and distinguishes Guthrie, Ralph, Carte, Robertson and 'the ingenious, penetrating, and comprehensive Hume'. Nevertheless, Smollett's omission here, at the very end, as he might have seen it, of history itself, is a sign of his otherwise immediate (that is, remediated) presence – in the form of an ongoing media event. For Smollett, the *Complete History of England* was always invested with continuation. The narration of present-time events gives this new significance. For example, at the end of the fourth volume of the *Continuation*, Smollett finds himself returning to some remarks he had inserted from John Moore (1718–79), a naval officer, at the end of the third volume, in order to supplement his account of the campaign in Martinique and Guadeloupe (in 1759).[61] Now Smollett presents the account of Moore alongside that of the army officer John Barrington (1719–1764), in order for the 'tribunal of the public' to decide the matter. In allowing his readers to become writers, and in presenting texts in parallel for the reader's judgement, Smollett shows how his *Continuation* (and perhaps, to some extent, his whole *History*) was itself a form of 'critical review'. Smollett's periodical of that name had been publishing (monthly) alongside his (weekly) historical project – its subtitle, 'Annals of Literature', declared itself to be another form of historical continuation. For it was only as such a compilation (not

dissertation) that the work of history – immediate, uninterrupted, and much improved – could take place.

III. The work of history

In his article on 'History' for the *Encyclopèdie*, published in 1765 as Smollett issued a further volume of the *Continuation*, Voltaire remarks on the difficulties faced by a modern historian.[62] A modern historian, he says, has to carry a 'heavier burden' ('un fardeau plus pesant') than those of the past – not least because the task (what Voltaire calls 'La carriere', or 'profession' or 'field') has grown enormously. 'Autant il est aisé de faire un recueil de gazettes,' he concludes, 'autant il est difficile aujourd'hui d'écrire l'histoire' ['It is as difficult to write history as it is easy to make a collection of gazettes.'] Smollett – who had worked on a collected edition of Voltaire's writing (including his historical work) – shared in this sense of burden. For Smollett, like Voltaire, history was more than a narrative of things taken to be true ('le récit des faits donnés pour vrais'), it was instead the ongoing task of his life. Whilst Voltaire compared its difficulties to the ease of collecting gazettes, Smollett seems to have turned to such collections as a way to resolve them. For Smollett, history appeared in the very work of compilation. As we have seen, what was ultimately important about his *Complete History* and *Continuation* was that he was engaged in writing it. Just as this work could not be represented by a volume (later added to a set of volumes by Hume), so it could not be contained by any particular title or project. We have noted, for example, how Smollett's historical writing was supported by articles in the *Critical Review*. The reviews of Smollett and Hume could be found alongside those of other historical writers, such as Tindal and Voltaire.[63] All reviews made use of long extracts and, as such, might well be read as forms of abridgement. This is particularly clear in the case of another of Smollett's projects, *The Modern Part of an Universal History*, which appeared both as volumes and in a series of reviews from 1759.[64] In a similar way, Smollett's *British Magazine*, published monthly from January 1760, ran a serialised and timely 'History of Canada'; its first issue also combined the kind of seventeenth-century history found in Smollett's *Complete History* (a reprint of a letter from Oliver Cromwell) with the present-day history of the *Continuation* (through an

article on the 'History of the Present War').[65] Smollett's historical writing might best be understood as being constituted by these different projects – or, to put it in a slightly different way, Smollett's work of history can be seen to appear in a network of social and material practices.

Like Smollett's *Complete History*, one defining feature of the *Critical Review* was that it had not been interrupted. 'The Critical Review having passed through a series of numbers with uninterrupted success', writes Smollett at the start of his preface to the first volume, 'the authors beg leave to present it in the form of a volume'.[66] In the same way, in the dedication to the *British Magazine* – notably addressed to William Pitt, to whom the *Complete History* was also directed – Smollett writes how his intention was to 'collect and keep alive the scattered seeds of literary improvement' (until the warmth of Pitt's patronage should 'call them forth to a more perfect vegetation').[67] Smollett's periodical projects, therefore, do not just support his historical work by publishing occasional articles in history – they do so by sustaining a form of continuation. By drawing attention to the numbers and volumes of the *Critical Review* (as well as its typeface, bookseller, and the distance its authors lived from the press),[68] the engravings or word count of his *Complete History*, or the royal licence on the blue wrappers of the *British Magazine* (along with an elaborate title page and frontispieces),[69] Smollett disclosed how such continuation was the work of getting into print. The *Critical Review* was presented as the work of a 'Set of Gentlemen', including the printer Archibald Hamilton, who remained open to 'all kinds of assistance or correction'.[70] Their views were not meant to be 'dogmatical'; instead, like Smollett in his history, who 'waved all remarks of his own', they were engaged in a work of compilation:

> As variety is the soul of such entertainment, and the confined nature of the plan would not admit of minute investigation; they [the reviewers] have endeavoured to discover and disclose that criterion by which the character of the work may at once be distinguished, without dragging the reader through a tedious, cold, inanimated disquisition, which may be termed a languid paraphrase rather than a spirited criticism.[71]

The *Critical Review*, like the *Complete History*, avoided 'disquisition' (or 'dissertation') in favour of collecting together what it called 'proper quotations' (extracts from reviewed works). 'Proper quotations', like Smollett's assemblage of cut-down historical episodes, were meant to hold the reader's attention – and direct their own reflection (or, as the *Critical Review* put it, 'exercise his own understanding').[72] As ongoing works of compilation, Smollett's *Complete History* and *Critical Review*, and *British Magazine*, sought to sustain this ideal reader or historian who is free from the kind of factional politics the works themselves described. For Smollett, it was Pitt who had embodied these qualities (what he called 'qualities that exist independent of favour or of faction' in his dedication to the *Complete History*) and it seems likely that his continuous historical work was intended to lend some support to Pitt during difficult years of Seven Years War (which coincide almost exactly with its publication).[73] Smollett, therefore, seems to have found himself at the centre of a relentless media event – one that both acknowledged its own mediation and claimed to exist without it.

The term Smollett used to describe the work of the *Critical Review* was 'spirited criticism' (in the proposals for this project, he writes of 'reviving the true Spirit of Criticism').[74] This was contrasted, in the quotation cited above, with 'languid paraphrase' – it therefore involved the kind of activity and immediacy that 'tedious, cold, inanimated disquisition' did not. It also did not mean copying. Notably, Smollett's attempt to bring history 'home to our own times' was understood in a similar way. One review described Smollett as being 'animated with a fire unfelt and unknown to the copyist, in which light every succeeding remote historian must be considered'; another review noted that it 'demands all the powers of genius to give novelty and originality to an exhausted subject, without which a writer is nothing better than a transcriber and plagiary.'[75] Such remarks disclose a practice of translation. What Smollett aimed to achieve in assembling his history, or in collecting together 'proper quotations' for his reviews, was nothing less than the translation of a great literary work into his own time – the translation, we might even say, of the work of history. To present Smollett this way is to draw on the thought of Walter Benjamin who understood the 'task of the translator' as a work of continuation – something that supported the ongoing life of a work of art (not unlike the way Smollett described the task

of the *British Magazine*).[76] But it is also intended to support the way that Smollett revealed himself. In the mid-1760s, at the height of his reputation as both historian and critic, Smollett was painted by Nathaniel Dance, sitting in front of a bookcase with a single volume in his hand.[77] This volume was, perhaps surprisingly, a copy of Le Sage's *Gil Blas*. Smollett had translated *Gil Blas*, along with a number of other works, earlier in his career – its presence in the portrait suggests Smollett's continuing affinity with what was often regarded as literary hack work.[78] Smollett's aim as a translator was, as he put it in a note prefixed to his translation of *Don Quixote*, to 'retain the spirit and ideas, without servilely adhering to the literal expression of the original'.[79] His aims, as for the *Critical Review* and *Complete History*, were high: 'spirit and ideas' signaled forms of immediate and universal knowledge from which his readers might easily be distracted; nevertheless, such knowledge was necessarily tied to originals.[80] Smollett's work thus involved compilation (in *Don Quixote*, for example, Smollett presented collections of phrases from different translators)[81] and relentless forms of continuation. It was only through the work of the translator, conceived as both universal and local, immediate and mediated, that Smollett was able to take on the work of history.

———

In his correspondence, Smollett refers regularly to the exhaustion of writing. In 1757, we find him 'groaning all day under the weight of Tindal, Ralph, Burnet, Feuquieres, Daniel, Voltaire, Burchett, &c. ,&c.'; in 1758, after noting that he had been 'extremely busied in correcting my History for a new Impression', he writes how '[I] wish to God my circumstances would allow me to consign my Pen to oblivion'. In 1759, he observes: 'If I go on writing as I have proceeded for some years, my hand will be paralytic, and my brain dried to a snuff'.[82] These are more than conventional complaints about the work of a grub street writer – Smollett really does seem to have toiled himself, as he put it, 'into an habitual asthma'. The account of his trip to France in search of health in 1763, at the end of both the Seven Years War and the four volumes of his *Continuation*, might well be

read as the consequence of his work of history. Even so, although this begins by observing Smollett's removal from a 'scene of illiberal dispute' (an allusion to his support for the Bute ministry through a weekly journal, *The Briton*, in 1762-3),[83] *Travels through France and Italy* (1766) in fact describes the period of writing a further volume to the *Continuation* – something, as it happens, with which Hume assisted by helping Smollett to retrieve his confiscated books at Calais.[84] Why did Smollett keep on writing? He had received three guineas per sheet for the first edition of his *Complete History* (which ran to 332 sheets) and £500 to revise it – very significant sums.[85] The work of history must have partly been about money. But it was also bigger than any of its printed sheets. It was a work that appeared both in and as the eighteenth-century business of getting things into print. For Smollett, it was a continuous task; it allowed for no interruption and offered no completion.[86] It has been useful, in this article, to consider Smollett's historical writing in relation to that of Hume – and to address the view that Smollett continued his work. Of course, in a sense, this is what Smollett did: he remediated Hume's initial volumes, in various ways, and influenced the way that Hume's text was later repackaged. He continued the work of history. He did not, however, author a number of volumes starting where Hume stopped. This view of Smollett's work is misleading. It misses its attempts at supplementation and translation. Rather than seeing Smollett's *Complete History* and *Continuation* as works in the continuation of history, we should read them as works in a history of continuation.

---

[1] See the dedication to George Canning's *An Appeal to the Publick from the Malicious Misrepresentations, Impudent Falsifications, and Unjust Decisions, of the Anonymous Fabricators of the* Critical Review (1767). Canning is responding to a review of the first three books of his translation of Melchior de Polignac's *Anti-Lucretius* (1766).

[2] For an exploration of such a phenomenological approach to literature, see Brenda Machosky, *Structures of Appearing: Allegory and the Work of Literature* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013).

[3] Advertisement for *Hume's History of England, with Portraits* (London: T. Caddell, 1782 [ESTC: T036827]), 1 sheet, octavo.

[4] As an example of how Smollett's work is perceived as 'a history designed to continue the narrative of English history where Hume's account left off', see Mark Salber Phillips, *Society and Sentiment: Genres of Historical Writing in Britain 1740–1820* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), p.97, n.41.

[5] Mossner cites a report in the *New Evening Post* (6 December 1776); see Ernest Campbell Mossner, *The Life of David Hume* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954; repr. 1970), pp.555–6.

[6] Tobias Smollett and others, *The History of England from the Revolution to the End of the American War, and Peace of Versailles in 1783*. *Designed as a continuation of Mr. Hume's History*, 6 vols (Philadelphia: Robert Campbell, 1796–8), p.iv.

[7] *The History of England, by Hume and Smollett* was reprinted, for example, with '*a continuation to the death of William IV*' by H. Stebbing (1838), '*a continuation to the reign of Queen Victoria'* by E. Farr (1848), and '*to the 23rd year of the reign of Queen Victoria'* by E. Farr and E.H. Nolan (1859). For some account of the influence of Hume's history in nineteenth-century America (which does not consider the accompanying volumes by Smollett), see Mark G. Spencer, *David Hume and Eighteenth-Century America* (University of Rochester Press, 2005).

[8] For an account of Smollett's work in the context of the Scottish Enlightenment, see Richard J Jones, *Tobias Smollett in the Enlightenment*: *Travels through France, Italy and Scotland* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2011).

[9] See Hume's letter to William Robertson (12 March 1759), in J.Y.T Greig (ed.), *The Letters of David Hume* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1932), vol. 1, pp.301–3.

[10] For this view of the Enlightenment, see Clifford Siskin and William Warner (eds), *This is Enlightenment* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

[11] For a discussion of such 'literariness', see Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan history from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p.7; also see, for example, the focus on history's participation in a broad 'system of genres' in Phillips, *Society and Sentiment*, p.10.

[12] For an account of 'the disciplinary displacement of Scottish philosophy by English Literature'; see Clifford Siskin, *The Work of Writing: Literature and Social Change in Britain, 1700–1830* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp.79–99.

[13] Karen O'Brien has described how 'Eighteenth-century historians [such as Hume, Voltaire, Robertson, Gibbon and Ramsay] had a more dynamic sense of historical writing as an arena in which both historian and reader exercise political, emotional, and aesthetic choices; together they create, not an imagined, but an interpretive community engaged in a rhetorical arbitration of their own history'; O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment*, p.5.

[14] *Plan of a Complete History of England*, 4 pages octavo (London, 1757 [ESTC: T042413]), p.4. The *Plan* promises the publication of the *Complete History* 'in the month of February, 1757', suggesting a date of early 1757 or late 1756. Most of the plan is reprinted in the first volume of the *Complete History* (eventually published in April); it also forms part of a review in Smollett's *The Critical Review, or Annals of Literature* 3 ([May] 1757), p.449–51

[15] See *Public Advertiser* (11 April 1757).

[16] Tobias Smollett, *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, 5 vols, (London, 1760–1 and 1765), 'To the Public', vol 1., p.iii.

[17] The London booksellers would not trade with Hume's Edinburgh bookseller, Gavin Hamilton; Hume turned to the London bookseller Andrew Millar to continue the publication of his work. See Mossner, *Life of David Hume*, pp.312–15. For a discussion of the publication of Smollett's *Complete History* in this context, see Ian Simpson Ross, '"More dull, but by no means so dangerous as that of Mr Hume": Smollett's "Continuation" of *le bon David's History of England*', in O.M. Brack Jr (ed.), *Tobias Smollett, Scotland's First Novelist: New Essays in Memory of Paul-Gabriel Boucé* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2007), pp.217–39.

[18] *Critical Review* 7 ([April] 1759), p.289.

[19] Hume draws the conclusion that civilized nations 'like the English … ought to be cautious in appealing to the practice of their ancestors, or regarding the maxims of uncultivated ages as certain rules for their present conduct'; David

Hume, *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the accession of Henry VII*, 2 vols (London, 1762), vol. 2, p.446. As James Harris puts it, this is to conclude that 'there was no such thing as *the* English constitution'; see James A Harris, *Hume: An intellectual biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), p.389.

[20] See *Public Advertiser* (11 April 1757). A review of Smollett's fourth volume 'consisting of eighty sheets, given gratis to the purchasers of the three former volumes' was published in the *Critical Review* for January 1758 (pp.1–17). For the publication history, see Lewis M. Knapp, 'The Publication of Smollett's *Complete History* … and *Continuation*', *The Library* 16 (1936), 295–308. For a bibliographical account of early editions, see James E. May, 'The Authoritative Editions of Smollett's *Complete History of England*', in O.M. Brack, Jr (ed.), *Tobias Smollett, Scotland's First Novelist,* pp.240–305.

[21] *Proposals for Printing in Weekly Numbers, a Second Edition of the Complete History of England, from the Descent of Julius Caesar, to the Treaty of Aix-La-Chapelle, 1748. By T. Smollet, M.D.*, 4 pages octavo (London, 1758 [ESTC: T222051]), p.[1].

[22] See R.M. Wiles, *Serial Publication in England before 1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p.8; Wiles notes how 'No work published in numbers in the second quarter of the eighteenth century is more frequently encountered in newspapers' than Tindal's translation of Rapin (pp.96–7).

[23] See Smollett's letter to John Moore (September 1758) in Knapp (ed.), *Letters*, p.72.

[24] See *Public Advertiser* (20 and 23 May 1760).

[25] The *Public Advertiser* for 13 September 1760 notes that the author 'finds himself obliged to deviate a little from his original Design of Publication' and that the work 'for the future will be published every Fortnight'.

[26] The *Public Advertiser* includes a notice for the publication of Number 37 on 9 April 1762 and for 'Number XL. being the last' on 14 August 1762.

[27] An advertisement for the publication of 'The Fifth and last Volume' of the *Continuation* appeared in the *Public Advertiser* on 6 September 1765. It included a notice that 'This Work may be had in weekly Numbers at 6d. each to

accommodate those who chuse to purchase it in that easy Way, by giving Notice to the Booksellers or News Carriers in Town and Country'.

[28] See the Public Advertiser (23 December 1758 and 9 April 1762). In a letter to John Moore (September 1758), Smollett observes that 'the weekly Sale of the History has increased to above Ten thousand'; see Knapp (ed.), *Letters*, p.73.

[29] Thomas Keymer describes the 'diverse and vigorous tradition of serial writing' behind Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*; see Thomas Keymer, *Sterne, the Moderns, and the Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp.113–52; esp. pp.119, 135.

[30] Advertisement for *Hume's History of England, with Portraits* (London: T. Caddell, 1782 [ESTC: T036827]), 1 sheet, octavo.

[31] *Proposals for Printing in Weekly Numbers*, p.[1], [3–4].

[32] Hume's letter to Andrew Millar, 17 May 1762, in Grieg (ed.), *Letters*, vol 1, letter 193.

[33] See Smollett's *Plan of a Complete History* and an advertisement for *Cooke's Pocket Edition, Superbly Embellished, of Hume's History of England […] to which will be added, a continuation, By Dr. Smollett […] And a farther Continuation to the present Times, By T. A. Lloyd*, *Esq.*, 2 pages octavo (London, 1793 [ESTC: T161451]), p.[1].

[34] Smollett and others, *The History of England* [Campbell], p.iv–v.

[35] Campbell's six volume edition of Hume's *History* covers a period of over one thousand years; the subsequent six volumes by 'Smollett and others' cover 100 years, with 250 pages (half a volume) dedicated to just three years (or, in other words, the text of the fifth volume of Smollett's *Continuation*).

[36] *Plan of a Complete History of England,* p.1.

[37] *Critical Review* 2 ([Dec] 1756), p.386.

[38] *Critical Review* 2 ([Dec] 1756), p.395.

[39] *Plan of a Complete History of England*, p.3.

[40] *Plan of a Complete History of England*, pp.3–4.

[41] *Critical Review* 3 (1757), p.482; cf. pp.449–58.

[42] For a description of the 'contradictory imperatives for immediacy and hypermediacy' in contemporary culture (and the way that new media presents itself as 'refashioned and improved versions of other media'), see Jay David

Bolter and Richard Grusin, *Remediation: Understanding New Media* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2000), pp.5, 14–15.

[43] *Critical Revie*w 2 ([Dec] 1756), p.394

[44] *Critical Revie*w 7 ([April] 1759), p.289.

[45] *Critical Review* 2 ([Dec] 1756), p.392

[46] *Critical Review* 2 ([Dec] 1756), pp.392–3.

[47] Tobias Smollett, *A Complete History of England,* second edition, 11 vols. (London, 1758–60), vol. 7, pp.85–6.

[48] *Critical Review* 3 ([June] 1757), p.482.

[49] See Hume, *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688*, 6 vols (London, 1762), vol. 5, pp.90–92. According to Hume's account, Charles 'threw himself upon his bed, and cried, *I told you this before*; and fell into a new passion and new lamentations, complaining that he was undone, and should lose baby Charles.'

[50] Graham Slater has suggested that Smollett took Hume's work as his 'ur-text', noting that some of Smollett's reworkings are 'frequently only perfunctory'; see Graham Slater, *Authorship and Authority in Hume's History of England* (Oxford D.Phil, 1990), pp.250–2. For a comparison of some passages from Smollett and Hume, see Donald Greene, 'Smollett the Historian: A Reappraisal', in *Bicentenial Essays Presented to Lewis M. Knapp*, ed. G. S. Rousseau and P.G. Boucé (New York, 1971), pp.31–3 and 36–40. Greene finds that Smollett's style is 'Much leaner, more economical, more swift-moving', adding that 'it would be hard to point to anything omitted from Hume's prolixity whose loss we regret' (p.32).

[51] Smollett's practice might be compared with that of Oliver Goldsmith in his *History of England, from the Earliest Times to the Death of George II* (4 vols octavo; 1771). In his preface, Goldsmith described his aim as 'not to add to our present stock of history, but to contract it' – and aimed to create an 'epitome of history' through the 'art of blotting' (pp. i, v, vi). Hume's *History* has thus been described as a 'best-seller under Oliver Goldsmith's name'; see Laura B. Kennelly, '"Tory history incognito: Hume's *History of England* in Goldsmith's *History of England*", *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century* 303 (1992), pp.398–401. However, Goldsmith (who knew Smollett through work on the *Critical*

Review and *British Magazine*) also drew from Smollett's *Complete History* and *Continuation*, providing Smollett with another form of continuation well into the nineteenth century.

[52] *Critical Review* 3 ([June]1757), p.488.

[53] Karen O'Brien notes how Hume's 'sympathetic presentation' of the Stuarts aimed at 'more nuanced, less thoughtlessly Whiggish' version of English history; see O'Brien, 'History and Literature', in John Richetti (ed.), *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, 1660–1780 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p.376.

[54] O'Brien, 'History and Literature', p.376; cf. Karen O'Brien, *Narratives of Enlightenment: Cosmopolitan history from Voltaire to Gibbon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p.115. Harris associates Hume's new combination of the 'didactic and the pathetic' with the commission of Smollett, as a 'novelist', to write a competing history; see Harris, *Hume*, p.349.

[55] Hume, *The History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution in 1688*, 6 vols (London, 1762), vol. 5, p.458.

[56] Smollett, *Complete History*, second edition, vol. 7, pp.372–3.

[57] Smollett, *Complete History*, second edition, vol. 1, p.437 and vol. 3, p.216.

[58] The list was reprinted in the *Public Advertiser* on 10 February 1758. A 'List of Heads &c. given in the 38 preceding Numbers' of the *Continuation* appeared in the *Public Advertiser* on 16 June 1762.

[59] See Richard B. Sher, *The Enlightenment and the Book: Scottish Authors and Their Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain, Ireland, and America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), pp.167–71. Of his portrait, Hume told Millar that he would be 'much better pleasd to have the Edition come out without it'; see Hume's letter to Millar (October 1766) in Greig (ed.), *Letters*, vol. 2, pp.97–8.

[60] See Smollett, *Continuation*, vol. 4, pp.113–32.

[61] See *Continuation*, vol. 3, pp.447–62 and vol. 4, pp.371–88.

[62] See François-Marie Arouet de Voltaire, 'Histoire', in *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, (Paris, 1765), vol 8.

[63] For reviews of the *General* History of Voltaire and the continuation of Rapin, see *Critical Review* 4 ([Nov] 1757), pp.385–95 and 8 ([July] 1759) 44–54.

[64] The Modern Part of an *Universal History* was published in 44 volumes from 1759 to 1765; for an account of the project, see Louis L. Martz, 'Tobias Smollett and the Universal History', *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 56, no. 1 (1941), pp.1–14. Reviews appeared regularly from January 1759; see *Critical Review* 7 ([Jan] 1759), pp.1–14.

[65] See *The British Magazine, or Monthly Repository for Gentlemen & Ladies* 1 ([Jan] 1760), pp.22–4, 33–37, 44–50. The *British Magazine* continued to be published until 1767.

[66] *Critical Review* 1 (1756), Preface.

[67] *British Magazine* 1 (1760), Dedication, p.ii.

[68] Smollett excuses some errors by observing that the 'gentlemen chiefly concerned in the Critical Review, live at a considerable distance from the press; and sometimes the printer has been so hurried towards the latter end of the month by their sending in the copy so late, that he could not possibly furnish them with proof sheets for their correction'; see *Critical Review* 4 ([Nov] 1757), p.472. For comments on an 'elegant new type' and Smollett's relationship to his publisher, see *Critical Review* 2 (1756), Preface; and 1 ([April] 1756), p.192.

[69] For a description of Smollett's royal licence, see James G. Basker, *Tobias Smollett: Critic and Journalist* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988), p.190.

[70] See Smollett's proposals for the *Critical Review* in the *Public Advertiser* for 19 December 1755 and the 'Preface' to the first volume. For an account of the 'Set of Gentlemen', see Basker, *Tobias Smollett*, 43–45.

[71] *Critical Review* 1 (1756), Preface.

[72] *Critical Review* 1 (1756), Preface.

[73] Smollett, *A Complete History of England,* first edition, 4 vols (1757–8), vol. 1, Dedication. Smollett's dedication is dated March 1757, at the beginning of Pitt's rise to power; his dedication to Pitt in the *British Magazine* in 1760, whilst supportive, might hide some negative criticism in its aims to 'keep alive the seeds of literary improvement' during wartime. Smollett was later enlisted by Bute's ministry to write *The Briton* (1762–3) in support of concluding a peace with France.

[74] See *Public Advertiser*, 19, 24 and 30 December 1755.

[75] *Critical Review* 12 ([Oct] 1761), p.284 and 13 ([Feb] 1762), pp.81–2.

[76] See Walter Benjamin's influential essay, 'The Task of the Translator', in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (London, 1970). For Benjamin, translation 'comes later than the original' and marks a (non-metaphorical) 'stage of continued life' (71–2). Noting the Romantics' insight into the 'life of literary works', Benjamin acknowledges that they 'hardly recognised translation in this sense, but devoted their entire attention to criticism, another, if a lesser, factor in the continued life of literary works' (p.76).

[77] The portrait is held at the Yale Center for British Art; see <http://collections.britishart.yale.edu/vufind/Record/1668330> [Accessed February 2017]. It was probably painted in 1764 or 1766–8. For some speculation on the date, see O.M. Brack, Jr. and Leslie A. Chilton's introduction to their edition of Alain René Le Sage, *The Adventures of Gil Blas of Santillane*, trans. Tobias Smollett (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2011), p.xxvii, n.1.

[78] Smollett's works of translation include Le Sage's *The Adventures of Gil Blas* (1748), and *The Devil upon Crutches* (1749), Voltaire's *Micromégas* (1752), essays from the *Journal Oeconomique* (1754), Cervantes' *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote* (1755) and Fénelon's *Telemachus* (published posthumously in 1776).

[79] See Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra, *The History and Adventures of the Renowned Don Quixote*, trans. Tobias Smollett, ed. Martin C. Battestin and O.M. Brack, Jr (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2003), p.20.

[80] For a related view, see Adrian Johns, *Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998). Johns describes 'how print, like scientific truth, attains the level of universality – by the hard, continuous work of real people in real places' (p.42).

[81] Such notes have been described as 'a wonderful palimpsest of versions and revisions that foreground Smollett's writerly verve and allow us insights into his reading process'; see Julie Hayes, 'Eighteenth-Century Translations of Don Quixote', in *The Cervantean Heritage: Reception and Influence of Cervantes in*

Britain, ed. J. A. G. Ardila (London, 2009), p.71. For an example, see Cervantes, *Don Quixote*, pp.27–8.

[82] See Smollett's letters to William Huggins (20 June 1757), John Moore (28 September 1758) and John Harvie (10 December 1759) in Knapp (ed.), *Letters*, pp.61, 72–3, 85.

[83] Tobias Smollett, *Travels through France and* Italy, ed. Frank Felsenstein (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), p.2. For an account of Smollett's involvement in *The Briton* (as he was working on the *Continuation*, *Critical Review*, *British Magazine*, and *The Modern Part of an Universal History*), see Bryon Gassman's introduction to *The Briton* in Tobias Smollett, *Poems, Plays and The Briton*, ed. O.M Brack, Jr. and Leslie A. Chilton (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press), pp.221–40.

[84] Smollett refers to Hume's intervention in the fourth letter of his *Travels* (p.21). Describing the incident in a letter to William Hunter (11 July 1763), Smollett observes how 'I can neither write the Preface to the modern Universal History nor finish the Continuation of my own History of England, without having the books before me'; see Knapp, *Letters*, p.116. For hints of a friendly correspondence between Smollett and Hume, see Smollett's letter (31 August 1768) in Knapp, *Letters*, pp.135–6 and two letters from Hume (18 July 1767 and 21 September 1768) in Greig (ed.), *Letters*, vol. 2, pp.151–2 and 268–70.

[85] These details are found in papers belonging to the booksellers James Rivington and James Fletcher. They also note how Robert Baldwin was paid £7589.5s 'for printing and publishing four hundred and twenty one thous[d] six hundred and twenty five Numbers of Dr Tobias Smollett's History of England' (between 25 February 1758 and 1 Jan 1760). For an account of these papers (held in the British Library [Add. MS. 38730]), see Wiles, *Serial Publication*, pp.5–6.

[86] The fifth volume of Smollett's *Continuation* is presented as the 'catastrophe, or completion of all the transactions contained in the four preceding volumes'; see *Continuation*, vol. 5 (1765), p.v. Even so, a resistance to closure is suggested by the publication of Smollett's subsequent compilation, *The Present State of All Nations: Containing a geographical, natural, commercial, and political history of all the countries in the known world*, 8 vols octavo (London, 1768–9).