Goldsmith and the 'British Magazine': A reconsideration

Peter Dixon
Queen Mary and Westfield College, University of London, UK

David Mannion
Royal Holloway, University of London, UK

Abstract

Twenty-eight items in the *British Magazine* have been attributed to Goldsmith, the majority in *Essays and Criticisms by Dr. Goldsmith* (1798). The strength of the external evidence depends on the authority of that collection; it is shakier than its editor claimed. Internal evidence comes from a Goldsmith 'profile' of stylistic features, established by reference to contemporary essayists, from measures of sentence-length, distinctive features of the attributed essays, and parallels of word and thought. We conclude that most of the attributed essays, including those proposed since 1798, are unlikely to be Goldsmith's.

Correspondence:
David Mannion
30 St Margaret's Road,
Oxford OX2 6RX, UK.
E-mail:
david.mannion@
btinternet.com

1 Introduction

In his *Reconstructing Contexts*, Robert Hume lays down a rule which is also appropriate to studies of authorship: '*All conclusions must be regarded as provisional.* Additional evidence or better analysis may change our minds' (Hume, 1999, p. 70; author's italics). Some ten years ago we considered the essays in the *British Magazine* which have been posthumously attributed to Goldsmith (Dixon and Mannion, 1998). In re-examining these attributions, we offer some 'additional evidence' together with a much modified and (we trust) improved procedure.

The *British Magazine* was launched in January 1760 under Smollett's editorship. In its first year of publication it hosted three of Goldsmith's finest essays: 'A Reverie at the Boar's Head Tavern', 'The Distresses of a Common Soldier', and the narrative of the strolling player. His authorship of these pieces was established by his including them in *Essays by Dr. Goldsmith*, 1765 (a second, enlarged edition followed in 1766). These are the only essays in the magazine which are certainly his—a contribution limited in quantity, but of the highest quality. If, however, he was responsible for all the pieces since attributed to him, his contribution would be increased tenfold.

These attributions fall into two groups, the smaller consisting of 'The history of Miss Stanton', four items proposed by R. S. Crane in 1927, and two recent additions made by Edward Pitcher. For none of these is there any external evidence.

The larger group of twenty-one essays, to which we turn first, was printed in *Essays and Criticisms by Dr. Goldsmith* (3 vols., London, 1798: hereafter abbreviated as *E & C*). Its credentials would appear to be impeccable.

2 The External Evidence: The Role of Thomas Wright

The first volume of *E & C* reprints, without preliminaries, the contents of the second edition of Goldsmith's *Essays*. The remaining two volumes are a work of restitution, as the preface to the

Literary and Linguistic Computing, Vol. 25, No. 2, 2010.

doi:10.1093/llc/fqp040 Advance Access published on 30 November 2009

second volume explains: 'Many pieces of undoubted excellence were known to be omitted [from the 1765/6 *Essays*], and some which were suspected to be of [Goldsmith's] composition could not be certainly ascertained.' 'Several admirers' of his poetry, determined to set these excellent pieces before the public, enlisted the help of 'the late Mr. THOMAS WRIGHT, Printer, a man of literary observation and experience'. Wright, 'during his connection with those periodical publications, in which the early works of Dr. GOLDSMITH were originally contained, carefully marked the several compositions of the different writers, as they were delivered to him to print.' Wright 'was therefore recommended and prevailed upon to print the present Selection, which he had just compleated at the time of his death' (*E & C*, ii, pp. vii–ix; Wright died 3 March 1797).

Wright's long and successful career began on 5 December 1758, when he was apprenticed to Archibald Hamilton, a friend of Smollett's, and at that time printing the latter's *Critical Review* (McKenzie, 1978, p. 154). The *Critical* is therefore one of 'those periodical publications' with which Wright was connected. As James Basker has demonstrated, Hamilton also undertook the printing of the *British Magazine* from its inception (Basker, 1988, p. 189). Although Wright was of little more than a year's standing in Hamilton's shop, he was in a position to learn the identities of the anonymous contributors. As a junior apprentice he might have been called on to act as printer's devil, receiving copy literally 'delivered to him' by the authors' own hands at the authors' own doors. If he actually 'marked the several compositions', then in the 1790s he must have been relying on a remarkable long-term memory, since copy was normally destroyed when printing was completed. An alternative, and better, explanation is given in a letter of 3 September 1797 from the Shakespeare scholar George Steevens to Bishop Percy, who was then preparing his own edition of Goldsmith's miscellaneous works. Steevens reported that Wright had 'preserved a list of these fugitive pieces, which are now reprinting' (Nichols and Nichols, 1817–58, vii, p. 25).

That Wright accurately listed Goldsmith's contributions to the *British Magazine* is supported by considering his identification of the eleven 'specimens' of Goldsmith's criticism reprinted in volume iii of *E & C*. These are pieces from the *Critical Review*, all from 1759, after Wright had joined Hamilton's firm. To attribute a review from memory after thirty-odd years is no mean feat. If the attributions are correct, it seems reasonable to assume that Wright had something more concrete—Steevens' list—to rely on. That they are correct, in all but one case, is supported by Friedman's citing of verbal parallels in four reviews (there are minor parallels in two others), and by our own stylometric analysis (Friedman, 1946, pp. 27–34).[1] The exception is a review of the volume of Samuel Butler's *Genuine Remains* containing his verse. Friedman discounted this ascription on a number of grounds (our analysis concurs), and offered a plausible explanation for its inclusion: Wright correctly identified Goldsmith as the reviewer of Butler's prose writings in the *Critical* for September 1759; the review of the verse had appeared at the beginning of the July number, which included two reviews, of Marriott and Massinger, both on Wright's list. In looking through the *Critical* file for those items, the editor of *E & C* noticed the review of Butler's verse, concluded that Goldsmith could have been asked to review both volumes, and combined the two reviews into a single item, with a linking paragraph which the reader assumes (wrongly) to be by Goldsmith.

Something similar, though not quite so dishonest, occurred with the essays. The inclusion of 'On the Approaching Coronation' should not be laid at Wright's door. The piece had appeared on 9 December 1760 in the *Public Ledger*; it was reprinted in the *British Magazine* three weeks later. Mid-eighteenth-century periodicals freely reprinted good things from rival publications. Being a reprint, the coronation essay preserved its anonymity. Wright, ignorant of its author's name, would not have entered it on his Goldsmith list. But as with the review of Butler's verse, its presence is not difficult to account for. The final prose item in Goldsmith's 1766 *Essays* is Mr Grogan's humorous account of sleeping through the coronation

procession. When he decided to include 'On the Approaching Coronation' the editor of *E & C* revealed his thinking in a footnote: 'This Essay was composed previous to, as [Grogan's letter] in Vol. I. was written subsequent to the Coronation . . .' (*E & C*, iii, p. 47). The editor may also have recalled the ironic account of the same event in *The Citizen of the World* (Letter 105), and thought that if Goldsmith could engage with the coronation on two occasions, he could do so on a third. The same topic was taken to imply the same author, a not altogether safe procedure.

We accept that Wright's first-hand experience of the production of both the *Critical* and the *British* gives him authoritative status. And we accept that he possessed a list of Goldsmith's contributions, at least for the periods when he was actively engaged in the printing process. But we believe that Wright's authority was overruled on two occasions, most pertinently in the selection of essays. What, then, of the credentials of the editor of *E & C* who, trusting his own judgement, augmented Wright's list?

3 The External Evidence: The Role of Isaac Reed

Two of the essays from the *British Magazine* which were reprinted in *E & C*—'The History of Carolan' and 'On the different Schools of Music'—had previously been reprinted in the *European Magazine* for 1785; they were headed simply 'Written by Dr. GOLDSMITH'. At this time the *European* was edited by its founder, the learned and greatly respected antiquarian Isaac Reed. Goldsmith had died only eleven years before; Reed, who had published some biographical details of Goldsmith, in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1779 (de Montluzin, 2007, p. 478), could have had good (though undisclosed) grounds for making the attribution himself, or for approving that of a contributor or staff member. Were these two essays the starting point for a collection 'published under the superintendence of Isaac Reed'? The phrase is Prior's (Prior, 1837, i, p. 315). He is followed by Crane, in *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, who describes *E & C* as 'Prepared by Thomas Wright with the assistance of Isaac Reed' (Crane, 1940, p. 638). In *The New Cambridge Bibliography*, Arthur Friedman repeats Crane's words (Friedman, 1971, p. 1193).

The involvement of such a respected scholar as Reed gives the enterprise a definite prestige. And that he was involved is certain: the 'Life of Goldsmith' at the beginning of volume ii is a revised version of the biography in his edition of *Poems of Goldsmith and Parnell*, published three years earlier. The nine changes and additions which were made for *E & C* include the repositioning of a pronoun to improve the flow of a sentence, while a new footnote refers to the uncertainty surrounding Goldsmith's date of birth, and another identifies the source of a quotation. These careful and scholarly revisions would appear to be authorial; they are characteristic of the man whom George Steevens called 'the accurate Mr. Reed' (Nichols and Nichols, 1817–58, vii, p. 24), and whose 'biographical accuracy and bibliographical knowledge' were described by Thomas Park as 'almost proverbial' (Sherbo, 1989, p. 147). But if Reed was the editor of *E & C* the editorial practice displayed there would be strikingly out of character. Words are put into Goldsmith's mouth; the omission of 'Translated from the Spanish . . .' gives 'On Fascination' the appearance of an original piece; thirty-five words are cut from the opening sentence of 'Essay on National Union'. 'Introduction to the Study of the Belles Lettres' suffers unwarranted verbal changes ('awakened' for 'waked', 'worship' for 'culture'), and also loses four unfulfilled promises (e.g. 'as we shall have occasion to see in the sequel'); an evidently incomplete treatise is reshaped into seven linked essays on taste and poetry. Would Reed have treated his text in so high-handed a fashion? (The two essays reprinted in his *European Magazine* are faultlessly transcribed, probably by Reed himself.) It seems reasonable to suppose that having agreed to the use of his biography, having revised it for the occasion, and perhaps having drawn the compiler's attention to the two attributions reprinted in the *European Magazine*, Reed took no further part in the undertaking. He was an industrious and experienced editor, but

Arthur Sherbo's exhaustive account of his activities makes no mention of *E & C* (Sherbo, 1989).

John Nichols, a close friend of Reed, provides our only clue to the editor's identity. He states that the preface to volume ii, setting out the genesis of the collection, was written by William Seward, a somewhat less distinguished antiquarian than Reed (Nichols, 1812–15, iii, p. 399). If Seward (and associates?) rather than Reed assembled the material for *E & C*, the work loses something of its authority. A survey of the internal evidence may help to determine whether Seward allowed his zeal to sway his judgement on more than the two occasions we have detected.

4 The Internal Evidence

'Internal evidence is a notoriously unreliable guide to authorship' (Downie, 2004, p. 262). Alan Downie's forthright words stand like a dragon at the gate. Let us at least protect ourselves against some obvious sources of unreliability. As P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens (1994, p. xxxiii) declare, it is illusory to think that one can develop 'an infallible knack' for recognizing an author's prose style. Since these two scholars have so thoroughly immersed themselves in the writings of Defoe and his contemporaries, their observation is particularly telling. An appeal to the 'voice' or 'characteristic manner' of an author is akin to judging from the quality of the writing under investigation. Quality may be a valid criterion in the case of Shakespeare (Love, 2002, pp. 93–5; Vickers, 2002, p. 4 and 2007, pp. 1–2), but is best ignored in Goldsmith's case. The essay on physiognomy, reprinted in *E & C*, is mediocre, to say the least. Its author may have been a mediocre writer, best left veiled in anonymity, or he may have been Goldsmith on an off day, cobbling material together to meet a deadline. Both 'feel' and quality are, for our purposes, too impressionistic.

Even if we put in place necessary safeguards—an appropriate selection and adequate number of control authors and linguistic features—and refrain from pressing verbal parallels too hard, we cannot evade the fundamental difficulties: (i) we cannot be sure that every word we treat as Goldsmith's was really his. Editors of journals freely exercised their right to improve contributions, and 'Compositors in any period can do anything with their copy, and they frequently do' (Fleeman, 1967, p. 214). (ii) We have excluded from our analysis of Goldsmith's prose the translated and plagiarized material which scholars have brought to light, and which would have skewed our findings. But similar material may lurk undetected among the 'doubtful' essays. (iii) However positive the results from tests of stylistic features are, they can take us no further than 'possibly by Goldsmith'. We cannot rule out the possibility that one of the many unidentified contributors to magazines happened to share those features with Goldsmith.

We call on four types of internal evidence.

4.1 Linguistic features

As first published in the several periodicals for which he wrote, the essays which Goldsmith collected and revised in 1765 (as *Essays by Dr. Goldsmith*) amount to some 38,110 words. This body of material, with the pieces in their original, unrevised form, we refer to as the 'corpus'. Having first discarded translated material, parodies, and quotations, we divide the text into 40 samples of 750 words each. To establish a Goldsmith 'profile' we take 53 samples of 750 words from essays by ten mid-eighteenth century authors (listed in Appendix A; for our purposes Colman and Thornton are a single author), and compare the counts for occurrences of various grammatical, syntactical, and lexical features (listed in Appendix B). The resulting 'profile' can then be matched against each of the 'doubtfuls' from the *British Magazine*.

Adding the later attributions to those in *E & C*, we have twenty-eight doubtfuls in all. Since translated text is too dependent on its source to provide solid evidence, we make only passing reference, in later sections, to the 'Essay on Fascination. Translated from the Spanish', and the two essays, both using French sources, entitled 'Dream'. We postpone consideration of the highly derivative 'Letter supposed to be written by the Moorish Secretary …', first attributed by Crane (1927, pp. 1–4), while the

introduction to 'A curious Incident, translated from the Spanish', tentatively attributed by Crane (1927, p. 134), is too brief to yield sufficient data. Most of the remaining doubtfuls provide between one and three samples of approximately 750 words; the samples are numbered s_1, s_2,... in the list below. From one of the two longest texts, 'The History of Omrah', we have chosen three samples at random; of the four samples from 'An Introduction to the Study of the Belles Lettres', which ran for fourteen instalments, two are from the opening discussion of taste, and one each from the sections dealing with imitation and metaphor. The essays are listed in order of publication, with their original titles or running titles; we use bold type for the short titles which we adopt for convenience. Unless otherwise stated, the attributions were first made in *E & C*.

d_1 The History of **Omrah** ... An Oriental Tale. January–March, 1760 (s_1, s_2, s_3).

d_2 A Parallel between the **Gracchi**, and the Greatest Man of the present Age [William Pitt the Elder]. January, 1760 (s_4).

d_3 On the different Schools of **Music**. February, 1760 (s_5). First attributed in *European Magazine*, Oct., 1785. We omit the author's response to the critique by 'S.R.'.

d_4 **Igluka** and Sibbersik, a Greenland Tale. ca. 1 May, 1760: an additional number of the magazine (s_6, s_7, s_8).

d_5 The Effect which **Climates** have upon Man, and other Animals. May, 1760 (s_9) (Crane, 1927, pp. 5–11).

d_6 The History of **Alcanor** and Eudosia. May, 1760 (s_{10}, s_{11}, s_{12}).

d_7 A Parallel between Mrs **Vincent** and Miss **Brent** [two celebrated singers]. June, 1760 (s_{13}, s_{14}).

d_8 The History of **Carolan**, the last Irish Bard. July, 1760 (s_{15}). First attributed in *European Magazine*, October 1785.

d_9 A **True History** for the Ladies. July, 1760 (s_{16}).

d_{10} The History of **Miss Stanton**. July, 1760 (s_{17}, s_{18}, s_{19}) (Prior, 1837, i, pp. 350–1).

d_{11} Reflections on **National Prejudices**. August, 1760 (s_{20}, s_{21}).

d_{12} On the Proper **Enjoyment of Life**. August, 1760 (s_{22}, s_{23}).

d_{13} On **Pride**. August, 1760 (s_{24}, s_{25}).

d_{14} On the Imprudent **Fondness of Parents**. September, 1760 (s_{26}, s_{27}, s_{28}).

d_{15} An Essay on **Physiognomy**. September, 1760 (s_{29}). We include the first two sentences of the 'Continuation' (the remainder is quotation) which appeared a month later and is omitted from *E & C*.

d_{16} An Essay on **Instinct**. December, 1760 (s_{30}, s_{31}).

d_{17} On the **Approaching Coronation**. December, 1760 (s_{32}).

d_{18} Essay on **National Union**. December, 1760 (s_{33}, s_{34}).

d_{19} The Distresses of an **Hired Writer**. April, 1761 (s_{35}) (Crane, 1927, pp. 135–6).

d_{20} Introduction to the Study of the **Belles Lettres**. July, 1761–January, 1763 (s_{36}, s_{37}, s_{38}, s_{39}).

d_{21} A Letter to the Authors of the British Magazine, Containing an humble Proposal for Augmenting the Forces of Great Britain. January, 1762 (s_{40}, s_{41}). We use *E & C*'s less cumbersome title **Female Warriors**.

d_{22} Remarks on **False Religions**. December, 1763 (s_{42}) (Pitcher, 2000, pp. 18, 24).

d_{23} Some account of the ancient **Irish Bards**. May, 1764 (s_{43}) (Pitcher, 2000, pp. 105, 139).

The number of times a particular linguistic feature occurs in a sample of text is counted—for both the forty samples taken from the Goldsmith essays, and the fifty-three samples taken from essays written by ten contemporaries. Out of the large number of features initially considered, only those which show some discriminatory value in distinguishing between the genuine Goldsmith samples and the definitely non-Goldsmith samples are retained. For each feature, we calculate the variance ratio of the counts (the ratio of the between-group mean square to the within-group mean square), and compare this ratio with Fisher's F-statistic on (10, 82) degrees of freedom. We have Goldsmith and another ten control authors, making $m = 11$ authors ($10 = m - 1$). There are also $n = 93$ samples: 40 from Goldsmith, and 53 from the control authors ($82 = n - m$). If we assume no statistical differences (same group means and variances) between the eleven authors, a value of F greater than $c = 1.948$

has a probability of only 0.05. Accordingly, we take as an indication of differences a variance ratio greater than c. Since we know that the authors are different we expect a feature of good discriminatory value to have a variance ratio greater then c—and we retain only these features for our analysis of the doubtful samples. We found 34 (listed in Appendix B) and denote them $f_1, \ldots, f_{34}$. The raw data for the features in the Goldsmith and control samples are given in Tables 1 and 2, (Appendix C), Dixon and Mannion (2007b). (We have, however, now discarded our original test 7—word patterns; it reappears as a visible marker in Section 4.3)

Counts for the forty-three doubtful samples are given in Table C.1 (Appendix C). Where necessary these have been scaled to count*, where:

$$\text{count}^* = \frac{N}{750}\text{count},$$

N being the number of words in the sample.

For a particular sample, sample i, say, let $\boldsymbol{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{i34})$, where x_{ij} is the linguistic feature count for sample i and feature j. The data are in the form of a matrix $X = [x_{ij}]$ with eighty-three rows (there are forty Goldsmith samples and forty-three doubtful samples) and thirty-four columns: x_{ij} is the frequency of occurrence of feature f_j, $j = 1, \ldots, 34$, in sample i, $i = 1, \ldots, 83$. A statistical analysis of X is the principal device we use in our attempt to determine whether a doubtful sample is more or less likely to have been written by Goldsmith.

Our initial selection of the thirty-four features does not guarantee that these are in some sense optimal. It may be that some subset of $f_1, \ldots, f_{34}$ might be better at discriminating between Goldsmith and non-Goldsmith. The question then is: which subset? To give a partial answer to this, we find the best subset of a given size—'best' from the point of view of discriminatory value. Thus, for a subset of thirteen features, say, we find the best thirteen out of the complete set of thirty-four features. For each such optimal feature set, we proceed to the next step of deciding to which category a particular doubtful sample belongs: possibly Goldsmith or probably non-Goldsmith.

Let $\alpha = \{f_{j_1}, \ldots, f_{j_k}\}$ be a particular subset of size k of $f_1, \ldots, f_{34}$, and let B_α, W_α be the between-group and within-group sums of squares and products matrices derived from the matrix composed of the corresponding k columns (i.e. the columns $j_1, \ldots, j_k$) of X. The best α, which we denote by α_k, is the α, which minimizes

$$\frac{\det(W_\alpha)}{\det(B_\alpha + W_\alpha)};$$

or, equivalently, which maximizes

$$\frac{\det(B_\alpha)}{\det(W_\alpha)}.$$

(Krzanowski and Marriot, 1994, pp. 40–1). We see a table of the α_k in Table 4 (Appendix C), Dixon and Mannion (2007b).

Let X_k be the submatrix of X consisting of all eighty-three rows but restricted to the k columns corresponding to α_k, the best k features. The distance of doubtful sample i, $41 \le i \le 83$, from the Goldsmith samples is d^2_{ki}, given by:

$$d^2_{ki} = (\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_k - \boldsymbol{x}_{ki})' W_k^{-1} (\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_k - \boldsymbol{x}_{ki}),\ i = 41, \ldots, 83.$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_k$ is the average of the first forty rows of X_k, and where W_k is the covariance matrix of the Goldsmith data: i.e. calculated from the first forty rows of X_k. We replace d^2 by D^2 when we consider the counts $\boldsymbol{x}_{ki}$ as random variables (the counts that might have been—i.e. before the texts have been written). If we assume that the scores are statistically independent of each other and that they share a common multivariate normal distribution, then

$$F_{ki} = \frac{40}{41}\frac{40-k}{39k} D^2_{ki}$$

is distributed as Snedecor's variance ratio on k and $40 - k$ degrees of freedom. From this we can calculate

$$p_{ki} = \text{Probability}[D^2_{ki} > d^2_{ki}].$$

A large value of d^2_{ki} indicates that sample i stands outside (is an 'outlier' to) the cluster of Goldsmith samples. A small value of p_{ki} (which will result from a large value of d^2_{ki}) indicates that sample i is

non-Goldsmithian. For 'small' we adopt the usual measure of smallness in the rule:

$p_{ki} < 0.05$ indicates that sample i is unlikely to have been written by Goldsmith.

For a given sample i there are thirty-four values of p_{ki}, some of which are less than 0.05, some more than 0.05. We can regard as evidence of non-Goldsmithian authorship if at least half of these values are less than 0.05. We discover that this rule agrees well with rules based on the average, p_i, and median, m_i, of these values. If N_i is the number of p_{ki} that are less than 0.05, the rules:

$$N_i \geq 17;\ \ p_i < 0.05;\ \ m_i < 0.05,$$

agree well with each other. Accordingly, the following samples are identified as non-Goldsmithian:

$s_3, s_4, s_6, s_7, s_{10}, s_{11}, s_{12}, s_{13}, s_{14}, s_{19}, s_{20}, s_{21}, s_{23}, s_{24}, s_{25}, s_{26}, s_{28}, s_{29}, s_{32}, s_{33}, s_{34}, s_{36}, s_{37}, s_{38}, s_{40}, s_{41}, s_{43}$.

Values of N_i, p_i, m_i are given in Table C.2 (Appendix C).

4.2 Sentence-length

We believe sentence-length to be a valid criterion in the case of Goldsmith's essays (Mannion and Dixon, 2004). We apply the measures we established in that study to the twenty-three doubtfuls, using the complete texts, except for 'Omrah' and 'Belles Lettres', from each of which we have taken a hundred sentences.

We group the sentences of a particular essay, E, according to their lengths. The first group, (0,9], contains those sentences of length less than ten. The second group, (9,13], contains those sentences of lengths more than nine and less than fourteen. The remaining six groups are: (13,17], (17,20], (20,24], (24,29], (29,36], (36,∞)—making a total of eight groups.

Let N_{ik} be the number of sentences of d_i which are in the k-th group, $k = 1, \ldots, 8$. We compare the sentence-length profile of each doubtful essay with that of the sixteen Goldsmith essays combined into a single text G. Let N_{0k} be the number of sentences of G in the k-th group. We find $N_{01} = 162$, $N_{02} = 158$, $N_{03} = 174$, $N_{04} = 153$, $N_{05} = 153$, $N_{06} = 177$, $N_{07} = 152$, $N_{08} = 164$. The boundary values for the groups—{9, 13, 17, 20, 24, 29, 36}—were chosen so that the $N_0 = 1293$ sentences of G are shared in approximately equal numbers among the eight groups. $\phi_k = N_{0k}/N_0$ is the proportion of sentences in the k-th group: $\phi_1 = 0.125$, $\phi_2 = 0.122$, $\phi_3 = 0.135$, $\phi_4 = 0.118$, $\phi_5 = 0.118$, $\phi_6 = 0.137$, $\phi_7 = 0.118$, $\phi_8 = 0.127$ (3 decimal places). We then compute the goodness-of-fit measure for d_i:

$$c_i = \sum_{k=1}^{8} \frac{(N_{ik} - N_i\phi_k)^2}{N_i\phi_k},$$

where N_i is the number of sentences in d_i. The P-value for d_i is $P_i = Pr[Z > c_i]$, where Z is a χ^2 random variable on 7 degrees of freedom. A small value of P_i (less than 0.05, say) suggests that Goldsmith was unlikely to have been the author of d_i. Values of the P_i are given in Table C.3 (Appendix C). From this table we conclude that d_6, d_7, d_8, d_{12}, d_{15}, d_{16}, d_{18}, d_{20}, d_{21}, d_{22} are unlike the Goldsmith profile with regard to sentence-length; d_{13}, d_{14}, d_{19} are borderline cases.

4.3 Visible markers

A doubtful text may contain features of style which distinguish it from Goldsmith, other than those we have used to establish the Goldsmith 'profile'. The reader of 'Enjoyment of Life' will (we believe) be struck by the prevalence of symmetrical phrases and sentences. The patterning is 'visible'. It becomes a 'marker' only when we have designed a method of quantifying the patterning, have applied the method to our Goldsmith samples, and, after comparing the scores, have concluded that in this respect 'Enjoyment of Life' is significantly different from a genuine Goldsmith text. This marker (see below) provides real evidence against an attribution. But not every distinctive verbal habit in a doubtful text will serve. In 'True History', we cannot fail to notice five occurrences of the phrase *too much* and seven of *expect* and *expectations* in a mere 945 words. In the corpus (38,110 words) *too much* appears five times and *expect/expectations* thirty-three times.

We suppose that each element (for example, a word or phrase) in a certain population (for example, an essay) either has or does not have a certain property. Suppose we have two populations of sizes n_1, and n_2, and that the number of elements in the first population that have this property is k_1, and the number in the second is k_2. We suppose that an element in the first population has the property with probability p_1, and in the second with probability p_2. We wish to decide whether the two probabilities are the same. In the present context, this would be a test of similarity of authorship for the two texts. An appropriate test statistic is Z, given by

$$Z = \frac{\frac{k_1}{n_1} - \frac{k_2}{n_2}}{\left(\tilde{p}\tilde{q}\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)\right)^{1/2}},$$

where

$$\tilde{p} = \frac{k_1 + k_2}{n_1 + n_2}; \quad \tilde{q} = 1 - \tilde{p}.$$

Z is compared with the standard normal distribution, so that a value of Z (the 'score') less than -2 or greater than $+2$ suggests that $p_1 \neq p_2$, and that the two essays have not been written by the same author. For example, with the visible marker *expect/expectations* in the essay 'True History':

$$k_1 = 33, \quad n_1 = 38{,}110; \quad k_2 = 7, \quad n_2 = 945.$$

$$\tilde{p} = \frac{33 + 7}{38{,}110 + 945} = 0.001024;$$
$$\tilde{q} = 1 - \tilde{p} = 0.998976;$$

$$Z = \frac{\frac{33}{38{,}110} - \frac{7}{945}}{\left(\tilde{p}\tilde{q}\left(\frac{1}{38{,}110} + \frac{1}{945}\right)\right)^{1/2}} = -6.21.$$

With the visible marker *too much* in the same essay:

$$k_1 = 5, \quad n_1 = 38{,}110; \quad k_2 = 5, \quad n_2 = 945.$$

$$\tilde{p} = \frac{5 + 5}{38{,}110 + 945} = 0.000256; \quad \tilde{q} = 0.999744;$$

$$Z = \frac{\frac{5}{38{,}110} - \frac{5}{945}}{\left(\tilde{p}\tilde{q}\left(\frac{1}{38{,}110} + \frac{1}{945}\right)\right)^{1/2}} = -9.79.$$

Both *expect* and *too much* would appear to qualify as markers. But 'True History' is a cautionary tale: 'Perhaps they who expect least are often paid with most of the pleasures of a married state.' The danger of expecting too much from matrimony is pressed home by the simple device of repetition. Being so obviously content-bound, these two markers are inadmissible as evidence. A valid marker needs to be non-thematic.

A further check is required: the occurrences of the chosen marker in the Goldsmith corpus must be widely distributed, not concentrated in a single essay. The verb *to make* is frequent in 'Alcanor', but has a similar rate of occurrence in two of Goldsmith's essays, which puts it out of court.

The doubtfuls prove quite fertile in markers which we consider trustworthy:

(1) *as + determiner (+ adjective) + noun*: 'Irish Bards' has five instances of phrases so constructed (e.g. 'as a safe asylum', 'complained of them, as a burden') in 694 words; the corpus has thirty-three: score −5.29.
(2) *considerable*: rare in Goldsmith, with only two occurrences in the corpus (and only nine in all the work he had produced by November 1762, some 266,000 words). 'Omrah' has five *considerables* in ca. 9,000 words and 'Instinct' two in 1,124 words. Their scores are −3.52 and −5.65, respectively.
(3) *in* followed by *some/this/that/these/those*: 'Carolan' has seven instances, including 'in some measure' and 'in this respect', in 728 words; the corpus contains five, and the score therefore is −5.62. We may add that 'Vincent and Brent' uses 'in this respect' three times; the phrase appears only once in the corpus.
(4) *nevertheless*: absent from the corpus; 'Omrah' has four uses, and 'Belles Lettres' seven (in ca. 18,500 words), giving scores of −4.12 and −3.80, respectively.
(5) *particular* (noun): one instance in the corpus, but ten in 'Belles Lettres': score −3.86.
(6) *perfect -ion -ly*: in the 1,249 words of 'Vincent and Brent' we have eleven occurrences; in the

corpus nineteen: score −10.45. 'Vincent and Brent' is a debate on the 'respective perfections' of the singers, so the marker is edging towards being content-bound. But such a high score suggests something of an addiction.

(7) *though ... yet/however*: there are eleven instances of this construction in the corpus (e.g. 'Though he said nothing, yet he never was silent'[2]). 'Music' has five occurrences in 827 words; 'Vincent and Brent' has six, and 'Miss Stanton' three in 1,860 words. The scores are −8.10, −7.56, and −2.98, respectively.

(8) *doublets*: Morris Golden observed that the author of 'Hired Writer' 'fairly often ... doubles short sentence elements ... a mannerism not characteristic of Goldsmith' (Golden, 1955a, p. 165). The 803-word text has nine examples of *noun + conjunction + noun* ('sagacity and penetration' and 'grievances and vexations' in its opening sentence), and three examples of *verb + conjunction + verb*. Goldsmith has 120 well-dispersed instances: the score of −5.62 bears out Golden's observation. There is some overlap with our test 20, though we here exclude adjectives and include verbs.

(9) *fronting*: 'Hired Writer' has four examples of fronting, the construction which places the object or complement of the verb before its subject: 'these I honour ...'; 'but this circumstance I look upon ...'. Goldsmith uses the construction fourteen times: score −6.02.

(10) *on/upon*: the difference in syllable length between *on* and *upon* perhaps shields this pair of prepositions from the kind of compositorial accident or interference that *while* and *whilst*, or *beside* and *besides* are liable to. 'Fondness of Parents' (1,833 words) distinctly prefers *upon* to *on* (by a ratio of 6:1); Goldsmith much less so (142:121): score −4.94.

(11) *epithets*: in 'Igluka' and 'Alcanor' the names of the principal characters are commonly prefaced by *the + epithet*: 'the sentimental Igluka' is undone by 'the gallant Sibbersik'; 'the elegant and amiable Eudosia' is parted from 'the unfortunate Alcanor'. Of the twelve proper nouns in 'Igluka', eight have epithets attached; in 'Alcanor' the figure is eleven out of twenty-nine. Comparison with Goldsmith is restricted to two narratives in the *Bee*: 'The Story of Alcander and Septimius' and the shorter 'Sabinus and Olinda'[3]. The names of the three main characters in 'Alcander' appear twenty times, but only twice with preceding epithets; for 'Sabinus' the corresponding figures are twenty-one and one. Setting the combined Goldsmith texts against 'Igluka' gives a score of −4.46; against 'Alcanor' the score is −3.15.

(12) *word-length*: in examining Goldsmith's contributions to the *Busy Body*, we found that a count of the number of words of four or more syllables proved to be an effective marker (Dixon and Mannion, 2007a, p. 441). For the current study we have selected twelve Goldsmith samples, from his most serious pieces, and added four from *Polite Learning*, to make an appropriate comparison with 'Belles Lettres'. For Goldsmith, the counts (percentage of four and more syllable words per sample) have a mean of 3.956 and a standard deviation of 0.765. The count for 'Gracchi' is 5.7, and for the first two samples of 'Belles Lettres' 7.2 and 5.6, producing scores of 2.28, 4.24 and 2.15, respectively.

(13) *word-patterns*: verbal patterning, as we have said, is a notable feature of 'Enjoyment of Life': 'our eyes were captivated with glare and glitter, and our ears with noise and clamour ... .. we visited friends whom we did not love, and invited company whom we could not esteem.' To quantify these symmetries we assign points according to the length of such grammatically equivalent word strands. The examples quoted are awarded four and seven points, respectively. The whole essay scores eighty-five points, equivalent to forty-four in a 750-word sample. The mean and standard deviation for the Goldsmith samples

are 15.325 and 7.381, respectively, giving a score for the essay of 3.89.

(14) *prepositional phrase at end of sentence*: to test a first impression that many sentences in 'Igluka' have a similar cadence, we calculated for that and some other doubtfuls the percentage of sentences which terminate in a prepositional phrase. The percentages for 'Omrah', 'Igluka', and 'National Union' are 82%, 78%, and 75%, respectively. Those for sixteen Goldsmith essays (omitting substantially translated pieces) have a mean of 54.313 and a standard deviation of 9.257. Comparing each of the three doubtfuls with Goldsmith gives scores of 2.56, 2.99 and 2.23.

(15) *imagery*: Goldsmith uses similes and metaphors quite sparingly. They can be witty, droll, occasionally learned or grotesque, sometimes commonplace and derivative, and almost always brief. Images from horticulture are invariably unoriginal—grafting, lopping, exotic plants that die in an unfavourable climate—quite different from those in 'Belles Lettres', where for example, some mental capacities 'are like the *pyra præcocia*' because they 'soon blow', while geniuses of slow growth produce fruit 'distinguished and admired for its well concocted juice and exquisite flavour'; the image is seventy words long. Another sustained comparison (fifty-eight words) regrets that genius, instead of resembling a 'vigorous tree', is now too often a 'stunted yew', while in treating of poetical merit the author promises 'to display those delightful parterres that teem with the fairest flowers of imagination', and to 'distinguish between the gaudy offspring of a cold insipid fancy and the glowing progeny, diffusing sweets, produced and invigorated by the sun of genius'. Towards its conclusion 'National Prejudices' introduces an image 177 words long, of 'the slender vine' of prejudice twisting round 'the sturdy oak' of patriotism, while the 'bastard sprouts' of superstition and enthusiasm need cutting back before the 'goodly tree' of religion can flourish.[4] 'National Union' presents the strongest contrast with Goldsmith. To elaborate the distinction between moderate and violent political opposition, the writer creates a welter of 'confused' and 'grandiloquent' images (Golden, 1955b, p. 437)—gale, storm, frost, hurricane, shipwreck, an overflowing river, and a final gale which endangers the ship of state. Imagery accounts for almost a third of the essay's 1,340 words.

We add three further markers, but with some reservations.

(16) *hath*: the corpus contains two occurrences, one deliberately archaic—Mrs Quickly's 'where [Falstaff] hath flitted'—the other religious: the supernatural Genius tells Asem 'the father of the faithful . . . hath sent me'. 'Belles Lettres' uses the form five times, in non-specialized contexts (e.g. 'This . . . is a violent figure [of speech], and hath been justly condemned'). This suggests that 'Belles Lettres' is unlikely to be Goldsmith's—unlikely, but not impossible. *Hath* appears four times in Goldsmith's reviews for the *Monthly* (*Works* i, pp. 41, 80, 84, 131), in *Polite Learning*, together with 'praiseth' and 'furnisheth' (*Works*, i, pp. 294, 306) and later in the preface to Guthrie's *General History*, published in 1764 (*Works*, v, p. 283). So although Goldsmith avoided *hath* in his magazine articles (as being inappropriately formal or solemn), we cannot be certain that he might not have used it, almost by accident, in one or more of the doubtfuls. That we find it in 'Pride', 'National Union', 'Physiognomy', 'Irish Bards', 'On Fascination', and the Introduction to 'A curious Incident', as well as 'Belles Lettres', arouses our suspicions. The suspicions are numerous, but may not all be well founded.

(17) *authorial 'we'*: Goldsmith satirized its use as early as 1759: 'The most diminutive son of fame, or of famine, has his *we* and his *us*, his *firstlys* and his *secondlys*' (*Works*, i, p. 319).[5] Not considering himself a mere son of fame, Goldsmith refrains from *we* and *us* in

his magazine work. (The apparent exception, in the original (1760) text of 'On the Assemblies of Russia', is part of a paragraph derived from an 'ordonnance de Police'.) Caroline Tupper pointed out that authorial *we* appears throughout 'Belles Lettres', beginning with 'we shall proceed to observe' in its third sentence. She adduced this as strong evidence against Goldsmith's authorship (Tupper, 1924, p. 337). Other doubtful texts using *we* are 'Instinct', 'Physiognomy', and 'Gracchi', which begins 'We know not a character of antiquity which can be produced as a rival to that of the present minister.' But to return to 'On the Assemblies of Russia': when he revised the text for his *Essays* Goldsmith twice replaced *I* with *we*. Perhaps he defensively adopted a lofty tone ('has never before been printed that we know of') because the essay is a lightweight affair. Authorial *we*, despite his earlier mockery, had not been completely abandoned.

(18) *'though' with flanking adjectives*: we find two such constructions in 'Miss Stanton': 'a true though artless tale' and 'some modest tho' reluctant efforts'. There is nothing of this type in the corpus; the *Life of Nash*, however, has 'this honest, tho' veteran gamester' (*Works*, iii, p. 312) and an early review has 'a laudable, though perhaps mistaken, zeal' (*Works*, i, p. 125).

Finally, the expression of opinions that are at odds with an author's consistently held views and values must provoke doubts. A eulogy of pastoral poetry could be attributed to Johnson only if we could take it as burlesque. But to invoke Johnson is to recall his severe verdict that 'Goldsmith had no settled notions upon any subject' (Boswell, 1980, p. 917; an earlier version appears on p. 511). It may be hazardous to rely on the stability of many of Goldsmith's views over a long period, but his dislike, even detestation, of flattery was constant throughout his life (Dixon, 1991, pp. 26–30, and 140). 'Gracchi' is a fulsome tribute to Pitt, a piece of 'unabashed puffery' (Taylor, 1993, p. 26). Goldsmith was averse to flattering anyone, but Pitt is a particularly improbable recipient of his praise, since he disapproved of the Prime Minister's aggressive foreign policy (*Works*, ii, pp. 72–5, 213).

Though Goldsmith had a low opinion of the collective 'vulgar' (e.g. *Works*, i, pp. 470–3, 480, ii, p. 369), and could make fun of pretentious and ungrammatical 'moral philosophers' (*Works*, iii, pp. 15–16), he does not discredit such people by contrasting them with their social superiors. In his essay 'On Clubs' (*Works*, iii, pp. 6–16) 'my lord and Sir Paul', prominent members of a '*club of fashion*', are as unappealing in their own way as the somnolent members of the '*Muzzy Club*'. The essay 'On Pride', however, concludes with a lengthy point-by-point comparison between a gaudy vain lieutenant, the son of an exciseman, and a well-born, well-mannered, and elegant doctor. The latter has 'an extensive family-interest', whereas the former 'was but lately introduced to any sort of decent commerce'. Such favouring of birth and breeding is not Goldsmith's way.

When discussing national characteristics, Goldsmith repeatedly describes the English as proud (*Works*, ii, pp. 27, 32, 36; iii, p. 248; iv, p. 263), and asserts that they are not frugal by nature (*Works*, i, p. 435). Of the three adjectives applied to the English in 'Climates'—pensive, modest, and frugal—the two last are completely at odds with Goldsmith's characterization. And, at least for the period covered by our 'doubtfuls', he firmly believed that poetry was not poetry unless it was in rhyme. He declared that 'the English cannot have Odes in blank Verse', noted 'many unsuccessful attempts' to dispense with rhyme, and condemned 'the tuneless flow of our blank verse' (*Works*, i, pp. 113, 319, 319; also i, p. 505 and ii, p. 172). In complete contrast, 'Belles Lettres' sneers at rhyme—'this vile monotony', 'the jingle of similar sounds'—and praises those poems of

Collins and Warton which are free of the 'restraint' of rhyme.

These un-Goldsmithian attitudes and opinions can be added to our list of markers:

(19) *flattery of Pitt*
(20) *snobbery*
(21) *The English as modest and frugal*
(22) *antipathy to rhyme*

4.4 Parallels

As we have said, even the most favourable results from stylistic tests can take us no further than 'possibly by Goldsmith'. To move from 'possibly' to 'probably', we need the positive evidence that has traditionally been supplied by parallels of word and thought.

Traditionally, but not always infallibly: what appear to be verbal parallels may be merely expressions current at the time. This pitfall is not the hazard it used to be, thanks to the Gale database Eighteenth-Century Collections Online (ECCO). An example of its invaluable assistance: 'True History' begins 'In the flowery paths of novel and romance…'; Goldsmith's preface to Wiseman's *Grammar* (1764) has 'the flowery paths of pleasure' (*Works*, v, p. 311). The contexts are suggestively similar—the leading of young minds—but 'flowery paths' does not in itself qualify as evidence of authorship, since for the period 1740–60 ECCO produces twenty-six examples, including the delightful 'flowery paths of tuneful song'.

There are, however, secure grounds for attributing 'True History' to Goldsmith. Friedman cites parallels—important because they antedate the piece—from a letter to Goldsmith's brother, an early review, and Letter 18 of *The Citizen of the World* (*Works*, iii, pp. 120–1). The last of these had already been noted by J. W. M. Gibbs, who also thought that Letter 66, some seven weeks later than 'True History', taught the 'same lesson' (Gibbs, 1885–86, iv, p. 484, n. 1). Both phrasing and marital situation are comparable: at the end of 'True History' 'James and his wife rubbed through life with much contentment, and now and then some sparring'; *The Citizen of the World* describes 'A fidler and his wife, who had rubbed through life, as most couples usually do, sometimes good friends, at others not quite so well' (*Works* ii, p. 275). In both quality and quantity these parallels carry weight.

'Carolan' begins 'There can be perhaps no greater entertainment than to compare …'. Two very similar formulas—'There is perhaps, no …' and 'There is not, perhaps …'—occur three times each in Goldsmith's work between 1757 and 1759. More important, they appear twice as the first words of an essay, as here, and twice at the beginning of a paragraph (*Works*, i, pp. 353, 473; i, p. 27; iii, p. 243; the other instances are at i, p. 435 and iii, p. 264). For the period 1740–65, ECCO gives only three comparable examples from other authors. The phrasing is sufficiently frequent in Goldsmith, and sufficiently rare otherwise, to constitute a convincing parallel.

Sir James Prior was the first to attribute 'Miss Stanton' to Goldsmith, seeing it as 'something like the first rude germ' of *The Vicar of Wakefield* (Prior, 1837, i, p. 350). The affinities are obvious. Mr Stanton is a benevolent clergyman whose beloved daughter is seduced by a rake who treacherously abuses her father's hospitality, but to whom she is at last honourably married. The differences, however, are also plain: Fanny Stanton does not elope, as Olivia does, nor is she duped into a fake marriage. Moreover, the common elements of the two plots, apart from the concluding nuptials, can be found elsewhere. In no. 25 of *The World* (21 June 1753), Chesterfield relates the story of a well-educated daughter of a clergyman seduced by a 'perfidious wretch', and the heroine of the first of *The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen House* (1760) is also a clergyman's daughter, the victim of the son of her mistress.

The really significant parallel is a parallel with a difference. Stanton produces a pair of pistols and challenges the unrepentant Dawson 'as a man of honour'. Primrose, hearing of Olivia's elopement, reaches down *his* pistols and vows to 'pursue the traitor'. Reproached by his wife and son, he relinquishes the weapons, and goes to Thornhill's castle only to upbraid its master, and 'if possible, to bring back my daughter' (*Works*, iv, pp. 91–3).

Both fathers feel strongly that family honour has been 'contaminated' (both use the same verb). But Primrose forgoes revenge, while Stanton compromises himself by invoking the code of honour which sanctions duelling. If Goldsmith wrote 'Miss Stanton', then in *The Vicar of Wakefield* he offered a morally superior version of the retribution plot; if not, recalling the earlier, anonymous story, he used it as a starting point for his own more complex development.

Charles Osgood entertained the idea that 'Miss Stanton' might have 'served as a source of suggestion to Goldsmith for his novel' (a view to which we incline). But he judged it 'more probable' that Goldsmith 'wrote it himself' (Osgood, 1907, p. 246). Support for the second alternative, as Osgood recognized, comes less from *The Vicar of Wakefield* than from the story of Zelis in *The Citizen of the World* (*Works*, ii, pp. 246–50). This story had appeared in the *Public Ledger* eight days before 'Miss Stanton'. Zelis's father has been mortally wounded in a duel with his daughter's admirer, who is guilty, not of seducing her, as her father mistakenly supposes, but only of a breach of promise:

> I found him, the assertor of my honour, my only friend and supporter, the tutor and companion of my youth . . . just expiring . . . . "My dear, dear child, cried he, dear, though you have forgotten your own honour and stained mine, I will yet forgive you; by abandoning your virtue you have undone me and yourself . . . ." He expired . . . . I called out upon the dead body that lay stretched before me, and in the agony of my heart asked why he could have left me thus? Why, my dear, my only Pappa, why could you ruin me thus, and yourself for ever! [text of the *Public Ledger*]

Osgood found 'a striking correspondence of language' (Osgood, 1907, p. 249), first with Mr Stanton's reproachful speech:

> Fanny, my child, my child . . . Why was this, thou dear lost deluded excellence? Why have you undone yourself and me?

Secondly, after the sham duel between Dawson and Stanton, Fanny, rushing to the scene,

> was the first to see her guardian, instructor, her only friend, fallen in defence of her honour. In an agony of distress she fell lifeless upon the body stretched before her; but soon recovering into an existence worse than annihilation, she expostulated with the body, and demanded a reason for his thus destroying all her happiness and his own.

Are the verbal parallels and near-parallels—'agony of my heart'/'agony of distress', 'undone me and yourself'/'undone yourself and me', 'only friend', etc.—quite as striking as Osgood believed, or merely the predictable currency of such dramatic (or melodramatic) scenes? Brian Vickers (2007, p. 207) has cautioned against identifying parallels when the same subject-matter generates 'similar expressions'. We should also consider the possibility that Goldsmith could have seen 'Miss Stanton' before it was published. John Nichols, in a brief account of the work of Griffith Jones, writes: 'In the Literary Magazine with Johnson, and in the *British Magazine* with Smollett and Goldsmith, his anonymous labours were also associated' (Nichols, 1812–15, iii, p. 465). 'With Johnson' because Johnson was the editor of the *Literary*. Does 'with Smollett and Goldsmith' imply that Goldsmith had an editorial role, as an assistant to Smollett, in the *British*? If so, Goldsmith could have read the manuscript of 'Miss Stanton' when it was submitted for publication. And if so, Goldsmith being the literary magpie that he was, some of its phrases could have been carried over into the Zelis narrative. In any event, the parallels to both *The Citizen of the World* and *The Vicar of Wakefield* do not seem decisive.

Parallels of thought and attitude may legitimately prompt investigation, but like verbal parallels, and for the same reason, may prove to be deceptive: 'beliefs that were commonplaces of the age . . . cannot be allowed to count for much' (Love, 2002, p. 81). 'True History' expresses strong distrust of romances, those glamorous misleaders of youth. The same distrust certainly appears in some of

Goldsmith's early reviews, but, as Friedman observed, the attitude is not his alone (*Works*, iii, p. 120, n. 2). Nor is the argument for cosmopolitanism which is advanced in 'National Prejudices'. The most that can be asserted is that the views are consistent with views that Goldsmith also expresses.

The thesis of 'Climates' has antecedents in *Polite Learning* (*Works*, i, p. 263), and reappears in Goldsmith's *History of the Earth, The Citizen of the World* (Letter 91), and *The Traveller*. But as Roger Lonsdale points out, the impact of climate on character 'occupied many writers during the 1740's and the following decades': he cites Montesquieu, Gray, and François Espiard de la Borde (Lonsdale, 1969, p. 627). Almost half of 'Climates', as Michael Griffin has shown, either closely paraphrases or directly quotes the English translation (1753) of de la Borde's treatise (Griffin, 1999). Goldsmith was never unwilling to appropriate material, without much attempt at concealment, from any convenient source. But he was not alone in such literary freebooting. The second part of the essay considers the physiological impact of climate. Crane cites comparable passages from the *The History of the Earth*; since the phrasing is not close, these prove no more than that both texts draw on the same source, the third volume of Buffon's *Histoire naturelle* (1749). The presence of a topic which Goldsmith handles elsewhere, and of authorities which he appeals to elsewhere, may lead us (as it led Crane) to consider Goldsmith as a possible candidate. We still need to find positive evidence of his involvement.

With 'A Dream: the Elysian Fields' (July, 1760) Crane argued that Goldsmith's dislike of flattery, and his concomitant concern for justice, would have attracted him to the French original, which satirizes those who lavish praise on Homer, and notes that 'great men who owe their immortality to flattery, and unjustly imputed merit' are conspicuously absent from Elysium (Crane, 1934, p. 144). We are nudged a little closer towards Goldsmith by Crane's observing that the somewhat obscure source—van Effen's *Le Misantrope*—had been utilized in the *Bee*. The earlier 'Dream: The Fountains of Good Sense' (May, 1760) also expresses dislike of flattery, and does so in a paragraph which is not dependent on the French source.

A rather slender parallel was one element in Crane's hesitant attribution of 'A Letter Supposed to be Written by the Moorish Secretary in London, to his Correspondent in Fez' (January, 1760; Crane, 1927, pp. 1–4). Crane links this faux-naive account of sacrifices on the 'altar' of a card-table, with Altangi's visit to St Paul's, where the congregation appears to worship the sound of the organ (*Works*, ii, pp. 173–4). Friedman dismissed Crane's attribution, mainly because the description of the card-game is a 'fairly close translation' of the 'Fragment d'une lettre siamoise' in Dufresny's *Les Amusemens sérieux et comiques* of 1699 (*Works*, iii, p. 90). The proximate source, however, is Tom Brown's part translation, part paraphrase of Dufresny in his *Amusements Serious and Comical*, published in 1700 (Conant, 1908, p. 163). Brown's North American Indian writes: 'The *English* pretend that they Worship but one God, but for my Part, I don't believe what they say: For besides several Living Divinities, to which we may see them daily offer their Vows, they have several other Inanimate ones to whom they pay Sacrifices . . .' (Brown, 1707–08, iii, p. 69). The Moorish Secretary has: 'The English profess their belief only in one Supreme Being, and pretend to pay their adoration to him alone. But this is all a mere pretence; for, besides some living divinities, to whom they pay homage, there are a number of inanimate beings, to which every night they devoutly sacrifice . . .'. Only the first two sentences of the 'Letter' are not thus closely indebted to Brown. Goldsmith's essay 'On Clubs' begins by referring to Tom Brown's works, specifically, as Friedman notes, to an earlier passage in *Amusements*. That some two months later he should offer a rewriting of Brown to the *British Magazine* is not inconceivable, and puts Crane's other grounds for attribution in a stronger light: the first sentence describes the English as 'this proud people', as Goldsmith regularly does; the replacing of an 'Indian' by a 'Moorish' writer may be a 'surviving trace' of Goldsmith's original scheme

for what became the 'Chinese Letters': Prior reported a tradition that Goldsmith intended 'to make his hero a native of Morocco or Fez' (Prior, 1837, i, p. 360). Further possible, though slight, signs of Goldsmith's hand are the omission of Brown's 'likewise' (a word which Goldsmith avoided in his essays), the reducing of a list of four items to a triplet (a construction which Goldsmith favoured), and the presence of a triplet in the opening sentence. The likelihood of his responsibility for this unoriginal piece is a little greater than Friedman allowed.

5 Internal Evidence and the Individual Essays

Table 1 assembles the items of internal evidence for each doubtful text, and gives a verdict based on that evidence alone. We are mindful of the threat to our results posed by the unidentified author who shares aspects of Goldsmith's style. It follows that we assign less weight to positive than to negative evidence derived from linguistic features and sentence-length scores. By the same token we allow even a single strong visible marker

Table 1 Conclusions

Essay	Linguistic features	Sentence-length	Visible markers	Parallels	By Goldsmith?
Omrah	G,G,G*	G	2,4,14		Unlikely
Gracchi	G*	G	12,(17),19		Almost certainly not
Music	G	G	7		Possibly
Igluka	G*,G*,G	G	11,14		Unlikely
Climates	G	G	21		Possibly
Alcanor	G*,G*,G*	G*	11		Almost certainly not
Vincent and Brent	G*,G*	G*	3,6,7		Almost certainly not
Carolan	G	G*	3	✓	Probably[a]
True History	G	G		✓✓✓✓	Almost certainly
Miss Stanton	G,G,G*	G	7,(18)	(✓✓)	Possibly
National Prejudices	G*,G*	G	15		Almost certainly not
Enjoyment of Life	G,G*	G*	13		Unlikely
Pride	G*, G*	G?	(16),20		Unlikely
Fondness of Parents	G*,G,G*	G?	10		Unlikely
Physiognomy	G*	G*	(16,17)		Unlikely
Instinct	G,G	G*	2,(17)		Unlikely
Approaching Coronation	G*	G			Almost certainly not[b]
National Union	G*,G*	G*	14,15,(16)		Almost certainly not
Hired Writer	G	G?	8,9		Unlikely
Belles Lettres	G*,G*,G*,G	G*	4,5,12,15,(16,17),22		Almost certainly not[c]
Female Warriors	G*,G*	G*			Unlikely
False Religions	G	G*			Unlikely[d]
Irish Bards	G*	G	1,(16)		Unlikely

[a]'Carolan': the evidence pulls both ways; perhaps Goldsmith borrowed some anecdotal material, without fully absorbing it.

[b]'Approaching Coronation': almost certainly by Johnson, to whom it was attributed by Bishop Percy (McAdam, 1942, p. 197). The opening clause—'That a time of war is a time of parsimony . . .'—strongly suggests Johnson, eleven of whose periodical essays begin with a *that*-clause; none of Goldsmith's does.

[c]'Belles Lettres': probably by Smollett; the evidence includes a strong parallel between its final paragraphs and a review in the *Critical*, convincingly attributed to Smollett (Tupper, 1924, pp. 338–41; Basker, 1988, pp. 243–4); a parallel with *Peregrine Pickle* (Boucé, 1971, p. 430, n. 4); an advertisement for the *British Magazine*, 'probably written by Smollett himself', listing 'Belles Lettres' among his regular contributions (Brack, 1994, pp. 284–5).[6]

[d]'False Religions': Pitcher noted that the essay is signed 'H.D.', 'a signature used elsewhere by Goldsmith and probably his here' (Pitcher, 2000, p. 24). 'Probably' is an adverb too far. The first three letters of 'A Comparative View of Races and Nations' are signed 'H.D.'. They are almost certainly Goldsmith's, but are the only pieces by him which bear this signature. Pitcher himself has demonstrated the unreliability of signatures in the *British Magazine*, especially when, as here, they are attached to contributions addressed 'To the Authors' (Pitcher, 1981, 1986).

(i.e. one with a high score) to depress a set of positive scores; a visible marker is, by its nature, the sign of a writer who does not share that particular characteristic with Goldsmith.

Under Linguistic Features we give a score for each of the forty-three samples from the doubtful texts: G represents a score consistent with the Goldsmith profile, G? a borderline score, and G* a score that does not fit well with the Goldsmith profile. For Visible Markers (each of which provides evidence against the possibility of Goldsmith's authorship) we use the marker numbers, as in Section 4.3. A tick corresponds to one of the parallels discussed in Section 4.4, and provides evidence in favour of the possibility of Goldsmith's authorship. Curved brackets enclose those markers and parallels about which we have expressed reservations.

6 Conclusions

It is only too clear that for the majority of the texts reprinted in *E & C* the internal evidence would argue for their removal from the canon. That evidence is not cast-iron: we have acknowledged the area of uncertainty in the textual basis of our investigation (Section 4 above). Assessment of verbal parallels is highly subjective, and in the absence of supporting material positive scores have to be treated with caution.

Is the external evidence more trustworthy? We believe that the inclusion in *E & C* of 'Approaching Coronation' and the review of Butler's poetry did not have the warrant which Seward's preface claimed for the whole compilation, namely the testimony of Thomas Wright. And as we noted in Section 3, the editing of *E & C* leaves something to be desired. Seward did not scruple to pass off his own words as Goldsmith's, to make the translated essay on fascination appear to be original, and to tidy up the *British Magazine* text. There would seem no reason to give priority to the claims of *E & C*.

The internal evidence for seven items in *E & C* is so adverse that the history of the edition looks rather different from Seward's account. We conclude that Wright submitted only a modest list of Goldsmith's contributions to the *Critical* and the *British*, comprising ten reviews and perhaps five or six essays.[7] Eager to disengage Goldsmith's pieces from 'the rubbish with which they were surrounded' (*E & C*, ii, p. vi), the compilers overruled or overpersuaded Wright. (He would no doubt have admitted that other duties in Hamilton's shop sometimes took him away from working on the *British*, and that his list might therefore not be complete.) Whenever they perceived a link, however tenuous, with authentic Goldsmith, the compilers appropriated the essay in question. Goldsmith could have written 'Omrah' because he had certainly written the 'Eastern Tale' of Asem, and 'Belles Lettres' because he had discussed literary taste in *Polite Learning*. 'Enjoyment of Life' begins and ends by referring to his disabled veteran, to whose narrative it stands in explicit contrast. Jacob Henriques, the butt of contemporary satirists, is mocked in 'Female Warriors' and in *The Citizen of the World*. The narrator of 'On Clubs' claims to be skilled in physiognomy, and in 'National Prejudices' the phrase 'citizen/s of the world' occurs three times—an irresistible temptation.

The internal evidence, though not without its shortcomings, is, we believe, less fallible than the external evidence of *E & C*, and has a bearing on the later attributions. We conclude that 'True History' is almost certainly Goldsmith's, and 'Carolan' probably his. In the 'possible' category we place the Moorish Secretary's letter, 'Music', 'Climates', the two 'Dream' pieces, and 'Miss Stanton'.

It seems to us unlikely that Goldsmith wrote 'Omrah', 'Igluka', 'Enjoyment of Life', 'Pride', 'Fondness of Parents', 'Physiognomy', 'Instinct', 'Hired Writer', 'Female Warriors', 'False Religions', and 'Irish Bards'.

The remaining pieces we judge to be almost certainly not by Goldsmith: 'Gracchi', 'Alcanor', 'Vincent and Brent', 'National Prejudices', 'Approaching Coronation', 'National Union', and 'Belles Lettres'.

We began by accepting Robert Hume's dictum that all conclusions must be regarded as provisional.

Caution is perhaps less necessary at the extremities: our investigation has helped to strengthen the case for Goldsmith's authorship of 'True History' and 'Carolan', and against his having written 'Gracchi', 'Belles Lettres', and the other pieces in our final category. The present article supersedes our previous study of the *British Magazine*, but makes no claim to finality. While we await modification or correction of our methods and results, we suggest that the majority of the pieces we have examined should revert to the status which they had on their first, anonymous, appearances.

References

Basker, J. G. (1988). *Tobias Smollett: Critic and Journalist*. Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Boswell, J. (1980). *Life of Johnson*. Ed. Chapman, R. W., revised Fleeman, J. D. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boucé, P.-G. (1971). *Les Romans de Smollett: Etude Critique*. Paris: Didier.

Brack, O. M. (1994). Tobias Smollett puffs his histories. In Brack, O. M. (ed.), *Writers, Books, and Trade: an Eighteenth-Century Miscellany for William B. Todd*. New York: AMS.

Brown, T. (1707–08). *The Works of Mr. Thomas Brown*, 3 vols., London: Samuel Briscoe.

Conant, M. P. (1908). *The Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Crane, R. S. (ed.) (1927). *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crane, R. S. (1934). Goldsmith and Justus van Effen. *Times Literary Supplement*, 1 March 1940, 144.

Crane, R. S. (1940). Oliver Goldsmith. In Bateson, F. W. (ed.), *The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, vol. ii, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

de Montluzin, E. L. (2007). Attributions of authorship in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, *1776-79:* a supplement to the *Union List. Notes and Queries*, **252**: 472–82.

Dixon, P. (1991). *Oliver Goldsmith Revisited*. Boston: G. K. Hall.

Dixon, P. and Mannion, D. (1998). Goldsmith and the *British Magazine*. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, **13**: 37–49.

Dixon, P. and Mannion, D. (2007a). Goldsmith and the *Busy Body*. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, **22**: 435–46.

Dixon, P. and Mannion, D. (2007b). Goldsmith's contributions to the *Weekly Magazine*. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, **22**: 447–68.

Downie, J. A. (2004). What if Delarivier Manley did *not* write *The Secret History of Queen Zarah? The Library*, **5**: 247–64.

Fleeman, J.D. (1967) Review of Friedman, A. (ed.) *Collected Works of Oliver Goldsmith. Review of English Studies*, new series **18**: 212–14.

Friedman, A. (1946). Goldsmith's contributions to the *Critical Review*. *Modern Philology*, **44**: 23–52.

Friedman, A. (1971). Oliver Goldsmith. In Watson, G. (ed.), *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature*, vol. ii, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Furbank, P. N. and Owens, W. R. (1994). *Defoe De-Attributions: A Critique of J.R. Moore's 'Checklist'*. London and Ohio: Hambledon Press.

Gibbs, J. W. M. (1885–86). *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, 5 vols., London: George Bell and Sons.

Golden, M. (1955a). Goldsmith and 'The Distresses of an Hired Writer'. *Notes and Queries*, **200**: 164–5.

Golden, M. (1955b). Goldsmith and 'National Concord'. *Notes and Queries*, **200**: 436–8.

Golden, M. (1959). Two essays erroneously attributed to Goldsmith. *Modern Language Notes*, **74**: 13–16.

Griffin, M. (1999). Oliver Goldsmith and François-Ignace Espiard de la Borde: an Instance of Plagiarism. *Review of English Studies*, **50**: 59–63.

Hume, R. D. (1999). *Reconstructing Contexts: The Aims and Principles of Archaeo-Historicism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krzanowski, W. J. and Marriot, F. H. C. (1994). *Multivariate Analysis, Part 2*. London: Arnold.

Lonsdale, R. (ed.) (1969). *The Poems of Thomas Gray, William Collins, Oliver Goldsmith*. London: Longman.

Love, H. (2002). *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mannion, D. and Dixon, P. (2004). Sentence-length and authorship: the case of Oliver Goldsmith. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, **19**: 497–508.

McAdam, E. L. (1942). New essays by Dr. Johnson. *Review of English Studies*, **18**: 197–207.

McKenzie, D. F. (1978). *Stationers' Company Apprentices, 1701-1800*. Oxford: Oxford Bibliographical Society.

Nichols, J. (1812–15). *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 9 vols., London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley.

Nichols, J. and Nichols, J. B. (1817–58). *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols., London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley.

Osgood, C. G. (1907). Notes on Goldsmith. *Modern Philology*, **5**: 241–52.

Pitcher, E. W. (1981). Inconsistent attributions and arbitrary signatures in Smollett's *British Magazine* (1760–67). *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America*, **75**: 443–7.

Pitcher, E. W. (1986). Further remarks on arbitrary signatures in the *British Magazine* (1760–67). *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America*, **80**: 91–2.

Pitcher, E. W. R. (2000). *The British Magazine, January 1760–December 1767: An Annotated Index of Signatures, Ascriptions, Subjects, and Titles of Literary Prose*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

Prior, J. (1837). *The Life of Oliver Goldsmith*, 2 vols., London: John Murray.

Reed, I. (1795). Life of Goldsmith. In *Poems by Goldsmith and Parnell*. London: W. Bulmer and Co.

Sherbo, A. (1989). *Isaac Reed, Editorial Factotum. English Literature Studies, Monograph Series 49*. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.

Taylor, R. C. (1993). *Goldsmith as Journalist*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.

Tupper, C. F. (1924). Essays erroneously attributed to Goldsmith. *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, **39**: 325–42.

Vickers, B. (2002). *'Counterfeiting' Shakespeare: Evidence, Authorship, and John Ford's 'Funerall Elegye'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vickers, B. (2007). *Shakespeare, 'A Lover's Complaint', and John Davies of Hereford*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Notes

1 The results of our analysis will be presented in a forthcoming study of Goldsmith's contributions to the *Critical Review*.

2 *Collected Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. Arthur Friedman, 5 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966, iii, p. 99 (text of 1760). This edition is hereafter cited as *Works*.

3 Friedman expressed a doubt as to the authenticity of 'Sabinus and Olinda': *Works*, i, p. 490 n. 1. The tale is essay d_{24} (sample 44) in Tables C.1 and C.2, and sample 24 in Table C.3, of Appendix C; its scores of 0.295 for linguistic features and 0.109 for sentence-length are consistent with Goldsmith's authorship.

4 Golden cites *Works*, ii, p. 431: Goldsmith believed that persecuting religious enthusiasts would give them 'fresh vigour' (Golden, 1959, pp. 14–15).

5 Compare the ironical advocacy of 'we' in 'Some Rules by which a Man may appear learned', *Weekly Magazine*, no. 6; the parallel strengthens the case for Goldsmith's authorship of this squib: see Dixon and Mannion, (2007b, pp. 448, 460).

6 We are most grateful to Barbara Laning Fitzpatrick for drawing this essay to our attention. Professor Fitzpatrick is currently investigating the likelihood of Smollett's authorship of several items in *E & C*, including 'Omrah' and 'Igluka'.

7 The list would also have included the four pieces from the *Westminster Magazine* reproduced in vol. iii of *E & C*. Since Wright printed the *Westminster* in his own shop, the essays are almost certainly canonical (*Works*, iii, p. 205).

Appendix A

A.1 Control authors

Our tests are based on the following periodical essays. The years cited are those in which these essays appeared.

John Boyle, 5th Earl of Cork: *The World*, nos 47, 68, 161 (1753–56); *The Connoisseur*, no. 23 (1754).

Richard Owen Cambridge: *The World*, nos 107, 108, 116, 123, 206 (1755–56).

George Colman and Bonnell Thornton: *The Connoisseur*, nos 8, 57, 71, 80, 114, 131 (1754–56).

Samuel Johnson: *The Adventurer*, nos 45, 67, 84, 99, 102 (1753); *The Idler*, nos 2, 26, 53, 83, 100 (1758–60).
Hugh Kelly: *The Babler*, nos 3, 9, 17, 19, 36, 41, 46, 66 (1763–64).
Edward Moore: *The World*, nos 75, 128, 138, 173, 194 (1754–56).
Arthur Murphy: *The Gray's Inn Journal*, nos 52, 68, 76, 79, 84, 91 (1753–54).
Philip Dormer Stanhope, 4th Earl of Chesterfield: *The World*, nos 24, 49, 100, 105, 111 (1753–55).
Horace Walpole: *The World*, nos 6, 10, 14, 28, 103 (1753–54).
Joseph Warton: *The Adventurer*, nos 109, 127, 129, 133, 139 (1753–54).

Appendix B

B.1. Linguistic features

(fb = followed by; pb = preceded by)

(1) Occurrences of a group of emphatic words: *even*, *ever*, *every*, *much*, *only*, *so*, *such*, *too*, *whole* (n. and adj.), *yet*.
(2) Total number of verbs, main and auxiliary.
(3) Occurrences of present and past participles and gerunds.
(4) Ratio (as a percentage of all main verbs) of verbs fb a preposition or prepositional adverb.
(5) Occurrences of expressions of negation (other than verbs), e.g. *nay*, *no*, *nothing*, including words with negative affixes.
(6) Ratio of complex sentences to complex+compound+compound-complex sentences.
(7) Occurrences of selected expressions of contrast, difference, and reservation, e.g. *however*, *instead of*, *neither . . . nor*, *whether . . . or*.
(8) Percentage of sentences beginning with a subordinate clause.
(9) Occurrences of *for* (both conjunction and preposition).
(10) Occurrences of tentative expressions, understatements, concessive words and phrases, formulas of politeness and modesty, e.g. *perhaps*, *give me leave*, *for my part*, *possibly*.
(11) Occurrences of noun or pronoun fb adverb or adverbial phrase.
(12) Ratio of main clauses to main + subordinate clauses (other than 'reporting' clauses such as 'he said').
(13) Percentage of sentences with a main verb as the penultimate word.
(14) Auxiliary verb pb noun as percentage of all auxiliary verbs.
(15) Percentage of sentences terminating in an adjective or adverb, or equivalent phrase.
(16) Occurrences of *the* fb adjective, as a percentage of all occurrences of *the*.
(17) Occurrences of a co-ordinating or subordinating conjunction or relative pronoun fb a relative pronoun or subordinating conjunction, e.g. *and that*, *but although*, *that if*, *if when*.
(18) Ratio, as a percentage of all main verbs, of occurrences of *to be* and *to find*.
(19) Total number of adjectives.
(20) Occurrences of noun or adjective + coordinating conjunction + noun or adjective, e.g. 'blood and altercation', 'ridiculous or pleasing light'.
(21) Percentage of sentences having a deictic (excluding pronouns) or connective among their first four words.
(22) Occurrences of *that* and *zero-that* clauses.
(23) Percentage of single-clause sentences.
(24) Occurrences of selected deictics and connectives, including *accordingly*, *also*, *besides*, *on this occasion*, *thus*.
(25) Occurrences of preposition fb present participle or gerund.
(26) Occurrences of three- and four-word prepositional phrases, e.g. 'in this situation', 'a labourer in the magazine trade'.
(27) Adjective/verb ratio: adjectives as a percentage of main verbs (less *to be*) + adjectives.
(28) Occurrences of selected adverbs.
(29) Words and constructions favoured by Goldsmith (though not uniquely his): twenty items, including triplets, *but* (= only), *still* fb *however*, *at last*, *no way*, *as* fb verb.

(30) Ratio, as a percentage of main verbs, of verb fb infinitive, e.g. 'happen to come'.
(31) Percentage of sentences terminating in a monosyllable.
(32) Occurrences of *by* and *with*.
(33) Occurrences of a group of intensives: *all*, *any*, *entire -ly*, *indeed*, *must*, *very*.
(34) Occurrences of *as*, *or*, *so*, *such* (the last two only when unemphatic).

Appendix C

Table C.1 Linguistic feature counts for the *British Magazine* samples

	Features	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34
Essay	Sample																																		
d_1	1	3	113	21	34	10	54	0	3	2	4	1	51	0	47	6	29	0	13	60	11	31	0	27	4	3	71	42	8	7	9	21	27	1	7
	2	5	116	21	34	7	75	0	16	2	4	1	39	0	56	0	25	0	12	63	10	28	1	13	2	4	70	42	7	8	1	28	19	5	9
	3	6	119	10	34	13	54	2	0	3	2	2	51	0	76	0	22	0	7	45	16	24	1	15	1	1	64	34	11	3	4	18	28	7	4
d_2	4	8	121	9	25	11	70	1	11	5	5	2	44	4	42	15	43	5	22	82	17	23	5	26	2	1	61	55	2	11	5	11	19	9	6
d_3	5	18	136	11	18	11	65	8	3	5	16	5	44	11	74	11	45	3	26	77	5	22	1	30	7	6	36	49	15	6	5	24	15	6	13
d_4	6	7	148	12	28	12	83	9	16	2	3	2	44	0	51	11	35	3	25	63	3	41	6	22	7	2	44	46	20	9	4	29	12	9	9
d_5	7	10	100	29	42	8	59	4	0	1	1	7	41	0	56	5	21	0	7	56	20	14	1	23	1	7	57	42	12	11	4	18	22	6	13
	8	8	103	11	32	8	42	0	3	6	4	7	55	0	93	3	41	1	6	62	10	21	0	34	1	3	78	43	15	4	4	28	18	11	1
	9	7	114	14	28	23	41	2	12	2	6	3	52	0	73	4	37	1	8	61	8	31	2	15	2	5	71	40	8	6	6	19	16	5	8
d_6	10	11	111	9	27	7	83	4	5	3	12	7	37	5	50	38	33	4	29	81	7	29	1	14	7	5	60	56	18	14	4	48	11	4	12
d_7	11	4	130	18	27	16	52	1	13	3	5	2	38	8	73	8	32	0	16	62	8	17	9	4	1	3	73	41	8	7	2	17	14	8	2
	12	2	142	14	21	16	30	3	19	7	1	4	44	0	68	8	24	3	10	44	3	19	9	12	1	4	61	31	15	9	2	15	10	4	13
	13	5	128	11	24	16	42	1	21	5	3	5	53	7	69	7	24	2	13	55	8	38	4	17	3	0	73	40	8	5	4	28	18	5	3
d_8	14	17	130	9	18	12	70	8	4	6	24	5	38	0	55	4	22	2	21	56	1	9	8	13	5	5	50	39	18	8	4	17	7	7	14
	15	26	151	16	26	18	76	7	18	5	15	4	30	5	58	32	21	0	27	52	4	36	15	5	5	5	47	38	23	5	4	45	13	12	12
d_9	16	16	151	14	22	20	50	4	7	6	8	6	43	23	57	14	9	5	11	48	5	44	3	21	7	4	47	32	22	10	8	30	10	7	14
d_{10}	17	8	124	13	26	18	59	6	15	12	12	10	43	4	61	7	43	6	17	50	7	27	2	19	4	4	62	39	15	9	4	44	15	5	8
d_{11}	18	15	129	9	26	9	42	4	21	7	9	6	50	0	59	0	11	6	15	47	7	26	4	21	1	2	60	34	15	2	9	42	24	9	9
	19	10	139	11	22	10	60	0	21	4	5	16	52	6	64	15	46	4	9	59	4	24	1	24	7	4	56	37	25	4	4	39	18	8	7
	20	14	146	22	30	14	50	4	31	6	0	5	49	16	53	3	32	0	10	46	2	31	2	19	4	1	50	29	22	2	3	47	11	2	10
d_{12}	21	5	120	15	21	15	80	2	40	5	5	6	14	0	77	10	25	4	15	69	14	44	13	0	5	4	64	46	14	9	6	10	12	7	8
	22	20	126	12	17	27	80	4	38	2	7	4	26	6	56	19	38	7	33	66	15	19	17	6	5	7	47	50	9	12	0	19	4	10	15
d_{13}	23	14	120	10	23	18	39	3	8	6	7	2	44	4	63	4	28	0	13	62	5	22	0	25	1	6	71	43	7	2	1	25	18	4	4
	24	6	129	8	30	33	58	3	6	8	2	3	48	0	72	6	15	2	14	48	15	15	2	29	3	2	57	35	9	6	3	9	17	9	5
d_{14}	25	5	133	9	32	18	53	8	24	4	4	4	35	0	63	0	25	1	18	66	10	25	5	0	1	5	59	46	9	8	3	18	16	3	6
	26	4	117	14	29	11	41	1	4	9	1	1	53	0	68	8	12	2	15	65	9	21	6	29	1	4	75	46	9	11	1	13	12	7	6
d_{15}	27	26	140	9	19	31	78	4	6	5	1	9	43	16	50	13	25	5	23	47	1	33	2	28	3	0	42	35	7	6	5	31	9	9	4
	28	16	153	5	17	14	48	1	8	5	4	9	60	5	79	13	17	2	15	43	2	33	6	32	7	2	52	30	18	10	7	44	16	5	15
	29	7	161	16	34	16	59	1	2	9	5	9	59	13	69	20	26	1	21	39	2	29	9	41	2	5	52	28	22	14	2	57	14	7	7
d_{16}	30	9	138	24	31	10	76	3	16	4	4	3	24	5	74	0	17	5	9	51	10	41	10	11	3	9	58	36	15	5	5	16	21	5	41
d_{17}	31	3	125	7	29	12	50	5	22	4	5	4	44	0	50	0	25	0	16	48	12	41	3	0	6	3	72	39	15	7	7	6	19	12	13
	32	8	133	21	29	19	65	7	7	3	8	7	47	0	70	4	33	4	17	57	9	19	8	26	7	7	63	40	12	5	4	22	16	9	12
	32	5	129	14	29	15	58	6	13	3	7	5	46	0	59	2	28	2	17	53	11	27	5	16	6	5	67	40	13	6	6	16	17	11	13
d_{18}	33	13	124	8	34	22	31	9	26	6	13	2	39	0	56	0	10	4	13	47	9	44	0	16	1	0	82	37	7	6	4	26	10	12	6
	34	10	127	13	22	17	68	1	16	2	4	3	34	5	59	11	18	7	12	52	8	11	0	0	0	6	71	39	9	7	2	21	11	11	7
d_{19}	35	11	150	12	20	17	83	4	7	3	5	7	29	11	67	7	34	1	15	41	9	54	5	17	11	5	48	30	10	8	6	33	12	9	10
d_{20}	36	16	129	19	26	24	56	3	15	4	2	1	33	5	72	0	31	4	11	62	12	21	6	10	2	13	67	43	7	3	3	6	12	10	6
	37	11	145	15	32	21	48	2	8	1	5	0	45	4	56	8	18	2	5	68	21	40	4	8	4	1	53	44	6	10	3	12	22	8	9
	38	8	119	15	21	16	65	3	13	1	3	2	33	0	59	4	22	1	16	52	17	50	4	4	3	2	49	41	9	3	4	8	11	10	24
	39	13	127	28	28	13	68	5	22	3	2	0	30	0	78	4	13	1	14	54	9	22	6	21	6	8	59	39	8	5	6	22	13	6	18
d_{21}	40	3	131	14	28	10	82	1	28	3	3	3	25	6	20	6	28	4	15	49	10	24	9	6	1	5	68	37	8	7	4	39	16	7	10
	41	5	136	24	35	17	87	2	25	2	5	2	20	0	58	0	26	5	14	59	11	19	10	6	1	8	64	41	6	7	2	19	18	5	11
d_{22}	42	4	143	9	29	16	80	3	13	1	4	4	39	7	50	3	24	1	10	48	5	29	4	33	3	2	69	36	9	6	3	43	19	5	7
d_{23}	43	6	121	6	30	9	74	3	13	6	5	4	46	10	76	17	38	2	16	73	13	41	9	23	6	0	76	50	6	6	8	3	15	1	8
d_{24}	44	15	130	19	22	22	55	2	9	6	1	6	45	9	59	7	33	2	15	58	5	22	7	28	2	4	45	38	17	11	6	17	20	10	7

Table C.2 Linguistic feature scores

Sample	1	2	3[a]	4[a]	5	6[a]	7[a]	8	9	10[a]	11[a]
N_i	5	6	17	30	1	25	28	2	14	22	21
p_i	0.145	0.195	0.099	0.023	0.454	0.036	0.022	0.189	0.074	0.053	0.082
m_i	0.126	0.159	0.061	0.007	0.425	0.004	0.013	0.163	0.066	0.034	0.034
Sample	12[a]	13[a]	14[a]	15	16	17	18	19[a]	20[a]	21[a]	22
N_i	19	22	31	4	0	2	14	26	34	34	7
p_i	0.114	0.057	0.045	0.167	0.558	0.347	0.159	0.056	0.006	0.004	0.298
m_i	0.036	0.040	0.012	0.158	0.530	0.309	0.157	0.023	0.002	0.000	0.255
Sample	23[a]	24[a]	25[a]	26[a]	27	28[a]	29[a]	30	31	32[a]	33[a]
N_i	18	17	29	23	0	24	28	11	1	30	29
p_i	0.099	0.137	0.024	0.064	0.540	0.073	0.053	0.161	0.170	0.023	0.041
m_i	0.053	0.062	0.014	0.030	0.563	0.026	0.019	0.097	0.152	0.010	0.013
Sample	34[a]	35	36[a]	37[a]	38[a]	39	40[a]	41[a]	42	43[a]	44
N_i	26	5	32	33	18	6	32	20	4	34	0
p_i	0.047	0.239	0.014	0.011	0.075	0.307	0.031	0.083	0.307	0.005	0.343
m_i	0.005	0.205	0.006	0.004	0.038	0.210	0.008	0.015	0.287	0.003	0.295

[a]Sample not consistent with the Goldsmith profile.

Table C.3 Sentence-length

Sample *i*	1	2	3	4	5	6[a]	7[a]	8[a]
P_i	0.742	0.223	0.476	0.940	0.385	0.040	0.003	0.059
Sample *i*	9	10	11	12[a]	13	14	15[a]	16[a]
P_i	0.264	0.163	0.157	0.000	0.089 ?	0.089 ?	0.000	0.000
Sample *i*	17	18[a]	19	20[a]	21[a]	22[a]	23	24
P_i	0.804	0.000	0.063 ?	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.854	0.109

[a]Sample not consistent with the Goldsmith profile. ? denotes borderline result.