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Adam Smith’s Library: recent work on his books and marginalia
Nicholas Phillipson, Shinji Nohara, and Craig Smith

‘I am a beau in nothing but my books’ (Ross 2010: 330)

Adam Smith was a significant collector of books throughout his life and several of his biographers cite the reported comment that he was a ‘beau in nothing but my books’ which he is supposed to have made to the printer William Smellie who was admiring his library during a visit to Smith’s home.¹ The catalogue of Smith’s library from 1781 provides a detailed description of the library in Smith’s Edinburgh home Panmure House, and gives us a sense of the scope of his holdings. The library itself has attracted the attention of Smith scholars down the years. Professor Hiroshi Mizuta is perhaps most associated with this research and his modern catalogue provides a detailed account of the location of books known to have been owned by Smith. The aim of this paper is to report on work in progress and outline recent research that seeks to build on Mizuta’s work by surveying the books themselves to identify and assess marginalia.

The current project - Scotland

In 2014 Michelle Schwarze of the University of Wisconsin – Madison visited Scotland and examined books held by Kirkcaldy Museum (KM) and the Glasgow University Library (GU). She noted and photographed marginalia in several of the books and began a discussion with Nicholas Phillipson and Craig Smith about the possibility of identifying whether Smith was responsible for the writing. Interest was piqued by this discussion for a number of reasons: given Smith’s destruction of his papers and unpublished material, the books may represent the last unexamined material that Smith left us; moreover, the Mizuta research had focussed
on locating and describing the books, rather than examining the annotations, so we had no clear idea about how extensive the marginalia was. Professor Shield Nicholson (1884: 8), who held the Chair of Political Economy at the University of Edinburgh, reported that he undertook a survey of part of the library in the hope of finding marginalia that would help trace the sources for Smith’s views on the economy, but was disappointed to find the books he examined to be free of annotation. However, Nicholson’s survey was of a limited portion of the library and appears to have been restricted to books related to political economy.

Through 2014 Phillipson and Smith visited and made initial surveys of the books held in KM, GU and Edinburgh University Library (EU). What they discovered were a series of books with very similar marginal notes in what appeared to be the same hand. In order to establish whether the writing might belong to Smith photographs were shared with Professor Gerard Carruthers of the University of Glasgow’s Centre for Robert Burns Studies, and Dr Ralph McLean the keeper of the Eighteenth Century Collection at the National Library of Scotland. Carruthers and McLean have been engaged in a project to identify unattributed works by Robert Burns and have significant experience in identifying eighteenth century handwriting (for a further discussion of this initial attribution see below). Comparing examples of the marginalia to letters by Smith allowed a clear view of the similarity of the handwriting suggesting there was a very high likelihood that at least some of the annotation may be by Smith. This prompted an expansion of the survey. In March 2015 Craig Smith examined the portion of the library in Goldsmith’s Library at the University of London, and in November 2015 Phillipson and Smith met with representatives of EU and GU to discuss the survey and book preservation issues.
It became apparent that the initial stages of the research required a complete survey of the known books belonging to Smith and an identification of the number of books containing marginalia. To this end The Chancellor’s Fund of the University of Glasgow provided a grant to support the production of a database of the library which would allow the research team to complete a standard form for each book examined. The template allows us to confirm the details listed about each volume in the various catalogues of the library and to describe and link to images of any marginalia. In Spring 2017, with the support of a grant from the Tannahill Fund, an initial survey of the books held in the library of Queen’s University Belfast (QB) revealed further examples of marginalia.

In 2015 the Scottish researchers discovered that a parallel effort had been underway among Japanese scholars working with the portion held at Tokyo University Economics Library (TU) and the two groups began to share findings. In summer 2017 Phillipson and Smith visited Tokyo with the support of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and joined Shinji Nohara and others in examining the Tokyo University and Nihon University Law School portions.

**The current project - Japan**

In 1920, Inazo Nitobe of the University of Tokyo purchased a portion of Adam Smith’s collection of books in London and donated it to the University of Tokyo. Since then, the University has held 315 volumes of Smith's books, about one-tenth of all Adam Smith’s books. In 1951, Tadao Yanaihara published the catalogue of this collection, but the catalogue is incomplete. The current project involves a group of Japanese scholars (Daisuke Arie, Tomoji Onozuka, Hiroyuki Kojima, Natsuko Fukuda, Yuki Moriwaki, Masataka Yano, Hirofumi Takahashi), who hope to publish a revised catalogue of Adam Smith’s books at the
University of Tokyo. Many of the books have marginalia that might be in Smith’s own hand and the Japanese group have begun to record the marginalia and photograph the books.

Of the 315 books owned by Adam Smith at the University of Tokyo, 43 contain marginalia. The marginalia consist of marks (x’s and strike-throughs), lines, words in and around texts, and words on blank pages. The handwriting comes from different people so part of the current project involves an attempt to ascertain whether or not any of it is Smith's. At least some of the marginalia in Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* (London: Printed for Andrew Crooks, 1651) might be Smith’s and the handwriting in *Leviathan* can also be seen in David Hume's *History of England*, vol. 1, in *The Elements of Euclid*, and in several other volumes.

**The dispersion of the Library**

Adam Smith left his books to his heir, David Douglas, Lord Reston (1769-1819) and the books were subsequently divided between two of Lord Reston’s daughters (Mizuta 2000: xx-xxi).² David Anne Douglas (1819-79) married Rev. James Bannerman (1807-1868), they had three sons and six daughters, and she left her portion of the library to their son Rev. David Douglas Bannerman.³ The Bannerman’s portion of the library was donated almost intact to the library of New College Edinburgh in 1884. This is currently held in EU and represents the largest portion of the books. Cecilia Margaret Douglas (1813-98) married Rev. William Bruce Cunningham (1806-78); they had four sons and two daughters.⁴ Mrs Cunningham’s portion of the books has a more fractured history. Some of the books were sold in 1878 and became scattered among private collectors with portions eventually finding their way into GU, KM (7 titles), EU, Goldsmith’s Library (59 titles) and Johns Hopkins University Library (60 titles). The final elements of the Cunningham portion were donated to Queen’s University Belfast in 1918 by her son, the naturalist Professor R.O. Cunningham who taught
there, and to GU in the 1960s. The largest portion of the dispersed Cunningham portion was that purchased in 1920 by Professor Nitobe on behalf of The University of Tokyo Economics Department Library. Aside from the portions held by the main holders EU (898 titles), TU (148 titles), QB (110 titles), and GU (68 titles) there are a scattering of books held by private collectors and other Universities including New York Public Library (5 titles), Nihon University Law Library (4 titles), Keio University (2 titles), Kyoto University Library (1 title), and Reading University Library (5 titles). Despite the significant work that has been undertaken to confirm the location of the books, there are also around 411 titles which are listed as unlocated by Mizuta. Some of these have since appeared on the book market and will have to be traced to update the catalogue. In addition to Smith’s own 1781 catalogue we have Bonar’s 1894 and 1932 catalogues, Tadao Yamaihara’s 1951 catalogue of the Tokyo portion, the 2000 completed Mizuta catalogue, and now the renewed Tokyo catalogue and the Glasgow database.

The History of Smith’s book buying

W.R. Scott suggests that Smith used Glasgow University Library books while he was a student and professor there, and that he devoted much of his time in Oxford to use of the library. Scott surmises that it was only later in life that he began to build his own library. One piece of evidence for this is that many of the books that we know that Smith ordered for the Glasgow University Library were titles that he later went on to purchase for himself (Scott 1937: 178-82). We also have evidence of Smith acquiring editions of books that he cites in earlier publications, for example he has both a 1753 edition of Rousseau’s Oeuvres and a 1760 edition of the Oeuvres Diverses the latter of which includes the Discourses and post-dates his discussion of the Discourse on the Origin of Inequality in the Letter to the Edinburgh Review of 1756. That Smith began to consolidate his library after his time in
Glasgow seems to be supported by a letter he sends to Thomas Cadell dated 25th March 1767 (Correspondence: 124) arranging for books to be sent to Edinburgh. These books likely having been purchased in France, or in the period spent in London on his return with the Duke of Buccleuch. This leads Hiroshi Mizuta (2000: xvii) to trace the beginnings of Smith’s library to his time in France with the Duke in 1764-6. There is also another letter to David Hume sent from London in May 1775 (Correspondence: 181-2) which discusses sending books north that had been purchased while in the city taking the WN through to press. This suggests that Smith took advantage of travel to gain access to booksellers, a point confirmed in the discussion of book buying in Paris with Hume in a letter sent to Smith in August 1766 (Correspondence: 117-19). This general view is supported by the fact that many of the books in Smith’s Library have publication dates from the 1770s and 1780s. A number of these, such as his presentation copy of Gibbon (Nihon Law Library) and the complete works of Voltaire (EU) are very finely bound presentation editions which no doubt prompted Smellie’s admiring comments on the library, and several, such as the copy of the 1758 edition of Hume’s *Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects* and Robert Wallace’s *Thoughts on the Origins of Feudal Tenures* of 1783 (Goldsmith’s Library), are marked as gifts from the author.

While it is perfectly reasonable to conclude that as Smith’s income rose he devoted more to building his library, there are some reasons to be cautious about this. First, we know that Smith’s father had a library. Ross reports that we have a list of its contents from the winding up of his estate (Ross 2010: 3, 14) and that the son inherited at least part of it along with his mother and half-brother Hugh (Scott 1937: 21), so the nucleus of Smith’s holdings pre-dates his time at Glasgow. Ross points out the prevalence of books in French, religious and devotional texts, and *The Spectator* as an indication of the breadth of Smith senior’s library.
One clue to when Smith began to form his library in earnest is the now famous bookplate. Plain, yet remarkably stylish, the bookplate appears broadly the same across Smith’s library.
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Image 1: Adam Smith’s Bookplate by permission of Fife Cultural Trust (Kirkcaldy Galleries) on behalf of Fife Council.

This might lead us to believe that the labels were added to his books late in life, but there is reason to doubt this. Scott points out that GU holds a copy of Riccoboni’s edition of Aristotle’s *Ethics* which has both the Glasgow Moral Philosophy Class library mark of accession for 1732 in it and Smith’s bookplate in it. Scott speculates that it was accidentally counted among Smith’s books when he was having the labels added, but was then returned to the library. A further puzzle arises as there is a slip in the fold of the binding including note written by an Adam Smith with what appears to be a different signature from Smith himself. Scott (1937: 368) speculates that this may have been a student of that name who was in the moral philosophy class in 1762-3. If he is correct then this also tells us is that Smith may well have been using the bookplate during his time at Glasgow and so already beginning the process of forming a library to an extent that warranted marking the volumes with printed
bookplates. Unfortunately, on examining the volume in GU we found that the book (GU Catalogue RB2858) does not in fact bear Smith’s bookplate. This error by Scott means that it doesn’t help us with dating the point at which Smith began to mark his books. Examination of the bookplates themselves suggests small differences between them which may relate to different batches acquired at different times, though it is unclear if these differences are consistent enough to assist in dating Smith’s acquisitions.

There are several books that do not possess Smith’s bookplate, but do have his signature to indicate ownership. One example of early book buying is a book held by KM: Smith’s copy of *Eutropii Historiae Romanae breviarium in usum scholarum*. This was a standard school text of the time and Smith would have been required to complete classroom exercises from it. The book was published in London in 1725, so we know that it was purchased for Smith because it post-dates his father’s death. The book has examples of Smith practising his signature in the inside of the cover, complete with the date 1733.
So, we can assume that though Smith’s purchases increased with his income, it seems equally likely that his interest in books existed throughout his life and that he bought when he could and what he could afford. This should lead us to expect that a portion of Smith’s library was bought second hand. And, indeed, we find some evidence of this with the signatures and bookplates of previous owners being apparent in several volumes.

**Identifying the author of the marginalia**

There are a number of issues with confirming Smith as the author of the marginalia. Perhaps the most pressing of these is that some of the books appear to be annotated by more than one person. It is possible that Smith bought second hand books annotated by the previous owner, it is also possible that the annotations are by Adam Smith Senior, by David Douglas, by one of his four children, or by members of the Bannerman or Cunningham families. The image below illustrates part of the issue as it shows a volume which has the signature of both a previous owner and that of a member of the Cunningham family.
There are some positive initial signs which relate to the Cunningham portion. There is a consistent and widespread style of annotation that appears across these volumes. Before we look at this in detail, we should note what it may tell us about authorship. The style of annotation in question appears across Smith’s collection: in Hutcheson’s *Essay* (GU) published in 1742 (when Smith was 19); in Locke’s *First Treatise* (KM) published in 1728 (when Smith was 5); in Hobbes’ *Leviathan* (TU) published in 1651 (before Smith’s birth); in Bolingbroke’s *Works* (QB) published in 1754 (when Smith was 31); and in Bemetreider’s *Music made Easy to every Capacity* (QB) published in 1778 (when Smith was 55). The existence of the same style of annotation in books purchased new and second hand by Smith makes it almost certain that Smith or someone after him was responsible rather than a common seller. Further, we can rule out Smith’s father as some of the publication dates post-date him. While we can only decisively confirm this with detailed palaeographic analysis,
there is one further way of narrowing down the potential author. This rests on the fact that the Bannerman and Cunningham portions have quite distinct histories. If a complete survey of the Bannerman portion in EU reveals examples of the particular style of marginalia that we are considering here then the authorship is narrowed to Smith, David Douglas, or a member of Douglas’s household prior to his death and the break-up of the library on his daughter’s marriages. Completing the survey of the 898 titles at EU is the next step in the current research project.

**Smith’s Handwriting**

The initial speculation that Smith was the author of the marginalia was based on a comparison between Smith’s handwriting in letters and the marginalia from KM and GU. There are however some complicating factors in extending this to the other examples of marginalia. Some of these are related to the similarity of many examples of eighteenth century handwriting, produced by rote teaching of calligraphy, which require fine grained palaeographic examination to distinguish between them. Another issue with marginalia is that it involves a compressed and studied, and so distorted, version of the normal handwriting style.

According to Iain Ross ‘The evidence of his manuscript letters suggests that his penmanship was slow and laborious, the letters formed in a large, round manner like that of a child to whom the activity is not a comfortable or agreeable one.’ (Ross 2010: 250). This is a point that Smith seems to acknowledge in a letter when he describes his own writing as ‘so very bad a hand’ (Correspondence: 113). We certainly see examples of this in the KM image of a schoolboy Smith’s signature practise, but it becomes even more complicated if we examine
his later correspondence. Here we discover that Smith has left us what appear to be several slightly different styles of handwriting.
Dear Mother,

I have been these fourteen days last past paid here at Edinburg with Mr. Smith, the Place is agreeable enough & there is a great deal of good company in the town.

In my last letter I desired you to send me some Stockings, the sooner you send them the better. I have taken this opportunity to write to you to give my seniors to all friends, tho’ as you see I have not very much to say, I am Dear

Edinburgh

Oct. 20, 1741

Mother your most

Affectionate son

Adam Smith
Image 5: Smith’s signature 1776 by permission of Glasgow University Library Special Collections.
Small differences appear in Smith’s signature through his life, the most notable being a change in his preferred writing of capital A between the schoolboy signature of 1733 and the
later letters. Scott (1937: 366-7) surveys the examples of this from GU material and correspondence and shows that Smith was capable of a significantly neater and more ornate form of writing on official documents than in personal correspondence. While the general appearance of the handwriting found in his letters is consistent and as Ross describes it, it changes through time in some particulars and improves in documents such as his oaths as dean of faculty and professor. We also know that Smith’s discomfort in writing led him to employ an amanuensis and we have the example of letters written by the amanuensis and corrected by Smith, such as that to Andreas Holt from October 1780 (Correspondence: 249-53) held at GU. But it seems unlikely that he would employ one for marginalia.¹¹

The Smithian Style of Annotation

Mark Towsey (2012: 424), commenting on his examination of primary material from the Scottish Enlightenment, states that ‘coherent marginalia is rare’ and that more often than not the marks in books take the form of lines, ticks and other markings.¹² There is certainly a significant amount of this in the books we have examined from Smith’s library. Such marks are difficult to attribute with any certainty and their meaning requires significant degrees of interpretation. But in the case of Smith’s books there are also a number of examples of more substantive written passages. These nowhere reach the level of annotation found in some collections, but they do give us hope that we can pursue reliable attribution. Our initial survey suggests that the marginalia most likely to be identifiable as in Smith’s hand takes a particular form. The main grounds for identifying Smith as the author lies in the appearance of two very clear ‘Adams’ which match the handwritten styles of signature from both the 1733 and the later versions of his signature. This appears in the KM copy of Locke’s *Two Treatises* (1728) in the opening chapter of the *First Treatise*. 
Image 7: Smith’s copy of Locke’s *Two Treatises* by permission of Fife Cultural Trust (Kirkcaldy Galleries) on behalf of Fife Council.
In the image above we see the word Adam written at both the top and the bottom with different styles of the capital A which match the 1733 and later versions as used by Smith.
indicating that the author, like Smith, moved between the two styles of capitalised A. The letter m is also consistent with Smith’s signatures.

Examples of this sort of annotation in this hand can also be found in the GU copy of Hutcheson’s *Essay on the nature and conduct of the passions and affections with illustrations on the moral sense* (3rd edition 1742). Closer comparison of the handwriting is needed, but the prevalence of the style of annotation is consistent: The marginalia appears above the script and often in boxes (what H. J. Jackson calls ‘interlinear gloss’ (Jackson 2001: 28)); it occupies the first few chapters of the volumes; it corrects grammar, clarifies expression, renders the meaning clearer; and it converts the prose into the first person.\(^{13}\)

In a number of the volumes with examples of this type of marginalia there is also a second type of annotation in what appears to be a more ornate hand. This may suggest more than one author, or it may be that greater care was taken in the writing of the marginalia than of the superscript annotation. For example, in the GU copy of Hutcheson’s *Essay* we see interlinear annotation, marginalia, and underlining. The underlining appears to be in a different ink from the annotation and marginalia, which appear to be in the same hand.
Image 9: Smith’s copy of Hutcheson’s Essay by permission of Glasgow University Library Special Collections.

The same blend of notations appears in the opening chapters of Smith’s copy of the 1750 edition of Hobbes’s *Moral and Political Works* (TU).
However, things are complicated if we look at the marginalia in Smith’s copy of the 1778 edition of Hume’s *History of England* (TU). Here we see what appears to be a slightly different hand engaged in a similar form of notation. The material here looks less like a
summary of the main points and more like a series of questions answered by the corresponding underlined passages.
corded, could afford little or no entertainment to me
born in a more cultivated age. The convulsions of a ci-

eviled state usually compose the most instructive and most

3. By what certain

4. What are 6

5. Any Supposi-

6. How can we discover the

nations can indulge their curiosity in researches concerning
their remote origin, is to consider the language, manners,
and customs of their ancestors, and to compare them with
those of the neighbouring nations. The fables, which
are commonly employed to supply the place of true his-
tory, ought entirely to be disregarded; or if any excep-
tion be admitted to this general rule, it can only be in
favour of the ancient Grecian fictions, which are in cele-
brated and so agreeable, that they will ever be the object
of the attention of mankind. Neglecting, therefore, all
traditions or rather tales concerning the more early history
of Britain, we shall only consider the state of the inha-
bitants as it appeared to the Romans on their invasion of
this country. We shall briefly run over the events, which
attended the conquest made by that empire, as belonging
more to Roman than British story: We shall hale
through the obscure and uninteresting period of Saxon
annals: And shall reserve a more full narration for those
times, when the truth is both so well ascertained and so
complete as to promise entertainment and instruction to
the reader.

All ancient writers agree in representing the first inha-
bitants of Britain as a tribe of the Gauls or Celts, who
people that island from the neighbouring continent. Their
language was the same, their manners, their govern-
ment, their superstition: varied only by those small
differences, which time or a communication with the bor-

Image 11: Smith’s copy of Hume’s *History of England* by permission of Tokyo University Economics Library.
This second style of annotation summarises positions or raises questions about the content of the text. We have marginal notes that summarise content, interlinear glosses, corrections to the expression, and underlining of particular passages, but no translation into the first person. All of this raises a number of questions that need further study. Is the same person responsible for all three types of notation in each volume? Is the same person responsible for all three volumes or are there different hands at work (for example are the Hobbes and Hutcheson different enough from the Hume to conclude a distinct author)? Is that person, or one of those people, Adam Smith? And if not, then who wrote in his books and when did they do it?

**Leviathan**

We can get a clearer idea of the variety of annotations by looking at the markings in Smith’s copy of Hobbes’ *Leviathan* (TU). In the passage below the mark [ ] is the part the annotator added or changed.

*The addition of omitted words.*

Words or phrases omitted by Hobbes are glossed to clarify meaning. For instance, ‘For [the reason that] there is not any vertue that disposeth a man, either to the service of God, or [disposeth a man] to the service of his Country’ (Hobbes 1651, 1). The author added the phrase ‘the reason that.’ Stylistically, the phrase is unnecessary: it was added for clarity. The author intentionally repeated the phrase ‘disposeth a man’ for the same reason. In another instance, the writer added words to identify who did something. Hobbes wrote, ‘you find my labour generally decryed [by men], you may be pleased to excuse your selfe’ (2). The writer added the phrase ‘by men’ after ‘decryed’ to explain who was decrying the labour.
The replacement of pronouns with proper nouns

Smith added ‘S. Godophin’s’ to ‘his person’ (1) for clarification.

The replacement of people with ‘I’

The writer replaced Hobbes’ words referring people in general, and the third person with the first. Hobbes wrote, ‘But to reach us [me], that for the similitude of the thoughts [of one man] and Passions of one man, to the thoughts [of another man] and Passions of another [man], whosoever looketh into himself [myself] and considereth [consider] what he doth [I do], when he does [I do] think, opine, reason, hope, feare, &C., and upon what grounds.’ (2). For clarification, Smith replaced ‘us’ with ‘me’ and ‘he doth’ with ‘I do.’ Hobbes wrote, ‘here is a saying much usurped of late, That Wisedome is acquired, not by reading of Books, but of Men.’ In the writer's correction of the book, the sentence is rendered as, ‘here is a saying much usurped of late, That Wisedome is acquired, not by [my] reading of Books, but [by my reading of] Men.’ (2).

The change of words

In the writer's correction of Leviathan, some conjunctions have been manually changed:

‘Therefore [For that reason] in honour and gratitude to him’ (1). Other cases are how [in what manner]; yet [notwithstanding]; and if [supposing that].

Summary

Some of the marginalia summarizes the original text. In the margin of the first page of Leviathan we see the following notes:

‘1. Nature- God's creature and governing art
2. Man's Art- in imitation of God's creating and artificial animal- the Civil State.
3. The Civil state likened to man's nature'

These notes correspond to the contents of the text of that page. The writer summarizes the text but does not add comment or additional information. The marginalia suggest that the person writing it did not intend to improve Hobbes’ style. Instead they seem to be artefacts of reading, intended to clarify the meaning of words, analyze sentences, and improve comprehension.

**What is the purpose of the Marginalia?**

A number of recent studies have set out to explore the nature of reading and publishing during the Scottish Enlightenment. Richard Sher (2006) has examined the book trade and publishing, Mark Towsey (2010) has explored the circulation of texts, Murray C.T. Simpson (2012) has worked on the development of private libraries, and David Allan (2008, 2010) has written on the experience of reading and the practice of extracting in commonplace books.14

One thing that these studies have shown is that Smith’s book collecting was firmly in the fashion of the time. The development of a library was a key part of the polite culture of the late eighteenth century gentleman (Jackson 2005: 49; Allan 2010: 103-4). Perhaps the classic study of marginalia in the period has been H. J. Jackson’s work on the Romantic period of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Jackson’s work has demonstrated just how widespread the practice of annotation was at the time and, while she may exaggerate a little when she claims that ‘almost all readers fortunate enough to own books wrote in them’ (Jackson 2005: 251), she does highlight how: ‘Many readers had been deliberately trained to mark and annotate books using techniques that in themselves reveal prevalent attitudes towards books and reading.’ (Jackson 2005: 252). Jackson’s survey reveals a number of different styles of annotation, from the sharply hostile interrogation of a text (2005: 124,
154), to the unpacking of complex passages (2005: 61-2), and the criticism of the writer’s style and expression (2005: 61). Marginal annotations follow the text, they are ‘responsive’ (Jackson 2001: 16) and both reveal how a text was being read and what was being drawn from it by a particular reader.

One widespread view of the value of marginalia related to beliefs about the best way to profit from reading. This has to do with the idea of thinking through a text rather than memorising it or skimming over the surface. Jackson (2005: 61) traces this to Locke’s educational writings, where she suggests that genuine engagement with a text involves absorbing its arguments in active thought. This is a familiar concern in the Scottish Enlightenment. Adam Ferguson was concerned that book worship would lead to the diminution of practical knowledge (Smith 2006, 2008), and David Allan cites James Beattie’s argument from his *Essays on Poetry and Music* of 1776: ‘When we are so much master of the sentiments of another man as to be able to express them with accuracy in our own words, then we may be said to have digested them, and made them our own; and then it is, and not before, that our understanding is really improved by them.’ (Allan 2010: 120).

This leads us to the question of why the author or authors of our marginalia make notes in the way that they do. One possible explanation for the practice of changing the material into the first person and clarifying expression is that it is some sort of preparation for oral presentation. Both Jackson (2001: 66; 2005: 61) and Allan (2010: 143) note the widespread educational practice of vocalising or reading out loud is reflected in marginalia and commonplace books and we know that this was a widespread educational practice in eighteenth century Scotland. Reading aloud certainly occurred in the home and in various clubs and literary societies, but it was also a key part of formal education. The University
system that Smith experienced under Francis Hutcheson and in which he later taught himself involved a morning lecture followed by a later oral examination of the students on the subject of the lecture. It is plausible, then, that these annotations may have been part of a preparation for this by Smith or someone close to him. This is further supported by the educational practices of the Scottish Burgh schools, particularly in the case of Smith’s innovative School master David Miller (Ross 2010: 18). Charles Camic (1983: 154-55), citing Fay (1955: 49-50), outlines the widespread practice, often taking up the whole afternoon, of ‘expounding authors’ (Camic 1983: 155). The bulk of this sort of exercise tested translation from Latin and Greek, but Ross (2010: 19) points out that it was also used for English texts to improve rhetorical skill in spoken English. The point was not to memorise and read, but to expound the main arguments in the fashion advocated by Beattie. This would explain both the translation into the first person, and the tendency to summarise the main points or list the main concepts which are also a feature of this marginalia. If the notes are a classroom exercise, or a habit retained from early experience of such, it may also help to explain another strange feature of the marginalia: why the annotations always appear early in the text and only cover the first few pages. This could just be a sign of laziness, but it is also possible that this may have been the section of the text assigned to the student in question, or that the first few chapters was sufficient for the annotator to accustom himself to reading aloud in the first person.

In their discussions of Smith’s early education both Ross and Scott see evidence of this sort of teaching in Smith’s copy of Epicteti Stoici philosophi Encheiridion und cum Cebetis Thebani Tabula Heironymo Wolfo Oetingensi interprete (Scott 1937: 33-4, 365; Ross 2010: 41). This was a standard text for Alexander Dunlop’s Greek class at Glasgow. In Smith’s copy we see both his famous bookplate, which would have been added later in life, and his
schoolboy signature. But we also find marginalia including underlining and red pencil stars next to selected passages which Scott and Ross take as evidence that Smith had been assigned these sections as part of his studies. (Scott 1937: 33-4, 365; Ross 2010: 41). We know that Smith was exposed to this form of exercise in the Greek class, but it also seems to have been a staple of Hutcheson’s pedagogy in the moral philosophy class. Ross notes that after an early morning lecture Hutcheson’s students would be expected to explain and illustrate the works of the ancient, particularly the stoic, philosophers (Ross 2010: 51-2) followed by an afternoon private class which took the form of an extended conversation. So it is possible that this book may have been used by both Dunlop and Hutcheson during Smith’s student days.

All of this leaves open a number of possibilities. First, the widespread nature of this practice makes it possible that some of the apparent differences in handwriting are the result of different generations being put through the same exercise with the same book. Jackson (2005: 77) describes the phenomenon of ‘layers’ of marginalia, where the same person, or several people, add different annotations with each reading of a book. In the case of Smith it may be that he was using books owned by his father in his own exercises, or that the different styles of annotation represent ‘layers’ from different points in Smith’s life, or equally it may be that he was setting such exercises for David Douglas who was educated in Panmure House (Rasmussen 2017: 230). Smith took a keen interest in Douglas’s education. We know that he arranged for Douglas to attend the High School of Edinburgh (1777-82) and to study under John Millar at Glasgow University in preparation for a career in the law (he qualified as an advocate in 1791 the year after Smith died and Smith’s final letters mention his anticipation of the examination). He also employed a tutor, John Leslie (later Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Edinburgh), to assist in the education. Given Smith’s own experience in the University, and his approval for Scottish education more generally (WN V.
i.f), it does not take much of a reach to suppose that he would deploy the methods familiar from his own Kirkcaldy and Glasgow upbringing, and that he would make use of his now extensive library in the instruction of his heir.

That the marginalia was the result of an educational rather than a research setting is further suggested by a third significant group of marginalia which involves the translation of Latin and Greek passages.

Image 12: Smith’s copy of Josephus Olivetus’s 1758 edition of the *Works of Cicero* by permission of Special Collections, Queen’s University Belfast.
This type of annotation does provide us with another piece of evidence. Some examples of the marginalia are in pencil. This is usually evidence that the writing is from a later rather than earlier date: the widespread use of the pencil being a result of the industrial revolution. Though it is worth placing a caveat on this as the graphite stylus was first widely used in Britain in the mid to late eighteenth century and as H. J. Jackson observes its use was widespread by the 1790s. She cites the example of the second edition of Maria Edgeworth’s *Practical Education* where Edgeworth mentions using pencil lines to indicate the best passages in a work (Jackson 2005: 62). Having said that, in the example above the handwriting does appear distinct from that in our other samples, and is in a style of hand more usually associated with the nineteenth and early twentieth century. However, before we
are too quick to rely on different writing implements to differentiate writers, we need to note one significant piece of evidence that comes from Smith’s copy of the 1781 Foulis’s edition of Simson’s *Euclid* (TU).\textsuperscript{18} Here we see the author move from writing in ink to writing in pencil mid-sentence on the same page.
The move from ink to pencil here is clearly in the same hand, and it does not seem quite to fit the practice, discussed by Jackson (2001: 42; 2005: 70), of taking rough notes in pencil and
copying over the notes to be preserved in ink. Instead it looks like the writer has simply run out of ink mid-sentence, and switched to a pencil to complete his notes.

**Next Steps**

The Japanese and UK groups are now co-operating to take the research forward. We need to complete the initial survey of the known and located books to assess the existence of additional marginalia. The most pressing aspect of this is completing the survey of the EU holdings. Once we have a clearer idea of this and a set of reliable images we can begin detailed handwriting comparison. This will involve tracking down samples of the handwriting of Smith’s father and of the various members of the Cunningham and Bannerman families. Having done this we will be in a position to confirm the identity of the author of the various layers of annotation and to make an assessment of whether they represent the work of Smith.

Once the identification is out of the way we will be able to begin work on assessing what the markings in Smith’s books might tell us about Smith’s reading and interaction with texts. Even the particular style of annotations that we have highlighted in this brief note raises questions that may prove difficult to answer. Why are they restricted to the first few pages? Could it be that whoever it is simply gave up, or could it be that a particular person regularly had the task of summarising the beginning of the text? Moreover we’ve been focusing on one particular set of annotations, but there are many others including much underlining that invites speculation, a full survey of all of the known books will allow us to begin a consideration of what might be learned from each item of marginalia.
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Notes

1. See Smellie (1800: 297) and Rae (1895: 329).
2. Douglas had two other children: Elizabeth Craigie Douglas (1808-22) and Adam Smith Douglas (1816-38).
3. Rev. David Douglas Bannerman (1842-1903), Mary Turing Anne Bannerman (1844-?), Elizabeth Craigie Bannerman (1846-1875), Cecilia Helen Bannerman (1847-1923), Anne Jessie Bannerman (1850-1869), Jemima Margaret Bannerman (1852-1929), James Patrick Bannerman (1854-1905), William Burney Bannerman (1858-1924), and Catherine Maria Bannerman (1861-1898).
4. Elizabeth Douglas Cunningham (1835-1910), Adam Smith Douglas Cunningham (1839-1844), Prof. Robert Oliver Cunningham (1841-1918), Col. David Douglas Cunningham (1843-1914), Isabella Mary Cunningham (1847-1922), and James Bannerman Cunningham (1852-1915).
6. For a description of the TU portion see Nohara (2017).
7. Smith’s correspondence includes several references to books and book buying. He corresponds with Lord Hailes in 1769 (Correspondence: 139) to discuss borrowing books, and Hume writes to him in 1753 offering access to the faculty of Advocate’s Library (Correspondence: 9-10).
8. Smith wrote to Gibbon in December 1788 thanking him for the gift of the final three volumes of his *Decline and Fall* (Correspondence: 316-7).
9. Though this family connection may also create a potential source of confusion as Smith’s father was called Adam Smith, his father had an uncle also called Adam Smith whose son, Smith’s father’s cousin was yet another Adam Smith (Ross 2010: 8), while Smith’s heir David Douglas also had a son Adam Smith Douglas.
10. The inventory of the father’s library is in GU (GUL MS Gen. 1035/61).
11. Scott (1937: 362) shows a photograph of Adam Smith senior’s signature which is similar to that of the son, and so significant care will have to be taken with the handwriting analysis of the books which may have belonged to the father.
13. ‘...interlinear glosses that traditionally move word by word, as readers’ aids, translating or defining or paraphrasing the original….These are, as we paradoxically say, the same but different: the words have changed, but the meaning is as nearly identical as we can make it.’ (Jackson 2001: 42). Gloss is contrasted with ‘scholium’ which introduces new material not in the text itself to help interpret the text (Jackson 2001: 45).
15. For a discussion of Smith’s Kirkcaldy education see Ross (2010: 16-27) and Phillipson (2010: 17-23), for a more general discussion on the use of textbooks at the time see Moore (2012).
16. Scott (1937: 34) notes that Smith signs many early purchased books, i.e. pre-bookplate books, and that the presence of a signature is evidence for early purchase. Something he concludes is evidence supporting the supposition that Smith’s copy of Grotius was an early acquisition.
17. For Smith’s involvement in Douglas’s education see Correspondence (322-3, 431).