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In this essay, I claim that Richard Steele’s inclusion of an untranslated Latin epigraph from Juvenal within the framed narrative of the extremely popular Inkle and Yarico story complicates the cosmopolitan message that Steele’s own protagonists, Mr. Spectator and Arietta, espouse. Recent critics have not taken this paratextual device into account and, as a result, their analyses simplify the relations among class, gender, and race within The Spectator No. 11. Steele’s sympathetic characters implicitly ask his audience to identify with a dark-skinned Amerindian woman who displays traditionally masculine characteristics while the epigraph discourages such a reaction, which reveals larger tensions within eighteenth-century cosmopolitan discourses.

Richard Ligon’s Inkle and Yarico story (1657, later popularized by Steele in 1711) had forty-five alternate versions by 1800 in eight languages, and the George Colman theatrical adaptation was staged 164 times between 1787 and 1800 (Felsenstein 168). The sparse recent criticism on the tale disproportionately reflects its enormous contemporary popularity. Steele’s version of the Inkle and Yarico story in Spectator No. 11 is especially full of ambivalent material for New Historicist, postcolonial, and feminist critics to sift through, which makes sense when one considers the author’s complex background. Steele was a perpetually debt-ridden, Oxford-educated, Whiggish Irishman writing to and desperately needing to sell his work to both sexes of a predominately English audience in the midst of Whig and Tory struggles to gain power during the final years of Queen Anne’s reign (Winton). In general, critical discussions of Steele’s adaptation of Inkle and Yarico fit it into oversimplified categories of gender, race, and class. I argue that the epigraph of this story (“The Doves Are Censur’d, While the Crows Are Spared”), when applied in context, refutes the idea that Steele completely homogenizes Yarico sexually and racially; at the same time, however, the originally untranslated Latin phrase turns out to be a formidable class barrier, and its problematic traditional imagery undermines much of Steele’s egalitarian message.
This essay consists of three sections. In the first part, “Steele and His Readers,” I show that the author’s education exposed him to classical languages that were denied to much of the reading public, particularly women and members of the laboring classes. Steele’s decision not to translate the Latin epigraph therefore represents a deliberate exclusion of part of his audience. Section two reveals the ways in which Steele attempts to counterbalance the unfavorable Roman depiction of women in the Ephesian Matron story with an adapted version of a roughly contemporaneous English tale from Ligon’s True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados. Part three explores the contradictory sentiments about exterior color that Steele expresses through his sympathetic depiction of Yarico, on the one hand, and the epigraph’s bird imagery on the other. I summarize my argument by claiming that Steele’s Inkle and Yarico adaptation implicitly asks his elite audience to overlook boundaries of gender, skin color, education, and propriety in a benign cosmopolitan gesture that will enable them to identify with a highly unusual heroine: a lascivious and physically powerful Amerindian woman. Mr. Spectator articulates this seemingly universal message of commiseration, however, through an ethnocentric epigraph and an ideology that works on the principle of exclusion.

Steele and His Readers

When attempting to clarify who the target audience for Steele’s Spectator No. 11 was, and the extent to which it was a politically progressive text in terms of social class, gender, and race, one can begin by examining the type of knowledge the tale presupposes. At least some of Steele’s readers did not understand the classical allusions and their relevance to the story at hand, and education traditionally served as both a marker of social status and a gateway to it. Two of the primary ways someone might have become acquainted with the classics in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries would have been to have a tutor, which generally implied an aristocratic upbringing, or to attend a “public” school and then University. Women, of course, were still more than a century away from admittance to Oxford. While public schools in England such as Charterhouse, the one Steele attended, were ostensibly founded, in the words of seventeenth-century author Samuel Herne, “for the relief of poor men,” the reality proved to be quite different (qtd. in Winton 20). Herne goes on to say that, in actuality, “The way to obtain a place for a young lad” in one of these schools was “to make an address to any single governor the person has[d] most interest in, by way of friends, petition, or any other method of application” (20). It seems that Herne had good reason to suspect the political nature of admittance to such schools since Steele’s own registration in the Charterhouse reads as follows: “Richard Steele admitted for the Duke of Ormond, in the room of Phillip Burrell—aged 13 years 12th
March next” (emphasis added, 20). The fact that Steele was admitted “for
the Duke of Ormond,” his uncle Henry Gascoigne’s employer, leaves little
doubt as to who was pulling the strings behind his education. In Steele’s later
development as an Oxford student, he explicitly asked Gascoigne to use his
connections, as the following letter reveals: “the election of students is not
very far off now; if you would be pleased to speak with him or purchase
from my Lord a word or two; it would perhaps get me the most Creditable
preferment for young men in the whole university” (Steele, “Letter to Henry
Gascoigne” 5-7). As this passage demonstrates, “preferment” within the
hierarchical social structure of the University depended to some extent, in
Steele’s and most of his readers’ minds, on connections with “Lord[s]” and
other powerful figures.

In 1711, the people most likely to catch Steele’s allusions to Greco-Roman
literature, which was predominately by, for, and about men, would therefore
have been males with influential social connections. On a broad level, Norman
Simms discusses this patriarchal legacy by saying that Steele’s decision to
allude to but not to retell the story of the Ephesian Matron presupposes a
certain audience: “To know the story is to be well-educated, to be part of the
patriarchal order which underlies classical education and its institutions, and
thus to be at least tacitly complicit in the hatred of women which is at the
core of the tradition” (94). While Simms correctly points out that knowing
this story and being “well-educated” often meant exposure to a tradition
that favored men, his claim that such exposure necessarily tainted its pupils
by rendering them “tacitly complicit in the hatred of women” is perhaps an
overstatement. After all, Steele’s decision to add the Ephesian Matron story
as a parallel to Ligon’s tale overtly problematizes classical gender depictions
by setting up a dialogue between this story and its predecessors.

Ligon and Petronius

In Ligon’s account, the framing device around the story is an
anthropological voyage narrative that represents West “Indian” women in
Barbados as a cross between objects of desire and exotic beasts. For instance,
Ligon first introduces the Yarico figure, who remains nameless, as an example
of Amerindian women who refuse to wear clothing like civilized peoples: “We
had an Indian woman, a slave in the house, who was of excellent shape and
colour, for it was a pure bright bay . . . this woman would not be woo’d by
any means to weare Cloaths” (54). In addition to this objectification, Ligon
emphasizes the woman’s otherness by telling the story of how she went
alone into a wood, gave birth to a child not from the Inkle figure but from a
“Christian servant,” and came back three hours later (54-55). Had Steele kept
this part of the story, his readers would probably have had trouble identifying
with this woman. After all, in Moll Flanders, published eleven years after
spectator No. 11, all three options or "bills" that the midwife presents to the protagonist for her "Lying-Inn" involve "Three Months Lodging," "a Nurse for the Month," "Linnen" bedding material, and Christening fees (Defoe 223-24). For Englishwomen, birthing was an elaborate "Three Month" process and for West "Indian" women, in Ligon's account, it took a mere "three hours" alone in a wood.

It was in attempting to turn the Amerindian woman in Barbados from a mere spectacle into a human being, then, that Steele introduced and counterbalanced the Ephesian Matron story, which represented another related problematic portrayal of women. Like Ligon's version of the Inkle and Yarico narrative, the Ephesian Matron story emphasizes the woman's sexuality. Rather than admiring her unclothed appearance, though, the narrator ridicules her complete inability to curb her sexual appetite. Indeed, Eumolpus, the narrator of the tale in Petronius's version, tells the story as an example of "the inconstancy of women" and will not "bring instances from ancient tragedies, or personages notorious to antiquity." Eumolpus vows instead to relate a "story within the circle of his own memory" (Petronius 290). Interestingly enough, Eumolpus lumps "ancient tragedies," which would today be considered literature (i.e., fictional), into the same category as "personages notorious to antiquity," which sounds more like a modern conception of history (i.e., truthful accounts of real people). The main contrast, then, is not between the true and the false, but between the very old and the roughly contemporary. In other words, the preface to Petronius's tale attempts to establish the idea that the "inconstancy of women" was not merely a problem of the past (Eumolpus's allusion to feminine frailty in antiquity implies that he could give numerous instances of it from then as well) but ongoing and universal. The Ephesian Matron was reputed to be "the only true example of love and chastity" because of her elaborate and self-mortifying grieving over her husband (291). Yet, within the span of a few days, this supposed paradigm of fidelity ceased her lamentations and "receiv'd" the "embraces" of a soldier, "Not only that night they struck up the bargain, but the next and the next night after" (292). As this passage reveals, Eumolpus emphasizes that this transgression was repeated often and that it was not simply a moment of feminine weakness.

Meanwhile, someone buries the body of a crucified criminal the soldier was supposed to be guarding. Because he would face punishment if his negligence were detected, the Ephesian Matron offers the body of her dead husband to fill the place of the missing corpse. In addition to suggesting the interchangeability of male lovers, this story would have been particularly unsettling in the period that Petronius and Juvenal wrote in (ca. the first and second century C.E.) because of Roman beliefs in the relationship between the rites and treatment of a corpse and its departed soul's ability to enter the underworld, as the following passage from the third of Juvenal's satires reveals:
THE DOVES ARE CENSURED

Who’d know the people’s bodies dashed to bones? Like souls, the poor crushed limbs would disappear. . . . And while they work, the deadworld’s new arrivals shudder to see a deadly river’s slick. Their lips lack copper for boatfare and hope of that all-soothing bank. (259-60, 264-67)

According to these lines, losing the physical parts of the body is tantamount to losing the soul, and the fact that the dead man has no coin in his mouth to pay Charon the ferryman for passage to the underworld means that the former is stuck. Because of her inability to control her sexual desires, then, the Ephesian Matron has perhaps doomed her dead husband’s soul to eternal unrest. Crucifixion, after all, was a particularly dishonorable form of capital punishment in Rome that was often followed by mutilation of the corpse or by exposing it to the elements and wild animals. The primary rhetorical technique that Petronius employs to convince readers of female infidelity, then, is hyperbole; the Ephesian Matron, who is initially a paragon of virtue and faithfulness to her husband’s memory, cannot resist having sex with another man for the mere span of a few days, even when it means condemning her husband’s soul. If this especially fortuitous woman cannot curb her sexual appetite under such dire conditions, then the rest of the feminine world stands almost no chance whatsoever of maintaining female virtue.

Some women rightly found this mean-spirited attack on their gender offensive. Delarivière Manley, for instance, recorded the following reaction to the story in her 1710 Memoirs of Europe:

Can anything be more unnatural than a beautiful Lady . . . just expiring thro’ Grief and Abstinence, tempted to dishonour herself . . . [with] a despicable common sentinel! . . . Petronius’s Designs were doubtless to expose the Frailty of the Sex. (qtd. in Felsenstein 289)

A brief sampling of Manley’s word choices here, “unnatural,” “dishonour,” “despicable,” leaves little doubt of her unfavorable response to the tale as a depiction of her gender. On a purely practical level, Steele needs to tread lightly when introducing this story if he hopes to retain female subscribers, which he overtly states his desire to do in Spectator No. 4:

In a Word, I shall take it for the greatest Glory of my Work, if among reasonable Women this Paper may furnish Tea-Table Talk. In order to it, I shall treat on Matters which relate to Females, as they are concerned to approach or fly from the other Sex, or as they are tied to them by Blood, Interest, or Affection. (Addison and Steele 16)
Part of this catering to “reasonable women” doubtless had to do with Steele’s conception of himself as a gallant gentleman. From a more pecuniary standpoint, though, he could not afford to alienate potential subscribers because he was in debt throughout most of his life and was even briefly imprisoned for failure to pay his creditors in 1709 (Winton 106-07).

If Steele imagined women and men who subscribed to ideals of gallantry as his audience, he had some work to do if he was to include Ligon and Petronius in his periodical, though the former needed considerably less pruning. Steele’s penchant for using and modifying extant literature makes sense both from the standpoint of reaffirming his credentials as an educated gentleman and in terms of the production schedule under which he labored. In between his legal battles with his creditors and his duties as a husband, father of two, and Commissioner of the Stamp Office, Steele both co-wrote and co-edited *The Spectator*, which appeared six days a week with extensive advertising in the heated partisan struggles during the reign of Queen Anne. To give some idea of the pressure Steele was under, he once produced twenty-five papers in thirty-one days (Winton 118, 131, 133). In this politically volatile situation, stories from antiquity provided non-partisan content, though it could be subtly twisted, and a ready body of text that needed only modification rather than time-consuming original work.

Under these trying conditions, Steele needed to produce a periodical that was ideologically moderate enough to sell to Whigs and Tories, men and women, and aristocrats and members of the laboring classes. I argue that Steele did not, by implicitly suggesting that this diverse audience should recollect or, in Norman Simms’ words, make “the effort to track down the unspoken story,” expose them to “the inherent structures of misogyny” in the “study of the classics” (94). Simms uses the Ephesian Matron story from Petronius’ *Satyricon* as a representative of all classical literature, when in fact it is one of the more radical examples of female infidelity. His argument holds considerably less weight if one uses, say, Penelope from the *Odyssey* as the embodiment of classical male attitudes toward women’s faithfulness. In actuality, Steele rails against precisely this type of generalization based on insufficient evidence. For instance, Arietta, who appears to be one of Steele’s mouthpieces in *Spectator* No. 11, says that one should not credit authors who “leave behind them Memorials of their Resentment against the Scorn of particular Women, in Invectives against the whole Sex” (35). In other words, one should not make hasty generalizations about women based on the sour grapes complaints of rejected men.

Steele shows that the reception of the classics need not be uncritical through Arietta’s interpretation of one of Aesop’s fables, “The Man and the Lion.” Arietta cites this fable to illustrate the idea that the person who represents something has the power to manipulate its image as he or she pleases:
In this brief allusion, Arietta reveals that one need not swallow the skewed portrayals of women that some classical authors employ. In fact, Arietta shows how one can use other classical authors against the ones who represent women unfavorably. Arietta likely exaggerates the dichotomy between men who write and women who do not in order to make her point since female authors such as Delarivière Manley were able to “return the injury” to men by creating unbecoming male characters in their works. Rather than throwing up his hands at the “inherent structures of misogyny” in classical education, then, Steele attempts to counter one aspect of that tradition.

Steele implicitly criticizes the depiction of women in the Ephesian Matron narrative and offers a positive alternative through his reworking of Ligon’s story. In all likelihood, Steele was aware of Roman attitudes toward funereal rites since his epigraph in Spectator No. 11 also comes from Juvenal’s Satires (2.63). Indeed, Steele directly incorporates this belief into his own tale but reverses it by giving Inkle the power to condemn Yarico to a secular hell, slavery, which the ingrate chooses to do for the transitory satisfaction not of sex, but money. Moreover, like Petronius, Steele prefaces his tale with a comparison between old stories and new ones, but by 1711 the Ephesian Matron had become the “instance . . . from ancient traged[y]” that would be mentioned but not recited. Instead, Steele chooses a roughly contemporary account, with his own modifications, Richard Ligon’s A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados (1657). However, Arietta makes it clear that unlike Petronius’ “inventions,” her adaptation of Ligon consists of “Facts from plain People” who “have not either Ambition or Capacity to embellish their Narrations with any Beauties of Imagination” (Addison and Steele 35). Steele’s emphasis on the truth of this tale as opposed to the fictional nature of Petronius’ story might have been based on a genuine belief in Ligon’s presentation of his own account as factual. Yet with Steele’s extensive knowledge of the classics, it seems unlikely that he would miss the Inkle and Yarico story’s uncanny resemblance to an episode in Virgil’s Aeneid. In both cases, a traveler in a hostile land (Inkle/Aeneas) receives aid from a local female (Yarico/Dido) and then spends time with her in a cave before eventually abandoning her. Regardless of whether Steele suspected the truth of this tale or not, he argues, through Arietta’s refutation of the Ephesian Matron story, that in old fictional narratives written by men, women may have had unbridled sexual appetites, but not in contemporary accounts.
that have any semblance of truth.

In order to present a more balanced depiction of women, Steele had to tone down the carnality of the Yarico figure in Ligon’s narrative, which he indeed did. He cut out the descriptions of the Amerindian woman’s naked birth of a child in the woods. More importantly, the Inkle character becomes the father of her child rather than some “Christian servant” who knew her, in both the literal and biblical sense, before the central male character’s ship ever arrived in the West “Indian” settlement. Because Ligon’s account gives no temporal cues between the birthing anecdote and the Inkle and Yarico story, it does give the impression that the woman had the child of one man and then immediately “fell in love” with another one (55). Yet, in critical discussions of Spectator No. 11, some scholars tend to exaggerate Steele’s normalization of Yarico’s sexuality. Daniel O’Quinn, for instance, says,

Kathryn Shevelow makes a similar claim by saying that Steele’s Yarico “behaves very much like the virtuous and domestic English middle class wife whose husband’s needs and comforts are her primary study” and exhibits an “Impulse toward domestication that is innately female” (144). Steele tones down Yarico’s sexuality, but O’Quinn and Shevelow fit her into a paradigm of “English” femininity only by neglecting important parts that do not fit their theory, such as her sexual advances toward Inkle in the cave and her ability to physically carry him around like a child. The epigraph suggests the ways in which Steele retains Yarico’s otherness and sexuality, and it is the truly class divisive and cumbersome bit of cultural baggage that Steele inherits (not, as Simms asserts, the Ephesian Matron allusion).

The Epigraph

In an apparent attempt to minimize any interpretational ambiguity readers might encounter, Steele, in the guise of Mr. Spectator, provides them with a textual roadmap that manifests itself in the form of the following epigraph: “Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas” (34). The inclusion of this phrase not only flaunts the narrator’s erudition and mastery of languages, but it also assumes that readers shared his knowledge of Latin. While later editions of The Spectator, starting at least as early as 1744, often include English translations either alongside the epigraphs or in a footnote, they were notably absent in the original publication (fig. 1). From the outset of the
essay, then, Mr. Spectator singles out and privileges a select group within the vast contemporaneous English audience who read the story. Put differently, one must first pass a test in order to share the thoughts and feelings of Mr. Spectator.

Let us, then, using the 1744 edition’s translation, enter into the elite textual conversation that the epigraph begins: “The Doves are Censur’d, while the crows are Spared” (Steele “Number 11”). If one thinks about traditional Western iconography, it can safely be assumed that Mr. Spectator intends
the doves rather than the crows to elicit our sympathy. After all, the former represent peace, whiteness, and purity while the latter are black birds that have often been associated with death. These symbols depend upon a kind of animal physiognomy in which the exterior color of the bird represents something about its moral character. Yet this metaphor goes even further. The crow, by eating raw putrefying flesh, exhibits behavior that, in humans, would violate the laws of cleanliness established in the Old Testament; for instance, God tells Moses that

... every soul that eateth that which died of it self, or that which was torn with beasts, (whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger) he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be uncleane until the even: then shall he be clean.

But if he wash them not, nor bathe his flesh; then he shall bear his iniquity. (Lev. 17:15-16)

As this passage suggests, the physical act of consuming less-than-fresh flesh results in moral contamination or “iniquity.” Whoever Mr. Spectator refers to in the opening epigraph, then, has perverted morality by indulging a black beast that exhibits unorthodox behavior and censuring an innocent white creature. When the chosen readers peruse the subsequent article, they therefore already know that Mr. Spectator wants them to sympathize with the dove and condemn the crow and the character who indulges it.

Readers must then determine the narrative’s character representatives of the epigraph’s figures. One might begin by looking for a character whose evaluation of merit inverts the traditional notion that virtue should be rewarded and vice punished. Perhaps the most obvious candidate for this position is the Common-Place Talker, who “repeat[s] and murder[s]” celebrated works of fiction, such as Petronius’ *Satyricon*, to emphasize the “Perjuries of the Fair, and the general Levity of Women” (Addison and Steele 34). According to the Common-Place Talker and Petronius, women deserve censure while men, by implication, warrant indulgence. Arietta counters this accusation by reiterating the basic idea in Mr. Spectator’s epigraph:

These, and such other Reflections, are sprinkled up and down the Writings of all Ages, by Authors, who leave behind them Memorials of their Resentment against the Scorn of particular Women, in Invectives against the whole Sex. Such a Writer, I doubt not, was the celebrated Petronius, who invented the pleasant Aggravations of the Frailty of the Ephesian Lady. (35)

Because the “whole Sex” should not, in Arietta’s view, be held responsible for the transgressions of “particular Women,” the majority are innocent or dove-like. Arietta, therefore, argues that the Common-Place Talker censures
THE DOVES ARE CENSURED

the doves (most women) and indulges the crows (misogynistic men like Petronius) who make sweeping unjust accusations. Arietta then proceeds, like the Common-Place Talker, to illustrate her point with a story.

This tale, however, appears to subvert the very epigraph that it ostensibly illustrates. According to the animal symbolism, creatures with dark exteriors and strange behaviors are evil whereas those with white covering and conventional conduct are good. Although Arietta attempts to present Yarico as the sympathetic heroine of this framed narrative, the latter’s skin color immediately complicates the situation. While Yarico herself “delight[s] in the Opposition” of “Colour” between Inkle’s hair and her own hand, it is not entirely clear a contemporaneous English audience would have wholeheartedly shared her sentiment (36). Arietta also radically inverts traditional gender roles; Yarico opens Inkle’s “Bosome, then laugh[s] at him for covering it,” brings “him a great many Spoils, which her other Lovers had presented to her,” and “carr[ies] him in the Dusk of the Evening” (36). Unlike the dainty white virginal figures who abound in eighteenth-century sentimental fiction, Yarico acts as a sexual aggressor, mocks what appears to be a gesture of modesty in Inkle, and has premarital sex with him and perhaps some of her countrymen, depending on the exact meaning of “other Lovers.” In addition to usurping the casual attitude toward sexuality conventionally espoused by a male rake or perhaps a female character in a comedic Restoration play, Yarico appropriates roles traditionally held by men: she obtains food and earns commodities while Inkle stays “at home,” she protects him from other men, and she physically carries this grown man over an apparently considerable distance. Yarico therefore acts as both an exotic temptress and a mother-figure to a man who seems as helpless as a child. In other words, she is a complex amalgam of roles and not, as some critics argue, so “very much like the virtuous and domestic English middle class wife” (Shevelow 144).

As for Inkle, he can only resume his quest toward “proper” English manhood and wealth when he renounces this doubly inappropriate relationship. In fact, it is only when he reenters “English Territories” and considers his friends’ reactions that Inkle becomes “pensive,” “frugal,” and “prudent” (Steele, “Number 11” 37). While Arietta doubtless uses these adjectives in an unflattering way, they are not, in and of themselves, disreputable characteristics for an English merchant to cultivate. Steele himself belonged to the Whig party, which advocated these values, and he owned, as Rae Blanchard points out, a West Indian plantation with both “White servants” and “two hundred negro slaves” (283). Be that as it may, however, it now appears that Arietta wants her readers to disown the conventional English dove (Inkle) and identify with the unorthodox crow (Yarico).

Steele’s decision to include the excerpt from Juvenal as an epigraph put his early eighteenth-century English audience in an awkward situation. To
commiserate with Yarico, they would need to overlook her foreignness, her sexual openness, and her assumption of a traditionally masculine role. English readers would also need to disavow those bourgeois traits in Inkle that were widespread in their own culture, making it difficult to separate black from white and crow from dove. Steele probably did not intend for everyone to adopt this view, and certainly not “Common-Place” people. Instead, he targeted a portion of society who considered themselves hyper-sensitive and well-educated individuals, such as Arietta and Mr. Spectator, and who were capable of sympathizing with each other and the poor Amerindian woman. Fortunately for Steele, a lot of people thought of themselves in this flattering way.
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Notes
1. The Inkle and Yarico story occurs within the framed narrative of a discussion between Arietta, Mr. Spectator, and the common-place talker. In addition to these stories, Spectator No. 11 either alludes to or retells portions of Juvenal’s Satires (epigraph), Petronius’ version of the Ephesian matron tale, Aesop’s “Fable of the Lion and the Man,” and Richard Ligon’s A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbadoes. All italics in this essay are the authors’ own unless I specifically indicate otherwise.
2. My use of the term “race” in this essay focuses on skin color, though, as Derek Hughes points out, the word included a “range of possible intellectual combinations that is not easily reproduced today” in the long eighteenth century and “primarily meant family, genealogy, or nation” (xv). Yet skin color already had some of the connotations that it would acquire in later centuries. Ania Loomba argues convincingly that at least as early as the seventeenth-century English men and women held “a Bible-centered conception of the world in which humanity was graded according to its geographical distance from the Holy Land. . . . Blacks became identified with the descendents of Ham, and their color a direct consequence of sexual excess” (42).
3. The first reference in this sentence (“speak with him”) is Henry Aldrich, former tutor of the 2nd Duke of Ormond and Dean of Christ Church, Oxford from 1689-1710. The person Steele refers to as “my Lord” is the
Duke himself, who was Chancellor of the University.

4. All citations from *The Spectator* are from this critical edition unless otherwise noted.

5. Compare with book 4, especially the opening summary or “argument” (296).

6. Although this article cites a 1695 version of the Bible that Steele may actually have come across, the point is not that he had this specific passage in mind when he chose to include Juvenal’s quotation in his article, but rather that the Judeo-Christian taboos against certain eating practices were well-documented during the period in which he lived.

7. None of the three definitions of *lover* in Samuel Johnson’s 1755 dictionary explicitly mean that people are having sex (1. “One who is in love” 2. “A friend; one who regards with kindness” 3. “One who likes any thing.” *Dictionary of the English Language*, s.v. “Lover.”) However, the *OED* states that the sexual form of the word (“one who loves illicitly; a gallant, a paramour”) dates back at least as early as 1611. In fact, Steele himself uses *lover* in this sense when he says that Yarico shows Inkle “where to lie down in Safety” and “hold[s] him in her Arms. . . . In this manner did the Lovers pass away their Time” (Emphasis added, 36). Since Yarico ends up “with Child” after these encounters, one can assume they were more than platonic (37).

8. When Inkle sells his lover into slavery, he reveals an ungentlemanly obsession with money rather than upper-class and supposedly disinterested virtues.

Works Cited


