

JOHN BLYTHE DOBSON

The Spurious Articles In *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*—Some New Discoveries and Considerations

Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography, published in six volumes between 1887 and 1889, is one of the most comprehensive biographical dictionaries for the New World ever published.¹ Though smaller than its successors, the *Dictionary of American Biography* and the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, *Appleton's Cyclopaedia* nevertheless contains accounts of many significant figures who had never before been treated in such a compendium, and have never been since, especially Latin Americans.² Indeed a recent writer, discussing the development of the great biographical collections of the last century, praises the *Cyclopaedia* along with the British *Dictionary of National Biography (DNB)* as "the best of many such works in English."³ Unfortunately, however, an apparent attempt on the part of *Appleton's* to beat the *DNB* to completion⁴ lowered its editors' vigilance to a point where some contributor was able to insert a number of entirely spurious articles, dealing with people who never existed. The incident is perhaps unique in the annals of literary hoaxes, as the only case in which such inventions have infected an encyclopedia.⁵

Spurious articles were only first discovered in the *Cyclopaedia* in 1909, thirty years after its completion, by John Hendley Barnhart⁶ (1871–1949), bibliographer of the New York Botanical Society, and were announced in a short article in the society's *Journal*.⁷ Although a summary of this article was published in the *New York Sun* of 12 October 1919,⁸ his revelations seems to have remained unnoticed by the general public until a bibliophile named Frank M. O'Brien sent a summary of them to *The New Yorker* in 1936,⁹ and the editors of *Letters*, a notes-and-queries sheet of the day, carried an answer to a letter

asking if they had any information on the authorship of the forgeries.¹⁰ Their reply stated that they could not identify the culprit; but they made several important announcements, namely: that the staff of Sabin's *Dictionary of Books Relating to America* had discovered fourteen more fabrications; that a young woman, Margaret Castle Schindler, had just completed a Master's thesis on the subject at the Library School of Columbia University;¹¹ and that Barnhart had just sent them a list of forgeries found by him and a friend, Joseph Cantillon, of Woodstock College, Woodstock, Maryland. In 1937 Schindler, by this time a professor at Goucher College, Towson, Maryland, published in the *American Historical Review* an eleven-page summary of her investigations, in which she revealed that she had discovered eighteen more spurious articles.¹² None of these writers appears to have published anything further on the matter,¹³ and Schindler's article was the last important discussion of the forgeries, which are almost all to be found in the last four volumes of the *Cyclopaedia*, and mainly relate to alleged early explorers of Central and South America. A complete list is given in Appendix I of this paper.

Let us postpone the question of the forgeries' authorship, and begin by considering briefly the various ways by which they have come to be detected. Cantillon, whose interest was in Jesuits, seems to have relied mainly on the entries under that heading in the *Cyclopaedia*'s subject index in the back of the last volume; for only three of his figures (Ignacio, Joubert, and Klein) are not listed there.¹⁴ This method would not however have worked for Barnhart, for the indexing of the botanists is very poor; rather he seems to have worked by scanning for the words "botanist" and "naturalist" in the tags immediately following the names of the subjects, for he almost always misses these when the information on the subjects' careers is buried in the body of the text.¹⁵ The pervasiveness of the fake articles was not suspected until the staff of Sabin's *Dictionary*¹⁶—work on which had recently been reactivated after a long period of suspension—found many of the literary titles attributed to subjects in the *Cyclopaedia* to be unverifiable; it began to record these systematically only with the letter 'V', and stopped at the beginning of the letter "W" when (as it would seem) the effort was no longer proving profitable to its purpose.¹⁷ Observing that fourteen articles under so rare an initial as "V" could be repudiated on bibliographical criteria alone, Schindler undertook a complete examination of the articles under the letter "H" and found fifteen forgeries, as well as three others later in the alphabet which were located "more or less by accident."¹⁸

Not only have the standards of proof of the articles' spuriousness varied with the critics' purposes, but the nature of the evidence used by Barnhart and Cantillon in the lists they sent to *Letters* is completely unknown; and though their work seems on the whole to have been careful, Barnhart errs in including in his list of fakes Goicoechea, an obscure but perfectly genuine botanist (see Appendix I). The present study (the results of which are summarized in Appendix II) makes no special attempt to test these authors' conclusions, but six of the names labelled spurious by Cantillon have been examined afresh, and the cases against them strengthened, in two instances—those of Igolino and Imhoffer—to the level of complete certainty.

This study, closely modelled on Schindler's, is based like it on an alphabetic sample. Since only one article of doubtful authenticity had been found in the first few volumes, and since Schindler had found so many under the letter "H", it was decided to take a sample adjacent to hers, in the same volume; and accordingly the pieces chosen consisted of the part of the letter "G" covered therein, and the entire letter "I". It cannot be claimed that this sample is necessarily characteristic of the *Cyclopaedia* as a whole, either in the nature or in the frequency of its fake articles; but in any case it is full of interest in itself, and allows us to amplify many of Schindler's conclusions.

For the sake of consistency with Schindler's study, almost the same criteria of inclusion were adopted. Articles were only examined which dealt with subjects said to have been born before 1800 and dead by 1850, and those on American Indians were ignored. The only departure from her plan was that Schindler's stipulation that the subjects be "connected with the history of South America" was disregarded, a decision which proved fruitful in that it led to the discovery of two demonstrably spurious figures—namely Illiers and Issertieux—who had no stated connection with South America.

Once this selection had been made, the sample consisted of sixty-five articles requiring verification or refutation. As in Schindler's study, no attempt was made to use manuscript sources, nor to check the substantive accuracy of genuine articles. The former method would have cast a wider net for materials than the original compilers could plausibly have used, and the latter would have been irrelevant to the purposes of this study. Also, so far as possible, only works published before 1886, when work on the *Cyclopaedia* began, were used for the identification of the subjects, in order to minimize the possibility of copying therefrom.

The first phase of the study involved the consultation of various

standard biographical dictionaries and indices thereto, to eliminate demonstrably authentic articles from further consideration. These included Phillips' *Dictionary of Biographical Reference* and Hyamson's *Dictionary of Universal Biography* (which despite their titles are essentially not biographical dictionaries in themselves, but rather indices to various large biographical dictionaries), Riches' *Analytical Bibliography of Universal Biography* (an index to biographical dictionaries and books), and Gale's *Biography and Genealogy Master Index*.¹⁹ Thirty of the sixty-five subjects were thus proven authentic, leaving thirty-five requiring further investigation.

Since nineteen of these remaining thirty-five subjects had literary works assigned to them, a search for negative evidence against the remaining articles was begun in bibliographical works. The most important of these were the catalogs of the British Library, the Bibliothèque Nationale, and the Library of Congress (which covers the collections of all the large libraries of North America), and Molnar's index to Sabin's *Dictionary*.²⁰ For the many subjects stated to have been connected with South America, appropriate lists were also consulted.²¹ Finally, other more specialized subject bibliographies were examined wherever available. It is surely remarkable that not one the fifty-nine alleged literary works could be verified in any of these sources. Schindler has rightly stressed how singular is the failure of so many of the writings named in her sample to be cited by later writers, considering how often they are claimed to have been works of the utmost importance and influence.²² This failure is equally disturbing in the present case; for according to the *Cyclopaedia*, one by Iff was "a standard book on the continent for about a century," Ingrande produced the "standard work" on the early history of Montevideo, and a work by Igné-Chivré remained "the best authority on the Jesuit missions in South America."

Not only individual works but several serials are referred to in the pages of the *Cyclopaedia*. Three sets of supposed Jesuit relations are cited: a *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu* (for the years 1677 and 1729–45) in the articles on Hermstaedt and Zapata; a *Bibliotheca Nova Scriptorum Societatis Jesu* (for four different years spanning 1771 to 1792) in those on Imhoffer, Klein, and Zapata, where the omission of the work *scriptorum* in the title ascribed to Imhoffer is surely unintentional; and a *Bibliotheca Societatis Jesu* (1715) under Zapata. Research has failed to verify the existence of such series (at least for the dates stated), and it seems almost certain that they are fictitious.²³ The *Litterae annuae provinciae Paraguariae Societatis Jesu* (for 1646) cited in

the article on Isoart is an authentic title—though it should read *Paraquariae*—but it is not known to have existed for that date, and the stated place of publication does not match that of the only genuine issue known.²⁴ Clearly, any article containing these or similar titles should be subjected to minute scrutiny before being accepted as authentic.

Despite the necessary reservations about relying on negative bibliographical evidence, our confidence that the unconfirmed titles are fake is bolstered by certain psychological considerations. In the articles studied here and by previous writers, there are hundreds of unverifiable titles. If the author of the articles had really seen such works it would have been entirely inconsistent for him to have kept silent as to their location, when he invents elaborate accounts of dozens of manuscripts said to exist in various libraries around the world and in several places claims that a copy of this or that rare book sold for a certain price at an auction. Although he is acutely attuned to the kinds of flourishes that would impress an antiquary, he almost never says that a published work is available at a particular institution, because he knows that he would be immediately betrayed by its catalog. When his inventiveness begins to flag he simply says that the author is reputed to have left “an undiscovered manuscript,” or he paraphrases the contents of alleged works without citing any titles. Had all this pseudo-knowledge been genuine, he would have been one of the greatest bibliographers and manuscript hunters who ever lived, and presumably would not have had to eke out a living as a hack writer.

Along with the failure of cited works to be verifiable, we must consider the intrinsic implausibility of so many of the references. The manuscript notes of Ignacio are said to furnish material for two works by an alleged writer named Chastelard (who is probably a subsidiary fiction); Infante leaves notes which provide the entire inspiration for a military conquest; a manuscript by Imhoffer is so fine that a man named Gomberville labors to prepare it for the press as a three-volume work. Examples of such posthumous masterpieces could be multiplied over and over. More daring even than these unbelievable assertions about literary remains are the opinions on various men imputed to genuine modern writers whose works were readily available for consultation. Thus Igolino (who, we are told, is the subject of a full-length biography whose title refers to him as *illustrissimus*), is said to have been “the first European to study the anthropology of America,” thus leading the way “to the work of Darwin, Boyer, De Quatre-fages [Quatre-fages de Breaux], and Brasseur de Bourbourg.” While Igolino, who

was decisively discredited by Barnhart in 1919, was one of the first subjects ever to be impugned, it is nevertheless astounding that such an invention could have escaped suspicion for thirty years.

Following the search for negative bibliographical evidence against the thirty-five articles, the next step was to seek positive evidence against them. Of these articles, that on Igolino had, as we have just noted, already been proven spurious by Barnhart in 1919. Simple errors or anachronisms betray the falsity of the articles on Henry Louis, comte d'Illiers, who is named for a real *comté* of which however he could not have been in possession; and that on Dieudonné Gabriel Yves, comte d'Issertieux, who is named for a *comté* which never existed.²⁵ To these may be added grammatical errors in the titles of the alleged literary works, of a kind too serious to be dismissed as misspellings, copying mistakes, or printer's errors: the worst of these is a *Du mouvement religieuse . . .* by Iselin, with the incorrect gender of the adjective, an error which practically precludes the possibility of this title representing a real work.²⁶ The claim in the article on Iff that he accompanied the genuine George Marggraf on one of his travels invites comparison with the article on the latter, which reveals that both men are credited with works entitled *De Medicina Brasiliensis*, dated 1648, a coincidence which is surely beyond belief. The article on Imhoffer (whose interesting name we shall consider later) contains the implausible assertion that he was persecuted by a jealous Cristobál de Acuña, and when we turn to that article we find that the one on Imhoffer is practically a copy of it. Thus, six of our subjects can be definitely repudiated. Considering the risks the forger took in associating spurious subjects with real historical personages or events,²⁷ it is surprising that only one instance has been found in which he employed the relatively safe tactic of having fake articles reinforce each other; namely the reference made to Née in the article on Mondésir.

Finally, more concerted efforts were now made to authenticate the remaining subjects, and six of these—none of them among the alleged authors—were in fact verified (see the note on them in Appendix II); but the status of the other twenty-three remains indefinite, as no evidence could be found to settle the matter. In Appendix II we have called the subjects "authentic" or "spurious" when they could be proven so one way or the other, "unconfirmed" when there was no ground for a decision, and "suspicious" when there was circumstantial but inconclusive evidence against their favor. For convenience we shall hereafter refer collectively to articles in the last two categories as "doubtful" or "dubious".

Many of the merely dubious articles remain so because they contain statements of a kind which are practically impossible to disprove; but we can cast further aspersions on some of them by way of internal criticism. There are cases of marked incompatibility between a subject's supposed national origin and the language he uses in his writing, like the Dutchmen Ingenhous (whom Cantillon thought spurious) and Ihering and Iwert, who write mainly in French and German; these being the languages used for most of the literary titles proven spurious by Barnhart and Schindler, among them several purportedly by Dutchmen and Swedes. There are also cases of remarkable disjuncture between the profession attributed to a man, and his character and interests as suggested by the titles of his literary works, so many coming to the new world simply as "explorers" or "adventurers," and with no previous training or experience managing in brief stays to gather notes for elaborate multi-volume descriptions of the flora, fauna, languages, and customs, which even centuries later are accepted as authoritative by local experts. Similarly, many men have unlikely combinations of lifelong careers, such as Ingulf von Köln, who is made to be an explorer, celebrated sculptor, and prolific writer. The migratory tendencies of many subjects seem less reflective of natural necessity than of the requirement that they leave "no tombstone . . . in North America for skeptical editors to hunt up."²⁸ In the same vein, they are made to shun public life on returning to their native lands by immersing themselves in such austere pursuits as iconology and lexicography: thus Ietersdorf-Klasten produces a lexicon and a grammar of Carib in 1659 and 1661; Igné-Chivré in 1737 writes his *De arte Lingua Layagua*, which is said to be "the only monument left of the language of that extinct nation"; Imhoffer makes a dictionary of the "Amazon language" in the late 18th century; and Ignacio in 1774 busies himself with the cataloguing of Mexican hieroglyphs. But as the last effort was practically repeated by the fictitious Née in the 1830s, the reader is left to wonder how such an achievement can have any enduring value, and how it is supposed to secure one a place in a biographical dictionary.

It is frequently a simple matter to suggest more plausible alternatives to the statements made in the doubtful articles. Previous studies have discovered examples of the attribution of deeds to the subject which were actually accomplished earlier or simultaneously by someone else, and need not or could not have been repeated.²⁹ The book titles provide further evidence, some being copied from those of real works previously in existence,³⁰ and others echoing distinctive uses of

rare words like *prodromus*, which occurs in a metaphorical sense in an authentic title by an earlier botanist and recurs in a title attributed to Kjoeping.³¹ While not exactly unheard of, such slavish imitation of titles and figures of speech was not so common as the author of the fakes would have us believe. We should also be made wary by the simultaneous or subsequent appearance of literary works by real persons which, had they really followed upon those allowed to subjects in the *Cyclopaedia*, would surely have precipitated charges of plagiarism against their authors.³² We have already mentioned that Iff is credited with a *De Medicina Brasiliensis* (1648), the title and date of which have simply been lifted from the article on the genuine George Marggraf. Hjorn is said to have written *Les légumineuses arborescentes de l'Amérique du Sud* in 1789, a title which, as Schindler discovered, was copied intact from that of a genuine work by Tulasne of 1844.³³ Further variations on this title include a *Nouveau traité sur les légumineuses de l'Amérique du Sud* by Ibercourt (who is thus almost certainly spurious) and an *Études sur les légumineuses arborescentes de l'Amérique du Sud* by Monteil.³⁴

Similarly, there are deeds and works attributed to many of the subjects which, considered in isolation, would be difficult to refute, but as they are attributed to more than one subject in the corpus of the *Cyclopaedia* provoke strong suspicion of fraud. Barnhart points out that the phrase *plantarum circa Havana crescentium* appears both in the works of Kerckhove and Nascher,³⁵ and in the course of the present study it was noticed that the phrase *species plantarum in Peruvia crescentium* appears in a title attributed to Iselin, while *species plantarum quae in Mexico Crescent [sic]* appears in one for Née. Likewise Barnhart observed that the rather rare word *prodromus*, just referred to above, appears in the article on Kjoeping;³⁶ and in the course of the present study it was also discovered in those on Mortier, Ramée, and Thibaudin. As Barnhart concluded, "The element of sameness which characterizes these accounts, not conspicuous when scattered throughout the volume of the cyclopaedia, but very evident when they are brought together . . . is an added proof . . . of their spurious character."³⁷

Such sameness is also evident in the tone and style of the doubtful articles, a subject which has elicited less comment. First, a feature one cannot help noticing is their occasional silliness, as if the forger were flaunting the falseness of his work. The amazing name José de Jesu Maria Ignacio is, we are told, the alias of a German named Herman Loessing, assumed when he became a Jesuit. The article on Ingulf von Köln, to which we shall refer again below, is an utterly wild produc-

tion. In the group studied by Barnhart,³⁸ it is said that the works of Mondésir were valuable but few, yet there follow six titles, two of them being works of two volumes apiece. Second, a consistent trait of the dubious articles is the evasiveness of their references to sources. In that on Inama, for example, its subject is said to have written “an account of the California mission, which was published in the *Weltbote* [*recte* *Weltbott*] edited by Father Stöcklein.” The title of this collection is genuine,³⁹ and it is just possible that it contains something by Inama; but if so, how could the writer in the *Cyclopaedia* have discovered the fact while working within the time constraints imposed by its editorial policy? The *Weltbott* was a literary monstrosity published in at least forty fascicules,⁴⁰ and neither the New York Public Library nor the Library of Congress owns a complete example. It is an almost fantastically inaccessible work, and no sincere reference to it would give so vague a citation. Third, turning from the texts of the dubious articles to the alleged literary titles they contain, there are several errors and stylistic lapses apart from the fatal one we have mentioned earlier with respect to Iselin. The long strings of genitives and plurals in the latin are stylistically unconvincing, and have a decidedly awkward effect, as does the curious attempt in the title of Ignacio’s *De Arte Hieroglyphum Mexicanorum* to promote a nominal form of the word *hieroglyphicus*. To conclude our consideration of the sampled articles, the doubtful and spurious ones have a pervasive air of unreality about them, deriving both from the story-book situations they depict and from the irregularity of the period detail in which they are dressed. Barnhart was disposed to refer to them as “fairly tales.”⁴¹

Having dealt with some specific details of the impostures, we come to the question of locating a source whence their matter could have been drawn. We agree with Barnhart and Schindler in rejecting the possibility of the inventions having been copied whole from any previous work.⁴² But as for the raw subject matter, Schindler suggested in her thesis that “much of his information could have been obtained from French sources, some of it from a no more obscure work than the *Biographie Universelle* of Michaud,”⁴³ which was widely available at the time of the *Cyclopaedia*’s composition.⁴⁴ Strangely, she appears to have missed the significance of this insight, which she fails to mention in her published paper; moreover she seems not to have noticed that incidents in the life of her subject Houdetot, a soldier stationed at Martinique, correspond closely to those described in the account of César-Ange Houdetot, comte de Houdetot, given in the *Biographie Universelle*. Two of the subjects in the present study indeed bear strong

resemblances to genuine persons treated in the *Biographie Universelle*: Iselin, like the real-life Jacques-Christophe Iselin (1681–1737), was an historian born at Basel; and Ingenhous, like the real-life Jan Ingenhousz (1730–1799), was a botanist who wrote on plant physiology. We single out the *Biographie Universelle* for mention because, while the three real men who served as models for these articles were fairly well-known, and memoirs of them appear in several other places, probably no previous biographical dictionary contained all three, or even persons with all three of their surnames.⁴⁵ Furthermore, so many other rare surnames can be found only in the pages of this work⁴⁶ that it must have been scanned for inspiration, even when the contents of the associated articles were not imitated; it would have furnished in a few hours' perusal the surnames of Harmand, Icart, Iñigo, Irwing, Isambert, Kjoeping, and Mimeure, allowing for trivial spelling variations. This is to say nothing of the many surnames, amounting to over half of those of the doubtful subjects, which are shared by other biographical dictionaries. Probably too the *Cyclopaedia's* article on Gustav Melchior Imhoffer owes something to that on Melchior Inchofer in the *Biographie Universelle*; the change in the surname might even have arisen accidentally from the "nc" in a hand-written submission having been read as an "m" by the printer, an error against which the forger must have had little reason to protest if he saw the article in proof. It is clear from the error of "Montrueil" for "Montreuil" that such errors indeed occurred, so likewise it is not unlikely that the Verhuen and Soulabie in the *Cyclopaedia* were derived from the *Biographie Universelle's* Verhuell and Soulavie. Many more subjects in the *Biographie Universelle* were transmogrified into characters for the *Cyclopaedia* by changing their names entirely, as shown by Barnhart's and Schindler's work; but this is a matter which the present more modest study has necessarily left unexplored.

Still, there is another probable source which no previous writer has suggested, namely the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale (NBG)*,⁴⁷ which, until an injunction was issued against its publisher in 1855, plagiarized heavily from the *Biographie Universelle*. This later work, which has always been as widely accessible as the earlier one, not only contains all the names mentioned above except Irwing, but also would have furnished those of Illiers, (Hermenegildo) Infante, Jarque, Jügler, and Jungmann; and the name of Illgen which it contains could have provided the inspiration for that of Illigen (whether or not the change in spelling were intentional) in Appleton's *Cyclopaedia*. It is of course possible that the forger used both of these great French dictionaries in

his work: the *NBG* has more names but the *Biographie Universelle* is more expansive in the treatment of its subjects, so that while the former would have been easier to scan, the latter would have provided a less detectable repertory of personal detail.

These sources still do not account for all the rare surnames used in the dubious and fake articles in the *Cyclopaedia*, and since it is unlikely that anyone would have had personal knowledge of so many, the forger must have culled them from other biographical dictionaries and printed works as he came across them. He could for example have taken “Hermstaedt” (for “Hermstedt”), “Ihering,” and “Illigen” (for “Illgen” or “Illiger,” or a combination thereof) from the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, and it is possible that the surname Lottenschiold is based on that of O. L. Lohenschiold, a Swede who edited the German translation (Ulm, 1760–63) of Ladvocat’s famous *Dictionnaire historique portatif*. But even allowing for all these possible borrowings, and for the alterations, intentional or otherwise, of some of the originals, there remain many surnames (about thirty percent of the total) which are entirely unknown to the major nineteenth-century reference works, such as Huon de Penanster, Ibercourt, Ietersdorf, Igné, Igolino, Imfreville, Ingulf, Steinhefer, Villadarias, and Wallerton. Either the forger found them in less obvious places, or he invented them.

Having considered possible sources for the impostures, let us now consider briefly the question of their authorship. Unfortunately it is one which can never be determined through internal evidence, as the articles are not only unsigned but have obviously been edited for stylistic uniformity. Our only clues are the lists of major contributors at the fronts of each volume, for Appleton-Century’s records are all lost. Most previous discussion has centered on a contributor called in the credits lists William Christian Tenner, whose name Barnhart thought an alias, and who is somewhat oddly identified as a “graduate of the University of Paris” rather than by his profession; the reason for the suspicion against Tenner being that he was soon after tried for forgery and imprisoned.⁴⁸ The fact that this forgery was a financial and not a literary one was generally forgotten, and Barnhart’s and Schindler’s informants readily blamed Tenner after the fictions were discovered.⁴⁹ The version of the story told to Barnhart runs that Tenner “first suggested to the editors the desirability of including biographies of travelers in Latin America” and “sold to Appleton, for use in the Cyclop[edia], alleged South American biographical sketches and . . . transacted his business directly” either with Wilson or Johnson, the

former an editor and the latter the managing editor, "but never became acquainted with any of the other members of the editorial staff, and finally disappeared."⁵⁰ Barnhart wrote to Johnson asking for confirmation of this story but Johnson (who had by then forgotten who was responsible for the individual articles and did not have his working notes to refer to) neglected to respond to this point in his reply.⁵¹ However, these allegations regarding Tenner, to which Schindler attaches little credence, are contradicted on an important point by the fact that he is never credited with *any* articles on Latin Americans, which even if he had been responsible only for the fake ones would have been an oversight of enormous proportions. Besides, as Johnson had already told Barnhart,⁵² every member of the regular staff was free to comment on the contents, so that even if Tenner had managed to avoid direct confrontations with them, he could hardly have hoped that his work would indefinitely escape their criticism.

The obvious person to have provided such criticism was Hermann Ritter, head of Appleton's Spanish Department, who alone is credited with "articles on South and Central Americans" in the volumes with which we are concerned.⁵³ Even if not all these pieces actually passed through his hands while being prepared for the press, it is difficult to imagine how, in his own area of presumed expertise and over the course of two years, he could have remained innocently unaware of so many articles containing flagrant anomalies. The crucial point is that until Ritter took over as department head with volume three, only one possibly spurious article seems to have been intruded; while after his assumption of the office, the spurious articles come in floods.⁵⁴ The only credible explanation for this is that the deceptions were committed by Ritter alone, or that he collaborated with or was in collusion with another contributor. Even the one doubtful article published under his predecessor might, if it is indeed spurious, have been launched by Ritter as a test-case of the work's vulnerability, as his absence from the list of contributors to that volume does not imply that he wrote nothing for it. This is the conclusion regarding Ritter to which the present writer had come before having seen Schindler's thesis, and it is gratifying to learn that she there offers a hint along similar lines, discussing Ritter's career and concluding guardedly that "it should have been more difficult to deceive" him.⁵⁵

Whether a possible collaborator with Ritter could have been Tenner can presently be only a matter for speculation. The editors of *Letters* thought Tenner likely to have been involved in the forgeries because he, like many of the fake subjects, was French. But this, and even the

use of French works in his research, is no proof that the forger was a native Frenchman. If Tenner was indeed French—and this seems likely enough, as he was taken for a Frenchman by everyone who met him and was even hired by one of the editors to do some translations from French,⁵⁶—then his nationality would actually be an argument against his involvement in the forgeries, as he would thence have been unlikely to have countenanced the egregious grammatical error in the French title attributed to Iselin, which has been mentioned above. It is in any case not necessary to suppose that more than one person was directly involved in the forgeries, and on the whole it seems implausible that anyone would jeopardize so lucrative a stratagem by sharing his secret with others.

It is now time to attempt some assessment of the extent and influence of the fake material in Appleton's *Cyclopaedia*. The letters "G", "H", and "I" in the third volume comprise about 1140 articles, forty-three of which—or about 3.8 percent—are doubtful or spurious. If the same proportion should prevail throughout the last four volumes, then the problem confronting the user is clearly one of considerable magnitude. Given this situation, it is regrettable that the work of Barnhart, Schindler, and Cantillon is not better known.⁵⁷ In 1968 the Gale Research Company reprinted the first edition of the *Cyclopaedia*, making no mention of its tainted character, and reviewers of the reprint heaped indiscriminate praise on the work.⁵⁸ Gale's silence has been maintained throughout the publication of its *Biography and Genealogy Master Index*, which indexes the *Cyclopaedia*, its two supplements to Slocum's *Biographical Dictionaries and Related Works* (1972, 1978), and its new edition of Slocum (1986). One is led to wonder whether its proprietary interest in the works it reprints has not dulled its willingness to submit them to even the most casual evaluation. It might have been thought that a publisher which now enjoys a virtual monopoly in this market could afford the risk.

Barnhart and Schindler offered solemn warnings that the spurious articles in Appleton's would eventually find new life in other biographical dictionaries.⁵⁹ Subsequent developments have justified their fears. Imhoffer, who was plausibly declared spurious by Cantillon in 1936, and who is proved so in the present study, appears in the *Dictionary of Catholic Biography*.⁶⁰ Another work, *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History*, treats of Isles, who is otherwise unverifiable, Ingulf von Köln, who must be placed in the "suspicious" category, and Illiers, whom the present study has shown to be spurious.⁶¹ And these biographical compendia are not alone, for the standard bibliogra-

phy on Puerto Rico lists one of the works by the non-existent Illiers.⁶² Finally, it is not only direct copying of the *Cyclopaedia's* content that is to be feared, but also the risk, as Schindler noted, that its index will be used as a source of statistical information.⁶³

Schindler finally decided of the *Cyclopaedia* that "used with proper caution, it is still, as it has always been, a valuable and authoritative work."⁶⁴ But while there is no denying that many of its genuine articles have a practically unique value, is it not unduly generous to use the word "authoritative" of a work which is permeated with unidentified fictions? It is doubtless easier for us to admit the failure of Appleton's *Cyclopaedia* with the passing of a century, then it was for those who grew up regarding it as a source of national pride. And while it is tragic that the work of so many worthy contributors was effectively sabotaged by the hoaxes, perhaps the incident may serve as an object lesson to the editors of other encyclopedias. Unless the work is re-edited to remove fakes and warn against doubtful articles, there seems no possibility of its continuing to serve as a standard work of reference.

4 CROMER BAY, WINNIPEG

The author should like to thank his friend Steven Baljkas, who read and commented upon several drafts of this paper; Dr. Wesley Stevens, of the Department of History, University of Winnipeg, for whose Honors seminar in the Philosophy of History it was originally written, and who has made many valuable suggestions; and the audience at the Second Annual University of Winnipeg History Association Symposium (1989).

NOTES

1. *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, ed. James Grant Wilson & John Fiske, 6 vols. (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1887-1889), and supplement, 1 vol. (1901). The first six volumes were reprinted in 1900 with the words "revised edition" on the title page, but the revisions, if any, must have been very slight, as the pagination remains identical. A really new edition, called the *Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 12 vols. (New York, 1915-31), which carries forth the spurious articles, was never completed.
2. The second edition of the *Dictionary of National Biography* (1908-9), vol. I, p. xi, states that Appleton's *Cyclopaedia* contains 20,000 articles, but the present writer's estimate would suggest a much lower figure of about 13,400. The *Dictionary of American Biography* (original series) claims to contain 13,600. The *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (Permanent Series, to vol. 57) has over 58,000, but many of its figures are of no historical interest.
3. John A. Garraty, *The Nature of Biography* (New York, 1957), p. 102.

4. This point was suggested to the writer by Dr. Victor Batzel, Chair of the Department of History, University of Winnipeg.
5. This would appear to have been the opinion of Schindler, in "Fictitious Biography," *American Historical Review*, 42 (1937), pp. 680-90, and also of Curtis D. MacDougall, in *Hoaxes*, rev. ed. (New York, 1958), p. 227; and no examples are cited in H. M. Paull's *Literary Ethics* (1928). Of course, some quite erroneous names have appeared in encyclopedias as a result of honest misunderstanding, without the lives themselves being faked. The only incident that seems to compare with the present one is the wholesale faking of bibliographical references in the *Biographie Générale* which R. C. Christie exposed in the *Quarterly Review*, 157 (1884), pp. 222-3.
6. On whom see the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, vol. 28 (New York, 1938), pp. 442-3.
7. Barnhart, "Some Fictitious Botanists," *Journal of the New York Botanical Society*, vol. 20, no. 237 (Sept. 1919), pp. 171-81.
8. Reference from Schindler in her *AHR* article, p. 680.
9. Frank M. O'Brien, "The Wayward Encyclopedias," *The New Yorker*, vol. 12 (2 May 1936), pp. 55-8.
10. "Eighty-Four Phonies," *Letters* (New York: Time Inc.), vol. 3, no. 19 (14 Sept. 1936), pp. 1-2.
11. Margaret Castle Schindler, *Bibliographia Imaginaria: An Investigation of the Fictitious Element in Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, M.S. thesis, Columbia University, 1936, 117 pp. By the time a copy of this work could be obtained the present paper was practically finished, but a few references to it have been worked in. As Schindler's discussion of the individual forgeries is in alphabetic order it has seldom seemed necessary to give page citations.
12. This paper (cited in full above) was an abstract of Schindler's master's thesis.
13. Unless Barnhart dealt with the matter again in his posthumously-published *Biographical Notes upon Botanists* (Boston, 1965), which the present writer has not seen.
14. The "Joubert" of the Letters list may, however, be an error for Jaubert, another alleged but unconfirmable Jesuit, who does appear in the *Cyclopaedia's* index.
15. Barnhart, in "Some Fictitious Botanists," catches a few subjects who are not so styled, namely Kaiser, Kjoeping, and Martin de Moyville; but he misses a number of botanists who are certainly or almost certainly fake, like Ibercourt, Iff, Iselin, and Ingenhous (who was later pointed out to him by Cantillon).
16. Joseph Sabin [et al.], *Bibliotheca Americana, A Dictionary of Books relating to America, from its Discovery to the Present Time*, 29 vols. (New York, 1868-1936).
17. The work was resumed with vol. 20 (1928). Sabin's staff made no formal announcement of its discovery, which was first published in the *Letters* article, the editors having probably been informed of it by Schindler, who mentions it in her thesis, pp. 4-5, and later in her *AHR* article, p. 681. How Schindler learned of the matter is a mystery.
18. Schindler, thesis, p. 8. The reasons for her choice of the sample are given on p. 6.
19. Lawrence B. Phillips, *The Dictionary of Biographical Reference . . .*, 3d ed. (London & Philadelphia, 1889); Albert M. Hyamson, *A Dictionary of Universal Biography . . .*, 2nd ed. (London, 1951); Phyllis M. Riches, *An Analytical Bibli-*

- ography of Universal Collected Biography . . .* (London, 1934); *Biography and Genealogy Master Index*, 2nd ed., 8 vols. (Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1980); *Ibid.*, 1981–85 Cumulation, 5 vols. (1985). The writer has not had access to the K. G. Saur Verlag's *American Biographical Archive* (1986–); and the *Index bio-bibliographicus notorum hominum* (Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1973–), which in the future will greatly facilitate studies of this kind, has as yet only reached the letter D.
20. *British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books . . . to 1955*, 283 vols. (London, 1959–66); *Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 231 vols. (Paris: 1897–1981); *The National Union Catalog Pre-1956 Imprints*, 685 vols. (London, 1968–80); Molnar, *Author-Title Index to Joseph Sabin's Dictionary of Books Relating to America*, 3 vols. (Metuchin, N.Y.: Scarecrow Press, 1974).
 21. Raymond L. Grismer, *A Reference Guide to Twelve Thousand Spanish American Authors . . .* (New York, 1939); Antonio Palau y Dulcet, *Manuel del Librero Hispano-Americano*, 28 vols. (Barcelona, 1948–77).
 22. Schindler, in her *AHR* article, p. 682.
 23. Jesuit relations are gathered together under "Jesuit" in the British Museum and National Union catalogs. Since this was written, it has been learned from Schindler's thesis, p. 22, that she made an intensive search for the title cited under the name of Hermstaedt, without finding an example for the appropriate date. There was a volume of that name published at Rome in 1676 by Pedro di Rivadeneira, a revision of an earlier work by Philippe Alegambe (see *British Museum General Catalogue . . . to 1955*, vol. 202, col. 12); but Schindler's statement that it does not mention Hermstaedt is borne out by the absence of his name in Phillips, in which it happens to be indexed.
 24. It cannot be identified with the *Litterae annuae provinciae Paraquariae Societatis Iesu ad admodum R. P. Mutium Vitellescum . . .* (Antwerp, 1636), listed in the *National Union Catalog Pre-1956 Imprints*, vol. 280, p. 223.
 25. *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse [de la France]*, ed. Chenaye-Desbois & Badier, 19 vols., Paris, 1868–76.
 26. This error was kindly pointed out to the writer by his friend Steven Baljkas.
 27. Barnhart (on Kerckhove); Schindler, in her *AHR* article, p. 685 (on Herbette and Kerckhove), and pp. 685–6 (on Houdetot). Herbette and Kerckhove (and also Koehler, to whom Schindler seems to allude on p. 73 of her thesis) all had alleged associations with the great Alexander von Humboldt.
 28. O'Brien, p. 57.
 29. See Barnhart, p. 176 (on Lotter), p. 179 (on Sylvie); and Schindler, *AHR*, pp. 682–3 (on Huon de Penanster), p. 63 (on Huss), p. 685 (on Houdetot).
 30. See Barnhart, p. 172 (on Igolino), p. 173 (on Kehr); and Schindler, *AHR*, p. 683 (on Huon de Penanster and Huss).
 31. Barnhart, p. 174.
 32. Barnhart, p. 175, hints at this point with respect to Koehler.
 33. Barnhart, p. 174.
 34. For Monteil see Schindler, thesis, p. 28.
 35. This last is noticed in *ibid.*, pp. 55–6.
 36. As noticed in Barnhart, p. 174.
 37. Barnhart, p. 181.

38. As cited in the *Letters* article.
39. Joseph Stöcklein, *Allerhand so Lehr- als geist-reiche Brief, Schrifften und Reis-Beschreibungen, welche denen Missionariis der Gesellschaft Jesu aus beyden Indien und andern über Meer gelegenden Ländern . . . in Europa angelangt seynd . . .* [better known by its half-title, *Der neue Welt-Bott, mit allerhand Nachrichten dern Missionorum Societatis Jesu*], 5 vols. in 40 parts (Augsburg, &c., 1726–1761).
40. Their exact number and date of completion appear to be uncertain; see László Polgár, *Bibliography of the History of the Society of Jesus* (Rome & St. Louis, Missouri, 1934), pp. 136–7.
41. Barnhart, p. 172.
42. Barnhart, p. 171; Schindler, *AHR*, p. 687.
43. Schindler, thesis, p. 64.
44. *Biographie Universelle*, original series, 52 vols. (Paris, 1811–28); it was reissued in 45 vols. in 1843–65.
45. See Phillips, *Dictionary of Biographical Reference*, where all the important ones are indexed.
46. From this remark we except only the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, to which we shall come presently.
47. *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, 46 vols. (Paris, 1852–66); until vol. 8 the title, which the publishers were forced to change, was *Nouvelle Biographie Universelle*.
48. Schindler, thesis, p. 76.
49. See the documents reproduced in *ibid.*, pp. 93, 99.
50. Barnhart to Johnson, reproduced in *ibid.*, p. 93.
51. Johnson to Barnhart, *ibid.*, pp. 95–6.
52. Johnson to Barnhart, *ibid.*, pp. 89–91.
53. Johnson to Barnhart, *ibid.*, p. 90; Schindler's thesis, p. 96.
54. No fake articles have ever been found in vol. I, but vol. II has an article on Nepomuceno Dávila, whom Barnhart thought fake.
55. Schindler, thesis, p. 75.
56. Johnson to Barnhart, reproduced in Schindler's thesis, p. 96.
57. The only actual citations of their work which the present writer has seen are in MacDougall, p. 227; and in the American Library Association's *Guide to Reference Books* (Chicago: A.L.A.), at least from the 8th ed. (1967) onward. There are passing references to the spurious articles in Allan Nevins, *The Gateway to History*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1962), pp. 151–52, and in *Best Reference Books 1970–1980*, ed. Susan Holte and Bohdan S. Wynar (Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1981), p. 37.
58. "In Review," *RQ* [i.e. *Reference Quarterly*], vol. 8, no. 2 (Winter 1968–9), p. 131; "Trade Reviews," *AB Bookman's Weekly*, vol. 46 (14 Dec. 1970), p. 1837.
59. Barnhart, p. 171; Schindler, thesis, pp. 78–82 and 116, and *AHR*, p. 689, reports that she discovered traces of the spurious subjects in four bibliographies, in a scientific article, and in the first edition of Hyamson's *Dictionary of Universal Biography* (1916). The second edition of this last work (1951) drops Appleton's *Cyclopaedia* from the list of indexed works without saying why; it would be interesting to know whether Hyamson had learned of the fake material in it.

60. *Dictionary of Catholic Biography*, by John J. Delaney & James Edward Tobin (Garden City, N.Y., 1961).
61. *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History, from 458 A.D. to 1915*, by Benson John Lossing, 10 vols. (New York & London, 1915), not seen.
62. Antonio Pedreira, *Bibliografía Puertorriqueña, 1493-1930* (Madrid, 1932), p. 383.
63. Schindler, *AHR*, pp. 688-9.
64. *ibid.*, p. 689.

APPENDIX I

Master list of articles in Appleton's *Cyclopaedia* suggested or proven to be spurious by earlier writers. Names preceded by asterisks are alleged authors.

Sources:

B 1919 = Barnhart, *J. New York Botanical Garden*, 20 (1919), 171-81

B 1936 = Barnhart, as quoted in *Letters*, 32 (1936), 1-2

C = Cantillon, as quoted in *Letters*, 1-2

S = Schindler, *AHR*, 42 (1937), 680-90

Sab = Sabin's staff, as quoted in *Letters*, 1-2

I. SPURIOUSNESS INCORRECTLY SUGGESTED (1 subject)

Goicoechea (B 1936)¹

II. SPURIOUSNESS TENTATIVELY SUGGESTED (2 subjects)

Dávila (Nepomuceno) (B 1936) *Pierola (Nicholas de, the elder)² (B 1936)

III. SPURIOUSNESS SUGGESTED (62 subjects)

Hernandez (Vicente) (S) *Hjorn (S) *Ignacio (C) *Igné-Chivré (C) *Imhoffer (C) *Ingenhous (C) *Isoart (C) *Jansen (Olaüs) (B 1936) *Jarque (C) *Joubert³ (C) *Jouffroy (C) *Jügler (B 1936) *Jungmann (Bernhardt) (B 1936) *Keisar (B 1936) *Kjoeping (B 1919) *Klein (C) *Klüber (S) *Koehler (Alexander) (B 1919) *Loot (B 1936) *Lottenschield (C) *Martin de Moyville (B 1936) *Mimeure (C) *Mondésir (B 1936) *Montaigne de Nogaret (B 1936) *Monteil (S)⁴ *Montrueil⁵ (B 1936) *Moraud (C) *Mortier (B 1919) *Née (B 1919) *Oudin (C) *Percheron (C) *Pereira (Antonio) (C) Perret (C) *Quentin (C) *Ramée (B 1919) *Renaud (C) *Ribas (Andres Perez de) (C) *Soulabie (C) *Steinhefer (C) *Thibaudin (B 1919) *Uffenbach (C) *Urfê (Louis Edouard d') (C) *Verden (Sab) *Verdugo (Sab) Vergara y Zamoral (C) *Verhuen (Sab) *Veullot (Sab) *Viana (Francisco) (Sab) *Vicente y Bennazar⁶ (Sab) *Viel (C) *Vigier (Sab) *Villadarias (Sab) *Villiers (Sab) *Vilmot (Sab) *Vogué (Sab) Voisin (Charles Antoine)⁷ (Sab) *Voisin (Pierre Joseph) (Sab) *Voiture (Sab) *Wallerton (B 1919) *Wallon (C) *Watteau (Sab) *Zapata⁸ (C)

IV. SPURIOUSNESS POSITIVELY PROVEN⁹ (21 subjects)

*Harmand (S) *Henrion (S) *Hérauld (S) *Herbette (S) *Hermstaedt (S) *Herrera (Miguel)¹⁰ (S) Horne (S) Houdetot (S) Huden (S) Huet de Navarre (S) *Hühne (S) *Huon de Penanster (S) *Huss (S) *Igolino (B 1919) *Kehr (B

1919) *Kerckhove (B 1919) *Lotter (B 1919) *Nascher (B 1919) *Sylvie (B 1919) *Tapin¹¹ (S) *Vivier (B 1919)

1. Following a tentative suggestion by Barnhart in 1919. But in fact this subject was a real person, a memoir of whom appears in H. J. Rose, *A New General Biographical Dictionary*, 12 vols. (London, 1840–47).
2. In this case, especially, the present writer is inclined to demand stronger evidence against the subject, as the son of the same name with whom he is credited was a real person, having been President of Peru from 1879 to 1881.
3. The *Letters* article says “Joubert”, who is an alleged Jesuit; but it is Jaubert, another alleged Jesuit, who appears with the Jesuits in the index to the *Cyclopaedia*, where Cantillon might have noticed the listing. Neither man can be found in other sources.
4. Schindler notes that the facts cited in the article on Monteil had been questioned, but “with apparent acceptance of him as a real person,” by S. W. Gleisher in *Field and Laboratory*, 3 (1934), 11–12; see her thesis, p. 55, where she credits Barnhart for the reference.
5. *Sic*; doubtless “Montreuil” was intended.
6. The name is misquoted as “Bennazar” in the *Letters* article.
7. He is missed in the *Letters* article, but appears in Schindler’s *AHR* article.
8. Printed “Zopata” in the index to the *Cyclopaedia*.
9. The definitive proofs that Harmand, Hermstaedt, Horne, Huden, Hühne, Huon de Penanster, and Tapin are fake are given by Schindler only in her thesis, not in her *AHR* article.
10. The name is garbled in the *Letters* article.
11. Schindler was able to show in her thesis, pp. 56–60, that this article was probably written by the same person who prepared the genuine (but very faulty) article on Huerto in the supplement to the *Cyclopaedia*.

APPENDIX II

Survey of articles in vol. 3 of Appleton’s *Cyclopaedia* under the letters “G” and “I”, meeting the criteria described in the text above, with a summary of the relevant evidence. Names preceded by asterisks are alleged authors (while demonstrably authentic authors are not distinguished). Figures whose names are given in italics were declared spurious by earlier writers, and the references will be found in the previous appendix.

I. AUTHENTICATED ARTICLES¹ (37 subjects)

Growdon Grubé Gual Güemes y Horcasitas (Juan Francisco) Guerrero (Vicente) Guess Guest (John, d. 1707) Guignas² Gumilla Gutierrez de Lara Guy (Peter) Guy (William) Guzmán (Nuño Beltrán de) Guzmán (Rui Diaz de) Gwinnett Ibarra (Francisco de) Ibarra (José) Iberville Infante (José Miguel) Ingle Inglis (Charles) Inhambupe³ Irala Iredell Iribarren Irvine (James) Irvine (William, d. 1804) Irving (Paulus Aemilius) Irwin (Matthew) Isert Isthuanfi Itaparicá Iturbide Iturri Iturriaga Iturribalzaga Iturrigaray

II. UNCONFIRMED ARTICLES (9 subjects)

Guzmán (Agustin)⁴ Icart Idiáquez Illigen Imecourt Inama⁵ Infante (Hermene-gildo) Irwing Isles⁶

III. SUSPICIOUS ARTICLES (13 subjects)

*Ibercourt⁷ *Ietersdorf-Klasten⁸ *Ignacio *Igné-Chivré *Ihering *Imfreville-Beaudry *Ingenhous⁹ *Ingrande *Ingulf von Köln¹⁰ *Iñigo¹¹ *Isambert *Isoart *Iwert

IV. SPURIOUS ARTICLES (6 subjects)

*Iff¹² *Igolino *Illiers¹³ *Imhoffer¹⁴ *Iselin¹⁵ *Issertieux¹⁶

1. Of these subjects, only Guy (William), Guzmán (Rui Diaz de), Infante, Inhambupe, Irwin, and Iturri could not be found in some standard biographical dictionary. The references to the works in which they were authenticated are available on request.
2. The article is authentic, but his first name should be Michel, not Ignatius; see the *Dictionary of National Biography*.
3. He should, however, have been entered under his family name of da Cunha, by which he was generally known.
4. But there is no real reason to doubt his authenticity, as he is mentioned earlier in the article on Rafael Carrera, the president of Guatemala against whom he is said to have fought.
5. It is alleged that he wrote "an account of the California mission," published in Stöcklein's *Weltbott* (not seen).
6. None of the statements made about him can be verified, but an account of him also appears in *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History* (New York & London, 1915) (not seen).
7. The title of one of his alleged literary works, *Nouveau traité sur les légumineuses arborescentes de l'Amérique du Sud*, is practically the same as that of the genuine *Légumineuses arborescentes de l'Amérique du Sud* (1789) by Tulasne cited above in the text.
8. There is a grammatical error in the title of one of his alleged works.
9. Jean Simon Ingenhous: this article seems to be a thinly-disguised version of the article on Jean Ingenhousz in the *Biographie Universelle*.
10. None of the statements made about him can be verified, but an account of him also appears in the unreliable *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History* (not seen).
11. Abad y Lassiera Iñigo: the form of his name does not seem to make any sense.
12. Iff is credited with a *De Medicina Brasiliensis* (1648), a reference simply lifted from the article on the genuine George Marggraf, with whom Iff is said to have travelled.
13. Henry Louis, comte d'Illiers: the *comté* of Illiers was real but this count was not (see *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse*, Paris, 1868-76); yet an article on him also appears in *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History*

(not seen), and one of his alleged literary titles is quoted in Pedreira's *Bibliografía Puertorriqueña* (Madrid, 1932).

14. Gustav Melchior Imhoffer: the material in this article is practically copied from that on the genuine Cristobál de Acuña, and the name of the subject seems to have been based on that of the genuine Melchior Inchofer who is treated in the *Biographie Universelle*. The article on Imhoffer has found new life in the *Dictionary of Catholic Biography* (New York, 1961).
15. Jacob Christian Iselin: there is a grammatical error in the title of one his alleged works so serious as to preclude its representing a real work; and the account of his career is partly copied from the biography of Jean-Rodolphe Iselin in the *Biographie Universelle*.
16. Dieudonné Gabriel Yves, comte d'Issertieux: no such *comté* as "Issertieux" ever existed; see *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse*.