

Historical Gaucherie, Inaccuracy and Error in *An Irresistible Force*

Book Review by Rodney Stinson, published on www.mrschisholm.com

Part 1 – 29/12/17

In late 2017, Sarah Goldman's *Caroline Chisholm: An Irresistible Force* was published by Harper Collins, initially as an e-book and later in hardcover. Wanting to see what this new biography was like, I acquired the e-book for use on my PC. It was my very first e-book purchase. I found it difficult to read and resorted to browsing and then stopped reading, but not before the pejorative term "Jewboy" caught my eye. Neither "Jewboy" nor the bushranger Edward Davis for whom it was a (claimed) appellation is mentioned, I felt sure, in any of the major biographies of Mrs Chisholm or in the usual and principal primary and secondary sources associated with her life and work. Has the author discovered fresh historical evidence? The question was left floating until purchase of the hardcover edition allowed me to start once again on *An Irresistible Force*.

No, Sarah Goldman has not discovered fresh historical evidence linking Edward Davis, the so-called "Jewboy", with Caroline Chisholm. Despite the evidentiary absence, he is included as a minor character in the biography, albeit in the italicized section at the beginning of the "Going Bush" chapter. The author's italicizing indicates "imaged scenes that relate directly to incidents covered within the subsequent pages", and "when writing about Caroline's interaction with named people . . . [the author] . . . drew on historical records" [refer to *An Irresistible Force*, page 9]. How well the author manages this unorthodox approach to historical biography can be gauged by close analysis of Edward Davis's inclusion and what readily-accessible historical records show.

The biography's italicized section with the bushranger and his gang runs to almost 1,500 words and has one supporting endnote, as follows:

"This fictional account is designed only to give a view of how Caroline and her protégées travelled from Sydney and through the bush, and of the dangers they faced. There is no record of Caroline being stopped by bushrangers. This bushranger is loosely based on Teddy "Jewboy" Davis, who roamed with his gang throughout the Lower Hunter Valley up until March, 1841, when they were caught and hung. Until the end of 1840 they avoided killing anyone, but during an armed robbery in Scone in December that year one of the gang shot and killed a man. Teddy Davis and his gang had something of a Robin Hood reputation. Their stash of stolen goods has never been discovered. See www.jenwilletts.com/jewboysgang.htm." [*An Irresistible Force*, page 309]

The www.jenwilletts.com website provides a range of information under the broad heading of "Free Settler or Felon". However, its "jewboysgang" pages [accessed on 12 December, 2017] do not use the diminutive "Teddy" for Edward or claim the gang had a Robin Hood reputation and were caught in March, 1841 (it was December, 1840), but they did refer to a Mrs Freeman, an aged surviving eyewitness from the early 1840s, recalling that a man named Marshall was the leader of the gang. Sarah Goldman's endnote differs in these four ways from what is set out in the single source she has cited, but the term "Jewboy" is throughout that source. Although the endnote states there is "no record of Caroline being stopped by bushrangers", Edith Pearson's essay, on which the author elsewhere relies heavily, recounts "she was 'stuck up' by bushrangers . . . taking a party of emigrants out and away . . . and had

gone ahead . . . to find a suitable camping-ground.” Upon recognizing who she was, they reportedly said, “May our hands wither if we touch you or your party. Go on, and God bless you!” [cf. Pearson’s “Caroline Chisholm: ‘The Emigrant’s Friend’, 1808-1877”, as reproduced in *Unfeigned Love: Historical Accounts of the Life and Work of Caroline Chisholm*, Rodney Stinson (ed.), page 174]. Mrs Chisholm had a different encounter with bushrangers when three of them gained entry one night to her house on the Liverpool Road; having quietly opened the door to her own room and the yard door, she whispered, “John, do you and Peter go round the corner, and the other two men will surely seize them at the front door”. This was a successful subterfuge: there were no such protective males present, and the bushrangers left by the yard door. [See news item in *The Morning Chronicle*, 6 March, 1844, page 2.]

What historical evidence exists for “Jewboy” being applied to Edward Davis and the gang? G.F.J. Bergman’s entry for Davis in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* [ADB] acknowledges “the term is not to be found in the contemporary press”, yet he claims it was “soon” applied to the gang. A search on the Australian National Library’s *Trove* facility confirmed “Jewboy” was not used of Davis or the gang while they were active in 1839 and 1840 or subsequently until *Hunted Down*, a popular account of bushranging, was published in 1882. The earliest *Trove* hits for “Jewboy” are in *Bell’s Life in Sydney and Sporting Reviewer* of 28 July, 1849 on page 2, where it named “Aby Davis’ Jew Boy”, a pugilist fighting in Sydney, and in *The Sydney Morning Herald’s* 20 August, 1856 listing on page 1 for “Wanted, an Active Jew Boy, that can read and write, as a salesman”. The next hits were for a local racehorse in the 1870s. *Trove* turned up “Jewboy” in another bushranging account, George E. Boxall’s *History of the Australian Bushrangers* (first edition 1899); however, my *Trove* searches showed that the two Sydney newspapers Boxall has as the “Authorities Quoted” for his Chapter VII discussion of Davis and the “Jewboy” gang’s actions in June, 1839, for instance, did not refer to Davis by name, let alone to “Jewboy”. The common designations in the contemporary newspapers were “a Jew named Davis”, “Jew Davis” and “Davis the Jew”, and likewise for Davies, its variant. There looks to be no historical evidence for Edward Davis and the gang having the appellation “Jewboy” prior to the popular bushranging accounts appearing at the end of the 19th Century and (not coincidentally?) after the fighting career of “Aby Davis’ Jew Boy”. The term remains pejorative, in my view, though it might be said that it loses its real sting when applied to one’s own or oneself – as with the salesman and pugilist.

Sarah Goldman’s supporting endnote for the italicized section about the bushranger and the gang also states that they “had something of a Robin Hood reputation”. G.F.J. Bergman’s *ADB* entry for Davis alleges as much, but this is unsustainable romanticising. On my reading of the newspaper reporting of the gang’s trial in March, 1841, the “public sympathy that Davis enjoyed” was not, as the *ADB* entry hints, connected with any benignity, but with their misunderstanding as to how Davis and the whole gang were convicted of the wilful murder of young Mr Graham at Scone three months earlier, when only one of them (that is, Shea) shot him. Margaret Kiddle sums up how Colonials generally viewed bushrangers: “These men were nearly all ex-convicts, and they were ruthless in their treatment of women, as well as men” [cf. *Caroline Chisholm*, 2nd edition, page 33]. The same source gives a telling 1840 example: “Mrs. Morris, an elderly woman, was coming from Bathurst to Sydney with £300 to pay an account. She was set upon by two men, beaten, knocked down, stripped, and her corsets slit open with a knife to get at the money. Being careless with the knife, the bushrangers wounded her so that she was left naked and bleeding on the road . . .”. In an 1841

example, *The Australian* of 25 November reported on page 3 that three bushrangers had the previous week bailed up about 9pm “a poor widow” in her Morpeth home, where for her livelihood she operated a modest store. They “took everything, except about three bags of sugar”. Numerous contemporary newspaper reports about Davis and his fellow gang members depict recurrent, self-interested violence, the foremost cases being Mr Graham’s murder and the concerted gunfire they aimed at Mr Day and his team trying to kill or maim them and so avoid capture. On hearing of Mr Graham’s fate, Davis was heard to remark, “I would give £1000 that this had not happened, but as well a hundred now as one” [cf. *Sydney Herald*, 26 December, 1840, page 2]. So much for regret and his purported benevolence.

Prior to the Graham shooting, Davis and the gang had occupied overnight the home of the Freeman family, and on his watch, thinking the others were sleeping, Davis “made insulting overtures to Mrs. Freeman . . . [and] . . . [t]hese she strenuously resisted”, according to a later newspaper report on www.jenwillets.com/jewboysgang.htm. Marshall chanced to be awake, heard what was said, and “rushed out”, covering Davis with his revolver, “and would have shot him dead” had not her husband arrived. Davis, in other words, was intent on serious sexual assault. Bushrangers sexually assaulting women was not unknown; the bushranger Patrick Curran, for instance, was executed on 21 October, 1841 for rape and murder [cf. *The Sydney Monitor and Commercial Advertiser*, 27 October, 1841, page 2].

Curran’s execution occurred not long before Caroline Chisholm began her bush journeys. “One day, when travelling with a large party of emigrants, just as she came to a solitary part of the road, near a valley, she heard a man shouting to her, ‘Stop, stop!’ A stout, rough bushman, clearing a few bushes at a leap, placed his hand on her horse’s head, and said, ‘Are you Mrs. Chisholm?’ ‘Yes; what do you want?’” Take note of her clarifying question. It is direct and concise and suggests no fear, even though the bushman’s interception could have portended robbery and/or physical or sexual assault. The materially well-established bushman simply wanted a wife, which, he said, was “what every man like me wants when he sees Mrs. Chisholm!” [Refer to Eneas MacKenzie’s *The Emigrant’s Guide to Australia with a Memoir of Mrs. Chisholm*, as reproduced in *Unfeigned Love*, *op.cit.*, pages 135 and 136.]

In that exchange we can sense the authentic voice and presence of a strong, spirited woman, which is not how Sarah Goldman’s portrays Caroline Chisholm in the italicized section at the beginning of the “Going Bush” chapter [*An Irresistible Force*, pages 101 to 104]. The bush party was settling for the evening, when the sound of gunshot caused Mrs Chisholm to be “shaken and bewildered, much like the other women”, and in the ensuing interaction with the bushrangers “her brain scrambled”, “her mouth went dry”, she hoped “to garner a little sympathy” and so on. Not content with ascribing to Caroline Chisholm inanities of speech and action that are so obviously at variance with what the contemporary accounts document (not least the 1842 book, *Female Immigration Considered*), Sarah Goldman ascribes to her acceptance of £25 from the bushranger modelled on Edward Davis, who had intimated it was stolen money. This is not what Mrs Chisholm would have done and is a baseless slur on her moral character. Nor would she have replied “Yes, sir” to Davis’s question, “Are you really Mrs Chisholm?”, or accepted without challenge Davis calling her “Good girl” and the young women “[a] fine brood” – and to support my assertions I would refer readers to the text under the sub-heading “A Predatory North-shore Man” (among others) in *Female Immigration Considered*, reproduced in *Unfeigned Love*, *op.cit.*, pages 48 and 49]. The North-shore man was insolent and brusque when she went to retrieve a newly arrived, under-age girl; he

was wealthy, but Caroline Chisholm would not brook him, nor did she proffer inapt civilities like “sir”.

As noted above, in Sarah Goldman’s italicized sections at the beginning of chapters there are “imaged scenes that relate directly to incidents covered within the subsequent pages”. What are we to make of imagined facts in these italicized sections? The East Maitland immigration depot, Sarah Goldman writes, was “set up by Captain Edward Day, the local [police] magistrate” [cf. page 102]. It wasn’t. Caroline Chisholm recorded that she “was obliged to visit Maitland to establish a Home” [cf. *Female Immigration Considered*, reproduced in *Unfeigned Love*, page 61]. To that end, she advertised for “a House suited for an Immigrants’ Home” in Maitland [see, for example, *Sydney Herald*, 10 January, 1842, page 3] and duly acquired one. Within a month, 39 subscribers from the local district had been secured [see, for example, *Sydney Free Press*, 19 February, 1842, page 3], a local Agent appointed [cf. *Hunter River Gazette*, 12 March, 1842, page 1] and a Committee to run the East Maitland depot arranged [refer to Mary Hoban’s *Fifty-one Pieces of Wedding Cake*, page 75]. It can be said that Captain Day had agreed to the subscription list being opened under his auspices [cf. *Hunter River Gazette*, 5 March, 1842, page 2]. The depot was one of ten that Mrs Chisholm set up in country towns in her first year of bush journeys [see the “History” page (Emigrant Depots and Journeys), on www.mrschisholm.com]. Incidentally, Captain Day garnered deserved praise for his capture of Davis and the bushranger gang at the end of 1840.

Located in what the Committee’s handbill gave as “No. 1, Smith’s Row” [see *Fifty-one Pieces of Wedding Cake*, page 75] – not “Mill Street”, as Sarah Goldman’s states [on page 102] – the East Maitland depot had two stone-walled rooms, but not only was the lavatory outside (“a dunny out the back”, as the author put it), so were the kitchen and washing facilities. These were basically standard for all but substantial housing in the period. The obstinacy of bullocks on uneven terrain and rough paths, even with a lighter burden, invariably required the drivers to walk alongside or behind them, urging (or cursing) them on and administering physical goads. Bullock drivers were unlikely to be corpulent. But Sarah Goldman imagines “[b]ig-bellied” and “slow-witted” drivers [pages 101 and 102]. What purpose does this authorial denigration serve? Similarly, the author opines “[e]ven the plainest female can look inviting in youth” [page 101], before going on to conceive how bushrangers would attempt to flirt with a group of young women they have bailed up and at whom they had “levelled” their guns [pages 103 and 104]. The fear of bushrangers at the time was widespread and justified, included in which was the possible threat of sexual assault, as earlier recounted.

These four pages comprise Part 1 of my book review. The word count far exceeds that of the four pages of Sarah Goldman’s imagined scene at the beginning of the “Going Bush” chapter and its one supporting endnote in *An Irresistible Force*. That was brought about by close analysis of what the author had written and the necessary setting out of corrective historical evidence that was sourced, with a couple of exceptions, from readily-accessible historical records: namely, the online records accessed through the National Library of Australia’s Trove facility, the online Australian Dictionary of Biography, and copies of some hardcopy resources the author included in her book’s bibliography. Because Part 1 has looked at less than five pages out of 323 pages in the body and endnotes of *An Irresistible Force*, it is probably premature to settle whether Sarah Goldman has successfully managed her unorthodox approach to historical biography. Further parts of this book review will be uploaded to www.mrschisholm.com in early 2018.

Historical Gaucherie, Inaccuracy and Error in *An Irresistible Force*

Book Review by Rodney Stinson, published on www.mrschisholm.com

Part 2 – 08/01/18

Thomas Callaghan, an Irish barrister, arrived in Sydney on 8 February, 1840, not “in 1839” as Sarah Goldman records in endnote #1 for “The Trouble with Men” chapter. This could be an error introduced in the publication process, because the author cites *Callaghan’s Diary* often in her book and the diarist begins his Sydney pages with the 13 February, 1840, Thursday entry, “On Saturday morning last at about 10 o’clock the *Arkenwright* dropped her anchor in Darling Harbour” [cf. Francis Forbes Society for Australian Legal History, 2005, page 1]. It is an inauspicious beginning for a chapter that advances, along with its preceding four pages of italicized imagined scenes, the fanciful claim that Caroline Chisholm possibly had a romantic interest in Callaghan. Sarah Goldman’s strained support for this claim is drawn from a handful of entries in *Callaghan’s Diary* [abbreviated as *CD*].

She writes, “With one exception, all other biographies of Caroline fail to mention Thomas Callaghan” [see *An Irresistible Force*, page 129]. Mary Hoban, who was the exception, correctly places Caroline’s meeting Callaghan for the first time at the Therrys’ Christmas dinner in 1841 [cf. *Fifty-one Pieces of Wedding Cake*, page 66], whereas Sarah Goldman maintains it was “22 February, 1842” [page 125]. Mary Hoban’s source was extracts from the manuscript of Callaghan’s diary published in the *Journal of the Royal Australian Historical Society* in 1948 [see its volume 34, page 360, according to the Google book snippet – search on “Murphy and Brenan and Grant and Mrs Chisholm”]. The manuscript of Callaghan’s diary was held by the Society in the late 1940s, but where it was for the eight decades after Callaghan’s death I have not determined. The complete published diary, on which Sarah Goldman relies, has “Murphy and Brenan and Grant and Mr Chisholm” [*CD*, entry for 28 December, 1841, page 106], and its *Index* refers to “Chisholm, Revd Father, page 106” [*CD*, page 217]. There was no Catholic priest by that name in the Colony, and Archibald Chisholm had gone back to India in early 1840. It was Mrs Chisholm at the 1841 Christmas dinner; perhaps Callaghan, who was bothered by the Summer heat on that day [cf. *CD*, page 106], was seated away from her or perhaps the presence of senior Catholic clergy in the Bishop’s absence distracted him and precluded his focusing on her. We don’t know, but it is incumbent on the historical researcher to get to the bottom of conflicting evidence. This Sarah Goldman did not do in relation to ascertaining Caroline’s first meeting of Callaghan.

Sarah Goldman is wrong in asserting that Eneas Mackenzie, writer of Caroline’s 1852 *Memoirs*, “would probably have seen her in Sydney in the early 1840s” [see *An Irresistible Force*, page 129], when she was in her prime and thus a contrast to “almost always being portrayed as stout and sexually unappealing” (but when, where, and by whom?) The author’s source for putting Eneas Mackenzie in Sydney at that time is Professor John Molony’s book, *The Native-Born: The First White Australians*. Unfortunately, and surprisingly, Professor Molony’s text refers to Eneas rather than David Mackenzie, who was in the Colony in the early 1840s, but the page references cited in the accompanying Note #40 are from David Mackenzie’s “The Emigrant’s Guide”. The text error, I suggest, may be traced to Eneas and David Mackenzie each having “The Emigrant’s Guide” among their publications and both were included in Professor Molony’s bibliography. Sarah Goldman lists “The Emigrant’s Guide” for the two in her bibliography, and one would have thought that by consulting them she would have avoided reproducing another’s error.

Had Sarah Goldman read with understanding throughout *Callaghan's Diary* she would have avoided elementary mistakes in the evaluation of historical evidence and thus the errors in her flawed depiction of Callaghan and Caroline Chisholm in "The Trouble with Men" chapter and in the imagined scenes at the commencement of that chapter. The author makes a great deal of Caroline giving Callaghan "a very friendly salute" after church on 27 February, 1842, and of the notes exchanged between them on that day and the previous and following days [see *An Irresistible Force*, pages 127 and 128].

Caroline made a "very friendly salute" soon after Callaghan had assisted her with drafting a form of agreement for employment contracts, pursued monies owed to the Female Immigrants' Home from an amateur theatrical night, and subscribed a guinea to the Home, yet it was transposed by Sarah Goldman as "Callaghan believed that she was 'very friendly' towards him" [page 126]. The transposition signifies more than a simple salute, however friendly. As to other examples of salutes, Callaghan recorded in his diary that Governor Gipps "saluted me by name" as he was announced at a ball [CD, page 179], but "Old O'Connell cut me when he was saluting Mrs Therry" at an earlier ball [CD, page 14]. As to references to friendliness, their ubiquity in the diary is astounding. In the entry covering Callaghan's first six days in Sydney, we have: Gordon "was very friendly to me", Therry "was friendly but general in manner", and Polding "was most friendly" [CD, page 1]; Dillon "was friendly enough", Polding was again "most friendly", and Chambers was "very friendly" [CD, page 2]; Plunkett "was most friendly", Chambers "was friendly to me", and on the *Arkwright* they were "most friendly to me" [CD, page 4]. The fulsomeness was sustained for much of the diary, such that Mrs Therry was "very friendly in her manner" [CD, page 7], Therry and Mrs Therry were "very friendly" and "all friendly as ever" [CD, pages 14 and 17], Mrs Gordon was "particularly friendly to me" [CD, page 22], and Broadhurst was "most friendly to me" [CD, page 32]. J.M. Bennett, who edited *Callaghan's Diary* for publication, remarks that Callaghan's many references to others being friendly to him were a kind of "reassurance" [CD, *Editor's Introduction*, page ix]. Plainly, Caroline's "very friendly salute" had no romantic feeling, and this should have been apparent from a reading of the diary.

What of Sarah Goldman's emphasis on the notes exchanged between Caroline and Callaghan on 26 to 28 February, 1842? Page 117 of his diary has brief details on these notes. Callaghan was first to write, forwarding to Caroline his guinea subscription to the Home and the note he had received from Turner, another lawyer, about the outstanding amateur theatrical funds. Caroline's reply on the same day was, he thought, "kindly written . . . to receive 'my influence' for her asylum". The third note, written after the next morning's "very friendly salute", was from Callaghan. It was "a long note", in his words, but the diary did not disclose the content. Received late on the same day, the fourth note was from Caroline; it explained, Callaghan wrote, "my misconception about the proposal of her former note to me; it was kindly and anxiously written". No other content was disclosed. The fifth note in the exchange was from Callaghan; it was "in reply to hers", and no content was disclosed. The most one could state is that Callaghan accepted his "misconception about the proposal of her former note", concerning which he had related that Caroline sought his "'influence' for her asylum". Construing romantic interest from the miniscule information in this exchange of notes is untenable. But Sarah Goldman would have none of that: she claims that "although he doesn't describe it in detail in the diary, it sounds as though Caroline, aware of his growing interest in her, was trying now to hold him at arm's length" [pages 127 and 128]. This type of beat-up might succeed in journalism but it doesn't in historical biography.

Not all of Sarah Goldman's imaginative impositions lack merit. She observes crisply of Callaghan, "Like a love-struck schoolboy, he exclaims to his diary, 'Her name is Caroline!'" [page 127]. Sarah Goldman does not go on to observe that this was the only time he mentions the given name in the diary; all other references were to "Mrs Chisholm", even on the days when notes were exchanged quickly and Callaghan was, according to the author, "clearly besotted" with her [page 126].

Sarah Goldman's endnote #1 for "The Trouble with Men" chapter describes Callaghan as "impecunious", though this is shaved to "somewhat impecunious" in the chapter [see pages 310 and 125 respectively]. It is true that Justice Keith Mason used the same term in his *Foreword* to the published diary [CD, page iii], but the usual meaning of impecunious is having little or no money. Was this Callaghan's predicament, when his income for 34 months in Sydney was £773.11.0 and his expenditure included, for example, clothes £41.13.6, furniture £56.10.0 and £75.19.4 in cash for his brother Standish? [See diary entry for 19 November, 1842, page 149.] £773.11.0 does not equate to Callaghan's having little or no money during that period, and his income far exceeded, for instance, the average annual wages for emigrants starting work as labourers and shepherds (the largest occupations) of £26 in 1839 and 1840 and £22 in 1841, albeit with the employer's addition of lodging and rations [cf. "Report from the Committee on the Land and Emigration Debenture Bill", *Sydney Gazette and New South Wales Advertiser*, 21 December, 1841, page 4]. That said, his earned income was slow at the beginning, but attention could usefully shift, I think, to his expenditure choices as a contributory reason for his often being strapped. It appears Callaghan took too liberally Chief Justice Dowling's early advice that "if I were poor, not to seem poor" [CD, page 15].

One item of expenditure, highlighted by Sarah Goldman [on page 127], was the subscription of £1.1.0 (a guinea) to the Female Immigrants' Home. Subscribers of £1.0.0 were permitted as many female servants as required in a year without a fee [see, for example, *Sydney Free Press*, 2 December, 1841, page 1]. Whether Callaghan did engage a servant from the Home I have not tried to ascertain, but he had a potential benefit from what the author calls "not an insignificant amount". What then of the two guineas Callaghan paid for a "most ridiculous dinner of vain and silly personal buffoonery"? The dinner was for Chief Justice Dowling [see CD, pages 140 and 141].

This rounding on the Chief Justice is a telling illustration of Callaghan's moodiness. In J.M. Bennett's assessment, he could be "truly capricious, ranging suddenly from praise and good feeling to antipathy and even contempt", and there are "inconsistencies in his appraisals of people, depending on his moods and the surrounding circumstances" [CD, *Editor's Introduction*, page viii]. It's a pity Sarah Goldman did not take heed of these insights before accepting Callaghan's variable and negative opinions of Caroline Chisholm, including the diary's final reference to her being "as Mrs Therry says, a very unreasonable and indiscreet woman" [entry for 19 March, 1843, page 169]. Callaghan endorsed the view of Mrs Therry, someone whom he had quite recently thought was "too fond of gossip" and whose "mind is not sufficiently expanded" [entry for 18 December, 1842, page 152]. That pales with Callaghan's damning formative criticism of Mrs Therry: "She prides herself on her timeworn, her spiritless beauty. She assumes to be a matron, but is really an empty dowd . . . and she has no head except perhaps for shortsighted cunning", while he thought Therry "vulgar and shallow" [entry of 17 February, 1840, page 5]. Yet for years afterwards Callaghan continued his denigrating personal judgements and his dining at the Therry home, accepting their

hospitality and seeking assistance, if not preferment, in his legal career. Most would deem that hypocrisy. Callaghan's contradictory diary opinions cannot be accepted at face-value, let alone used to undermine the standing of others of historical interest or to build a romantic artifice as Sarah Goldman set out to do.

Callaghan is obviously inconsistent regarding talk about his marriage prospects. He bridled at Caroline Chisholm's comments about an eligible young woman [CD, page 156], and Sarah Goldman backs his reproach that she wanted "judgment" [see *An Irresistible Force*, page 131]. Yet he and the author let pass Bishop Polding quizzing him about getting married and prospective partners [CD, page 26]; the three Plunketts quizzing him on his supposed "engagement with Eliza Maguire!!" [page 36]; the quizzing about "Miss Chambers" by Miss Harnett and her family [page 113]; the Therrys quizzing him about his marriage intentions, including on consecutive days [page 114]; and the rumour from Ireland of his match with "Miss Chambers!!" [page 120]. This does not exhaust the frequency of the topic.

The author's handling of *Callaghan's Diary* fails to demonstrate any expertise in evaluating historical evidence, and the remainder of this part of the review will look at some shortcomings in the use of different source materials in "The Trouble with Men" chapter. Consideration of the four pages of italicized imagined scenes before that chapter I will leave until Part 3 of my review.

Sarah Goldman commences "The Trouble with Men" chapter with an outline of the ill-treatment at sea of Margaret Ann Bolton, who arrived on the *Carthaginian*, whose captain and surgeon were the perpetrators of the ill-treatment. Margaret Ann Bolton was very unwell. Citing the *Sydney Herald* of 19 April, 1842, the author incorrectly claims that "Caroline's doctor diagnosed a severe pulmonary infection" [*An Irresistible Force*, page 123]. Dr Savage, who was the government health officer of Port Jackson, saw and diagnosed her "at the Barracks" – the Immigration Barracks administered by Mr Merewether, not the Female Immigrants' Home conducted by Mrs Chisholm. In his evidence at the Water Police Court, Dr Savage stated he had seen her "at the request of Mr Merewether" [cf. *Sydney Herald*, 16 February, 1842, page 2].

The author writes that Caroline Chisholm "petitioned the governor to charge both men" [see *An Irresistible Force*, page 124], implying the governor could himself bring the charge/s, whereas Samuel Sidney recorded in *The Three Colonies of Australia* that she wanted the governor to institute a prosecution, which he agreed to do [see its Chapter 13 reproduced in *Unfeigned Love*, op.cit., page 112]. The prosecution of the captain and surgeon, formally arising from an affidavit sworn by Edward Farrell, one of the *Carthaginian* passengers, commenced in the Water Police Court on 12 February, 1842, at which other passengers also gave evidence [cf. *Sydney Herald*, 16 February, 1842, page 2]. This prosecution, on "a charge of [their] having committed a violent assault", was undertaken by Messrs. Innes and Browne, presiding as officers of the Court. Towards the end of the one-day hearing the defence barrister asked if the case was to be dealt with summarily or if it would be committed to another court. It proved to be the latter, and the Attorney-General, Roger Therry, then led the prosecution in the Supreme Court trial, beginning on 18 April, 1842. It was the committal hearing that had put "the colony in thrall", to quote the author's narrative, and not the trial alone as she implies [see *An Irresistible Force*, page 124].