



## ***The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer***

N.S. Volume 35, Number 2: October 2021

Published by the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies

Editor: James E. May  
1423 Hillcrest Road  
Lancaster, PA 17603  
JEM4@psu.edu

Executive Secretary: Peter Staffel  
Humanities Dept., West Liberty University  
208 University Dr., CUB #130,  
West Liberty, WV 26074  
staffelp@westliberty.edu; Tel. 304-336-8193

*The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer* is distributed twice a year (spring and fall) to members of the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. For membership information, contact Executive Secretary, Peter Staffel, at his address above. Annual dues are \$25 for regular members; \$15 for students; \$40 for joint memberships. For information about the EC/ASECS, see the current EC/ASECS homepage, [www.ec-asecs.org](http://www.ec-asecs.org) (maintained by Susan Cherie Beam). The next submission deadline is 15 March 2022.

Through this newsletter, scholars and teachers can pass along to colleagues news, opportunities, and practical tips normally not communicated in scholarly journals. Members are encouraged to submit book reviews, notes and essays, notices, accounts of travel, conferences, concerts, and exhibitions, pedagogical advice, light verse, and queries. They are asked to report news of their publications, lectures, grants, and on-going projects. Please submit contributions as an attachment in Word 2003 or 2010 or in RTF. Pertinent articles are indexed in *The Annual Bibliography of English Language & Literature*, *MLA International Bibliography*, *The Scriblerian*, and *Year's Work in English Studies*.

The EC/ASECS gratefully acknowledges past financial support from Robert D. Hume, Evan Pugh Professor of English, Pennsylvania State University. The *EC/ASECS Newsletter* was founded in January 1978 by Leland D. Peterson and later edited by W. R. McLeod (1981-1983) and Kevin Berland (1983-1986). This newsletter was entitled *The East-Central Intelligencer* from 1988 until February 2005. Indices for preceding volumes appear in the issues of May 1992, September 1996, September 2001, January 2005, January 2008, and October 2011; the January 2005 contains a register of EC/ASECS newsletters 1978-2004. Penn State University Library has archived n.s. Vols. 1-34; Old Dominion University has archived issues from 1987-2009. Issues for May 2007 through March 2021, the indices for 1992-2019, and a table of contents for issues since December 1986 are all available at the Newsletter Archive of the EC/ASECS website noted above. The *Intelligencer* has been printed by Action Graphics of Clearfield, PA, since 1986.

# The Dean and the Father: Swift, Lactantius, and “that Definition animal rationale,” a Further Note

by Kirsten Juhas and Hermann J. Real

Human beings are, by ancient definition,  
rational animals. Rationality is our most distinctive  
characteristic. It differentiates us essentially  
from creatures of all other kinds.

Harry G. Frankfurt, *On Truth*

## I

On 23 June 1988, Simon Finch Rare Books of London was the last antiquarian bookdealers to have offered for sale Jonathan Swift’s copy of the works of Lucius Caecilius (or perhaps Caelius) Firmianus Lactantius (c.AD 245-c.325), Father of the Church often described as the Christian Cicero.<sup>1</sup> The Dean’s copy was brought out by the Cologne printer Peter Quentel (c.1520-46) in 1544, and it contained, in addition to the seven books of *Divine Institutes* (“*Institutiones divinae*”), Lactantius’ wide-ranging and deeply learned defence of Christian doctrine, his two theological treatises *On the Wrath of God* (“*De ira Dei*”) and *On God’s Handiwork* (“*De opificio Dei*”) as well as an *Epitome of the Divine Institutes* and two poems on the resurrection and passion of Christ generally attributed to him.<sup>2</sup>

Swift’s edition of Lactantius not only merits scholarly attention as almost any volume from the Dean’s library shelves would but also because various of the Father’s theological concerns intersect with the Dean’s thematic preoccupations; themes such as the Trinitarian God, His providence and justice, Mankind’s eternal well-being, the ontological and social hierarchy of the cosmos, its harmony and teleology as well as the relationship of revealed religion and reason, knowledge and faith.<sup>3</sup>

## II

What this survey does not make immediately manifest, however, is that the intellectual affinity between the Father and the Dean is also conducive to a more guided understanding of a contested paragraph in Swift’s famous, or, if you prefer, ‘notorious,’ letter to Alexander Pope of 29 September 1725, the ‘hate mail’ in which the Dean refused to plead guilty to the charge of misanthropy and which is probably the most frequently quoted (and misunderstood) letter in all of his correspondence.<sup>4</sup> Writing from Tom Sheridan’s country cottage at Quilca, Swift tells his friend at Twickenham that he has employed his time “in finishing correcting, amending, and Transcribing [his] Travells,” the newly revised and augmented text of his masterpiece; he concludes on what reads like the announcement of a promise: “I have got Materials Towards a Treatis proving the falsity of that Definition animal rationale, and to show it should be only *rationis capax*.”<sup>5</sup> The Dean thought ill enough of “that Definition” as to pounce on it again two months later, on 26 November 1725, in another letter to Pope, in which he declared, with the same aplomb, “to have always rejected that Definition

[reasonable Animals] and [to have] made another of [his] own.”<sup>6</sup> This declaration sounds pretty straightforward; in fact, it is not. As new, recently surfaced evidence shows, it is ambiguous and misleading at best and self-contradictory at worst.<sup>7</sup>

### III

It is, however, possible to put our understanding of “that Definition animal rationale” on a firm(er) footing by the realization that it is embedded in an elaborate matrix of ideas whose individual provenance dates back to the philosophers of antiquity and their at times considerable impact on intellectual history far into the eighteenth century. In other words, it is no longer valid to assume, the redoubtable R. S. Crane and the adherents of his ‘hard’ school notwithstanding,<sup>8</sup> that in *Gulliver’s Travels* Swift rebelled against his College’s scholastic curriculum as represented in the “Provost’s Logic,” Narcissus Marsh’s manual of the *Institutiones Logicæ in usum juventutis Academicæ Dublinensis*, first published in 1679, and revised and reprinted in 1681,<sup>9</sup> which had to be “read through at least thrice” during the first year.<sup>10</sup> What exasperated Swift most about the “Provost’s Logic” was less that it was required reading for all junior freshmen, but that, early in life, as he was to insist in 1725, he encountered in it ‘the doctrine of the schools,’ the boastful belief in the rationality of Humankind – *homo animal rationale* – the conviction that made reason “God’s defining gift to Man,” the “most excellent and noble creature of the World,”<sup>11</sup> which the mature Dean was to run down in *Gulliver’s Travels* as well as in his less well-known fable *The Beasts’ Confession to the Priest* six years later.

While it is still safe to assume that Marsh’s *Institutiones Logicæ* was among Swift’s targets,<sup>12</sup> it seems more safe to assume that the Dean was aiming not at *individual*, identifiable sources but at the *whole school* of ‘orthodox’ thought according to which Reason “stands for a Faculty in Man, That Faculty, whereby Man is supposed to be distinguished from Beasts,”<sup>13</sup> and of which Marsh was but *one* representative.<sup>14</sup> Remarkably, Swift’s massive two-volume edition of Aristotle’s *Opera omnia* (1629) also contained the *Institvtiones Porphyrii*, in which the *Arbor Porphyriana*, or Porphyry’s tree, depicted an ontological pyramid of the Creation named after the third-century Neoplatonist Porphyry (AD 233-c.305): “Substantia est & ipsa genus. sub ea est corpus, & sub corpore, animatum corpus: *sub quo animal. sub animali autem, rationale animal: sub quo homo. sub homine autem Socrates, & Plato, & particulares homines.*”<sup>15</sup> Likewise, Swift would certainly have spotted a similar Porphyrian-tree diagram, a most elaborate “Tabvla Svstantiæ [Table of Gradation],” in a bulky anthology of Hermetic writings, published at Cologne in six volumes in 1630, of which he had a copy in his library before 1715 and which he may have already mined for his satire on occultism in *A Tale of a Tub*. And this is most certainly not to ignore the *Arbor Porphyriana* in John Guillim’s *A Display of Heraldry*, an edition of which Swift saw in, or before, 1712, and in which “Reasonable MAN” is pitted once more against “Unreasonable Animals.”<sup>16</sup>

### IV

Most of these ‘sources’ fade in momentum when compared at this stage with all segments of “that Definition animal rationale,” “that Definition” being incomplete without the qualifying addendum which the angry Dean insisted was his own: “it should be only *rationis capax*.” Swift may have

been somewhat disingenuous in this claim, however. Given his “thorough familiarity” with the writings of Cicero,<sup>17</sup> it seems inconceivable that the qualification *rationis capax* should have escaped him in his reading of the philosophical dialogues, more particularly *De natura deorum* [On the Nature of the Gods], *Tusculanae disputationes* [Tusculan Disputations], and *De finibus bonorum et malorum* [About the Ends of Good and Evil], as well as *De legibus* [The Laws] and *Academica*, all designed to disseminate knowledge of the various schools of Greek philosophy in Rome. In several of these dialogues, Cicero assigns to Stoic speakers the role of setting out the chief doctrines of their school. For example, Nature, which is identical with the created cosmos (also *Natura naturata*), is controlled by Reason, “which is inherent in Nature [rationem inesse in ea contendum est],” and from which “it follows of necessity that the world is an intelligent being [necesse est intelligentem esse mundum].”<sup>18</sup> Reason in turn is identical with God, or *Natura naturans* – “Deum verò esse animal ... rationale” – who not only created the world – “in seipsum omnem substantiam consumens, ac eam rursus ex seipso gignens [who absorbs into himself the whole of substance and again creates it from himself]”<sup>19</sup> – but who also makes Himself felt in the world process as Providence: “Talis igitur mens mundi cum sit ob eamque causam vel prudentia vel providentia appellari recte possit.”<sup>20</sup> Reason, although a distinctively human faculty, is in fact “the most divine element in Man [qua nihil est in homine divinius],” the divine essence, like any whole, taking “its name from its predominant and preponderant part [semper enim ex eo quod maximas partes continet latissimeque funditur tota res appellatur].”<sup>21</sup> In *Academica*, his epistemology, Cicero summarized the gist of this Stoic thinking on Nature and the nature of Humankind in a formula which seems to predate Swift’s, however vaguely: “Si homo est, animal est mortale, rationis particeps.”<sup>22</sup> In Cicero, “rationis particeps” denotes Man, who, since not identical with God on account of his mortality, “only” *partakes* of Divine Reason, a God-given *donnée* distinguishing him from all other animals in the Creation. The only truly rational ‘animal’ is God. To claim this selfsame status for any ‘animal’ other than God, however, is a sign of overreaching oneself, the symptom of being “smitten with *Pride*,” the very vice that Man cannot afford to indulge in and that, consequently, “immediately breaks all the Measures” of Gulliver’s misanthropic patience (IV, xii, 12 [*Prose Works*, XI, 296]). At the same time, the fact that God alone among all ‘animals’ is Reason pure and unalloyed may perhaps provide an explanatory matrix for the Dean’s often quoted exhortation of his parishioners in his sermon “On the Trinity” (printed in 1744): “Reason itself is true and just, but the *Reason* of every particular Man is weak and wavering, perpetually swayed and turned by his Interests, his Passions, and his Vices.”<sup>23</sup> Structurally as well as thematically, this contrast between true (that is, presumably divine) Reason and fallible (that is, human) reason reflects the belief of a fair number of ancient luminaries, both pagan and Christian, but there is more than meets the eye.<sup>24</sup>

#### V

In some important respects, Lactantius assimilated the assumptions of his Stoic predecessor into his (Christian) theology whenever he saw fit, but laconically rejected whatever he found he had to dispose of, such as the Stoic equation of Creator and Creation, of *Natura naturans* and *Natura naturata*,

for example: “Aut si natura est cœlum atque terra, & omne quod natum est: non est Deus natura, sed Dei opus [But if sky and earth are Nature and everything which has been born, Nature is not God but God’s work].”<sup>25</sup> The alpha and omega of Lactantius’ theology was the belief in one eternal, incorruptible, and most powerful Creator-God, who of necessity was the one and only Lord of the Creation: “Si autem interitus procul est à Deo, quia incorruptibilis est & æternus: consequens est, vt dividi potestas diuini non possit. Deus ergo vnus est [If, however, decay is alien to God, because He is incorruptible and eternal, it follows that the power of the divine cannot be divided. God therefore is one].”<sup>26</sup> And it is to this God only that “human worship” is due (p. 266): “ex vno [enim] procreatur: ergo deos etiam multos colere, contra naturam est, contraque pietatem [Out of one only procreation occurs; to worship many gods, then, is against Nature and against piety]” (p. 109; see also p. 218). Unlike his favourite scapegoats, the indifferent Epicurean gods who in everlasting tranquillity and self-sufficient happiness were thought to live in intramundane spaces of the universe (pp. 90-92, 245-46, 269, 274-75), Lactantius insists on the divine *fiat* and the teleology of the Creation. Although potentially self-sufficient, his Christian God, also addressed as Heavenly Father, is operational, propelling Himself into action on behalf of Humankind. In the *Divine Institutes*, the claim that He created the world because of Man (*propter hominem mundum esse fabricatum*) is one of Lactantius’ leitmotifs: “Parens [enim] noster ille vnus & solus, cum fingeret hominem, id est, animal intelligens & rationis capax: eum vero ex humo subleuatum, ad contemplationem sui artificis erexit [Our one and only Father when he made Man, that is, an intelligent being and capable of reason, having raised him from the dust, erected him for the contemplation of His artwork]” (p. 39).

At the same time, this relationship is not unilateral: not only did God create the world because of Man, he also created Man because of Himself. The question, “*Why* Man was created by God [Cur homo à Deo factus],” Lactantius countered in a terse marginal gloss: “Mundum hominis causa, hominem Dei creatum [The world was created because of Man, Man because of God]” (pp. 214-15; 297). At one stage in these theological and anthropological considerations, Lactantius goes so far as to insist (in a sentence reminiscent of the old apophthegm, *Natura nihil agit frustra*), “Nihil est (vt opinor) [quod] sit propter seipsum factum: sed quidquid [omnino] fit, ad vsum aliquem fieri necesse est [Nothing, I believe, is made because of itself, but whatever is made at all is necessarily made for some purpose]” (p. 213 and marginal gloss).

## VI

It is this teleological orientation of Lactantius’ thinking that conditioned, even necessitated, further constituents of his (theo-)logical system. This statement particularly applies to the Father’s view on the position of Humankind vis-à-vis its Creator, of which Chapter XIV of *De ira Dei*, “De homine, eiusque commodis,” provides a most striking precis: “Solus est [enim],” Lactantius argues, “qui sentiens *capaxque* rationis, intelligere possit Deum, qui opera eius admirari, virtutem, potestatemque perspicere, idcirco [enim] consilio, mente, prudentia instructus est: ideo solus præter cæteras animantes recto corpore ac statu factus est, vt ad contemplationem parentis sui excitatus esse videatur]” (p. 257). Equipped

with feeling and capable of reason as he is, Man's position in the universe is unique; his *raison d'être* consists in paying homage to the divine architect and in glorifying his goodness and might in the contemplation of the Heavens. When engaging in this goal, the praise and worship of the common Father of Humankind ("venerari & colere communem parentem generis humani" [p. 80]), Man, aided by the faculty that distinguishes him from all other animals of the Creation ("sentiens *capaxque rationis* ... solus præter cæteras animantes" [p. 257]), may rely on the particular gift by which God has facilitated Man's nearest approximation to Himself, the Supreme Essence: the ability to walk upright and to look at the sky: "Idcirco [enim] soli animantium ad adspectum cæli erecti sumus, vt summum bonum nostrum in summo Deo esse credamus" (p. 84; see also p. 222). This last thought seems to have been of particular importance to Lactantius if the rhetorical fervour marking its elaboration in Chapter VII, "De homine, & brutis," of *De ira* is anything to go by (p. 247).

## VII

At this point, the temptation may have become great to (try to) establish a direct link between the Father and the Dean. In fact, by the time Swift was putting his finishing touches to his masterpiece, and enlarging on his provocative intentions in the letters to Pope of 1725, he did not yet own the 1544 Cologne edition of Lactantius. This only came to him as a present from Sir Edward Lovett Pearce, the architect of the Irish Parliament House (1699-1733), in 1730,<sup>27</sup> and there is no evidence that Swift had access to it before, and while, working on *Gulliver's Travels*. He is bound, however, to have taken a closer look at his new acquisition before, or while, he was working on *The Beasts' Confession to the Priest*, ostensibly "Written in the Year 1732," some two years later.<sup>28</sup> From early on, editors have noticed the parallels between Swift's innovative, if somewhat circumstantial, version of a fable by Jean de La Fontaine and *Gulliver's Travels*: "Creatures of ev'ry Kind but ours / Well comprehend their nat'ral Powers; / While We, whom *Reason* ought to sway, / Mistake our Talents ev'ry Day." By the end of the poem, Swift has not only collapsed all features constitutive of the fable genre, he has also inverted the traditional hierarchy of the Chain of Being, more particularly, Humankind's vaunted superiority over the rest of the Creation: "Now and then / Beasts may *degen'rate* into Men."<sup>29</sup>

In Swift's earlier reading experience, there are more traces which point towards at least some familiarity with Lactantius before 1730. The 1720 Dublin edition of *A Letter to a Young Gentleman* is preceded by an epigraph from the *Divine Institutes* (II, iii) on the title page ("*Quid igitur profuit vidisse te Veritatem quam nec defensurus esses nec secururus* [What then has it profited you to have seen Truth, which you would neither have defended nor followed]"), the quotation coming from an unidentified edition.<sup>30</sup> Given his close friendship with Thomas Sheridan, though, it seems noteworthy that schoolmaster 'Tom,' who was considered to be one of the best classical scholars of his age and country, should have owned two editions of Lactantius, both predating the Dean's 1725 letters to Pope: the Leiden *Opera omnia* of 1652 and the *Epitome divinarum institutionum*, published at Cambridge in 1718.<sup>31</sup>

However, we would like to suggest that irrespective of the question whether Swift had access to any edition of Lactantius, and whether perhaps

he even felt inspired by his reading of him (without acknowledging this), it is still useful to compare, and contrast, the use of *rationis capax* and its meaning in the two, if only because it sheds some light, however dim, on Swift's professed intentions in 1725.

We have the Dean's word for it that *Gulliver* was his all-out attack on what he regarded as a hubristic understanding of human nature. In Swift's view, the doctrine of the schools, condensed into the formula *homo animal rationale*, was but an exercise in boastful self-deceit, which amounted to a violation of the "Tabyla Svstantiae, or Table of Gradation." In this, the divine essence at the top of the scale *alone* represented the manifestation of Reason pure and unalloyed, while any 'animal' of an inferior order such as Man was necessarily granted but a stunted faculty of it ("only *rationis capax*"). To claim the status of Reason, however, where Reason was not due made Humankind the object of Swift's satiric furor.

All this seems rather a far cry from what Lactantius has to say on the subject, and we must make sure not to push a point in establishing a temperamental affinity, or even other affinities, between the Father and the Dean. Of course, unlike the Dean of St Patrick's, this Father of the Church was not a satirist but a teacher of its doctrine; as a teacher, he neither attacks nor calls into doubt; he explains. In some of these explanations, Swift seems to be in accord with Lactantius, such as the (implicit) conviction that God is Reason;<sup>32</sup> in others, he is not, such as the bilateral teleology of God's work, the Creation, and Humankind: "Mundum hominis causa, hominem Dei creatum [The world was created because of Man, Man because of God]." Such an all-embracing purposiveness created a mutual dependence between Creator and Created, not only forcing Man into God's service but also God into granting Man the instrument for His own glorification. This instrument is the spark of reason making Man *rationis capax*; it constitutes the Creator's permanent link with Himself.

## VIII

Assuming that the 1725 letters to Pope contain the Dean's (ostensibly misanthropic) philosophy in brief, at least in parts, *Gulliver's Travels* constitutes its pictorial sequel, its thinking in images on Mankind's misguided self-reflection. In a sense, Swift's letters to Pope of 1725 and his masterpiece of 1726 relate to each other like (the philosopher's abstract) precept and (the historian's concrete) example.

In the wake of his memorable 'rape' by a randy Yahoo female in the country of the rational Houyhnhnms, Gulliver suffers a shock of recognition; shaking with disgust at himself, he confesses the end of his humanity: "For now I could no longer deny, that I was a real *Yahoo*" (IV, viii, 7), an 'animal' *rationis non capax* (or, *rationis non particeps*, if you prefer). But at the end of his story, the shock has not led Gulliver anywhere. In his (now obvious) madness, Swift's protagonist, having contracted "Love and Veneration" for rational beasts (IV, vii, 2), physical manifestations of an ideal claimed by philosophers for Mankind's own nature, but in the divinely ordered hierarchy of things the Creator's sole domain, lands himself in a position-less paradox: being mad for reason (*homo animal rationale*) results in the rule of unreason. Living a life of reason is for beasts only, not for Men. Whereas in Lactantius (and Cicero as well as others) the formula "*rationis capax*" marks, and guarantees, the continued relationship between

the Creator's inherent Reason and Man's share in it, in the Dean's satirical logic "*only rationis capax*" becomes an instrument with which to cut Man down to true human size.

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

### Notes

1. See, for example, Anthony Blackwall, *An Introduction to the Classics: Containing a Short Discourse on their Excellencies and Directions on how to Study them to Advantage*, 2nd ed. (London: George Mortlock and Henry Clements, 1719), p. 141: "*Lactantius* has so much of the Strength and Beauty of the great *Roman Philosopher and Orator*, that he has gain'd the honourable Character of the *Christian Cicero*."

2. See the full bibliographical description in Dirk F. Passmann and Heinz J. Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift: A Bio-Bibliographical Handbook*, 4 vols (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 2003), II, 1021-22.

3. See Louis Landa, "Introduction to the Sermons," *Irish Tracts, 1720-1723, and Sermons*, eds Herbert Davis and Louis Landa (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968), pp. 97-132.

4. *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. David Woolley, 5 vols (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 1999-2014), II, 606-7 and n7.

5. In Lord Oxford's transcription, the phrase *rationis capax* was underlined, probably for reasons of emphasis (*Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 606-7 and n7).

6. *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 623.

7. In what follows, we rely, and enlarge on, to some extent also reconsider, positions first proposed in Kirsten Juhas and Hermann J. Real, "'The Falsity of that Definition animal rationale': Philosophical Foundations of Swift's 'Misanthropy,'" *The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, 29, no 1 (2015), 16-30.

Since Swift posits "the whole building of [his] Travells" to be erected upon the foundation of his 'misanthropy,' we assume that in "Materials" and "Treatis" he was referring to Gulliver's Travels, yet unpublished but finished and ready for the press. We hasten to emphasize, however, that this reading is by no means certain. To us, "Materials" – documents and 'evidence' of whatever (factual or fictional) kind – and "Treatis" – projected to utilize these "Materials" proving "the falsity" of the thesis in whatever (factual or fictional) way – may refer to *another* future work, substantiating the Dean's 'misanthropy' beyond *Gulliver*. While in eighteenth-century diction "treatise" may signify, loosely, any literary work, it also, more specifically, denotes a systematic, methodical, and principled discourse of a serious, preferably philosophical matter (such as misanthropy). We admit that, if this second assumption is thought to be plausible, or even correct, we have failed to find any evidence for its existence. But then, there are more cases than one in the 'enigmatic' Dean in which his readers have failed to present the evidence they desperately desire.

Another, perhaps equally plausible though more subtle account is that Swift here reverted to a technique already familiar from his first stroke of

genius, *A Tale of a Tub*, which is preceded by a list of “Treatises wrote by the same Author ... which will be speedily published” (*A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*, ed. Marcus Walsh [Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 2010], p. 4). All of these “Treatises” are as void of meaning as the *Tale* itself; analogously, the Dean’s projected anthropological off-spin of *Gulliver’s Travels* is as ‘misanthropic’ as his masterpiece.

8. For the difference between ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ school, see the bibliography of the most influential titles in Hermann J. Real, “Swift Horsing Around: or, The Madness of Reason,” “... that I wished myself a horse”: *The Horse as Representative of Cultural Change in Systems of Thought*, ed. Sonja Fielitz (Heidelberg: Univ. Winter, 2015), pp. 61-81.

9. See, in addition to M. Pollard, “The Provost’s Logic: An Unrecorded First Issue,” *Long Room*, n.s. 1 (1970), 38-40, James A. W. Rembert, *Swift and the Dialectical Tradition* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 63-72, and Muriel McCarthy, *Marsh’s Library, Dublin: All Graduates & Gentlemen* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), pp. 15-16 and n6.

10. Robert Bolton, *A Translation of the Charter and Statutes of Trinity-College, Dublin, 1760* (Dublin: Samuel Watson, 1760), pp. 70-71.

11. Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy*, 5th ed. (Oxford, 1638), p. 1; see also Howard D. Weinbrot, “‘Tis well an Old Age is out’: Johnson, Swift, and his Generation,” *Reading Swift: Papers from the Sixth Münster Symposium*, eds Kirsten Juhas, Hermann J. Real, and Sandra Simon (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2013), pp. 595-620 (603 and n16).

12. For the reason, see Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken, “Vistas of Porphyry’s Tree,” *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 8 (1983), 92-94.

13. John Locke, *Essay concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter H. Nidditch (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979 [1975]), p. 668 (IV, xvii, §1).

14. We agree here with Ian Campbell Ross, who has argued that Swift was rather “concerned to indicate his personal resistance to the folly and pride of humans who, for over a thousand years had perpetrated the notion that human essence could be captured confidently and unproblematically in the formulation that man is a rational being” (“‘No Horse is a Rational Being’: Jonathan Swift, Provost Marsh and *Gulliver’s Travels*,” *Treasures of the Mind: A Trinity College Dublin Quarter-centenary Exhibition*, ed. David Scott [Dublin: Sotheby’s, 1992], pp. 109-17 [114]). Conversely, J. A. Downie has more recently argued that “Swift is indeed remembering a specific writer’s treatment of the subject in *Gulliver’s* fourth voyage, and that that writer is Locke” (“*Gulliver’s* Fourth Voyage and Locke’s *Essay concerning Human Understanding*,” *Reading Swift: Papers from the Fifth Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, ed. Hermann J. Real [Munich: W. Fink, 2008], pp. 453-64 [459]).

15. *Opera omnia quae extant, Graece et Latine*, ed. Guilelmus Du Val, 2 vols (Paris, 1629), I, 1-14 (sigs A1v-B1v) (p. 3 [A2r]); see also Chapter XII: “semper enim Socrates est rationalis, & semper Socrates est homo” (p. 11 [A6r] [Passmann and Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift*, I, 85-86]); our emphasis.

16. See also Nic Panagopoulos, “*Gulliver* and the Horse: An Enquiry into Equine Ethics,” *Swift Studies*, 21 (2006), 56-75 (p. 60).

17. Passmann and Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift*, I, 405-18 (pp. 416-18).

18. Cicero, *De re publica; De legibus*, ed. and trans. Clinton Walker Keyes (London: William Heinemann, and Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1970 [1928]), pp. 389, 381-82 (II, vii, 16; iv, 10); *De natura deorum, Academica*, ed. and trans. H. Rackham (London: William Heinemann, and Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1961 [1933]), p. 157 (II, xiii, 36).

19. Diogenes Laertius, *De vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus clarorum philosophorum libri X*, ed. Meibomius, I, 451, 458 (137, 147). The English translation is from Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, ed. and trans. R. D. Hicks, 2 vols (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1970-72 [1925]), II, 241.

20. Cicero, *De natura deorum, Academica*, ed. and trans. Rackham, pp. 179, 197 (II, xxii, 58; II, xxx, 76).

21. Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, ed. and trans. H. Rackham, 2nd ed. (London: William Heinemann, and Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1967 [1921]), pp. 435, 497 (V, xiii, 38; V, xxx, 92). See also pp. 133, 207, 429-31 (II, xiv, 45; II, xxxiv, 114; V, xii, 34).

22. Cicero, *De natura deorum, Academica*, ed. and trans. Rackham, p. 495 (II, vii, 21).

23. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, eds Herbert Davis, et al., 16 vols (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939-68), IX, 166.

24. See Juhas and Real, “‘The Falsity of that Definition animal rationale’: Philosophical Foundations of Swift’s ‘Misanthropy,’” pp. 16-30.

25. All quotations are from the Cologne 1544 edition of Lactantius (p. 103; see also pp. 4, 48, 252-53), which was in Swift’s library (see note 2); abbreviations have been silently expanded. In what follows, they are given in parentheses within the text. As for the crucial events occurring here in the background, Stoicism’s working itself into the fabric of Christian thought and vice versa, see Herschel Baker, *The Wars of Truth: Studies in the Decay of Christian Humanism in the Earlier Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1952), pp. 110-16.

26. Lactantius never tires of praising God as “solus ædificator mundi, & artifex rerum” (p. 10). See also pp. 253-54.

27. Passmann and Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift*, II, 1021. It is doubtful whether the numerous underlinings, saltire crosses, and pointing hands which permeate the book are Swift’s.

28. The heading including the year 1732 is by Faulkner, who published *The Beasts’ Confession* in 1738 (D. F. Foxon, *English Verse, 1701-1750: A Catalogue of Separately Printed Poems with Notes on Contemporary Collected Editions*, 2 vols [Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1975], S804-808). However, the text refers to the Excise Crisis of 1733 and to Sir Robert Walpole’s mismanagement of it (ll. 141-50), so that the date of composition may have been around 1732-33.

29. *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Harold Williams, 2nd ed., 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), II, 607-8. On the collapse of the fable features, see Hermann J. Real, “‘Forming’ Destruction: or, The Sabotage of Genre in Jonathan Swift’s Poetry,” *Literary Form – Theories – Dynamics – Cultures: Perspectives on Literary Modeling*, eds Robert Matthias Erdbeer,

Florian Kläger, and Klaus Stierstorfer (Heidelberg: Winter, 2018), pp. 148-51 (160-66).

30. H. Teerink, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Jonathan Swift*, 2nd ed., rev. Arthur H. Scouten (Philadelphia: U. of Philadelphia Press, 1963), 619. Ehrenpreis supposes that Swift was responsible for the motto (*Swift: The Man, his Works, and the Age*, 3 vols [London: Methuen; Cambridge, MA, Harvard U. Press, 1983 [1962-83], III: *Dean Swift*, p. 82n1). In Swift's edition, it is on p. 42. We have slightly modernized the text.

31. Teerink, *A Bibliography of the Writings of Jonathan Swift*, IV, 255. See also Jonathan Swift and Thomas Sheridan, *The Intelligencer*, ed. James Woolley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), pp. 20-21.

32. See Charles Peake, "Swift and the Passions," *Modern Language Review*, 55 (1960), 169-89 (p. 172).

## Sterne and Alexei Pisemsky (1821-1881)

by Melvyn New

Sterne's popularity in Russia in the mid-nineteenth century is well chronicled by Neil Stewart, "From Imperial Court to Peasant's Cot: Sterne in Russia."<sup>1</sup> One contemporary of Gogol, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Turgenev, whom contemporaries rated as their equal although he has since fallen into almost total obscurity, is the novelist Alexei Pisemsky. His major work, *One Thousand Souls* (1858; New York: Grove Press, 1959) has a reference to Sterne that puts British commentators of the same period (Thackeray, obviously, comes to mind) to shame.

*One Thousand Souls* is in the epic tradition of nineteenth-century Russian novels in its sweep and length, but also in its unflinching condemnation of wealth, dishonesty, and state corruption; of all nineteenth-century British novels, it perhaps most closely resembles Trollope's *The Way We Live Now* (1875), more even than any of Dickens's reformist novels.

At one point the hero Kalinovich responds to the notion of romanticism being embodied in the story of lovers who exchange letters for ten years without any desire to meet, by saying he regards "such romanticism *à la* Sterne . . . in an entirely different light."<sup>2</sup> Rather than seeing such self-imposed chasteness as a true indication of a dedicated love, he argues it demonstrates a complete "absence of passion," and elaborates that "to be satisfied with letter-writing shows a kind of moral deficiency, for . . . these eternal letters can only result in irritation." His auditor (Belavin) asks, "Why irritation? You confuse sentiment with sensuality." One suspects Kalinovich's response to this is the author's as well:

But how on earth can one separate the two, soul and body, especially when it comes to love? It's like the roots and the earth; the roots hold on to the earth, and the earth clings to the roots. (292)

The syntax<sup>3</sup> makes it difficult to know whether Pisemsky believes “romanticism *à la* Sterne” is embodied in the letter-writing or in Kalinovich’s “entirely different light” (and the popular reading of Sterne in Russia did emphasize his sentimentalism and ignore his eroticism), but the “different light” cast by Kalinovich’s question (and the splendid pertinence of the accompanying simile) strongly suggests both author and hero have read Sterne against the grain of the age, finding in his blend of the sensual and the sentimental the essence (and ethic) of his writing. Indeed, while I am unable to comment on the original Russian, the translator, Ivy Litvinov, captures beautifully Yorick’s own statement of Sterne’s principle: “If nature has so wove her web of kindness, that some threads of love and desire are entangled with the piece—must the whole web be rent in drawing them out?”<sup>4</sup>

In support of this reading of Sterne being Kalinovich’s, it is worth pointing out that much later in the novel *Belavin*, a perceptive and rational observer, is nonetheless condemned by the heroine (and moral center of the work) as a man afraid of intercourse with the world, while Kalinovich, who bargains with the devil, ultimately comes to understand that all his successes are irrevocably and eternally entwined with the base actions that launched his career. It is possible, then, that before Bakhtin grasped the formalistic innovations of the Rabelaisian Sterne, another Russian, the forgotten Alexei Pisemsky, had fully understood his Erasmian ethical achievement.

University of Florida (emeritus)

### Notes

1. In *The Reception of Laurence Sterne in Europe*, ed. Peter de Voogd and John Neubauer [London: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004], 142-44.
2. *One Thousand Souls*, trans. Ivy Litvinov (Grove Press, 1959), 292.
3. I am grateful to Michael S. Gordon, Professor of Russian Studies at the University of Florida, who examined the original Russian text and found it, as I did its translation, “a bit ambiguous.”
4. *A Sentimental Journey*, ed. Melvin New and W. G. Day, *The Florida Works of Laurence Sterne* (Gainesville: U. Press of Florida, 2002), 6:124.

## **Eighteenth-Century Satire, Comedy, & Humor**

by Cheryl Wanko, West Chester University

A course in 18th-century satire is neither innovative nor original. However, several reasons present themselves for why such a course might be useful at the spring of 2021’s particular historical moment. First of all, our students swim in satire and irony: they underpin most memes, most Netflix comedy specials, and a lot of current standup. Second, folks on the left place trust in the efficacy of satire to do political work. Yet, as Dannagal Young

has recently argued in her book *Irony and Outrage*, this trust might be misplaced. And third, in a politically-fraught pandemic world that had us all isolated, stressed, and enmired in doom and Zoom, spending time with satiric and other comic material might be psychologically helpful, since humor's function as a coping mechanism is well-documented.

Yet satire also needs contextualization within humor studies, because, even though we often think of satire as a mode of humor, satire's relationship with humor is not always clear. If one accepts the four-part definition of humor/amusement as laid out in John Morreall's *Comic Relief: A Comprehensive Philosophy of Humor* - that humor requires a cognitive shift, the play mode, a sense of enjoyment, and the urge to laugh (if not actual laughter) - we can see how the reactions caused by some satire may complicate its categorization. So, when it came to course design, I tried to construct my course as an in-depth exposure to satire, supplemented with representatives of other comedic genres and numerous theories of humor. Such a design would provide a broader context for students to understand both the 18<sup>th</sup>-century texts as well as the satire, comedy, and humor they encounter every day.

### **Class Circumstances**

ENG530 is a variable-topic 18th-century graduate course at West Chester University. Populating it with comic texts created new prep for me; though I've recently started teaching an undergraduate interdisciplinary course in comedy and humor, I had never seriously brought that thinking to bear on my 18<sup>th</sup>-century background.

I'm not the only one for whom study in this area is new. For many of our students, this class is probably their only exposure to 18<sup>th</sup>-century material as either undergrads or grads. Many of our students are working teachers who received BSEds, and 18<sup>th</sup>-century material is not well-represented in teaching training programs, in part because not a lot of it is taught in secondary schools (the exception being, perhaps, "A Modest Proposal"). This prompted my desire to expose them to the major writers of the period, which meant that the bulk of our readings would center on satire. Thus, other comedic modes received shorter shrift, which is one of the regrets I have about the course.

Our university was 100% remote during the Spring 2021 semester, and so the class met once a week over Zoom. I judged the originally-scheduled three-hour block as far too long a time to be on Zoom, especially for employed students who may have spent the rest of the day on a remote platform. So, the class met synchronously for anywhere between 1-½ to 2 hours. Those of you who teach distance ed also know that building class community is important for learning – and this was especially important in 2021, given that it was students' second virtual semester. For each of our Zoom sessions, I thus included both a full-class discussion and a smaller breakout segment called "The Coffeehouse." Membership in their coffeehouse groups remained the same for the first half of the semester, to allow them to build relationships, and then I switched them up, so that they might meet additional peers. I provided prompts for these 10-15-minute discussions, though I could tell that conversation ranged far beyond those

prompts, which was part of the point. Our final session, in which we spoke informally about their final projects, was renamed “The Public House,” and those who wanted to shared a virtual convivial beverage together – though they may have been doing that all along, for all I know! I based a lot of the final grade on active participation, and my students both appreciated and excelled at exploring the complex ideas verbally.

### Organization

It is difficult for me not to organize an 18<sup>th</sup>-century class chronologically – it just seems wrong somehow. However, I decided I would need to divide the semester between a longer section on satire that would introduce them to the major authors, and then a section on other comic modes. After a class session in which students got their feet wet by reading a few types of comic texts, the satiric section of the course was organized by genre, so that we could identify specific generic traits or operations.

Students were required to produce two researched video reports that scaffolded the readings. For each reading, there were multiple reports: explicatory, biographical, and an overview of five pieces of scholarship related to the text (bibliographical). Each class also required an assigned scholarly reading, and so the fourth type of report, critical, walked us through the arguments of the critical piece. Much of the asynchronous work that made up for the other F2F class time was devoted to students watching and responding to these videos on a discussion board. This introduces my second regret with this class: though I certainly filled in information as we went along, I didn’t devote enough time to building the cultural and historical contexts, and, while adequate, it still seemed thin for the graduate level. If I taught this class again in this way, I would add a topically-focused video report category, to have students learn more about literacy, -political parties, etc.

The course opened with a general reading from Morreall’s *Comic Relief*. Couching our investigations within the three main categories of humor theory - relief, superiority, and incongruity - allowed an easy entry into discussions of 21<sup>st</sup>-century humor and the 17<sup>th</sup>-century texts we read for the first night of class. These three main theories, supplemented by my additions from John Draper’s classic “The Theory of Comedy in Eighteenth-Century England” (which I recommended but did not require), became touchstones for us throughout the semester to which we were able to add the other approaches we read about. Students wrote their first short paper on how these theories might fit with some of the early texts we read in the course.

Sometimes the primary and secondary readings matched closely – for example, Felicity Nussbaum’s chapters on Swift and Pope from *The Brink of All We Hate* when we read Swift and Pope, or Robert D. Hume’s article about *The Beggar’s Opera* on the night we read *The Beggar’s Opera* – but, because I also wanted my students to know about humor studies more generally, I also asked them to read about other methods, such sociological approaches, Bakhtin on the carnivalesque, and Robert Phiddian’s excellent explication of the need for new theories of satire, among others. I concluded the course with the article I would have liked to have placed first, if it had

worked organizationally: Joseph Meeker's "The Comic Mode." Originally published as a chapter in *The Comedy of Survival*, this piece links comedy and tragedy with environmentalism, which is my current research focus. To tell the truth, one of the main reasons why I wanted to teach this course was to teach this essay, which asks us to consider how a tragic ethos has reinforced a cultural disposition to biocide.

The course seemed to be a success. Students gave me positive feedback, and all of our discussions were lively. The resulting final projects, which could be research papers, websites, or researched lesson plans, showed high engagement with the topic if not the depth of research into 18<sup>th</sup>-century context that I would have preferred. I see this as simply a result of students encountering complex 18<sup>th</sup>-century texts for the first time and working to graft complicated ideas of satire and humor onto them – as well as an opportunity for me to improve the course for future semesters.

### Works Cited

- Draper, John William. "Theory of the Comic in Eighteenth-Century England." *Journal of English & Germanic Philology*, vol. 37, Apr. 1938, pp. 207–223.
- Hume, Robert D. "'The World is All Alike': Satire in *The Beggar's Opera*." *The Rakish Stage: Studies in English Drama, 1660-1800*. Southern Illinois UP, 1983.
- Meeker, Joseph. "The Comic Mode." *The Ecocriticism Reader*, ed. Cheryl Glofelty and Harold Fromm, University of Georgia Press, pp. 155-169.
- Morreall, John. *Comic Relief: A Comprehensive Philosophy of Humor*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Nussbaum, Felicity. *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women 1660 to 1750*. University Press of Kentucky, 1984.
- Phiddian, Robert. "Satire and the Limits of Literary Theories." *The Critical Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2013, pp. 44–58.
- Young, Dannagal Goldthwaite. *Irony and Outrage: The Polarized Landscape of Rage, Fear, and Laughter in the United States*. Oxford University Press, 2019.

### Syllabus

#### COURSE GOALS:

This course aims to introduce you to the cultures and texts of 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>-century Britain via a study of several of its comic modes. The 18<sup>th</sup> century is often referred to as "the golden age of satire," so we will focus primarily on that mode. You will develop:

- an understanding of the cultural contexts of our class texts.
- a sensitivity to the historical construction of genres, including positionality in relation to gender.
- an ability to apply major theories of satire, comedy, and humor.

- an ability to use theoretical terms and concepts, especially in relation to humor studies.
- a greater familiarity with using bibliographic, archival, periodical and other research resources.
- an enhanced knowledge of electronic databases and web-based resources used for scholarly work and teaching.
- a greater facility with writing and presenting in professional genres.

### TEXTS:

- Behn, Aphra. *The Rover*
- Fielding, Henry. *Jonathan Wild*
- Gay, John. *The Beggar's Opera*
- Swift, Jonathan. *Gulliver's Travels*
- Others are linked in the syllabus or are in class online materials

### PROJECTS:

- Short paper – 10%
- Video reports (2 per student, posted to Discussion Board three days before class) - 15%
- Responses to video reports (1 per each report, posted before class) - 15%
- Topic proposal for final project - 10%
- Final research project - 30%
- Final coffeehouse roundtable - 10%
- Participation - 10%

### SCHEDULE:

Week 1: Introduction to class

Jonathan Swift, "A Modest Proposal" (read in class)

Week 2: A introductory miscellany.

- John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, "A Satyr Against Reason and Mankind"
- Ned Ward, *The London Spy* (selections)
- Aphra Behn, "The Disappointment"
- Rochester, "The Imperfect Enjoyment"

Critical readings: John Morreall, *Comic Relief: A Comprehensive Philosophy of Humor* (Chapters 1 and 2; pages 50-60)

Week 3: Establishing historical contexts.

John Dryden, *MacFlecknoe* and verse 1 of *Absalom and Achitophel*

Critical readings: Dustin Griffin, *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. Chapter 1, "Theories of Satire in Polemical Context"

Short papers due

Week 4: Establishing literary contexts.

Pope, *Dunciad* Book IV (1742-3 version)

Critical readings: Chapter 1 of Ashley Marshall, *The Practice of Satire in England, 1658-1770*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2013.

Week 5: Gender disputes

- Jonathan Swift, “The Lady’s Dressing Room”
- Miss W---, “The Gentleman’s Study”
- Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, “The Reasons that Induced Dr. S[wift] to Write a Poem Call’d the Lady’s Dressing Room”
- Pope, “Of the Characters of Women: An Epistle to a Lady”
- Montagu, “Verses Address’d to the Imitator of the First Satire of the Second Book of Horace”
- Jane Collier, *The Art of Ingeniously Tormenting*. Read “To the Husband” and “To the Wife.”

Critical reading: Selected chapters from Felicity Nussbaum, *The Brink of All We Hate: English Satires on Women 1660 to 1750*. University Press of Kentucky, 1984.

Week 6: Self-referential performances

- Buckingham, *The Rehearsal*
- Anonymous, *The Female Wits*

Critical readings: Robert Phiddian, “Satire and the Limits of Literary Theories.” *The Critical Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2013, pp. 44–58.

Week 7: John Gay, *The Beggar’s Opera*

Critical readings: Robert D. Hume, “‘The World is All Alike’: Satire in The Beggar’s Opera.” From *The Rakish Stage: Studies in English Drama, 1660-1800*. Southern Illinois UP, 1983.

Week 8: Jonathan Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels*

Critical readings: Sociology and rhetoric sections from Victor Raskin (ed.), *Primer of Humor Research*. De Gruyter Mouton, 2008.

Week 9: Henry Fielding, *Jonathan Wild*

Critical readings: Selections from Mikhail Bakhtin

Week 10: Laurence Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*, Book 1

Critical readings: Melanie D. Holm, “Laughter, Skepticism, and the Pleasures of Being Misunderstood in Laurence Sterne’s *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*.” *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 55, no. 4, Dec. 2014, pp. 355–375.

Week 11: Aphra Behn, *The Rover*

Critical readings: Joseph Meeker, “The Comic Mode.” *The Ecocriticism Reader*, ed. by Cheryl Glorfelty and Harold Fromm, Georgia UP, pp. 155-169.

Week 12: Topic workshop. Topic proposals due.

Week 13: Richard Sheridan, *The School for Scandal*

Week 14: Individual conferences on final projects. Drafts due.

Week 15: Final exam session coffeehouse. Final projects due

### **A Memorial to Manuel Schonhorn (1930-2021)**

Manuel Schonhorn, a longstanding member of EC/ASECS and distinguished literary historian and critic, died in hospice, holding his son's hand, on 22 April 2021. He had had two heart attacks, the first 26 Dec. 2019, and his heart was failing, making breathing very difficult during his last year. He had fought to maintain relatively good health into his late 80s despite painful spinal stenosis that made more common octogenarian complaints like skin cancer seem incidental. He is survived by his wife of 63 years, Bonnie Schonhorn, daughter Mardi Montgomery, and son Morris.

Manny grew up in Brooklyn, enrolled at 16 in NYU as a music major (trumpet), left school to be a merchant seaman in 1948, sailing through the Suez, visiting Karachi, and disembarking in Sydney where he fell in with musicians and laid water pipes until an appendicitis returned him to NYC. He attended Brooklyn College intermittently in the early fifties before taking his degree in 1955. These years, eager to write fiction from life, he worked for a time in the Borscht belt waiting tables and at an Alaskan mining camp, returning when the snow flew by freight train, and in another sojourn from education, served in the Army (1952-54). About 1957 he met his wife Bonnie Montgomery, who was a professional singer, and they soon married, and Manny entered Penn for graduate studies. He was pulled from history to English under the sway of A. H. (Joe) Scouten, for whom he wrote his dissertation, "Defoe's Sources and Narrative Method: *Mrs. Veal, Journal of the Plague Year, Robinson Crusoe, Captain Jack*." Manny taught at the U. of Kansas in 1963-67 then a year at SUNY Binghamton before taking up his extended residence at Southern Illinois U. in Carbondale, punctuated by a year in the mid 1970s as a visiting professor at Maryland.

In the 1960s he joined with Maximillian Novak to produce a works edition of Defoe. About 1970, he received a fellowship from the American Philosophical Society to work on his edition of *The General History of the Pyrates* (1972; 1999). In the winter of 1974/5 he enjoyed a residential fellowship at the Newberry Library, which led a year later to his receiving a British Academy-Newberry Library fellowship to work in London. His research on Defoe led to fellowships at the Clark and the Huntington libraries, allowing him to collaborate better with Novak. Since the 1990s he assisted in the annotating of Defoe's works for the Stoke Newington edition published by AMS Press and very recently Bucknell. For the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary of his edition of *The General History of the Pyrates*, he added a lengthy postscript on the recent cultural engagements with pirates and reprised his arguments attributing the work to Defoe. After retiring in 1997

the Schonhorns moved to Conashaugh Lakes, near Milford, PA, and Dingman's Ferry on the Delaware River. They were good neighbors there, with Manny writing occasional news and humor articles for the community weekly. They worked out at the local Y and Manny had pals for morning coffee at the local donut shop and in the VFW. From here they increasingly spent months in NYC, where Manny attended Columbia seminars and worked at libraries. In his last decade he spent much trying to gift his library and print collection to libraries and found in the UAE a colleague to put his collection of pirate trials to use. Since November 2019, after closing up the woodland home in Poconos, the Schonhorns resided on 110<sup>th</sup> St in Manhattan. He maintained his scholarly inclination, always an avid and perceptive reader, to the end.

Although Manny was more broadly known for his participation on C18-L and in the Columbia Seminars, to put our organization first, I start by noting he joined EC/ASECS soon after moving to the Poconos. Beginning in January 2007 he contributed seven times to the *Intelligencer*, two notes in 2007 (on “St. Augustine’s *Confessions* in *Clarissa* and *Tom Jones*” and “Robinson Crusoe’s ‘Apartment’”), four reviews: of G. Darley study *John Evelyn* in 2008, M. Bowden’s *Yorick’s Congregation* in 2009, M. New and P. de Voogd’s *Letters of Laurence Sterne* in 2010, and R. Frohock’s *Buccaneers and Privateers* in 2013, and a tribute to Gabe Hornstein in 2017—and on other occasions, I turned to Manny for a compliment to late colleagues like Irwin Primer. He sent me info on the Columbia Seminar and notices of publications and the like that might interest our community. Manny presented at several of our meetings, such as those in Baltimore and in West Chester, where he spoke on Don Mell’s Swift seminars about the misinterpretation of the “attempted rape” of Gulliver—given the Yahoo’s age, Gulliver was vainly mistaken and Swift was playing with us. (He spent years collecting as context data about traditional and legal notions regarding the onset of menarche, the conventional age of marriage, and the age of the youngest prostitutes—a larger ongoing project was collecting evidence of three archetypal fathers in European literature, and he had for our day a rare interest in masculinity, pondering, for instance, whether the 18C fad for clubs was a new “civilized masculinity” substituting for, as an earl in 1700 told his son, “the martial tradition that has been the function of the family males for generations.”)

Most of Manny’s reviewing was for *The Scriblerian*. He figures in the first issue and later wrote nearly twenty reviews for the journal, co-founded by his friend Roy Wolper (“Any trip to Philadelphia meant a visit to Roy—friendly, energetic, hospitable”). He is often appreciative during the initial overview but liked to have something to add, bringing a new perspective or consideration. On occasion he is too condensed, too witty and allusive to be lucid—probably leaving some authors wondering if they’d been praised or censured. When he reviewed publications working toward historical generalizations, the historian in him was often skeptical. In reviewing *Sexuality in 18C Britain* edited by Paul-Gabriel Boucé for *Scriblerian* (Autumn 1984), he remarks that *Fanny Hill* “seems to be cited an inordinate number of times, becoming a Hite Report of one. Thus, attempts at conclusions drawn from limited texts and data begin to induce skepticism . . . . One starts to yearn for lists, numbers, clean statistics . . . . Too many

contributors press for significance. . . . Can one make such inferences from such small occasions in the fictions?" (17.1: 70).

Manny Schonhorn's principal contributions to scholarship center around Defoe's political journalism and the political content of his writings in general. The tangential relation of his research on piracy and editing of *The General History of Pyrates* to this focus on Defoe's politics is apparent in his seminal essay "The Literature of Politics and the Politics of Some Fictions," wherein the fictions considered are the first two Crusoe volumes and the *General History*. The essay appeared in *English Literature in the Age of Disguise*, edited by Maximillian E. Novak (1977), empowered as Clark Library Professor 1973-1974, a gathering of six essays following Novak's discussion of the dominance of disguise in the early 18C. For Schonhorn, Defoe's political ideas, distinguishing them from Locke's and others' that Defoe closely read, were more influenced by the Old Testament than by ancient world or early English history or the theorizing from reason. Thus the study of Defoe's politics went hand in hand with the study of his reading of scripture and his reading of recent English history mindful of providential design. Defoe's ideal government is commanded by a warrior monarch (like William III) who gains the consent of the people, reflecting his election by or approval by God. Defoe analyzes the fiction to find there displayed this martial governor—King Crusoe. As further support for the interpretation of *RC*, Schonhorn argues, "*The Farther Adventures* is a continued dramatic rendering of the evolution of the society following the record in the Bible." Before glancing at Defoe's unpublished manuscripts "Of Royal Education" and "The Compleat English Gentleman" for confirmation of his contempt for the vicious aristocracy and corrupt Parliament, etc., Schonhorn demonstrates how in the second *Pyrates* volume's account of pirate polities (1728) Defoe portrays Captain Mission as the "consummate gentleman-warrior-prince." Schonhorn's expansion of this understanding of Defoe's politics led to a series of reinforcing essays, such as "Defoe, the Language of the Politics, and the Past" (*Studies in the Literary Imagination*, 1982), "Defoe, Political Parties, and the Monarch" (*SECC*, 1986) and then to his monograph *Defoe's Politics: Parliament, Power, Kingship and Robinson Crusoe* (Cambridge UP, 1991; paperback, 2006), which analyzes works indisputably by Defoe from the reign of William III as well as *Jure Divino* and *RC* and counters misrepresentations of Defoe as too modern and Lockean. Manny examines Defoe as both journalist and political theorists while explaining contradictions following from Defoe's very diverse publications against shifting political developments. An important follow up essay is his "Defoe and the Limits of Jacobite Rhetoric" in the excellent special issue of *ELH* entitled "Jacobitism and 18C English Literature" (1997). Here, noting Defoe's anti-Jacobite rhetoric was not anchored to anti-Catholicism, Manny draws from a wide range of texts Defoe's usual distinction between "conscientious" Nonjurors and Jacobites (whom he respected) and the unprincipled occasional conformists. Manny introduces as a core, structuring belief Defoe's notion of balance between forces both within a state and within Europe, quoting Defoe's approval of the "True Balance" of the sword in the monarch's hand and the purse in the Parliament's and summarizing his fear that the Jacobites would "ally the Stuart Kings with 'the exorbitant power' of France."

Among his essays on *Robinson Crusoe* is his contribution “Weber, Watt, and Restraint: *Robinson Crusoe* and the Critical Tradition” in *Approaches to Teaching Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe*, ed. by M. Novak and C. Fisher (MLA, 2005). Manny’s publications on pirates go back to grad school: he published “Defoe’s Pirates: A New Source,” treating *A General History of . . . the Pyrates*” in *RES*, 14 (1963). Other Defoe attributions received his attention: “Defoe’s *Capitain Singleton*: a Reassessment with Observations (*PLL*, 1971); “Defoe’s *Four Years Voyages of Capt. George Roberts* [1726] and *Ashton’s Memorial*” (*Texas Studies in L&L*, 1975); “Two Other Defoe Voices” (*MLQ*, 1983); “Defoe’s *Journal of the Plague Year*: Typography and Intention” (*RES*, 19 [Nov. 1968]); and *Daniel Defoe and Others, Accounts of the Apparition of Mrs. Veal* (Clark Library; AMS Press, 1965). A search for “Manuel Schonhorn” in Proquest’s *Literature Online* reveals what a large footprint he made, bringing up many citations akin to “Schonhorn argues” and “see Manuel Schonhorn.” His attribution of texts to Defoe—particularly several disputed works involving piracy and navigation—makes him a contestant in ongoing debates. Like Novak, he was often at odds with Furbank and Owens’ de-attributions, yet Manny corresponded about Defoe with Furbank and obtained his advice on manuscripts. He had huge affection and respect for Furbank, and he greatly valued F&O’s arguments regarding attribution.

Besides being a literary historian with one foot in history, Manny wrote criticism of a broad range of fiction, from *Huckleberry Finn* (“Mark Twain’s Jim: Solomon on the Mississippi” in *Mark Twain Journal*, 14.3 [Winter 1968-69] to *Mansfield Park* (“Climate, Sites, and Sanctuary: Austen’s *Mansfield Park*” in *Age of Johnson*, 21 [2011], treating symbolic significances of physical spaces). His criticism of fiction reflects very close reading working toward bigger questions. See for instance his “Fielding’s Ecphrastic Moment: Tom Jones and his Egyptian Majesty” in *Studies in Philology*, 1981, where Manny glosses one scene in relation to others; in a review of this “persuasive” and “ingenious reading,” the reviewer in *Scriblerian* finds we are forced to “reconsider how we interpret Fielding’s art” (15.1 [Autumn 1982], 35-36). He wrote mindfully of the question “so what?” He wrestled with literary conventions and traditions in such essays as “The Writer as Hero from Jonson to Fielding” in *Defoe’s Footsteps: Essays in Honour of Maximillian E. Novak* (2009) and “Pope’s *An Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot* and Justus Lipsius” in *Paper Ink and Achievement: Gabriel Hornstein and the Revival of 18C Scholarship* (2021), his most recent essay. He published half a dozen essays relating to Pope, the first in 1967. Fielding placed third among authors on which he published. He long hoped to write on “the father” in *Clarissa*, which he thought the finest English novel and taught as early as the 1960s.

Manuel Schonhorn was proud to be, with Novak and Irving N. Rothman, General Co-Editor of the Stoke Newington Edition of Daniel Defoe—it found a place in his contributor’s notes. He remarked long ago that, when this editorial duty ended, he’d be dead. Though sometimes not credited, he played a supportive role for decades, proofreading, correcting, and adding & revising notes to the many volumes published by AMS Press, beginning with *An Essay upon Projects*, ed. by Joyce D. Kennedy, Michael Seidel, and Max. Novak, 1999, followed by *The Consolidator* ed. by J. D.

Kennedy, M. Seidel, and Novak in 2001; *The Political History of the Devil* ed. by Rothman and M. Bowerman in 2003; *An Essay on the History and Reality of Apparitions*, ed. Kit Kincade, 2007; and *The Family Instructor* ed. by Rothman et al., 2 vols. 2012, 2016. Delays and then the demise of AMS Press held up the *Crusoe* volumes. With the publication of *Robinson Crusoe* by Bucknell UP in 2020, Manny made it to the title-page beside Novak and Rothman. Equally his is *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, due from Bucknell on 15 Oct 2021, ed. by the three colleagues with contributions by Kit Kincade and John Peters. (The volumes from AMS are now very hard to obtain, and one wishes Bucknell would gain the rights to release them in paperback.) In 2015 Novak turned over to the Clark Library several boxes of his and Manny's correspondence regarding and plans for the Stoke Newington edition, 1967-2004 (MS 2015.06).

Max Novak, at his friend's request, announced to C18-L on 22 April Manny's passing, briefly summing up his career, noting, "He was well known for his work on eighteenth-century literature from Defoe to Jane Austen. He is perhaps best known for his book on Defoe's politics, but he had recently written on Swift and Pope. He was one of the founding editors of The Stoke Newington Edition of the Writings of Daniel Defoe. . . . His unique sense of humor as well as his learning appeared often on the C-18 lists." Tributes followed. Maureen Mulvihill wrote, "'Manny' was a special friend to many New Yorkers . . . . I enjoyed seeing him many times at the NYPL and the Morgan Library. He was a dedicated contributor to 18thC studies." Ellen Moody added, "I knew Manny Schonhorm only in his later years and as a friend-acquaintance at the EC/ASECS meetings. He was so friendly, kind, full of fun, and candid. Wonderfully pleasant over drinks, informative if you sat with him for a full lunch. He and I would exchange email missives too. I'll miss his presence at our meetings." Frances Singh wrote of how she too will miss him: He had quite an astonishing life in his younger days, and fine-tuned those stories about Alaska, etc. He was always kind to me though I was always a little afraid of him, since at those Columbia meetings, I could see that he liked to punch and jab. Al Coppola posted a fine tribute to Columbia Seminar members: "As most members of the Columbia 18C Seminar know, Manny made our group his intellectual home after retiring from his position at Southern Illinois University, and he was part of a core group of emeritus scholars who attended regularly and enlivened the proceedings. Whether over a drink or in Q&A, Manny was always quick to share his insights, and his love of the field was rivaled by none. When I became chair of the seminar as an untenured scholar, I was so grateful for the support and encouragement that I received from Manny and the other senior scholars who formed the core membership at the time. Manny was a gentleman scholar of the old school, and he will be missed. Seminar co-chair Kathy Lubey added, "Manny indeed was a central presence with the Columbia group, and everyone particularly valued his outreach to younger scholars"—I well remember how he engaged Rob Hume's graduate students at our meetings. He proudly reported to me when two college kids at the local restaurants asked for advice about college.

Recalling how proudly Manny and Vincent Carretta exchanged compliments at the Baltimore EC/ASECS when Vin gave a plenary, I asked Vin for his recollections, and he replied:

My wife, Pat, & I are very sorry to hear of Manny Schonhorn's death. We took his 18th-century novel course together in spring 1968 as undergraduates at Harpur College (now Binghamton University). Manny deserves much of the credit--or blame, depending on one's assessment of my subsequent career--for my becoming an eighteenth-century scholar. We met when I was in my fifth undergraduate year, trying to get my GPA over 2.0 so that I could finally graduate after having spent the previous 5 semesters on academic probation (not the dean's list most of our colleagues were ever on). Manny's enthusiasm for, and knowledge about, the eighteenth century inspired me to actually do the work to try to meet his expectations. Without his support I would never have been accepted into a graduate program. We stayed in touch ever since his brief time at Harpur. Manny often expressed his pride in how successful he thought his formerly errant student had become. Manny Schonhorn was truly a mensch.

Another of Manny's former students is Paulus Pimomo, an English Professor at Central Washington University, with academic and personal accomplishments that surely endeared him to Manny. When told by Frances Singh of Manny's death, he wrote for us following recollection that stresses what a "caring man" Manny was:

I arrived in Southern Illinois University at Carbondale in 1984 as a graduate student. It was my first time in the US, straight from the backwaters of northeastern India. I was a complete stranger in the university town and unsure of anything, except that I needed to do well in graduate school, get a job, and take care of my young family. One of the first things I did, before the department orientation, was to get to the library and get a feel of the place. I identified the humanities floor and was trying to figure things out. I must have looked new and uncertain because a kind and curious gentleman (it was Manny) came up to me, greeted me, and asked who I was, what I studied at the university, and when he learned I was going to be a student in his department, Manny became animated and introduced himself, chatted me up about where I had arrived from, and showed me around the library. . . . By the time I left . . . for a job in Georgia Southern, Manny and I had become friends, . . . The last dinner out my family and I had in Carbondale, was in the best Chinese Restaurant in town hosted by Manny and Bonnie Schonhorn. We kept in touch through emails over the decades . . . between jobs, and through our parallel aging [as in the email exchanges within the past year]

I too have found Manny's life (and his death) inspiring—as he himself did (“it's been a great ride”), marveling at his many blessings and good fortune—at how full of lucky adventure his early years were when he admired Hemingway and the veterans of WW2, and then at how his loving marriage with Bonnie had steadied him in a new direction. He wrote emails that were bursts of gratitude for those who aided him over 50 years ago, like the librarians at Kansas and SIU or his beloved history professor at Brooklyn

College, Morris Roberts, who passed out ACLU applications the first day of class. One of his refrains was “Penn taught me well,” which once was followed by Professor A. C. Baugh’s sensible advice, “go back to any article 50 or more years old and redo it.” He praised those of his “professors who fought in WWII, what a list of accomplishments!” They were better men and teachers than the “stout” old boys above them, more flexible, grounded in reality, eager to see students move on to employment and family life.

Manny took an unusual intimacy with people of all stripes—standing close, listening close, sometimes touching you. This was part of his gentleness and curiosity, which extended to animals, sharing breakfast with them on the porch (worrying that he was a bad influence) and helping the local dog shelter, even sheltering and walking dogs. He liked to make us laugh. He loved people, places, and ideas passionately. A good day in NYC meant Thai dumplings, a museum, music or theatre, a few hours in the library, and an encounter with visitors on the streets or the subway whom he could greet and guide to their destinations. He tried to live his principles. For instance, he confessed recently to buying a book for \$8 on ABE after finding it \$23 in a local bookstore: “I’m embarrassed, for my purpose in life is to buy a book every few months and help keep bookstores on the streets. I failed. Money is all. Ripeness is for bananas.” He was proud to have participated in the civil rights marches of the 1960s and remained very concerned, to the point of despair, about discrimination, economic inequality, and climate change. Though he had been a good neighbor in the red countryside, “Tarrump” supporters reminded him of the ravings of the schizophrenics in the violent ward of Brooklyn hospital. With Justice Learned Hand (a favorite author), he wondered why there wasn’t more courage in America. Noble and heroic acts could make him cry.—J. E. May

## **Phillip Harth: An Appreciation**

by Stephen Karian

Phillip Harth died on April 28, 2020 at the age of 94, leaving behind a distinguished legacy of teaching and scholarship. He earned his graduate degrees from the University of Chicago, his M.A. in 1949 and his Ph.D. in 1958.\* Immediately after earning his M.A., he taught for one year at Marquette University. As a PhD candidate, he taught at Northwestern University, and continued working there after earning his PhD, ultimately being promoted to Associate Professor. In 1965, he left Northwestern for the University of Wisconsin in Madison, his academic home for the next three decades. In 1977, he became the Merritt Y. Hughes Professor of English and Permanent Fellow of the university’s Institute for Research in the Humanities. He retired from these positions in 1996.

Throughout Phil’s career, he mainly wrote about how late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century religious, philosophical, and political contexts shaped the literature of the period, with a primary but not exclusive focus on

Dryden and Swift. As the field of literary studies changed, he was receptive to new approaches while insisting that critics and scholars reflect on how and why they conduct their studies: “If criticism is to remain a healthy discipline, it must always be ready not only to ask new questions about literature but to seek to find out whether we have been answering familiar questions in the right way. Are the assumptions underlying this criticism trustworthy? Is the method of investigation appropriate in this case? Are the means of interpreting the literature of another period applicable to this particular work?”<sup>1</sup> The language here signals Phil’s openness to multiple approaches and his opposition to a *a priori* argument and critical dogma.

This particular kind of critical pluralism owed much to his training at Chicago, especially under the tutelage of R. S. Crane. Phil exemplified Crane’s insistence on method in both historical scholarship and criticism.<sup>2</sup> That dual focus is evident in Phil’s doctoral dissertation, “Swift and Anglican Rationalism: The Seventeenth-Century Background of Swift’s Early Writings,” adapted into book form as *Swift and Anglican Rationalism: The Religious Background of “A Tale of a Tub”* (U. of Chicago Press, 1961). The introduction to his dissertation, not included in the book, outlines a method of studying satire that should be more widely known. To reconstruct a satirist’s milieu, Phil advises using multiple hypotheses to identify the group of contemporaries who not only attacked the same objects but also did so for the same reasons and from the same philosophical point of view. This method allows Phil to pinpoint the milieu for Swift’s satire on abuses in religion among the writings of a group he termed “Anglican rationalists.”

*Swift and Anglican Rationalism* details with admirable clarity and precision how Swift satirically associated the Puritans with occultism, enthusiasm, and materialism. Nearly sixty years later, it remains one of the essential books for understanding *A Tale of a Tub*. This book and his two on Dryden—*Contexts of Dryden’s Thought* (U. of Chicago Press, 1968) and *Pen for a Party: Dryden’s Tory Propaganda in its Contexts* (Princeton U. Press, 1993)—consistently exhibit nuanced arguments, a mastery of primary materials, and thorough awareness of the relevant secondary materials from many fields. Throughout these books Phil attends to the multi-faceted nature of literary works: their generic conventions, rhetorical strategies, specific historical, political, and intellectual occasions, and their reception. Each book offers myriad discoveries, and takes readers on intellectual adventures. *Pen for a Party* in addition showcases a talent not prominent in Phil’s other two books: his crafting of a richly detailed narrative, in this instance concerning the three Tory propaganda campaigns in the years 1681–85.

Phil’s expertise as a textual critic has not been sufficiently recognized. During his graduate years at Chicago, he was taught bibliography by Fredson Bowers during one of Bowers’s summer stints there. *Swift and Anglican Rationalism* is in part a work of textual criticism; the opening and closing chapters provide great insight into when and why Swift wrote different portions of *A Tale of a Tub*. In *Contexts of Dryden’s Thought*, Phil shows how Dryden composed the first half of *Religio Laici* by reworking material in his friend Sir Charles Wolseley’s *The Reasonableness of Scripture Belief*. For the only time that Phil edited a literary work, Bernard Mandeville’s *Fable of the Bees* (Penguin, 1970), he includes a full textual apparatus of substantive variants, which is unusual for a student edition. In his review of

L. A. Beaurline and Bowers's editions of Dryden's plays, he offers new evidence that defended their choice of copy-text, which differed from that used in the California edition.<sup>3</sup> Phil's last publication, a review essay of the first two volumes of the Longman Dryden, makes an articulate, detailed argument against modernized editions.<sup>4</sup>

One of Phil's unheralded textual contributions is in Appendix 2 of *Pen for a Party*. There he hypothesizes that all editions of Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel*, starting with the first, misplaced a set of twelve lines. In his concise and compelling explanation, he shows where Dryden must have intended the lines to appear. I remember Phil telling me over twenty years ago that he was disappointed that this discussion had not attracted much attention. I'm sorry to say that the situation has not improved in the years since. Readers can test this for themselves. If you're reading a text of the poem such that line 107 ("T' espouse his Cause by whom they eat and drink") is immediately followed by "From hence began that Plot, the Nation's Curse" rather than "Th' Egyptian Rites the Jebusites imbrac'd," then you're relying on a text that has not yet caught up to Phil's discovery in 1993. In my cursory survey of recent anthologies and editions, I have not found a text edited in light of Phil's discussion.

Phil was a painstaking reviewer of scholarly work, and the most trenchant comments in his reviews offer expert lessons in scholarly and critical argumentation. There we find him: exposing a "close reading" as "so far-fetched as to be inherently improbable: a peculiarly unfortunate example of what can happen when a determinate judgment is applied, a priori, to a literary work" (*Modern Philology* 58 [1961]: 284); challenging a logic "which assumes that vague resemblance amounts to wholesale identity" (*Modern Philology* 69 [1971]: 166); pointing out that offering readers "an interpretative hypothesis without weighing it against its respectable competitors . . . is to substitute dogmatism for critical inquiry" (*Philological Quarterly* 53 [1974]: 788); rejecting binary thinking that produces "those contrasting pairs of ideologues (Aquinas and Scotus) or ideologies (rationalism and empiricism) dear to the hearts of intellectual historians and university examiners" (*Modern Language Review* 72 [1977]: 660); chastising a critic for "arguing in a circle when he interprets Dryden's remarks in the light of his hypothesis and then produces them as evidence proving that hypothesis" (*Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 78 [1979]: 129); criticizing scholars who "resorted to essentialism, explaining the diverse productions of a period by a single 'controlling idea' ('truth,' 'nature') or the spirit of the age ('the Age of Reason') . . . [or who] recognized sharp differences of opinion in a period but substituted dichotomies for single ideas, treating them as mutually exclusive categories under one or the other of which every writer could be listed as a committed adherent ('empiricists and rationalists,' 'ancients and moderns')" (*English Language Notes* 20 [1982]: 62); noting that the alleged crypto-deism of the Latitudinarians is "a myth created out of inaccurate paraphrase and selective quotation drawn exclusively from their religious apologetics, where the issues discussed are those already chosen by their adversaries" (*Journal of Modern History* 55 [1983]: 698); and so on.

A complete bibliography of Phil's writings is in his festschrift: *Eighteenth-Century Contexts: Historical Inquiries in Honor of Phillip Harth*

(U. of Wisconsin Press, 2001), edited by Phil's friend and Wisconsin colleague Howard Weinbrot and two who earned their PhDs there, Peter J. Schakel and me.

As a teacher, Phil had great passion about the literature of the period in all its disciplinary facets. With typical understatement, the full course description in one of his syllabi reads: "An intensive study of significant poems, plays, and prose works of the early eighteenth century, and of their relations with the other arts." In addition to the primary literary texts and five of Hogarth's satirical series, Phil taught us so much in that course: generic conventions of the georgic, the role of booksellers and copyright, theatrical practices, popular fairs and entertainments, opera, crime and punishment, historiographic debates about political parties and literacy, modern theories about satirical personae, and other aspects of political, intellectual, and cultural history. His curiosity was infectious and inspiring.

In the classroom he displayed a prodigious memory. Because his lectures compressed a wide range of information and an impressive level of detail, I wondered how he prepared them. In the second course I took from him, I had an opportunity to surreptitiously glance at his materials after he set them down on the table and left the room for a drink of water. All I saw was a photocopied essay from *The Spectator*, and in the margins at particular points there were four small check marks. With only these cues, he delivered a deeply informed lecture ranging across eighteenth-century literary theory, Pope's *Essay on Criticism*, the Ancients/Moderns controversy, and I am sure many other things I have since forgotten.

Later that semester we read George Lillo's *The London Merchant*, and because I was reading *Great Expectations* for another course, I had noticed Dickens's use of Lillo's play. Proud of my newly acquired erudition, I prepared comments on this topic to instruct my fellow students and, perhaps, impress my professor. Shortly after pointing out this connection and the light it cast on both works, Phil pounced on the point, and even though I don't think he had prepared to speak about Dickens at all, he corrected my inaccurate reference to the Dickens chapter (it was 15 not 17), extended the discussion much further than I could have done, and did so with such grace and good humor that I forgot I had been scooped.

As I was completing my coursework, Phil was about to retire. Another graduate student and I asked him to supervise an independent study on Restoration and eighteenth-century satire. He agreed, and assigned us primary texts about satire from the period as well as major theoretical discussions by modern scholars. The highlight for me was reading individual satires and a dozen or so critical essays about each one and discussing these with him. This experience taught me much about how arguments are constructed, how they could be analyzed to reveal their often unstated critical frameworks, and how they fit within the broad history of modern literary criticism. His masterful understanding of how and why critical trends shifted is evident in Phil's two complementary articles about the study of eighteenth-century literature: "The New Criticism and Eighteenth-Century Poetry" and "Clio and the Critics," his 1979 Presidential address to ASECS.<sup>5</sup>

I learned a lot in those independent study sessions, and I laughed a lot. Phil had a great sense of humor, especially satirical humor. As a student of satire, he found scandalous behavior to be a source of amusement, such as

the disreputable scholarly activities of Francesco Cordasco and his Smollett forgeries. The true test of one's sense of humor is the ability to laugh at things closest to oneself. Perhaps because Phil was a product of the "Chicago School," he found hilarious the parody in Frederick Crews's mock-casebook *The Pooh Perplex* (1963), in which "Duns C. Penwiper" situates his pompously verbose "Complete Analysis of *Winnie-the-Pooh*" in relation to the abstruse theoretical statements of Chicago Neo-Aristotelian critics and those critics alone. Phil would laugh at the mere mention of Crews's phrase "the succinct words of Richard McKeon."

Phillip Harth was a great scholar and teacher. He had a deep belief that there is "genuine progress in the learned disciplines, however slow."<sup>6</sup> That conviction kept him engaged for decades about new discoveries concerning the work that inaugurated his career, *A Tale of a Tub*. As he concluded one of his last publications: "If, as I continue to believe, the interpretation of a literary text depends on our reading it in its specific historical contexts, then we need to remain alert to the changes occurring in not just one but several disciplines, in order that our understanding of Swift's religious satire in *A Tale of a Tub* can undergo the kind of steady correction, revision, modification, and extension that is the substance of intellectual inquiry."<sup>7</sup>

University of Missouri

\**Editor's Note*: Reprinted with permission of the editors and the author from *Swift Studies*, 36 (2021), 7-12, a volume dedicated to Professor Harth.

### Notes

1. Foreword to *New Approaches to Eighteenth-Century Literature: Selected Papers from the English Institute* (Columbia U. Press, 1974), vi.

2. An excellent introduction to Crane and the Chicago Critics is Robert D. Hume, "'What Is Your Evidence?' R. S. Crane as Scholar, Critic, and Theorist of Methodology," *Modern Philology* 115 (2018): 432-73.

3. *Modern Philology* 67 (1970): 379-82.

4. "The Text of Dryden's Poetry," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 63 (2000): 227-44.

5. "The New Criticism and Eighteenth-Century Poetry," *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1981): 521-37, and "Clio and the Critics," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 10 (1981): 3-15. The latter essay contains an example of the sly wit Phil could employ, in this instance concerning the excessive number of New Critical readings of *The Rape of the Lock*: "there are natural limits to the number of times the same operation can be performed on a poem without causing fatal post-surgical complications" (4).

6. "Clio and the Critics," 9.

7. "Recent Religious History and *A Tale of a Tub*," *Swift Studies* 14 (1999): 36.

### **In Memory of Henry L. Fulton, 1935-2021**

Henry Levan Fulton died on 19 August surrounded by his family following a heart attack and several organ failures. A vigil for Henry was held on 26 August and a memorial service will be held in the fall. Henry Fulton was born on April 16, 1935, in Pittsburgh to Henry Roedel Fulton and Harvene Levan Fulton. He married Ann-Adele Lloyd in 1959, to whom two children were born, Jenny and Matthew (Max), before their divorce in 1970. He married Nancy Jane Casey in 1974, and they were blessed with a son, Charles. Henry was preceded in death by sisters Barbara Ann Hinton and Louise Coffin.

Henry took his B.A. from Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut, and then his M.A. and Ph.D. in English from the University of Michigan. In 1967, about the time he finished his dissertation, he began teaching English at Central Michigan University in Mt. Pleasant, specializing in Shakespeare and Scottish literature, and teaching through his retirement in 2000. His service to CMU including being Director of International Programs from 1986 through 1991 (study locations included Austria and Japan). That commitment is reflected in his and his wife Nancy's endowing a scholarship at CMU for undergraduate or graduate students studying for at least a semester at one of several major Scottish universities. (Nancy, a Deacon in the Episcopal Church, took an English degree from CMU.) His two decades of retirement were until recently still devoted to scholarship but also diverted by cheering on Detroit's major league teams, gardening, and attending plays and concerts. His obituary informs us that "He was an active member of the congregation of St. John's Episcopal Church in Mt. Pleasant, where he sang in the choir and took part in the administration of the church and the diocese."

As far back as the 1980s, Henry participated in EC/ASECS meetings with a frequency that would suggest he lived within the region, not in Michigan--in recent years his attendance at meetings was encouraged by his son Charles's living in Easton, PA. For three years Henry served on EC/ASECS's executive board and judged the Molin Prize. His contributions to the *Intelligencer* date back to his lending us the syllabus of "The Garden Seminar" for the Pedagogue's Post of Sept. 1994 (8.iii: 16-17). For an insight into his teaching, we note that the demanding reading list for this thematic survey included Donne ("First Anniverserie"), Marvell ("The Garden"), Milton (*PL*) and Finch ("Petition for an Absolute Retreat"), poetry of Dryden, Pope, and Thomson, Locke's *Second Treatise of Government*, Defoe's *Crusoe*, and then *Clarissa*, *Tom Jones*, and *Rasselas*, before ending with Goldsmith's two major poems. The syllabus lists "principal ideas" in *Paradise Lost* to be searched for in the 18C titles and concludes with poems and books Henry might have assigned "were the course longer." (Clearly, Henry had a capacity to dream--in 2001 after retiring he hoped to edit Defoe's *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland* after completing his biography of John Moore.) In the June 2006 issue he reviewed *The Lisbon Earthquake of 1755*, a collection edited by T.E.D. Braun and John Radner that included many essays presented at EC/ASECS meetings. Henry's generosity and collegiality is most in evidence in the offer to help younger scholars with

projects he had once contemplated attempting or had begun. In the October 2018 *Intelligencer* he offered, "topics pertaining to Dr. John Moore, that scholars in our period, looking for something new to work on, might be interested in." He pledged his help with such "productive projects" as "The bankruptcy of William Fogo of Killorn (Glasgow merchant), in the 1740s. Moore's uncle. I have a lot of notes on this"; "Themes or preoccupations of Moore's two travel books; and and editions of Moore's *Medical Sketches* (1786) and Moore's second novel *Edward* (1796)." Henry stretched out his hands to us. I wasn't surprised to hear that he and Nancy put up Laura Kennelly and Rob Mayerovitch when Rob came to CMU to perform a piano recital. Of course, they would. As Peter Briggs wrote, "Henry was a gentle soul who particularly enjoyed the warmth and collegiality of our EC/ASECS meetings."

But it must be admitted that Henry's principal institutional commitment was to the Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society (ECSSS), being one of its inaugural members at its founding in 1987. Reading the PDFs of Rick Sher's annual newsletter, *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (available at [www.ecsss.org](http://www.ecsss.org)), one finds most contain contributions by Henry or references to his scholarship and often service to ECSSS. To the newsletter he contributed at least nine reviews between 1990 and 2019, five between 2013-19. In spring 1996 he provided an account of "the International Bicentennial Burns Conference." He served as Vice-President during 2002-03 and remained longer on the Executive Board. He frequently participated in ECSSS's annual meetings, perhaps especially those outside the U.S., and also at their sessions at ASECS meetings, sometimes being the organizer of those panels and presiding over its luncheon. At ECSSS's 2014 meeting in Montreal he spoke on writing biography, and at the 2018 meeting in Glasgow, he presented "Marrying Glasgow, Dr. John Moore, His Mother, and Financial Anxiety."

Before the start of our survey of Henry Fulton's publications, we have Beth Lambert's informative tribute to Henry:

In July 2018, during the ECSSS meeting in Glasgow, Henry was given by the Lord Provost the honorary title of "Burgess and Guild Brother of the City of Glasgow, Scotland." This honor is rarely presented to outsiders and was given in honor of Henry's work on Dr. John Moore (1792-1803), a physician, writer, and prominent citizen of Glasgow. As a doctoral student at the University of Michigan, Henry began his work on Moore and then spent 40 years researching and writing the biography that became *Dr. John Moore, 1792-1803, a Life in Medicine, Travel, and Revolution* (2015). Henry's title of Burgess and Guild Brother of Glasgow, making him a "Freeman Citizen" of the City, was unexpected. An individual must be nominated and is usually given to "eminent Scotsmen," so he was completely unprepared for the honor when he attended a conference on Scottish Studies in Glasgow. At the time he received the award, Henry noted "I'm 83, so travel is hard."

Having said that, in his mid-pandemic Christmas letter of 2020, Henry reported "reading the *Cambridge Companion to Edward Gibbon*, the first two volumes of Macaulay's *History of England*, and Jack Hill on Adam Ferguson." In addition, he "spent the entire year on a narrative of my

favorite aunt, a missionary in China during the Sino-Japanese war...I also contribute a biography for the monthly parish newsletter on a "worthy" Episcopalian (I have written more than 360.)"

Henry's dear, sometimes-curmudgeonly, voice will be missed by those of us fortunate to have known this exceptional eighteenth-century scholar and friend.

Henry Fulton's dissertation at the University of Michigan was entitled "The Making of a Reputation: John Moore from 1729 to the Publication of *Zeluco*" (*DAI*, 28 (1968), 4755A. His early publications include "Theme and Structure in *Rasselas*" in the 1969 *Michigan Academician* and "An Eighteenth-Century Best Seller" in the 1972 *PBSA* on Moore's *A View of Society and Manners in France, Switzerland, and Germany* (1779), which grew out of Moore's Grand Tour with the Duke of Hamilton and passed through 24 editions in six countries in 21 years. To *Studies in Scottish Literature*, he contributed "Smollett's Medical Apprenticeship in Glasgow, 1736-1739" (15 [1980], 175-86); "Disillusionment with the French Revolution: The Case of the Scottish Physician John Moore" (23 [1988] 46-63); and "Robert Burns, John Moore, and the Limits of Letter Writing" (35 [2007])--all now online with open access. His "John Moore, the Medical Profession and the Glasgow Enlightenment," presented at an ECSSS meeting in Glasgow in 1990 appears in *The Glasgow Enlightenment*, edited by Richard Sher and Andrew Hook (1995), a volume to be reprinted this year with Sher's new bibliographical preface. He contributed "From Mrs. Dunlop to the Currie Edition: The Missing Links" to *Love and Liberty: Robert Burns: A Bicentenary Celebration*, ed. by K. Simpson (1997). He published "What Would Hospice Do? The Wretched Death of the Villain *Zeluco*" in the 2002 volume of *1650-1850*. In *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Henry examined the beneficial patronage by influential friends of Dr. Moore and especially of his son General Sir John Moore (1761-1809) to their descendents (15 [1986], 145-60). He taught us much about patronage and education also in his "Private Tutoring in Scotland: The Example of Mure of Caldwell" in *Eighteenth-Century Life* (27.3 [Fall 2003], 53-69). It detailed the steps taken to provide a Francophone education for two sons of William Mure, a baron of the Scottish Exchequer, including private tutoring in Paris by George Jardine during 1771-73. In these essays as in his admired biography, Henry searched for broadly applicable general patterns in the lives of individuals. He wrote the *ODNB* entry on Moore and then revised it several years later. He contributed reviews to serials other than the *Intelligencer* and *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, including *Scriblerian* and *Aberdeen U. Review*. His reviews are maturely appreciative, even when he had expertise invested in the subject and had corrections to make, as in reviewing for *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* in 2015 *The Travel Writings of John Moore*, edited by Ben P. Robertson. However, in rare cases he creates fine if worthwhile distinctions and rejects assertions after minutely examining evidence to conclude "not proven," as in his refusal to agree with Richard J. Jones that Smollett, particularly for his *Travels through France and Italy*, carried forward the Scottish (Glasgow) Enlightenment (*ECS*, Spring 2013). Yet he concludes with praise for "impressive" scholarship.

One would never learn from the *Annual Bibliography of English Literature and Language*, despite its inclusion of reviews, of those nine reviews in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, nor of all the reviews produced for and the editing and compiling performed for *ECCB: Eighteenth Century Current Bibliography*. Henry was a contributing editor to *ECCB* volumes for 1989 to 2004, supervising "religion" entries from 1990 on. This effort over nearly two decades, well after this retirement, partly explains the delay in publishing his biography of Moore. He was reviewing books for *ECCB* by the 1980s. He reviewed Roderick Watson's *The Literature of Scotland* in n.s. 10 for 1984, and two books for the 1988 volume, that before he took on editorial duties, including James Basker's groundbreaking *Tobias Smollett: Critic and Journalist*. He regularly reviewed books for volumes he helped compile, such as, of Patrick Griffin's *The People with No Name: Ireland's Ulster Scots . . . 1689-1764* for n.s. 27 on 2001 (2005), Philip Benedict's *Christ's Church Purely Reformed* for 28 (2006), and Mark Noll's *The Rise of Evangelicalism* for 29 (2007). Henry was a dependable teammate.

Henry's career focus on Dr. John Moore culminated in the 2015 publication of *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802: A Life in Medicine, Travel, and Revolution*, a 800+ page biography, which Delaware published when surely few presses would have signed on for such a tome (again we look back with thanks to Don Mell). The biography was partly built through essays published over decades. What a gamble it was to spend 40+ years working up a definitive biography and career study that would not be printed until one was 80! (The tenure system militates against such a plan.) Richard Sher praised the book in *The Bulletin of the History of Medicine* (90.i [Spring 2016], 152-53), stressing how "the number of spheres" in which Moore won "distinction" required the biographer "to master a vast amount of relevant published and archival material, including unpublished correspondence, memoirs, and banking records, scattered in dozens of libraries and repositories on both sides of the Atlantic. Fortunately, Henry L. Fulton has spent decades engaged in this task, and it shows, not only in the heft of the book, but in the depth and breadth of the coverage." Sher stressed Fulton's "careful attention" to Moore's medical education and practice. In *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, Pam Perkins, calling the book a "deeply researched and very enjoyable biography," observed that it "presents Moore as a 'representative of the Scottish Enlightenment' (p. xii), and . . . is as much the picture of an age as it is of an individual." She notes that, although Henry did not wish to offer "extended commentary" on Moore's books, "the close integration of Moore's life and work means that literary readers will find a great deal to interest them." She singles out his "soft spot" for the flawed novel *Mordaunt* and his thorough account of *Journal during a Residence in France*, observing that "Fulton makes a significant contribution to the study of British debates on the French Revolution" by attending to Moore's evolving responses.

The biography was ably and very favorably reviewed by Corey Andrews in the March 2017 *Intelligencer* (31.i: 32-35). We quote below from the first two and final paragraphs of that review:

The subject of Henry Fulton's voluminous new biography epitomized many ideals associated with the Scottish Enlightenment, as well as those

concerning revolutionary social and political events occurring at the end of the eighteenth century. Dr. John Moore was widely known in his day, not only for his capable work as a physician but also for his novels and travel writings; his works attracted the attention and admiration of British contemporaries . . . . [But] Moore had been a neglected figure in literary and historical studies before Dr. Fulton began his critical and biographical works on the doctor. The labor of many years, Fulton's biography is the first in-depth assessment of Moore's life and works, providing a much needed account of the doctor's influence and importance during a critical period of British and continental European history.

Fulton notes in his Preface that writing a person's first biography is "rather like assembling a jigsaw puzzle, trying to fit seemingly disparate pieces together, though never finding them all, but trying to end up nevertheless with a reasonable result" (xi). Fulton's biography assembles the pieces of Moore's life with admirable clarity and depth, offering extensive analyses of its various phases; throughout the biography, one finds many intriguing portrayals of Moore and his milieu based on primary research and the author's extensive knowledge of his subject. Moore's relevance during his life derived from a number of factors; as Fulton notes, "Moore is fairly representative of the Scottish Enlightenment as it developed in Glasgow" (xii). He further states that "no Scottish figure of the eighteenth century was more involved in France than Moore was" (xi), citing the doctor's six trips to France, his fluency in French, and his focus on French affairs in five of his works . . . .

Fulton has indeed succeeded in bringing the life and work of Dr. John Moore back to light; this biography is a major work in the fields of biography and social history, and it will serve as the definitive life of Moore and his intellectual and political milieu for years to come.

In reading Henry's reviews and articles in preparation for this tribute, I found myself finishing them despite my intention to skim them, for Henry was a courteous and conscientious writer, interested in central and universal issues and questions--my discovery about his prose will surprise no one who sought out Henry's conversation at conferences.--J. E. May

**Jacob Sider Jost. *Interest and Connection in the Eighteenth Century: Hervey, Johnson, Smith, Equiano.*** Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2020. Pp. [x] + 194; bibliography; illustrations; index. ISBN: 9780813945057: paperback: \$27.50. (Also available in hardcover.)

"Can a single word explain the world? In the British eighteenth century, 'interest' comes close." The rhetorical question within this statement from the back cover of Jacob Sider Jost's new book raises further issues. Since the obvious answer is "no," then how "close" must an advocate come before the reading becomes valuable? Is the natural suspicion that some of us have toward such a sweeping approach justified? If not, how does

an author convince readers of the importance of this philological approach? The proof of the pudding is in the eating, a commonplace that remains true despite the changing meaning of “pudding.” In this case, tracing the widening definition of “interest” allows for close readings of texts that are, for the most part, new and convincing.

Sider Jost has written previously on this topic. He references but does not repeat three essays: “The Interest of Crusoe” (2016); “Party Politics in [Shaftesbury’s] *Characteristics*” (2018); and “Proust and the Water Company” (2018). This monograph consists of a very necessary introduction, largely philological, followed by four chapters mainly treating the four subjects listed in his subtitle. The author stakes out his territory with care and with conciseness in the Introduction. “Befitting its derivation from the Latin verb *interesse*, to be between or among, ‘interest’ is a go-between, allowing authors to think about one realm of experience using another. . . . The object of this book is to explicate such go-between moments, describing the intellectual and literary work that the polysemous word ‘interest’ does” (4). Sider Jost lists eight “semantic strands” of the word “interest” in the long eighteenth century, while reminding us that “the oldest meaning . . . , the price paid for a loan, is also the most enduring” (7-8, 13).

The first chapter, “The Whig Theory of Mind,” focuses especially on two of the eight strands, here termed “erotic and political interest” (41), in the life and writings of Lord Hervey (1696-1743). There are far too many provocative ideas here to summarize, among them, “This chapter explains why the eighteenth century made courtiers act like textual scholars. . . . The topos of attribution reappears . . . throughout Hervey’s work and thought” (16); and “The image of a channel, which carries Walpole’s ideas to George II’s ear through Queen Caroline in [Hervey’s] *Memoirs*, works differently in the intimate sphere than it did at court . . . . It is no longer an expression of power but rather an eroticized outflowing of confidence and trust” (36). (I take “outflowing” to be a sexual pun on Sider Jost’s part, and possibly on Hervey’s part as well, in the passage from the letter to Henry Fox that inspired this paraphrase.) Instead of summary, then, I shall highlight two sections, one typical of the great strength of Sider Jost’s approach, the other perhaps suggestive of a weakness.

To illustrate that “metaphors and habits of thought derived from interest-based electioneering appear in Georgian texts . . . quite remote from the literal hustlings,” the author calls attention to a letter in *Clarissa*, an angry exchange between Clarissa and her sister Arabella in the first volume of Richardson’s novel, (“Near the two-thousand-word mark of the letter,” Sider Jost writes with a straight face). Both women allude to the parable of the good and faithful servant (Matthew 25), and all readers of Richardson would recognize these allusions, but when Arabella shifts from accusing Clarissa of having her rake, Lovelace, “put [her money] out at interest for [her],” to her resembling “a candidate or patron making gifts or loans to secure the votes of electors and ‘aiming to carry the County’ in the next election” (21-22), an awareness of the century’s multiple meanings of “interest” explains Arabella’s rhetorical jump and deepens our understanding of the passage.

Not Richardson but Hervey, especially his *Memoirs*, receives the bulk of the attention in this chapter, which concludes with a suggestion of the

importance of Hervey's theory of how the mind works. Again, no simply summary is possible. Suffice to say, Sider Jost finds Hervey's relating of a Walpole speech to the queen to be a text "rich in the third- and fourth-order inferences about intentionality that literary historians have celebrated as an achievement of the eighteenth-century novel tradition of Defoe, Richardson, Burney, and above all Austen" (39). Clearly, Sider Jost is right to show, as has been shown before, the inadequacy of one previous approach to the century's fiction: "Far from simplifying human psychology as the postulate of a self-interested *Homo economicus* might be imagined to do, 'interest,' in Hervey's sense works to make it ever more complex" (40). One may even agree that "the example of Hervey raises the question of whether Jane Austen is in fact the watershed that cognitive literary scholars have claimed" (40). My question is a bit different. Is Austen worth-reading due to her being early in demonstrating the complexity of the "fourth-level mental embodiment" in narrative? That Sider Jost argues she was far from first to achieve this—and he makes that point—leads me, if not him, to question whether being first with increased complexity of narrative is an important standard for determining literary excellence.

"The Variety of Human Wishes" treats some of Samuel Johnson's periodical essays and two longer works, *Irene* and *Rasselas*. Sider Jost sees in them "the simultaneous mid-eighteenth-century emergence of 'boring' and 'interesting' as a dynamic opposition." In what he terms "the crucial decade of Johnson's career," from 1749 to 1759, Johnson "tak[es] up the theme of interest in all of its senses: as a name for romantic passion, for the occupations of life, for money and gain, for partisan political allegiance and the ties between patrons and clients" (45). The treatment of *Rasselas* is solid, and there is certainly a biographical side to recommend *Irene* in a study of interest. The play would never have appeared on the boards, were it not for the personal interest between Johnson and his friend and former student David Garrick. But, to my mind, *Irene* has little to recommend it beyond the part it played in Johnson's life. I doubt it would be studied if it had been penned by an author who was and remained unknown. *Rasselas*, on the other hand, provides fertile ground for Sider Jost. Here is a sample:

Nekayah's chiasmic equation of kingdom to great family and family to little kingdom advertises its status as a commonplace by appealing to Imlac . . . , but the sting in its tail (the "factions" and "revolutions" that tear and trouble both public and private life) is entirely Nekayah's (and Johnson's) own. Classical and Renaissance moralizing about the unhappiness of kings emphasized the fickleness of fortune. Johnson's account instead emphasizes the irritations and compromises of running a patronage system. (57)

A quibble: Sider Jost depends on a contemporary scholar for his opinion that the merchant in *Adventurer* 102, who rises "from narrow beginnings to great prosperity would have been exceptional in an era when, as now, most rich traders came from wealth" (55). Johnson may have been depending on anecdotal rather than statistical evidence, but his friendship with one such trader, Thomas Cumming, suggests that one employ the generalization with caution.

The longest and arguably the best chapter in this monograph treats Adam Smith. The scholarly starting point, which Sider Jost goes far beyond, is given thus: “A rich revisionist tradition in the field of intellectual history has long since corrected the notion, derived from the selective reading of a few passages in *The Wealth of Nations*, that Smith viewed self-interest as the ultimate single explanation for human conduct (though the news has not reached all economists)” (63). “Smith uses the word ‘interest’ and its derivatives far more often than the average eighteenth-century author” (66), quantitative evidence of which is wisely reserved for detailed endnotes. The text itself makes a convincing argument, from both his oeuvre and his life, that “Smith was much more a *Homo rhetoricus* than a *Homo economicus*” (89). Especially enlightening is the demonstration of Smith’s tendency to propose stages of human history or aesthetic development, sometimes in ways that he knows are factually erroneous, in order to persuade. A perfect synecdoche for Smith’s intellectual process is found in his statements about, in paraphrase, “the persuasive power of the shilling” (84). Sider Jost believes Smith has been undervalued by intellectual historians; to cite one of many attempts in this chapter to remedy this, here is first Smith, then Sider Jost: “the principle which prompts to save is the desire of bettering our condition, a desire which, though generally calm and dispassionate, comes with us from the womb, and never leaves us till we go into the grave”; “The desire to better our condition, to save our money, to augment our fortune, comes from what Johnson, Rousseau, and Goethe describe as our inability to rest with what Smith calls ‘present enjoyment’” (76, 77).

Two aspects of *Equiano* are the subject of the final chapter. The first is the title: *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, The African. Written By Himself*. Thus, this well-crafted monograph circles back to changing definitions of “interest,” this time with emphasis on its reflection in book titles during the century. By now no reader should doubt that “the adjective ‘interesting’ is at the center of [a] wider semantic and intellectual current” (104), or even clashing currents. Sider Jost quotes from Hume’s *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739-1740)—“The histories of kingdoms are more interesting than domestic stories” (105)—written at exactly the same time that Richardson was publishing *Pamela* (1740). The second aspect is the key passage in *Equiano* where the slave purchases his freedom (sort of). His advocate with the Quaker master Robert King argues, “I think you must let him have his freedom; you have laid your money out very well; you have received good interest for it all this time, and here is now the principal, at last” (115). Sider Jost carefully parses the legal situation (a slave really had no standing to make such a purchase, for example) and the advocate’s doubtful analogy, to arrive at the correct reading: “Equiano’s master is right to recognize that the claim on the validity of his promise [to allow his slave to purchase his freedom] is a pressure point: part of the reputation for commercial probity enjoyed by Quakers such as King derived from their refusal to swear oaths, binding themselves by promises alone” (117).

The book has been carefully produced. I noted only a handful of erroneous accidentals in quotations of Johnson’s poetry, probably the product of proofing by reading for sense rather than versus the original text. I especially enjoyed Sider Jost’s occasional light touches, welcome indeed in a

book so heavily researched and documented. Here is a final example, which should appeal to some readers: “Smith, like Johnson and their contemporaries, uses ‘interest’ in a wide range of settings, in writings that would now be described as belonging to economics, aesthetics, ethics, psychology, finance, and that under-theorized quasi discipline, university administration” (61). This book is never frivolous—there is no reference to the Dos Equis beer commercials, featuring the “most interesting man in the world.”

Robert G. Walker  
Washington & Jefferson College

**Paul A. Elliott.** *Erasmus Darwin’s Gardens: Medicine, Agriculture and the Sciences in the Eighteenth Century*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, England: The Boydell Press, 2021. Pp.xii + 347; bibliography [315-42]; illustrations; index. ISBN 978-1-78327-610-3: hardcover: \$90/£40. ISBN: 9781800101401: e-book: \$24.00/£19.99.

Paul A. Elliott’s *Erasmus Darwin’s Gardens: Medicine, Agriculture and the Sciences in the Eighteenth Century* is the ninth monograph in a “Garden and Landscape” series published by Boydell Press. Elliott’s main title fits neatly under the “garden” half of the series rubric; however, only the first chapter focuses directly on Darwin’s gardens. The subtitle and balance of the book relate to the “landscape” half of the rubric and illustrate how Darwin’s interest in his gardens and medical practice expanded to include his involvement in many aspects of the Midlands landscape, including agriculture, animal husbandry, and arboriculture. One could say that Elliott expanded his focus in the spirit of Darwin by showing the interconnectivity of all living matter, or, as Darwin wrote in *Phytologia*: “vegetables are in reality an inferior order of animals,” and mushrooms are “animals without locomotion.” Elliott, Professor of Modern History at the U. of Derby, has developed new insights into Darwin’s polymath career, especially in agriculture and arboriculture. In the “Acknowledgements” Elliott pays special tribute to Desmond King-Hele FRS, author of several books on Erasmus Darwin including *Erasmus Darwin: A Life of Unequalled Achievement* (1999) and the *Collected Letters of Erasmus Darwin* (2007). King-Hele was a mentor to Elliott. His publications and advice serve as a solid foundation for Elliott’s informative analysis of some less-explored facets of Darwin’s life and work. The monograph is copiously illustrated with over 80 figures. Unfortunately, Elliott is not well served by his editors and publisher, as the book is plagued by many production errors which will be discussed below.

Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802), grandfather of Charles, was admired during his lifetime as a poet, botanist and medical doctor. Physicians in the eighteenth century depended largely on plant-based *materia medica*. Darwin received a solid training in botany while studying medicine at the U. of Edinburgh. He purchased an eight-acre parcel for his first botanical garden about a mile from Lichfield in 1777. The site included springs, streams, a cold-water bath, a natural grotto and trees. No plan or plant list for this

garden survives; however, some elements of the garden can be inferred from written records. Charles Stringer, a local artist, described the botanic garden as “highly picturesque” and having “the effect of an extensive wilderness”(29). This description does not suggest a traditional, strictly ordered botanical garden such as the Chelsea Physic Garden or the Oxford Botanic Garden. Rather, Darwin’s Lichfield garden combined naturalistic landscape style with a systematic layout based on the Linnaean system. Darwin’s own poem, *Botanic Garden* (1789) also provides many hints to the inspiration behind the Lichfield garden. The garden remained in Darwin’s possession throughout his lifetime and provided *materia medica* for his practice, and served as a living laboratory where he could observe and experiment with botanical cures.

Darwin moved to Full St. in Derby in 1783 where he established a smaller, urban garden on both sides of the Derwent River. This garden is well documented with Darwin’s own plant lists and notebooks and an 1806 map of Derby. The garden included a hothouse, a summerhouse and an orchard. It produced food for the family as well as being a living laboratory and dispensary for his medical practice. Summing up the importance of these gardens Elliott writes: “The Lichfield and Derby gardens were places of scientific observation and experimentation, spaces for the study of plant physiology and taxonomy, horticulture, agriculture and other sciences, as well as providing him with opportunities to consider the dynamic operation of nature and landscape aesthetics” (46).

Chapter two, “Medical Plants and their Places,” examines the tension between “written herbal medicine” and “official medical thinking” (55). “Darwin’s use and understanding of medico-botany suggests that the division between herbal and ‘official’ medicine in the period between 1730 and 1830 should not be exaggerated” (55). Darwin himself combined the two approaches. As for the new Linnaean taxonomy, Darwin valued some aspects of the system and translated Linnaeus’ theory into English (1787). However, the new taxonomy was not always useful in his gardens and medical practice because the medical efficacy of the plants was not necessarily indicated by the classification system.

Chapter three opens with a brief summary of agricultural improvement and enclosure in the Midlands in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Darwins were a land-owning family, and many of Darwin’s patients and associates gained their wealth through agriculture. “He had an excellent practical knowledge of agriculture and gardening from his own experience, and those of family friends and patients of all ranks” (110). Elliott deftly positions Darwin within the complex advantages and drawbacks of enclosure and of estate and agricultural improvement. As a polymath, his keen interest in botany extended beyond *materia medica* to methods of improving the health and production of field crops and livestock. This wide-ranging knowledge is articulated in *Phytologia: or, the Philosophy of Agriculture and Gardens* (1800). The direct link here is that better and larger crops would improve the diet of his patients. He recommended eating more vegetables, less meat, and drinking no alcohol, having seen too many of his aristocratic friends drink themselves into poor health and death. He probably would have endorsed Michael Pollan’s motto: “Eat food, not too much, mostly plants.”

Chapter four focuses on Darwin's study of plant physiology and how this knowledge translates into better food supplies and better nutrition for humans. Darwin used his knowledge of human physiology as one side of a complex system of analogies to explore a theory of similarities between plants and animals and to better understand plants. "The language. . . underscored his repeatedly asserted belief in analogies between animal and vegetable bodies, and therefore the relevance of his medical knowledge and experience for the study of agriculture and horticulture" (117). This method served him well to a certain point but becomes a bit fanciful when he referred to plants as having "muscles, nerves and brains."

This interrelationship between plants, humans, and other animals continues in chapter five, "Vegetable Pathology and Medicine." "The prestige [Darwin] acquired as a medical practitioner meant he was consulted about diseases and other problems affecting animals and plants as well as humans" (150). Darwin's analysis of plant diseases in some cases anticipates modern practice, and Elliott appropriately applies modern terms such as "biodiversity" to Darwin's diagnostic methods. Failure of wheat and potato crops due to external pathogens such as smut and blight resulted in poor nutrition and poor health for Darwin's patients, hence his interest in diagnosing the causes of these crop failures. He also identified environmental causes for crop failure such as air pollution from lead-smelting furnaces. "Darwin made few physiological distinctions between humans, animals and plants, believing that all animate creatures shared common characteristics, which helped determine his approach to the role of sciences in agricultural improvement" (166).

Chapter 6, "Among the Animals," explores the place of animals in the late Georgian landscape and analyzes Darwin's position on the intelligence, agency, and intentionality of animals. Although the chapter sets the context for animal diseases in the following chapter, some of the content, such as the exploration of the learned behavior and acquired "language" of animals, seems tangential to Elliott's main thesis. However, readers should not miss Elliott's defense of "porcine perspicacity" and the learned pig that performed in Derby in October 1784. Chapter 7, "Animal Diseases," returns to Darwin's focus on disease and medicine--human and animal--and again, his heuristic technique depends to a large extent on analogy. Veterinary medicine as a specialty did not yet exist. "[T]he authority medical practitioners already had as experts encouraged farmers to consult them concerning their stock. . . . Some diseases, such as cowpox, were well known. . . as spreading from animals to humans" (201). Elliott also records Darwin's contributions to the treatment of cattle in the great cattle distemper of 1783.

The last two chapters show Darwin's place in the ancient fraternity of tree-loving foresters which began with classical authors such as Virgil and Pliny the Elder, continued through John Evelyn, and is brought up to date by contemporary authors like Peter Wohlleben in *The Hidden Life of Trees* and Suzanne Simard in *Finding the Mother Tree*. "For Darwin, trees, more than other plants, bridged the divide between humans and nature, between medicine and botany, and between poetry and natural philosophy" (226). Chapter 8 "'Eating of the Tree of Knowledge': Forestry, Arboriculture and Medicine," and Chapter 9, "Trees in the Economy of Nature," explore these

close relationships. Darwin may have bought and developed his Lichfield botanic garden partly to preserve the natural woodland growing there. His smaller Derby garden contained over 200 trees. As he travelled through the Midlands to visit patients, he witnessed many examples of extensive tree planting as part of estate improvement, both for economic and aesthetic reasons. Also, like John Evelyn in *Sylva*, a century before him, Darwin was concerned with the shortage of timber supplies for the navy.

The personification of trees in Darwin's poetry and scientific writings created a sympathetic kinship between trees and humans, and a better understanding of the longevity and lifecycles of both. Elliott illustrates these concepts with an account of Darwin's efforts to preserve Needwood Forest and its majestic oaks. Darwin's "Address to Swilcar Oak" in *Phytologia* illustrates a sympathetic kinship to this "closest vegetable cousin of humanity" (226). In Chapter 9 Elliott elaborates further on Darwin's human/tree analogy where he compares the human circulatory system to the movement of sap in trees, and the human respiratory system to leaves. He tasted leaves and sap from domestic trees in search of *materia medica* and employed substances such as quinine from exotic trees in his medical practice. Trees held an important position in the economy or inter-workings of nature.

In Chapter 1 Elliott wrote that "Darwin's Lichfield creation became one of the most influential botanical gardens in British history"(12). In the concluding chapter Elliott returns to this theme. Darwin's influence is seen in the incorporation of the aesthetic with the scientific in public botanic gardens in the nineteenth century. That garden also became the inspiration and source for some of Darwin's best-known poetry, his "poeticized science" *Loves of the Plants* for example. The English Romantic poets admired the ecological content of Darwin's poetry, but found the prosody lacking. Many women were inspired to pursue botany as a result of Darwin's work. The animal rights movement had an early champion in Darwin. And perhaps most important of all, his grandson, Charles was greatly influenced by his grandfather's work. Charles had a special respect for Erasmus's *Phytologia*, his last prose work, which synthesized much of his theory on the relationship of all living things.

Elliott's important addition to Erasmus Darwin scholarship has a number of production errors which detract from the content. Some representative errors include simple repetition of words such as "to be be"(285). Some are word substitution errors such as "that" for "than" (4 times). In adjacent lines in chapter notes 2 and 3 (p.47) "Bowerbank" becomes "Bowersock." The engraving credit for Figure 1 (Erasmus Darwin) should be William Holl, Jr., not J. Joll. On p. 250 Elliott quotes Darwin's "Address to Swilcar Oak." There are over 20 errors in the 26-line poem, including substituting "they" for "thy" 9 times. Other misquotes such as "night" for "bright" and "gales" for "vales" render parts of the poem almost incomprehensible. Anyone seeking the original poem on pages 480-81 in the 1800 London edition of *Phytologia* (as cited in chapter note 65) will not find it there. Two editions of *Phytologia* were published in 1800, one by J. Johnson in London and one by P. Bryne in Dublin. The editions were printed from different type settings and have different pagination. Elliott lists only the London edition in the "Select Bibliography" and in all the chapter

notes. But the page numbers cited are from the Dublin edition. All 130+ page citations for *Phytologia* in *Erasmus Darwin's Gardens* are thus incorrect. These are a few examples of errors found in the book. Nor is the outside spared: on the front of the dust jacket the author's surname is "Elliott," but on its spine and on the spine of the hard cover, "Elliot." Scholars may be reluctant to pay \$90/£40 for a monograph so poorly edited.

Peter Perreten  
 Ursinus College (emeritus)

**Noah Shusterman. *Armed Citizens: The Road from Ancient Rome to the Second Amendment.*** Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2020. Pp. xii + 273, notes and index. ISBN: 978-0-8139-4461-6; hardcover: \$39.50. (Also available as e-book.)

Every president and member of Congress and the Supreme Court should read this slim volume. In fact, it ought to be required reading for all Americans concerned about gun rights, gun ownership, gun safety, and gun control in the twenty-first century.

The book sets out the origins of the Constitution's Second Amendment, ratified in 1791, and furiously debated in our own time. The question is whether its words refer to an individual or collective right of gun ownership. Its wording is among the most befuddling in the English language: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed." For gun-safety advocates, the meaning lies in the first, or dependent clause, indicating that the collective security of the community must be bound up in a militia, an army comprising property-owning citizens. For opponents, the controlling independent clause focuses on the "right" to "bear arms," indicating that its framers meant that all citizens possessed an individual right to own firearms.

So, which is it? In 2008, after declining to deal with the issue for almost seven decades, the Supreme Court settled the matter. By a bare majority, Justice Antonin Scalia determined that its original meaning was rooted in an individual right (see *District of Columbia v. Heller*).

But is this the right answer? Not according to Noah Shusterman, a history professor at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. His is a sweeping account of the origins, development, and inclusion of the republican idea (and ideal) of the armed citizen dedicated to the safety and security of his country. The book's focus is on the ongoing tension between militias and standing armies. Militias are made up of ordinary men (and, yes, some women) who have a literal stake in society and politics, largely because they are landowners. J. G. A. Pocock analyzed this phenomenon in his 1965 essay, "Machiavelli, Harrington, and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century," which addressed "the sword-bearing citizen," that is, the person empowered by law to carry a weapon. Ten years later, he worked out its meaning in his iconic and magisterial *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition*.

Shusterman draws on several earlier works on military organization in the ancient world related to the drafting of the Second Amendment, but he does not mince words about its meaning. In other words, Scalia got it wrong. And yet, his opinion for the Court is now the law in the United States until the decision is overruled. In a later essay, Shusterman derided Scalia's distorted reasoning in his Heller opinion: "Justice Scalia's justification of that decision, while rooted in an analysis of the amendment's eighteenth-century context, was based on a fundamental misconception of the way that gun rights and militia service were understood and debated during the eighteenth century." In this scholarly book, he is far more discreet. Here, he concludes that "the United States has become a society where the Second Amendment no longer makes sense."

By offering us a romp through history, Shusterman seeks to understand the context in which the framers of the amendment approached the subject of the best military organization in a republic of free citizens. Fear of a professional standing army was surely foremost in the Americans' minds, having so recently taken on the most sophisticated, largest, best trained army and navy in the world when it sought separation from the British Empire, 1776-1781. But their angst over standing armies was not only because of the Revolutionary War: it was rooted in the ancient Roman Republic, the short-lived Florentine Republic, and the experience of so many nations that failed after eliminating or ignoring the citizenry in arms.

Shusterman is aware of the shortcomings of militias. They do not perform as well as professional standing armies, like the Continental Army. In America, especially in the South, they all too often became the embodiment of slave patrols, seeking runaway slaves and acting when there was even a slight threat of a slave uprising.

Most of the book will appeal to dix-huitiémistes because the bulk of it concerns the period after the late seventeenth century to the drafting, passage, and ratification of the Second Amendment in 1791. While he begins his study with the Roman Republic and its degeneration into empire as it lost its contacts with its citizens, he works out his main themes. Like Pocock, he concentrates on the republican ideas of Niccolò Machiavelli who was forced to return to his estates when the Florentine Republic collapsed. Machiavelli heralded the value of armed citizens who, if well trained and in possession of workable weapons, best protected the republic.

From this foundation, Shusterman moves onto other historical examples in chronological order when the idea of a militia of citizen soldiers was regarded as far superior to a professional standing army. These include reasons for the demise of the short-lived French republic of La Rochelle and then the ideas of James Harrington, who was central to Pocock's work, to emphasize the importance of a militia as a reaction against the New Model Army of Oliver Cromwell following the execution of Charles I in 1649. For Shusterman, however, it is not Harrington who is central to the debate but the Scot Andrew Fletcher who in 1698 published *A Discourse of Government with Relation to Militias*.

The bulk of this history concentrates on the American context. Two incidents occupy Shusterman's attention: a 1739 slave rebellion in Florida, which receives summary treatment and of course the Americans' decision to separate from the Britain and the resulting war. From the latter comes the

constitutional debate over what to do about military organization and, as Shusterman's subtitle has it, "the road to the Second Amendment." Surely not many in America thought that militias were the best protection for a free state. George Washington and Alexander Hamilton supported a standing army, but only a small force. Their fear was that militias often led an insurrection: Shays's Rebellion in western Massachusetts in 1787 and the Whiskey Rebellion just a few years later in western Pennsylvania. Those in arms against American policies in both incidents were militiamen.

In the end, Shusterman's point is rather simple: we have lost the moment for this debate: two centuries have passed since Americans hotly argued the proper military structure for the new republic. He correctly concludes that few people today understand what the framers of the Constitution were addressing. As a result, we have lost the true meaning of the Second Amendment.

Jack Fruchtman  
Towson University (retired)

**James Mulholland. *Before the Raj: Writing Early Anglophone India.***

Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2021. Pp.293;  
bibliography; endnotes; 18 b/w illustrations; index. ISBN: 9781421439600.  
Hardcover: \$94.95.

I suspect that many of the readers of the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer* will not be familiar with most of the primary literature—literature written in India and the Indian Ocean area in English in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries—discussed in James Mulholland's fantastic *Before the Raj*. I edited the anthology of Anglo-Indian writing *British Encounters with India, 1750-1830* myself (with Tim Keirn from our California State University--Long Beach's History Department), and yet I was unaware of some of the poems, plays, narratives, and non-fiction here. Nevertheless, everyone should read this excellent book (and familiarize themselves with the primary material) since it sheds an entirely new light on literary production during a brief window of time between the establishment of the East India Company as a cultural company-state around the middle of the eighteenth century and the victory of Orientalism in Edward Said's sense in the first third of the nineteenth. Apart from a fascinating analysis of the primary material, Mulholland offers a cogent metacritique of some strands of postcolonial scholarship.

For the uninitiated, allow me to offer the briefest of historical summaries and explanation of terminology. The East India Company (EIC) was established in 1600 with a monopoly on trade in the East Indies, i.e., the Indian subcontinent, the Indian Ocean area, and China. For about 150 years, the EIC traded more or less peacefully with local merchants and rulers, from petty kings to the Mughal emperors, and their only physical presence was small outposts known as factories. Around the middle of the eighteenth century, however, the EIC started to become more involved: now, the company intervened in local succession disputes, tried to counteract the

French and Dutch influence in the region, and stationed more British traders and EIC soldiers in India. In 1765, the EIC became the official administrators of one province of the Mughal empire, and from there they expanded to exert fiscal and military control over more and more of the continent. At this point, they were a cultural company-state, by which Mulholland means that the EIC, though an economic entity, “pursued functions typically reserved for nations” and “thrust national institutions into the artistic sphere to complement its fiscal-military power” (43). By about 1819, the EIC was the dominant force on the continent, and any local rulers survived only by their permission. In the first decades of the nineteenth century, there was a debate within the company between the (confusingly named) Orientalists, who believed in the importance of learning local languages, religions, laws, and customs, and the Anglicists, who argued on the contrary that Indians should learn English language, literature, and practices. The Anglicists won the debate around 1830, but they are what we call ‘Orientalists’ (in Said’s sense) today. In *Before the Raj*, Mulholland focuses on these ca. 50 years, when there were largish British communities in several places in South Asia, most importantly Calcutta (now Kolkata), Madras (Chennai), and Bombay (Mumbai). These are the communities he calls ‘Anglo-Indian’: made up of individuals born in Europe or in Asia, usually ethnically European but sometimes from various ethnicities, and often fluent in various languages.

As he lays out in his introduction, Mulholland uses the approaches of translocality (analyzing movement and circulation through space) and critical regionalism (understanding regions as diverse even within themselves) and the method of middle reading, which is situated between close reading of individual works and distant reading of large groups of texts. Mulholland rejects literary studies’ focus on formal innovation by authors and clever interpretation by critics; instead, he wants to investigate how texts function in specific cultural groups (in his case the Anglo-Indian public) to maintain social connects, enact geopolitical strategies, or create a sense of purpose. In one of the exceedingly few points where I dissent from Mulholland, he (somewhat facetiously?) calls the texts he examines ‘boring’ or ‘bad writing’—for one, I don’t agree that the texts are boring, otherwise it would have been impossible to write such an entertaining book about them; secondly, I don’t think those categories can be maintained or have much relevance for literary studies. And of course his interpretations are quite clever themselves...

The most well-known authors Mulholland studies are Sir William Jones, who wrote poetry inspired by Vedic texts in the 1780s, and the pseudonymous Anna Maria, who published a volume of poems in Calcutta in 1793, some of which turn up in recent anthologies of Romantic poetry. (There is also a brief section on Laurence Sterne and his connection to India.) The other authors to whom Mulholland devotes entire chapters are Eyles Irwin (1751-1817) and James Romney (1745-1807), both middling administrators in the East India Company who worked and travelled across South and East Asia, including India and China, and both of whom have hardly been recognized or republished in recent years. Two other chapters in *Before the Raj* deal with newspaper poetry and with captivity narratives, and the final chapter of the book expands the scope of the primary materials and

argument to Penang (today in Malaysia), Sumatra, and Java (both Indonesia). Some of this material is available on Gale's ECCO and Burney Collection and Adam Matthews's Eighteenth Century Journals, but the newspapers in particular are hard to come by, and some of the poetry and plays only exist in manuscripts—perhaps a teaching anthology would be in order.

The traditional reading of these authors and texts (where critics bothered to study them at all) has been that they were derivative of British literature and that they promoted imperialism and racism. Instead, Mulholland proposes that the texts were produced and consumed, and accrued meaning, in literary communities that constantly negotiated between the extremely local (e.g., the community of about 20,000 White individuals in Calcutta in the period), the regional (Anglo-India more generally), the British, and the global. According to Mulholland, the texts and authors didn't just mimic literary traditions from London, but reshaped British modes and genres according to their own literary and cultural context and for their own aesthetic and political purposes. For instance, a closer reading of Sir William Jones shows that he imagined his poetry as an atonement for British failings in India, so he admitted imperial guilt, creating an "uncomfortable mixture of complicity and critique" (120). Anna Maria for her part adapted Della Cruscanism, but located it "in an Indian framework, turning it into an artistic movement anchored in many locations and derived from current as well as ancient cultural customs" (111), including Vedic religion.

Similarly, Romney wrote a stage adaptation of *Tristram Shandy* that magnified Anglo-Indian women's power and suggested that Bombay might serve as an origin for a renovation of British manners. He also focuses on social and economic stratification across communities rather than racialized hierarchies and criticized British norms in those regards. Eyles Irwin, a fascinating figure and my personal favorite—we included his *sati* (widow-burning) poem *Bedukah* in our anthology *British Encounters with India*—undermined binaries such as metropole v. colony or domestic v. imperial, and he voiced concerns over the effect of imperialism on Britain. In his pastoral *St. Thomas's Mount*, he argued that his poetry was superior to British models because of his location in and inspiration from India, and in his *Occasional Epistles* he recognized that Europe's imperialism was hardly innocent and worried that the British Empire might destroy sites of aesthetic significance. In other words, he introduced a kind of early cultural relativism—not something most postcolonial critics have recognized in Anglo-Indian writing of the period.

Along the same lines, the authors and texts discussed in *Before the Raj* did not always support the British government's or the EIC's political and ideological ventures. On the one hand, as Mulholland describes in detail, the EIC was an important sponsor and sometimes censor of literary production in Anglo-India; on the other hand, the Anglo-Indian communities and publication venues allowed for some flexibility. For instance, newspaper poetry "recognize[d] the pluralism of the subcontinent and acknowledge[d] alternate polities such as the Mughal Empire" (67), so it did not assume European superiority. Local spaces and practices such as the punch house or smoking a hookah could be seen as dangerous, but were also figured as places of translocal sociability. Poetry included texts by classical South

Asian authors in English and sometimes included parallel translations, reducing the distance between the two cultures. This was true for newspapers on the Indian subcontinent as well as newspapers from Sumatra, Java, and Penang. (Mulholland's last chapter on writing from these locales seems a bit extraneous to me, but I understand that the chapter contributes to the argument by demonstrating the existence of another intermediate public between India and Britain.)

By the same token, captivity narratives from South Asia (particularly the Anglo-Mysore wars 1767-99) are not just celebrations of nationalism and imperialism, but enact complicated subject positions. For one, of course, the captives were humiliated and mortified because they were often treated as spectacles or even as slaves. Many were apparently circumcised and forced to convert to Islam. At the same time, the captives were almost equally upset with the EIC hostage negotiators, the Anglo-Indian audience, and the British government and public, none of whom really seemed to make an effort to liberate or even acknowledge them. The narratives suggest that the authors felt justified making money from their captivity (by publishing their narratives), experienced an artistic awakening as prisoners, and were ultimately uncomfortable with the cost of empire, which they personally had to pay. The situation was even more complicated with young male captives who were made to perform as dancing boys: in addition to other humiliations, they were feminized, and in contrast to other captives most of them were never heard from again. They drew attention to the fact that not all Europeans participated willingly in imperial war and indicated that "the critique of empire was an essential component for the emergence of Anglo-Indian culture" (166).

Thus, Mulholland makes a compelling argument that Anglo-Indian literature written between about 1770 and 1820 across a variety of genres took up a position somewhere between imperialism and relativism. (I only wish there had been some discussion of narratives about the 'Black Hole' incident, which are only mentioned in passing.) The authors depended on the EIC for their own existence—most of them were employed by the company—and the literary infrastructure, but that did not stop them from voicing or at least implying critique of the company, the British government, and imperialism in general. Mulholland's argument is important beyond his specific primary material and beyond the eighteenth century because it challenges the simplistic claims that have marred some strands of postcolonial criticism, namely that all Europeans went to Asia in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries exclusively for nefarious reasons and with racist results. (I realize this may be a bit of a caricature.) These claims need to be taken seriously, of course, but they also need to be tested against the entire available archive for scholarship to move forward. By excavating that archive and reading it from new theoretical positions (like translocal regionalism and middle reading), Mulholland is giving us a shining example of how to engage in that kind of scholarship in *Before the Raj*.

Norbert Schürer  
California State University--Long Beach

**Crystal B. Lake. *Artifacts: How We Think and Write about Found***

**Objects.** Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2020. Pp. x + 261; works cited [227-51]; 4 engravings; index. ISBN: 9718421436494: hardcover; \$94.95. ISBN 97181421436500: paperback. ISBN 1421436515: electronic; \$34.95.

Crystal Lake grew up in a log cabin that her father filled with the “detritus of [the] rural community” surrounding the cabin—oil lamps, pocket-watches, quilts, farm equipment, books, fossils, a spinning wheel, a pie safe, a trunk organ (Q&A with author Crystal Lake, JHU Press; “Five Questions: Crystal B. Lake on *Artifacts*” – BARS Blog). Lake is now a full professor at Wright State University, and the cabin and its contents were sold when she was in her late teens. However, this upbringing made her acutely sensitive to the loquaciousness, or what she, following the new materialisms scholar Jane Bennett, refers to as the “vibrancy” of old and fragmentary objects, meaning their ability to invite, occasion, instigate and redirect interpretation exactly because they lack wholeness.

Lake claims this definition for artifacts, and she builds upon this understanding in her book. *Artifacts* takes off with John Aubrey’s *Monumenta Britannica* (c. 1665-1695), in which he argued that very old objects, such as the Avebury henge in Wiltshire, needed “to give evidence for themselves” (2). It ends with a vibrant artifactual reading of Shelley’s 1821 *Defense of Poetry*, in which she argues that Shelley conceptualized language, words, sentences, phrases, as a series of historical fragments. Detached from their temporal context, “these pieces of language lie in wait for a future poet to come along and ‘reanimate [the] sleeping, the cold, the buried image of the past’” (189). In the *Afterword*, she suggests that the works she has studied “chart the emergence of ‘an artifactual form’ [that] stages contradictions and provokes its readers to interact with the text as if it were an artifact in need of completion and interpretation.” (201).

Lake devotes a chapter each to four kinds of vibrant objects in *Artifacts*--coins, manuscripts, weapons and grave goods. In these case studies, she moves from a discussion of these objects as matter to their representations in literary texts, but her point is that the artifact, be it the thing itself or a symbolic representation of it, elicits competing, compelling narratives largely dependent on the politics of the period.

As object and symbol, the *Magna Carta* is probably the most famous and most resonant of the artifacts, appearing in her chapter on manuscripts as an object that almost suffered an abject fate, and as a symbol that inflicts a justified abject fate. As one who finds it difficult to throw paper away, Lake’s recounting of Sir Robert Cotton’s providential recovery of a copy of the *Magna Carta* resonated strongly. Cotton was watching his tailor making a ruffled collar and just in the nick of time noticed that he was about to use a copy of the *Magna Carta* as stuffing. Or was its timely recovery just a little too providential? Cotton was a bibliophile who collected so as to preserve England’s past for posterity, but, as Lake informs us, Cotton was also strongly anti-Stuart and anti-absolutist monarchy, and always on the lookout for early documents that proved that kings had willingly shared their power with Parliament. Did he really save a priceless document or was the story a charged symbolic reading of English political history? In the latter half of

the same chapter, Lake proffers a *sic semper tyrannis* reading of *The Castle of Otranto*. Walpole was a Whig, and Lake reads Walpole's villainous but ultimately power-stripped Manfred as a combination of King John and his son, Henry III. Both kings were considered proud, insolent, overbearing, rapacious, arbitrary, and power hungry, and both were forced to yield their power, John by signing the *Magna Carta* and Henry by reaffirming his commitment to its principles.

The following examples, culled from the chapters on coins, weapons and grave goods, are also noteworthy. The solidity of coins, the fact that they withstood the vicissitudes of time and could be organized by chronology and geography, gave them verisimilitude. Coins were also valued because their visual features helped people memorize historical information. Richard Grey, author of the popular guide to memorization, *Memoria Technica* (1730), began his work by paying tribute to the value of coins as mnemonic devices. But memory is even worse than a pocket with holes out of which coins can slip, for what it brings up can be a recollection so inaccurate as to be false—the equivalent of a counterfeit coin put into circulation. Solid they were, but they could also be melted down, their histories wiped out, making them unreliable narrators of a country's past. History belongs to the victor, and one of the first things Parliament did following the execution of Charles I was to requisition all the coins minted during his regime and melt them down. With respect to weapons, they, too, produced a variety of responses. The display of weapons at the Tower of London delighted one viewer (a woman), exhausted a second, and angered a third, who saw in them a glorification of destructiveness. In her case study of the exhumations of four kings between 1774 and 1813, Lake contrasts the report the antiquarians produced in 1774 following their exhumation of Edward I's body and a widely-circulated satire on the same subject dating from 1770 from the pen of John Wolcot, better known as Peter Pindar. When Edward I's body was exhumed in 1774, the antiquarians eschewed politics, presenting themselves as disinterested medical examiners. In their report, they noted that the royal ring was missing but did not speculate about what happened to it. But in 1790 the ring became vibrant. In that year, Wolcot/Pindar claimed that it had been lifted from the king's finger by Richard Gough, who in that year was the director of the Society of Antiquarians. Lake puts the story in the context of the polarized political stakes after the French Revolution began and also Burke's 1790 *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Since in that book Burke set forth a vision of right government as one in which "the parts [stay] exactly as they were" (179), the removal of the insignia of royal power would suggest that Jacobin sympathizers were no better than desecrators.

"Vibrancy" is a new word with a long history. In the seventeenth century, it was known as "vitalism," and the subject of great debate. Could matter move or even think for itself or was it, on the contrary, devoid of soul and moved about only by external agency? Those who supported the former position were known as the vitalists while their counterparts were the mechanists. Lake points out that this debate was politically charged, becoming associated with and even providing theoretical justifications for standpoints about a sovereign's power, a parliament's prerogatives, and the rights of people. In politics, vitalists were not necessarily tinged with

revolutionary fervor, but they were progressives, opposed to monarchical absolutism, supported Parliamentary oversight, and had no truck with superstitious unscientific thinking. Mechanists distrusted change. Not surprisingly, when Charles II was restored to the throne, he became a patron of the mechanists.

Lake is a latter-day vitalist, as the majority of the texts she examines challenge English political authoritarianism. Dryden's "The Medall," Swift's in *Tale of a Tub*, Shakespeare's editor Lewis Theobald's *The Censor* and Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* are notable exceptions, but with Theobald and Swift, Lake tries to find some wiggle room. Theobald appears in her chapter on Don Saltero's, the fantastically popular all-purpose coffee shop which Steele described as home to "ten thousand gimcracks." Theobald reads the artifacts through the lens of Hobbes' mechanism but acknowledges that the objects speak variously to the coffee shop's visitors. Referencing both Orwell's "Politics vs. Literature" and Said's "Swift's Tory Anarchy," Lake writes that "few like what the work [*Tale of a Tub*] implies about Swift's political convictions—generally accepted to be nasty, brutish endorsements of blunt authoritarianism but with little conviction that even an iron rule could forge a peaceful state—but most agree that Swift's style remains disconcertingly compelling." (150-1). That said, because vibrancy is an on-going process, she (nervously?) notes that in Shelley's "Ozymandias" and Byron's "Windsor Forest" the bodies of the kings "risk revitalizing divine right as much as they promise to deliver a democratic revolution." (187)

With the exception of relics, all of the artifacts she studies vibrate, many Whiggishly as spokespersons for constitutional government, and one of the pleasures of *Artifacts* is getting entangled with the objects Lake discusses. Robert Boyle's moss had that effect on me. Boyle is regarded as the first modern chemist and a pioneer of the scientific method who did not jump to conclusions. However, as Lake writes, he also suffered from violent nosebleeds and, in this connection, "flirted with the magical power of things." (54) Robert Boyle of Boyle's Law, which evoked memories of high school physics? Nosebleeds? Magical thinking? Testifying to the vibrancy of printed matter, this trinity took me rabbit-holing and provided me with a backstory. In the Middle Ages, it was believed that cranial moss, the lichen that grew on the skulls of hanged corpses exposed to the weather for a long time, was effective in staunching the flow of blood during a nose bleed (H. Feldman, "Nosebleed in the History of Rhinology," *Laryngorhinootologie* 75:2 (1996), 111-20). Boyle the scientist wanted to test the efficacy of cranial moss as a clotting agent on Boyle the sufferer. Boyle procured such moss. His plan was to gather witnesses and plug his nostril with the moss during a nosebleed, but then he changed his mind and merely held the moss in his hand. To the wonder of all, the bleeding stopped.

Montaigne, who wrote in 1572, with the trenchant skepticism he is famous for, that "there are men on whom the mere sight of medicine is effective," would have regarded Boyle's efficacious hand-held cranial moss as an example of what we now call the placebo effect, that is, the power of mind over matter or how the imagination cures disorders of the body, but for Whigs like Richard Steele the crediting of objects with miraculous properties could not be so easily dismissed. Granting curative properties to something

like cranial moss was politically troublesome, akin to believing in the power of the king's touch or relics. To believe in the power of the king's touch was to believe in the divine and absolute power of kings, so at the end of my deep dive, I was not surprised to learn that Boyle had been favorably received at court following the Restoration. Relics spoke to Richard Steele of veneration, of superstition, of Catholicism and the bad old days of royal absolutism. Steele was concerned that veneration of the past threatened the achievement of the Glorious Revolution, which limited monarchical power. Though Steele pooh-pooed the relics on display at Don Saltero's as gimcracks, as a Whig with a firm grasp on political realities, he considered them objects vibrating with power, and even went so far as to announce, in a coded way, that at least half of the politicians assembled at Don Saltero's were just biding their time in an environment that mirrored their political sensibilities, to "extract a Protestant monarch from the throne" (39).

Unquestionably, the keyword in *Artifacts* is vibrancy, the ability of material objects to elicit responses. While this review singles out only a few, Lake's examination of the narratives generated by many eighteenth-century first responders to coins, weapons, manuscripts and grave goods, is thorough and illuminating, as are her detailed and scholarly readings of literary texts where artifacts shape form and content. I suspect that Lake's reading of Swift's authoritarianism will make some Swift scholars bristle, but my quibble with Lake's book, and it is really not so much of a quibble as part of a larger conversation, has to be with its subtitle, "How we think and write about found objects." For Lake, the thinking and writing speaks almost entirely to the sensibilities of Whigs and Tories, the woman who found the Tower of London's collection delightful being an exception to the rule. The "we" refers to the group I have just called "first responders," and it also includes literary theorists such as Jane Bennett. Perhaps it is outside the scope of her book, but surely artifacts spoke to others nonpolitically besides the nameless woman. So I think that, if the "we" had been more inclusive, readers would have been vouchsafed other perspectives worth hearing. One group that doesn't speak in *Artifacts* but potentially could make a contribution to the presentation of some of the artifacts discussed in this book are the museum curators who manage the exhibits at the Tower of London that made the Tower, then as now, a "must see" destination for tourists. Another is scientists, such as those involved in the laboratory analysis of Richard III's remains, which were discovered in 2012. This discovery is parenthetically mentioned in the Afterword; I would have liked to have heard their response to Lake's analysis of the royal exhumations of Kings John, Edward I, Edward IV, and Charles I.

Frances Singh  
Hostos Community College, CUNY (emerita)

**Clive Probyn, *Jonathan Swift on the Anglo-Irish Road*.** Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink; Leiden: Brill, 2020. Pp. xviii + 291; bibliography; 11 illustrations (3 in color);; index. ISBN: 978-3-7705-6575-7; hardbound, \$159 / €129.91. (Available as an e-book in PDF at similar prices.)

*Jonathan Swift on the Anglo-Irish Road* is a pleasure to read. In this book Clive Probyn is deliciously knowledgeable and accurate both about Swift and about the logistics, geography, and ideology of travelling in Swift's time. Since Swift claimed that in his life he had crossed the Irish Sea 28 times, and this trip, both overland and by sea, took between 7 and 17 days each time, Probyn has made an excellent choice of a lens through which to examine Swift's life.

Probyn uses a rich variety of sources for his research. He makes frequent references to *Gulliver's Travels*, but he also uses abundant evidence from Swift's lesser-known works and letters, including a note that Swift checked casually with Isaac Newton before responding to a ship surgeon about his proposal for a better way of calculating longitude at sea (173). Probyn also includes the important detail that Swift kept a map of Leicester on his Deanery bedroom wall, almost certainly as a sign of affection for his mother (59).

The organization of Probyn's book is similar to that of a spirograph, the child's drawing game in which you put your pen through a hole in one of a series of interlocking plastic discs, and then just follow where the pen and the rotating discs take you, which culminates in a beautiful multi-pointed star. In Probyn's case he starts with and comes back repeatedly to Swift's *Holyhead Journal*, a self-reflective 25-page journal Swift wrote in 1727 just before he boarded a packet boat at Holyhead for his last trip across the Irish Sea. But Probyn's book wanders from this *Journal* into all facets of Swift's travels (104): the people (mostly servants) whom he travelled with, the people he was coming from or going to, the people he was writing to while he was travelling, how frequently (e.g. every two or three months) he moved in his mid-40s when he lived primarily in west London (231-233), how staying with friends cost as much as staying at inns because of the requisite tips for servants, Swift's lifelong commitment to exercise for his health, and the usefulness of his daily walking to accumulating his raw material for writing his Drapier's Letters, his *Modest Proposal*, and his *Proposal for Giving Badges to Beggars* (32), and for stimulating the wide range of charities that he managed from the time he became Vicar of Laracor. Probyn finds meaning in all these details, as, for example, when he concludes a section, "Walking in Dublin . . . manifested Swift's contrarian spirit, that characteristic readiness to confront inconvenient truths" (241). With such remarks, Probyn gets closer than many previous biographers to the essential character of Swift.

Probyn's organization and transitions are sometimes tenuous, sometimes non-existent, but the reader easily forgives him, because every new topic he turns to is as fascinating as his previous one (125, 131-32, 135, 198). He may be informing us about the detailed geography of Chester, Leicester, and London, of the many widows and not-very-close relatives Swift knew in Chester and Leicester, or about the St. George inn on Aldersgate Street, Swift's common point of rendezvous with the Monday

morning coach for Chester (70). For good measure he gives us a wealth of information about eighteenth-century Wales, thoroughly a foreign country, both in language and in behavior, in Swift's day (xiii, 160, 168).

Travel elucidates key aspects of Swift's character, such as his love of independence, which led him so often to walk or ride a rented horse rather than to take a coach (34). Swift several times had to endure a harrowing climb around the Welsh mountain Penmaenmawr, but he never mentioned in his writings either the difficulty of this or the views made possible by it (16). Swift was interested in moral rather than physical landscapes, such as he depicted in two masterpiece poems, *A Description of a Morning* and *A Description of a City Shower* (65). Likewise, his life and creative energy were full of "subaltern" voices (29) – a consequence of "his minute interest in contemporary social behavior" (66), which he fed most often by walking. Having to travel to London to publish *Gulliver's Travels*, Swift's cautious self spent more than a month making an extra copy of the work so that he could take a copy to London on one boat, while his friend Charles Ford took another copy on a different crossing (140).

Probyn offers an abundance of evidence for how physically and psychologically taxing Swift's voyages were. Swift called them "fearful and enervating" (11). Probyn provides the details, including the hazards of storms, drowning (121) and French privateers (87, 136-38). While Swift in his 20s was working for Sir William Temple at Moor Park, he at least occasionally walked the 90-mile round trip to London. Until Swift was in his 40s and working for the Tory ministry, he either walked or thought about walking each time he traveled from London to Chester (134). Once Swift was working for the Tory ministry he routinely rode long distances with a servant behind him and a guide in front until in his late 60s his limited mobility led him finally to buy a coach (125). The 1715 incident when Swift on horseback was nearly run into a ditch by Cadwallader, 7th Lord Blayney, isolated in most Swift biographies, fits right into Probyn's narrative of the challenges of Swift's travels. His father's early death resulting from the "itch" acquired in a bed at an inn made Swift the traveller always fastidious about cleanliness (183). As Swift moved toward death he had to give up horses, and to do his walking indoors, which led to considerable mockery from those who did not wish him well (151-57, 253). As Swift's opportunity to travel diminished, Probyn notes that Swift's writing "was his only means of continuing as a public man in England" (32).

Probyn is consistently sensible on biographical and interpretive issues (55). He reads the end of *Gulliver's Travels* not as a puzzle where we have to choose between Yahoos or Houyhnhnms, but as a critique of the "consequences" of "a modern colony" (6). Probyn accurately sees the post-1714 Swift as a radical, a position which he held simultaneously with a belief in Church government, and a position that he gradually learned more about as he evolved from *A Story of an Injured Lady* (c. 1707) through 1729's *A Modest Proposal* (236). I think Probyn is correct that Swift's walking tour in the Cotswolds in 1726 was the high point of the Swift-Pope friendship (67). Probyn concludes that "No one travelled so much [as Swift] and seemed to enjoy it so little" (63).

A key point that Probyn emphasizes is that Swift, despite his responsibility from 1713 to 1745 as Dean of S. Patrick's Cathedral, was able

to travel and to live elsewhere so regularly because his vicar, John Worrall, stayed put (206). Probyn gives appropriate prominence in his book to Swift's trust and friendship with Worrall, in the process explaining why Swift's decidedly frequent absences from St. Patrick's were so readily tolerated by his superiors (206). Probyn is also appropriately skeptical about the tales told by Swift's first biographers (206), and also about the tales in Swift's own autobiographical fragment, written in 1738-39, by which time Swift was more interested in the myth of his family history than in its realities (206). Orrery's early biography and Swift's autobiographical fragment are two of the worst biographical sources any biographer could inherit, sources that have utterly misled us into psychoanalyzing Swift in the light of very doubtful "facts," such as his having been neglected by his mother, and been swept away from his family by his nurse for several years. Probyn, though he questions these sources, does accept the idea of Swift's mother's "absence," his "separation" from her, and her "parental abandonment" of him (82, 179, 206, 216), but we need more solid evidence, I think, before we keep using those terms.

Probyn's Swift is a healthy, twenty-first-century Swift who has been gradually released from the biographical shackles placed on him during the first 250 years after his death. Probyn's Swift is not a psychological misfit, not a lifelong misanthrope, not first and foremost Pope's best friend, not a hack party writer, not a Jacobite, not a hater of the Irish. He was a man able to visit, write to, and even admire men without agreeing with their politics (197). He changed parties and even ideology in the face of new experience and of new facts as he became aware of them. He grew as a thinker from his youth to his maturity. He was capable of being both fond of Esther Johnson and attracted to Esther Vanhomrigh. He loved many aspects of ordinary life, whether it was a playful, youthful, unsupervised life with Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley in Ireland from 1699-1710, the spirit of which is reflected, I think, in Swift's exuberant 1710-13 Journal to "Stella" (41), or the responsibilities for buildings, music, and domestic management incumbent upon the Dean of St. Patrick's from 1713-1745 (221-222). He also enjoyed the role of guest, entertainer, and conversation stimulator in others' families, most notably with his mother and her relatives and friends in Leicester, with the Temples at Moor Park, with the Vanhomrighs in London, with the Berkeleys at Dublin Castle and at Cranford, with the Worralls in their Dublin home in Great Ship Street (104), with the Achesons at rural Market Hill, and in his last years with the Delanys in Delville (323).

I see only a couple of minor points open to contention in this book. Probyn falls into the trap of giving Swift's sometime names to the two principal women in his life. He refers several times to "Stella Johnson" (xx, 44, 51, 56 ff) and to "Vanessa Vanhomrigh" (53ff, 56, 43, 183), neither of which were their names. The more carefully we shift to allowing these women their own names, desires, and interests, the closer we will be able to approach a better understanding not only of their characters but of their disparate roles in Swift's life. Probyn also perhaps underestimates the importance of Swift's horseback exploration of southern Ireland in 1723. Swift's three-month journey, planned for several years, which included no visits to old friends, has yet to be plausibly explained; we have very little evidence to go on. Finally, given the title of his book, Probyn tries in his

second appendix to identify all 28 of Swift's "voyages" across the Irish Sea. Everything he says seems plausible, except his enumeration of Swift's first two "known" voyages (274). "1. The infant Swift taken from Dublin across the Irish Sea to Whitehaven, Cumbria, by his nurse, c. 1668," and "2. Both return from Whitehaven to Dublin, Swift now 3 years old, c. 1670-71." There is little reason to believe this whim of Swift's from his autobiographical fragment. One reason we do, I think, is that we feel the need to identify more voyages to reach Swift's credible assertion that he made a total of 28 (he was a good counter). But, if Probyn, like others, infers an early (1681-82) Swift visit to Leicester to see his mother, surely we can infer two such visits and less "neglect." Instead of using Swift's number "28" to reinforce his story of being stolen, I believe we should allow for the possibility that Swift made two unrecorded round trips to Leicester in his early years and that they served to link mother and son, not to divide them.

Probyn's wonderfully detailed account of all aspects of Swift's traveling is very satisfying and has left us with but two vexing mysteries – Swift's exploration of southern Ireland and his early life with his mother -- yet to untangle.

Eugene Hammond  
State University of New York at Stony Brook

**William R. Everdell.** *The Evangelical Counter-Enlightenment from Ecstasy to Fundamentalism in Christianity, Judaism, and Islam in the 18th Century.* (Boston Studies in Philosophy, Religion, and Public Life, 9.) Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2021. Pp. xiii + 444; bibliographies (for each of ten chapters); illustrations (some in color); index. ISBN: 978-3-030-69761-7; hardcover, 119.99 (to individuals, excluding VAT; also available as an e-book, \$89; also available in Kindle, for rent at \$32.70).

William R. Everdell's new investigation into religion and its history is described on its cover and WWW venues as a "contribution to the global history of ideas . . . [using] biographical profiles of 18th-century contemporaries to find what Salafist and Sufi Islam, Evangelical Protestant and Jansenist Catholic Christianity, and Hasidic Judaism have in common. Such figures include Muhammad Ibn abd al Wahhab, Count Nikolaus Zinzendorf, Jonathan Edwards, John Wesley, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Israel Ba'al Shem Tov." It further notes that the book examines "the conflicted relationship between the 'evangelical' movement in all three Abrahamic religions and the ideas of the Enlightenment and the Counter-Enlightenment," while also reaching back to antecedents and forward to the evangelicals' legacies in the present. This is in part misleading: evangelical movements are presented as in conflict with Enlightenment thought but not with Counter-Enlightenment thought: "a Counter-Enlightenment, led by ecstasies and evangelicals (and Romantics) in all three Abrahamic religions, re-legitimized mysticism and inspiration, at the same time the rational Enlightenment was arising to attack them" (418), and orthodox traditionalists in Islam and Judaism had already done so. The lengthy title is the best reflection of contents, but let us cut "Salafist and" from the first sentence and

add "George Whitefield" to the second and then expand on the cover's précis. Everdell's principal focus is enthusiastic religious *experiences* that impacted and shaped Christian, Hasidic, and Sufic beliefs and behaviors, via figures like Count Zinzendorf (among whom the Christians looked back to Paul, Augustine, the Hussites, Calvin, etc.). Everdell's biographical profiles are essential in defining and tracing Pietistic experiences by individuals and congregations and the personal interactions of believers. His secondary focus is the reactionary development or movement away from ecstatic experience and its inspired beliefs toward reason and law by some enthusiasts and by reactionaries in their faiths who never had ecstatic experiences (like Al Wahhab). The reactionary figures share some of their censorious responses with Enlightenment figures like Voltaire but as devout Christians, Jews, and Muslims are worlds apart from Voltaire and Company. The ecstatic Christians and Jews profiled lived in the long eighteenth century, but the ecstatic Sufis profiled, like Al-Ghazali and Ibn Arabī, lived during the golden age of Islamic thought, 900-1250 C.E. Everdell has much to say about the eighteenth-century Salafist al Wahhab, so important in jihadism today, but his early encounters with Sufism were not formative and his fierce intolerance mirrors that of influential medieval authors like Ibn Taymiyyah al-Harrānī (1263-1328). However, Everdell identifies a recurrent pattern in Salafist (originalist) imams as having some experience in moderate Sufic communities, suggesting that exposure without the achievement of mystic experiences induced a reactionary intolerance of Sufism later in life.

The book is faultlessly well organized. The first chapter ("Dialectic of Enlightenment: Ecstasy to Piety to Moralism") kindles interest by describing the ecstatic frenzy in the Protestant awakenings in 18C America, defining the "evangelical" experience, first the conviction of one's sinfulness and then of God's merciful intervention; it then outlines dialectical relationships between religion grounded in Pietistic experiences and those anchored to the law and morality of revealed texts. Everdell identifies the transvaluations that usually followed from ecstatic religious experiences, such as an enhanced confidence in salvation, trust in passion and imagination, an antinomian rejection of universal truisms, and a social movement toward democracy (as in communities of the Moravian Brotherhood and in Methodism). Though Everdell never uses this language, the dialectical struggle involves a human model centered on the heart vs. one centered on the head--this might suggest how relevant the material is to anyone working in our period.

Chapters 2 through 5 address developments in Protestantism, with the second examining Count Zinzendorf and his Moravian Brethren and their thriving global missionary movement in the 1730s through 1750s (of universal interest as the Count and the Brethren he nurtured were a fountainhead of faith who lived what they preached, but also of special interest to Pennsylvanians). Chapter 3 reaches back to "Zinzendorf's Christian Antecedents," those like John Calvin who follow St. Augustine in stressing the helplessness of humans to throw off sin and reach salvation without divine grace along with those mystics who sought out and celebrated direct union with the divine and others. This survey reaches up to Zinzendorf's godfather the Pietistic Lutheran Philipp Jakob Spener. Everdell covers the opposition of Jacobus Arminius in the early 1600s to the Calvinist doctrine of election (differences over predestination and free will eventually

separated John Wesley from his spiritual brother George Whitefield and his mentor Zinzendorf). Chapter 4 examines Jonathan Edwards's formative religious experiences, doctrinal development, and use of a scientific method in recording events in the evangelical conversions or rebirths for publication (as in *The Faithful Narrative*, 1737--read by Wesley in 1738); also the American Great Awakening driven by Edwards and others such as William Tennent and his son George, and the reactionary opposition to the ecstatic Christianity as by Charles Chauncy at Harvard ("The struggle over which feelings were God-inspired and which were delusions, or which behaviors were godly and which devilish, resulted in the succession and splitting of congregations . . . [and] founding of new denominations"). Everdell offers a compellingly empathetic narrative of a childhood and adolescence growing up fearing hellfire and hoping one has been elected and of parents anxious that one's child would miss salvation when "they had no power to bring themselves to it"--he reflects, "No wonder they set such store by education" (157-62). Chapter 5 moves to Wesley and George Whitefield as Everdell's describes the rise of Methodism and the Transatlantic Awakening (first Whitefield and then Wesley begin demanding preaching to massive crowds in America and England in the 1730s). Here too are covered reactions by the Church of England and also doctrinal conflicts between Calvinists and Arminians, within the evangelicals (Zinzendorf's criticism of Whitefield's Calvinist position, etc.). The chapter ends by examining opposition to slavery as one impact of Wesley's evangelism (in 1775 Wesley, like Samuel Johnson, attacked Americans' calls for their freedom as undercut by slavery; in 1784 the American Methodist Conference "agreed to expel any slaveowner who did not emancipate all slaves" within two years [224-25]).

Chapter 6 examines developments within Catholicism in France, beginning with convulsions and claims of miraculous healings in the 1730s linked to Jansenists (those with Augustinian beliefs akin to the views that Cornelis Jansen published in 1640). Among the enthusiastical vanguard are individuals linked to the convent of Port Royal, the Oratorian order, and many Parisian clergy, including their Archbishop, Cardinal Louis-Antoine de Noailles (with whom Zinzendorf at 19 while in France discussed the power of grace), also Pasquier Quesnel, whose commentaries on the Bible maintained Jansen's positions and were condemned by Clement XI's papal bull *Unigenitus* (1713)--with the support of the Jesuits and soon the French monarchy. Everdell details the opposition to that bull by Parisians, their universities, and the *parlements*, but eventually Noailles's side lost the struggle before his death (1729). [The related publications by Noailles, Quesnel, the Pope, and others were often translated by the London press, including by clandestine Catholic presses apparently divided between pro- and anti-Jesuit partisans.] Nonetheless the convulsions, especially in Paris, as at the tomb of Jansenists seen as martyrs, carried forward religious enthusiasm. Everdell apparently corrects the relative neglect of Jansenism in Jonathan Israel's account of the Counter-Reformation in *Radical Enlightenment* (261, n20). The chapter's second half concerns Rousseau, who had an early engagement with Augustinianism, and whose life later offers several conversions or inspired illuminations that are examined relative to Counter-Enlightenment and Enlightenment ideas. Here Everdell falls back on expertise flowing from his 1971 NYU dissertation, revised and

published as *Christian Apologetics in France, 1730-1790: The Roots of Romantic Religion* (1987). Graeme Garrard has noted that Everdell was the "first to situate Rousseau as the founder of the Counter-Enlightenment." I left the chapter with greater appreciation of Rousseau.

Chapters 7 through 9 take Everdell into territory where he has less expertise--but then most EC/ASECS members will have none whatsoever. The seventh chapter examines the life and beliefs of the religious ecstatic Israel Ben Eliezer (1698-1760), who in land then ruled by the Lithuanian-Polish aristocracy became "the Ba'al Shem Tov or 'Master of the Good Name,'" and founded Hasidic Judaism, which has Messianic beliefs and practices transcending the Torah, as rapturous dancing. The chapter examines as background other enthusiastic or mystical Jewish teachers (as Sabbatai Zevi in the 17C and Menachem Mendel & Shneur Zalman in the 18C) and traditions like the Kabbala, as well as reactions to these approaches, as by Moses Maimonides in the 11C and by Moses Mendelssohn & Eliyahu ben Shelomoh Zalman in the 18C (the last described his own mystical experiences but was skeptical of others' and felt Hasidics discouraged study of the Torah and wrongly formed conventicles, and he found their dancing idolatrous). The reactions against mystic Judaism share parallels with those against Sufism: both are charged with idolatry, insufficient grounding in texts and traditions, and claiming an impossible oneness with the divine. Chapter 8 surveys kindred experiential, antinomian approaches in Islam, usually by the Sufi and reactions against them as threats to Islamic law (shariah). Mystical paths are explored by Al Ghazali and Ibn Arabi and criticized by Averroës and Ibn Taymiyyah. Chapter 9 focuses more intensively on two 18C figures: Al-Wahhab, who led the emirs of the Saud family in a campaign against heresy in Arabia, and Shah Waliullah, who after studying in Medina alongside Al-Wahhab returned to his native India in 1733 to wage jihad against Sufic piety and any belief or practice out of line with his moralism and legalism. As Wahhabism fueled Al-Queda and other religio-politico movements, Waliullah's intolerance to idolatrous Muslims and Hindus had an impact on the Indian Mutiny of 1857 and the struggle against the Russians and then Americans in Afghanistan (377). Working outside his linguistic range and in a field without good printed records, Everdell, especially in his footnotes, is candid about his dependence on sources and the limitations in the sources (e.g., 365, n7); on occasion he must offer conflicting source information (e.g., 376, n32).

This is a sprawling, erudite study that most EC/ASECS members, not having a research interest in Jewish and Islamic authors and developments, may not finish. (As Kevin Cope recently remarked to me, mostly we read to write.) Its chapters with their extensive bibliographies and footnotes surveying major studies will assist anyone who is solely interested in one of the Abrahamic religious traditions. But they should turn to the concluding chapter's philosophical and psychological meditation on what is a religion. The whole book reflects an astonishing effort to master religious studies, but the Conclusion contains an extraordinary confrontation with the universal human need to find meaning and morality in our mortal lives. I was uplifted by Everdell's nonjudgmental, open review--with David Hume by his side--of the religious and its omnipresence in all cultures, including the scientific and secular. Everdell takes what could have been only erudite and abstract,

suiting to specialists, and has given it fundamental human interest (the lives of Zinzendorf and others are inspirational), thus overcoming the weight of so many references to primary and secondary texts. That scholarly lumber is reflected by a third of the book's being occupied by chapter bibliographies. As one might expect with so many citations, there are some punctuation and spacing errors, but I find few substantive errors (two are "Paul" for "Augustine" on p. 112, up 12 ll.; and Wesley's age as "23" on p. 205). There is wit throughout, sometimes rooted in the ironies between different historical perspectives (e.g., after quoting American Calvinists terms for "backsliding" from inspiration, Everdell adds, "a generation of 1960's activists in the West called it 'the 1980s' [27]); and we are often refreshed with such levity as that St. Bonaventure, though "sober and scholarly in most of his theological writings, was an ecstatic after office hours" (118). The author's delight in teaching history must lie behind the use of the Jets in *West Side Story* to explain the conflict between Augustine and Pelagius (113). A stunning passage within the Acknowledgements is where Everdell, thanking his students at St. Ann's in Brooklyn over decades by name, runs through an endless catalogue of authors and professors.--J. E. May

***The Age of Johnson: A Scholarly Annual. Volume 24 (2021).* Edited by Jack Lynch and J. T. Scanlan.** Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2001. Pp. 238; 3 b/w illus. ISBN: 9781684483013: hardcover, \$150. (Also available as e-text.)

The Return of *The Age of Johnson: A Scholarly Annual*. I must confess myself rather surprised when I tore the shipping wrappers off my review copy of *AJ* 24. I suspected these tightly bound papers to contain a book, but not the *AJ* volume I had been looking out for (and anticipating for year): the size of the package was diminutive, fitting quite easily into my standard-size US Postal Street box alongside clutch of various other papers. But it was *AJ* 24 indeed, standing like a slender Greek goddess when set next to its shelf companions, the Gothic massiveness of the earlier volumes. My momentary confusion was quickly dispelled by reading through the brief (page and a half) Preface, which gnominically announces, "the size of our volumes is now more in line with most other scholarly books." This, I gather, tacitly acknowledges the new publication realities facing the journal as it transitions from the now defunct AMS Press to Bucknell University Press.

Neither did a few other changes escape my notice. *AJ* 24, viewed as an object bearing physical properties, is more attractive, aesthetically considered, than its predecessors. A smooth embossed cover replaces the paper sleeves covering the coarsely textured boards favored by earlier volumes. And the attractiveness of this more professionally conceived and executed cover is worthy of notice. The red color has been retained, but one notices and lingers over more subtle differentiating effects: the yellow and white tints and contrasts of font size of the verbiage on the upper front exterior cover are balanced in font and (much larger) size by the "24" found at the bottom. And if one holds the book open facedown, a larger visual ensemble emerges: the darker contrast of the "24" is paralleled, in reverse, by the back cover's transposition of this darker shade at the top. Skillfully,

the production team (no cover designer is acknowledged) have created something akin to a piece of art that may be observed from four vantage points: front cover, spine, back cover, and whole cover. Such elegant symmetry befits a volume dedicated to an eighteenth-century poetics that favored elegant balance and subtle, finely-toned contrast, whether verbally, as in Johnson and Pope's end-stopped poems of the 1730s and 1740s, or in the cadences ending Mozart's parallel musical phrases. Nevertheless, despite these changes, *AJ* 24 retains more than it disposes of or alters. It remains, in the words of its founder Paul Korshin, dedicated to offering a "first port of call" for novice scholars and to disseminating Johnsonian studies "in the broadest sense," as well as a familiar harbor for seasoned scholars.

The book commences with an excellent study, "Milton at Bolt Court." Here Stephen Clarke offers an adroit history of a print of Milton (based upon the engraving by Jacobus Houbraken) owned by Johnson and honored with a spot on the wall in the study of 8 Bolt Court. This meticulously researched account assists the reader in imaginatively reconstructing the interior appearance of Johnson's last dwelling place. Clarke's essay reads fluidly, grasping the reader's attention like a good novel (as Johnson would have it, taking "possession of the memory by a kind of violence, and produc[ing] effects almost without the intervention of the will, *Rambler* 4—I read the chapter in the waiting room of a busy hospital: I was transfixed.

The following chapter, Marcus Walsh's "Mimesis and Understanding in Samuel Johnson's Notes to Shakespeare (1765)," moves the reader from historical reconstruction to critical inquiry. Citing contemporary philosopher Richard Gaskin's emphasis upon the referential and cognitive values of literary texts, Walsh affirms the mimetic and intellectual emphases he finds in Johnson's theoretic orientation—and not just with Shakespeare, but other authors Johnson wrote about, such as Thomas Gray, John Dryden, and John Milton. To this he adds the importance of morality in this recipe of Johnson's critical agenda. To claim for Johnson the importance of such properties as general nature, representation, intellectual truth, and morality in literature is hardly earthshaking news. However, I found Walsh's claim of novelty in discovering a cohesive unity in Johnson's Shakespeare notes somewhat troubling. His contention of originality may be a stretch: "Johnson's notes have not been generally thought of ... as adding up to a coherent and consistent discourse" (15). Walsh himself cites an exception—in an endnote—Jean Hagstrum's *Samuel Johnson's Literary Criticism* (1967, chap. 4); in this case, the exception does not prove the rule. For example, in *Preface to Shakespeare* (1985), P. J. Smallwood writes,

A primary purpose of the Commentary has been to link the *Preface* with Johnson's annotations to Shakespeare in the edition of the plays. His general remarks, it is often the case, flow from a multiplicity of particular judgements on moments in the plays, giving to his general judgements the support of his detailed attention to Shakespeare's text. (69)

And the book Walsh quotes from to undergird his contention itself resists his formulation: Johnson "developed and abided by certain critical positions" and "my decision to ... [treat] the *Notes* as practical criticism, then proceeding to the *Preface* or the level of theory, and then moving to a

formulation integrating them, is fundamental to this study” (Edward Tomarken, *Samuel Johnson on Shakespeare: The Discipline of Criticism* [2009], 1, 7).

Matthew M. Davis’s “Samuel Johnson and the Allen Family” returns us to a historical inquiry by divulging hitherto unknown details about Johnson’s relationship with members of the family of his landlord and close friend, Edmund Allen (1718-84). Based upon original research and the discovery of two manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, two parts of an Allen family history composed by Mary Allen Brooke, cousin to Johnson’s friend the printer Edmund Allen, Davis exposes new networks in the Johnsonian circle. Subjecting the MSS to skeptical critical scrutiny, he finds that Johnson was on friendly terms with three other members of the Allen family: Rev. Charles Allen (c. 1730-95), grandfather to Brooke; Rev. John Allen (c. 1720-84), great-uncle to Brooke; and Rev. William Allen (1770-1829), father to Brooke. Marshalling considerable ancillary evidence in addition to the MSS, Davis fills out in satisfying detail the four Allens and their friendship with Johnson. Incidentally, sometimes I found it difficult negotiating among all the different Allens interweaving the chapter. Davis takes considerable pains to help the reader out, including a genealogy (34). However, this graphic depiction itself fosters a bit of confusion: Edmund Allen (1718-84) is here described as a “painter,” where the proper designation is surely “publisher.” (Gremlins are often at work to thwart our aspirations toward print perfection.) Davis presents a lively anecdote respecting William Allen’s first meeting with Johnson. While details about the exact time and circumstances of this interview vary, the point focuses upon Johnson giving the youngster a half crown, a sum that he quickly loses to gamblers at Oxford, giving him “his lesson for life”—to avoid gambling ever after. It is not clear whether Johnson ever learned the result of his benefaction; if so the great moralist surely would have approved. The research gathered here, valuable in itself, should also spur further investigation and critical comment upon Johnson’s clerical associates.

My own contribution, “‘Con Amore’: Hester Piozzi’s Annotations upon Johnson’s Early Poetry,” endeavors to use Piozzi’s commentary upon Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* to probe more deeply into Johnson’s writings, especially specimens drawn from his earlier poetry. Furthermore, the paper seeks to promote, by delving with greater analytic precision into her mind and art, recognition of the author in her own right. Piozzi’s marginalia offer fruit ripe for the plucking—and not just in the area of Johnson’s early poetry, but in larger and more general fields of literary investigation.

Paul Tankard’s piece, “Johnson (and Boswell) in the Lists: A View of Their Reputations, 1933–2018,” follows. This lengthy but entertaining effort examines the appearance of Johnson and Boswell in American reading lists since 1932. Many of these lists stem from the Great Books program that began at Columbia University and spread to the University of Chicago, as well as the two St. John’s Colleges at Santa Fe and Annapolis, and elsewhere, many with individual approaches to the basic curriculum. So, we see the names of authorities such as, John Erskine, Robert Hutchins, Mortimer Adler, the Van Dorens (Mark and son Charles), Clifton Fadiman, et al., as well as staunch champions of the Western Tradition as Harold Bloom. Tankard is not a neutral observer: he criticizes the project of these

men (and they are indeed mostly males) as doomed to failure: “these authorities even then [1952] were fighting a rearguard action against cultural fragmentation and the decline in literacy” (83). Tankard also complains about the difficulty of accessing information in the *Syntopicon* that occupies first two volumes of the Great Books in the sixty-volume 1990, such that he is forced to “trawl through” all two thousand plus pages of Adler’s exordium. This was not necessary: if he had consulted the *vade mecum* accompanying the 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., *The Great Conversation* (Chicago, 1990), he would have found the “Author-to-Idea Index, which lists the correlation between each author and various great ideas. However, it is reassuring that Tankard’s and Adler’s tally for Boswell is identical: a correlation numbering seventy-four (*Great Conversation*, 89-90), with each great idea associated with Boswell. Tankard’s labors are accurate. His survey of “great,” or “self-help” books ranges from 1932 to 2018. A useful table of Johnson and/or Boswell appearances in these “lists” is provided on pages 108-110. The chapter concludes with the takeaway of Tankard’s eight-year project, the healthy persistence of the writings of Johnson and Boswell. I’ll give Tankard the last word, where he throws down his gauntlet into the lists of the twentieth century and issues this challenge to the reader: “We know that Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* is the best biographical work, and that the greatest critic, biographer, essayist, grammarian, and poet, is Samuel Johnson, and that the world would be a far better place if more people read them both. We should not be keeping this knowledge to ourselves” (115).

“The Curious Case of Charlotte Lennox: Conducting a Professional Literary Life in Eighteenth-Century Britain outside the Bluestocking Circle,” by Susan Kubica Howard, moves us out of the precincts of masculine authors to a female who has garnered considerable critical attention of late. (See, for example, Susan Carlile’s acclaimed biography, *Charlotte Lennox: An Independent Mind* [2018]). Howard’s chapter intends to “consider what it was to be a professional woman writer in mid- to late-eighteenth-century Britain” (121) by analyzing Lennox’s career, and more particularly, examining the reasons why Lennox was distanced from the Bluestocking salon overseen by Elizabeth Montagu, even as she was welcomed into Johnson’s circle. In prosecuting her thesis, Howard wisely distinguishes between patronage and mentoring: “Mentorship suggests a less unequal relationship than patronage” (124). Howard cites a passage from one of my books on mentoring to support her categorization of Lennox as a protégé in a mentoring relationship with Johnson, while adding that “the two left that relationship behind them as she gained more experience” (134, n16). I heartily agree with this characterization, as I make clear in an earlier book on mentoring, one serving as a foundation to *Dead Masters* (Bethlehem, PA, 2011). There I discuss the “redefinition phase” of the mentoring relationship, where, if one or both of the partners have psychologically advanced beyond the hierarchical nature of initial phases, then their partnership “should modulate into a peer relationship” (*Mentoring Relationships in the Life and Writings of Samuel Johnson* [2005], 33). In contrast, the patronage relation begins and ends with a hierarchical positioning of the patron and the “client.” This distinction is crucial to Howard’s thesis, which asserts the independence and self-reliance of Lennox, as opposed to the subservient role played by such beneficiaries of Bluestocking patronage as Catherine Talbot

(to say nothing of Hannah More and Ann Yearsley). This sturdy self-reliance suggests the perhaps irreconcilable gap between Lennox and Montagu (and the Bluestocking Society that the latter patronized)—distinctions of class and birth could not be overcome at that period in Britain history. Other factors contributed to differences between Lennox and the Bluestockings: “Lennox’s choice of literary themes, her politics, her religion, her uncertain social standing, her personal, familial, and financial situations, her directness and candor—all of these put her at odds with the Blues” (132). Howard’s chapter is an important contribution to the growing literature devoted to this pioneering author, and we should be grateful for its appearance.

The essays section of *AJ* 24 concludes with Suzanna Geiser’s “Punitive Injustice in *Caleb Williams*: Godwin’s Vexed Call for Penal Reform” and Peter M. Briggs’s “Sensibility Reclaimed: Thomas Blackwell, Robert Wood, and the ‘Conjectural History’ of Homer.” Geiser, following earlier critics, poises Godwin’s novel with his treatise, *Political Justice*. Her analysis demonstrates “how the novel systematically works to affirm Godwin’s theoretical assessment of coercive punishment as an ineffective and, therefore, unethical medium for regulating or reforming individual behavior” (141), even as she notes that the tension between this and the pressures dictated by the generic form of the novel (psychological, sentimental, and political) complicate the potential cohesiveness between the fiction and the treatise. Geiser’s insightful and informed study contributes positively to the critical body of work accumulating around this remarkable novel.

In the last chapter, Briggs notes the considerable gap existing between the modern critical apprehension of Homer (enhanced by substantial philological, archaeological, and comparative studies) and the Homer understood by the eighteenth century and the English tradition underlying it—a tradition culminating in Alexander Pope’s landmark translation (as Johnson wrote, “the translation of the *Iliad* [is] a performance which no age or nation can pretend [aspire] to equal,” *Life of Pope*). Briggs, however, finds an intermediary link between the modern and eighteenth-century Homers: Thomas Blackwell and Robert Wood. Blackwell (Aberdeen professor of classical history and Greek), in his *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735), takes up the thread of Richard Bentley’s prescient but undeveloped suggestions (found in the 1713 *Remarks upon a Late Discourse of Free-Thinking*) in seeking to move past the hyperbolic veneration of the Homeric mystique by looking more closely into the historical circumstances attending the production of the two epics. Wood carried this project considerably forward by physically visiting the traditional site of the Trojan War twice, and publishing his findings in two later books published in 1753 and 1757. This chapter goes on to explore the pioneering work of Blackwell and Wood in greater detail. While Briggs’s premises and conclusions are not entirely original, he convincingly supports his thesis and offers a shapely, winning introduction to his topic. Of course, no human activity, literary or otherwise, occurs in a vacuum. Briggs astutely draws parallels between the work of these two Homeric scholars to concomitant fascination with Scottish, Welsh, and Irish antiquities (most famously found in Gray’s Odes and the Ossian phenomenon), the digs at Pompeii and Herculaneum, as well as Captain Cook’s explorations in the Pacific. Briggs does not mention this, but I find a similar parallel between

Blackwell and Wood's demystification of the cult of Homer and Samuel Johnson's attempt to dismantle some extravagant bardolatry surrounding Shakespeare then manifesting in his 1765 Preface to *Shakespeare*.

The rest of the volume is devoted to reviews, two of them review essays. The expert on Johnsonian poetry, David Ventura, contributes "Organizing a Life and the 'Lives': Samuel Johnson and the Yale Edition of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*." Eric Bennett's "Is Historical Fiction Still Revolutionary?"--examining two historical (or fantasy!) novels "set in Johnson's world"--follows. As editors Lynch and Scanlan observe, *AJ* reviews are "longer and more detailed than standard book reviews. They are essentially literary essays on Johnsonian topics" (x). This certainly holds true for the first of the pair. In addition to providing a condensed but illuminating survey of the *Lives*, the author traces their relationship to Johnson's larger career--indeed, the culmination of this career--as well as probing some of the psychological issues that underlay the Johnson *oeuvre*. Ventura concludes by comparing the Yale trilogy with Lonsdale's four-volume edition of the *Lives* (Oxford, 2004). While I demur from agreeing with his preference for the former, we can both agree that all Johnsonians "are lucky to have the labors of both Roger Lonsdale and John Middendorf" (189).

This volume of *AJ* concludes with a handful of shorter reviews. John Richetti on Michael Schmidt's *The Novel: A Biography*; Jacob Sider Jost on David Alff's *The Wreckage of Intentions: Projects in British Culture, 1660–1730*; Robert DeMaria Jr. on Aileen Douglas's *Work in Hand: Script, Print, and Writing, 1690–1840*; Joseph F. Bartolomeo on Julie Flavell's *When London Was Capital of America*, and Heinz-Joachim Müllenbrock on John Phibbs's *Place-Making: The Art of Capability Brown*. I am sure that many of the readers of the *Intelligencer* will find many things of interest in this distinguished collation.

*AJ* has been missing from the academic scene for far too long. Here's to our earnest hope and expectation that the hiatus of the past years is now permanently bridged, and that we may expect from editors Lynch and Scanlan, their publishers, and their future contributors, the thorough, steady, and stable emission of volumes on a regular and timely basis, one volume per year. Johnsonians deserve nothing less, nor does Johnson. *AJ*, welcome back. It's good to see you again.

Anthony W. Lee  
Arkansas Tech University

**Zoom into the EC/ASECS 2021 "A Virtual Prelude,"  
October 14<sup>th</sup> through 16<sup>th</sup>--Register Now!**

Due to ongoing pandemic uncertainties, our regional society's annual conference will once again be held virtually. As its title suggests, "A Virtual Prelude to Material Culture 2022" anticipates our return to an in-person meeting next fall at the Winterthur Museum, Garden, and Library, Winterthur, Delaware, and features a program considerably expanded from

last year's "Brief Intermission." The conference opens on Thursday evening, October 14th, and will run through Saturday afternoon, October the 16th. For more than two decades, the Oral/Aural Experience has marked the conference's start. We hope that many of you will join us Thursday the 14th at 7:30 pm for this perennial EC/ASECS favorite. If you have not yet contacted our inimitable Secretary, Peter Staffel, to let him know what you would like to read, please don't delay.

On Friday and Saturday we will have a full slate of consecutive panels. A draft program is now available on the conference website (<https://ecasecs2021.wordpress.com/>). In addition to the papers, we will have our business meeting, a wonderful talk entitled "Tuneful Treasures" by a Winterthur curator, and Dr. Joanne Myers's presidential address, "My Journal of the Plague Year."

Information about registration and instructions are posted on the conference website (see the Registration tab). Graduate student registration is free, but grad students do need to complete the online registration form. For all others, the registration fee is \$25.00. You may pay the registration fee either by using the EC/ASECS's PayPal account [Go to the EC/ASECS website ([www.ec-asecs.org](http://www.ec-asecs.org)) and scroll down; on the right-hand bottom corner you will see the PayPal button] or by sending a check made payable to our Executive Secretary, Peter Staffel, PO Box 52, Bethany, WV 26032. We ask that you register by Monday, October 11th.

We are looking forward to re-connecting with so many of you in October. We hope, too, that if you know of any colleagues who have lost touch with East Central or new graduate students who don't know about us, you'll invite them to register for the conference. Please feel free to email the conference organizers, Dr. Sylvia Marks, [sm3390@nyu.edu](mailto:sm3390@nyu.edu), and Dr. Eleanor Shevlin, [eshvlin@wcupa.edu](mailto:eshvlin@wcupa.edu), directly or at the conference email address ([ecasecs2021@gmail.com](mailto:ecasecs2021@gmail.com)) if you have any other questions.

### **Additions and Corrections to the Directory**

- Bannet, Eve Tavor: (emerita, U. of Oklahoma, Editor, 18C Connections, CUP); [etbannet@ou.edu](mailto:etbannet@ou.edu); 25400 Cedar Road / Beachwood, OH 44122
- Betz, B. G. [bbetz@wcupa.edu](mailto:bbetz@wcupa.edu); English Dept. / West Chester U. / West Chester, PA 19383
- Clarke, Stephen. (English letters) [stephen.tabards@btinternet.com](mailto:stephen.tabards@btinternet.com); Tabards / 6 Church Street / Ewell / Surrey DT17 2AS / U.K.
- Holahan, Cassidy. English / U. of Pennsylvania / Philadelphia, PA 19104
- McCull, Ron. Curator, Special Collections Library / West Chester U. / West Chester, PA 19383
- Newman, Steven. [Stevenewman1970@gmail.com](mailto:Stevenewman1970@gmail.com); English Dept. / Temple Univ. / Philadelphia, PA 19122
- Nollen, Elizabeth. (English, West Chester U.) [enollen@wcupa.edu](mailto:enollen@wcupa.edu); 1111 Kelly Dr. / Newark, DE 19711
- Porter, Elizabeth. [Eporter@hostos.cuny.edu](mailto:Eporter@hostos.cuny.edu); English Dept. / Hostos Community College, CUNY
- Qiu, Xinyuan. (English, Binghamton U., SUNY) [qiu4@binghamton.edu](mailto:qiu4@binghamton.edu); 61 Chestnut St., 1 RF / Binghamton, NY 13905
- Shaffer, Jason. (English, U. S. Naval Academy) [tshaffer@usna.edu](mailto:tshaffer@usna.edu);

304D Hilltop Lane / Annapolis, MD 21403  
Witucki, Barbara. bwituck@utica.edu; English Dept. / ECJS Bldg. / Arts &  
Sciences / 1600 Burrstone Rd. / Utica College, Utica, NY 13502

### News of Members

Many are lamenting that we are not meeting this fall, but there's much to be said for avoiding the congested roads and attending a meeting close by your own microwave and fridge--and then there are breakthrough infections, about 30% of Lancaster General's cases. I have found the Zoom Q&As and discussions very lively and entertaining--also nobody knows I'm looking at them and rooting through their study or livingroom. (I showcase my books as do many others--so far I've seen no paintings worth stealing, but there are sometimes beautiful bouquets, as besides **Eleanor Shevlin**.) I more lament the cancellation of the ASECS Affiliates Softball League this year, which I attribute to the SEASECS's refusal to wear masks and SCSECS's refusal to satisfy proof of vaccinations. We were prepared to show ours, even **Bob Walker**, who thought it an inexcusable breach of trust--I wouldn't say he was "furious" but he was "confused" given earlier ASECS guidelines. And poor **Ted Braun** was to umpire our opener against the SCSECS--he was a trustworthy choice as a regular at both societies' meetings,--and he was the more excited as there was to be a coin toss over who'd get to wear orange jerseys. We had negotiated to allow them to field dual members **Ric Reverand** and **Joe Rudman** provided we kept **John Scanlan** and **Michael Edson**. **Kevin Cope** tried to insist on fast pitch, but **Sam Cahill's** reputation preceded her; however, we did happily accept Kevin's insistence that we play for a keg of beer. It's a shame--somebody might have gotten a publication out of the game! I'm bearing up and looking forward to next year's season when we're at home in Winterthur. I'm confident that ASECS won't change the agism safeguards that each team field two over 70 in the infield and the prohibition against stealing bases. And we're all agreed "there's no Latin in baseball." ASECS's intrusion in the league was needed back when it prohibited shirts vs. skins (the things done to keep women out!), but some recent rules suggested by WSECS seem wokey to the Johnson Society, and, as it is, the Kant Society has trouble fielding a team. Though they can't be played online, concerns over sustainability could well end the games--as they will to paper *Intelligencers* if someone steps up to edit an e-newsletter.

As the months pass since most of us were vaccinated against covid-19, some members have had breakthrough infections. Nonetheless, a number of us have successfully risked air travel, as **Norbert Schürer** working masked at the Free U. in Berlin, **Laura Kennelly** and **Rob Mayerovitch** to Hawaii and Italy, **Elizabeth Powers** to British Columbia for a month of writing, and **Ashley Marshall** to Iceland to escape smokey Reno, but generally the members have taken shorter trips by car, as **Brij** and **Frances Singh** to South Carolina and more recently Vermont. Some destinations have blocked entries, not just libraries but the Cayman Islands, where **Bob Walker** long hoped to scuba. Several members retreated to summer homes, as **Bill Everdell** and **Jack Fruchman** to Martha's Vinyard and **Lorna Clarke** to the Canadian forests. Lorna and **Ellen Moody** are among those who have zoomed at odd hours to Britain; **Vin Carretta** gave ten public Zoom talks on

Anglo-African writers in Sept. to May 2021; and **Eleanor Shevlin** continued into summer a monthly lecture series by zoom that would have been held at West Chester U., with both **Ron McColl** and **Chris Sasaris** participating. SCSECS and ASECS are expecting to hold physical meetings (SCSECS, chaired by **Samara Cahill**, in College Station, TX; and ASECS in Baltimore, at the beginning and end of March respectively). Most members have hunkered during the pandemic, and those retired were glad not to have taught remotely, which was time-consuming and less satisfying. **Andrew Carpenter** speaks for many when he wrote, "I'm using the lockdown to catch up on some careful reading--the house is full of books, after all--and much enjoying it." The past year I've had more than the usual number of recommended books. **James Woolley**, e.g., found amusing and profitable *The Diary of Edmund Harrold, Wigmaker of Manchester 1712-15* (2008).

Former Molin Prize winner **Nick Allred**, who has been writing his dissertation at Rutgers, published "Mother Gin and the Bad Examples: Figuring a Drug Crisis, 1736-51" in the Spring 2021 *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* ([ECF] 33.3:369-92). He explores Hogarth's use of drunken figures to typify the gin epidemic as in the *Lamentable Fall of Madam Geneva* and *Gin Lane* and explains why the central figures are often women. Among the reviews of note in the Winter 2021 *ECF* (33.2) are **Jess Banner's** of Lissa Paul's *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*; **Elizabeth Neiman's** of Kathleen Hudson's *Servants and the Gothic, 1764-1841: A Half-Told Tale*; and **Leah Thomas's** of Amelia Dale's *The Printed Reader: Gender, Quixotism, and Textual Bodies in 18C Britain*; here too we find Jennifer Golithly's review of **Albert J. Rivero's** *The Sentimental Novel in the 18C*. That winter *ECF* is focused on indigenous people as represented in or participating in scholarship. **Eve Tavor Bannet**, retired from Oklahoma, has moved to Cleveland ("it's got everything a city is supposed to have" and is esp. wonderful "given climate change")--this puts her on the edge of our region. She published "'Modern Biography': Form, Function, and Celebrity in 18C Genre Theory" in *ECL*, 45.2 (April 2021), 24-55. Eve's important study *18C Manners of Reading* was reviewed favorably up and down the block, by James Raven in *ECF* (Fall 2020), by Jennie Batchelor in *ECS* (Summer 2020), by Paul Trolander in *Scriblierian* (Spring 2020). Eve writes that she has "at Cambridge a book called *The Letters in the Story: Narrative-Epistolary Fiction from Aphra Behn to the Victorians* supposed to be out in November" and embarked on a project on the Minerva Press. She is editing "with Rebecca Bullard in England an exciting, principally online series of short (30,000 word) books for Cambridge" called "18C Connections." **Lisa Berglund's** term as Executive Director of ASECS ended this summer, marked by a superb issue of ASECS's *News Circular* in June. During her term Lisa engineered online meetings, provided free renewals to 354 grad students and unemployed faculty, scrutinized the finances of funds, ushered in a policy on harassment to the Bylaws, saw the edition of Vols. 1-19 of *SECC* to Project Muse, negotiated with Gale for online access to *ECCO* for members; and oversaw the search for a new editor of *ECS* (Ramesh Mallipeddi of the U. of British Columbia). She is succeeded by a "full-time" Director, Dr. Mark Boonshoft, an Asst. Prof. of History at Duquesne, who published *Aristocratic Education and the Making of the American Public* in 2020 (the new HQ keeps the office address asecsoffice@ gmail.com).

**Samara Cahill** has edited and posted with open access the 2nd number of Vol. 2 of *Studies in Religion and the Enlightenment* ([www.srejournal.org](http://www.srejournal.org)), which begins with her introduction "Race, Religion, and Revolution in the Enlightenment" (now in a revised version), acknowledging the recent protests following the murder of George Floyd and others and providing an overview of the contents. The first essay is Erica Johnson Edwards's "Christianity's Role in Colonial and Revolutionary Haiti" (on Catholicism and voodoo); the three roundtables--with largely pedagogical interest--are "Talking Back to Enlightenment: Practicing Anti-Racist Teaching and Learning in 18C British Literature" by Kate Ozment and others; "*The Age of Phillis*" (on Wheatley, by Honorée Fanonne Jeffers, 2020) with four participants including David Mazella and JoEllen DeLucia; and "*The Woman of Colour* (1808): Pedagogic and Critical Approaches" with five participants introduced by Kerry Sinanan discussing an anonymous novel about a biracial Jamaican heiress's fortunes in England; and two reviews or commentaries on a statue: "'Honoring' Mary Wollstonecraft" by Rebekah Andrew and "The Wollstonecraft Statue at Newington Green" by Miriam Al Jamil. **Andrew Carpenter** late last fall was writing an essay on "the literary scene in Dublin 1713-1745" for a book on "Contexts of Swift" being edited by Joe Hone and Pat Rogers. As a tip to others, besides recommending Clive Probyn's book reviewed by **Gene Hammond** above, he notes that Valerie Rumbold's recent book *Swift in Print: Published Texts in Dublin and London, 1691-1765* (2020) is "a really wonderful contribution and has sent me scuffling back to my early Swift editions and enjoying them again with a more acute perception of careful layout, type sizes, etc." **Vincent Carretta's** 2021 publications include both "Oludah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa, a Self-Made Man" and "Phillis Wheatley, a 'Genius in Bondage,'" in "Black Lives in the Founding Era" in the 60th issue (Summer 2021) of *History Now* (Gilder Lehrman Institute); also "Black Intellectual History in the Period of Abolition before Abolition," in *Expanding the Boundaries of Black Intellectual History*, edited by Brandon R. Bryd and Russell Rickford (Northwestern, 2021); and "Phillis Wheatley and the Rhetoric of Politics and Race" in *African American Political Thought: A Collected History*, edited by Melvin Rogers and Jack Turner (Chicago, 2021). Last year Vin published "Revisiting Oludah Equiano, or Gustavus Vassa" in *New Writings on Britain's Black Past: The Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries*, ed. by Gretchen Gerzina (Liverpool UP, 2020); and he contributed to *Cambridge History of Black and Asian British Writing*, ed. by Susheila Nasta and Mark Stein, 2020, both "Black People of Letters: Authors, Activists, Abolitionists" and "Black People of Letters: Authors, Activists, Abolitionists."

We are delighted to welcome to EC/ASECS **Stephen Clarke**, a practicing lawyer in London, who is an honorary research fellow of the U. of Liverpool's School of English, a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and also the Chair of Dr. Johnson's House Trust. (He was THE man to review a book on writer's house museums in the March *Johnsonian News Letter*.) Stephen's essay in this year's *Age of Johnson* is favorably examined in **Anthony Lee's** review above (58). Stephen's research has long focused on Horace Walpole, issuing forth in *The Strawberry Hill Press and its Printing House: An Account and an Iconography* (Yale UP, 2011) and more recently in *The Selected Letters of Horace Walpole* for Everyman's Library (2017),

which makes the superb textual editing for the lengthy Yale edition available. His current projects include an essay on Thomas Gray's Grand Tour for a volume marking the 250th anniversary of Gray's death, edited by Ruth Abbott and Ephraim Levinson for CUP. He is also writing an essay on Johnson for a festschrift in honor of Howard Weinbrot to be edited by **Kevin Cope**. **Lorna J. Clark** contributed "Discoveries in the Archives: New Sarah Harriet Burney Letters at the Borthwick Institute for Archives" (137-49) to the Spring 2021 *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*. She thus supplements her edition of the letters of Sarah Harriet Burney, Frances Burney's half sister (1997) with this find at the U. of York. In early Sept., Lorna published her *Burney Letter* for Fall 2021 (Vol 27.2). It begins with **Geoffrey Sill's** "James Burney and the 'Severities' of a Marine Education." Geoff provides an overview of Frances's brother's naval career, begun in 1766-69 as a midshipman under Capt. Richard Onslow and ending as a Captain in 1784; he ponders whether James's reclassification to "able seaman" was a positive event to aid promotion or a demotion; also covered is James's later success as a writer: his editing of William Bligh's *A Narrative of the Mutiny* and then Bligh's fuller journal of the voyage led to his discovering the proclivity that led to his writing two books, a five-volume history of South Sea voyages before Cook's (1803-17) and an account voyages in search of a northwest passage (1819)--which resulted in his promotion to Admiral. Geof's particular focus involves the "severities" and "disgrace" that Frances felt Onslow had brought to her brother while on Onslow's ship, and he puzzles out all the evidence, too insufficient for a resolution of the mystery but sufficient to qualify conjectures by Lars Troide (as in James's *ODNB* entry).

The issue also includes **Peter Sabor's** "A New Letter by Charles Burney, Jr.," that to William Farr Rose which Burney dated and posted 30 November 1813 (from Deptford). Peter provides all the background to the letter (there are interesting familial connections) and offers a transcription. He heard from Michael Kassler that the autograph was listed on AbeBooks; though priced at only 25 pounds, Peter virtuously had McGill's Rare Books make the acquisition! Peter notes that Sophie Coulombe is "currently planning the first biography" of Charles Burney, Jr. as well as the first edition of his correspondence, which "extends to some 2000 items." The issue also includes **Catherine Keohane's** review of the Biennial Burney Society meeting held by zoom in July on re-assessing the Burneys, with 40 participants from the U.S., U.K., and New Zealand. Among those giving papers were Geof Sill (a version of that noted above), Francesca Saggini on the centrality of houses in Frances Burney's "construction of herself as an author"; **Tara Ghoshal Wallace** on recent shifts in Burney scholarship; **Terry Doerksen** on Edward Francis Burney's *Elegant Establishment for Young Ladies*, and Alicia Kerfoot on Burney's needlework references in the journals. In her President's Message Elaine Bander thanks **Catherine Keohane** for convening the meeting and notes that the Society elected her to its Board with the official job of "Conference Coordinator," which she has unofficially been performing "for years now"). And she thanks **Marilyn Francus** for editing *The Burney Journal* from Vol. 9 (2007) to the recent Vol. 17 (2020), co-edited with Hilary Havens and published in May (and now for the first time posted as a PDF online). Hilary is unable to continue as editor beyond this year, and a new General Editor is sought for Vol. 19.

Bucknell UP in May published Vol. 26 of *1650-1850* (316 pp; illus; \$150; available too as PDFs or for Kindle), edited by **Kevin L. Cope** and book-review editor **Samara Anne Cahill**. The essays include Samara's "Localizing Women? Mary Wollstonecraft, Burka Avenger, and the Adaptable Heroine," and **Melvyn New's** "In Quotes: Annotating Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*." In a special section edited by the late Mark A. Pedreira (Puerto Rico), appear **Michael Edson's** "Feeling Allegory: Affect, Metaphor, and Milton's 18C Reception," **Jacob Sider Jost's** "The Worldliness of Edward Young and the Metaphorics of Georgian Patronage," and **Linda L. Reesman's** "Coleridge and Metaphor: Crossing Thresholds." We've a review copy for someone who'll discuss those essays. Vol. 26 also includes Robin Runia on 18C female enthusiasts, Norbert Col on Burke on Monarchy, Matthew Davis on Johnson's *Taxation No Tyranny*, Andrew Connell on "Charlotte Smith's Literary Assaults on John Robinson"; and Adam Rounce on "Organizing Poetry in the 18C: Anthologies and Metaphor." The reviews include **Greg Clingham's** of *Johnson on Demand*, Vol. 20 of the Yale Johnson, **Paul J. DeGategno** on **Rivka Swenson's** *Essential Scots and the Idea of Unionism*, **Gloria Eive** on *Ballet Music from the Mannheim Court*, and multiple efforts by Malcolm Jack and Christopher Johnson (Chris's include Vols. 46-47 of *SECC*, co-edited by **Eve Tavor Bannet**). Kevin and Sam have already sent Vol. 27 to press--Bucknell has posted its publication date as 15 April 2022. The last issue of *TSWL* begins with an introductory dialogue on "Women and the Archives" by **Laura Engel** and Emily Ruth Rutter (40.1:5-13). Laura contributed "The Archival Tourist Take Two: Looking at Legacies of 18C Portraiture through the Works of Elizabeth Colomba and Fabiola Jean-Louis" to this summer's *ECF* (33.4:557-76). She uses two contemporary artists who reimagine the history of black women with 18C imagery to "re-examine, interrogate, and acknowledge" her positions "as a white scholar" in her 2019 *Women, Performance, and the Material of Memory: The Archival Tourist*. The last issue of *TSWL* also offers **Kristina Straub's** review of Katherine Binhammer's *The Form of Capital and the Sentimental Novel*.

In July Springer published **William Everdell's** *The Evangelical Counter-Enlightenment: From Ecstasy to Fundamentalism in Christianity, Judaism, and Islam in the 18C* (462 pp.)--reviewed on 53ff. above. Bill examines the evangelical (or enthusiastic) religious movements in the three Abrahamic religions in a search for commonalities and responses to traditional orthodoxies and to the Enlightenment. We hope Bill will write another book, but, if he doesn't, this last book places him "in the heights." **Emily C. Friedman** won ASECS's 2020-21 Innovative Course Design Competition for "'Let people tell their stories their own way': *Tristram Shandy* as Novel, Provocation, Remix" (the assignments include annotating texts together on Perusall, the subject of her pedagogical article in the October 2020 *Intelligencer*). In the spring we learned that **Jack Fruchtman** was updating his book *American Constitutional History: A Brief Introduction*, published by Wiley-Blackwell as recently as 2016 but, then, many constitutional issues followed in DJT's wake. Jack has been mainly writing on Constitutional history for the past decade, but his engagement goes way back--his *The Supreme Court: Rulings on American Government and Society* first appeared in 2006 (2nd ed., 2013). The third edition of

Jack's *The Supreme Court and Constitutional Law* appeared in 2019. **Sayre Greenfield**, with Brycchan Carey and Anne Milne, have edited *Birds in 18C Literature: Reason, Emotion, and Ornithology, 1700-1840*, to which he contributed "When Poet Meets Penguin: British Verse Confronts Exotic Avifauna" (193-209). The volume also offers **Kevin J. Berland's** "The Passenger Pigeon and the New World Myth of Plenitude." Avian topics in Irish poetry are addressed by Lucy Collins, in Gilbert White by Carey, in Beilby & Bewick by Milne, and in Cotton Mather by Nicholas Junkerman. **Cassidy Holahan**, a PhD candidate at Penn, will speak at this month's EC/ASECS on "Actor Portraits, Costuming, and the Making of Theatrical Character." Cassidy shared the award for the best Graduate Student Paper at the 2021 ASECS conference, for a paper entitled "A Digital Schema on the Printing Press: Richardson's **Moral Sentiments** as Case Study." Below I praise her essay in the summer *ECS*. **Melanie Holm** and fellow editors of *The Scriblerian* were prevented from publishing the spring 2021 issue by financial and legal entanglements after the journal's acquisition by Penn State UP. They will catch up by publishing a double issue in early 2022.

**Jacob Sider Jost** was awarded a fellowship by the Interdisciplinary Center for European Enlightenment Studies in Halle. Jacob's *Interest and Connection in the 18C* is reviewed favorably above by **Robert Walker** (32ff.). **Stephen Karian** has been promoted to full professor at Missouri and appointed to a three-year term as the Catherine Pain Middlebush Chair of English. His tribute to Howard Weinbrot appears in the Summer 2021 *ASECS News Circular*. Above in this issue we reprint from *Swift Studies* his tribute to another of his professors at Wisconsin, Philip Harth, which has much to impart regarding excellence in teaching and scholarship. Steve continues to produce the newsletter of the Johnson Society of the Central Region. This year **Ula Lukszo Klein** published *Sapphic Crossingd: Cross-Dressing Women in 18C British Literature*, which rethinks the roots of lesbianism and transgender identities. *Community and Solitude: New Essays on Johnson's Circle*, edited by **Anthony Lee** with many essays by EC/ASECS members, is very favorably reviewed by Allen Reddick in this summer's *ECS*; its essays are also closely examined by Teresa Saxton in *ECF*, 34.1 (2021), and **Jack Lynch** recommended in *Choice*. Tony and **Melvyn New** edited, and many members contributed to, "Scholarly Praxis: Annotating Eighteenth-Century Texts in Our Own Time," a book now under consideration by Penn State U. Press's editorial board. This well focused collection includes Tony Lee's Preface and his essay "Annotating *The Rambler* / The Annotated Rambler" and Mel New's Introduction and his "The Angry Annotator Annotated." Other members contributing, most with much editorial experience, are **Maximillian E. Novak** ("Annotating Dryden, Southerne, and Defoe"); **Robert D. Hume** ("Annotation in Scholarly Editions of Plays: Problems, Options, and Principles"); **Stephen Karian** ("Annotating Topical Satire: The Case of Swift"); **Michael Edson** ("Uninformed Readers and the Crisis of Annotation"); **William McCarthy** ("The Rhetoric, Ethics, and Aesthetics of Annotation: Some Reflection"); and **Robert G. Walker** ("Annotation and Scholarly Conversation: The Musings of a Non-Editor Annotator"). Among the six other contributors are Marcus Walsh ("Annotating Pope"); Thomas Lockwood ("Footnote Failure"); Robert

DeMaria, Jr., "Annotating the Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson"); and Elizabeth Kraft ("Annotation and Editorial Practice").

**Jack Lynch** and **J[ohn]. T. Scanlon** have edited Vol. 24 of *The Age of Johnson*, their first issue with Bucknell UP (we've been waiting for it since the demise of AMS Press in 2017--the price has been reduced and now it is available in a Kindle version). The volume is closely discussed above by **Anthony Lee** (on 57-62). Contributions by EC/ASECS members include **Stephen Clarke's** "Milton at Bolt Court," centered around a print of Milton hung on Samuel Johnson's wall; **Susan Kubica Howard's** "The Curious Case of Charlotte Lennox: Conducting a Professional Literary Life in 18C Britain outside the Bluestocking Circle"; Tony Lee's on "Hester Piozzi's Annotations upon Johnson's Early Poetry"; **Peter Briggs's** "Sensibility Reclaimed: Thomas Blackwell, Robert Wood, and the 'Conjectural History' of Homer," on the writings of two Homerians, originally drafted as an EC/ASECS paper; and reviews by **John Richetti** and **Jacob Sider Jost**. The April *Eighteenth-Century Life* edited by **Cedric D. Reverand** (and book review editor **Ashley Marshall**), included, besides **Eve Bannet's** essay on "Modern Biography," **Marie E. McAllister's** "Rhetoric, the Pox, and the Grand Tour," as well as reviews by **Jack Lynch** of the festschrift to **Jim Springer Borck** ed. by Reverand and **Kevin Cope**, by **Marscha Hansen** of four volumes of memoirs edited by Michael Kassler, **Lorna Clark**, et al. (the lengthy essay "Women's Records of the Court of George III and Queen Caroline"), and by **Ian Higgins** of Marsha Keith Schuchard's *Masonic Rivalries and Literary Politics from Jonathan Swift to Henry Fielding*. The Sept. *ECL* contains papers from the 16th David Nichol Smith Seminar ("Spaces of Enlightenment"). Late July saw the death of the beloved **Muriel McCarthy**, retired from Marsh's Library after 40+ years of service, for over two decades its first female and first Roman Catholic keeper. She regularly mounted exhibitions with catalogues and wrote a history the library. Muriel contributed an article on the library's catalogue to the April 1998 *Intelligencer*. *The Irish Times* printed a lengthy tribute to her on 14 August and she was warmly eulogized by Michael the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin after he had attended her funeral 3 August at her parish church.

Recent accomplishments by **Maureen E. Mulvihill** include "Writing Irish History," an illustrated review essay of the new *Cambridge History of Ireland* (4 vols., 2018), hosted online by *Rare Book Hub*, May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2021; this piece also received an illustrated page in the Florida Bibliophile Society newsletter (online; May, 2021). *Rare Book Hub* also hosted her illustrated, article on the 2021 Detroit Book Fair, "Detroit Hustles Harder" (1 July 2021); an illustrated page on the event's success ran in the Sept. newsletter of the Florida Bibliophile Society newsletter. Her recent essay "New Work on Mary Tighe" (*Irish Literary Supplement*, Spring 2020), her twelfth essay for *ILS*, is now uploaded on the publisher's website; a generous annotation was included in "Some Current Publications," *Restoration* (Spring, 2021). On other fronts, Maureen assisted EC/ ASECS's Web Wizard, Susan Beam, by tracing the source of the website's homepage image, with detailed annotation, to its 17C Flemish painter. She also donated digital images of seven frontispiece portraits from her rare book collection to the upcoming new design of *The Orlando Project...Women Writers* (CUP). Recent additions to her collection include *The Lay of the Irish Harp* by Sydney

(Owenson) Lady Morgan (L/NY, 1808); *The Family Legend* by Joanna Baillie (Edinburgh, 1810); *De Vinculis* (poems, Galway Jail, with frontis.) by Irish patriot, Wilfrid Scawen Blunt (L, 1889), an uncommon copy with decorative (Irish motif) cloth binding by Jane Morris (wife of genius polymath, William Morris, Kelmscott Press); and *Memories* by portraitist John Butler Yeats (D: Cuala Press [the Yeats sisters], 1923), with tp logo of Lady Emer. Maureen is preparing for *Scriblerian* three brief reviews of papers from the 7th Münster Swift Symposium and investigating "rhetorical sound structures" (auditory design & devices) in 17C women poets. We thank **Mel New** for his exemplary note above, which was suited to *The Shandean* but that journal, superbly edited by Peter de Voogd for over 30 years, is coming to an end. The 2021 volume is in the press and the last, for 2022, to which Mel is now writing a contribution on Sterne and Joyce, will be a festschrift for de Voogd. Mel has just finished a 48-page essay ("On the Cutting-Room Floor") outlining cuts to annotations he and co-editors E. Derek Taylor and Elizabeth Kraft were forced to make to their edition of *Sir Charles Grandison*, which he'll send off after Cambridge publishes the edition, which he anticipates to occur in February or March, for some 800 of the 2400 final page proofs have changes, though many are but page numbers. On 24 Nov. Bucknell will publish *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, ed. by **Maximillian Novak, Manuel Schonhorn, I. Rothman** et al.

In this summer's beefy *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (nearly 250 pp. long) is a "special issue" on "Book History and Digital Humanities," with a good introduction by guest editor Justin Tonra (U. of Galway). The first two essays, by EC/ASECS members **Leah Orr** and **Cassidy Holahan**, are cautionary examinations of the research tools we now relied upon. In "From Methods to Conclusions: The Limits of the Knowable in Digital Book History" (54.2:785-801), Leah reminds us that one gets different generalizations or assumptions about what was published depending on the tools chosen for perspective, thus one must be mindful of their limitations. Focusing on 1728 for her case study, she briefly examines literary histories and records by contemporary readers (one of special note is Gertrude Savile, whose diaries of 1721-57 were published in 1997), and, more interestingly, Leah shakes down what is in ESTC as opposed to what she found advertised in the 1728 newspapers of the Burney collections (1541 titles, which include publications in preceding years or with "1729" dates). This figure can be compared to 2091 titles in ESTC; she found 29% of the titles and 44% of the authors mentioned in advts "were in the ESTC list for 1728"; some of the discrepancies reflect the frequency with which authors' names were not given in advts (37%) and the absence of advts for books published outside London. She repeatedly reminds us of all excluded from the ESTC.

The second essay is "Rummaging in the Dark: ECCO as Opague Digital Archive" by **Cassidy Holahan**. Cassidy offers a good overview of the history of ECCO and the underlying short-title catalogues as she interrogates ECCO's provenance to illuminate its scope, biases, and limitations (803-26). She notes ECCO has 2092 institutional subscribers in 42 countries (809) and that the roughly 186,000 titles in ECCO I and the 2009 ECCO II are to be expanded with an ECCO III (812). We gain her good insights into what tended to be included and excluded from ECCO. She repeats Michael Suarez's underestimation of printed matter not in the

ESTC (10%). There are interesting remarks on the consequence of the underlying microfilms deriving mainly from a small number of collections. She finds ECCO's selection compared to the ideal has "fewer ephemeral texts, a dearth of print material on the theater, a low proportion of texts from America . . . a large percentage of the copies originating from the British Library, and an increased number of texts from later in the century" (819). Cassidy also provides an up-to-date survey of the scholarship in three major journals that rely on or digest ECCO as well as a helpful examination of the new search platform introduced late in 2020 and mentioned in our last issue (35.1:42-43)--she attends to the new access to "the underlying OCR for each image page" (a transcript) and the ongoing critique of the limitations in the OCR work (820f). She finds the new positioning of metadata more accessible, and she does not criticize ECCO for failing to contain revisions to the ESTC. Three scholars at the BL have been updating ESTC for years--I alone have sent in over 600 corrections--all not found in ECCO citation pages. (Given too that ESTC has added or cut thousands of records since ECCO II, it is foolish not to go directly to ESTC). Cassidy reveals that Gale now offers confidence ratings on the accuracy of page images; we might then ask why pisspoor pages are never redone. In an exchange this summer, **Kevin Cope** stressed the often faulty digitized images--here again Gale goes on making money off the rental property without fixing the plumbing. **Catherine Ingrassia** wrote in agreement regarding flaws in the new ECCO platform: she was asked to test it and offered objections, such as that one cannot view a full page in legible font. **James Woolley** was also asked to pre-test the platform and found his suggestions largely ignored as well. **Ric Reverand** offered as an example of how the citation pages haven't improved that Francis Burney is still not a recognized author but only "Fanny" is. The consensus is that the new platform was largely intended to prepare for the sale of ECCO within a larger package and not to improve it.

On **Jane Wessel's** panel on theatre at our October meeting (Saturday morning), **Chelsea Phillips** speaks on "Belles and Bumps: Pregnancy, Prosthetics, and the 18C Stage." In the March 2020 issue of *Theatre Journal*, Chelsea reviewed Kate Hamill's *Vanity Fair* in *Theatre Journal*. **Elizabeth Porter**, who speaks at this month's EC/ASECS on "Moving against the Marriage Plot: London in Burney's *Cecilia*," published "Clarissa's Commerce: Relocations and Relationships in London" in *ECF's* Spring issue (33.3: 393-412). Elizabeth examines Clarissa's relocation to Covent Gardens' commercial environ to "illustrate how the novel imagines alternative possibilities to marriage and sex work . . . within commercial urban spaces." The issue also includes **Konstantinos (Kos) Pozoukidis's** "The Survival of Non-Productive Labor in Mary Shelley's *The Last Man*" (393-412). Also here is **John Richetti's** review of Marina McKay's *Ian Watt: The Novel and the Wartime Critic*. **Elizabeth Powers** in *TLS* of 25 June 2021 reviews and recommends for translation Stephan Bollmann's *Der Atem der Welt: Johann Wolfgang von Goethe und die Erfahrung der Natur*, a broad discussion of Goethe's research into the natural sciences and his ecological understanding (benefiting from correspondence with Alexander von Humboldt from 1794 on). Elizabeth notes how Goethe, who preferred his own color theory to Newton's, was not a "straightforward Enlightenment materialist." Elizabeth also contributed to *Goethe Yearbook*, 28 (2021) reviews of two books

published in 2019, 200 years after Goethe's *West-östlicher Divan*. The first is Eric Ormsby's translation, *West-Eastern Divan: Complete, Annotated, New Translation, Including the "Notes and Essays" & the Unpublished Poems* (2019). Elizabeth notes that Ormsby's background in Islamic studies allows him to comment on the Persian poetic traditions and "annotate Arabic, Persian, or Turkish references to unfamiliar persons and places, while also referring to Goethe's own sources in the German translations he used." The second book is Barbara Schwepcke and Bill Swainson's edition *A New Divan: A Lyrical Dialogue between East & West* (2019), with 24 poems by 24 poets, east and west, who take up Goethe's themes, and "six exciting essays that examine issues of translation," including those raised by Goethe in his "Notes and Essays" (much of the review concerns the essays). Elizabeth wrote after the last issue with praise for **John Heins's** presidential address--it reminded her of her visit to Wörlitz about the time the Wall fell. She sent a passage from Nicholas Boyle's biography of Goethe on his visit in 1778 ("Goethe was enchanted by the 'dream' that 'the gods' had here allowed the Prince to make into reality"). That visit led to a similar park for Weimar.

We are thankful to **Hermann J. Real** and **Kirsten Juhas**, editors of *Swift Studies*, for allowing us to begin this issue with their essay "The Dean and the Father" and not reserving it to brighten their own journal. Although its genesis is related to works of Lactantius acquired in duplicating Swift's library, they were mindful that it continues their 2015 discussion here of the notion of "animal rationale" and the "Philosophical Foundations of Swift's Misanthropy." Earlier this year they published the 36th volume of *Swift Studies*, which begins with prefatory remarks on the Centre, noting Hermann's stepping down as Director of the Centre, though his continuing to co-edit *Swift Studies* with Kirsten and too his remaining chair of the Centre's Friends. Those remarks include the sad admission that the Centre was closed for much of the year due to the pandemic and fellowship winners had to be disinvented. Hermann and Kirsten there report on further acquisitions for the duplication of Swift's library, a task getting much harder now it approaches completion. Since the issue went to Dirk Passmann's press, the Centre has acquired still more long-sought editions: three were located by Andrew Stewart of Cornwall: *Biblia Sacra: sive, Testamentum Vetus ... Et Testamentum Novum ... e Graeco in Latinum Versum* (L, 1680; Olaus Magnus, *Historia ... de gentium septentrionalium variis conditionibus statibusve ...* (Basle [1567]); and Edmund Wingate, *An Exact Abridgment of all the Statutes in Force and Use from the Beginning of Magna Charta* (L, 1700). From a H.H.J. Lyngé in Copenhagen came Roland Fréart, *Parallele de l'architecture antique et de la moderne* (Paris, 1702), and on E-Bay they found Evaristo Gherardi, *Le Théâtre italien*, 6 vols (Amsterdam, 1701). The Centre also bought from Schilb of Philadelphia St Irenaeus's *Adversus Valentini, & similibus Gnosticorum Haereses libri quinque* (Paris, 1639), which Swift read in an unidentified edition in Sir William Temple's library. Other acquisitions include oddities dug up by Ulrich Elkmann and donations from benefactors like Bernhard Fabian, Michael Düring (Russian, Polish, & Georgian titles), and **Ashley Marshall**. Essays in Vol. 36 were previewed in the last *Intelligencer* (69): Howard Weinbrot on Swift's "Thirtieth January Sermon as Self-Defence," Corrina Readioff on the Scriblerus Club working "from Verse Invitations to Robert Harley," **Melvyn New's** examination of

*Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus* and *Tristram Shandy*," **David Palumbo's** "Raillery and Satire in the Bathurst-Swift Correspondence," Michael Düring on Swift holdings in Tabilisi, Georgia; and Hermann and Elkmann's "Swiftiana Rara: Eine liebliche junge Nymphie giebt sich zu Bette."

**Michael Ritterson**, who retired in 2008 from Gettysburg College after teaching German for four decades, served as the German-language consultant & translator in **Kay Etheridge's** edition of Sibyla Merian's book on caterpillars, translating the text along with relevant sections of Merian's journal. That was familiar work for Michael, who has for over twenty years concentrated on translating German works into English. **Jason Shaffer** of the Naval Academy speaks at our 2021 meeting on "Costuming Elements in Early Republican Drama"--Jason works on Restoration / 18C drama and early American studies, and has published essays that include "Staging Race in 19C America" in the March 2016 *Theatre Journal* and "The Arts of War and Peace: Theatricality and Sexuality in the Early Republic" in the Summer 2015 *Journal of the Early Republic*. Many will find very interesting **Carrie Shanafelt's** "Jeremy Bentham and the Aesthetics of Sexual Difference," published in *The Eighteenth Century*, Fall 2020 (61.3:335-52). Working from Bentham's extensive MSS on sexual nonconformity at University College London, Carrie indicates that Bentham considered sexual preference "an aesthetic reaction," immutable, "not a proper object of moral judgment by others"; he held violence against sexual nonconformists sprung from the urge to make "sexual asceticism" a "priority of social discipline" to "justify the exclusivity of political enfranchisement." She concludes by noting that Bentham would have us "imagine an alternative discourse of political liberation that acknowledges sensual, sexual, individual pleasure and security from violence--full custodianship of the body--as the basis of a happy and just society" (350). She also published "Against Rights: Jeremy Bentham on Sexual Liberty and Legal Reform" in *LIT: Literature Interpretation Theory*, 31.3 (2020) and has forthcoming from Virginia *Uncommon Sense: Jeremy Bentham, Queer Aesthetics, and the Politics of Taste*, which we will get a copy of for a committed reviewer. Carrie has turned her attention to the finance of the Atlantic slave trade.

**Gordon Turnbull** in his "Yale Boswell Edition Notes" in the March *JNL* announced that **Richard Sher's** edition *The Correspondence of James Boswell and Sir William Forbes of Pitsligo* will be published within a year by Yale and Edinburgh University presses--here too we learned that Yale was terminating the **Private Papers of Boswell** project as of 30 June 2021 and that Yale UP and Edinburgh UP were conversing about the publication of "volumes in progress." This info and much else is found in **Richard Sher's** *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, no. 35, a 56-p. PDF. As ever, it is loaded with important news for Scottish studies (back issues are now posted for open access). Among its reviews is **Jack Lynch's** lengthy account of *James Boswell's Life of Johnson: An Edition of the Original Manuscript in Four Volumes*, on the occasion of **Thomas Bonnell's** final volume (2019), and also **Carla J. Mulford's** review essay of three books, "James Watt's Life and Legacy in Technology, Collaboration, Innovation." Also, Tom Bonnell reviewed **Sandro Jung's** *The Publishing and Marketing of Illustrated Books in Scotland, 1760-1825*, and **Frances Singh's** book on Jane Cumming is reviewed by Rosalind Carr. **Geoffrey Sill** had a very enjoyable journey to

Australia and New Zealand last year, spending a week on a small boat retracing Cook's voyage up the western coast of New Zealand and giving an invited talk at the Cook Society's conference in Auckland. He spent a productive week at each country's national library. As noted above, Geof has an article on James Burney in **Lorna Clarke's** Fall 2021 *Burney Letter*. Congratulations to **Kristina Straub** of Carnegie Mellon on the receiving ASECS "2021 Excellence in Mentorship Award."

The June *News Circular* from ASECS has a remarkably well detailed account of "Affiliate and Regional Societies" produced by Coordinator **Rivka Swenson**. Much shorter lists of "forthcoming meetings" have long been produced for the *News Circular*, but now there are dozens of affiliates, and Rivka provides more than meeting dates, such as upcoming awards, recent prizes, and newsletter notes, and her catalogue contains hyperlinks to Societies' webpages. Since this publication is online with open access, it removes any need for me to patch together a partial list. **Katherine Temple's** *Loving Justice: Legal Emotions in William Blackstone's England* is called "an important contribution to the emergent Law and Humanities movement" in Nicole Eustace's review in the Spring *ECS*. Volume 61 of *Studies in Bibliography*--with essays on extra-illustrated books by **Stephen Clarke**, the Declaration of Independence, and bibliophile John Carter--has been edited by **David Vander Muelen** and should reach subscribers by year's end. On 5 April **Robert Walker** sent me the PDF of his "Subscribers, Shoemakers, and Sterne" published in *ANQ*, identifying subscribers to Sterne's works hitherto unidentified by **Mel New** in Vol. 9 of the Florida Edition of Laurence Sterne. Bob also published this year in *ANQ* "Quakers, Shoemakers, and Thomas Cumming" (34.1: 31-33), and his article "Boswell's The Cub and the Shadow of Augustan Satire" is forthcoming in *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 47.2 (Fall 2021) and his "Woodmas, Woodmoss, and Lawrence Sterne" is in *The Shandean*, 32 (2021). We thank **Cheryl Wanko** for her course description and syllabus above and ask those teaching to consider sending us something similar, even if not so good, as Cheryl's above. Like some other members (such as **Mascha Hansen**), Cheryl's activities increasingly involve defending the planet. At West Chester U., she oversees a new interdisciplinary minor in Sustainability and chairs a curriculum sub-committee of the Sustainability Council, as she pushes for the inclusion of sustainability topics across the curriculum; off campus Cheryl campaigns against spraying pesticides and herbicides (this summer she chaired an online roundtable on pesticides) and sits on her township's Environmental Advisory Committee. We are happy to welcome to EC/ASECS **Barbara Witucki**, who teaches English at Utica College, but her doctorate is in classics, and she also teaches Latin and works on ancient Greek epic & romance, and also on the influence of Classical literature and archaeology on Romantic writers.

### Announcements, Impacts of Covid, &c.

ASECS's **A. C. Elias, Jr., Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship** for 2021 was awarded to Joel W. Herman, a PhD student in History at Trinity College Dublin, assisting him with research necessary for writing his dissertation on "Revolutionary Currents: Ideas, Information, and the Imperial Public Spheres in Dublin and New York, 1776-1782." He was in New York

this past summer investigating “the production, circulation, and reception of patriot print culture, focusing particularly on the newspaper, in transatlantic and local comparative context[s].” He looked for “networks of publics linked by correspondence and news reports,” identifying common themes, as in their critique of Empire. The Elias Fellowship, with \$2500 in annual funding, supports “documentary scholarship on Ireland in the period between the Treaty of Limerick (1691) and the Act of Union (1800), by enabling North American-based scholars to travel to Ireland and Irish-based scholars to travel to North America for furthering their research.” Projects conducting original research on any aspect of 18th-century Ireland qualify for consideration, but recipients must be members of ASECS who have permanent residence in the United States or Canada or be members of its Irish sister organization. Applications for the fellowship are due on 15 November to its two trustees: Jason McElligott, Keeper, Marsh’s Library, St. Patrick’s Close, Dublin 8, Ireland (jason.mcelligott@marshlibrary.ie) and James May (jem4@psu.edu; 1423 Hillcrest Rd / Lancaster, PA 17603 / USA). Applications consist of short curriculum vitae (no more than 3 pp.), project description (3 pp. or less, treating contribution to the field and work done & to be done during the proposed research), a one-page bibliography of related books & articles, a short budget, and two signed letters of recommendation. Please try to submit all the materials but the letters as one Word file or PDF. If the two letters of support cannot be supplied as PDFs of signed letters, the original copies should be mailed to one of the trustees.

David Brewer and Crystal Lake, the editors of *SECC*, have welcomed “submission of revised and expanded versions of papers, roundtable remarks, and clusters thereof present in *any* public venue in the previous two years,” including papers given online. See [www.asecs.org/secc](http://www.asecs.org/secc).

In Sept. David T. Gies (emeritus, UVA) published online with open-access another lengthy issue of *Dieciocho*, Anejo 8 (Fall 2021), w 334 pp. of essays and reviews, treating Enlightenment controversies as on poetic language, censorship, etc. across the Hispanic world (plus abstracts).

American colleges and universities began fall 2021 intent to hold physical classes (Penn State in July estimated that 95% of classes at University Park would be in person as would 88% at its Commonwealth Campuses). This was a financial necessity. Both Penn State and Temple needed to raise tuition (in-state tuition rose 2.5%; out-of-state, 2.75%) after several years with freezes. While vaccination is required at hundreds, most American colleges don't require vaccinations; 14 states prohibit the mandate in public universities (only 8 states require a vax); and in 20 states, all with Republican governors, proof-of-vaccination requirements are prohibited (*Ballotpedia*, 22 Sept). In cases like Penn State, universities know the Republican-controlled legislature will be angry if vaccination is mandated. An NBC survey found 253 schools in the Northeast required vaxing but only 90 in the South did (only 8 of Georgia's 70 did, 5 of those being historically black). Exceptions to the vax mandate are widespread and cause controversy. At least nine states have banned or restricted mask mandates, including AR, FL, IA, SC, TN and TX, many with very high rates of contagion, but these bans are blocked by court action in some. Many institutions without vax mandates do mandate masks in campus buildings, as does Penn State. *EducationWeek* reported 21 Sept that 16 states and DC require masks in

public schools. Faculty in southern states where masks are optional, as NC, report most students are not wearing masks to class. The Univ. of Iowa obeys the Regents and state legislature, not Iowa City, and prohibits faculty from requiring students to mask in class or even during office visits.

Recent events planned to occur in physical spaces have often been shifted to virtual, as the Library Company's lecture by John C. Van Horne on Thomas Bray and Associates, shifted to virtual only within a week of the event--on a day that Pennsylvania surged to over 5000 new covid cases. Several weeks earlier this Library announced that it was joining its "cultural partners" in "requiring all of our guests to show proof of vaccination . . . or a negative covid test within 48 hours of the event," and added that all guests must wear masks covering nose and mouth. The Huntington on 25 August announced that as of 7 September all researchers need show proof of full vaccination two weeks prior to visits (negative tests not being accepted.) One may book an appointment in advance for 9-12 and 1-4:00. As of June Yale's libraries were open only to its students and staff authorized to be on campus (only those retired faculty with emeritus status were permitted). There are positive developments in some places. Our National Gallery of Art and its Library are open to masked wearers. The National Library of Ireland as of 20 Sept extended its hours to 9:30-5:00 M-F, requiring readers to book a seat in advance and order books online. But with fewer in the US vax'd than in Europe and more covid here, the EU in Sept. advised its 27 member states to block nonessential travel from the US (The Netherlands bans unvax'd Americans and allows in those vax'd but requires quarantining on arrival).

**The Intelligencer needs reviewers for:** *1650-1850*, Vol. 26, Kevin L. Cope and Samara Cahill, eds. (see p. 68 above at "Cope"); W. G. Miller, *British Traders in the East Indies, 1770-1820: "At Home in the Eastern Seas"* (Worlds of the East Indies Company, 19) (Boydell, 2020), Pp. xx + [3] maps + 220 + [2] of series bibliography; bibliography [191-208]; index; on who was in the intra-Asian trade, how they operated, & how they interacted with indigenous societies. We still need reviewers for books previously described more fully: Sharon R. Harrow and Kirsten T. Saxton, eds, *Adapting the Eighteenth Century: A Handbook of Pedagogies and Practices* (Rochester, 2020), pp. 315 (discussed on p. 66 at "Harrow" in the news for March 2021); Barbara Crosbie, *Age Relations and Cultural Change in Eighteenth-Century England* (Boydell, 2020), pp. c. 290 illus.; 15 tables/graphs (see Oct. 2020); Elizabeth Dill, *Erotic Citizens: Sex and the Embodied Subject in the Antebellum Novel* (Virginia, 2019), pp. 296; illus; on ruination moving from sex into politics, etc., with chapters on Shaftesbury, Wm Hill Brown's novels, H. W. Forster's *The Coquette*, Richardson's *Clarissa*; and John D. Lyons, ed. *The Dark Tread: From Tragical Histories to Gothic Tales* (Delaware, 2019), pp. 266; on violence in families (see March 2019).

**Cover illustration:** Francesco Londonio (Italian, 1723-1783), "Shepherd with Walking Stick and a Peasant Woman with Child, 1758/1759," etching heightened with white gouache on blue paper, 11 x 8 3/4"; in the permanent collection of the National Gallery of Art, Washington [part of a masterful series of etchings of animals and peasants done by the painter].

***The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer***

The Newsletter of the EC/ASECS

N.S. Volume 35, Number 2: October 2021

James E. May, editor

1423 Hillcrest Road

Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603

U.S.A.