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In 1799, sitting at his desk in his newly-built house in Northumberland, Pennsylvania, arguably the most eminent philosophe – indeed, arguably the only philosophe – of the Susquehanna Enlightenment, put pen to paper in a controversial cause, the cause of liberty. He was 66, and prudence dictated a certain circumspection, discretion, in his behavior, and a certain moderation in his speech and writing. But Dr. Joseph Priestley was not a man to heed the calls to prudence when he believed himself to be in the right: he had weathered many political storms in his life, and he was not about to let a little thing like the Alien and Sedition Acts intimidate him now. We can see his suitability for inclusion in a conference with the theme of Liberty in the series of letters addressed to his “friends and neighbors” in Northumberland:

WHEN any person becomes an object of more suspicion than he wishes to lie under, he naturally appeals to those who have had the best opportunity of knowing him; and if they be satisfied with respect to his conduct, it is the best means of satisfying others. This unpleasant character of a suspected person, hostile to the country in which I live, aggravated by the consideration of its having afforded me protection when I could not live with comfort, or even with safety, in my native country, you well know I have borne for some time. I think it barely possible for a man who has, in the five years that I have been among you, done so little of an offensive nature, to have become the object of more suspicion and rancour than I have incurred. The most popular writer in this country [William Cobbett], and who receives the greatest countenance from the persons in power, says, "I hope I shall see the malignant old Tartuff" of Northumberland begging his bread through the "streets of Philadelphia, and ending his days in the "poor house, without a friend to close his eyes." The curse of Ernulphus in Tristram Shandy does not exceed this.

In order to keep as clear as possible, and as free from suspicion, with respect to the politics of this country, I did not chuse even to be naturalized, and the President, to whom I mentioned my objection to it, much approved of my resolution. But I find that this precaution has not availed me any thing. [As I am] an alien, the President has been again and again called upon to carry into execution against me the late act of congress respecting aliens. It has been said, that "if what I have done passes unnoticed by government, it will operate as the greatest encouragement" that its enemies have ever received. They will say "and justly too, that tho' the President is armed with" power, he is afraid to make use of it, and that the "alien law is a mere bug bear."
I hope, however, to convince you that such an order would be cruel and unjust; for that I am not so very dangerous a person as this writer and his party suppose.

In the first place, I consider what is objected to me from what I am. In some respects neither praise nor blame will attach to what a man is, because it was not in his power to have been any other. It will not, for instance, be objected me, at least as an unfavourable circumstance, that I am a native of England, even by those whose greatest boast it is that they are native Americans. Nor shall I be censured for saying, what I always have done, and what with great truth I repeat, that I am proud of my native country, and am as sincere a well wisher to it as any American can be to this country. It does not depend on ourselves, but upon our parents, and upon God, who assigns to every man his proper station and duty, where we shall be born.

But of what importance is it where I was born, or whence I came; whether I dropped among you from the clouds, or rose out of the earth? Here I am. Here is my family. Here is my property, and every thing else that can attach a man to any place. Let any person only view my house, my garden, my library, my laboratory, and the other conveniencies with which I am surrounded, and let him withal consider my age, and the little disposition that I have shewn to ramble any whither, and say whether any person among yourselves, or in the United States, could remove with more difficulty, or with more loss, than I should do.

And yet there are great numbers who would think no more of an order to send me out of the country . . . than if I was a pauper, without house or home, and they would rejoice as much in it as if I had been a burden to the district. It is surely, also, as probable that I shall have a real attachment to a country, and the government of it, to which I came voluntarily, and from a preference of them to any other, as if I had been a native, and consequently had had no choice in the case. And if I am an alien myself, my sons are naturalized; and must not a father feel for them? Can he be an enemy to the country to which they belong?

People objected to him, Priestley went on, saying that he should not presume to criticize American politics. But he wrote,

Can any man, whose person and property are in any country, be wholly unconcerned about the conduct of its affairs? Though a man may be a mere passenger in a ship, must he be content to see it suffer, or sink, and not give his opinion how it might be saved, because he is not the owner, the captain, or any officer on board acting under him. I have heard, indeed, of a man who when he was alarmed with the cry of fire in the house in which he was sleeping, said “what is that to me, I am only a lodger.” But his conduct is not generally thought worthy of imitation.

To be perfectly serious: in all countries, and under every form of government, opinions of every kind, and those of all persons, natives or
aliens, in office or out of office, should be perfectly free... Governors vainly endeavour to ward off impending evils by imposing silence on their adversaries. History shews that no government ever derived any permanent advantage from measures of this kind. The less men have the liberty to speak, the more they will think; and they naturally suspect that what they are forbidden to examine will not bear examination.

Priestley is best known today as a chemist, and his house in Northumberland has been designated one of the Landmarks of American Chemistry established by the American Chemical Society. But he wasn’t a chemist in the modern sense, but rather what in the 18th century was called a natural philosopher. He was also, in the 18th century sense, a political philosopher. And standing behind both his natural philosophy and his political philosophy was his theology. As his modern biographer, Robert Schofield, put it: “Basically speaking, he was a theologian. And he was also, in his own peculiar way, a determinist. He said that God had set forward for mankind an entire future which was benevolent because God was benevolent. And so whatever happened to him he believed it was for the best.” And he also believed in what Schofield refers to as the “sheer lunacy” of an entire century, “an entire century that honestly believes that they can solve all their problems by reason.” And having called it “sheer lunacy,” Schofield went on to say, “It’s wonderful! What an absolutely wonderful thing to believe in.”

Priestley expressed his views in voluminous writings, publishing 250 books in his lifetime, many of which are hundreds of pages in length. With diagrams. Dr. Schofield has read every word of them – I have not – but what anyone who has read any of them can attest to is that Priestley was enormously charming as a writer. As Jenny Uglow, author of The Lunar Men, put it, “Priestley is such a warm communicator. He loved communicating; he loved talking; he loved writing notes and letters.” And he used the charm of his writings as an extension of his face-to-face charm as preacher and teacher and friend, in what I think of as the best tradition of the republic of letters, in which people used writing as a way of building community. In this paper, I will use Priestley’s writings to extend that 18th century social network to us now, and to talk not only about the “airs” of Joseph Priestley, that is, the gasses he discovered, but also, in what I admit is a very bad pun, the “heirs” of Priestley’s vision for chemistry and for enlightenment.

Joseph Priestley was born to a not particularly well off family in Yorkshire, and he became a minister and also a teacher. He developed a passion for natural philosophy – and not for natural history, which might have been cheap, but for chemistry, which required very expensive apparatus. He believed, as Uglow put it, in “chance and accidents” in his experiments. As she explained it, “a democratic merit of discovery so that everybody can make discoveries of gases or whatever as long as they are observant and completely by chance odd things will happen, and then you notice them, and that chance is actually a mode of Providence providing this information.” This irritated very careful experimenters
like James Watt, inventor of the steam engine, who referred to it as “Mr. Priestley’s usual way of groping about.” But in fact it worked for Priestley, who discovered eight new “airs”, as gases were called, within a three-year period:

- Oxygen (O$_2$), [Dephlogisticated Air] (1775),
- Nitrous oxide, aka laughing gas (N$_2$O), [Diminished or dephlogisticated nitrous air] (1774)
- Ammonia (NH$_3$), [Alkaline air] (1772),
- Nitric oxide (NO), [Nitrous air] (1773),
- Sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), [Vitriolic acid air] (1774),
- Nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$), [Phlogisticated nitrous air] (1772),
- Anhydrous hydrochloric acid (HCL), [Marine acid air] (1772), and
- Silicon tetraflouride (SiF$_4$+H$_2$O), [Flour acid air] (1775).

He also developed the standard apparatus for collecting them, still used in an updated form today. And a whole set of other discoveries I’ll get to later. His work was supported by a number of friends, like Watt, like Josiah Wedgewood, and by patrons like the Marquis of Shelbourne. And in his case the patronage system worked exactly the way Joseph Addison had described its ideal state earlier in the century: “where there are power and obligation on the one part, and merit and expectation on the other.” [Tatler, number 196]

Part of the charm of his writing comes in his ability to take abstruse philosophical principles and make them concrete. This is his discussion of David Hartley’s concepts of the association of ideas:

Since propositions and reasoning are mental operations, and, in fact, nothing more than cases of the association of ideas, everything necessary to the processes may take place in the mind of a child, of an idiot, or of a brute animal, and produce the proper affections and actions, in proportion to the extent of their intellectual powers. The knowledge of these operations, which is gained by the attention we give to them, is a thing of a very different nature, just as different as the knowledge of the nature of vision is different from vision itself. The philosopher only is acquainted with the structure of the eye, and the theory of vision, but the clown sees as well as he does, and makes a good use of his eyes.

Suppose a dog to have been pushed into a fire and severely burned. Upon this the idea of fire and the idea that has been left by the painful sensation of burning become intimately associated together; to that the idea of being pushed into the fire, and the idea of the pain that was the consequence of it are ever after inseparable. He cannot tell you in words, that fire has a power of burning, because he has not the faculty of speech; or, though he might have signs to express fire and burning he might not have got so abstract an idea as that of power; but notwithstanding this, the two ideas of fire and of burning are as intimately united in his mind, as they can be in the mind of a philosopher who has reflected upon his mental affections, and is able to describe that union or association of ideas in proper terms.

If you endeavour to push the dog into the fire, he will instantly spring from
it before he has felt anything of the heat; which as clearly shows his apprehension of danger from a situation in which he suffered before, as if he could have explained the foundation of his fear in the form of regular syllogism and conclusions. No philosopher who can analyse the operations of his mind and discourse concerning them, could reason more justly, more effectually, or more expeditiously than he does.

Priestley carried that very descriptive, engaging style into his writings on electricity, one of the favorite subjects for 18th century natural philosophers. Priestley, like everyone else, corresponded with Benjamin Franklin on it and the two men shared experiments back and forth, like this one:

Suspend a plate of metal from the conductor, which is supported by two pillars of baked wood, and must be supposed to be supplied with electricity from the globe, and underneath it, at the distance of about three or four inches, put another plate of the same size. Upon the lower of these plates lay a feather, or a small slip of light paper; and, as soon as the wheel begins to turn, the feather or the paper, will be attracted, and jump to the upper plate; from whence it will be immediately repelled, and fly to discharge itself upon the lower; after which it will be ready to be attracted and repelled again. Thus will the feather, or paper, fly from the one plate to the other alternately, and with inconceivable rapidity, if the electrification be pretty vigorous. When the pieces of paper are cut into the figures of men and women, they exhibit a kind of dance, which is extremely amusing.

This experiment will be the more diverting, if it be accompanied with that of the electrical bells, which depends upon the same principle. Two bells hang by a chain, from a brass rod communicating with the prime conductor, and another bell, with a chain fastened to it, reaching to the ground, hangs in silk from the same rod between them, and a small brass ball, suspended by a silken thread, hangs between each two bells. The consequence of this disposition is, that the two outermost bells, which hang from the prime conductor by brass chains, are electrified, and attract the brass balls which hang in silk; and the attraction being vigorous, they are made to strike the bells with some force, and make them ring.

Being then loaded with electricity, they are immediately repelled from these outermost bells, and fly to unload themselves, by striking upon the middle bell, which hangs in silk; and from which the electric matter passes to the floor, by means of the chain hanging to it. The brass balls, which may now be called clappers to the bells, are then ready to be attracted by the outermost bells, as at first; and thus the ringing may be continued as long as it is agreeable. The amusement will be heightened, if the operator now and then touch the prime conductor with a brass rod, or with his finger: for then the dancing and ringing will cease, and will not be renewed till the singer or rod be removed. If he conceal this application of his finger, or the rod, with a little art, the figures will seem to dance, and the bells to ring, at the word of
Now in addition to developing new experiments, and to identifying all those new “airs,” Priestley also developed the two most useful methods of distinguishing among gasses. The problem with gasses is that they all look alike: in order to identify them, he had to develop tests in which they reacted differently. Nowadays there are a whole series of tests, but the two that Priestley developed are the two that I describe to my students as “the candle test” and “the mouse test.”

The candle test, as you might think, has to do with the behavior of a candle when put in vessels containing the different gasses. Here is Priestley’s account of a candle burning in Oxygen, which he called “dephlogisticated air”: “The dipping of a lighted candle into a jar filled with dephlogisticated air is alone a very beautiful experiment. The strength and vivacity of the flame is striking, and the heat produced by the flame in these circumstances is also remarkably great. But this experiment is more pleasing, when the air is only little more than twice as good as common [atmospheric] air; for when it is [pure oxygen], the candle burns with a crackling noise, as if it was full of some combustible matter.”

Priestley found a quite different reaction when he studied what he called “fixed air,” or what we call carbon dioxide. He was first introduced to it, he tells us, while living near “a public brewery,” in 1767:

I was induced to make experiments on fixed air, of which there is always a large body, ready formed, on the surface of the fermenting liquor, generally about nine inches, or a foot, in depth, within which any kind of substance may be very conveniently placed.

A person, who is quite a stranger to the properties of this kind of air, would be agreeably amused with extinguishing lighted candles, or chips of wood in it, as it lies upon the surface of the fermenting liquor. For the smoke readily unites with this kind of air, probably by means of the water which it contains; the smoke is also apt to form itself into broad flakes, parallel to the surface of the liquor, and at different distances from it, exactly like clouds. These appearances will sometimes continue above an hour, with very little variation. When this fixed air is very strong, the smoke of a small quantity of gunpowder fired in it will be wholly retained by it, no part escaping into the common air. Making an agitation in this air, the surface of it . . . is thrown into the form of waves, which is very amusing to look upon; and if, by this agitation, any of the fixed air be thrown over the side of the vessel, the smoke, which is mixed with it, will fall to the ground, as if it was so much water, the fixed air being heavier than common air.

When the fermenting liquor is contained in vessels close covered up, the fixed air, on removing the cover, readily affects the common air which is contiguous to it; so that, candles held at a considerable distance above the surface will instantly go out. I have been told by the workmen, that this will sometimes be the case, when the candles are held two feet above the mouth of
The “mouse test” was even more important. Priestley explained:

If I want to try whether an animal will live in any kind of air, I first put the air into a small vessel, just large enough to give it room to stretch itself; and as I generally make use of mice for this purpose, I have found it very convenient to use the hollow part of a tall beer-glass, which contains between two and three ounce measures of air. In this vessel a mouse will live twenty minutes, or half an hour.

For the purpose of these experiments it is most convenient to catch the mice in small wire traps, out of which it is easy to take them, and, holding thereby the back of the neck, to pass them through the water into the vessel which contains the air. If I expect that the mouse will live a considerable time, I take care to put into the vessel something on which it may conveniently sit, out of the reach of the water. If the air be good, the mouse will soon be perfectly at its ease, having suffered nothing by its passing through the water. If the air be supposed to be noxious, it will be proper (if the operator be desirous of preserving the mice for further use) to keep hold of their tails, that they may be withdrawn as soon as they begin to shew signs of uneasiness; but if the air be thoroughly noxious, and the mouse happens to get a full inspiration, it may be impossible to do this before it be absolutely irrecoverable.

It was, in fact, a mouse that had the privilege of being the first being ever to breathe pure oxygen, once Priestley had extracted it from a substance known today as mercuric oxide [red calx of mercury]. As was his custom, Priestley had put the mouse in with the gas, to see how long it would continue without “uneasiness”. After half an hour, the mouse was “still vigorous,” and so he replaced it in the jar, “when,” he wrote, “I observed that it seemed to feel no shock upon being put into it, evident signs of which would have been visible, if the air had not been very wholesome; but that it remained perfectly at its case another full half hour, when I took it out quite lively and vigorous. . . .

My reader will not wonder that, after having ascertained the superior goodness of dephlogisticated air by mice living in it, I should have the curiosity to taste it myself. I have gratified that curiosity, by breathing it, drawing it through a glass-syphon. The feeling of it to my lungs was not sensibly different from that of common air; but I fancied that my breast felt peculiarly light and easy for some time afterwards. Who can tell but that, in time, this pure air may become a fashionable article in luxury. Hitherto only two mice and myself have had the privilege of breathing it.

It was as a result of his studies in the brewery that he happened upon – no doubt by that chance that men call Providence – the technique for creating carbonated beverages. He first described it in Directions for Impregnating Water with Fixed Air. He assumed that the main purpose of the technique would be for
creating, artificially, waters used for medicinal purposes, but as he noted, “By this process may fixed air be given to wine, beer, and almost any liquor whatever: and when beer is become flat or dead, it will be revived by this means.”

We also find in Priestley what was to become a staple of popular chemistry writing, instructions on how to create explosions. Speaking of the properties of oxygen, he wrote, “It may be inferred, from the very great explosions made in it, that, were it possible to fire gunpowder in it, less than a tenth part of the charge, in all cases, would suffice. I should not think it difficult to confine gunpowder in bladders, with the interstices of the grains filled with this, instead of common air; and such bladders of gunpowder might, perhaps, be used in mines, or for blowing up rocks, in digging for metals, &c.” Indeed, he wrote “I have sometimes amused myself with carrying in my pockets phials thus charged with a mixture of dephlogisticated and inflammable air [oxygen and hydrogen] confined either with common corks or ground-stopples; and I have perceived no difference in the explosion, after keeping them a long time, and carrying them to any distance.”

All these experiments made Priestley well known to natural philosophers of his day. But what made him, not famous, but notorious throughout Britain, was his association with the radical political ideas of the 1790s. He was outspoken in his support of the French Revolution, and he was cruelly caricatured during the anti-Jacobin reaction in Great Britain.

In 1791, an angry mob attacked and burned his house. Priestley and his family had been warned, and were staying with friends; by all accounts he took the total loss of his possessions, including his library and laboratory, with “saintly resignation.” We know exactly what he lost because he submitted an inventory to the government for compensation – many people know Priestley’s house was burned down, but not many know he was entitled to, and in fact received, compensation from the government. He asked for £4000, but he was given £3000, which according to one estimate translates to about $300,000 in today’s money.

He went to live in London, but three years later decided to move to Pennsylvania, where his sons had already gone as merchants and, to be accurate, land speculators. He was welcomed in Philadelphia, but his wife, Mary, disliked it, and he found it too expensive. He moved to Northumberland, at the intersection of the east and west branches of the Susquehanna, then a five days’ journey from Philadelphia. There he built a new house, library, and laboratory, as he described: “with respect both to convenience and elegance, it is superior to any house in the county, and excepting Philadelphia, and its neighbourhood, there are perhaps few that are equal to it in the whole State. Its appearance is perhaps too Aristocratical for the habitation of a Democrat. My library and philosophical apparatus are, without boasting, superior to any thing of the kind in this country, and of much more value than my house.”

Sadly his wife, who really designed the house, did not live to move into it, but Priestley lived, worked, and wrote in it for another five years after his Address to his friends and neighbors in 1799. He missed the scientific community he’d been used to, and tried to get to Philadelphia as often as his strength and the
roads allowed; he also bemoaned how hard it was to get the apparatus he needed, and how liable his glassware was to be broken en route. But he was content in Northumberland, and died there peacefully in February, 1804. “His faculties of mind, his composure, and his good temper,” wrote his colleague Thomas Cooper, “continued to the last.”

The “heirs” of his body did not long remain in America, though they seem to have kept the property in Northumberland for a few decades. His descendants were teachers, ministers, lawyers, statesmen, and writers, including Hillaire Belloc and Marie Belloc Lowndes. One of his grandsons, John Finch, visited his house in 1832:

I went to view his mansion, where the last few years of his life were passed, on the peaceful shore of the gentle Susquehanna. The garden, orchard, and lawn, extend to the side of the river. A sun-dial, which still retains its station, was presented to Dr. Priestley by an eminent mathematician in London. Two large willow-trees grow near the mansion; under their shade he often enjoyed the summer evening breeze.

His laboratory is now converted into a house for garden-tools! the furnaces pulled down! the shelves unoccupied! the floor covered with Indian corn! A stranger might be inclined to say, “Sic transit gloria philosophise.” But, when the chemist, or the historian, or the philosopher, or the divine, examine the records of the various branches of learning in which they are skilled, then will his name be honored. To this laboratory the children from the school were accustomed to come, once a week, and he would amuse them with experiments.

His intellectual heirs, indeed, can be found among all those who take the same delight in experiments. They include Jane Marcet, author of Conversations on Chemistry, which went through numerous editions from 1806 throughout the 19th century. It featured conversations between a Mrs. B and her two charges, Emily and Caroline, and taught chemistry, and chemical experiments, at a very high level, as the following dialogue will show:

**Caroline.** I long now to see some of the rapid and brilliant combustions which take place in oxygen gas. Is it difficult to procure it in a state of purity?

**Mrs B.** It is not difficult to procure it sufficiently pure to exhibit its properties.

Our first example of combustion in oxygen gas will be that of a taper, which, for convenience sake, I have attached to a piece of bent wire. I now light the taper and introduce it into the jar; and you perceive how much the flame is increased, both in size and brilliancy. If I blow out the taper, and immerse it again in the gas before the wick is entirely extinguished, it will burst into a flame with a slight explosion; and this you perceive I can repeat five or six times in succession.

**Caroline.** What a beautiful experiment! and how plainly it shows that an atmosphere of pure oxygen would not answer our purposes, although it might
make good business for the tallow-chandlers. Our candles would burn away
as fast as we could light them, and it would be of no use to blow them out, as
they would be instantaneously rekindled.

Mrs B. The metals I have told you are combustibles, and most of them may be
made to burn very readily in oxygen. I will show you the experiment of
burning iron, the combustion of which is very rapid and brilliant.

Emily. It is well that iron will not burn in atmospheric air, or I do not know of
what we should make our grates and stoves.

Mrs B. At a very elevated temperature, iron will burn in atmospheric air, as the
blacksmith sometimes learns to his cost, when he leaves it too long in his fire.
When minutely divided, it burns very readily, as you will find by dropping
some iron filings into the flame of a candle.

The usual way of burning iron in oxygen gas is to twist a piece of piano
forte wire, spirally, like a cork screw. One end of this wire is fixed into a cork
which fits the top of a receiver, and around the other end a small piece of
thread may be wound. This should be touched with wax, or sulphur, to ignite
the wire in the first instance; as the combustion cannot commence unless the
wire be red hot. This receiver is filled with oxygen, and, as you see, has its
lower end standing in water. I will now light the piece of thread and then
remove the stopper, and insert the cork in its place.

Caroline. Is there no danger of the gas escaping while you change the stoppers?

Mrs B. Oxygen gas is a little heavier than atmospheric air. It therefore will not
escape very rapidly; and if I do not leave the opening uncovered, we shall
lose but a very small quantity.

Caroline. Oh, what a brilliant and beautiful flame!

Emily. It is almost as dazzling as the sun.

Jane Marcet gave due credit to all of Priestley’s experiments on airs, calling
him the “father of pneumatic chemistry,” and also to his discovery that the red
color of the blood comes from oxygen:

Caroline. But how is this possible? Whilst the air and the blood are completely
separated from each other by a membrane, they cannot possibly come into
contact with each other.

Mrs B. Your objection is one which any, person unacquainted with the facts of
the case might fairly urge. Dr Priestley first observed that the red colour
which is so soon produced upon the surface of the blood drawn from the
veins, resulted from the action of the oxygen contained in the atmosphere;
and he ascertained that when kept from contact with this gas, it retained its
dark colour. Upon enclosing a portion of blood in a bladder, he found that the
same change was effected, notwithstanding the intervention of the membrane
between the fluid, and the oxygen of the air."

But Priestley’s “heirs” don’t just include chemists: rather they include all of
us who value those Enlightenment ideals of fellowship during the pursuit of
The hot weather coming on, when electrical experiments were not so agreeable, they put an end to them for that season, . . . in a party of pleasure on the banks of the Skuylkill. First, spirits were fired by a spark sent from side to side through the river, without any other conductor than the water. A turkey was killed for their dinner by the electrical shock, and roasted by the electrical jack, before a fire kindled by the electrified bottle, when the healths of all the famous electricians in England, Holland, France, and Germany, were drunk in electrified bumpers, under a discharge of guns from the electrical battery.

Happy would the author of this treatise be to see all the great electricians of Europe, or even those in England, upon such an occasion, and especially after having made discoveries in electricity of equal importance with those made in Philadelphia in the year referred to. With pleasure would he obey a summons to such a rendezvous, though it were to serve the illustrious company in the capacity of operator, or even in the more humble office of waiter. Cheerfulness and social intercourse do, both of them, admirably suit, and promote the true spirit of philosophy.

And so I hope you’ll agree with me that through cheerfulness, through social intercourse, through true spirit of philosophy, not to mention proximity to the mighty Susquehanna, that EC/ASECS members, and all of us here today, are the true “heirs” of Dr. Joseph Priestley.

**Works by Joseph Priestley Cited in the Paper**

*Directions for Impregnating Water with Fixed Air.* London, 1772.
*Letters to the Inhabitants of Northumberland and Its Neighbourhood.* Philadelphia, 1801.

**Works about Joseph Priestley**

Not all students of the eighteenth century may have a clear idea of Johan Zoffany’s (1733-1810) artistic range or achievement. This is largely because his paintings, engravings and mezzotints are scattered throughout the world, so that no one museum, nor indeed the museums of any one country, can provide the viewer with a comprehensive view of the artist. The recent exhibition at the Yale Center for British Art, entitled “Johan Zoffany, RA: Society Observed” (Oct. 27, 2011 – Feb. 12, 2012), free to visitors and co-sponsored by the Royal Academy of Arts, London, was therefore most welcome and should go a long way towards redressing the situation. As a significant offshoot of, and indeed important complement to, this exhibition was another on a separate floor of the gallery building, called “Adapting the Eye: An Archive of the British in India, 1770-1830.” The two exhibitions ought ideally to be reviewed together, but space constraints prevent that here.

The Zoffany exhibition consisted of nearly 70 oil paintings, as well as several drawings and prints borrowed from 45 museums and private collections in the US, Britain, Germany, France, India, Italy and Australia. It was the first in the US ever devoted to this artist and marked only the second time that his works have been thus brought together, the first being in London in 1977. It was accompanied by a fine catalogue edited by Martin Postle. What follows is my impressionistic review of selected paintings.

Born in Germany, Zoffany was early apprenticed to a sculptor in Regensburg, from where he traveled to Rome (reputedly walking the distance) in order to study art under Raphael Mengs. He returned to Germany, went back to Italy, and his restlessness finally took him to London in 1760. Arranged chronologically, the exhibition opened with his pre-London works. They are characterized by a rococo and at times high baroque style devoted to mythical or allegorical subjects. Some were very disturbing. In “Time Clipping the Wings of Eros” (1761), Eros is shown as a feminized young man and Chronos as a powerful older man with one hand on Eros’ breast. He holds what looks like a scythe with which he is about to cut off one of Eros’ enormous wings. The brute violence is palpable; a homosexual element may be discerned, and a casual passer-by might, on glancing at the work, think of it as a detail from a rape scene.

The oil painting showing a young David with the head of Goliath (1756) was equally troubling. David, muscular and handsome with a bare torso, has, however, a right hip whose curvature suggests an androgynous figure, while
Goliath’s very living head, with its expressive eyes turned towards the viewer, forms a disturbing contrast. David is holding a glans, which, as the museum notes suggest, is a visual pun, referring not only to a stony projectile such as the one that killed David but also, of course, to a part of the male anatomy, and thus reinforcing the sexual content.

Zoffany’s first decade in London, when he became friends with David Garrick, led to his second phase as a painter of theatrical conversation pieces. He portrayed Garrick several times. Thomas Gainsborough once said that the mobility of Garrick’s face and his constantly shifting expressions rendered the artist’s job difficult. Zoffany seems to have captured this mobility, for in a portrait he shows Garrick as a handsome middle-aged man, with dark, expressive eyes and a sensitive mouth which is at present closed but whose corners can turn any moment into a smile or a frown, or open to utter a speech. The dramatic tension is very appealing.

Several paintings showed Garrick and other actors and actresses on the stage, often playing Shakespeare. Perhaps viewers were most drawn to “Garrick and Mrs. Pritchard in Macbeth.” This was the actress’s last stage performance; she died shortly after the picture was completed in 1768. The museum notes said that the painting depicts the moment in Act II, Scene 2 when Macbeth has just told his wife: “I am afraid to think what I have done; / Look on’t it again, I dare not,” and she is about to say her lines about the eye of childhood that fears a painted devil. Mrs. Pritchard is shown as powerful and in control, whereas Garrick, his mouth open and eyes wide, is striking a theatrical pose that convention says should accompany a feeling of horror.

Zoffany’s paintings of the royal family marked another phase. In a 1771 portrait George III is shown sitting in his soldier’s uniform, the red coat unbuttoned, his sword and hat resting nearby on a table. He looks at the gazer with equanimity and confidence and seems unbothered either by the cares of office or his emerging double chin. He is in repose, but there is a suggestion that he is also alert and could spring up and reach for his hat and sword and go into action whenever called for. It is a sympathetic but not flattering portrait of a good and competent man rather than of a king in all his panoply.

Indeed, there was always an informality in Zoffany’s royal portraits. One picture shows George with Queen Charlotte and six of their children, and in another she sits with her two eldest sons and a dog by her side. She was so pleased by Zoffany’s work that she commissioned his trip to Italy so he could paint the Tribuna Gallery, the Uffizi’s finest room, while the king nominated him in 1768 to the newly-formed Royal Academy. Both acts were to have major implications for his art.

Membership in the Academy resulted in his painting, during 1771-72, the monumental “Portraits of the Academicians of the Royal Academy.” The Academy consisted of a total of 40 members, of whom 38 are depicted here, two in the form of their portraits on the right wall. One notable absentee is Gainsborough, who, dissatisfied with decisions of the “hanging committee,” had begun to boycott meetings of the R.A. The other members are shown scattered
around two nude male models, one of whom is sitting in a chair with right arm raised while the other sits on the dais as he undresses. The members are talking, strolling, or looking at the model in various poses and stances and all of them are easily identifiable, thanks to a key that accompanies the painting. Zoffany himself sits in the extreme left corner, palette in hand. Perhaps the most intriguing figure, about whom I would have liked more information than the exhibition provided, is a man in a Chinese hat with vaguely Oriental features and listed as Chitqua Tan. As I discovered subsequently from the National Portrait Gallery’s website, Tan Che-Qua had arrived in England from China in 1769 and set up as a modeler working with clay brought from China. Though not a member of the Royal Academy, he attended its meetings and exhibited there in 1770. In 1772 he returned to China; he is thought to have committed suicide in Canton in the 1790s.

The absent members whose pictures hang on the right wall are the two women members of the Academy, Angelica Kauffman and Mary Moser. Being women, they could not have attended Academy meetings where nude male models were being studied. No wonder Kauffman’s critics complained that she was not able to paint the human body correctly!

Gainsborough was not represented in this picture, but Zoffany was to paint him in 1772. Seen sideways, Gainsborough reveals a handsome, well formed profile with prominent nose, mouth, chin, and a high forehead, and he is shown, head uplifted, gazing into the distance with a look combining curiosity and wonder. It is a fine tribute to a friendship which did not even end in death, for Gainsborough, at his request, was buried in the same cemetery within talking distance of his old friend.

This period also saw Zoffany painting a large number of conversation pieces and formal portraits for the aristocracy and the affluent bourgeoisie. Two depict the Earl of Bute’s three sons and three daughters respectively, each set engaged in activities appropriate to its gender, and both sets clustered around an old oak tree which held special significance in the family history. The charming, slightly early (1766) family group of Lord Willoughby de Broke shows the couple and their three young children, one of them mischievously reaching out for a piece of cake on a tea table while the father playfully shakes an admonitory finger at her from his position behind his wife’s chair. “The Drummond Family” (1769) shows three generations, Drummond sitting underneath a tree with his wife and grandchildren, looking towards one granddaughter being helped on a horse by a groom while her father watches and her mother looks on from another horse. A video display next to the picture shows how there was an earlier version of the picture in which people and the horse faced in different directions, and how Zoffany skilfully cut the canvas into four, reattached the pieces and painted over them in order to create a totally different picture. The somewhat later “Sharp Family” (1779-81) is a group of several members of the family on a boat, with various people playing on musical instruments, including a black snake bassoon and flageolets, or holding up the music sheets. The painting is marked by lively coloration and an organic composition that brings into a remarkable unity a
number of sitters in various poses.

In 1772 Zoffany set out for Italy to execute Queen Charlotte’s commission, inaugurating another phase. He returned seven years later, in 1779, with a picture of the Tribuna (not included in the exhibition) that displeased the Queen, and she withdrew her patronage. He also sensed that the public was losing its taste for his conversation pieces. Always restless and adventurous, he decided to set out for India.

Arriving in 1783, he became friendly with the leading British figures, including the Governor General Warren Hastings and the Chief Justice, Sir Elijah Impey. He painted both several times. The exhibition had a charming family portrait, painted 1783-84, of the Impey family listening to music provided by a band of strolling Indian musicians to which one of Impey’s daughters is dancing in the Indian style while Sir Elijah encourages her by clapping to the music. Hastings was represented in the exhibition by one of his portraits rather than by the better-known conversation piece figuring him, his second wife and an Indian servant girl, but the portrait that was displayed was striking. With a thin, almost pinched and elongated face, but displaying both sensitivity and strength of character, and dressed informally, Hastings appears as a man of surprisingly “modern” rather than conventionally eighteenth-century appearance.

As the Impey painting suggests, relations between Indians and the British in Hastings’ time were very different from what they became after the 1857 Mutiny. In Calcutta the British had already established their rule and therefore the two races did not generally mix on equal terms. The many Indians who figure in Zoffany’s Calcutta pictures are largely servants or agents. But the British valued Indian culture, and friendships were still possible, at least in a certain age group. The conversation piece depicting the Blair family (1786-87) is a good example. The husband and wife are sitting together in their verandah, the older girl is providing music at the spinet while the younger plays with a cat that an Indian girl is holding. Though this Indian girl appears at the far end, it is unlikely that she is a servant. A little shorter than the Blair girl but with a mature face suggesting somewhat greater age and experience, she seems more a member of the family and one who is humoring a younger friend than someone in a position of inferiority, and this impression is confirmed by the fact that she and the Blair girl seem to inhabit a world of their own in which each is conscious only of the other—and the cat. Zoffany is able to suggest a complex of racial and cultural interrelationships with a subtleness and clarity that make many of his Indian paintings fraught with historical interest.

Nowhere is this more true than in his Lucknow paintings. Lucknow, the capital of Awadh, was wealthy, cosmopolitan, and cultured. A number of Europeans from different nationalities flocked there to seek service under the young Nawab Asaf-ud-daula who was fantastically rich, grossly corpulent, utterly incompetent as a ruler, given to debauchery and excess of all kinds, but also determined to attract painters and poets to his court and make the architectural wonders of his city the envy of India. Though nominally under the Mughals, Awadh was for all practical purposes an independent state where the British were
trying to get a toehold. They had succeeded in levying heavy taxes on Asaf-ud-daula, which he was trying his best not to pay. It was in order to extract money from him that Hastings made a trip there in 1784, and he invited Zoffany to come along.

In Lucknow, to which he was to return twice again, Zoffany made friends with Claud Martin, a Frenchman, and Antoine Polier, a Swiss. Both were in the Nawab’s service and were accomplished linguists and connoisseurs of Indian art. Both had Indian “bibis” or wives, wore Indian clothes while at home, and cultivated totally Indian lifestyles. Both figure in a number of Zoffany’s works. Zoffany also painted Asaf-ud-daula, the Nawab, dressed in a fine muslin upper garment such as was favored by contemporary Muslim aristocracy. In the same year, 1784, he made a portrait of Jawan Bakht, the Mughal Emperor’s eldest son, who had come to Lucknow to negotiate British help in support of his father. The sitter is shown as young, handsome, trim, eyes aglow with hope, and with a face that reflects both confidence and competence.

But Zoffany’s masterpiece of his Lucknow years, and indeed Indian years, is “Col. Mordaunt’s Cock Match,” painted between 1784 and 1787. It shows a cock fight in which the major protagonists are Col. Mordaunt, a British army officer, and Nawab Asaf-ud-daula. They are surrounded by attendants, spectators and hangers-on. Cock fights were extremely popular in Lucknow among both the Indians and British, and they drew vast throngs representing all classes of men and women. Zoffany obviously took advantage of such an event to portray different sections of Lucknow society. Mordaunt and the Nawab urge on their birds, Martin and various other Europeans sit or stand, watching the fight, talking, or engaged in different activities, some Indians are actively involved in the fight as the seconds on the two sides, others are singing or carrying on various kinds of trade. The whole scene is dynamic, colorful, and though suggesting some chaos, carefully organized and controlled by the artist. The painting shows the complex political and social dynamic that operated between the Indians and the British: it seems to be an even match, but through the cock fight power relations, political confrontations, economic activity, forms of social organization, and individual character are all suggested.

This painting was often copied. One that was hung right next to it in the exhibition was made through collaboration between English and Indian artists, but by exactly whom is unknown. There are some significant differences. Zoffany had set his scene below a canopy; the copy places it under the sun. There are fewer Englishmen in the copy than in Zoffany, and the perspective has been rather flattened out in the copy, suggesting an Indian hand. Perhaps most significantly, the figure of Polier, who is absent from Zoffany’s original, has been added to the copy. He is shown with a very European bearing, resting his right arm on the handle of a cane and sitting upright. But his whiskers definitely favor the Indian fashion, as does his head dress, and his shoes are of Indian design. His presence is representative of the hybrid culture that had begun to develop in Lucknow and which Zoffany recorded so astutely and accurately.

In 1789, 56 years old and in indifferent health, Zoffany returned to Britain
after six prolific years in India, only to find that Europe had changed. The French Revolution had begun. A monarchist and as one who had been honored by Maria Theresa, he was horrified by its excesses. The exhibition closed with two of his late pictures, both dated 1794, one showing the massacre of the Swiss guards and the other the plundering of the king’s cellar in Paris. Both show violence and chaos in horrific detail. In the former, mutilated dead bodies litter the ground. In the lower left foreground there is a slaughtered family with mother and child, next to whom their faithful dog sits desolately. People carry heads on pikes. To the right a Jew bargains with a soldier over a Swiss guard’s coat. The exhibition notes call this an example of Zoffany’s anti-Semitism. I am not so sure. With so many trades and professions closed to the Jews, they had perforce to take to occupations that others would regard with loathing or contempt. If a Jew is in the middle of a carnage trying to buy a dead soldier’s uniform, it is not that he is acting despicably but rather that he is earning an honest day’s bread by doing something that he has been forced into. Is this anti-Semitism, or is it rather Zoffany’s comment on an anti-Semitic society?

The exhibition makes an overall assessment of Zoffany possible for the first time in the U.S. He comes across as a constantly evolving artist, a fine story teller who narrated the lives of the upper classes with psychological insight while also capturing the nuances of a foreign culture and depicting subtle and shifting racial and cultural interrelationships. The astuteness with which he delineated a wide range of characters, combined with his strong story line, makes him a great novelist in paint. Fond of large, crowded canvases, and a masterful colorist, he often painted actual scenes but peopled them with characters who were not necessarily there but could well have been, thus heightening realism. To these qualities he added a penchant for theatrical melodrama and a voyeuristic interest in scenes of violence and sexuality, while his several self-portraits show him to be worldly, with a smile lurking just underneath a staid exterior and ready willingness to laugh, mostly at himself. He is a complex artist indeed, in whom the Yale exhibition will inspire renewed interest.

Flushed, New York (bsingh1029@aol.com)

**Mathew Carey: A Transatlantic Figure, A Transatlantic Discussion**

by Molly O’Hagan Hardy

The conference “Ireland, America, and the Worlds of Mathew Carey” brought scholars from Ireland and the United States together to discuss the many facets of this transatlantic figure (27-29 Oct. in Philadelphia and 17-19 Nov. in Dublin). Reversing the arc of Carey’s own life, the conference moved from the McNeil Center for Early American Studies and the Library Company of
Philadelphia to the National Library of Ireland and Trinity College Dublin. Carey made the reverse journey at the age of 24 to escape British officials after his seditious *Volunteers Journal* (1783-84) caught their attention. In his *Autobiography* (1834), Carey reports he made the journey disguised “in female dress,” in which he “must have cut a very gawkey [sic] figure.”

Born to middle-class Catholics in 1760, Carey had the privileges of a good education, though, as a Catholic, he could not take a degree at Trinity College. His father objected to apprenticing him with a printer, but by 1775, Carey was working for Thomas McDonnell, one of the most radical Irish printers of the period. Carey first caught the attention of British officials with *The Urgent Necessity of an Immediate Repeal of the Whole Penal Code* (1781). To avoid capture, Carey was sent to Paris by his father, and it was there that Carey met Benjamin Franklin. He worked for Franklin’s press at Passy and then for the famous Parisian printing house Didot. In about 1782, Carey returned to Dublin, where he became “conductor” of *The Freeman’s Journal*, the most radical newspaper of the day until, three years later, Carey started his own newspaper, *The Volunteer’s Journal*, the endeavor that would necessitate a permanent emigration from Ireland. A few weeks after landing in Philadelphia, Carey received a check for $400 from his French friend General Lafayette; through his introduction by Franklin, Carey had impressed Lafayette as a young radical who knew how to manipulate the power of the pen, and moreover, the press. In Philadelphia, Carey bought the printing equipment of recently deceased Robert Bell, the very press on which Thomas Paine’s *Common Sense* (1776) was first printed. Carey’s purchase of Bell’s equipment speaks in part to the legacy that Carey would bring with him and in part to his inheritance from predecessors in his new nation. M. Pollard describes Robert Bell as noteworthy for bringing with him to America the Dublin principle that copyright of English booksellers did not hold in other places, and practicing this with cheap reprints. Combining the Dublin principle with a keen sense of the zeitgeist of the new republic for the next fifty years, Carey established himself as one of the most influential printers and polemicists in the United States.

In his welcoming remarks, the Library Company’s James N. Green asked the audience to consider whether Carey was a founder. Green pointed out that Carey certainly shared one quality with the founders: ever enigmatic, Carey is as hard to pin down as Jefferson, Franklin, et al, on the questions that faced the new nation. Borrowing from Roslyn Remer’s insight in *Printers and Men of Capital* (1996), Green observed the tension that those who have worked on Carey have noted—a tension between cooperation and competition—reflect the paradox of the book trade itself in the period. Green concluded by describing Carey in the parlance of his time, as a man of incredible passion who had mixed success in regulating those passions.

The next morning in his plenary address, Maurice Bric posed a question that remained on the table for the rest of the conference: How did Carey’s experience in Ireland shape his understanding of American publishing, politics and culture? Bric asked this question in relation to Carey’s *The Urgent Necessity*
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of an Immediate Repeal of the Whole Penal Code (1781), which became the sort of urtext of the conference. Bric identified “oligarchy” as Carey’s primary concern in the pamphlet and looked at how Carey targeted oligarchy in the American context, specifically in his exchanges with William Cobbett. The panels that followed were as varied as the career of a ceaseless scribbler of nearly 50 years. Topics such as politics, economics, religion, and print culture reflected the fact that Carey, to borrow a description from Samuel Blodget, was like “the proboscis of a noble elephant,” surveying the landscape all around him.

University of Pennsylvania’s Rare Book and Manuscript Library’s Lynne Farrington and John Pollack brought a number of treasures to the McNeil Center on the second afternoon of the conference. After a day of riveting discussion, conference participants were reinvigorated by this jaw-dropping show of Carey’s “stuff.” Some of Carey’s most impressive publishing ventures were featured, including his ambitious A New System of Modern Geography (1794-95), which Richard Sher would discuss at length in his plenary address in Dublin. Carey’s catalogues of books reflect the innovations he made in the bookselling and distribution business in early America. Also an influential newspaper and magazine publisher, Carey’s massive non-book publishing were represented in issues of his Independent Gazetteer and American Magazine. The bulk of Carey’s correspondence are housed at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, but the University of Pennsylvania’s Rare Book and Manuscript Library does hold some of his correspondence with luminaries of his day. Farrington and Pollack displayed a few of these letters, including those to Benjamin Rush, Isaac Wayne, and Richard Penn Smith.

In the spirit of the conference, this display reflected the contradictory and paradoxical nature of Carey. While many of the items mark some of the greatest publishing accomplishments in the early United States, Carey’s most contentious and contested authoring and publishing venture was also displayed, his Short Account of the Yellow Fever (1793). In this pamphlet, Carey angered his fellow committee members; the committee had been formed “to attend to and alleviate the sufferings of the afflicted with the malignant fever,” and Carey’s copyrighted pamphlets upended the committee’s plans to issue a public report on the crisis. Carey also criticized the African Americans of Philadelphia. The question of Carey’s perspectives on race percolated throughout the conference. Carey held contradictory positions on the status of African American in the new republic, and one wonders if his understanding of himself as a racialized subject in colonial Ireland influenced his perspectives and actions in Philadelphia.

The Dublin half of the conference kicked off weeks later at the National Library of Ireland. In his plenary address, Richard Sher asked if Carey’s publishing practices were best understood as “Piracy or Patriotic Publishing?” Outlining the central debate about competitive reprinting as one between inferior quality of production versus affordable consumption, Sher posited a theory of “heroic reprinting,” in which Carey’s influences include “rich traditions of Scottish and Irish justifications of reprinting on the basis of appeals to public utility rather than to law or needs of the trade.” To answer this question, Sher
looked at how the Dublin printing “pirates” John Chambers and James Williams influenced Carey’s reprints of William Guthrie’s *A New System of Modern Geography*, and Oliver Goldsmith’s *An History of the Earth, and Animated Nature* (1795).

Following the spirit of Sher’s plenary address, the Dublin conference examined Carey’s experiences as a printer and publisher. Sarah Arendt looked at the motivations behind Carey’s bookshop in Baltimore, which Carey writes in a letter he would like to call his “Bible Warehouse.” Carl Keyes looked at innovations in Carey’s advertising practices in his newspapers and magazines, and I showed how Carey, Richard Allen, and Absalom Jones used copyright claims to stake authority in their pamphlet war of 1794. Despite spending less than a third of his life in Ireland, Carey was influenced by what he experienced there: from his defense of protectionism and staunch patriotism to his magazine formats and his “heroic reprinting” practices.

In the two days that followed at Trinity College Dublin’s Long Room Hub, a number of papers focused on Carey’s milieu in Dublin, showing that the trajectory of Carey’s life was not unique, though the particularities of his certainly were. Papers examined other Irish radicals of the period, including George Douglas, Matthias O’Conway, and Peter Finnerty. Many papers examined Carey’s positions in his first newspaper, *Volunteers Journal*, including James Kelly’s close reading of it and Tim Murtagh’s comparison of it to William Paulet Carey’s own radical newspaper. William Paulet Carey received more than a little attention, as Niall Gillespie gave a paper on him in the “House of Carey” panel. On that same panel, Jim Green explained why Carey and Benjamin Franklin were more at odds than we might imagine them to be. Participants also considered how Carey’s perspectives changed when he crossed the Atlantic: an ardent separatist in Ireland, he would staunchly defend the union of his newfound nation in the Nullification Crisis of 1832.

The idea of a Carey biography kept coming up at the conference, but it seems that, despite the firmament of 18th-century specialists in attendance in Philadelphia and Dublin, no one feels qualified to write his life. The fact that a biography of Carey has not been written speaks volumes about him. The multiple disciplinary specialists at the conference and the dual locations of the conference are indeed representative of the many worlds that Mathew Carey has left us.

Mellon Writing Fellow / Southwestern University

*Author’s note:* The conference was sponsored by The McNeil Center for Early American Studies, the Library Company of Philadelphia, the Program in Early American Economy and Society, and the University of Pennsylvania Libraries, The Centre for Irish-Scottish and Comparative Studies at Trinity College Dublin, The Trinity Long Room Hub, University College Dublin, the University of Aberdeen, and the National Library of Ireland.
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The Melvyn and Joan New Collection of Sterne and Sterniana at Florida

Melvyn New and Joan New have donated some 500 titles (in 850 volumes) to the University of Florida Special Collections. The collection centers around Laurence Sterne, whose works have been edited for the Florida Edition of Sterne by Melvyn New with his wife Joan and others. When combined with the Sterne materials that Melvyn New induced the librarians to purchase during his forty-three years at the University of Florida, it constitutes the most valuable holdings for the study of Sterne west of Shandy Hall (in Coxwold, Yorkshire) and east of the ECCO. The collection is a working one, deficient in first editions but pursuing titles that Sterne might have read, and pursuing hobby-historical interests, as with John Norris of Bemerton, William Collins (31 different editions), John Hall-Stevenson, and, of course, Sterne himself (e.g., more than 50 different editions of Sentimental Journey). Also donated are the scholarly papers produced over a lifetime working on Sterne. From Mel New’s inventory notes prepared for the library, we reprint the following details on the collection:

Sterne’s Works: Among the items are two lifetime sets of all nine volumes of Tristram Shandy (1760-67), including one containing the very rare concealed and unsigned second editions of volumes 7-8; volumes 1 and 2 are the first London edition (UF library has a set containing the York first edition). A second set contains the concealed second edition of volume 4. There are first (a subscriber’s—Lord Porchester’s—copy), second, and third editions of Sentimental Journey (1768), and a large-paper copy (one of 150) of the first edition as well. The seven volumes of sermons are also first editions; other sets include the 2nd and 3rd eds. of 1 and 2. The first and second editions of Lydia Medalle’s Letters (1775, 1776) are included, along with several versions of Letters from Yorick to Eliza, and William Combe’s two imitations, Sterne’s Letters to His Friends (1775) and Original Letters of the Late Reverend Mr. Laurence Sterne (1788). Numerous sets of Collected Works, include 1783 (10 vols.), 1788 (10 vols.), 1790 (8 vols.), 1803 (Edinburgh, 8 vols.), 1803, 1808 (4 vols.), 1815 (4 vols.), 1823 (6 vols.), 1894, ed. Saintsbury (6 vols.), 1904, ed. Cross (12 vols.), 1926-27 Shakespeare Head edition. Finally, there are several editions of the Beauties of Sterne (1782), 3rd ed. (1782), 5th ed. (1782), etc., and a beautiful set of colored plates, Humourous Illustrations to the Works of Sterne (1888), among the many illustrations in the Sterne texts themselves.

Subsequent publications of Tristram include a French translation (1785), scarce separate London editions of 1786, 1793, 1798, 1803, 1832. Some 20 additional editions are included, the Golden Cockerel Press and Arion Press editions among them. There are also modern editions in German, Italian, Spanish, Russian, and Japanese. Subsequent editions of Sentimental Journey number some 54 different versions, in French, German, Italian, many illustrated, and several bound with the Continuation, at times attributed to John Hall-Stevenson, but probably the work of another hand. And there are first and second editions of
John Ferriar’s Illustrations of Sterne.

Sources and Analogues: Among the works thought to have played a part in Sterne’s own writings: Addison, Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, etc. (1745 ed.); Allemire, Whole Duty (1673); the anonymous Life of James, Late Duke of Ormonde (1747); several contemporary editions of Aristotle’s Masterpiece (and one 19th-century edition, almost certainly the one Bloom fondles at a Dublin bookstand); Francis Bacon, Historie of Life and Death (1638); Blackwell, Sacred Classics (1725); Brown, Estimate (1757); Gilbert Burnet, Some Letters, Containing an Account of... Travelling through Switzerland, Italy, etc. (1687); John Burton (Dr. Slop), Genuine and True Journal of the Most Miraculous Escape of the Young Chevalier (1749); Butler, Hudibras, annotated by Grey (1764) and Genuine Remains (1759); Motteux, Don Quixote, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1766); Works of Charles Churchill, 2 vols. (1763); Cibber, Apology (1740), Crebillion, Les Égaremens du Coeur et de l’Esprit (1779); James Douglas, Travelling Anecdotes, 3rd ed. (1786); Erasmus, Familiar Colloques, trans. N. Bailey, 2nd ed. (1733); Flanders Delineated (1745); Thomas Goulard, Effects of... Lead (1770); Locke, Thoughts Concerning Education (1710); Longinus, On the Sublime, trans. by William Smith (1739); John Millard, Gentleman’s Guide in his Tour through France, 9th ed. (1787); Le Fevre de Morsan, Manners and Customs of the Romans (1740); Rabelais, Works, trans. by Urquart and Ozell, new ed. (1750); Rapin de Thoyras, History of England, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (1732-33); James Ray, Complete History of the Rebellion (1749); James Ridley [ESTC notes the author is Sir Charles Morrell], The Schemer; Or, Universal Satirist (1763); Rochefoucault, Moral Maxims (1749); Thomas Sheridan, Course of Lectures on Elocution (1762); William Smellie, Theory and Practice of Midwifery, 2nd ed. (1752); John Spencer, De Legibus Hebraeorum Ritualibus, 2 vols., 3rd ed. (1705); Stanley, History of Philosophy, 4th ed. (1743); Steele, Christian Hero, 2nd ed. (1701); Swift, Tale of a Tub, 5th ed. (1710) and Three Sermons (1744); William Temple, Works, 4 vols. (1754); Philip Thicknesse, Observations on the Customs and Manners of the French Nation (1766); James MacKenzie, Essays and Meditations 2nd ed. (1768), and his History of Health, 2nd ed. (1759); and Robert Burton, Anatomy of Melancholy, 5th ed. (1638).

Imitations and imitators: These include a German translation of Richard Griffith’s Posthumous Works, including the Koran (1771--also in several 19th-century English editions of Works), many works by Hall-Stevenson, including his Works, 3 vols. (1795), Two Lyric Epistles (1760), Crazy Tales (1762, 1769, 1780, 1894), A Pastoral Cordial (1763), Makarony Fables, 2nd ed. (1768, 1897). Also Yorick’s Skull, or College Oscitations, 2nd ed. (1777), Isaac Brandon’s Fragments, 2nd ed. (1798), Life and Opinions of Bertram Montfichet (1761), Sentimental Journey. Intended as a Sequel to Mr. Sterne’s (Southampton, 1793), Sterne’s Maria: A Pathetic Story (1800).

Sets: Some useful sets include Barrow’s Sermons, 7 vols. (1831), The Works of Fielding, ed. Maynadier, 6 vols. (1920), and another Works, 10 volumes, ed. James P. Browne (1871); Browne’s ed. of Sterne’s Works, 4 vols. (1871), Works of Goldsmith, 12 vols., ed. Peter Cunningham, (1900), Works of


Miscellaneous: Colley Cibber, Letter to Mr. Pope (1742) and his Another Occasional Letter to Mr. Pope (1744), 31 eds. of William Collins, including 1771, 1775, 1776, 1787, 1788, 1798 (illus., with Johnson’s Preface), Francis Fawkes, Idylliums of Theocritus (1767) and Works of Anacreon, Sappho, et al. (1760), Henry More, Divine Dialogues (1743), and Poems (1787), Richardson, Collection of the Moral and Instructive Sentiments, etc. (1755), and Sir Charles Grandison. (1753-54), Elizabeth Rowe, Miscellaneous Works, 2 vols. (1739), Ignatius Sancho, Letters, 5th ed. (1803), Edward Young, Love of Fame (1752).
Carla Mulford Awarded Bibliographical Society of America’s 2011 Mitchell Prize

At its January 2012 meeting, The Bibliographical Society of America awarded the fourth triennial William L. Mitchell Prize for Bibliography or Documentary Work on Early British Periodicals or Newspapers to Carla Mulford, Associate Professor of English at Penn State University (University Park, PA). Her winning publication, “Benjamin Franklin’s Savage Eloquence: Hoaxes from the Press at Passy, 1782,” was published in *The Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 152, no. 4 (December 2008), 490-530. This fourth competition involved publications from 2008-2010, drawing a number of fine submissions, each a competitive submission. All three anonymous judges agreed that Carla Mulford’s essay deserved a first-place ranking.

“Benjamin Franklin’s Savage Eloquence: Hoaxes from the Press at Passy, 1782” concerns the printing, distribution, rhetorical strategy, and impact of Franklin’s bogus *Supplement to the Boston Independent Chronicle*, no. 705, dated 12 March 1782. In its distributed, second impression, this single-leaf extra contained two principal texts by Franklin that purport to be by others. On the front is a report by an American Captain, Samuel Gerrish, on his capturing a cargo of human scalps taken in recent years “by the Senneka Indians from the Inhabitants of the Frontiers,” with incriminating documentation transcribed within the article (including an Indian’s note asking that the scalps be sent “over the Water to the great King” with the starving Indians’ request for better treatment). The second item, not present in the undistributed first printing of the hoax as a single-sided broadside, was a purported letter by John Paul Jones to the British administrator Sir Joseph Yorke, who had previously failed to honor a prisoner exchange agreement with Jones and had written disparaging testimonies regarding Jones and the related events. To fill out the pages of the paper, the hoax also contains advertisements typical of the *Boston Independent Chronicle*.

Dr. Mulford first discusses Franklin’s printing of the hoax within the context of his press operations at Passy, France, where he had his own press, well supplied with type, set up for printing various governmental documents. As Dr. Mulford describes the *Supplement*, it contained six different fonts, one of which was solely designed for Franklin’s use, but several were more common and better suited to producing an issue that credibly resembled the Boston newspaper. On 22 April and repeatedly in the several months that followed, Franklin sent the fraudulent *Supplement* to John Adams, John Jay, Charles-Guillaume-Frédéric, an agent in the Netherlands, and to the Moravian leader James Hutton, indicating his desire to see the issue’s articles reprinted in the London papers. Dr. Mulford argues that Franklin sought to cast shame upon the British employment of Indians and its harsh treatment of American sailors as rebels, not as prisoners of war. Dr. Mulford closely interprets the two articles in terms of Franklin’s persuasive appeal to the British public, hoping thereby to increase the likelihood of British reparations to the injured and a speedier release of American sailors. The letter on Indians’ scalping colonists was extracted in *Parker’s General Advertiser* of 29
June 1782, and the Jones letter appeared in the Public Advertiser of 27 September 1782. Dr. Mulford stresses the “savage” force of Franklin’s attack on savage British behavior. She also attends to the continued life of the first article (on the harvest of scalps) soon printed in American newspapers and reprinted at least 34 times, well into the nineteenth century, when it had the unintended effect of justifying hostilities to American Indians. The essay concludes with an appendix of “Nineteenth-Century Newspaper Re-Publications of the Supplement.”

The judges all commended Dr. Mulford’s work for detailed examination of Franklin’s press at Passy and the physical features of the Supplement, including attention to typography and paper, and to the varying settings of the Supplement. In the words of one of the judges, “The evidence she gives for Franklin’s font use, and his establishment of his press at Passy, where she is at pains to establish a correct provenance for the piece as a hoax, adds to the depth and value of her analysis.” All three judges praised her discoveries regarding the distribution and republication of the Supplement. Of this second objective, one judge remarked, “I especially appreciated her account of this piece’s republication, as that gives her article a genuine place as a study of the newspaper; the Supplement becomes more than a one-off broadside in her hands.” And, thirdly, they were impressed by her rhetorical and political analysis of the two texts, offering, as another remarked, “new insights into the thought and work of the world’s most famous printer-intellectuals.” One judge summed up her achievement: Dr. Mulford "displays a remarkable knowledge and control of the vast Franklin materials, primary and secondary, along with an excellent, precise bibliographical approach. A rare combination."

Professor Mulford took her Ph.D. in English at the U. of Delaware, writing (and editing) “Joel Barlow’s Letters, 1775-1788” under the direction of J. A. Leo Lemay. She was an assistant professor at Villanova prior to moving to Penn State in 1986. A member of the American Antiquarian Society, Dr. Mulford is a distinguished Franklin scholar but has an extraordinary command of early American literature in general. A very experienced editor, she has edited John Leacock’s The First Book of the American Chronicles of the Times, 1774-75 (1987), the Poems of Annis Boudinot Stockton (1995), William Hill Brown’s The Power of Sympathy (1789) and Hannah Webster Foster’s The Coquette (1797). And she has edited several anthologies of early American literature, including Early American Writings for Oxford UP (2002). She has also edited a number of scholarly collections, including The Cambridge Companion to Benjamin Franklin (2009), Teaching the Literature of Early America (1999), and Finding Colonial Americas: Essays Honoring J. A. Leo Lemay (2001). In addition, she has contributed a score of essays to journals and books. In recent years Dr Mulford has been writing the book “Benjamin Franklin and the Ends of Empire,” a revisionist cross-disciplinary study of Franklin’s writings on trade, populations, race, and empire.

The Mitchell Prize for Research on Early British Serials was endowed to honor William L. Mitchell, former librarian at the Kenneth Spencer Research
The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer, March 2012

Library at the University of Kansas, where he was curator of the Richmond P. and Marjorie N. Bond Collection of 18th-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals and of the Edmund Curl Collection. The late Alexandra Mason, long the Spencer Librarian, spearheaded the establishment of the award’s endowment, to which she was the principal donor. The Prize serves as an encouragement to scholars engaged in bibliographical scholarship on 18th-century periodicals published in English or in any language but within the British Isles and its colonies and former colonies. The next Mitchell Prize competition has the deadline of 30 Sept. 2014 and will consider works (including theses, articles, books, and electronic resources) published after 31 Dec. 2010. The competition is open to all without regard to membership, nationality, and academic degree or rank, requiring little more of applicants than the submission of a short CV and three copies of printed work (or one electronic copy). For information (and an account of former prize-winning essays), see the Society's website (www.bibsocamer.org) and Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America. Questions can be directed to James E. May, the prize’s coordinator: jem4@psu.edu / English / Penn State U.--DuBois / College Place / DuBois, PA 15801.


The fourth in Pickering & Chatto’s Chawton House Library Series, Sarah Harriet Burney’s The Romance of Private Life (1839) is a useful addition to the Library’s series of works by lesser-known women writers. Much more is known about Burney’s father, musicologist Charles Burney, and her famous half-sister Frances Burney, and this addition to our knowledge of the larger Burney family, as well as another woman writer of the period, is invaluable.

Editor Lorna Clark has done a masterful job of resurrecting a work that further illuminates the world of women’s fiction in the early nineteenth century. Her enthusiasm for her subject is evident, and infectious. As Clark argues in her introduction, the text itself also stands as an interesting example of family romance with elements of the Gothic, including kidnapping, murder, Continental travels, and larger issues of identity. Originally in three volumes, the text includes two tales: The Renunciation and The Hermitage. The Renunciation follows a young heroine from the time of her abduction from England and through changes of scene, name, and identities as the heroine escapes and establishes herself as a self-sufficient portrait-painter (surpassing, as Clark notes, the failed attempts at independent artistry by the heroine of Frances Burney’s final novel, The Wanderer [1814]). The tale ends with the family identity, love, and fortune returned, in ways that would become increasingly formulaic in the later nineteenth century.

The Hermitage is decidedly Gothic in tone, featuring a love triangle and a mysterious (and bloody) death. Clark’s introduction convincingly argues for The
*Hermitage's* parallels to Wilkie Collins's *The Moonstone* and shades of George Eliot's *Adam Bede,* but is on less sure ground when claiming Burney here "ushers in a new form of fiction" (xxiii). It is important to note that the origins of the detective story predate Collins and the stories of Edgar Allan Poe, but William Godwin's *Caleb Williams* predates all of these texts and has been more persuasively connected to the earlier origins of detective fiction.

It is not always clear who this series is designed for: the binding and cost of the average Pickering & Chatto volume (and this one is no exception) makes it both physically and financially tricky to incorporate into classroom teaching, though the material itself would be an excellent addition to courses on the Gothic, women's travel and work, or the early origins of detective fiction. Indeed, the notes seem better calculated to a more widely-circulated Broadview edition. In this volume, the apparatus does not wholly clarify the sense of best audience. While the bulk of the endnote material is incredibly well-researched and useful, some notes seem almost too basic for the likely audience (a note on the use of the phrase "the sublime and beautiful," for example). It is to be regretted that the tales will not see such a comparatively wide circulation, as Clark has created a readable and useful modern edition.

Emily Friedman
Auburn University


This very welcome biography gathers up a surprising amount of scholarly notes on and book references to the important early American printer and newspaper publisher William Parks, and then adds new documentary evidence to the pile. To tell the story (and that it is a good narrative is one of the book's strengths), Professor A. Franklin Parks has truly had to produce a transatlantic study, not only because the materials of production and the information communicated involve British and American relations but because Parks the printer worked in both worlds. William Parks was one of Maryland's first public printers and Virginia's first, pushing open a door previously locked, but he was also an apprentice in Worcester, the first printer and/or newspaper printer in Ludlow, Hereford, and Reading, and also a newspaper printer in London before sailing to Annapolis. The biographer has had to learn a good deal about English literature and print culture, especially that related to provincial newspapers, and then again learn about the economic and political history of Maryland and Virginia. Few know much about all the sorts of history that Frank Parks surveys: the student of British printing history will gain much insight into the early colonial print-trade, Americanists will learn British background and roots of
America’s printers, and economic, literary and political historians will discover many useful facts in this printer’s career in Annapolis and Williamsburg.

The biography provides a jargon-free overview of a printer’s trade and life, starting with apprenticeship, and it covers such specializations as book binding, for Parks as a provincial and then colonial printer had to be able to perform and supervise a diversity of related crafts and trades—in his twenties back in England Parks had styled himself a “typographer.” Parks’ typographical style is discussed, aided by the book’s many illustrations. More might be said here to stress the superior quality of Parks’ printing from his first book in 1720: his books meet the standards of those from major contemporary London presses, and he had a mature taste in graphic design such that his title-pages look like those produced decades later. Given all his government and newspaper publications, his book output is impressive, over 140 entries in the ESTC, some quite substantial in length. Of course, much of his trade involved job printing like handbills and forms for receipts, and printers in Parks’ circumstances were also booksellers and stationers: his shops offered the sorts of stationery materials one would have expected (religious and school literature, sealing wax, ink and paper, etc.—the biographer details some of this as with the merchant Colonel Thomas Jones’s inventory of purchases in 1732-35). In Williamsburg, as Calhoun Winton has noted, Parks would open a bookstore in 1742 that was contracted to provide the College of William & Mary with books. The biography is attentive to all the revenue streams, particularly to advertising (which Parks’ papers never enjoyed near so much of as did the London papers), and to taxes and their impact (such as discouraging advertisements leading to six-page newspapers during those years after the 1712 Stamp Act when they could be classed as pamphlets and thus pay a lesser tax). Frequently the biographer has had to deal with Parks’ finances, as in his real estate purchases, accounts with Franklin, and the settlement of his estate.

Readers will be glad to get to know William Parks. He is an engaging and interesting man, a man of vision who enlightened two colonies, while succeeding in a more humdrum daily regimen that employed many people and moved his family up the ladder of gentility (his granddaughter would marry Patrick Henry—there is an appendix on Parks’s family history). He helps us take better measure of Benjamin Franklin, to whom Frank Parks often compares William Parks. Both were printers, apprenticed before puberty, who moved to more thriving regions to set up networked shops. Both grew by cultivating connections with political structures and leaders, both profited from the improvements in civil society, like paper currency, public mail, and increased public discourse that they helped generate. They sometimes acted in concert, with Franklin handling Parks’s accounts (paying bills in the north), loaning him money, and helping him find people to build Parks’ Williamsburg paper mill and the resources (like rages) to run it. Also, they printed books that the other had first published.

At age 11 or 12, Parks was apprenticed to Stephen Bryan, printer of The Worcester Post-Man, who had been apprenticed in London to Bennet Griffin and then Lewis Thomas (freed June 1706). After Parks’ apprenticeship and about a year as a journeyman, early in 1719, Parks settled in Ludlow, near his childhood
home, founded in October The Ludlow Post-Man, or Weekly Journal, which ran for 22 issues, and married two months later (here and elsewhere Frank Parks corrects accounts by Llewelyn C. Lloyd, Thomas Wright, and the several others who’ve written on William Parks). The biographer is very attentive to the presence of Parks’ early English associates in the subscription list for the 1733 Collection of Virginia laws. In a few years he moved family and business briefly to Hereford, where he published several books, one a Welsh translation by dissenting minister Benjamin Meredith of John Bunyan’s Jerusalem Sinner Saved and then to Reading, where he initiated The Reading Mercury (8 July 1723) in partnership with David Kinnier, a less experienced printer only freed in September 1722. Then, while Kinnier continued on, Parks moved to London, establishing the Half-Penny London Journal, in association with John Lightbody (thrice a week, beginning 18 October 1724). Besides the usual news borrowed from other papers, it includes spoof epistles and other elements of the essay periodical and scientific discussions after the fashion initiated by John Dunton’s Athenian Mercury three decades earlier. In early 1725 when Parks’ name disappears from the Half-Penny London Journal, he was presumably in negotiations with the Maryland Assembly or colony’s governor, and in March 1726 he was in Annapolis proposing payment for printing laws and proceedings with the two houses of the legislature (e.g., 2000 pounds of tobacco per session per year, etc.). The negotiations were complicated by the tensions between the two houses of the legislature, the lower house being the more eager to see the public informed about laws and government policies and regulations. Scholars should find particularly useful the account here and elsewhere of Parks’ relation to two or three “bosses” in Maryland and Virginia.

Park applied to the Virginia Council to be its public printer several years after establishing himself in Annapolis. In March 1731 Parks stopped publishing the Maryland Gazette while setting up his Williamsburg business and then produced the Maryland Gazette Reviv’d for two more years, beginning in December 1732, in the first year with the assistance of Edmund Hall (from 1735-1745 Annapolis had no newspaper until Parks’ replacement, Jonas Greene, started one in 1745). For over eight years, beginning in July 1731, Parks was the public printer for both Maryland and Virginia, riding and ferrying 120 miles between shops. He now, of course, had two venues for selling much of his merchandise and could buy paper and the like in greater quantity. In various ways, he tried to profit from owning two shops, such as by making certain that Grew’s Maryland almanac in 1732 “applied to Virginia as well.” If helping create interest in Maryland’s poets had sold newspapers and books (such as Ebenezer Cooke’s The Maryland Muse [1731] and Richard Lewis’s Carmen Seculare [1732]), then he would try to produce a Virginian miscellany. He recognized that the colonists took interest in foreign news, particular wars, and slave revolts. All the newspaper story-ideas that had worked in Maryland (or back in England) might be tried with improvements in the weekly Virginia Gazette, begun 6 August 1736. Frank Parks thinks, for instance, that the “Monitor” essay series in Virginia is less prone to reprint earlier material and more prone to the
“reformation of public morality in a jocular tone” after the fashion of The Tatler. In various ways, Parks’ success in Maryland provided a template for his success in Virginia. He bought land and established a post office in both colonies. Eventually, after playing catch up at the two print shops, it was apparent that he couldn’t produce the publications needed in Maryland (he fell behind in 1735-36), and the Assembly, dissatisfied by 1737, allowed “his seven-year contract . . . to expire in 1740.”

Frank Parks qualifies Thomas Jefferson’s characterization of the Virginia Gazette as a government organ, showing that Parks could stand up for himself and principles before hostile overseers, but the biography does not show him much engaged in advocacy journalism or ever a martyr to press freedom. His arrest by the House of Burgesses in 1749 for printing in the Virginia Gazette the lower house’s summary of a dispute with the Burgesses (who wished to “inspect the Council’s journals” regarding a division of two counties) did not cost him much. He had hesitated to print the account for months, and he was released upon the Council’s admission that he was indeed ordered to print it. Previously he had steadily received praise from the government and pay increases. He wished to publish both sides of disputes. More often, we see him pushing against, even overstepping, popular morality and tastes. Sometimes he republished and probably wrote humorous pieces that risked offending the populace or a segment of it, and at other times he pushed, as Franklin and other Enlightenment figures did, for inclusive, thoughtful discourse in politics and religion (recognizing doubt as no sin in itself, publishing defenses of the Maryland Assembly’s reduction in tithes to the clergy, etc). If Parks overstepped, he apologized; if others did, that led to submissions for a controversy that sold papers. Chapter 11 looks in particular at “controversies involving the Virginia legislature [that] spilled over to the press . . . during the late 1730s.” Several involve the export and inspection of tobacco, and one concerns the former governor Alexander Spotswood’s failure for over ten years to purchase arms for Brunswick County with appropriated funds, with exchanges in the Gazette between Spotswood and Sir John Randolph, speaking for the House of Burgesses. There were a fair number of religious controversies that also led to pamphlets and newspaper articles and letters—several of which concern itinerant preachers of the “New Light,” outside the synod of established churches, not always well received by the local clergy and parishes—Whitefield’s second visit through the Williamsburg area led to strong pro and con letters in the Gazette of 10 October 1745.

Certainly, too, even in the English newspapers produced in his twenties, he tried to cultivate interest in the mathematics and the sciences, as by question-and-answer pieces and the announcement of natural events and discoveries (the diving bell for undersea work). Parks and his readers shared particular interest in medicine, with his newspapers attentive to inoculations, tar water, and, in three issues early in 1739 a memorial biography on the accomplishments of Dr. Herman Boerhaave, and Parks’ books included Virginian John Tennent’s Every Man His Own Doctor, 1734) and Essay on the Pleurisy (1736), the illness that would take the printer’s life on his voyage from England. When Tennant’s
snakeroot cure was contested, this only led to newspaper exchanges. Above all, Parks promoted reading, writing, and education in the broadest sense. The biographer provides much summary of the contents of Parks’ newspapers and other publications as well, and these materials are often discussed as reflections of readers’ interest or at least the printer’s sense of such. The closest attention to printer-reader relations occurs in Frank Parks’ coverage of the inaugural issues of the newspapers, where the printer/publisher spelled out his emphasis, intent, and limits, promising to avoid violations of privacy, injury to individuals, and irresponsible provocations, and inviting submissions of poetry, news, and public comment.

Parks’s papers often employ lengthy front-page essays, in which from his first newspaper he was influenced by Addison and Steele’s periodical essays, in characters, structure, tone, topic, and purpose. The biographer, sometimes with the aid of earlier scholars, has located the source for many unsigned articles in Parks’ newspapers--William Parks at times justified his failure to attribute pieces with the claim that he was forcing readers to make their own evaluations. Common sources are The Tatler, The Spectator, Grub-Street Journal, and Nicholas Amhurst’s opposition semi-weekly The Craftsman, and for many essay in his “Plain Dealer” series on founding the Maryland Gazette, Ambrose Philips’s periodical The Free Thinker (1718). Often the materials involve anecdotes or character sketches for moral homily and mild satire--and there are some critical disputes or letters of criticism, as from invented adversaries, which mitigate the periodical’s satire of others. On occasion commentary on national issues gets reprinted: a 1733 letter to The Craftsman appears in the Maryland Gazette of 27 September 1734, characterized by Professor Parks, as “attacking Virginia’s complicity in Walpole’s attempt to substitute an excise tax for duties on tobacco and wine”--the Virginia envoy John Randolph was rewarded for supporting the administration’s efforts.

Parks’ most important Virginia publication in his first decade was the 1733 Collection of All Acts of Assembly, for two decades the main legal reference for the colony and full of historical information said by Lawrence C. Wroth to be Parks’ “most ambitious undertaking yet in America” (he was producing an updated edition when he died, completed by William Hunter [1752]). The second most important was Reverend William Stith’s History of the First Discovery and Settlement of Virginia (1747). His service to the community led to his election as one of Williamsburg’s three aldermen in 1739 and 1746. He had also helped initiate printing in North Carolina. When Parks sailed to England in 1749 he “was ready to shift his focus from being a tradesman to becoming a member of the landed gentry.” When his will was settled in 1754, after Hunter paid over £350 for the printing business and the paper mill and other holdings were sold, his “credits exceeded the debts by over £600,” and his wife Eleanor moved in with her daughter, son-in-law John Shelton, and four grandchildren.

James E. May  
Penn State University--DuBois Campus
After more than 200 years, Anna Seward's idiosyncratic text, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Darwin*, has been made accessible to modern readers by a trio of sympathetic editors in their new edition, *Anna Seward's Life of Erasmus Darwin*. From its initial publication in 1804, most readers have found Seward's *Memoirs* to be a flawed account of Darwin's life. Seward anticipated this reception in her "Preface": "In publishing these *Memoirs* . . .of Dr. Darwin, I am conscious of their defects, that they do not form a regular detail of biographical circumstances, even in that moiety of his professional existence formed by his residence in Lichfield" (Anna Seward's Life of Erasmus Darwin, 52 [hereafter cited as *Seward's Life*]).

An early reviewer of Seward's *Memoirs of . . . Dr. Darwin*, in the April 1804 *Edinburgh Review* focuses his evaluation on the biographical defects: "Miss Seward apparently spurns the fetters of vulgar, chronological narration; and has chosen rather to expatiate, free and at large, under the impulse of her own spontaneous feelings, or accidental associations. . . . The reader may look in vain for anything which merits the name of just biographical narrative" (*Seward's Life*, 297, 299). Only about one quarter of Seward's *Memoir* focuses on "chronological . . . biographical narrative." She doesn't even include Darwin's birth date or his parents' names. Another one-fourth of the text is taken up with sketches of Darwin's friends and associates in and near Lichfield--and with gossipy digressions. An analysis of Darwin's *The Botanic Garden* constitutes the balance of the *Memoir*. Desmond King-Hele, in his definitive biography, *Erasmus Darwin: A Life of Unequalled Achievement* (1999), concedes that Seward's text "is still essential to later biographers" of Darwin, but he also reinforces the evaluations of earlier critics: "The book is prolix in style and sometimes unreliable. It swings between extravagant praise and calumnies which she had to retract with printed apologies in magazines" (King-Hele 26).

Given the largely negative reception Seward's *Memoir* has received since its first publication, the editors faced a daunting task in preparing this new edition for a modern audience. The editorial team came to the task with strong qualifications. Philip K. Wilson, Professor of Medical Humanities at Penn State Hershey College of Medicine and Science Technology, spent a sabbatical year (2006-07) as the first Scholar-in-Residence at the Erasmus Darwin House in Lichfield. During that year, Wilson and Malcolm M. Dick, Director of the Centre for West Midlands History at the University of Birmingham, conceived the idea for this new edition. The third editor, Elizabeth A. Dolan, Associate Professor of English and Director of the Health, Medicine, and Society program at Lehigh University in Bethlehem, PA, a specialist in recovering Romantic-era women's texts, completes the team. The editors identify the weaknesses and strengths of Seward's *Memoir*, and articulate their goals for this edition in the "Foreword."
Our efforts in bringing out a new version of Dr. Darwin's first biography—a work written by Anna Seward—complements continuing efforts to reintroduce both luminaries to a new generation. Although Seward's biography is not the most accurate, particularly in comparison to later accounts whose authors had the benefit of hindsight, her work has the unique strength of being the only life story written by one of Darwin's contemporaries. Moreover, unlike later biographies of Dr. Darwin, Seward's account purposefully records a broad view of the city in which he lived, practiced medicine, and wrote at least the first drafts of many of his major works. (vi)

To prepare Seward's Memoirs for a new generation, the editors employed two strategies. They created a rich historical and social context for Seward's Memoirs, and they provided copious annotations in the form of chapter notes to the original text. Many features of this new edition provide context. "A Selective Time Line" showing parallel events in the lives of Darwin and Seward establishes a clear chronology. A "Biographical Register" identifies figures named in the text and explains their relationships to Seward and Darwin and to each other, and their attachments to Lichfield and the Midlands. The "Register" also includes bibliographical notes for further research and reading.

The "Introduction," a comprehensive reader's guide to Seward's Memoir, is the key to the editors' "efforts to reintroduce both luminaries to a new generation." The West Midlands of Seward's and Darwin's era, the editors posit, was "the eighteenth-century equivalent of California's Silicon Valley in the twentieth century."(3). A roster of Darwin's friends and associates, including Josiah Wedgewood, James Watt, Joseph Priestly and many others, describes a stimulating and innovative intellectual milieu. Three sections of the "Introduction" provide basic biographical information about Darwin (often lacking in Seward's Memoir) and explore his ideas on evolution and his life as a physician and medical author.

The editors sketch Seward's life as the daughter of the Reverend Thomas Seward, canon of Lichfield Cathedral, a woman who remained unmarried and pursued a career as a poet and critic. A section titled "British Women Writers of the Late 18th Century" is especially helpful for understanding her career path, and it also illuminates some aspects of her personal and artistic relationship with Darwin. Seward was 14 years old in 1756 when Darwin (age 25) became her neighbor and her poetic mentor. Seward wrote to a friend that during the twenty-five years Darwin lived in Lichfield, "we two were the poets of the place"(qtd. in Seward's Life 11). The dynamics of that poetic friendship were strained at times as Seward matured and struggled to establish her artistic independence, while Darwin still viewed her as his protégé. This struggle erupts in the Memoir when Seward angrily points out that Darwin was guilty of an "unprecedented instance of plagiarism" when he incorporated, unacknowledged, 46 lines of her poetry into The Botanic Garden (Seward's Life 213).
Two more sections of the "Introduction" on the creation and publication of Seward's Memoir provide insight into Seward's theory of biography, issues which she addresses in her "Preface" (Seward's Life 52-54). Who is best positioned to write a person's life? When should the biography be written? What aspects of the subject's life should be included? The editors posit that Seward had two personal goals in writing and publishing the biography: "In addition to fixing her place in the Lichfield circle, she saw it as a means to secure further her status as a critic" (31). A "Chapter Summary" concludes the "Introduction."

Wilson, Dolan and Dick outline their editorial policy in the "Preface":

The text of Anna Seward's that we have reproduced here includes the insertion of the twelve items of errata that she had listed in later printings of the 1804 edition which were published that same year. In reproducing this text, we have retained Seward's spelling and punctuation, though we have modernized her capitalization. Except when we concurred with Seward's emphasis, we have omitted her wide and scattered use of italics throughout, though we have followed the modern form of italicising the genus and species of scientific names of plants and animals. Where possible, we have indicated instances in which passages that Seward quotes deviate from those in the original sources available to us. (ix)

This policy produced a clean text for the modern reader while at the same time retaining most of the details of the original. Seward's text is filled with references to contemporary people, historical events, place names, literary texts and allusions, etc. She must have assumed that her audience would be familiar with these references, since she provided only about 20 footnotes. While the modern editors have done an excellent job of creating general context in the "Introduction" and "Biographical Register," a 21st-century audience needs more textual annotation to fully comprehend Seward's text.

Apparently intending this edition for a very wide audience, the editors have provided nearly 1,000 chapter notes, ranging from brief citations to complete poems mentioned by Seward. Many of the chapter notes clarify and greatly enhance the reading experience. Some very basic notes identifying mythological figures (Phoebus, Bacchus, Narcissus, etc.) and definitions of poetic meter (dactyls, iambic) are probably unnecessary for most general readers. A large proportion of chapter notes are simply line citations for quoted passages and might more conveniently be placed in the text following the quotation.

Still another substantial number of notes identify errors/variants in Seward's quotations. She misquotes Shakespeare and Milton (sometimes just a trivial error, sometimes more substantially). The most intriguing errors (nearly 60) occur in quotations from Darwin's The Botanic Garden in chapters 5 and 6 where Seward showcases her critical powers. Here, too, some of the errors are trivial, perhaps compositor's errors ("bands" instead of "hands" or "o'er" instead of "on"). Other misquotes substantially change the meter and/or meaning of the line ("sounds" instead of "blows"; "fretted" instead of "ample"; "crystal" instead of
"dusky"). Was Seward quoting from memory? If she had Darwin's text in front of her when writing the critique of *The Botanical Garden* was she merely careless, or was she "silently editing" Darwin for some reason? What does Seward's inaccuracy in quotation suggest about her standing as a critic? Since the editors draw the reader's attention to this pervasive textual problem, they might provide some explanation for, or discussion of, the issue. But perhaps it is unfair to ask the editors, who have done so much so well, to do even more.

Wilson, Dolan and Dick have succeeded admirably in achieving their goal "to reintroduce both luminaries to a new generation." *Anna Seward's Life of Erasmus Darwin* is beautifully designed and remarkably free of error. A fine series of over 30 illustrations complement the printed text. Reading Seward's original *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Darwin* is like encountering a cabinet of curiosities in an English country house; it is sometimes difficult to see a central focus for the heterogeneous objects on display. Fortunately, the three editors provide a lucid and entertaining guidebook for Seward's curious *Memoirs*.

Peter Perreten
Emeritus, Ursinus College


This is one of twenty-three volumes in print in a series called “Analysing Texts,” with more titles “in preparation.” The gentle reader may wonder why space in the *Intelligencer* should be devoted to what is in fact a fairly simple-minded reader’s guide to *Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, and Roxana* clearly aimed at undergraduates. The short answer is that this series is produced not by SparkNotes or its ilk, but by a respected publisher of academic monographs whose offerings are bought by academic libraries. My own university library has as of now purchased fourteen of the volumes in this series. Even if a library buys the paperback and gets it bound, the cumulative investment is far from insignificant—and if the library buys the hardbacks, we are looking at a rather alarming total cost. In these circumstances, we will be wise to ask exactly what we are getting for our money.

Marsh supplies six chapters devoted to “Analysing Defoe’s Novels” and three on “The Context and the Critics.” Chapter 1 (“Setting the Agenda”) analyzes particular paragraphs in each of the three novels, seeking to establish the author’s foci and aims. Chapters 2-5 address such “themes” as “Conscience and Repentance,” “Society and Economics,” “Women and Patriarchy,” and “Instability and the Outsider” in basically bland if unobjectionable terms. Chapter 6 reviews “Themes and Conclusions” and covers such issues as class, marriage, capitalism, colonialism, morality, and the “Anarchy of Experience.” The underlying method reminds me of the way “literature” was taught in the New
England prep schools I attended in the late 1950s and early 1960s. One searches out theme; identifies structure and organizational principles; and seeks to establish authorial viewpoint and sympathy. At an elementary level, this is useful enough. Marsh is commendably undogmatic: he recognizes (and illustrates in Part II) divergent critical perspectives (e.g., gender-oriented and postcolonial), and readily grants that “there are many different approaches and interpretations” (223), without taking sides or trying to evaluate the evidentiary bases of the different approaches. Very much a case of “And I am right, And you are right, And all is right as right can be!” as W. S. Gilbert once said.

In Part II Marsh gives potted accounts of “Defoe’s Life and Works”; sets forth “The Place of Defoe’s Novels in English Literature”; and devotes twenty pages to summaries of “Six Critical Views” (those of Miriam Lerenbaum, Virginia Ogden Birdsall, John J. Richetti, Ellen Pollak, Michael Seidel, and Katherine Clark—a distinctly odd assemblage). Six pages of suggestions towards “Further Reading” and half a dozen pages of “Notes” conclude the enterprise.

Marsh writes clear prose; he is a perfectly sensible if slightly timid reader; his references are in the main pretty accurate. Why then is this reviewer disgusted—indeed, outraged? If the book had appeared twenty-five years earlier, it would merely have seemed an exercise in new critical close reading with an added dollop of superficial contextualization. But the “Defoe” of 1987 ceased to exist in 1988 when P. N. Furbank and W. R. Owens’ *The Canonisation of Daniel Defoe* was published by Yale University Press (hardly an obscure or marginal outlet). The names of Furbank and Owens do appear in Marsh’s book, but only as authors of a political biography of Defoe published in 2006. No mention is made of *Canonisation*, or of their *Defoe De-Attributions* (1994), which specifically disallows 252 of the 570 items attributed to Defoe by John Robert Moore in his abominably undocumented *Checklist of the Writings of Daniel Defoe* (1960; 2nd edn. 1971). Nor does Marsh ever mention Furbank and Owens’ *Critical Bibliography of Daniel Defoe* (1998), now widely accepted as our best guide to a more soundly based and much shrunken Defoe canon.

One cannot blame Marsh for being ignorant of very recent or not-yet-published contributions to the ongoing Defoe attribution debate. We should, however, object strenuously to Marsh’s suppression of the fact of the existence of three important books about the Defoe canon, as well as to his saying that Defoe “wrote a vast number of works” (171) and that “the full list of his productions runs to several hundred titles” (178). For “A full list of ‘Works by or attributed to Defoe’” Marsh refers the reader to Paula Backscheider’s biography of 1989 (226), also mentioning the “Works Cited” list in “Maximilian [sic] E. Novak’s *Daniel Defoe: Master of Fictions*” (2001). Both Backscheider and Novak claim more than 350 titles for Defoe and have continued stoutly to resist the reduction of the canon proposed by Furbank and Owens. Marsh is entitled to endorse their faith in a vastly bloated and largely undocumented canon, but he does not seem to me to have the right to pretend that we are not at present in the midst of a serious struggle to determine what Defoe did (and did not) write.

The attribution issue is by no means irrelevant to the principal novels
assumed by twentieth-century critics to be by Defoe. The only lifetime attribution of *Robinson Crusoe* to Defoe was in a hostile pamphlet by Charles Gildon in 1719. *Moll Flanders* and *Roxana* were never publicly attributed to Defoe until the 1770s—attributions made by the scoundrelly publisher Francis Noble when he put out bowdlerized editions with manifestly falsified tales of their provenance. Marsh ought at least to have mentioned the attributional status of the novels (and their anonymity in Defoe’s lifetime), most especially since his critical enterprise is very much devoted to finding commonalities among the “big three” novels. He seems, in fact, to have a poor grasp of the “Defoe” canon. He announces that Defoe wrote eight novels in five years, twice insisting that *Roxana* was the “last” novel (162, 183)—ignoring the interestingly different *A New Voyage Round the World*, published nine months after *Roxana* in 1724. And a book titled *Daniel Defoe: The Novels* might be expected to say a bit more about the other five (or six or seven) and how they differ from those privileged in this book. Some of the differences are drastic, in subject, in structure, and in narrative technique.

The account of Defoe’s life is (unsurprisingly) derivative. One might hope, however, that Marsh would want to demonstrate to students the sharply contested state of Defoe biography. He is blandly cheerful about the Backscheider, Novak, and Richetti biographies, though they work from different premises and arrive at strikingly different pictures of their subject. We actually know very little about Defoe personally, unless we are prepared to extrapolate wholesale from the novels he *may* have written. Backscheider made some important manuscript discoveries about Defoe, for which we must be grateful, but (as Richetti and Marshall have argued) her account of Defoe the man seems more an exercise in fantasy fiction than in documented biography. Novak gives a more sober and fact-based account, but still tries to reveal the inner man. Richetti has mounted forceful objections to attempts at reconstruction of Defoe’s interior personal life, and I have to agree that the evidence simply is not there. Our students deserve to know that as of right now we face daunting problems in determining what Defoe wrote and how we should view him as a man.

Marsh does say some smart and sensible things. I applaud his insistence that “it would be naïve to identify Defoe with Robinson” (102), though all too many Defovians have done so. He is also correct in maintaining that no “novel genre” existed in Defoe’s lifetime, and that for Defoe “his fictions had no particular label: they were simply some of his many writings” (184). Too frequently, however, Marsh seems ignorant or innocent—hardly surprising in someone who is a former teacher of literature in a girls’ school in London and whose other books in this series concern Austen, Blake, Emily Brontë, Larkin, Lawrence, Shakespeare’s tragedies, Shakespeare’s problem plays, Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*, and Virginia Woolf.

Marsh announces at the outset (page 3) that he is keen to reconstruct the “original reading experience.” This being so, he might usefully have paid less attention to New Critical accounts of paragraph structure and more to Defoe’s entire lack of chapter division—a feature of his texts preserved in the Penguin
editions cited in this book. Marsh might also have emphasized the fact that as virtually everything Defoe ever published appeared anonymously, original readers would have had no idea who the author was. Neither would they have had any reason to imagine that the same person might have written both Robinson Crusoe and Moll Flanders, which are strikingly different in ways Marsh does not sufficiently underline. He makes a brief and superficial gesture towards examining Defoe’s development of fictional techniques prior to 1719, but without ever mentioning Geoffrey Sill’s highly relevant book on that subject. Marsh’s assertion that Defoe was working in a “rich tradition of fiction” that included such writers as Chaucer, Cervantes, and Boccaccio (187) seems more than a bit misleading: how familiar was Defoe with these writers, and how much does he owe to them? Marsh says flatly that Defoe’s novels “had and have a wide-ranging influence on English literature” (198), but does not demonstrate it. There is no evidence that Fielding was familiar with the novels later attributed to Defoe, and one cannot readily imagine that Richardson would have been anything but horrified by Moll and Roxana if he read them (which seems unlikely). Exactly what novelists did Defoe influence, and how, prior to the nineteenth century—or thereafter?

Marsh’s account of critics seems patchy and ill-informed. Few present-day critics take Ian Watt’s The Rise of the Novel (1957) seriously, but Marsh never mentions his principal successors: Richetti’s groundbreaking Popular Fiction Before Richardson (1969), Michael McKeon’s The Origins of the English Novel, 1600-1740 (1987), J. Paul Hunter’s Before Novels (1990), and William Warner’s Licensing Entertainment: The Elevation of Novel Reading in Britain, 1684-1750 (1998). Citation of the principal books on Defoe is extremely erratic. George Starr’s important books are noted (barely), but Hunter’s Reluctant Pilgrim (1966) and Everett Zimmerman’s Defoe and the Novel (1975) are simply ignored. Richetti’s biography is given a passing nod, and his 1987 Twayne Defoe is quoted, but not his vastly more important Oxford book of 1975 (Defoe’s Narratives). Almost no articles get cited, though much of the important critical work on the big three novels over the last fifteen years appeared in article rather than book form. Marsh’s attitude towards his predecessors is consistently amiable, but he neither renders needed judgments nor conveys a sense of just how sharply contested these novels remain a decade into the twenty-first century. Reference to “Gale Echo” (227 [recte ECCO, or Eighteenth-Century Collections Online]) is a bit unnerving. Referring the reader to the Dodo Press edition of Captain Singleton (237) seems bizarre: this is a reprint in a children’s adventure series. Why not direct readers to the Oxford World Classics edition? In his account of “other biographies” Marsh refers to John Martin’s Beyond Belief: The Real Life of Daniel Defoe (2006) as a “fringe contribution” which “asserts that he was a homosexual” (229). This seems a curiously bland and neutral way of describing an account of Defoe that claims he was a cross-dresser who delighted in drag parties, prostitution, and sodomy—and fathered multiple illegitimate children. Defoe may have done all these things and more, but there is no evidence that an academic scholar could accept or even entertain.
Exactly how was this book refereed, if it was refereed? Marsh is the “General Editor” of Palgrave’s “Analysing Texts” series, and he has authored ten of the twenty-three titles now in print. Am I unreasonably suspicious in wondering just what vetting was carried out, and by whom? “Defoe” is (though one would not learn this by reading the present book) a fiercely turbulent and contested field, and has been for nearly a quarter of a century. One cannot fairly denounce Marsh for his implicit allegiance to the Defovian Flat Earth society, but expert readers should have insisted that the attribution controversy be pointed out and documented. Quite aside from the attribution issues, however, there is quite a lot in this book that I cannot imagine a competent specialist approving for print—and I am no Defoe specialist.

Palgrave publishes good scholarly and critical books by proven scholars. We must be grateful that for-profit enterprises can still print academic books. In sober sadness, however, I have to say that this is not a book, or even a kind of book, that a scholarly publisher should be peddling to academic libraries. Plenty of my undergraduates need assistance in reading Robinson Crusoe, Moll Flanders, and Roxana—but this amateurish pastiche is not where they should be getting “help.” At a time when university libraries are suffering acute financial stress they should not be buying shoddy goods like this book.

Robert D. Hume
Penn State University---University Park

Notes


2. For a detailed assessment of the evidentiary basis of the 276 titles they accept as definite or probable, see Ashley Marshall, “Beyond Furbank and Owens: A New Consideration of the Evidence for the ‘Defoe’ Canon,” forthcoming in Studies in Bibliography. Marshall puts the number of absolutely solid attributions at around 80.


*Woman to Woman* is a collection of essays that serves as a tribute to the life and scholarship interests of Mary Waldron. In making its tribute, the book enacts the very subject it works to highlight—a sense of female community. Looking at communities of women from various social classes, the essays of this book seek to highlight productive relationships between women. The book consists of ten essays, an introduction, and a foreword, written by Isobel Grundy, which provides the reader with a touching introduction to Mary’s life and scholarship interests. The essays are grouped into three sections: family alliances; friends and companions; and adventurous women.

The editors of the collection quickly and succinctly lay out the book’s motives; they highlight that the objective of the collection is to “provide a multidisciplinary approach to this under-explored theme [of women’s cooperative activity], in order to demonstrate the rich diversity and productivity of female relationships” (19). The essays themselves explore collaborative relationships between women, and highlight the varied and unique experiences of women throughout the long eighteenth century. Though the women discussed in these essays had differing experiences, the common thread between them is how they were able to work together for their mutual benefit. The editors note, “Whatever the uncertainty regarding any individual woman’s potential, the range of possibilities became much wider when two or more began to work together” (41).

The “family alliances” essays explore relationships between mothers and their children, as well as the relationships between siblings. Mary Waldron fittingly opens the scholarship with her essay, “Childhood and Child Rearing in Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth-Century Fiction: A Quiet Revolution.” In this essay, Waldron argues that Jane Austen resisted prominent constructions of child rearing, such as those found in conduct books and popular fiction at the time, in her texts: “[I]t was Austen who took the first steps toward a representation that broke with the conduct books, and uncovered a more recognizable and believable version of childhood and family dynamics” (51).

Exploring how children and childhood are discussed in Austen’s novels, Waldron discusses how “this realistic inclusion and centrality of children in fiction continued and developed” during Austen’s lifetime (60). This move away from sentimentalized depictions of children and towards a more realistic view of the relationships between children and their guardians in Austen’s novels begins to shift the way children are presented in texts, commencing the “quiet revolution” of the essay’s title.

In “Revolutionary Mothers and Revolting Daughters: Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley, Anna Wheeler and Rosina Bulwer Lytton,” Marie Mulvey-Roberts and Joanna Goldsworthy discuss the lives of Wollstonecraft and Wheeler, and how these women’s daughters dealt with their mothers’ legacies in
the field of women’s rights. Mulvey-Roberts and Goldsworthy argue that looking at these two mother-daughter relationships is important because “This paired mother-daughter coupling, the one imagined and idealized, the other jealous and antagonistic, are two sides of the same coin: linked thematically and historically, they illustrate the unchanging nature of the mother-daughter relationship while supporting a claim for Wheeler’s and Bulwer Lytton’s neglected importance in the history of women’s rights” (63-4). While Shelley idealized her radical mother, Bulwer Lytton scorned hers, and the daughters’ views infiltrated their fictional works. Ultimately, this essay explores how these two daughters created their own identities separate from those of their mothers—and the benefits and problems of being a daughter of a “radical” mother.

Continuing the pattern of the previous essay, in “Sisters—Ambition and Compliance: The Case of Mary and Agnes Berry and Joanna and Agnes Baillie,” Judith Bailey Slagle focuses on the relationships of two pairs of sisters. Here, Slagle discusses “the psychological and philosophical inclination of these [sisters] and raises the question about how creative collaboration and / or support from sisters may have affected the publications of Mary Berry and Joanna Baillie” (79). Indeed, Slagle argues that Berry and Baillie were able to freely express themselves because they were supported by a community of women that allowed the writers to be creative. Drawing parallels between the two sets of sisters, Slagle notes that Agnes Berry and Agnes Baillie were important supporters of their sisters’ creative activity, taking care of financial business which allowed the writers time to be creative (89). Slagle’s essay highlights the significance of these siblings’ support of two important women writers of the early nineteenth century.

Shifting away from familial community, section two deals with communities of female friendship. These essays highlight the significance of women’s friendships and the importance female communities held for women of various social classes. In “A Woman of Extraordinary Merit: Catherine Bovey of Flaxley Abbey, Gloucestershire,” Jessica Munns and Penny Richards examine the life of Catherine Bovey. Widowed at age twenty-two, Bovey became the landowner at Flaxley Abbey, her late husband William Bovey’s familial estate. Rather than remarry after her husband’s death, Bovey chose to live with her friend, Mary Pope. With the support of her friend, Bovey was able to oversee the management of Flaxley Abbey and actively participate within the Anglican establishment: “[Bovey] exemplifies a female method of engagement with the public and social worlds in which she lived through sociability, benevolence, and patronage” (111-112). Bovey’s wealth, her widowhood, and her close friendship with Pope allowed her to live as an independent woman.

The next essay in this section is Jennie Batchelor’s “The Limits of Sympathy: The Histories of Some of the Penitents in the Magdalen-House (1760),” which explores the fictionalized account of a community of fallen women being rehabilitated to “a life of virtuous industry” (118). Histories formulates a pattern of sisterhood and community based on the sympathy the women of the Magdalen House have for each other, attempting to create a space
of compassion and equality among them. However, Batchelor argues that “despite the novel’s attempt to refute the supposed synonymy of virtue and chastity, and its radical assertion of female solidarity, Histories fails fully to achieve its utopian promise, largely because […] the sympathetic mechanism upon which the novel’s notion of community depends is unstable” (119). Batchelor explores the different ways community functions within the novel, and the extent to which its constructions of female solidarity are limited. Thus, the novel’s sentimental message ultimately undermines its construction of female community.

The two other essays in this section deal with women who used writing to strengthen their communities. In “Changes in Roles and Relationships: Multiauthored Epistles from the Aberdeen Quaker Women’s Meeting,” Betty Hagglund discusses a set of seventeenth-century collaborative letters written by two groups of Quaker women and how these letters illustrate changes in the groups’ relationship: “In these epistles we can trace two important sets of changes over the twenty-five year period: firstly, the changing role of women within Scottish Quakerism and corresponding changes in their textual self-representation; and secondly, the changes in the relationships between the two groups of women” (137-8). Similarly, in “Elizabeth Carter and Modes of Knowledge” Judith Hawley explores the different ways writing fosters female relationships by looking at the work of Elizabeth Carter; Hawley argues that Carter reinforces the religious faith of the friends to whom she dedicates both her public and private writings. Exploring the tension between Carter’s “rational public persona” and her “private affectations,” Hawley argues that Carter was ultimately able to ease this tension because “For [Carter], feelings were a mode of knowledge” (158). Thus, Carter used her religious beliefs to temper the conflict between her public and private identities.

The final section of this essay collection centers around women who made an impact on the world stage. In the first essay of this section, “‘The best friend in the world’: The Relationship between Emma Hamilton and Queen Maria Carolina of Naples,” Julie Peakman explores how the relationship between Hamilton and Maria Carolina “offers insights not only into intimacy between a queen and a commoner, but also into the strong political influences these women exerted in a [political] realm where women were less known for their involvement” (175). The friendship between these two women aided Britain in its war with France; however, it also served as a means of political advancement for Hamilton during a time of war, revealing her as a figure who left a significant impact on international politics.

Tanis Hinchcliffe’s essay similarly explores a group of women influential on an international scale. “Founding Mothers: Religious Communities in New France” examines the community of religious French women who traveled to Canada (“New France”) to establish a utopian society, a “perfected version of the old country”; to do so, these women worked to establish nursing and teaching facilities (195). However, while helping to establish the new French colony in Canada, these women also had to struggle against objections from the church
against the path they chose. Hinchcliffe notes that social conditions in France and Canada during the seventeenth century offered these women the opportunity to travel and work; more importantly, though, it was through their ability to work together as a united group that these women were able to overcome the hardships they faced.

The figure of Boadicea serves as the topic of the final essay in the collection. In “‘On Boadicea think!’: In Search of a Female Army” Carolyn D. Williams explores the controversy surrounding Boadicea and her followers in the eighteenth century. Williams notes, “References [of Boadicea] reveal a wide variety of attitudes toward female cooperation and its practicability, promises, and perils. She figured as heroine, villain, religious bigot, ancient British Bluestocking, shrewd tactician, and raving lunatic” (204). Boadicea, her female soldiers, and her daughters were figures whose exploits were manipulated to suit the religious and political motives of those referencing them. Thus, Boadicea’s influence “might be considered benign or dangerous,” creating a sense of ambiguity surrounding the female companionship associated with the figure (221).

*Woman to Woman* offers new ways of thinking about female companionship in the long eighteenth century. In exploring relationships between women in the public sphere and the private sphere, and in looking at the lives of women from varying social classes, political backgrounds, and religions, this collection resists popularized notions of female collaboration in the eighteenth century—women were not mindless or vicious towards one another. Rather, women were capable of cooperative work and mutual benefit. *Woman to Woman* provides insight into diverse primary material and its topics invite further research into other successful collaborations between women.

Suzanne K. Cook
Duquesne University

**Notes from Newark: A Tale of (more than) Two Cities**
by Theodore E. D. Braun

So AMTRAK and Southwest didn’t come closer than an hour and a half from Winston-Salem, and there I was on US Airways flight to Greensboro in early March. Except for the fact that I had to pay for my checked baggage, things went alright on the ground and in the air. And I arrived at my hotel, a Marriott Residence, in plenty of time to settle in, grab a (free) bite to eat, and set out to Wake Forest University, where SEASECS began with a reception. I followed the driving directions (although I was on foot), having calculated that the walk would be just a mile or a little bit more. The directions brought me to the edge of campus, or would have if I had continued on the road longer. I was getting nervous seeing churches rather than campus buildings, and, when I asked the
local people for assistance, they didn’t know where anything on campus was. To make a long story short, I walked in what seemed like circles, managed to stumble and bruise my knee, staggered about here and there until finally, mirabile dictu, reaching my destination. I must have put in a good hour in my quest for a glass of wine and good fellowship, but by gum it was worth it, for I encountered numerous old friends there.

I had been to Winston-Salem once before, for an EC/ASECS meeting in 1980 hosted by Salem College in Old Salem. This is a Moravian college, the only one I’d visited until we went to Bethlehem in recent years. They had a strong tradition of music, not just hymns but also what we might think of as secular music, which my now deceased colleague Bob Hill was gradually transferring to 20th-century musical notations. Winston-Salem, in the heart of tobacco country, was ironically the first place I had a non-smoking hotel room. It took a few years for the rest of the country to catch up with North Carolina in this respect. Wake Forest is in a different part of town from Salem, and the rainy weather that set in made me give up my plan to revisit that beautiful 18th-century community. The rain also encouraged me to use the shuttle.

Weathery mists have burdened my memory like the mists of time, but I do recall attending Joe Johnson’s session on “Travelers Abroad,” which managed to include four continents in three papers, a perhaps unparalleled feat in the archives of SEASECS panels! Jin Lu’s “The Chinese Ancien Régime on Eighteenth-Century France: A Delayed Response” started the festivities, and was followed by Stephen C. Fisher’s “Three Britons Named John in the Habsburg Lands in 1785/86” and Shannon Duffy’s “Not Just Pirates and Pagans: Early United States’ Views of the Barbary Coast”—a breathless start to the intellectual festivities! I somehow frittered away the first part of the following session, but did manage to hear Michel Lopez speak on “L’Obélisque de Port-Vendres (Roussillon – France): First Monument Raised in France to Honor King Louis XVI.” I remember wondering then, and I’m still wondering, how many other monuments were dedicated to this king, who lost his head in the Revolution.

In the first plenary, Mark Evan Bonds addressed an interesting and important issue: “What Do Sonatas Want? The Paradox of Musical Language in the Enlightenment.” This was followed by a performance by Jacqui Carrasco on the violin and Peter Klairoff on the fortepiano, who played works by Bach and Mozart. Superb. Misty Anderson invited several faculty members and grad students to a party at her suite, which was even larger than my princely quarters. A great ending to a wonderful first day.

I missed most of the first session of day 2, rereading my paper and getting otherwise ready for the rainy day, but I did make it to the next session, which closed out the morning’s activities: “Studies on Eighteenth-Century French Literature,” chaired by esteemed friend William Edmiston, and featuring Marie Wellington, whom I’ve known for years and who read “La Religieuse: Suzanne is ‘Out of Order’”; my good friend Felicia B. Sturzer, speaking on “‘Aimer tous les hommes, c’est n’aimer rien’: Enlightenment Sociability and Riccoboni’s Lettres de Mylord Rivers à Sir Charles Cardigan”; another good friend, Joe Johnson,
whose “Models for Friendship in French Children’s Literature from Berquin to Woillez” followed up on work he’s done on friendship between men and between
women; and David Eick, yet another good friend (are you sensing a pattern here? There’s a strong French group within SEASECS, and for one reason or another I
didn’t get to hear them all) reading a fine paper on “Voltaire, Dictionaries, and the Questions sur l’Encyclopédie.” A great session fit for a king who didn’t lose
his head.

After the SEASECS luncheon we enjoyed the second plenary, by Peter
Reill, whose talk “Aesthetics, the Life Sciences and the Construction of Gender
in the Enlightenment and Romanticism” was a hit with everyone in the audience,
winning him a 9.5 on the applaudometer (we are not making this up, as Dave
Barry would say).

It was at this point that I sat out another session, tempted though I was by
one on “The Colonial Gaze: Illustrated Travel Accounts of the Atlantic World
and Africa,” to make sure my paper would produce the desired effect; for my
session closed out the day’s work. The session, “Life in the Eighteenth Century:
Pleasures, Threats, and Crises,” was chaired by Kathleen Hardesty Doig (dare I
say it? yes, another friend!), and contained papers on French and English
literature, to wit: Peggy Thompson, “Samuel Johnson, Habit, and the Limits of
Reason”; Lissa Peterson, “The Perfectibility of Woman: The Role of Motherhood
in Wollstonecraft’s The Wrongs of Woman, or Maria”; yr reporter, “A Midlife
Crisis? Le Franc de Pomigliano Turns 40”; and Jérôme Brillaud, “Rousseau’s
Simplicity.” Then, I joined a jolly crowd for dinner.

A new day dawned, or a half day, and I crept out of the sack in my
sumptuous suite to face it. I don’t like mornings, especially the first hour or two
when I’m up. I can’t understand people who rise at 5 a.m. and run 3 miles, and
are ready to face the day at 6. But I digress. Fortunately the day’s first session
began at 9:45 on a rain-
free Saturday. I attended “Visual Arts in the Age of
Enlightenment,” chaired by Morna O’Neill, and with strong papers by the
participants: Robert Mode, “In and Out of the Window: A Hogarthian Metaphor”;
Christelle Gonthier, “The Idea of Supplement in Diderot’s Salons”; and Candace
Jean Kern, “Geographies of Anacreontic Style: Diderot – une Lapone – un
Patagon – 1767 Salon – Encyclopédie.” This was followed by the final plenary,
with Felicity Nussbaum’s presentation “The Tragic Muse Speaks: The
Eighteenth-Century Orient on Stage.”

Near the end of March, Anne accompanied me to Seattle and Vancouver for
the ASECS meeting and a visit to our friends Keith and Alice Percival. Rain
followed us, or rather preceded us there, until, of course, our last day. We
enjoyed what we could of our visit, Keith being seriously ill in the hospital, and
Alice in quite a stir. Fortunately, Alice has two sisters in Seattle with whom she is
very close, and they ferried us hither and yon. Keith has been recovering and
seems to be faring well; however, Alice died unexpectedly shortly after we had
returned home. We miss her more than we can say.

We had hoped to take the train to Vancouver, but mud slides had covered
the tracks in several locations, so we traveled by Amtrak bus instead.
Comfortably and quickly, we were delivered to the heart of the city, and made it to our luxurious hotel, the site of the conference. We spent some time trying to get to know our temporary neighborhood and the layout of the two towers of the hotel separated by a kind of courtyard outside and a conjoining lower structure inside. And, of course, just as Robert Frost can claim to be a person “acquainted with the night,” we are people well acquainted with the rain, which came down to meet us in Vancouver as it had in Seattle, and earlier in Winston-Salem, and was to be our friend later in Austria. Hmm. All that rain accompanying conferences.

Anyway, here we were in Vancouver, a beautiful and vibrant city like Seattle. Our room was on an upper story facing a hospital in case of emergency (at my age you can never be too prepared!) and a church, which would have been useful if I were by any stretch of the imagination a believer. This hotel was in the heart of downtown Vancouver, in the older part of town. Like Seattle and Portland, and virtually every city on the west coast, the “old” part of town is scarcely a century old, virtually yesterday by the standards of the east coast and yesteryear by those of Europe. Even my little town of Newark, Delaware was first chartered in 1758.

There were relatively few EC-ers at ASECS this year. A pity, because it was a wonderful experience. A few highlights will have to suffice here. One was the SECFS dinner across the bay and on the fringe of Stanley Park, a huge green space which I have had the pleasure of seeing on a previous trip. To get to the Bistro Chez Michel at Waterfront Park, you have to take a boat ride. At the dinner, several long tables were filled with francophones, including the members of the panel I participated in, among others Mary Trouille, who had put together an exciting and diverse session on Law and Literature for the ISECS meeting in Graz, Austria. Good eats, good drinks, good talk, a good time. On the way back the ferry plied the waters in the gathering dusk, and the lights from downtown were incredibly gorgeous. And the receptions! ASECS with an invitation from President Heather McPherson, AMS Press hosted by the irrepressible Kevin Cope, UD Press hosted by my great colleague Don Mell, and I think I've forgotten one or two, like the Ibero-American’s. To read this you would almost think there were no sessions, or that I didn’t attend any. Well, in fact, I must admit to my everlasting sorrow and shame that I attended far fewer than in the past. One reason was to see at least something of the city, often enough in the company of my friend Dick DeArmond whom I had met in my Milwaukee days. On one afternoon Anne and I walked to the Vancouver Art Museum, specializing in modern urban art. On another day we visited the Anthropology Museum on the UBC campus, very strong in artifacts of the various Indian tribes up along the Pacific coast north of Vancouver. And, it being almost dinner time on the way back to the hotel, Dick looked up a diner that was fortuitously on our way; it turned out to be run by a couple from England, who maintained its pub-like atmosphere, and who served a great salmon dish. But we don’t live on salmon alone, even in the Pacific Northwest: the mind demands some attention, too. Which brings me back to ASECS and the annual meeting.

One untoward event was the absence of books for the University of
Delaware Press table. For reasons unknown, they were held up at the border until after the meeting. Maybe the Canadian authorities thought that Delaware prints too many subversive or otherwise censor-worthy books. You ought to check us out at www2.lib.udel.edu/udpress/. You might find Joseph Pappa’s Carnal Reading to your liking. And what about the salacious lives of the heroes and heroines found in Natural History of Delmarva Dragonflies and Damselflies by UD’s own Hal White? The Canadian authorities, you gotta hand it to ‘em, are on to something. But they managed to get Don Mell madder than a March hare!

My own session, “The Alps, the Pyrenees, the Andes: Literature and the Arts,” had one paper scheduled for each of those mountain chains. Mark Malin spoke diaphanously on “Skirted Mountains, Dammed Streams: The Pyrenees in the Work of José Mor de Fuentes,” while Natasha Duquette tackled lofty concepts in “‘On the Andes’ Icy Steep She Glows’: Sublime Freedom in Helen Maria Williams’s Peru.” Elizabeth Liebman, who most unfortunately broke her hip less than a month before the meeting, could not give her paper, which dealt partially with representations oh the Alps; I hope she’s back on her feet and that she’ll be able to give this paper in San Antonio or at another venue. The discussion was longer than usual, since we had some unexpected extra time, and often very insightful.

In July we then went to Graz, Austria, for the ISECS, spending a couple of days in Vienna and then in Salzburg before the conference. I’m conflating here the initial days and the final days. In Graz we did some heavy sightseeing, beginning with the spectacular armory museum: the ground floor holds its overview of the history of Graz, and above are four larger-than-football-fields stories of armor, an absolutely incredible experience. We also climbed I don’t recall how many steps (150? 200?) up to the Uhrturm and its ancient clock and great view of the city. We visited several parks and went to visit the new synagogue replacing the one destroyed in WWII, in this case accompanying Brij and Frances Singh. Frances had relatives there, as did our 100-year-old neighbor Irma Stevens. We saw Irma’s family’s old house while we were there. The old synagogue had over 2000 members in the city itself, the new one just over 100 members from the entire area. The numbers tell a chilling story of the history of Nazism in Graz, a grim history repeated in Vienna and Salzburg. We went by foot and bus and tram to the Old City to see the sights, once accompanied by John O’Neal. From our hotel we could see the hill on the other side of which Arnold Schwarzenegger grew up. A highlight was a day trip to Pöllau, up through mountains and farms (an incredible amount of grapes and vegetables were growing in espalier fashion), to the lovely town, its former monastery and old churches, not to mention a great meal and local wines.

At the 13th International Congress on the Enlightenment, there were fewer than 100 Americans, only about 10% of the total attendance. We haunted Brij and Frances, and spent a good deal of time with John O’Neal and other friends, including the Dutch historian Edwin van Meerkerk, with whom I had co-authored an article proving that Voltaire had written Micromégas in 1739 and not 1751, thus clearing up a centuries-old problem. My own session, “Law and Literature,”
organized by Mary Trouille, went without a flaw, and included papers by Mary (Law, Literature, and Life Experience in Accounts of Wife Abuse in 18th-Century France), Lise Andries (Figures de brigands dans les romans français du XVIIIe siècle: Lesage, Prévost, Sade), Linda Simonis (La justice mise en scène: Évocations du droit dans l’opéra et au théâtre du XVIIIe siècle) and yours truly (Violations of the Law in [Prévost’s] Manon Lescaut). Also rich and varied were the congress with its many national and international panels. Of particular interest to me were the numerous panels dealing with matters French or containing one or more papers concerning French literature, including Anthony Strugnell’s paper (Les sources de “l’Histoire des deux Indes . . .”). But there were other gems, such as Edwin van Meerkerk’s two papers (“Visions of a New Colonial System: The van Hogendorf Brothers’ Cosmopolitan Utopia,” and “News from Russia in the Early 18th Century: The Dutch Nouvelles littéraires hollandaises”), and Brij’s paper (Christianity and Islam in 18th-Century South India. And Encounter at Tranquebar), delivered with his unique combination of erudition and wit.

England was not by any means ignored, witness the three-panel session on “Ways of 18th-Century Spirit” chaired by Brycchan Carey, who also read a paper (Quaker Rhetoric and the Origins of the Transatlantic Antislavery Movement). Overall, virtually all your favorite authors were included during the Congress. The Congress itself was superbly managed. A great experience! Where, you might wonder, will the 2015 be held? I’d love to keep you in suspense, but I won’t. Rotterdam! We’ve never ventured there and look forward to that meeting.

In Austria we visited Vienna and Salzburg, as indicated above. Many of my readers have been to both cities before, so I’ll limit myself to one mention of each place. At my daughter Jeanne’s request, we made a pilgrimage to Mahler’s grave and to a house he occupied for about 10 years. The cemetery was out of the way in the northwestern part of Vienna, and the house was in the Ring, to the southwest. It took us almost a day to see both. In our travels we pondered how, if Mozart had owned all the companies using his name, he would have died a rich man—bakeries, plumbing repairmen, furniture stores, and I can’t remember what all. At least there are a few places that were actually connected to him such as his birth-house. We also visited the so-called catacombs, actually a series of caves in a mountain climbing above the beautiful city, inhabited in medieval times by monks.

State College, PA, was the seventh city we visited, on the grounds of Penn State University, which hosted the 42nd meeting of EC/ASECS, where we have made enduring friendships with a large number of people. The conference ended just as the Sandusky scandal broke out there, so we were spared that anguish. Penn State is huge, but State College seems like a small town; there’s a diner on College Avenue called The Diner, where we regularly went for breakfast. Then we would go from our hotel, the Atherton (located on Atherton Street) up a few blocks to the Nittany Lion Inn, where the meeting took place. The meeting rooms were all huddled together off a large foyer housing an unusually large book display. Our great friend Don Mell was often to be seen behind the UD Press table.
Peter Staffel’s OAX (Oral/Aural Experience) occupied the first evening, with a choice of terrible poems brilliantly read and a thoroughly unrehearsed performance of excerpts from Dryden’s comedy *Marriage à la Mode*. This is always a great experience, and has been going on since at least 1995. Way to go, Peter and your hardy crew! The first day’s opening session, “Wilkes and Liberty,” included stimulating papers by Jack Fruchtman (Radicalism and Reform: The Case of John Sawbridge, M.P.), Corey Andrews (Feast and Famine: Sources of Charles Churchill’s Scottophobia) and Brij Singh (The Radicals, General Warrants, and Press Freedom). For the second session, we found seats in a well-attended round table honoring our long-time friend Roy Wolper and *The Scriblerian* featuring the organizer/moderator, W. B. Gerard, along with Jim May, Mel New, and Derek Taylor, who gave short encomia to Roy, and were joined in by members of the audience. This to me was one of the highlights of the conference, even though it meant missing Linda Troost’s paper in another session. We then went to the luncheon in Roy’s honor, met his wife Alice, and filled up on good food.

In the afternoon I went to hear Cal Winton speak (Libraries, Liberty, and Literacy in the Early American Mid-Atlantic). I have never failed to enjoy his presentations, and to learn a great deal from them. Thank you, Cal! I then skipped over to “Liberty in Historical, Post-Colonial and Rewritten Novels . . .” in time to hear the last half of Sylvia Kasey Marks’s paper (Another Jane: A Foreign Grandison), Geoff Sill’s paper (*Col. Jack, Tom Jones*, and *The Sot-Weed Factor: A Trans-national, Trans-Atlantic Dialogue*), and Ellen Moody’s (‘I have a right to choose my own life’: Liberty in Winston Graham’s Podark Novels), another wonderful experience. I missed papers by Teri Doerksen and John Heins, but alas! Such are the vagaries of multi-panel sessions. I’ll try to refrain from mentioning other potentially fascinating papers and panels I missed, but it’s harder to do than you might think! After these sessions we turned our attention to the plenary speaker, Jenifer L. Morgan, who delivered a fine talk entitled “Their Children Shall be Bound: Freedom and Family Life in New World Slavery.” Then came a reception and the banquet, allowing us to speak with people like Linda Merians, Peter Briggs, Kevin Berland, Peter Perreton, Marie Wellington, Sayre Greenfield, Laura Engel, Erlis Wickersham, James Myers, President Lisa Rosner, Doreen Saar, Elizabeth Lambert, Mary Margaret Stewart, Scott Gordon, conference organizer Christine Clark-Evans, and many others. I was unfortunately unable to attend the papers most of these amazing people read. And let me say here rather than at the very end this was a superbly organized and run conference. Congratulations to all involved.

The second highlight of the conference for me was my panel, at 9 a.m. on Saturday. My paper was an improved version of what I read in Graz (here called “The Many Sins and Crimes of Des Grieux: Morality and Law in *Manon Lescaut*”), profiting from several criticisms of the earlier version, in particular setting the scene better. But the other papers made the panel vibrate. Jade Higa’s study (*A Closet Drama on Display: The Mysterious Mother* and the Beauclerc Closet) was a closet drama both in the literal sense—some of the action took place
in a very small room—and in the parlance of the time, a book to be read in your bedroom. Philippe Barr brought England and France together in his talk (Aesthetics and Politics of the Imagination: Addison as Literary Critic in Late Eighteenth-Century France). If you need proof that we were serious, note the colon in each title! We took time to find the statue of the Nittany Lion, then went to the business lunch where Lisa Rosner delivered the Presidential address on Joseph Priestley. After that we heard a special presentation: Charles Pettaway, Jr., spoke on “Le Mozart Noir–The Life and Times of Joseph Bologne, Le Chevalier de Saint-Georges.” It would have been nice to hear more of Bologne’s music, but one can’t have everything.

On Sunday morning, I was particularly interested in the final paper of each session, Peter Briggs on Homer, Kevin Berland on Anacreon, and Peter Perreten on an unusual combination, Liberty, Patriotism, and Ornithology (!). Ultimately, I chose Kevin and Anacreon, and I do not regret it. Then we packed up and left.

In February I’ll be at SCSECS in Asheville, in March at ASECS in San Antonio, and in April I’ll give my discours de réception at the Académie de Montauban in France. I’ll be busy taking notes for you!

Emeritus, University of Delaware


Lisa Rosner, our President, called for order and we began the Business Lunch as we always do, with applause for those who organized our gathering. How indebted we are to Christine Clark-Evans and the members of the wonderful committee: Jonathan Pritchard (English Department), and a fabulous group of graduate students, among them Julian Fung, Patricia Gael, Leah Orr, Stacy Shaffer, and David Spielman. We also are indebted to Norm Brown and others who work for Conferences and Special Events, and the staff at the Nittany Lion Inn. Thanks and gratitude also to Penn State University’s French and Francophone Studies Department; the English Department, particularly Robert D. Hume; and our great friends in the PSU Library, Sandra Stelts (Rare Books and Manuscripts) and Timothy D. Pyatt (Dorothy Foehr Huck Chair and Head of Special Collections).

Lisa announced that our 2012 meeting will be held at the Hyatt in Baltimore, November 1-3. Calls for Papers, Panels, and Posters were inserted in the folders of all those who attended the meeting and were later mailed to all members. Conference information can be found at our Society’s website at http://www.jimandellen.org/ecasecs. Beverly Schneller will chair the Conference Committee; her co-conspirators are Kathy Temple, Jack Fruchtman, George Hahn, Beth Lambert, and Mary Margaret Stewart. You can reach Beverly and the members of the Committee at Baltec18@gmail.com. The theme for the conference has been inspired by a line from Juvenal’s First Satire that has much resonance for both our beloved century and our own time: “What does infamy
matter when you get to keep your fortune?” The deadline for panel submissions is March 15th.

Next Jim May extended his thanks to all the contributors to our *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, and to Robert Hume, James L. West, III, and the DuBois Campus for printing subvention funding. And he encouraged members to submit articles, notes, and reviews, particularly submissions that would redress oversights and imbalances in the newsletter’s coverage of our fields. Moving forward, Jim said that we will produce two rather than three issues per year (March and September). You can reach Jim at jem4@psu.edu.

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Lisa presented the slate of nominees for 2012: Kathy Temple for President, James Woolley for Vice President, Anna Foy for Elected Board Member. The nominees were accepted by applause. The members of the Executive Committee are listed below.

On behalf of the Molin Prize Committee, Christine Clark-Evans, the 2011 chair, announced that there were nine very worthy submissions for consideration. We are grateful to the graduate students for their participation. Thanks also are due to Christine, Corey Andrews and Rivka Swenson for their work on this Committee. [See the article below on Molin Prize winner, Melissa Wehler.]

This year our Society presented the Leland Peterson Award to Laura Kennelly and Rob Mayerovitch. Linda Troost, our treasured former president and also a winner of Peterson Award with Sayre Greenfield, her husband, made the presentation on behalf of EC/ASECS. Year after year, Laura and Rob enliven our gatherings with their individual and collective warmth and friendliness, Rob’s booming and musical voice and expert piano playing, and, always, their great intelligence and generosity of spirit. It is our pleasure to honor them with this award.

Linda Merians, who is honored to serve our Society as its Executive Secretary, gave her brief summary in regard to our membership (about 400) and finances. Linda explained that we are working very hard to keep our expenses as low as possible, especially because we want to be able to continue to offer graduate student members discounted rates for attendance at our annual meetings. The members of the Executive Committee are working to devise a book exchange program. See the EC/ASECS website at http://www.jimandellen.org/ecasecs for details and information. EC/ASECS is in good financial shape, thanks to so many of you who pay your dues promptly. There is no need to raise our annual dues, which remain $10 for graduate students, $15 for other individuals, $25.00 for couples, and $250 for a lifetime membership. We have close to 40 members who have elected to become lifetime patrons. After promising more specifics in the financial report, offered below, Linda then had the great pleasure of asking Lisa Rosner to return to the podium to deliver her Presidential Address [the lead essay in this issue].

Respectfully submitted,
Linda E. Merians
Executive Secretary
Executive Committee: 2012

President: Kathy Temple  
Vice President: James Woolley  
1st. Past President: Lisa Rosner  
2nd. Past President: Linda Troost  
Web Wizard: Jim Moody with the able assistance of Ellen Moody  
Newsletter Editor: James May  
Past and Future Conference Chairs: Linda Troost, Christine Clark-Evans, Sayre Greenfield, Laura Engel, Scott Gordon, Beverly Schneller  
Elected Board Members & Molin Prize Judges: Corey Andrews (term up at end of 2012, will serve as Chair of the Molin Committee); Rivka Swenson (term ending 2013); Anna Foy (term ending 2014)  
Executive. Secretary: Linda E. Merians (term ending 2013)

Financial Report for the 2011 Calendar Year

As you can see from the figures below, we are continuing to keep our expenses and our revenue in close balance! Since we had to pay a considerable deposit in 2011 for the 2012 meeting, our expenses for the year overran our revenue, but we were able to absorb that situation. You will see that postage is our highest regular annual expense. We are grateful to several offices at Pennsylvania State University that provide support for the printing expenses of our newsletter. Our conference organizers work hard every year to make sure that the registration fee we charge for the annual meeting covers all expenses related to it. With more of our meetings taking place at hotels, this is not easy to do, but we promise you that we will continue to make the effort. At the end of December 2011, we had a bank balance of $4,533.65. Thank you so much for your prompt dues payment and for your support of our Society.

Revenue  
Dues membership: $5,120  
Conference registration: $15,444.05  
Interest: $5.16  
Total revenue: $20,569.21

Expenses  
Bank charges: $81.49  
2011 Conference: $14,625.93  
2012 Conference Deposit: $3,625  
Mailing and office expenses: $281.02  
Molin Prize for 2010 co-winners: $300  
Newsletter printing: $903.49  
Postage: $2,020.60  
Total expenses: $21,837.53
Melissa Wehler Wins 2011 Molin Prize

We are pleased to announce that Melissa Wehler of Duquesne University has won the Molin Prize competition for the best paper by a graduate student at our 2011 meeting (November 3-6 at Penn State University). Melissa’s winning presentation was entitled "Ready to burst: Dorothy Jordan, Leigh Hunt, and Restraining Desire." The paper drew on her dissertation research, though it may well be excised to form a stand-alone article. Melissa’s dissertation, directed by Laura Engel, is currently entitled "Illegitimate Celebrity in the British Long Eighteenth Century."

Melissa kindly provided us with an abstract of the winning essay:

The essay examines two of Leigh Hunt's diatribes against the actress Dorothy Jordan, the famed comedic actress who built her celebrity persona based on titillating, cross-dressing performances. While such performances proved popular with audiences, Hunt insultingly referred to the theatrical practice as "barbarous," "injurious," and "unnatural," and suggested that such practices threaten to "unsex" actresses entirely and irrevocably. Because Jordan is able to "unsex" herself through cross-dressing and to appeal to both male and female audience members, Hunt worries that Jordan, and actresses like her, are no longer subject to the kind of self- and social-policing that advocates female "charity and discernment." Using close reading and performance theory, I argue that women like Jordan became their own authorities and worked to undermine the presumed authority of male critics like Hunt who wanted to contain women within the bounds of constrictive gender roles.

The Molin Committee members--Corey Andrews, Rivka Swenson, and Christine Clark-Evans, its chair--praised Melissa Wehler’s paper for its originality, method and style. One remarked, "A very original examination of 1) cross-dressing by Dorothy Jordan as an illustration of the highly charged gender dynamics that proscribed the public and private actions of women, especially targeting here women theatrical performers; 2) the role of critical reception on the theater, dramaturgy, and their theatrical social circles; and 3) the aesthetics of stage and theatrical performances in maintaining normative gender values in defense of 'public virtue'." Melissa’s approach was praised for its complexity: "An interdisciplinary, feminist, and literary analysis of the cultural debate on a series of issues: the theater as a social institution and its cultural practices, how this woman actor demonstrated her resistance to the discipline-and-punishment procedures that presumed to control public performances . . . and the dynamics of acting out gender roles." Her points were “solidly based on historical sources, both published and private documents, illustrated with well chosen citations, [and] raised important interpretive and analytical questions.” The judges also found that she employed “an interesting stylistic alternation between different styles (descriptive discourse, narrative recounting of events, rhetorical
questioning) that made the paper interesting to follow and very persuasive.” Finally, the judges thought that Melissa “used the question and answer period effectively”: “she took care to understand and respond directly to questions as asked; moreover, she took the opportunity to address any perceived deficiencies, and did so gracefully and without defensiveness.”

Melissa graduated with her bachelor’s degree in English from Penn State. During her graduate studies at Duquesne, Melissa received the Duquesne University Graduate Student Award for Excellence in Teaching in Spring 2011 and McAnulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts Dissertation Fellowship 2011-2012. While finishing her dissertation, Melissa is spending time at her parents’ home in St. Marys, PA, just 30 miles north of your editor (St. Marys is the home of the Intelligencer’s official beer, “Peter Straub Dark”). Corresponding with Melissa about her work makes us confident that she has a fine career ahead in 18th-century studies. We are looking forward to future presentations from Melissa, hopefully as soon as this fall’s meeting and hope she attends the meeting as Dr. Wehler.

Eric Sven Molin was one of the founders of EC/ASECS and regularly enlivened our meetings. Eric was a much beloved colleague and teacher, providing great encouragement and assistance to graduate students, particularly those working in English with him at George Mason University. After his death in 1987, many of our members wanted to honor him and so it was decided to create this award, which, with its small cash prize ($150), encourages and recognizes good scholarship at our annual meetings. The prize is only given when the judges (drawn from our executive board) feel there is a graduate student paper (sometimes two) of high excellence, both in its content and presentation. Graduate students interested in submitting their papers for consideration in the 2012 Molin Prize competition should keep an eye on the website for special instructions. (See too the useful tips offered to candidates in the October 2011 Intelligencer [n.s. 25.3:27].)

To the Memory of Leland D. Peterson

Our good friend and colleague Leland Douglas Peterson died in Norfolk on 12 January 2012, having survived for almost fourteen years a stroke that impaired his left side. He was Professor of English at Old Dominion University for over 31 years (1961-1992). He was born in Stanchfield, Minnesota, on 19 July 1926, and graduated from Braham High School in Braham, Minnesota in 1944. After serving in the Army Air Corps during and after World War II (for a time in Europe), he attended the University of Minnesota, where he earned a B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. in English. In 1961 he accepted a position in the English Department of what was then the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary (which became Old Dominion College and is now Old Dominion University). He was a founding member of the Old Dominion College Faculty Senate, was its Chairman from
1965 to 1967, and was for some years faculty advisor to the campus literary magazine. Later in his career he also taught Latin at the University—including a year of Latin taught without compensation following his retirement, to ensure that his students got a second year to secure their grasp of the language.

More to the point for our membership, he was instrumental in founding the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies and served as its Executive Secretary for two terms, 1977-1983. He also served as an Executive Board member, Vice-President, and President. He founded the East-Central’s newsletter (The EC/AECS Newsletter, now The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer) in 1978 and edited it until 1980. (An account of his newsletters, always marked by good humor and efforts to provoke discussion, can be found on pp. 33-34 of the January 2005 issue of the Intelligencer, with a bibliographical account of the newsletter.) Also, he was a regular and important contributor to the issues of those editors succeeded him, contributing, for instance, “Spectator” columns signed “Kikerow” to the Intelligencer.

His main interest throughout his career was the work of Jonathan Swift and especially for the last 20 or 30 years Swift’s poetry. He led and was a part of many sessions on Swift’s poetry. He published articles on Swift from at least as early as 1967, in PMLA (“Swift’s ‘Project’: A Religious and Political Satire”), to as recently as the 2007 issue of Swift Studies (“James Arbuckle, Author of The Beasts’ Confession to the Priest”). His work on Swift as a poet and satirist tended to involve bibliographical and textual evidence and was often directed toward attribution problems—he sometimes argued to remove items from Swift’s canon and long wanted to argue such with metrical evidence, feeling confident that he could identify verse not up to Swift’s abilities. Some of his most important articles were “A Variant of the 1742-6 Swift-Pope Miscellanies,” in Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America [PBSA], 66 (1972), 302-10; “The Spectral Hand in Swift’s ‘Day of Judgement,’ in PBSA, 70 (1976), 189-219; “Jonathan Swift and a Prose ‘Day of Judgment,’” in Modern Philology, 81 (1984), 401-06; “Problems of Authenticity and Text in Three Early Poems Attributed to Swift,” in Harvard Library Bulletin, 33 (1985), 404-24; “Gulliver’s Travels: Antient and Modern History Corrected,” in Swift Studies, 6 (1991), 83-110; and “Revisions of Swift’s ‘On the Day of Judgment,’” in PBSA, 86 (1992), 461-71. A good colleague, he reviewed a number of books on Swift for the major journals, and for a time was a proofreader for The Scriblerian. Of course, he published, particularly in his youth, much outside Swift studies, including an article on Ezra Pound in American Quarterly, 17 (1965), 33-47.

Although I have known him since 1965, my fondest memories of him started in 1973, when he chaired (and I served on) the local committee that organized the EC/AECS meeting for that fall in Virginia Beach. With Leland directing things, the meeting, of course, went well and has made a firm member of me ever since—so firm that Leland and I contrived together to attend nearly every meeting, regional and national, until well after we both
retired, in 1992. We’ve been as far afield as Houston, Boston, New Orleans and Toronto, attending national meetings by car, train, and plane—most frequently within the East-Central region, to some places more than once. I know it was a pleasure to him; he was always close to EC/ASECS, offering enthusiasm and guidance to the organization and advice to young scholars, and directly contributing to the scholarly business with good papers and well chaired sessions. I enjoyed seeing his friends at the meetings, and in the first decades of our society knew almost the whole membership. It was in view of his great contribution to our Society that he was awarded the first of EC/ASECS’s career service awards and that award was designated the Leland D. Peterson Award.

He was a very good teacher and student adviser, respected by peers and students at Old Dominion University, whose attention and affection he easily held. He leaves many well-taught and devoted former students, especially Swiftians, in his wake. He is survived by his wife Betty and three of their four children. Merrie Jo Milner (Randy) of Norfolk, Kristin New (Michael) of Norfolk, and Eric F. Peterson, a Colonel in the U.S. Marines, who took his English B.A. from the University of Virginia and now teaches at the National Defense University and lives near his mother in Norfolk. Other survivors include daughter-in-law Marcie Peterson, fourteen grandchildren and a great grandchild, plus a sister, Donna Hanson, in Lake Orion, Michigan. (One son, David Leland, predeceased him.) A memorial service was held at the First Lutheran Church in Norfolk on 17 January, at which Leland’s son Eric gave a fine eulogy, richly detailed. Internment was to follow in Stanchfield, MN. Betty, Leland’s wife of 60 years, whom some of us will remember from past conferences, still lives at their longtime home at 1051 Manchester Avenue, Norfolk, VA 23508, not far from her children and grandchildren.

Philip Hines, Jr.

**In Memorium, Blanche T. Ebeling-Koning, 1928-2011**

Dr. Blanche T. van Berckel-Ebeling Koning of Greenbelt, Maryland, died on 25 May 2011, following surgery. Dr. Ebeling Koning was born in Rotterdam, but passed her adult life in the United States. She took degrees from Hunter College and Columbia University, writing a dissertation involving the early Middle Ages, “Style and Structure in Ekkehard’s Waltharius” (1977). Most of her life was spent as a rare-books cataloguer and librarian. Working into her late seventies, she was employed for a time at the John Carter Brown Library, Harvard’s Houghton Library, and the Archives of American Art at the Smithsonian Institution. She has been a member of EC/ASECS for nearly three decades, during which time her home in Greenbelt was her permanent residence. She worked for years at the University of Maryland and then Catholic University’s Oliveira Lima Library (of whose rare materials she provided an
overview in Remate de Males, 24 [Campinas-SP, Brazil, 2004]). She brought to
the study of rare books considerable language abilities, having learned Dutch in
her youth and taught Latin early on, she also could translate Portuguese. As
reported here in 2008, she worked during her retirement on a translation of
Caspar van Baerle’s The History of Brazil under the Governorship of Count
Johan Mauritas of Nassau, 1636-1644, published last September by the
University of Florida (448 pp.; ISBN: 081303664x). Baerle’s history, in Latin,
offers the official record of the Dutch’s rule over northeast Brazil in the early
seventeenth century and contains much on the native population, the flora and
fauna, the economy and social life (including the development of the slave trade).
The Amazon listing for the book records Jonathan Israel of Princeton’s
comment, “The translation is of excellent quality and the introduction is both
clear and helpful.” We understand from an obituary in The Shelter Island
Reporter (she was a regular visitor of a step-daughter and her family there in New
York), that “The final edit was completed just before her surgery.” Dr. Ebeling
Koning over the years also published various exhibition catalogues, including
Katherine Anne Porter at One Hundred: New Perspectives (U. of Maryland,
She was active in numerous societies related to book history, such as the
American Printing History Society, the William Morris Society, and the
Bibliographical Society of America. During the past decade, she contributed to
The Atlantic World and the Dutch, 1500-2000 (http://awad.kitlv.nl), a research
project, funded in 2004-08 by the Netherlands, to create an internet resource
archiving and registering published and unpublished Dutch. The site (AWAD)
lists her as a resource on the history of the West India Company in Brazil. Dr.
Ebeling Koning was the wife of Jacob J. Ebeling-Koning (d. 1987). She is
survived by her several children and three sisters in The Netherlands. A
memorial service was held at Catholic University on 18 June 2011.

Corrections and Additions to the Directory
Boyle, Frank. new address: 549 W. 123rd St., Apt. 15F / New York, NY 10027
Connors, Logan. lc050@bucknell.edu; French and Francophone Studies
Program / Bucknell Univ. / Lewisburg, PA 17837
Eadie, Lorraine M. (Hillsdale College) leadie@hillsdale.edu
56 Carriage Park / Hillsdale, MI 49242
Gillespie, Janne: email: jgillespie@gc.cuny.edu
Greene, John: jcg3525@centurytel.net
Thomas Hothem. (English) thothem@ucmerced.edu
Writing Center / University of California at Merced / Merced, CA 95343
Powers, Elizabeth. new email: elizabethmpowers@yahoo.com
Rosner, Lisa. History Department / Stockton College / 101 Vera King Farris
Drive / Galloway, NJ 08205-9441
News of Members


Eve Tavor Bannet has published Transatlantic Stories and the History of Reading, 1720-1810: Migrant Fictions (Cambridge UP, August 2011; 306 pp.; ISBN 1107007461), and she is editing with Susan Manning a collection of essays for CUP (“Transatlantic Literary Studies”). Eve has published the review essay “Studies in British and American Epistolary Culture,” on eight or so volumes, in ECL, 35.3 (Fall 2011), 89-103, on eight or so books about letters, from Temma Berg’s Lives and Letters of an 18C Circle of Acquaintance (2006) to Sarah Pearsall’s Atlantic Families: Lives and Letters in the Later Eighteenth Century (2009; paperback 2011) and Susan Whyman’s The Pen and the People: English Letter Writers, 1660-1800 (2010). Eve, Karen Cajka, Emily Friedman, and Marte Kvande have essays in Masters of the Marketplace: British Woman Novelists of the 1750s edited by Susan Carlile (Lehigh U. Press, 2010). The Spring 2011 Scriblerian has a fine review by Anna Battagelli of Charles Knight’s A Political Biography of Richard Steele, 2009 (212-14). Anna and Eleanor Shevlin posted much useful material on their Early Modern Online Bibliography last year, including their “Preliminary Guide for Students Using the Burney Collection of Newspapers” and news reports on the theft of 4.8 million articles from JSTOR by Aaron Swartz and his subsequent arrest and discussions of JSTOR itself. Temma Berg published “Truly Youngs: Arranging a Letter Collection” in the Winter 2011 issue of Eighteenth-Century Life, an issue (vol. 35, no. 1) focused on editing letters, which also includes Peter Sabor’s “‘The Job I have Perhaps Rashly Undertaken’: Publishing the Complete Correspondence of Samuel Richardson.” Eighteenth-Century Life, 35, no. 1 (winter 2011), 9-28. Arne Bialuschewski’s “A True Account of the Design and Advantages of the South-Sea Trade: Profits, Propaganda, and the Peace Preliminaries of 1711” appears in Huntington Library Quarterly, 73 (2010), 273-85. Arne argues that Abel Boyer, not Daniel Defoe, is the likely author, based on the discovery of a manuscript in Boyer’s hand that matches two-thirds of the printed text; also recounts the publication history of this and other pamphlets encouraged by the government to support the trade. Several years ago, Martine Brownley organized at Emory University a small conference on biography to celebrate O M Brack’s editing of the Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D. by Sir John Hawkins; the essays from that celebration, including Brack’s own “Reassessing Sir John Hawkins’s The Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.: Some Reflections,” will be soon published as Reconsidering Biography by Bucknell. Skip’s edition of Hawkins will be released in paperback by Georgia U. Press. T. E. D. Braun was this past fall elected a membre correspondant of the Académie de Montauban, the very academy founded by Ted’s poet, Le Franc de Pompignan, as the Société

Andrew Carpenter’s “A Verse Confrontation in Late-Eighteenth-Century Ireland,” in Eighteenth-Century Ireland, 25 (2010), 33-47, provides an account of the trendy purchase in 1780s of Gaelic ballads written by an itinerant ballad maker, bought by sophisticated Dubliners, principally to make fun of them, but one ballad was translated into polite metrical stanzas and anthologized (the article contains transcripts of texts involved). Andrew also co-edited with Marc Cabal the collection of essays Oral and Print Cultures in Ireland, 1600-1900 (Four Courts Press, 2010), which contains his “Garbling and Jumbling: Printing from Dictation in Eighteenth-Century Limerick.” Vincent Carretta’s review essay “Recovered Lives,” on Kathleen Chater’s Untold Histories: Black People in England and Wales during the Period of the British Slave Trade (2009) and on C. Adams and E. Pleck’s Love of Freedom: Black Women in Colonial and Revolutionary New England (2010), appeared in the most recent Eighteenth-Century Life (Winter 2012), 36.1: 98-102. This same issue has David Hill Radcliffe’s review essay “Romanticism and Genre, Theory and Practice” (36.1:128-34), on David Duff’s Romanticism and the Uses of Genre. During the 2012-13 academic year, Logan Connors will be in Paris writing a critical edition of Pierre De Belloy’s tragedy, Le Siège de Calais (1760), as well as teaching and conducting research at the Université Paris-Sorbonne. In the 2011 Eighteenth-Century Scotland, edited by Richard Sher, JoEllen DeLucia reviews Pam Perkins’s Women Writers and the Edinburgh Enlightenment (Rodopi, 2010), Rivka Swenson reviews Elizabeth Hamilton’s The Cottagers of Glenburnie and littéraire de Montauban in 1730 and given its patent as a royal academy in 1743.

In Persuasions, 31 (2009), we find the following essays by members: Jan Fergus’s “‘Rivalry, Treachery between sisters!’: Tensions between Brothers and Sisters in Austen’s Novels” (31: 69-88); Jocelyn Harris’s “Francis Burney’s The Wanderer, Jane Austen’s Persuasion, and the Cancelled Chapters” (130-44); and Peter Sabor’s “Brotherly and Sisterly Dedications in Jane Austen’s Juvenalia” (33-46). Also, in the Persuasions On-Line posting of papers from the 2009 meeting appears Jan Fergus’s “Hazel Holt’s My Dear Charlotte: A Novel Based on Jane Austen’s Letters” (http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol30no1/toc.html). Polly Fields presented “Hrothwissa’s Working Women: Punishment, Gender, and Staging the Unspeakable” at the Conference on Gender and Medieval Studies in January held at the U. of Manchester. In the fall at the Rocky Mountain MLA, she presented “The Graceful Iconoclast: 18th-Century Poet Jane Johnston Schoolcraft as Historical Revisionist” (pertaining to the first text reference to a “White Indian,” on Schoolcraft’s grandfather [Ojeeb], in an epic with the same name--Polly thinks Schoolcraft “vastly unheralded” despite “her innovations”). Barbara L. Fitzpatrick reviewed Periodicals and Publishers: The Newspaper and Journal Trade, 1740-1914 (2009), ed. by John Hinks, Catherine Armstrong, and Matthew Day in Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 104 (2010), 544-46. Emily Friedman is working on olfactory data in the 18C novel--she asks that anyone who finds smelly passages in novels to let her know (ecfriedman@auburn.edu). Her article “Sir Charles Grandison’s Neverending Story: Richardson, Closure, and the Rise of the Novel” will appear in the summer 2012 issue of SEL, and her essay “Austen among the Fragments: Understanding the Fate of Sanditon” has recently or will soon appear in a special issue of Women’s Writing on “Rethinking Influences.” We thank Emily for the review above that she penned on Lorna Clark’s edition of Sarah Harriet Burney’s The Romance of Private Life. W. B. Gerard, with Brigitte Friant-Kessler have published in The Shandean two more instalments of an ongoing effort (begun with a first part in Shandean 2005): “Toward a Catalogue of Illustrated Laurence Sterne (Part Five): Life


Linde Katritzky sends us news after a long hiatus. Linde continues to work on the polymath G. C. Lichtenberg, more specifically through comparisons and parallels with English authors, on whom she also writes. She’s working “on Thomas Bentley (1731-80), mentor and collaborator of Josiah Wedgwood the potter, friend of Erasmus Darwin, and founding member of the Lunar Society, with which Lichtenberg had various contacts, esp. through his friendship with Joseph Priestley.” Bentley was the uncle of Anne Radcliffe, and Linde has written an article on how Radcliffe’s fiction is enhanced by her contacts with Bentley’s circle and other scholars and thinkers, such as Sir William Hamilton. Linde published “Zensur und Gegenstrategien Gesellschaftskritik in Moritz

April London published Literary History Writing, 1770-1820 (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010; pp. 240). In last year’s Review of English Studies April reviewed Sandra Macpherson’s Harm’s Way: Tragic Responsibility and the

William McCarthy is co-editing Volume 5 of Samuel Richardson’s Correspondence with Tom Keymer. Kathy McGill published “‘The Most Industrious Sex’: John Lawson’s Carolina Women Domesticate the Land” in the July 2011 issue of The North Carolina Historical Review. Kathy spoke at the last Society of Early Americanists on “‘I am Myself Head Gardener’: Eliza Lucas Pinckney and Communication through Horticulture” and at the Virginia Forum in 2011 on “Man of Mystery: The Loyalism of Nicholas Cresswell.” We are saddened to report that Joyce Mitchell Melissinos, formerly a member of our society, passed away last year. Judith Milhous contributed “The Finances of an Eighteenth-Century London Theatre: The Lincoln’s Inn Fields Company under John Rich in 1724-1725” to The Stage’s Glory: John Rich (1692-1761), ed. by Berta Joncus and Jeremy Barlow, 2011 (pp. 61-69). Judy’s review of Derek
Hughes’s Culture and Sacrifice: Ritual Death in Literature and Opera appears in Journal of Eighteenth-Century Studies, 33 (2010), 120-21. Ellen Moody published “Trollope on Television: Intertextuality in the Pallisers and Other Trollope Films,” in Adaptations: Teaching British Literature of the Nineteenth Century and Film, edited by Abigail Burnham Bloom (Cumbria Press, 2012), and “‘People that marry can never part’: An Intertextual Reading of Northanger Abbey,” in Persuasions Online, 31:1 (Winter 2010). Recently she presented the paper “‘What are men to rocks and mountains’: The Content of Ann Radcliffe’s Landscapes” at the South-Central conference in Asheville. Ellen has been reviewing the Later Manuscripts volume of the Cambridge Edition of Jane Austen’s works for ECCB and working on a book (“A Place of Refuge: The Austen movies”) and an article on Winston Graham’s historical fiction. Ellen always has an on-going project for the Net: now she’s publishing each week an analysis of a Jane Austen letter--in late January she was at Letter 63 (on her “Reveries under the Sign of Austen, Two” blog. A word of thanks here to Jim Moody who continues to tackle with gusto all the Society’s web business, most recently agreeing to handle postings that will make the book exchange possible for our next meeting. Jim is apparently the fellow who never rolls down his sleeves! (Ellen writes that Ted Braun made a helpful contribution too.)

The Age of Johnson, which contains about 17 essays, including contributions by members John Dussinger, E. Derek Taylor, and Robert G. Walker. This past summer Delaware published Hugh Ormsby-Lennon’s Hey Presto! Swift and the Quacks (396 pp.; 978-1-61149-012-1; $85), investigating the impact on medical shows by mountebanks, or state-itinerants, influenced the manner and content of Swift’s A Tale of a Tub. Leah Orr has continued to publish long, solid articles while working on her dissertation at Penn State: over the winter appeared her “Genre Labels on the Title Pages of English Fiction, 1660-1800” in Philological Quarterly, 90 (2011), 67-95, and “The Basis for Attribution in the Canon of Eliza Haywood” in The Library, 7th ser., 12 ([Dec.] 2011), 335-73, concluding with a valuable 12-page table, cataloguing works along with a rating of the evidence for their attribution to Haywood. Those at our Pittsburgh meeting might recall the fine paper from which the latter article arose—the Haywood study is also a part of but one chapter in Leah’s dissertation. (Frankly, some of us prefer it when the youngsters are lazy slackers so that we can bad-talk to our envious spleen’s content.) Catherine Parisian’s The First White House Library: A History and Annotated Catalogue (published by Penn State for the Bibliographical Society of America, 2010) is reviewed in Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, 105 (2011), 110-12. The library is that formed by President Millard Fillmore and his wife Abigail (1850-53); besides Cathy’s catalogue of the library’s holdings (over 250 pp.), the essay contains essay by her (“The White House Collection: The Mind of the Common Man”) and others.

This summer or fall Lehigh U. Press published a collection of thirteen essays by William Pencak: Contested Commonwealths: Essays in American History (the press’s catalogue indicate that the topics include “colonial and revolutionary crowds and communities,” “popular ideology in songs and almanacs”; and the thought and lives of Washington, Adams, Franklin and the loyalist Peter Oliver. In the Winter 2012 ECS, William’s essay “Anti-Semitism, Toleration, and Appreciation” is appreciatively reviewed along with others in The First Prejudice: Religious Tolerance and Intolerance in Early America (2011), edited by Chris Beneke and Christopher S. Grenda. Adam Potkay has three publications coming out this year: the “Rethinking the Romantic Sublime,” forthcoming in The Sublime: From Antiquity to the Present, ed. Timothy Costelloe (Cambridge UP, 2012)—he writes that his “‘Romantic sublime’ basically begins with Mark Akenside, so ‘Romantic’ is a capacious term here”—-an 8,000 word entry on "Philosophic and Discursive Prose" (Shaftesbury, Hume, et al.) for The Oxford History of Classical Reception in English Literature, Vol. 3: 1660-1790, ed. David Hopkins and Charles Martindale (Oxford UP, 2012); and, from Johns Hopkins UP, his book Wordsworth’s Ethics, which is very attentive to the poets that Wordsworth read, including Thomson and Akenside and much loco-descriptive verse—Adam notes that his title is “an homage to the title of an 1876 Leslie Stephen essay.” I asked Adam for news of Bob MacCubbin and learned that, though retired for seven years now, Bob has been teaching occasional courses at William & Mary, including courses on Burns and

Angus Ross recently published _A Political Biography of John Arbuthnot_, in Pickering & Chatto’s series Eighteenth-Century Political Biographies, with Alan Downie as general editor; also last year would have been published Michael Brown’s biography of John Toland and Chris Fauske’s of William King (the Bishop, 1650-1729). Paul Ruxin contributed an essay on his first-edition copy of Johnson’s _A Dictionary of the English Language to Other People’s Books: Association Copies and the Stories They Tell_ (Chicago: Caxton Club [distributed by Oak Knoll], 2011; pp. 214; 112 illus.). The book has essays on 52 association copies (24 from institutions and 28 from private collections), many inscribed for presentation. Caxton Club members formed a prize jury to select the essays and edit and index the book. There’s a review on the website FineBooks by Rebecca Rego Barry that says Paul’s essay “reads like a literary mystery” and quotes Paul to the effect that association copies expand the nature of books into a “different realm,” underscoring how there can be no digital equivalent of a physical book. Another essay in the collection noted in that review concerns books at the Library of Congress by Thoreau and Whitman that they exchanged and annotated in reading. Manuel Schonhorn’s current projects include Pope’s borrowing from and knowledge of Justus Lipsius and also “Fathers and Mentors in Selected Fictions from Spenser to Burney.” Manny’s examination of the weather and geography in Austen’s _Mansfield Park_ has just been published in _The Age of Johnson_, vol. 21 (2001); "Climate, Sites, and a Sanctuary: Austen's Mansfield Park." Eleanor Shevlin’s _The History of the Book in the West_. Vol. 3: 1700-1800 (Ashgate, 2010) is reviewed by Margaret J. Ezell in _Eighteenth-Century Studies_, 44 (2011), 555-57, who calls the collection “deftly selected” and a “useful first-stop for any aspiring researcher entering the field.” It’s also reviewed in the fall 2011 _Scriblerian_. After beating a severe illness, Eleanor will be back chairing a session for us at the Baltimore meeting.
Roy Wolper and the other editors of The Scriblerian are to be congratulated on their Spring 2011 issue. The issue has some very fine reviews in it by members (and of other members’ work), particularly John Dussinger’s examination of the two vols. of The Letters of Laurence Sterne edited by Mel New and Peter de Voogd, which offers a clear and concise account of how this edition expands and improves on earlier editions and relates to them and also of the major decisions by the editors. John, who’s an accomplished editor of letters from working up several volumes of the Cambridge edition of Samuel Richardson’s letters, applauds the decision by New and de Voogd to quote at length the notes in L. P. Curtius’s 1935 edition of the letters rather than repeatedly draw on them without crediting that dependence (as is commonly what’s done). Another good review of an important edition is J. Alan Downie’s of the Cambridge Swift volume English Political Writings 1711-1714, edited by the late Bertrand Goldgar and Ian Gadd. Alan has high praise for the volume— it’s always nice to read reviews confirming one’s impressions. Anna Battigelli’s review of Charles A. Knight’s A Political Biography of Richard Steele (P&C, 2009), besides making note of the redundancy often a part of poorly edited books, digs into meaty questions about Steele’s life and relates well Knight’s approach to that in Calhoun Winton’s two-volume biography of Steele (Winton is hoping to publish an expanded, revised biography of Steele in a few years). There’s much to be learned from James Tierney’s model review and close analysis of Lisa Maruca’s The Work of Print— he finds problems, but his summary of its major topics led to me order a copy. There are a couple reviews here by such stalwarts as W. B. Gerard and probably half a dozen by Mel New, and at least one review by Kevin Berland, Sharon Harrow, Pam Lieske, Marte Kvande, Geoffrey Sill, and Robert Walker. Of course many members’ publications are reviewed (Martin Battestin, Erik Bond, Rachel Carnell, Kevin Cope, J. Paul Hunter, Chris Johnson, Sandro Jung, Adam Potkay, et al.) As ever, I gathered some intelligence on scholarly trends, such as in the review of an article on theriophily (love of animals—a word not in my dictionary)— and then I noticed the advt. on the inside cover for a book on this trendy subject (Laura Brown’s Homeless Dogs and Melancholy Apes), with a puff pronouncing human-animal relations “a leading concern in contemporary cultural studies.”


**Forthcoming Meetings**

SHARP (Society for the History of Authorship, Reading, and Publishing) will hold its 2012 meeting on 26-29 June at Trinity College Dublin, with the theme “The Battle for Books.” The deadline for submitting proposals is 30 November. SHARP will meet in Philadelphia during 2013.

The Tercentenary Laurence Sterne Conference will be hosted by the Royal Holloway College of the U. of London on 8-11 July 2013 and organized by Judith Hawley (J.Hawley@rhul.ac.uk). The conference fee of c. 400 will include on campus lodging and board (see www.shandean.org/conference for details). Proposals for individual papers or panels should be sent to peterdevoogd@fastmail.fm by 1 December.

The ECSSS’s 25th annual conference will occur on 12-14 April 2012 at the U. of South Carolina, Columbia, hosted by its English Dept. and library. The theme is “Media & Mediation in 18C Scotland: Voices, Manuscripts and ‘Guid Black Prent,’” and sessions occur in the new Hollings Special Collections Library, home to the G. Ross Roy Collection of Robert Burns. Contact Patrick Scott, head of rare books and conference organizer: scottp@mailbox.sc.edu.

The annual meeting of NEASECS will take place at Wesleyan U. on Oct.
11-14, 2012, with the theme the “Social Individual” and plenary speakers Laurent Dubois (Duke) and Sophie Rosenfeld (UVA). Situated on the Connecticut River, Middletown is a charming 19C New England city of 50,000 that is known for its wide main street and excellent restaurants. Supported by Wesleyan’s Center for the Study of Public Life, registration will include two cocktail parties, a lunch, a banquet dinner on Saturday, and continental breakfasts. Proposals for panels are due by 15 March, and for papers, by 15 May to Prof. Paul Erickson (perickson@wesleyan.edu) – panel topics are posted at NEASECS’s website. On arrangements query Prof. Andrew Curran (acurran@wesleyan.edu).

Announcements of New Resources, Publications, etc.

The Library Company of Philadelphia has issued press releases on a number of institutional initiatives and changes, which your editor will here Curr- ize (adapt and plagiarize). On 26 October 2011, The Library Company appointed its first Director of the Program in African American History and announced a partnership with the U. of Georgia Press. Erica Armstrong Dunbar, an associate professor of history at the University of Delaware, has been named the first Director of the Library Company's Program in African American History. Professor Dunbar specializes in African American life and culture from 1619 to 1865. She received a bachelor's degree from the Penn in 1994 and a doctoral degree from Columbia U. in 2000. Dunbar's book A Fragile Freedom: African American Women and Emancipation in the Antebellum City (Yale UP) is based in part on research she conducted in the Library Company's collections as a fellow. Library Company Director John Van Horne remarked, "We are genuinely excited to have a distinguished scholar with strong ties to this institution providing leadership for this important Program." The Program in African American History, established in 2007 with a grant from The Albert M. Greenfield Foundation, brings together scholars and interested members of the public to explore every aspect of the experience of people of African descent in the Americas from the first European colonization through 1900. Professor Dunbar will provide direction for the fellowships, conferences, exhibitions, publications, public programming, teacher training, and acquisitions (about which, see PPL’s new website). The Library Company does not overstate in claiming to possess “one of the nation's most important collections of African American literature and history before 1900. Comprising more than 13,500 titles and 1,200 images from the mid-16th to the late-19th centuries, the Afro-Americana holdings include books, pamphlets, newspapers, periodicals, broadsides, and graphics documenting slavery and abolitionism in the New World; the printed works of Black individuals and organizations; descriptions of African American life throughout the Americas; and the exploration and colonization of Africa." The PR goes on to a very proper tribute: “Curator of African American History Phil Lapsansky, who has served in that capacity since 1971, has made significant contributions to the development of the larger discipline over that time, as well as helping to shape the Library Company’s
acquisitions, exhibitions, and programming. Mr. Lapsansky will retire in 2012.”

In a significant enhancement to the Program in African American History, the Library Company has formed a partnership with the U. of Georgia Press to support Race in the Atlantic World, 1700-1900, a series of books focused on racial aspects of transatlantic history. The first book under the new partnership will be Eva Sheppard Wolf's *Almost Free: A Story about Family and Race in Antebellum Virginia*, to be published in spring 2012. Professor Dunbar, who’ll serve on the series’ editorial advisory board, believes that “this partnership provides a critical platform for disseminating the research that will be conducted at the Library Company by our Fellows, and we are very pleased to be associated with such a distinguished press and well-established series.”

The *Folger Shakespeare Library* exhibits until 20 May “Shakespeare’s Sisters: Voices of English and European Women Writers, 1500-1700.”

In the dedication to the exhibition catalogue *Of Elephants & Roses: Encounters with French National History, 1790-1830* (Philadelphia: APS Museum, 2011. Pp. 40), Sue Ann Price, the Founding Director and curator of the *American Philosophical Society Museum’s* writes of the Museum’s founding: “The new museum opened its first exhibition in Philosophical Hall in October 2001. It had been almost 200 years since Charles Willson Peale’s successful museum—the first in America—had occupied the same building. Since 2001, more than 600,000 people from around the nation and the world have visited the new APS Museum.” The catalogue (sent to us by Catherine Lafarge) is well produced, with colored illustrations and short essays on French natural history and its patronage and public support. It describes what must have been a very fine exhibition (offering a diversity that included manuscripts, printer materials, paintings, artifacts, such as preserved bird specimens and mastodon bones).

*Reading Experience Database* accumulates evidence of reading experiences, 1495-1945, placing documented evidence in a database that can be browsed and searched (beginning in 2005 and growing to include national subsets in early 2011, for Australia, Canada, Netherlands, New Zealand, and United Kingdom—the UK database held 10,000+ records in 2009 and 30,000+ in 2011). The website, at http://www.open.ac.uk/Arts/RED/, has a form for contributing records to that database. The international growth of the database was made possible with a grant from the Arts & Humanities Research Council in 2010 (the AHRC had earlier been supporting the RED). Based at the Open University and the Institute of English Studies of the University of London, the RED published from 2005-2009 *RED Letter: The Newsletter of the Reading Experience Database*, edited by Rosalind Crone of the Open University and Katie Halsey of the Institute of English Studies, in Winter, Spring, and Summer issues, noting publications, conferences, and scholarly activities of other sorts, while posting updates on the database itself. These issues have been placed in easily available PDF files at the website. In 2010 *RED Letter* was replaced with the web-blog *Reading Experiences, Reading Technologies*. In 2010 Crone, Halsey, and Shafquat Towheed edited a collection on *The History of Reading* (Routledge); then in 2011, a three-volume series related to the RED project was

This past year Cambridge UP published *The Child Reader, 1700-1840*, ed. by M. O. Grenby (2011; pp. 336; bibliography; index). It has an introduction valuable for its discussion of bibliographical and extra-textual sources and methods; chapters follow that cover the owners, the books themselves, the acquisition of books, their use, and attitudes of adults and children toward children’s reading.

Agustin Mackinlay is now operating a weblog devoted to Raynal's *Histoire philosophique et politique de Establissements et du commerce . . . les deux Indes*. You can find it at www. histoiredesdeuxindex.blogspot.com. Mackinlay has just published on kindle ($9.99) his book (in Spanish) on Raynal's work: *El best-seller que cambió el mundo: Globalización, colonialismo y poder en el siglo de las Luces*.


Juan Carrete Parrondo and others have compiled *Bibliografía sobre las estampas de Francisco Goya*. Pp. 166. Open-access online bibliography posted at *Arte Procomún* on the WWW in 2009 and last revised in 2011. http://sites.google.com/site/arteprocomun/bibliografia-sobre-estampas-de-francisco-goya. (With divisions into works and genres, as “Caprichos.”)

One recent book that looks important is Jane McLeod’s *Licensing Loyalty: Printers, Patrons, and the State in Early Modern France* (University Park: Penn State UP, 2011; pp. 302; with impt. appendices). Apparently a strongly evidenced study of the threat of print culture to government and actions by the government and the press in response. Topics covered include actions by the royal council in 1667 and 1701, the enforcement of printers’ quotas in the provinces after 1704, arguments by printers in their requests for licenses, 1667-1789, five case studies during the reign of Louis XVI, and an assessment of the social position of printers in 1750-1789. The two appendices contain: 1) Printers’ Wealth in the eighteenth century; and 2) Some licensed provincial printers involved in the clandestine book trade, 1750-89, by town.

I recently stumbled upon Brycchan Carey’s “John Wesley (1703-1791),” one of his many bio-bibliographies posted online with open-access at *British Abolitionists*, a repository of approximately three dozen bio-bibliographies, some compiled by scholars other than Carey (as that on “William Fox {fl. 1791-1794}”
The British Abolitionists was created 2001 and has been regularly expanded and updated. Carey even earlier had mounted a bibliographical site on Slavery (http://www.brycchancarey.com/slavery/index.htm), which contains such webpages as “Histories of Three-Fingered Jack: A Bibliography” by Diana Paton (2008, at www.brycchancarey.com/slavery/tfj/index.htm).


The Journal of Scholarly Publishing keeps continual attention to the state and health of university presses and scholarly journals. Regarding the presses, it periodically offers a “University Press Forum” for the year, as in the October 2011 issue. Cecile Jagodzinski offered “The University Press in North America: A Brief History” (40 [2009], 1-20), and that article was followed by short accounts, “snapshots,” of the state of six university presses (Iowa, Michigan, Ohio State, Virginia, Wisconsin, Washington State). Another article on the state of affairs was “The Market Demand for University Press Books 2008-2015” by Albert N. Greco and Robert M. Wharton (42 [2010], 1-15). Joseph J. Esposito’s “Creating a Consolidated Online Catalogue for the University Press Community” shakes down a feasibility study for such a catalogue funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Monterey Institute for Technology and Education, intended to help the presses sell more books (41 [2010], 385-427). A related concern involves the conversion of dissertation into books, with articles in the July and October 2011 issues on the revision of dissertations into books (articles that define the virtues of good scholarly writing are rather common, too). Regarding journals, it offers such articles as “Project MUSE and the E-consolidation of Journals” by Elizabeth W. Brown (42 [2010], 83-88), also two articles on the journal ranking process employed by many universities. I found worth remembering the conclusions offered in Colin Day’s “Judging Journal Prices: A Cost Index for Academic Journals,” based on data in the American Economic Review, that journals have not risen in cost relative to inflation. This journal (JSP) receives contributions so frequently from some authors that one wonders if they are contributing editors or staff members, such as Jean-Pierre V. M. Hérubel, who often writes of publishing historical scholarship. To me, his most interesting title in recent years is an article co-authored with Anne Buchanan: “Taking Clio’s Pulse . . .: or, Examining the Characteristics of Monographic Publications Reviewed by American Historical Review” (42 [2011], 160-81). And I would note one other article that could interest our readers: Humphrey Tonkin’s “Navigating and Expanding the MLA International Bibliography” (41 [2010], 340-53), which notes that the MLA bibliography ceased being printed with the 2009 survey and that mechanisms are being sought to make it more useful, such as a bibliographical wiki that would be separate
from the bibliography.

There’s a note by Susan Rennie in the 2011 *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* on *James Boswell's Scottish dictionary manuscript*, which Boswell began to compile “in Utrecht in 1764, and later showed a sample of . . . to Samuel Johnson, but . . . never completed” (25:3). The MS (40 leaves, on about 800 words and including a specimen) is at the Bodleian, where it was long wrongly catalogued. Rennie is transcribing the MS for an edition. Rennie is to provide an account of the MS in the 2011 issue (no. 32) of *Dictionaries: The Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America*. The manuscript and edition project are discussed in Gordon Turnbull’s article “Boswell’s ‘Dictionary of the Scots Language’” in the *Johnsonian News Letter*, 62, no. 2 (September 2011), 37-42.

From the Midwestern ASECS’s spring newsletter (May 2011), edited by Jeanine Casler of Northwestern, we learn that the *William Blake Archive* (www.blakearchive.org) has mounted electronic “editions” of two copies of Blake’s *The Book of Thel* (1790, copies D and G, held by the British Museum and the Fitzwilliam Museum). With these added, the Archive has “79 copies of Blake’s nineteen illuminated books in the context of full bibliographic information about each work, careful diplomatic transcriptions of all texts, detailed descriptions of all images, and extensive bibliographies. In addition to illuminated books, the Archive contains many important manuscripts and series of engravings, sketches, color print drawings, tempera paintings, and water color drawings.” The site, freely open to all and made possible by the UNC at Chapel Hill and the U. of Rochester, has a table of context, or index.

The annual *Royal Historical Society Bibliography of British and Irish History*, long an impressive printed resource, has become the *Bibliography of British and Irish History Online* (BBIH). To the Royal Historical Bibliography have been added records from partner projects *London’s Past Online* and *Irish History Online*. To 460,000 acquired records will be added about 10,000 per year in three instalments. The reorganization was made possible by grants from such patrons as the Leverhulme Trust, Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the UK’s Arts & Humanities Research Council. Data enters the bibliography from the British Library’s *Inside* article database and the British National Bibliography. The online bibliography records the contents of 600 journals (plus books). The online product is sold by subscription to individuals and institutions (with several institutional packages), overseen by Brepols Publishers (Belgium), which offers 30-day free trials to institutions (www.brepolis.net).

The British SECS’s *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* has much to recommend it, and I find its articles more useful to my slice of the 18C than I do those in *ECS*. Some of its specifically focused issues have been memorable, as that on animals. The December 2011 issue offered many review essays on fields of 18C studies, thus attempting to offer, as M.O. Grenby says in his introduction, “an overview of the current state of eighteenth-century studies.” While he notes some areas excluded, there are essays surveying scholarship or the state of the discipline on the Americas, the Muslim World, Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and China—and such fields as art French and German studies, history, geography,
and music. The Wiley-Blackwell website offers quick and easy contents tables for each issue, with page numbers (something missing from a many journals’ websites) and with abstracts of the articles. My only criticism of *JECS* is that one of last year’s issues had four or five essays that treated Romantic material in the Romantic period (34.2). Given the breadth of the 18C, our journals would be wise to leave Shelley, *et al.* to journals on Romanticism and the 19C.

Americanists should know of the American Antiquarian Society’s e-journal, or e-newsletter, *Common-Place*, open to all at http://www.common-place.org, which regularly appears on the web with many interesting and well illustrated articles. I found many articles of interest. First, Endina Taylor and Jeremy Dibbell’s “Reconstructing a Lost Library: George Wythe’s ‘Legacie’ to President Thomas Jefferson” (10, no. 2: January 2010). Taylor and Dibbell found among Jefferson’s papers (both work at the Thomas Jefferson Foundation in Monticello) an 8-p. list of books in Jefferson’s hand. The list has 5 pp. of books referenced to family members, noting books Jefferson gave away, and then three pages of books without reference. The three-pages are books that Jefferson kept, and many of these are books given to Jefferson by his former law tutor during the 1760s at Williamsburg, George Wythe, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. The two dozen or so Wythe books went with Jefferson’s collection to the Library of Congress and have been matched to the listings in the manuscript. Some of the articles of particular utility gather up or survey resources, such as Sean Smith’s “Food History on the Web” is in “Web Library” of Oct. 2009. Two others are:


In the summer 2010 issue of *Quadrat*, we learned about “‘Murders and Marvels’: The Chapbook Project at the University of Leicester,” a project involving John Hinks, Roey Sweet, Kate Loveman, and Malcolm Noble (no. 23:16-18). This research project, funded by the Bibliographical Society, involves the production of a database of chapbooks. With web mastery by Malcolm Noble, it offers a sample from collections at Cambridge University Library, Nottingham University Library, and Birmingham City Library and generalizes about their content, readers, and publishers.

*Christ Church Library Music Catalogue*, compiled and clearly introduced by John Milson, in a website designed and programmed by Matthew Phillips, was posted online on the WWW in 2002-2006.  http://library.chch.ox.ac.uk/music/. It’s reviewed favorably by Alan Howard in *Music and Letters*, 91 (2010), 91-94, who notes the holdings are “Particularly strong in printed music before 1700 and in manuscript English and Italian music of the same period” but also strong for the early 1700s, thanks in part to the personal libraries of faculty, such as two Richard Goodsons, who were organists, the younger dying in 1741.

**New MSS discovered:**  F. P. Lock’s “New Gibbon Letters” in *Review of
English Studies, 60 (2009), 96-107, identifies eleven letters, to diverse people and written between 1767 and 1793. In “Gravely Wounded in the Battle of the Bottle: James Beattie’s ‘The Grotesquiad’: A Major Literary Find at Abbotsford Library,” in TLS (10 June 2011), Rhona Brown reveals a 9000-word poem by Beattie found at the Abbotsford Library in Edinburgh. Also, from a BBC news announcement on 19 January 2012, we learned that Nicholas Cronk, Director of the Voltaire Foundation, announced the discovery in U.S. libraries of 14 Voltaire letters and documents, shedding light on Voltaire’s two years in England, testifying to Voltaire links to English nobility (as Voltaire’s remarks about staying at Lord Bathurst’s home at Richings). Among the MSS is a “signed acceptance . . . for a £200 grant from the Royal Family” (presumably at Queen Caroline’s instigation, to whom Voltaire dedicated a poem), on which Voltaire signed his first name as “Francis,” the only known instance of such.

From Lindsay Levy, the rare-books cataloguer of the Advocates Library, we received the following instructions for using the Advocates Library online catalogue to search for Abbotsford material. Go the website for the library’s catalogue at www.advocates.org.uk/library/catalogue.html, and click on “Search the Library catalogue” and choose “Advanced search.” Now click “Set Limits” button on right hand side and choose “Abbotsford Collection” from the locations drop-down menu. Then reclick the “Set Limits” button. Now enter an author’s name in the search box and click “search.” This library is home to the principal Sir Walter Scott collection. One can search for books with annotations by Scott, by using the keyword search with terms such as “Scott note” or Scott annotated.” Levy notes that, “if you want to ensure you only have long notes by Scott, add the word ‘substantial’ to your keyword search.” Anyone wishing help with Abbotsford materials will find Levy helpful (lindsay.levy@advocates.org.uk).

Edward Goedeken, the Humanities Bibliography at Iowa State U., posts online at the American Library Association’s website (on its Library History Round Table section) his “Bibliography of Writings on the History of Libraries, Librarianship, and Book Culture.” That for “Spring 2011” was posted in 2011 and the fall 2011 has or soon will be at www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/rts/lhrt/popularresources/libhistorybib. Goedeken has cumulative bibliographies for 1990 to Spring 1995; Fall 1995-1999; 2000-2004; thereafter bibliographies were compiled and posted for spring and fall 2005-2011 (given the inevitable delay, a fall 2009 publication might be in the spring 2010 list). Lists are divided geographically and topically (e.g., “American,” “History of Books.”).

Joceilyn Harris’s Oxford Univ. Press edition of Samuel Richardson’s The History of Sir Charles Grandison (1972), “the” edition and very hard to acquire used, is available in soft-cover for $110 (NZ), plus postage and handling. Vols. may be ordered separately. To order, send name, address, and full credit card info to uniprint@otago.ac.nz (Tel.: 0064 03 479 8043; FAX: 0064 03 479 8177).

Cover illustration: A title-page from the first collected octavo edition of The Tatler, the important English periodical edited by Sir Richard Steele, with one of printer John Nutt’s most distinctive cut ornaments.