Tributes to Betty Rizzo: From the 2013 EC/ASECS Roundtable Book Launch "Honoring Betty Rizzo"

Edited by Temma Berg

The roundtable was organized both to honor Betty Rizzo and to celebrate the publication of *Women, Gender, and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain: Essays in Memory of Betty Rizzo*. Although 16 people contributed to the book, only nine were able to attend the meeting in Philadelphia. Like a whimsical game of musical chairs, we are now six (for one of us wrote her tribute to Betty as the final essay in the book and felt she would only repeat herself here, and three withdrew to leave room for others who knew Betty better; and I, who did not prepare a tribute for the roundtable but instead prepared contextual notes about the book as a whole, now take advantage of this forum to share the paper I would have written for Philadelphia had I not served as moderator but been able to speak as a participant).

Participants were asked to focus on how they were inspired by Betty's work and on how she might have directly or indirectly guided their research. Rather than sum up their tributes I thought it best for the presenters to speak in their own voices. They follow my remarks, arranged in alphabetical order.

For Betty, publication was a way of helping women, not only forgotten women writers from the past but also women scholars working in the present. Seeing herself as part of an ongoing community of women, Betty not only helped young scholars but also established researchers. Many of us—both men and women—have benefited from her generosity, graciousness, and tenacity.

I first met Betty at the 2000 meeting of EC/ASECS, which met in Richmond, Virginia. I presented on "Susannah Dobson: Learned Lady Lost." As author of the then still recent *Companions Without Vows* (1994), Betty was enthusiastic about my subject, and we spent much time together at the conference and afterwards engaged in a long and complex email correspondence. One of her first emails to me was written in the wake of reading an early version of my work in progress *Circle of Her Acquaintance*: "I was up till 2:30 last night till I had rapidly half-read half-skimmed your ms—it was that fascinating to me. What a dream of a find—a whole collection of letters in an old box. Millions of things to learn, but one impression on me is very strong—kinship is beneath many, many eighteenth century connections" (2/16/01 email).

What scholar would not be thrilled by such an enthusiastic response? Maybe my book wasn't *Jane Eyre* but it had kept one reader awake through the wee hours of the night. Two and a half pages of single-spaced email followed her introductory paragraph, full of detailed information about who married whom, who lived next to whom, wills, births & deaths, genealogies, shipwrecks, and insights into events as nearby as life at Westminster school and as far away as battles in India. Betty's range of information was wide and deep. She apologized for sending such a long list of details – "no doubt you will have little use for much of it" – but concluded with a request that undermined her doubt: "Let me know what you make of all this." And that was Betty, both apologetic for all the information she heaped on you but also insistent that you pay

attention to it, acknowledge its value, and develop its importance, which I tried to do as I revised and expanded my book over the years. "Millions of things to learn." When I first read this sentence, I saw it as optimistic, hopeful, energizing. Gradually I saw that it was also ominous: "Millions of things to learn." As we all know there are worlds of pain and gain behind such an ostensibly cheerful dictum. But because Betty put me in touch with as many of those millions as she could, my book is much better than it would have been had I never met her or engaged her enthusiasm and support. As a mentor she was both relentless taskmaster and tireless supporter.

As we all know, Betty lived in the eighteenth century, and she was as hard on herself as she was on others, probably harder. She never rested until she had dotted every "i," crossed every "t," searched every archive for relevant material, and crafted the perfect and unassailable footnote. She was exhaustive and exhausting, and she was confident that she would find what she wanted if she looked hard enough. She would not let me be satisfied with anything less than the complete picture. For example, she was sure that John Clerke, one of the letter writers in *Circle*, had a wife on the side and that I needed to find his will so that I could affirm this. It was not enough to have Lydia's and others' complaints about her husband's faithlessness. I needed to find the document that would prove his infidelity, and a will was a likely document for it might indicate money left to another woman. But there was no will. Perhaps his improvidence extended that far, and he did not bother to leave one either with his wife when he travelled to India or with a fellow traveler once there, despite the fact that India was a country in which English lives were vulnerable for many reasons. Although there were indications in his wife Lydia's letters and in those of her friends that he had not been an ideal husband, there was no absolute proof of a family on the side or of a mistress. I thought to find such a document or person was a hopeless quest until I read *The Ordeal of Elizabeth Marsh: A Woman in World History* by Linda Colley (2007), where I found proof that John Clerke committed adultery. In 1773, he became the "protector" of Eliza Draper, who ran off with Clerke to escape "her indolent, abusive husband." It was indeed wonderful to discover that Eliza Draper, most famous for being the eponymous subject of Laurence Sterne's *Journal to Eliza*, was the missing piece of evidence to prove John Clerke's infidelity. How happy Betty would have been to know that her intuitions were correct. If only I had waited another year or two before publishing my book!

Betty was as aware of the infidelities that could be found among researchers as she was of the infidelities that could be found among ordinary folk like John Clerke. When I asked Betty for advice about sending a paper I had just completed but yet published to a well-known scholar, she advised caution, and, in her last email on the subject, summed up the incident with Johnsonian care and balance: "Temma, I am so glad this has worked out. . . . [Famous Scholar] will indeed be generous with credit for anything you give her. But I am rather glad there has been a bit of a fuss here, because otherwise I think she would have wished the text of the letters to publish first. Now she will have the text of the letters, but I hope will only quote bits, summarize, and credit you with the discovery. It is true that within reason we need to assist one another, but

passing on the text of important letters like yours to someone else eager to use them should be done with care!" As she ruefully noted in the same email, Betty could be seen as generous and forthcoming but also as "possessive and uptight" (Betty's words). I believe that if she erred, she erred on the side of dispensing rather than keeping things close to herself: "I am also delighted to disperse all the bits and pieces I have accumulated into the possession of those who can use them." She wanted to add to the sum of knowledge, not keep things to herself and perhaps risk their never being heard after all. And that is not to err at all.

Betty was a living example of the adage that, if you dwell in the archive long enough, you become part of it. I should not have been surprised to find a 1983 letter from her at the National Portrait Gallery. She had written to ask a question about a painting in their collection, Richard Samuel's *Portraits in the Characters of the Muses in the Temple of Apollo (The Nine Living Muses of Great Britain)*, a painting in which I too was now interested. Betty had written to find out "who the nine muses are—and which is Elizabeth Griffith!" In her response to Betty, the archivist suggested that, based on Page's engraving of Samuel's painting, the seated figure to the far right of the painting was Griffiths but could not identify which muse was which for "the figures do not appear to hold the standard attributes of the Nine Muses." Despite her earnest desire to find the correct answer, Betty was unable to unearth it. But by asking questions, she kept the process going. That is how research moves (or doesn't move) forward. Depending on the hard work of skilled archivists, building on one another, filling in and correcting one another, researchers not only add to our understanding of the past but they also add to the archive.

The essay that I wrote for *Women, Gender and Print Culture* was based on an incident that I first learned about from Betty. In 1740, Captain John Brathwaite was killed during a privateer attack on the *Baltic Merchant*, a ship on which he and his family were journeying home from South Carolina to England. It was an exciting event and, as I studied it, and read many accounts about it, it became stranger and stranger. In the end I learned that the merchant ship was turned into a privateer—by the same people—Quaker merchants – who had first owned and lost the ship! I wish Betty had been able to learn about the ship's final transformation. She would have loved the irony of it.

By Lorna Clark, Carleton University

In my paper, "'Hidden Talents' and Betty Rizzo," I focused on one aspect of Betty Rizzo's scholarship, a major one, her work on Frances Burney. An important chapter in *Companions Without Vows* focused on the friendship between Burney and Hester Thrale, a topic Betty also considered in an essay she contributed to a volume of essays that I edited, *A Celebration of Frances Burney* (2007). Most importantly, Betty Rizzo edited volume 4 of Burney's *Early Journals and Letters*, a hefty volume which represents many years of research, and which proved invaluable when I came to edit my own two volumes (volumes 3 and 4 of *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney* [2014]). So we had much in common.

Betty was also a founding member and past-president of the Burney Society, for which I produce the newsletter, so we were brought together at meetings. A highlight I recall was the conference held in Westminster Abbey in 2002 to install a memorial window to Frances Burney in Poets' Corner (she is one of the few women to be recognized there). This was an important milestone which Betty and Ray Rizzo both attended—undeterred by the difficulties of travelling to the UK with Ray in a wheelchair. Understandably, wheelchair access to the 1000-year-old Abbey was a challenge, and Betty recounted amusingly the many difficulties she and Ray encountered that gave them a behind-the-scenes look at the Abbey. She suggested that Ray might enjoy writing them up for the *Burney Letter*, an idea which never came to fruition.

My last interaction with Betty is also worth recalling. I happened once to mention to her a book that I had found useful—the Paris diary of Frances Crewe dating from 1786, edited by a British scholar who had access to the family papers. The book was hard to get hold of, as it had been privately printed. Betty apparently remembered this conversation and wrote to me some time later, asking if she might borrow the book. I was happy to send it to her, although I was prepared for the eventuality that, in lending it out, I might well be seeing the last of it. I had reckoned without my borrower, however. Long afterwards, out of the blue, I was puzzled to receive in the mail a carefully wrapped brown-paper parcel. Opening this mysterious item, I discovered inside that very same diary of Mrs. Crewe that I had by then long forgotten. Betty, however, had not forgotten her responsibility as a borrower—and showed traits of honesty and consideration that were characteristic.

Nor this was all—for apparently (as I was given to understand in no uncertain terms) some of the footnotes in the book did not meet with Betty's approval. She set such high standards for herself in her scholarship that she had little tolerance for those who, in her estimation, fell short. And as she did not hesitate to express her opinions in a forthright manner, I got quite an earful about the shortcomings of the footnotes!

Betty's kindness also came through in this exchange, for she enquired about my own work, and I explained that my progress had been slowed recently by deaths in the family. Betty's sympathy was immediate and heartfelt; she sent a message of condolence that was moving enough to save (it struck just the right note). This incident points to something I always appreciated about Betty: as devoted a scholar as she was, she was always fully aware that life embraces more than just scholarship, and she would reach out to colleagues in friendship, in a way that was more than just collegial. All of this took place not long before I heard the sad news about Betty's own passing, which somehow made it strike me all the more. When I heard that a festschrift was being organized, I hoped that I would be able to make a contribution to it, and I was glad that my essay was accepted. I feel that somehow, Betty would have approved.

The essay I selected as my own way of paying tribute to Betty Rizzo is the kind of work she would herself have enjoyed, partly because it involves archival research—delving into unexplored material—and also because it gives a voice and standing to some forgotten and overlooked women writers. My chapter, "Hidden Talents: Women Writers in the Burney Family," is based on exploring

the Burney family archive, a rich treasure-trove of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century material that is the more remarkable in that it includes so many women. These were women of modest circumstances who lived their lives quietly in the domestic sphere and whose voices one might expect to be "silenced"—but who were notably *not* silent. Apparently, these women inherited not only a "scribbling habit" but also a "hoarding habit," and left behind many writings which yield insight into the lives of women of the time.

In my essay, I related this project to the professionalization of the woman writer, situating these works within the context of an era which saw the dramatic expansion of print culture and the expanded role of women within it. During this period, women were participating in increasing numbers in the literary marketplace, either as producers or consumers, and they produced an astonishing range of publications. The Burney women writers participated fully in this creativity, and the variety of their output is astonishing.

My first task was to conduct a wide-ranging search for the writings of what I loosely call "Burney women" (but whose identities would not be recognizable to most people, as their names often changed with marriage). I first glanced at private writings: the letters, for instance, of Frances Burney's sisters, which contain information about the musical scene in London, and of her niece, Marianne Francis, who started a correspondence with Hester (Thrale) Piozzi. Then I looked at ephemera, which included the staple of the Grub Street hack, reviewing; there were some translations (from French and Spanish), religious pamphlets and editions. These activities included the editing of Frances Burney's papers, a task which trained up several nieces, one of whom went on to publish a volume of letters of her own.

Then I looked more carefully at a few works—some examples of children's fiction, and one of travel-writing. A young niece of Burney published a volume of *Letters from Madras*, which presents the experience of an Englishwoman in India in the early 19th century. I also traced down through the generations to find another "Fanny Burney" whose writings were published as *A Great-Niece's Journals*; this Burney was very aware of her family heritage and her famous kinswoman (and actually somewhat resentful of it). All in all, in this wide-ranging study, I covered six generations of writing women.

The last example brings out the double-edged sword of the Burney heritage and the thread I was trying to follow in the family background. As I examined plays and novels written by those closest to the patriarch, Charles Burney, I found certain themes and patterns emerging which suggested the ambivalent role he played in the lives of the writing women around him. On the one hand, he provided encouragement and support (in dealing with publishers or ensuring good reviews), while meanwhile his high expectations and emotional demands instilled the fear of incurring his disapproval. For those generations further away, he offered a model of industry and ambition, a standard to live up to. At the very least, Charles Burney seems to have given these women something to write about—or perhaps something to write out of their system.

In the essay for the festschrift, I hoped to shed some light on the work of Frances Burney, helping to contextualize her work, and also to expand our views of early women writers through the exploration of a largely forgotten group. The

essay was exploratory and wide-ranging, covering a lot of material, and I think it would have pleased Betty—who always encouraged us to keep breaking new ground, to keep expanding the canon, and especially to include forgotten women writers. I also think it was apt in emphasizing the importance of a nurturing emotional-support network, which I think Betty Rizzo also emphasized, both in her published work (and the way she looked at female friendship) and in the model she provided of nurturing supportive relationships with her colleagues.

By Elizabeth Lambert, Gettysburg College

At our 2000 conference I presented a paper on Gilbert Elliot in which I lauded his deep love for and fidelity to his wife Maria despite years of separation when he was a Member of Parliament living in the political and social world of London while she maintained their estate in Scotland. During the discussion period Betty, seated in the front row, suggested that I look into the *Journal of Lady Elizabeth Holland* for a different view of Elliot and his fidelity. A few days after the conference I received a lengthy email from Betty quoting several passages from Lady Holland's journal. In the portions of the journal that Betty sent, Lady Holland writes of an attempted seduction, and, when she repulsed the man in question, he was "in great alarm at his wife's knowing this *ecart* as he affects great conjugal fidelity." Betty was mistaken in her assumption that Elliot was the seducer, but her question sent me on a search for the "other woman" in Elliot's life.

In my essay for this collection, "Lady Minto and Her Lord," I explain how easily Lady Holland's comments re: Elliot's account of his retreat from Toulon could be conflated with her account of the seduction in the preceding paragraph of her journal. In an entry for February 1793, Lady Holland discusses Gilbert Elliot's appointment as joint commissioner for arranging all civil concerns at Toulon. The following entry begins with the explosive comment: "Surprise and embarrassment have completely overset me. . . . What vile animals men are, with headstrong passions." Moreover, she writes that the seducer attempted "downright violence." Then, in the next paragraph Lady Holland returns to Elliot and Toulon, speaking of his account of the retreat from there as abounding "with affecting situations of distress and wretchedness."

At first glance, it might appear that Elliot was the seducer except for the differences in tone between the passages speaking of Elliot and those describing the seduction. Also, Elliot was in London on the date that Lady Holland wrote from Florence. But this did not let Elliot off the hook; in fact it brought to mind a letter of his to a woman that I had read many years before in the Osborn Burke collection at Yale.

It was a short note to an Ann Hayman. The tone struck me as particularly familiar and unlike other letters from Elliot to women friends such as Mrs. Crewe. He wrote to Hayman: "I wish also that you may be as dangerously ill here as you were at Mrs. Burke's so as to give us some chance at least of your staying till we are tired of you." I copied the message and made a note: "affair?" I filed the whole in the back of my mind because I had bigger fish to fry re: Elliot, namely his role as one of the leading prosecutors under Burke in the

impeachment trial of Warren Hastings. But Betty's supposition re: Lady Holland brought that note and Ann Hayman to the fore. Who was Ann Hayman?

She could not be found in any of the usual primary and archival sources. Then when I worked on the Elliot letters in the Scottish Record Office the mystery of Hayman's identity became even more significant when I found a cache of letters from him to Hayman. No doubt, these letters were incriminating and sexual in tone. At the distance of some 200 years, and without more specific evidence than the letters give, a sexual relationship cannot be proven; nevertheless there is ample evidence for a deep emotional attachment. But again, there was nothing in the Scottish Record Office to reveal who she was or why she was a prominent fixture in London life. For the solution of the mystery of Ann Hayman's identity I am indebted to my colleague Mary Margaret Stewart. (Need I add that this is the kind of collaboration Betty loved?)

Mary Margaret had been aware of the mystery woman and her growing importance to my essay for this collection. One morning in April 2011 I received an email from her written the night before: "Tonight I was playing around on my computer instead of finishing up my paper . . . and for some reason I went to Princess Charlotte of Wales on Wikipedia and in the article I came across this: 'Prince George fired his child's sub-governess Miss Hayman, for being too friendly with Caroline and the Princess of Wales promptly hired her.'" Thanks to Mary Margaret's "playing around on her computer," I had the key to Ann Hayman and was able to fill in the blanks with some very interesting and pertinent material. And, as already noted, Mary Margaret found the link between Princess Charlotte and Ann Hayman on Wikipedia, no less—I suppose there is a lesson in here somewhere.

Betty concluded her email on the excerpts from Lady Holland's journal with the comment: "Have fun folding this in! But don't fail to finish and publish." Thank you Betty, I certainly did have fun chasing Ann Hayman down, and it has been an honor to publish in a volume dedicated to you.

By Sylvia Kasey Marks, NYU Polytechnic School of Engineering

I didn't know Betty Rizzo very well. I was never on a panel with her; she wasn't my dissertation supervisor or teacher; we didn't teach in the same university; we met only casually at conferences. But, as I note in my article, "Sarah Fielding's *The Governess*: A Gloss on Her 'Books upon Education,'" in Temma Berg and Sonia Kane's wonderful festschrift honoring Betty, I wanted to pay tribute to her as a professional friend and colleague who set a good example in every way. My understanding is that, even when her activities were curtailed by a stroke, she was still very actively engaged in scholarship. She never retired.

I corresponded with her several times, and she was generous and forthcoming with suggestions, information, and encouragement about scholarly and academic matters. She brought to my attention the fact that she had mentioned me in a footnote in one of her recent articles and thought it might help in the promotion process at my university. What would Betty have said about my article in the festschrift? I know she wrote about the unappreciated

works of unappreciated authors, and so I suspect she might have approved of my attention to Sarah Fielding, one of the writers she studies in *Companions Without Vows*.

Among the many academic hats Betty wore early in her career was that of freshman writing teacher. She once observed in an article entitled "Systems Analysis for Correcting English Compositions" that the writing teacher is, among other things, "the nurturer of promising new growth" ("Staffroom Exchanges," *College Composition and Communication* 33.3 [1982]: 322). I like to think of her today in that role, looking over our shoulders with any number of suggestions for new people to study, new approaches to take, and new places to go to find the information. Thank you, Betty.

By Stephanie Oppenheim, Borough of Community College, CUNY

I came to know Betty Rizzo when I was a graduate student in English at the Graduate Center, CUNY, where she was my professor and one of my dissertation advisors. I initially met Betty in a seminar she taught on Frances Burney. It was my first real introduction to 18th-century British women writers. I had taken one previous course on the 18th-century novel, but we had read no novels by women. Betty's course was a turning point in my academic life.

While the course centered on Burney's four novels, Betty provided a deeper insight into the fiction by situating it within the broader context of women's lives in eighteenth-century Britain. One strategy for doing so was to send her students to the New York Public Library with a challenging research project. Having little background in historical research—and a lifelong fear of threading microfilm—I found this assignment rather daunting. Betty's instructions for the assignment began: "Study the newspapers for one year of the *London Gazette* from the period 1750-80 and write up your conclusions about the ways in which women in that year could figure in public (as opposed to private) life." Betty included detailed practical guidance, directing our attention to the bankruptcies and outlining the bankruptcy process so that it would be intelligible to us. She posed concrete questions, such as: "What businesses were women most often associated with? What businesses do you find them never associated with?" She concluded the assignment with the adjuration: "You have two responsibilities: to undertake your research with care and thoroughness, and then to conclude what you *can* legitimately conclude with honesty and creativity. The two tasks are equally and mutually important."

I chose the year 1766 and slogged through roughly one hundred issues of the *London Gazette* on microfilm. In that entire period, I found fewer than two-dozen references to women, eighteen of which appeared in the bankruptcy lists. Three other women in business were mentioned elsewhere in the paper, as well as one notorious female criminal.

I was pretty embarrassed that I had found so little, and felt somehow that I had done a bad job on the assignment. I did detect some trends in terms of what businesses women pursued, and speculated on the connections between business and marital status for women. For instance, the most common business for a single woman to go into appeared to be millinery. I also noted a surprising range

of businesses women followed. I had never imagined that a woman in eighteenth-century Britain might work as an ironmonger, a brazier, or a ship-chandler. Since most of the women mentioned in connection with these lines of work were identified as widows or had male partners, I conjectured that women were not likely to enter such businesses on their own. Yet overall I felt that I had failed to come up with significant findings. Having turned up so few references to women, what claims could I legitimately make? I began my write-up of the material by stating: "The paucity of my findings concerning women in public life makes it difficult to draw conclusions."

Betty's response to my completed assignment is one I will never forget. She typed up an entire page of comments, but what struck me most deeply was her opening remark: "The paucity of your findings itself suggests a conclusion—women were not particularly prevalent in public life!" With this observation, Betty managed to change what I had thought was a failure to find anything important into an important finding in itself. I hadn't *failed* to discover useful information about women in public life. Instead, I had discovered what was *missing*. In other words, in finding so little, I had uncovered a very significant phenomenon: women's absence from the public record.

Betty's validation of my research has had an enduring influence on my academic interests. In my reading of eighteenth-century literature, I am always on the hunt for what is *missing*, especially what aspects of women's experience. What stories about women's lives do not get told? Where in the text can we find traces of these untold stories, and what do these traces reveal? Betty's words have allowed me to view my work as part of the larger project of feminist scholarship, the recovery of this important missing material.

Betty's influence can clearly be seen in my essay, "'I have travelled so little': Jane Austen's Women on the Road." In this essay I look at what is missing for Austen's heroines—in particular, missed trips, or missed opportunities for mobility and exploration. I was always puzzled by the fact that Elizabeth Bennet's trip to the Lake District is canceled, and that Ann Elliot has to leave Lyme Regis before she gets a chance to explore its breathtaking scenery. My essay grew out of two questions: Why must these trips be missed? What can they tell us about the lives and desires of women and women writers in the long eighteenth century?

As I puzzle over the missing pieces of eighteenth-century women's textual lives, Betty's encouraging words continue to guide and inspire me. I hope, too, that I will always undertake my research with care and thoroughness, and draw my conclusions with honesty and creativity.

By Mary Margaret Stewart, Gettysburg College

Because my essay "'Walking upon Glass': The Madness of Lady Frances Coningsby," written in memory of Betty Rizzo focuses primarily upon a series of letters written by Mary Trevor, Lady Frances's companion, to Charlotte, the Hon. Mrs. R. B. Walsingham, Lady Frances's daughter, and because so much of Betty's archival research concerned letters or correspondence, it seemed appropriate that my few remarks center on correspondence between Betty and

me through the years – first through our posted letters and then in more recent years our emails.

We first met via US mail in late August 1982. Betty wrote: "I don't know if you know that Bob Mahony of Catholic University and I have been working for four years on a bibliography of the works of Christopher Smart, and are just finishing it. Actually it's a lot more extensive than just the works of Smart—it's all scholarship and all secondary references as well. You already appear in the contemporary scholarship section because of your note on Karina Williamson's article; and now a letter from M. J. Jannetta [editor of *Library*] tells me that he is publishing an article of yours in March . . . . It will be too late to include this article in the bibliography if we wait till it is out, but I thought perhaps you would be willing to send me a brief summary of the contents, and I can write it up as forthcoming . . . . If you can, it will make the bibliography a bit more complete and up to date" (August 30, 1982). This first letter reveals Betty's constant desire in all her scholarship to be as complete and thorough as possible. Explaining that I was preparing at that time to enter the hospital for open heart surgery, I begged off writing a summary and sent Betty a copy of the article.

A few days later Betty responded: "I was most interested to receive the copy of your paper today. I was of course very sorry to hear about the serious operation you are facing. (I hope you had a second opinion!)" (September 15, 1982). At first, I was a little put off by this remark, seeing it as intrusive, but then regained my sense of humor and accepted her admonition as concern. So began a correspondence—and a friendship—which continued uninterrupted until just before Betty's death.

In the eighties and nineties both Betty and I moved from exclusive interest in male poets to the lives and works of women and the relationships between women. I in no way wish to suggest that my work was ever as extensive, original, wide-ranging, insightful, knowledgeable as Betty's scholarship—only that we shared interests and enjoyed exchanging information, sources, and ideas. I began working in the Lewis Walpole Library in Farmington, CT, in particular with the Sir Charles Hanbury Williams Papers housed there, and became fascinated with Lady Frances Williams, Sir Charles's wife, and Mary Trevor, Lady Frances's friend and companion, and became curious about how I could use the information about their lives. In May 2000, Betty wrote: "Hope you get to the Walpole Library all right, and get some work done. There is so much interest in women's relationships just now. If you wrote, for instance, an analysis of the long relationship between Trevor and Lady Frances, showing how Trevor was there for her (as they say)—contrasting it to the male relationships Lady F had—and perhaps illustrating similar situations from novels—it would be a great study. Epistolary novels must have long-standing loyal relationships between women in order to keep the story going—and men are causing the trouble. That's just one-way, off the top of my head, that I can see using your material" (May 28, 2000). And so flowed the ideas, almost always beyond anything I envisioned for myself.

The next year I came upon Mrs. Delany's description of Mary Trevor—"so lank and so lean!" I immediately sent the description to Betty with comments and questions. The response was almost instantaneous: "I think that is so

interesting, getting a description of Mrs. [Mary] Trevor. It doesn't always happen. I would agree that Mrs. Delany wasn't mad about her. It could be this was a general impression—that would account for the rather nasty tone of those newspaper paragraphs I sent you. Perhaps she was sycophantic, very necessary to Lady F. but seen through by others. . .?" (August 15, 2001).

Here, I think, Betty jumped to hasty conclusions based on lack of evidence, especially concerning the newspaper paragraphs. The blame was mine, too, for I had quoted out of context. The description comes from a letter Mrs. Delany wrote to her niece Miss Dewes. Writing on the evening of June 16, 1769, Mrs. Delany tells her niece that she had dinner with Mrs. Pitt (Ann Pitt, Lord Chatham's sister); they had had a good time. She continues: "a Lady Erskine, (widow of Sir Charles Erskine,) and her two little boys, came after coffee; she is a pretty woman, fine person, and very unaffected. *Her contrast*, Lady F. Coningsby, followed, with Mrs. M. T____r, so lank and so lean!" (*The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany*. II, 216-7).

I had completely ignored what Mrs. Delany thought of Lady Frances, and thus, I think, altered the way both Betty and I interpreted what she thought of Mary Trevor. It seems to me now, Delany may have felt sorry for Mary. I wish I could now reopen my discussion of this letter with Betty.

To clarify any confusions that might have arisen among my audience because of Lady Frances's two names, Williams and Coningsby, I added the following remark: "Lady Frances Coningsby's surname, which had been Williams since her marriage in 1732, was changed in 1762 following the death of her sister Lady Margaret, Countess of Coningsby, from Hanbury Williams to Coningsby by an Act of Parliament.

In April 2001, Betty wrote "I think of you as the custodian of the recovery of Lady Frances into recorded history" (April 9, 2001). And thus she passed on any information or references to Lady Frances she came upon in her reading. While reading the letters of Mrs. Elizabeth Montague she came upon the following passage written in September 1759 to Lord Lyttelton: ". . . by a letter I had from Mrs. Trevor last post, I find her Ladyship is very ill in health as well as spirits . . ." (IV, 250). Betty then adds: "There are many references to Lady Frances throughout [volumes of letters]. As you can see, I am nearly as interested in the pair as you are, perhaps because it looks as through Mrs. Trevor may actually have been a companion who became more and more empowered as Lady Frances weakened" (Dec. 18, 2001). And, indeed, Betty was right.

I, however, now wonder where the letters written by Mary are [besides the letters written to Charlotte Walsingham about her mother's illness]. Lady Frances, in her letters to her friends and daughters, frequently wrote "When I am unable to write, Mrs. Trevor will write." What does the absence of these letters say about attitudes toward Mary Trevor?

In July 2006, at a time we were discussing the fates of so many single women—in particular Mary Trevor and her sister Grace Trevor, Babs Montague and others, Betty wrote: "On the more exciting front [we had been sharing dismal reports concerning our health], if it were me I would hook your narrative to a subject which has interested me for years—the difference between the fates of brothers and sisters. If you just underlined this contrast without moralizing

it—a dispassionate historicizing—it could be very effective! However you shape it, I hope you do it. The more we know about the more ordinary denizens of the century, the better we know the century" (July 22, 2006). This passage is typical of Betty, encouraging others and suggesting new projects for herself and others.

Lest we forget that Betty was a bit of a rebel as well as an outstanding scholar, I concluded with a short passage written on July 1, 1988. I had recently returned from Ireland and had described some of the libraries where I worked. Betty responded: "I worked in Ireland one summer too. I really love the contrasts of different libraries. I was at Yale today, and did something really wicked. I carried an eighteenth-century Sarah Scott novel downstairs in the Sterling to the snack bar and read it while I drank a coke."

Editor's note: Betty Rizzo (1928-2008), long professor of English at CUNY and former President of EC/ASECS, receives memorial tributes from Beverly Schneller, Brijraj Singh, and others in the September 2008 issue of the *Intelligencer* (22.iii:39-44 and 66-67).

Addison's Mistress[1]

By J. A. Downie

In one of the few extant letters in which he offers anything approaching confidential information about his personal and private life, Joseph Addison wrote to Edward Wortley on 21 July 1711:[2]

> Dear Sir
>
> Being very well pleased with this day's Spectator [no. 123], I cannot forbear sending you one of them, and desiring your opinion of the story in it [of Eudoxious and Leontine]. When you have a son I shall be glad to be his Leontine, as my circumstances will probably be like his. I have within this twelvemonth lost a place of £2000 per annum, an estate in the Indies of £14,000, and what is worse than all the rest, my mistress. Hear this, and wonder at my philosophy. I find they are going to take away my Irish place from me too; to which I must add, that I have just resigned my fellowship, and the stocks sink every day. If you have any hints or subjects, pray send me up a paper full. I long to talk an evening with you. I believe I shall not go for Ireland this summer, and perhaps would pass a month with you, if I know where. Lady Bellasis[3] is very much your humble servant. Dick Steele and I often remember you.
>
> I am, dear sir,
>
> [Saturday] Yo^{rs} eternally, etc.
>
> July. 21.
>
> 1711

As well as offering an interesting perspective on his commitment to *The Spectator*, Addison's reflections on the financial situation of his character,

Leontine, led him to contemplate his own personal circumstances in the summer of 1711. A year earlier he had returned from Dublin where he had been acting as Chief Secretary in Ireland. After arriving in London on or around 19 August 1710,[4] he began to send the Lord Lieutenant, Thomas, Earl of Wharton, reports of the extraordinary political events following on from the dismissal of Lord Treasurer Godolphin. By 23 September, with the resignation of Lord Chancellor Cowper, the Whigs had virtually left the stage, and Addison was apparently writing *The Whig-Examiner* in a vain attempt to counteract the allegations of mismanagement directed at the old ministry, allegations which Henry St John—soon to be appointed Secretary of State for the Northern Department—had loudly trumpeted in *A Letter to the Examiner*.

This, then, is the context of the sentence of Addison's letter to Wortley referring to his losing, "within this twelvemonth," not only his place as Chief Secretary in Ireland, but also the residue of the estate of his brother, Gulston, Governor of Fort St. George in Madras, who had died on 17 October 1709.[5] He had resigned his fellowship at Magdalen College, Oxford, a week earlier, and although he also anticipated losing his other "Irish place," he did not in fact give up until just before his death in 1719 what, according to Swift, was "an old obscure Place, called *Keeper of the Records in* Berminghams *Tower*, of Ten Pounds a Year," to which Addison got "a Salary of 400 *l.* annexed to it, though all the Records there are not worth Half a Crown, either for Curiosity or Use."[6]

The final loss to which Addison refers, "worth all the rest," is more difficult to gloss, however, and I do not find any of the existing explanations convincing. Interestingly, Wortley, in replying to Addison, neither commented on his allusion to a "mistress" nor sought an explanation. Instead, he contented himself with the observation that: "You was never in possession of anything you lose but your places, and those you could not call your own."[7] But in his edition of Addison's letters, Walter Graham annotates "my mistress" thus: "Addison may have felt that without such a fortune he could not aspire to the hand of the Countess Dowager of Warwick; or he may have meant, of course, something quite different."[8] In his biography of Addison, Peter Smithers expands Graham's sentence into a paragraph, but fails to offer any additional information:

> It has been assumed that this reference is to Lady Warwick, but there is no evidence that this is the case. Addison was much occupied with thoughts about women; in his writings he showed a deep interest in the details of their dress and behaviour; his attitude towards them was paternal, condescending, but not unsympathetic. Yet no shred of evidence indicates that he was associated with any woman upon more than a social footing. In his letter to Wortley, Addison is obviously bantering himself upon his misfortunes, which he exaggerated. He was able to put up a bond for £1,000 not long after this declaration of financial calamities. In this context the reference to his mistress wears an air of banter which suggests that it did not proceed from any heartfelt emotion. It is consistent with a reverse in a half-serious courtship of a fashionable and wealthy woman, and as such Lady Warwick may be described.[9]

In describing the letter in this way, Smithers appears to forget that Addison "drew a prize of a thousand pounds in the Lottery" in December 1711.[10] And while I accept that there is a playful element to Addison's tone, I think it unwise to leap to the conclusion that he was seeking to minimize the seriousness of his misfortunes by writing in this way. His reverses were real enough.

There is, however, another way of approaching the allusion to Addison's mistress which has been completely overlooked. It is bracketed by references to Addison's losing the position of Chief Secretary in Ireland, and his anticipation that he was also about to lose the sinecure of Keepership of the Records. On this view, when he writes about the loss of his "mistress" being "worse than all the rest," Addison was actually making a recondite but touchingly regretful allusion to Queen Anne's decision in the previous year to turn her back on Marlborough, Godolphin and the Whigs.

As the flurry of letters between Swift and members of his circle occasioned by the last Stuart monarch's final illness and death strongly suggests, in the early eighteenth century Addison's referring to Queen Anne as his "mistress" was not an unusual idiom to use. On 29 July 1714, Abigail, Lady Masham, wrote to Swift to complain about the conduct of Lord Treasurer Oxford:

> I cannot have soe much time now to write all my mind because my Deare Mristriss [*sic*] is not well; and I think I may lay her illness to the charge of the Treasurer who for three weeks together was teazing and vexing her without intermission; and she cou'd not get rid of him till tuesday last.[11]

While it might seem natural for Lady Masham to refer to the Queen as her dear mistress, it is perhaps significant that Swift, in his reply, chose to make use of the same phrasing, calling his correspondent "the best and most faithful servant to your Mistress, that ever any Sovereign had."[12] Whether Swift (who was never introduced to Queen Anne) was being entirely sincere when he wrote to Lady Masham in these terms must remain a question, but it is interesting that Dr. Arbuthnot also referred to the deceased sovereign as his "mistress" in his much-quoted reply to a letter he had received from Swift just before the Queen's death:

> My Dear Friend
>
> I thank yow for your kind letter, which is very comfortable upon such a melancholy occasion My Dear Mistris's days were numbred ev'n in my imagination & could not exceed such certain Limits but of that small number a great deale was cut off by the last troublesome scene of this contention amongst her servants. I beleive sleep was never more welcome to a weary traveller than death was to her . . . ."[13]

If, as I am suggesting, Addison's letter of 21 July 1711 to Edward Wortley referred not to the loss of the affections of an unknown woman with whom he had been intimate—a loss which he regarded as worse than losing "a place of £2000 per annum, [and] an estate in the Indies of £14,000"—but to the loss of the confidence of the Queen, then it would be wrong to argue, as Smithers does,

that Addison's "reference to his mistress wears an air of banter which suggests that it did not proceed from any heartfelt emotion." On the contrary, and regardless of the bantering tone of Addison's letter, what is revealed is the depth of his feelings at no longer being in the service of Queen Anne.

Goldsmiths, University of London

Notes

1. I should like to thank James Woolley for his advice and encouragement in the preparation of this note.

2. The Letters of Joseph Addison, ed. Walter Graham (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), pp. 263-4. The source of this letter is the facsimile reproduced as one of the engraved facsimiles (no. 6) of the first volume of *Addisoniana. In two Volumes* (Printed for RICH[D] PHILLIPS St Pauls Church Yard By T. Davison, [1803]). The Preface is dated 10 September 1803. According to a footnote, "the originals" of the correspondence between Addison and Wortley—which "claims the particular notice of the curious reader"—"are in the possession of Mr. Phillips" (vol. 1, p. v).

3. Susan, Baroness Belasyse of Osgodby, was created a life peeress in 1674 after her husband, the Hon. Sir Henry Belasyse, the son and heir of John, Baron Belasyse of Worlaby, was killed in a duel. "Y know old Ldy Bellesis is dead at last," Swift informed the ladies in Dublin on 14 March 1713 (Jonathan Swift, *Journal to Stella*, ed. Abigail Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), p. 512).

4. In his letter to Joshua Dawson from Chester dated 15 August, Addison noted that: "I arrived here this after noon & set out for London where I propose to be on Sat." (*Letters*, ed. Graham, p. 231).

5. See the account of Gulston's death in his widow's letter to Addison from Fort St George dated 7 January 1709 [for 1710] (*Letters*, ed. Graham, pp. 199-200). Addison was pessimistic about his prospects of recovering his legacy.

6. Jonathan Swift, *A Letter to the Whole People of Ireland* in *The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis et al., 16 vols. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939-74), vol. 10, p. 58.

7. *The Works of the Right Honourable Joseph Addison*, with Notes By Richard Hurd, D. D., Bohn's Standard Library, 6 vols. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1885), vol. 5, pp. 401-2.

8. *Letters*, ed. Graham, p. 263n5.

9. Smithers, *The Life of Joseph Addison*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 234-5. In the *ODNB* entry on Addison, Pat Rogers simply observes that: "Nothing is known of the mistress."

10. *Letters*, ed. Graham, p. 266: Addison to Joshua Dawson, 18 December 1711.

11. *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. David Woolley, 4 vols (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999-2007), vol. 2, p. 32.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 55: 7 August 1714.

13. *Ibid.,* p. 70: 12 August 1714.

Are They Keeping up? A Cursory Inspection in September 2014 of *The MLA's International Bibliography* and MHRA's *The Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*

By James E. May

My searches in early September for articles in a broad spectrum of journals from recent years lead me to two observations about the *Modern Language Association International Bibliography (MLAIB)*: digitization has resulted in the very rapid posting of articles in many journals, by the *MLAIB* and also in the online *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature* (*ABELL*), but I also found surprising gaps and important journals and books neglected, particularly in the *MLAIB*'s coverage of foreign-language publications overseas. The *MLAIB* was printed on paper through the 2008 volume, long after its electronic search engine was created, and in 2009 became solely an online product, containing entries back into the nineteenth century. It includes not only books, articles, and dissertations but also electronic periodicals, online bibliographies, electronic monographs, and scholarly websites, stipulating conditions for their inclusion on its webpages. One of these pages claims that searching the *MLAIB* is "better than searching Google" because *MLAIB* has "2.1 million citations in more than 70 languages" compiled by a "professional indexing staff and scholars in relevant fields," who ensure "the most accurate listing possible." But, using Google for the *ECCB*, I have drawn from the contents pages of dozens of journals hundreds of references to articles in recent years that are not on the *MLAIB*. I suspect it was once much more inclusive than it presently is, but the failure to check dozens of journals (and books) likely to contain scholarship on the long eighteenth century began long ago. Perhaps the MLA's effort since 2003 to convert JSTOR records reflects awareness that it had some lost bibliographical control.

In early September 2014, the bibliography had no 2011-2014 articles from *Annales Benjamin Constant*, *Annales de la Société Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (3 articles ever, 2002-2007), *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* (not since 1988), *La Bibliofilia* (not since 1999), *Biblos* (none since 1982), *Boletín de la Biblioteca de Menéndez Pelayo* (not since 2006), *Bulletin du Bibliophile* (the French equivalent of *The Library*, one 1996 article since 1962), *Charta* (one article in 2008), *Dix-huitième siècle*, *Giornale storico della letteratura italian* (none since 2006), *Gulden Passer* (one ever), *Histoire et civilisation du livre* (never), *Humanisitica Lovaniensia* (not since 2006), *Imprimatur* (not since 1987), *Jaarboek voor Nederlandse Boekgeschiedenis* (one since 2007), *Leipziger Jahrbuch zur buchgeschichte* (not since 2008), *Lichtenberg-Jahrbuch* (not since 1989), *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, *Magyar Könyvszemle* (not since 1989), *Lychnos* (not since 1975), *Marginalien* (not since 1993), *Paratesto* (only one ever, in 2004), *Philobiblon* (one 2001 article since 1998), *Quærendo* (not since 1974), *Rassegna della letteratura italiana* (not since 1992), *Revue française d'histoire du livre* (not since 1996), *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France* (one 2009 article since 2006), *SVEC*, *Tijdschrift voor Skandinavistiek, TS: Tijdschrift voor tijdschriftstudies* (not since 2006), *Wolfenbütteler Notizen*

zur Buchgeschichte (not since 1988), and *XVIIe siècle* (four articles since 1979). The bibliography has no records at all from *L'Almanacco Bibliografico*, *La Bibliografía, Bibliologia*, *Biblioteca Universitaria*, *Il Bibliotecario*, *Bollettino AIB* (now *AIB Studi*), *Cahiers Voltaire*, *Cuadernos Dieciochistas*, *Culture del testo e del documento, Histoire et civilisation du livre, International Association for Neo-Latin Studies, Misinta, Revue Fontenelle*, and *Studia Bibliograhica Posoniensi*.

Even with major English-language journals I found no articles published after 2010 listed for *1650-1850, Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Bunyan Studies* (not since 2003), *Early Music* (not since 2007), *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer* [not since 2005, when we switched from "East-Central," though we send the issues still to the MLA,], *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (none since 2006) *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (none since 1995), *Eighteenth-Century Thought* (not since 2007), *Electronic British Library Journal, Emblematica, English Historical Review* (not since 1976), *English Manuscripts Studies, Fontes Artis Musicae* (not since 2005), *Gazette of the Grolier Club* (not since 2000), *Imago Mundi* (two since 1955), *Johnsonian News Letter* (one article since 1950), *Library & Information History, Notes & Records of the Royal Society* (two since 1960), *Princeton University Library Chronicle* (not since 2009), *Private Library* (not since 2003), *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* (two since 2000), *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* (one in 1980 since 1972), *RBM* (not since 2008) *Scottish Historical Review* (not since 2008), *Seventeenth-Century News* (not since 2003), *The Shandean* (not since 1994), *SHARP News* (not since 2004), *Swift Studies* (not since 2008), *Theatre Survey* (not since 2008). The *MLAIB* appears never to have recorded an article in *American Journalism*, *Children's Books History Society Newsletter, Historical Research*, *Hume Studies*, *Journal of the Printing Historical Society*, *Locke Studies, Parliamentary History*, *Print Quarterly*, *Quadrat*, and the reborn *Studies in Burke and his Time*. The MLA apparently neglects journals principally on history and the arts (though there's no divide between literature and history for so many studies and now the vogue in history of the book has made historical journals all the more pertinent to literary scholars--James Raven is a historian), and it neglects newsletters and bulletins. There are anomalies hard to explain if the bibliography is compiled from journal issues; for instance, for 2011-2014: for *Dieciocho,* there is one article in the first issue of 2014 only; for the Canadian SECS's annual *Lumen,* one in 2010 and one in 2013 since 2009; and for *Scriblerian*, one in 2011 since 2004. Gaps appear in journals usually covered, e.g., all the 2012 *Recherches sur Diderot et sur l'Encyclopédie.*

The most recent entries for a number of journals are dated 2011, as for *Editio*, *Eighteenth-Century Novel, Eighteenth-Century Women, English Language Notes, French Historical Studies, Journal of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, Seventeenth Century, Slavic Review, Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*--the last volume of *Studies in Bibliography*, 59, published in 2012, is missing. But more journals seemed to be checked to 2012 than 2011, including *Age of Johnson, Dictionaries, Goethe-Jahrbuch, Journal of the History of Ideas, Harvard Library Bulletin, Herder Yearbook, Opera Quarterly, Printing History, Restoration and 18C Theatre*

Research, Textual Cultures, William & Mary Quarterly, etc. A three-year delay for a printed bibliography would be understandable, maybe expected, especially in that journals often appear after their issues' nominal dates; now that electronic texts are being downloaded, three years isn't so good. However, the bibliography has 2013-14 articles for dozens of journals relevant to 18C studies, many from overseas: e.g., for 2014: *American Periodicals*, *Anglia*, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies, Eighteenth Century*: *Theory & Interpretation* (*EC*), *Eighteenth-Century Life* (*ECL*), *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (*ECS*), *Érie-Ireland, Euphorion*, *Genre*, *Library*, *Milton Quarterly*, *Modern Language Notes, Modern Language Review* (*MLR*), *Modern Philology*, *Neophilologus, Notes and Queries* (*N&Q*), *PMLA*, *Review of English* Studies (*RES*), *Revue de littérature Comparée, SEL: Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*, *University of Toronto Quarterly*, and *Women's Writing*. Already posted too are 2013 records from such overseas journals as *Achttiende Eeuw, Das Achtzehnte Jahrhundert*, *Australian Journal of French Studies*, *Bodleian Library Record, Gutenberg-Jahrbuch,* the Lithuanian *Knygotyra*, *Script & Print,* and *Studi Francesi*. The speed in compiling these records is remarkable. Nonetheless, articles posted on some journals' online websites several years ago have not yet been inserted into the *MLAIB*. Most importantly, major European journals found in few American libraries have not been entered as one would hope.

Also, I can't resist complaining about the style used by an institution that's tried to enforce some zany stylistic rules. The *MLAIB* fails to use italics: italics within titles of journal articles aren't transcribed (records from before there was an online *MLAIB* also lack them), nor are quotation marks normally used to signal what would be italicized (this is true of *AJ, ECF, ECL, ECS, Library, MLN, MLR, PMLA, Script & Print, RES*, *SP*, etc.)--nor can I understand why this essential info is lost, when there are italics in the web-posted contents, such as of *EC* on Project Muse, *ECL* on its Duke Univ. Press website, *RES* on Oxford Journals, and *Script & Print*--and *ABELL* has the italics. Much else is left out that *ECCB* would not miss, such as the presence of bibliographies, chronologies, glossaries, illustrations, maps. Too often full publication information is missing: thus, *British Literature and Print Culture*, ed. by Sandro Jung (2013) is said to be published by Brewer, not by D. S. Brewer for the English Association, and *Be Merry and Wise* . . ., ed. by Brian Alderson *et al*. (2006) is described as New York and London: Oak Knoll and British Library, leaving out co-publishers The Pierpont Morgan Library and The Bibliographical Society of America. Volumes and dates are sometimes wrong: the *ECCB* vol. 35, for 2009, published in 2013, is dated 2009 (v. 34 is missed). But, overall, I find *MLAIB*'s titles, dates, and paginations very accurate.

There are some problems in the search engine. Notice that *MLAIB*'s journals list does not include many journals for which it has records, such as *Eighteenth Century* and *Scriblerian*. Also, when one searches articles in a journal, typing in the title, the *MLAIB* will provide many records that are not in that journal but have the same words, though not necessarily in that order. Thus, if one searches articles in "Eighteenth Century Fiction" but fails to put the title in quotes, results will include an article in *Age of Johnson* that has those three words in its title or in the special-issue's title in which the article is found. If you

type "Archive" or "Biography" as a journal title even with quotation marks, anything with that word in its title can come up (this does not happen with *ABELL*). False hits occur in author searches unless names are placed in quotes.

There are many services selling scholarly articles that provide bibliographical references, such as JSTOR, Project MUSE, and Dialnet, the last is particularly good for Spanish-language materials. These have far fewer references than the *MLAIB*. The MLA's only rival as an online bibliography for English literature is *ABELL,* long published by Maney for the Modern Humanities Research Association--the printed volumes, the first covering 1920 (1921), are still published: Vol. 87 covering 2012 is available from Turpin Distribution on paper (c. 1200 pp., $450--vol. 88 is promised for $472). *ABELL*'s printed volumes--which credit compilers & editors and create responsibility, now lacking from *MLAIB*--have been the more valuable to me for having sections on "Book Illustration," "Newspapers and Other Periodicals," and other divisions beyond literary periods. Although I'm involved as one of the compilers, I must say that the 18C is lucky to still have printed the *ECCB* with its many field divisions (the volume on 2010 having now been sent to press by Kevin Cope). Most who consult *ABELL* do so through the online subscriptions of research libraries. The comprehensive bibliography is marketed by ProQuest, which in 2013 subsumed it with the *MLAIB* into *Literature OnLine,* in part a repository of literary texts; ProQuest's promotional literature claims 814,000 records for *ABELL*, with the bibliography updated at least nine times a year.

ProQuest's *Literature Online* has a joint search function for *MLAIB* and *ABELL*, said to reach back to 1884, well before either bibliography was established c. 1920 (there are a hundred pre-1900 records from the *MLAIB* with "English" in the title but none with "Johnson" or "Voltaire"; *ABELL* reaches back to books published in 1906 and 1907). Searching within the unified field called "all" brings up records not in either--perhaps a tenth or less of what is listed is in neither (much being reviews). One of the great benefits of *ABELL* is that it includes book reviews (the *MLAIB* does not). The reviews add reference to books that might not otherwise be recorded. *ABELL* also uses italics to distinguish titles in the articles of many journals. There are more gaps in *ABELL*'s journal coverage than in the *MLAIB*'s. Unlike the *MLAIB, ABELL* has no records after 2009 (sometimes none for years before) for *Bodleian Library Record, Book Collector, ECL, Harvard Library Bulletin, Law and Literature, PMLA, Restoration and 18th-Century Theatre Research, Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society,* and *WMQ*. MHRA quit recording the contents of *all* those journals between 2006-2009. Unlike *MLAIB*, it has no records for *Digital Defoe*, *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch, Journal of the Early Republic, Journal of Printing History*, or *Opera Journal.* Its last record for *Pennsylvania Magazine of History & Biography* is 1989 and for *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada* is 1997. *ABELL* is less likely than *MLAIB* to have a stray reference in a non-literary periodical, like *Archives of Natural History*. While it has 2014 records for a small percentage of journals covered, *ABELL* presently lacks any 2014 records for articles in most, including many for which *MLAIB* has early 2014 records, such as in *EC*, *ECF*, *ECS, The Library, Library Trends, MP, Neophilologus, N&Q, RES, SEL,* and *Women's*

Writing. And it lacks 2013 records in the *MLAIB* for journals that *ABELL*'s compilers have analyzed only to 2012, such as *Bunyan Studies, Dictionaries,* and *Library Trends*. Like *MLAIB*, *ABELL* lacks 2011-13 articles in *Electronic British Library Journal, Eighteenth-Century Scotland, Eighteenth-C. Thought, Hume Studies, Johnsonian News Letter, and Library & Information History.*

But *ABELL* has 2011-2013 issues not in the *MLAIB*, such as for *1650-1850, EC Ireland, International Research on Children's Literature, Journal of Irish and Scottish Studies, Journalism History, Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, Literary and Linguistic Computing, RBM, Scriblerian, Seventeenth-Century News, SHARP News, and Swift Studies*. It has more recent materials for many journals, such as *ELN, The Shandean, Theatre Notebook, Theatre Survey,* and *Yearbook of English Studies,* covering 2013, whereas *MLAIB* stops at 2011 or 2012. And it has older journal issues missed by *MLAIB*, such as *Long Room* issues 1977-2006 and the *Intelligencer*'s 2006-10. As does the *MLAIB*, it has some spotty entries, just two records for 2007 *SECC* (missing 2000 altogether), one article from *Print Quarterly* (in 2011), and two in *Libraries and the Cultural Record* (one from 2011 and one from 2012). In 2012 (with vol. 47) the latter became *Information & Culture: A Journal of History* (it had been *Libraries & Culture* in 1988-2005), and *ABELL* has not caught up with this--*ABELL* and *MLAIB* lack the new title but have "Information Culture" (skipping ampersands) in their lists of journals to search; however, clicking that box leads to no records. But typing "*Information & Culture"* into the journal slot of the MLA's search page brings articles to the first number of 2014. Some articles from 2012's second issue (47.2) are wrongly listed by the *MLAIB* as published in "*Libraries and the Cultural Record*." As noted above, *ABELL* is more restrictive in response to journal titles typed in, and, thus, it's more useful to select a title from its journals list--if you type in "*Modern Language Notes*," the results are empty--the journals list makes clear the title of record is "*MLN*."

The *MLAIB* has over twice the number of records as *ABELL*, but then it covers all the modern languages and reaches further back. Whether it has more records on 18C British literature is another question. To get some comparative measure of the inclusiveness of the two, I checked what was recorded for 20 scholars, chosen to reflect a range of fields and decades: Paula Backscheider, Barbara Benedict, O M Brack, Jr., Vincent Carretta, Brean Hammond, Robert Hume, Louis Landa, J. A. Leo Lemay, James May, Maximillian Novak, Ricardo Quintana, Claude Rawson, Hermann Real, Betty Rizzo, Pat Rogers, Valerie Rumbold, Peter Sabor, Geoffrey Sill, G. Thomas Tanselle, and Calhoun Winton. I counted 1982 records for the cohort in *ABELL*; 1416 in the *MLAIB*. The raw totals are much higher, inflated by contributions by others to collections that authors edited, but I subtracted these: thus, I removed from Backscheider 13 essays by others from the 107 entries in *ABELL* and 72 by others of the 177 in *MLAIB*; from Tanselle all 203 hits on *ABELL* were his, but I removed 43 of the *MLAIB*'s 219 entries. The greater number of entries in *ABELL* results from *ABELL*'s inclusion of reviews: *ABELL*'s total includes 782 reviews by the 20 scholars. With these removed, *ABELL* is reduced to 1200, compared to 1416 for the *MLAIB*. (*ABELL*'s being a half-year behind in recording some journals' articles lessens its comparative total.) Scholars who have written many reviews

have higher total publications in *ABELL* than in *MLAIB*: Hammond has 70 reviews among 104 *ABELL* entries (vs. 36 total records in *MLAIB*); Rogers has 159 reviews among 344 *ABELL* records (vs. 178 in *MLAIB*); Claude Rawson has 97 reviews among 159 *ABELL* records (vs. 70 in *MLAIB*) and Tanselle has 41 reviews among 203 *ABELL* records (vs. 176 in *MLAIB*). Due to search engine errors on *ABELL* (in less than half the review searches), I had to remove reviews of the author by another, as three reviews of Landa among the ten reviews by Landa. Some surveyed authors reviewed often for *TLS* or *Scriblerian*, and *ABELL* has 1293 hits for the *TLS* in 2011-14 and 79 for *Scriblerian* in 2011-13. *ABELL* has 406 hits since *Scriblerian*'s inception; whereas, *ABELL*'s "all" category has 2847, with PDFs of reviews in recent years (*MLAIB* has only 130). Also, "all" brings up more recent issues of some journals than *MLAIB* does, as *Raritan*). As this shows, ProQuest adds many reviews and articles to *Literature Online* that are in neither *ABELL* or *MLAIB*. However, much that "all" searches add is already in both *ABELL* and *MLAIB*.

Totals for some individuals hint that *MLAIB* may include more publications by an American Americanist than a Brit working on British literature, and that *ABELL* may do the reverse. *ABELL* seems to cover Irish materials better. The regional prejudice was no doubt stronger in their first decades. I notice that British biographer Ralph Straus, the biographer of Curll, Dickens, and Dodsley, has only one hit in the *MLAIB* but nine in *ABELL*, and English Shakespearians like G. Wilson Knight and J. Dover Wilson have several times as many *ABELL* as *MLAIB* records. However, there's no suggestion in my survey that either bibliography is faltering more in recent decades: Landa had more in *ABELL* than *MLAIB*, but Quintana the reverse; Benedict has more in *MLAIB* than *ABELL*, but Rumbold slightly more in *ABELL* than *MLAIB*. Parenthetically, I'd suggest that major literary historians of half a century ago published fewer articles than their peers today (according to *ABELL*, Landa and Quintana, for instance, published 10 and 18 articles; Maynard Mack, 47.

To conclude, the *MLAIB* has not done well with foreign publications, and even users in English literary study need beware of its and *ABELL* limitations. People can check what's missing in the online bibliographies from their own CV's, but the results would be worse were they working outside English studies and living outside North America. Deficiencies for distinguished scholars on the European continent are alarming: no record for Frédéric Barbier after 2008, none for Edoardo Barbieri after 2001, two for Frans Janssen after 1987, one for Liliana De Venuto after 2003; none for Judit Ecsedy Vizkelety after 2007, one for Marina Garone Gravier after 2008 (I've a dozen after 2008 in *ECCB*), one (2000) for György Gömöri after 1991, one after 2000 for Éva Knapp, one (1993) for Francesco Malaguzzi; one (1997) for Alfredo Serrai; two for Dominique Varry after 1999, and none for István Monok and Vincenzo Trombetta--since 2009 Trombetta published five books and Monok two dozen books or articles.

The inadequacy or tardiness of the *MLAIB* is also apparent from checking some titles of books shelved at my elbow, suggesting the coverage of books is as weak as that for journals. *Printing and Bookselling in Dublin, 1670-1800* by James W. Phillips (1998), a very important book, is not in *MLAIB* but is in *ABELL*. There have been five *Reading Swift* volumes from Hermann Real's

Münster symposia on Swift, all essential to Swift studies: the most recent, 2013, missed by both *MLAIB* and *ABELL,* the 2008, 1998, and 1993 only in *ABELL*, the 1995 only in *MLAIB*, and the 2003 in both. *ABELL* lacks Vol. 4 and *MLAIB* Vols. 2-4 of David Woolley's edition of Swift's *Correspondence*. Unlike *ABELL*, *MLAIB* has only one volume of the Florida Sterne edited by Melvyn New *et al*., whether you check under "New" or "Sterne." Missing from *MLAIB* are two 2011 festschrifts from the University of Delaware Press that include essays by many in EC/ASECS, *Swiftly Sterneward* ed. by W. B. Gerard *et al*. and *New Contexts for 18C British Fiction*, ed. by Christopher Johnson (honoring Mel New and Jerry Beasley respectively), as is the festschrift for Mary Pollard, *That Woman* (2005), yet all three are in *ABELL.*

The MLA is recording "online bibiographies" and "scholarly websites": *MLAIB* lists ARTFL, Kevin Berland's C*18-L*, Carolyn Nelson's *Union First Line Index of English Verse* at the Folger's website, and Emily Lorraine De Montluzin's websites *Attributions of Authorship in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731-1868: An Electronic Union List* (13 March 2003) and that for the *European Magazine* and her *Poetry of the Gentleman's Magazine* (2003; revised 2014). The *MLAIB* records no dates for the last four, and, while database websites can evolve, the inception dates should at least be given. I failed on *MLAIB* to find a dozen of the bibliographies posted at the Bibliographical Society of America's *BibSite*, Anna Battigelli and Eleanor Shevlin's substantial website *Early Modern Online Bibliography,* Brycchan Carey's bibliographical websites, Laura Mandell's *18thConnect*, Marie McAllister's *Eighteenth-Century Audio*, or Benjamin Pauley's *Eighteenth-Century Book Tracker*. This bibliographical curmudgeon is not the right man to evaluate what on the WWW is being overlooked, but I welcome an *Intelligencer* article on the subject.

S. Davies, D.S. Roberts and G. Sánchez Espinosa (Editors). ***India and Europe in the Global Eighteenth Century.*** (Oxford University Studies in the Enlightenment; SVEC 2014—01.) Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2014. Pp. [*xii*] + 341 pp., including bibliography; 13 illustrations; index; and summaries. ISBN: 978-0-7294-1080-9. Paperpack: £65; 80 euros; $110.

Rightly eschewing any claims for a unified approach to its subject, Daniel Sanjiv Roberts, in introducing the present collection of essays by scholars from India, Australia, Britain, Denmark and France (many of which were originally presented at a symposium held at Queen's University, Belfast, in 2011), emphasizes instead their "nuanced analysis" which focuses on the transactional nature of Indian-European relations in the eighteenth century rather than on either Saidean or post-colonial antagonisms and confrontations between East and West. He points out that the essays deal not just with India, Britain, and France but with other European powers, like Denmark, that had dealings with India. And he concludes that contributors to the volume "examine aspects of Enlightenment theory; European and Persian representations of India; economic history; war and piracy; material culture and display; book history and translation; travel writing, critical theory and fiction; European missions and

British evangelicalism; Hellenism and Orientalism and Mughal history and culture." The range of the volume is clearly vast, though the dismissed postcolonial or post-Saidean critic would be quite at home in discussing these topics. What marks the essays' originality is not any methodological novelty but rather that they bring up issues that are not generally discussed and deal, in many cases, with little known texts, without, however, resorting to any attempt to advance a "theory." Indeed, there is not a whiff of theory about most of them. Instead, they are all characterized by good, solid, intelligent analysis of texts and generalizations that are fully backed up by thorough and up to date scholarship, and are written in clear, lucid, readable prose rather than a turgid academic style.

This does not mean that all the fifteen essays are of equal value or quality. Morgens R. Nissen's "The Danish Asiatic Company: Colonial expansion and commercial interests," while providing a welcome new perspective on India since the Danish presence there is so seldom noticed, remains, at best, a simplified history of the Danish East India Company, founded in 1616 and, after several incarnations, abolished in 1843. The essay focuses upon the bickerings in Copenhagen over the monopolistic nature of the Company. While it is richly footnoted, one wishes that there had been instead an account of the far more important encounter, in the form of its long-lasting impact, of the Danish missionaries in Tranquebar with south Indian culture.

Gabriel Sánchez Espinosa's "The Spanish Translation of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's *La Chaumière indienne*: Its fortunes and significance in a country divided by ideology, politics and war" argues that though India had no significant contact with Spain at the end of the eighteenth century, Spanish translations of Saint-Pierre's book survived several censorship attempts not because they dealt with an exotic theme but essentially because they were read allegorically in terms of Spain's inconsistent and not always successful efforts to modernize in the early 1800s. The argument is backed by rich bibliographical scholarship, but it has little bearing on the theme of the book since it is not about India's impact on Spain or vice versa but rather about the fortunes of a Spanish translation of a French book in Spain. Puzzling, too, is why Sánchez Espinosa twice spells "Delhi" as "Dehli."

Similar praise and criticism, the latter to a more moderate degree, can be leveled at the essay by another of the book's editors. Daniel Sanjiv Roberts, in "Orientalism and 'textual attitude': Bernier's appropriations by Southey and Owenson," performs a useful task in dealing with the British Romantic interest in India, arguing that François Bernier's *Histoire de la derrnière Révolution des états du Grand Mogol* (1670) and *Suites des Mémoires [...] sur l'empire du Grand Mogol* (1671), which remained among the most influential travel accounts of the eighteenth century, were appropriated by Robert Southey and Sydney Owenson to their own uses. Bernier had criticized Hindus. In *The Missionary* (1811) Owenson softened this criticism while agreeing with Bernier that Christianity could never take root in India, while Southey, in his epic poem *The Curse of Kehama,* published the previous year, supported Bernier's critical stance but also maintained that Hindus should be converted to Christianity, by force if necessary. Between them the two represented conflicting British views of the need for missionary activity in India at the time. Sánchez Espinosa and

Roberts are concerned less with India than with the uses that various European writers made of the image of India as it came down to them through other writers, though in fairness they never claim otherwise.

Sonja Lawrenson's "'The country chosen of my heart': The comic cosmopolitanism of *The Orientalist, or, Electioneering in Ireland, a tale, by myself"* (1820) is also about the idea of India being put to the service of European authors, but it is more. It deals with India and Ireland, a welcome focus since so many Irish served in India, but the Irish point of view on India, while not ignored, is not often discussed. Lawrenson identifies the anonymous author of this neglected novel as a female learned in Hindu thought, which makes the work even more interesting, since though many women wrote about India, few ventured into arcane areas of Indian philosophy and theology. Placing the work in the context of post-Union Irish politics, Lawrenson maintains that, by establishing links between India and Ireland, it "offered an alternative to British pejorative stereotyping of Ireland" and developed a "national image that highlighted the artistic, spiritual nature of the Irish." Simultaneously it parodied both Romantic nationalism and Romantic Orientalism. Clearly, the novel will repay further research.

Two of the essays in the book, Claire Gallien's "British orientalism, Indo-Persian historiography and the politics of global knowledge," and Javed Majeed's "Globalizing the Goths: 'The siren shores of Oriental literature' in John Richardson's *A Dictionary of Persian, Arabic, and English* (1777-1780)," deal with an equally neglected but important and therefore welcome theme, the Indo-Persian literary connection in the 18th century as understood by Western commentators. Both are important and complex essays, Gallien's somewhat more so than Majeed's, but they are written in a crystal clear style. Gallien's also accommodates "theory" to her scholarship rather more than the others in the book. Her main point is that early British empire builders, wanting to know more about their newly conquered land, turned first to Indian history written by the Indians themselves. They soon decided to reject that by Hindu historians as being more myth and legend than fact, in favor of Muslim historians who wrote largely in Persian. For one thing, this history appeared "truer," since it dealt with more recent events in some of which the empire builders had themselves participated. So they proceeded to offer the West their translations of Muslim/Persian history. These translations show a thorough knowledge of the Persian language and conventions, and offer a positive view of Mughal rule. As such, they offer a challenge to the Saidean notion that European scholars presented only a distorted, "orientalist" vision of the East: rather than being that, they are polyphonic and hybrid. However, whereas Homi Bhabha sees hybridity as a disruptive force working from within colonial discourse, the hybridity of the translators is not. Instead, it seeks to further reinforce the rightness of British colonial rule. The translators were willing to alter their sources to serve the needs of empire: thus every "Orientalist" is, at bottom, not a disinterested scholar but a colonialist. By arguing thus, Gallien is able both to incorporate the diverse views of Said and Bhabha in her essay and yet to transcend them.

She makes a further point. British translators altered their Persian originals not only in terms of content but also with regard to style, organization and

structure, thereby making the very different ways of Muslim/Persian historiography conform to the British. By doing so, they "proved" that British historiography had a universal applicability and hence contained the greatest amount of "truth." Scholarship was again made to subserve imperialist interests.

Majeed approaches the Persian scholarship of eighteenth-century Britons in a different way. His position is that John Richardson's "A Dissertation of the languages, literature, and manners of the Eastern nations" prefixed to his *A Dictionary of Persian, Arabic, and English*, challenges the centrality of Greek and Roman classics to Britain's language and culture on the grounds that not only the English language but also the value that the British place on freedom and respect for women derive from the Teutonic or Gothic rather than from Graeco-Roman sources. And since the Gothic is, in turn, derived from Arabic and Persian sources and legends, Richardson expands the sense of Englishness to encompass a larger global identity that is marked by overlapping and interconnected geographical regions and cultures. By associating Indo-Persian and Indo-Arabic languages and culture with Britain, he also provides a higher valuation of recent Indian history, which was largely Muslim. His tactics suit the 1780s, when British power was growing in India and the "Orientalists" were in the ascendant, though in the process the "Englishness" of Britain is hollowed out somewhat. Majeed concludes by linking Robertson's views to his Scottishness and unclear social status.

Not the least welcome feature of this book is the attention it devotes to Indo-French connections, a topic sadly neglected by many British and even Indian historians. It is true that after the 1750s the French lost significance in India. But in the early years of the century there were times when it looked as if they, not the British, might become the ascendant power, and French soldiers and citizens remained prominent in Indian public life well into the nineteenth century. That is why it is good to have, apart from discussions of French texts in the essays of Roberts and Sánchez Espinosa, Anthony Strugnell's "A View from Afar: India in Raynal's *Histoire des deux Indes"* and Felicia Gottmann's "Intellectual history as global history: Voltaire's *Fragments sur l'Inde* and the problem of enlightened commerce." They form an interesting contrast. Strugnell argues that, though Guillaume-Thomas Raynal's popular and widely circulated *Histoire* was based largely on English sources, it offered a critique of British imperialism. Following upon France's reversals in Canada, the Seven Years' War, and losses in India, he and his collaborators, chiefly Diderot, indicted British greed, arrogance, and sense of racial superiority over Indians and propounded an alternative vision of Indo-European relations based on mutually beneficial trade and respect. But, noble as the vision was, it was motivated by a sour grapes attitude and a desire to supplant the British. Diderot, in fact, recommended stationing French troops in islands in the Indian Ocean that could take over India when Indians, sick of British atrocities, rose up against them. Nor was he quite willing to accept Indian society on equal terms. He castigated the caste system, and suggested that the French, after they took over India, should, instead of treating the Indians equally, help them rise by degrees to the European level of civilization.

Gottmann deals with Voltaire's involvement with India, about which he was very knowledgeable. In early life he had supported trade in luxury goods between nations as being beneficial to both. But in *Fragments sur l'Inde* he rejected luxury trade with India as being harmful not just to Indian merchants but also to Indian culture. But then Gottmann argues that radical as this vision was, it was less so than that of Diderot's in the 1780s. As evidence she adduces the latter's contributions to Raynal's *Histoire*, which is just the opposite reading to what Strugnell offers.

For a good part of the eighteenth century the British were in India for one reason and one reason only: to make as much money as they could. In the process they brought back vast quantities of Indian artifacts and also produced any number of art works of their own dealing with Britons in India, their life and their work. John McAleer has a fascinating and informative essay called "Displaying its wares: Material culture, the East India Company and British encounters with India in the long eighteenth century" in which he discusses, with illustrations, the different exhibitions over the years in which some of this work has been displayed, and what these exhibitions tell us about the East India Company as well as about changing attitudes to India-related artifacts in Britain. One may cavil with some of the material chosen for discussion and some that is left out. Thus I would have liked a more detailed discussion of Zoffany and of the fabrics and textiles that Britain imported as well as manufactured in imitation of these imports. However, though the essay merely scratches the surface of a very rich and complex topic, it serves as a salutary reminder of new avenues of research into Indian material culture of the period to be explored.

Material culture is, in a sense, also a theme of the very different essay by James Watt on "Fictions of commercial empire, 1774-1782." By the 1770s the venality of the British in India had become so common a topic not just of jests but also revulsion that Adam Smith and some other writers, the latter now largely forgotten, tried to make it somewhat less unpalatable by distancing it. In *Wealth of Nations* Smith justifies British exploitation and greed in India as being a necessary by-product of a system which helps increase wealth. Richard Clark's poem *The Nabob* justifies growing rich. So do the anonymous novel *Memoirs of a Gentleman who Resided Several Years in the East Indies* and Helenus Scott's *Adventures of a Rupee.* Both also try to render the goings-on in India so remote from the concerns of the British public that the sting of criticism is softened. Clearly, the process of trying to shake off guilt and overcome anti-Company sentiment started in Britain as soon as these feelings became perceptible.

The last three essays in the collection, all by women scholars born or living in India, are the most Indocentric. Instead of dealing with how Europe was affected by distant India, they deal with how India was affected by Europe. Florence D'Sousa's somewhat academic and mechanical contribution offers "A Comparative study of English and French views of pre-colonial Surat" and provides an account of the relationships between Hindus, Muslims, British, French and Dutch traders and citizens in the Surat from the 1680s to the 1760s. Basing her work largely on the writings of the English John Fryer and John Ovington and the French Anquetil-Duperron, she concludes that the Mughal governor, who was a Muslim, the Ethiopian controller of shipping between

Surat and the Red Sea, who, though also a Muslim, was not necessarily an ally of the Mughals, and later on the British, vied for control, but relationships between these groups were peaceful, based on mutual give and take, and with no community or group proving to be isolationist or banding against the others.

One of the longest and most complex essays, but also one of the most opaque on account of there being such a thronging of ideas and facts in it, is Lakshmi Subramanian's "Whose pirate? Reflections on state power and predation on India's western littoral." The argument seems to be that after dealing successfully with Maratha pirates on the Konkan coast, the Bombay Presidency turned its attention northward to Kathiawar and Kutch coasts. The situation here was complicated, which only a few British administrators like Col. Alexander Walker appreciated. Some pirates were hereditary; others had turned to piracy out of economic necessity. Some, when not engaged thus, served various littoral rulers as expert steersmen and pilots. Piracy was not necessarily regarded as robbery but as a form of taxation levied by rulers, or as legitimate tribute exacted by big temples like that of Dwarka. Merchants engaged in it as a form of profit making. Walker was clear that, because of its multi-layered links with money, politics and religion, it could be stamped out only by overwhelming force. But since the East India Company at the time was lacking in financial as well as naval resources, he advocated an understanding of the pirates' motivations, a respect for their bravery and skills, and financial accommodation. In a footnote Subramanian mentions his association with attempts to eradicate female infanticide, but she does not institute a comparison of these efforts with his recommendations on dealing with privacy. The fact is that in both efforts his methods, marked by what may be called "soft" imperialism, yielded only partial success. It took determined military action, or a "hard" imperialistic approach, to eradicate both from Kathiawar.

The last essay in the book, Seema Alavi's "The Mughal decline, and the emergence of new global connections in early modern India," has a rather cobbled quality in that a number of ideas seem summarized from the author's other works, but none of them is fully developed, the development having taken place in those works. For all that it is an important essay, one of the most significant in the book. "Wider conceptual spaces" got created which helped India connect itself afresh to global influence. Through an examination of examples from the fields of medicine, religious scholarship, and soldiering, Alavi maintains that contrary to the traditional view, the eighteenth century in India represents not a decline but a shift of energy from the court and the major cities to other elite groups of high-born families. In medicine the language of treatises shifts from Persian, the court language, to Arabic, the language of science in the non-Western world. Corresponding to this is a shift away from the view that the health of the people is dependent on the health of the sovereign, and by extension to the importance of proper comportment and values in maintaining the health of the individual as well as the body politic, towards a more modern and global view. Religious men, too, while continuing to use Persian, started writing in Arabic and Urdu as well, thereby extending their reach to a larger Indian as well as pan-Islamic readership. They also began to emphasize the importance of the individual in interpreting scripture. Sensing a

great release of energy, these men migrated abroad, entered service in India with whoever wanted them, and began to engage in trade, extending their reach. In soldiering, too, the increasing number of European mercenaries in the armies of the various Indian satraps who sprang up with the break-up of the Mughal empire fertilized Indian military traditions by introducing modern European arms and the notions of discipline. The essay ends with a detailed consideration of the figure of Antoine-Louis Henri Polier and others like him who, by serving as mediators of knowledge between the Indian courtly world and the East India Company, ensured that there was never a total fracture between the worlds of India and Europe.

I have kept for consideration at the end an essay that is quite unique in a collection consisting essentially of historical essays. Roberts' is, of course, partly literary, but it uses literature in the service of history. But Deirdre Coleman's "'Voyage of Conception': John Keats and India" is purely literary, though of the old-fashioned kind that traces influences. It analyzes in painstaking detail Keats's interest in and knowledge of India dating from the time when, as a schoolboy, he devoured Lempriere's *Classical Dictionary*. She sees his interest in processions and pageants, the frequent occurrence of a nymph or maid figure, and especially of Bacchus, as all features in his poetry that can be traced back to India: some Greek myths regarded Bacchus as the first conqueror of India from where he returned in a triumphal and riotous procession. Keats's rejection of the Christian "vale of tears" for a "vale of Soul-Making," and his notions of "negative capability" and "diligent indolence" may have come from India, the latter via Sir William Jones's praise of the Indian imagination which is fostered by indolence and love for leisure. Coleman points out that at one time Keats thought of becoming a ship's surgeon to India; she also says that a reference to "two-and-thirty Pallaces" in a letter to J.H. Reynolds of 19 February, 1818, which has puzzled editors thus far, may derive from the misremembered title of *Vikrama's Adventures, Or the Thirty-Two Tales of the Throne,* an Indian work originally translated into French and thereafter into English in 1817. Altogether, she establishes that there is much more of India in Keats than has been noticed before, perhaps even more in his letters than his poems. The essay is a genuine contribution to the recent scholarship on India in the Romantic imagination.

To sum up. *India and Europe in the Global Eighteenth Century* offers no new methodology or theory but good, solid, rather old-fashioned historical essays on interesting if little known aspects of India's transactions with the West. The scholarship is impeccable, the bibliography complete and up to date, and the book is an important contribution to studies of India in the eighteenth century. A useful feature is the paragraph-long summaries of the essays at the end of the book. Inevitably, a collection such as this cannot be comprehensive. However, at the risk of making an already thick volume thicker, I should have welcomed essays on the Dutch and especially Portuguese presence in India, missionary work, and the work of various eighteenth-century linguists and anthropologists like C. J. Beschi, S.J. and Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg. India also comes across as a country which was traveled to, rather than as one that produced travelers. In this context an account of some India-born men and

women who went to Europe for short or long periods of time would have been welcome. Enough material exists to make this a fruitful topic of research. The most famous of such men was Raja Rammohun Roy, but Dean Mohammad is also fairly well known. *Varthamanappusthakam* by Thomas Parammakkal (1786), which was translated from Malayalam into English in 1971, describes the voyage of two south Indian priests to Rome. Then there were the Indian begums who settled in Britain, whom William Dalrymple mentions in *White Mughals,* besides those women who were taken there as children, like Eliza Raine, who became Anne Lister's first lover, Margaret Stuart Bruce Tyndall, who instituted a bursary at the University of Edinburgh, and Susan Cochrane Morehouse and Jane Cumming, both of whom became entangled in long drawn-out litigation. They represent what has been called the "inner life" of empire.

India and Europe in the Global Eighteenth Century has enriched Indian historical studies. It is hoped that other works in this vein will keep coming.

Brijraj Singh
Emeritus, Hostos Community College of CUNY
bsingh1029@aol.com

Johann Wilhelm von Archenholtz. *England: From the 1787 Expanded Edition of England und Italien*. Edited and Translated by Lois E. Bueler.
Lanham MD: University Press of America, 2014. Pp. xxvii + 392; index of biographical footnotes. ISBN: 978-0-7618-6290-1. Hardcover: $90.00.

Professor Bueler makes no extravagant claims about the literary merit of this work. She labels it "a socio-political commentary" (not a travel book, as it sometimes is called), and views it as "the beginning of serous modern journalism." But literary scholars of the mid and late 18th century will find the work as interesting as, apparently, did Archenholtz's contemporary audience: he was much more famous and widely read during his lifetime than his current obscurity would suggest, despite writing for a German, not English, readership. There was an English-speaking audience as well. *England und Italien*, first published in 1785 and then expanded in 1787, received a partial English translation in 1791 by Joseph Trapp (as *A Picture of Italy*), which accounts for Bueler's decision to make available, for the first time in English, a complete version of the half of the work dealing with England and ignored by Trapp. (Trapp's translation, which Bueler considers "complete and accurate," I found online, although in a 1790 Dublin edition rather than the 1791 London edition she mentions.)

I am not competent to evaluate the accuracy of Bueler's translation, but it certainly seems to achieve her goal to provide a clear and complete text. Her introduction explains how Archenholtz's 1785 best-seller "raised German Anglophilia to its peak." The author's interesting life is briefly sketched—his expertise comes from his having lived in England for a total of six years between 1769 and 1779—although Bueler soft-peddles his rakish reputation. Are other sources that find his life more disreputable in error? Bueler does not

tell us. She is careful to delineate the type of edition she is presenting, enumerating what a "complete scholarly edition" would do that she has not done. She decides not to seek sources of her author's information. But she does "seek to identify every person mentioned [by] full name, dates of birth and death, and a sentence or two of general significance. I also note those few names I have not been able to identify." Ironically, by eschewing the type of flexibility that a non-scholarly edition could have, she introduces the major shortcomings of her annotations. I will cite a few examples in detail, examples that will also serve to give the flavor of the widely diverse subject matter Archenholtz treats.

Discussing the peculiarities of the British, Archenholtz writes, "A few years ago there still lived in Worcestershire . . . a man named Tallis who, from the notion that he could not stay warm in any other way, chose to live in his bed, where he dwelt for 28 years without once getting out of it." Bueler's endnote reads, "John Tallis . . . of Worcestershire appears in the bill of mortality of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1755." This is useful for establishing the truthfulness of the author's observations, but slightly misleading if used as a hint of his source. The obituary puts Tallis's confinement at 30 years while Archenholtz says 28, indicating that his source was a letter to the *GM* in 1753, a letter reprinted in the *Scots Magazine* of the same year. It is a mystery why Bueler does not cite the earlier, much longer reference, especially since it is cross-referenced in the later one.

In a discussion of the extravagant lifestyles of some English clergy and the concomitant lack of respect for the clergy in England, Archenholtz notes that "a few months after the execution of Dr. Dodd for forgery of bills, another clergyman was hanged in London for raping girls of 10 to 12 years old who were receiving religious instruction from him." Adhering to her rules, Bueler ignores the other clergyman, who is easily discovered to be the Reverend Benjamin Russen, hanged in December 1777. Also unnamed and therefore unnoted is the Scottish nobleman from the isle of Harris who, having been "very unsuccessful in love," decides to "seek out another people under the sun, and in pursuit of this goal sold his estate. With the money thus raised he outfitted two good ships rich stocked with all necessities, and on these embarked for Glasgow with sixty families who were his vassals. His design was to sail to New Zealand . . . ." Archenholtz's source was probably the *London Journal* (Feb. 1785). A modern scholar has tentatively identified the nobleman as General Norman Macleod and has argued that the supposed emigration never happened. (See R. Mack, "The Mystery of the Scottish Gentleman Emigrant from 1782," *Journal of Pacific History* 32 [1997], 243-49.)

All named persons (including John Locke, Alexander Pope, Jonathan Swift, et al.) are either identified in a sentence or two or marked as stumpers. "I have not identified Thiele from Bremen," Bueler remarks of the German clockmaker that Archenholtz tells us would have shared Harrison's prize for the Longitude if he had not been late [!] displaying his clock in London. A two-minute Google search reveals the tardy contestant to have been Johann Georg Thiele (1714-84). Archenholtz is a great admirer of the disinterested British legal system, where "even an Atkinson, a very well connected man of £300,000 could not escape punishment for fraud." Atkinson could not escape justice but

he eludes Bueler ("I have not located Atkinson.") He is Christopher Atkinson, later Saville or Seville (c. 1739-1819), the subject of *The Trial of Christopher Atkinson, Esq.* (1783). In his portraits of morals section, Archenholtz covers the sexual waterfront, ending a chapter and volume thus: "Because in London sensuality and voluptuousness know no other boundaries than what possibility allows, here there are women who renounce all intimate relations with the male sex and keep only to their own. . . . They form small societies called anandrous associations, of which Mrs. Y . . . . ., a famous actress on the London stage several years ago, was a directress." Bueler's note reads, "I have not been able to identify Mrs. Y . . . . .." Mary Anne Yates (1728-87) is certainly meant, as recent scholarship suggests.

Archenholtz finds the pastimes of the English "distinguished by idiosyncrasy and variety." Londoners taking delight in foreign attractions, "a short while ago a society of persons of rank was formed at which a Frenchman named Tessier reads French plays all winter by subscription." Here Bueler gets part way to her goal: "Horace Walpole mentions Tessier by surname in his letters; I have not turned up more information." A more complete answer took more than a few minutes, but again only the most common on-line search engine was required. Antoine de Texier (1736- ?), from Lyons, was in England from 1775-1805. He lived at least until 1814, when he arrived in Paris. (See *N&Q*, 7th Series [April 18, 1891], 309.)

Archenholtz loves to illustrate his descriptions, which otherwise might be dry, with juicy morsels of micro-history. A paragraph that begins, "Great Britain has no fortifications," goes on to illustrate the defensive quality of Britain's island status with the story of a thwarted French invasion in 1761: "[S]ix thousand shallow-draft boats were readied, landing places along the English coast were probed . . . . But the attempt never took place because the English government received the most precise information about the entire plan and . . . mount[ed] the necessary precautions. This disclosure came by means of an Irishman in Paris named Macallester, who through the most extraordinary accident came by the very important state papers in which this undertaking was laid out in all its parts." Bueler notes, "I have not located Macallester," but a very brief on-line search turns up the following title by Oliver Mac Allester: *A Series of Letters, Discovering the Scheme Projected by France . . . for an Intended Invasion upon England with Flat-bottom'd Boats* (London, 1767).

Despite these issues, Bueler's work is valuable. For someone wishing to become familiar with British social, political, religious, literary, and moral customs in the second half of the 18th century, it provides an easy and informative read, mixing practical information with political and literary analysis. We learn that a passenger in a hurry would take a post chaise from London to Dover, covering the 72 English miles in eight hours. Discount travel was challenging then as now: "Whoever wishes to pay only half price . . . takes a seat on the roof of the coach where he sits comfortably enough, but rather precariously; if the coach turns over it is never without great calamity, as usually 12, 15, or even more people are sitting up there." As a critic Archenholtz sides more with French than German opinion in a set-piece comparison of Richardson and Fielding: "Why do German intellectuals speak with the greatest warmth of

Fielding and with colder admiration of Richardson? . . . Because of its excellence the *History of Thomas Jones* is worthy of being seen in everyone's hand, but the *History of Clarissa* is written for eternity." One seeking a feel for the everyday lives, values, and viewpoints of the late-18th century Englishman could do far worse than to read Archenholtz.

Robert G. Walker
Washington and Jefferson College

***Thomas Killigrew and the Seventeenth-Century English Stage: New Perspectives*. Edited by Philip Major.** Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013. Pp. xii + 223; bibliography of works cited; illustrations; index. ISBN: 978-1-4094-6668-0. Hardcover: £60; $109.95.

This collection is the first book about Killigrew to appear in print since Alfred Harbage's doctoral thesis was published in 1930 as *Thomas Killigrew Cavalier Dramatist 1612-83*. Killigrew is now remembered principally as the patentee of the King's Company from 1660 to 1677. His father was a courtier who became Queen Henrietta Maria's Vice Chamberlain in 1630. His elder brother William—author of five plays—was named Gentleman Usher of the Privy Chamber to Charles II in 1660 and had become Vice-Chamberlain to Queen Catherine by 1664. Their younger brother Henry—author of just one play—was to become a noted preacher and a government functionary holding numerous offices. The family, wives included, were hard-wired into the Stuart court-patronage system. Young Thomas had been appointed Page of Honor to Charles I by 1632; was mostly an exile during the interregnum; and served as Groom of the Bedchamber to Charles II from at least 1658 to his death. Neither his personal life nor his business dealings are unproblematical: even Harbage admitted that he was a pretty unsavory character. He wrote three plays before 1642, at least two of which were performed, and while in exile he wrote another five (three of them in two parts—a total of eleven plays) eventually published in his folio *Comedies, and Tragedies* of 1664. As a bosom friend of Charles II he was a fairly conspicuous member of court society. His contributions to literature are negligible, though his *Thomaso* was heavily plundered by Aphra Behn for *The Rover* (1677), which remained popular for many decades.

Why do we need a book about Killigrew? What we get is a mixed bag. The editor's twenty-page "Introduction: 'A Man of Much Plot'" suggests that we should not neglect or ignore Killigrew just because he was what is now an "unfashionable" "*type* of royalist" with ugly "aspects" to his "life and character" (2). The "question" Philip Major poses is "who is the 'real' Thomas Killigrew?" (6). This is an interesting but essentially unanswerable question, given our almost total lack of evidence concerning his inner life and psyche. This is exactly the conclusion to which J. P. Vander Motten comes in chapter 6: "Any attempt … at uncovering the dramatist's 'real' self through the extant portraits and drawings, or indeed through readings of the characters he created, must inevitably founder" (150). Just so. Philip Major maintains that "The exilic

provenance of much of Killigrew's repertoire has been understudied" (13). I grant that it has been little studied, but the theme of exile seems obvious and no great profit is to be derived from studying it. Major says that Killigrew's life was "a complex binary of continuity and change" (16)—but this could be said of most lives. We are told that "the time for a reassessment of Killigrew and his art is at hand" (13), but why one is needed is hard to see. He was a minor league non-professional playwright. Major says that "Nobody has disputed Killigrew's huge influence on Restoration theatre production" (14), but who has ever claimed that Killigrew had more than a modest influence, if that? David Roberts's chapter does indeed offer a "radical … reappraisal of Killigrew's career as a theatre manager" (16)—one that in my view tries to make a totally untenable case. Of this, more in due course.

Four of the book's eight chapters make substantive contributions to our understanding of the territory they cover. Karen Britland's "Henry Killigrew and Dramatic Patronage at the Stuart Courts" concerns *The Conspiracy*, a play by Thomas's younger brother, performed at York House in 1635 and published in 1638. It was considerably revamped by the author and published in 1653 as *Pallantus and Eudora*. The play is pretty small beer, but in its contexts it presents features of interest. It was apparently commissioned, and certainly performed, in celebration of Lady Mary Villiers's marriage to Charles Herbert, son of the Earl of Pembroke, who was Lord Chamberlain to Charles I. It was staged in the York House theatre constructed for the first Duke of Buckingham—a venue conspicuous as what John Orrell calls "the chief London centre for the production of the scenic drama until 1640." Britland makes a plausible case for identifying *The Conspiracy* as the play for which Inigo Jones created an elaborate set of scene designs (which, happily, survive). The first version was produced at Blackfriars by the King's Company later in 1635 (non-scenically). As Britland points out, that version has "primarily religious" meanings (99), but the 1653 revision was rejigged to emphasize the restoration of young Prince Cleander to his murdered father's throne. Application to the exiled Charles II and his father is glaringly obvious, though that could not have been foreseen when the first version was written, fourteen years before the beheading of Charles I. The play is no prize, but it makes a splendid example of "application" meaning changing over time.[1]

Marcus Nevitt's "Thomas Killigrew's *Thomaso* as Two-Part Comedy" makes the best critical justification I have seen for what is in print a sprawling, unstageable ten-act monstrosity. Writing in Madrid in 1654, Killigrew probably

[1] Britland mentions that a reduced and slightly mangled version of *Pallantus and Eudora* was published under the title *The Tyrant King of Crete*, "A Tragedy. Never before Printed," in volume 2 of the 1722 edition of *The Works of the Honourable Charles Sedley, Bart* without acknowledgement of Killigrew (111). This is noted by Montague Summers in *The Playhouse of Pepys* (1935), pp. 66-67. I agree with Summers that Sedley (1639-1701) was capable of writing such "poor stuff," but cannot agree that "it is by no means unlikely" that the work is "an exercise from Sedley's pen." If Sedley wrote the play, he must have done so prenatally at the age of minus 4.

had little hope that it would ever be staged. After the appearance of the 1664 folio, however, Killigrew set to work to edit several of the plays down into performance texts, working from a copy now in the library of Worcester College, Oxford. His cutting, editing, and revisions have been the subject of useful articles by C. H. Wilkinson (1926), William Van Lennep (1948), Albert Wertheim (1969), and Colin Visser (1978), but (surprisingly) the "performance" text of *Thomaso* has remained unpublished. Nevitt analyzes that text in a sensible way and makes a well-grounded argument for its potential viability in the theatre. He is absolutely correct in saying that we have no proof that the King's Company did not stage the revised text in the later 1660s (121), but nor is there evidence they did: the calendar of known performances is drastically incomplete.

Vander Motten's "Recycling the Exile: *Thomaso*, *The Rover* and the Critics" is, as one would expect, an assured and competent exegesis of the autobiographical foundations of Killigrew's two plays. It is also a polite demonstration of the ways in which Behn enthusiasts have failed to understand and appreciate the artifact from which *The Rover* was crafted. Vander Motten is the author of *Sir William Killigrew (1606-1695): His Life and Dramatic Works* (Gent, 1980) and also of two articles that add substantially to our knowledge of Thomas Killigrew: "Unpublished Letters of Charles II" (*Restoration*, 1994) and "Thomas Killigrew's 'Lost Years', 1655-1660" (*Neophilologus*, 1998).

Geoffrey Smith's "'A Gentleman of Great Esteem with the King': The Restoration Roles and Reputations of Thomas Killigrew" does an excellent job of teaching us "what" (if not who) Thomas Killigrew really was—primarily a courtier, and as one of the Grooms of the Bedchamber someone close to Charles II in private life. His remuneration was £500 per annum (though hard to collect), and as Harbage long ago demonstrated, Charles lavished an astonishing amount of money on Killigrew in a variety of ways. Harbage reckoned that his income was some £2000 per annum (at a time when average annual household income in England was under £40), some of it from his second wife's 1662 appointments as Keeper of the Sweet Coffer for Queen Catherine and "first Lady of her Majesties Privy Chamber in ordinary." Killigrew had no title (though he had enough pull with Charles that he could reportedly collect £500 for getting a title conferred on someone else), but he had potent social connections that are not at all apparent to a theatre historian.

Three of the chapters strike me as problematical in various ways. Eleanor Collins's "From Court to Cockpit: *The Prisoners* and *Claricilla* in Repertory" offers descriptive appreciations of two early efforts that dabble in the platonic love mode that Henrietta Maria's court favored. They are not good plays, but they are exemplars of a 1630s vogue that is worth our attention. Collins says that these plays "have not previously been treated as repertory pieces" (34) and concludes triumphantly that in them "Killigrew combined his political and aesthetic aspirations … to create successful repertory pieces" (44). I have to wonder what she means by both "successful" and "repertory." We know that *The Prisoners* was produced by Queen Henrietta's troupe before it ceased performing in 1636 because the 1641 title page says so, but we have no other record of performance before or after 1660. We have the same title page

evidence for *Claracilla*, though in that case the play was licensed for performance by Sir Henry Herbert in 1660 and we know of four performances between 1660 and 1669. "Repertory" is generally taken to mean "a regular rotation of works performed" (OED). On this basis *Claracilla* may have been part of the King's Company's repertory in the 1660s, and conceivably *might* have been so before 1642, but we have no reason to think *The Prisoners* ever was. The plays are at best curiosities of little interest even to specialists.

Victoria Bancroft's "Tradition and Innovation in *The Parson's Wedding*" makes heavy weather of a cheerful, somewhat smutty farce. Bancroft sees Killigrew as "a key author in the Caroline and Restoration periods" (45). Really? She asserts that production of the play after 1660 "contributes meaningfully to the growing dialogue between the artificial and real which is so key to Restoration comedy" (45). Again, I have trouble with "key." To judge from what Pepys says, people went to see an all-female cast doing a risqué play and showing off their legs in male attire. Bancroft is much taken with metatheatrical matters that, I suspect, passed right by most or all of the seventeenth-century audience. She states that the play "soon gained notoriety" (47), though what proof do we have other than Pepys's salacious interest? She asserts that "the production ... was frequently revived" (47), but offers no evidence, and I believe there is none. We have record of performances in October 1664, and the show was mounted at Lincoln's Inn Fields (again all with women) in spring 1672 after the destruction of the Bridges Street theatre by fire. And that is the totality of the performance record. Bancroft says that Rebecca Marshall spoke "the Prologue to the first performance in October 1664 … in the leading role of the Captain" (47). But the only surviving prologue is for 1672; I do not think we know what role either of the Marshall sisters took in 1664 (and the Highfill-Burnim-Langhans *Biographical Dictionary of Actors* takes as Anne the likelier speaker of a prologue in 1664). Bancroft could have set herself straight by consulting Pierre Danchin's edition of *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration*.

In "'This Lemon in mine eye': Writing the Exile in Thomas Killigrew's *The Pilgrim*," Philip Major complains that the play has been "largely overlooked by literary critics" or "treated cursorily" (175). This is perfectly true, but hardly surprising. It is not a good play, and it has no known stage history, though Major is correct in saying that the Worcester copy of the 1664 *Comedies and Tragedies* proves that Killigrew was at least thinking about producing it. Why its being "intended for performance" can be said to have "ratcheted up its potential significance for theatre historians and literary critics" (176-77) I am afraid I do not see. I grant Major's claim that there is at least some possibility that *The Pilgrim* could have been written five years earlier than the 1664 title page says, and performed by English actors known to have been in Paris in 1646 (183). The actors included Burt, Clun, Hart, Shatterell, and Wintershall. I confess to being dumbfounded by Major's footnote 30: "For biographical details of these actors, including the roles they performed for Killigrew, see Malcolm Elwin, *The Playgoers' Handbook to Restoration Drama* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1928), pp. 217-42." Elwin's book was regarded with disdain eighty years ago, and the magnificent Highfill-Burnim-Langhans *Biographical Dictionary of*

Actors ... 1660-1800 has been complete in sixteen volumes since 1993. That work *is* in this book's bibliography, albeit with the second author named "Kalvin" rather than Kalman Burnim, and the whole set ascribed to 1973. But why direct readers to an ancient piece of commercial trash instead of to one of the major scholarly reference works of the last half century?

If Thomas Killigrew matters—if he was more than an exceedingly minor non-professional playwright and a sleazy hanger-on at the court of Charles II,—then his significance must lie in his role as patentee of the King's Company and (briefly) as Master of the Revels (1673-1677). In "Thomas Killigrew, Theatre Manager" David Roberts attempts to overturn a scholarly consensus that goes back nearly a hundred years. Every previous scholarly investigation has reached either the conclusion that Killigrew was a very bad manager or that he had little actual involvement in the company's management.

Most of what we know about the operation of the King's Company from 1660 to 1677 comes from the Lord Chamberlain's records first extensively mined by Allardyce Nicoll in the 1920s and from the Chancery lawsuit material that gives Leslie Hotson's *The Commonwealth and Restoration Stage* (1928) its substance. Hotson's still foundational work is dismissively alluded to by Roberts, but never really engaged with. Hotson has vast amounts of specific, nitty-gritty evidence, and he recites it accurately. I see no indication that he had an axe to grind. He reports what he found about the King's Company and concludes that "Advancing age [of the actors] and (more disastrous still) dissension, greed, and bad management, combined to bring about their downfall. A good share of the blame must go to Tom Killigrew" (242). Hotson says that, unlike Davenant, Killigrew "had little notion of sound methods of playhouse rule. He could boast to Pepys of the great physical improvements of the Restoration stage over its predecessor; but when we read of the disintegration of his company because of mismanagement, the boast rings hollow." Speaking as one intimately familiar with both the regulatory documents and the vast bulk of lawsuit evidence, I have to say that this verdict seems just about exactly right to me.

The best account of the King's Company's offerings as such remains Summers' chapter in *The Playhouse of Pepys*. He expresses great admiration for the actors and for the quality of their plays, old and new, but he accurately reports the company's vicious infighting, stoppages of acting, and descent into chaos. His conclusion was that by the mid-1670s Thomas Killigrew "had long left the government in the hands of Hart and Mohun" (92) and observes that when the patent fell into the hands of Charles Killigrew in 1677 his "rule … proved even more unsatisfactory than the management of his father" (93). Highfill, Burnim, and Langhans are if anything even more skeptical of Killigrew's competence and involvement in day-to-day management. They condemn his "financial mismanagement" and express contempt for his failure to capitalize on his advantages in 1660: "Killigrew and his company must have blundered badly during their first season to have lost such a golden opportunity," and they conclude that "part of the problem was Killigrew himself" (IX, 11-12). He was, they say, "really a closet dramatist" (true, as of 1660) with little practical experience in professional theatre. They are correct in

saying that "little information about the day-by-day operation of the company and Killigrew's part in it" survives. He was of course the patentee, "so whether he was only nominally manager or really worked at theatre management, his name was attached to many of the [Lord Chamberlain's] orders concerning the company operation" (IX, 13). Another late twentieth-century view of Killigrew's shambolic and ever squabbling company may be found *en passant* in Judith Milhous's *Thomas Betterton and the Management of Lincoln's Inn Fields* (1979). She found what her predecessors had found: starting with enormous advantages, the King's Company deteriorated, collapsed in ruins, and was absorbed by the rival Duke's Company in the Union of 1682. This is simply a fact.[2]

With all due respect to Professor Roberts, an established and well-published scholar, I have to say that I think that he committed himself to a revisionist position for which there is virtually no evidence. I admit that the assignment is daunting: faced with it, I do not think I could say much of substance not already said by Hotson and his successors. Roberts' strident insistence on Killigrew's sagacity, foresight, and competence as a manager baffles me. He sneers repeatedly and condescendingly at the "shopkeeper mentality" of Davenant and Betterton (67, 71). He notes the success of *The Humorous Lieutenant* as the opening production at Bridges Street in 1663 and says "It is perhaps a sign of how rattled Kiligrew's rivals were that they turned to a revival of the ever-popular *Hamlet* in the same month" (76). What? One would expect much public curiosity about the first purpose-built new theatre after 1660, but there is no evidence whatever that *Hamlet* was specially "revived" or that the Duke's Company was "rattled." Roberts says "Killigrew was prepared to take risks of the kind Davenant tended to avoid" (79). His example is the all-female production of *The Parson's Wedding* in 1664, which to all previous commentators has looked more like pandering than risk taking. He praises Killigrew for taking stock during the closure for plague in 1665-66, implying that Davenant was negligent in failing to do so (82). But what evidence do we have that Davenant needed to? In the course of a snarky and nitpicky survey, Roberts does cite many of Hotson's documents—and the picture that emerges to this reader is very much the standard one of infighting and chaos. The truth is that we just do not know how involved Killigrew was in management. Roberts does not mention that as early as summer 1662 Killigrew turned over all managerial responsibility to Mohun, Hart, and Lacy (National

---

[2] In his well-informed and judicious *ODNB* account of Killigrew, J. P. Vander Motten observes that "Despite the manifest advantages" he "enjoyed as the manager of the King's Company, he appears to have had insufficient practical sense of the theatre to compete successfully with Davenant, a professional playwright and theatrical innovator." And Vander Motten concludes that "It is undeniable … that the King's Company's problems must be attributed to Killigrew's dubious handling of his theatrical holdings, resulting in conflicts with the disgruntled sharing actors, and, indeed, his own son Charles."

Archives, SP 44/10, pp. 70-71), revoked with much uproar in April 1663.[3] Roberts tries to rebut the "idea of Killigrew as detached from the daily business of theatre management," using as evidence a note he wrote to a copyist about parts for two actors in February 1667 (81-82). I point out, however, that the parts are in one of his own plays.[4]

A crucial point should be noted. No one has ever denied that the King's Company had great actors, fabulous scripts, and much popular success between 1660 and the destruction of the Bridges Street theatre by fire in January 1672. So it should have. The question is whether the patentee made much (if any) contribution to its success. The company handed to the King's favorite regarded itself as the direct continuation of Shakespeare's company. In 1660 its members included every proven, experienced male actor in London, and it almost immediately hired some fine women. (Who did the hiring we have no idea.) It held the performance rights to almost all extant English drama: Davenant had to

---

[3] Roberts appears to me to have confused himself badly about actors' "shares." Three quite different things are at issue. On 20 December 1661 shares were assigned in the building that was to become the Bridges Street Theatre: Killigrew and Sir Robert Howard took nine each, and eight actors bought in. Lacy took four shares; two each were taken by Mohun, Hart, Burt, Robert Shatterell, Clun, Cartwright, and Wintershall (BL Add MS 20,726 fol. 1v). The earliest known document reporting the assignment of *acting* shares to the "sharing actors" is recited in National Archives C6/221/48, an agreement of 10 January 1661/2 that Killigrew was to have two, while eight actors (Mohun, Hart, Lacy, Wintershall, Cartwright, Burt, Clun, and Bird) were assigned most of the rest of a total of 12¾ shares. The third "share" issue concerns an acting share given to Mohun, Hart, and Lacy in 1662 as remuneration for taking over managerial responsibility for the company. This was what Killigrew "revoked" in 1663, *not* the shares belonging to the senior male actors that constituted their pay for performing. Killigrew did not, in fact, make so bad an error as Roberts imagines when he says that Killigrew "turned his [senior] actors into employees" (76).

[4] A source that Roberts does not cite is Richard Flecknoe's vitriolic thirteen-page attack on Killigrew, *Life of Tomaso the Wanderer. An Epitome* (Printed for the Author, 1667). It survives in a single copy in the Bodleian, but was reprinted by Dobell in 1925. The "Occasion of Writing this Life" says Flecknoe (who signed the dedication to Killigrew) was his giving up all hope that "Tomaso'*s malice wou'd ever have had an end ... but seeing that my suffering one injury, but invited a second, and that a third, &c*," his "*patience*" is at an end. I take this to imply that he regarded Killigrew as responsible for refusing three of his plays for production between 1661 and 1667, two of them published with "intended" King's Company casts. This may suggest Killigrew's active involvement in vetting new play submissions. I note, however, that Flecknoe's *Damoiselles a la Mode* actually *did* get produced at Bridges Street in September 1668 (meeting with boisterous derision, according to Pepys), and I have trouble imagining Killigrew countenancing this after the publication of the *Life of Tomaso* if he was exercising control over what the company performed.

petition in December 1660 for the right to stage his own plays, plus eleven other titles then (wrongly) regarded as obsolete. Killigrew's position at court and social cachet, plus a glorious array of star actors, naturally attracted writers of high social standing who were trying their hands at playwriting—Sir Robert Howard (prior to Dryden, the foremost active playwright of the 1660s), the Earl of Orrery, the Duke of Buckingham, and others among the nobility and gentry. As Howard's brother-in-law, Dryden naturally became an "attached" playwright for the King's Company. Yet somehow they blew it—and as Hotson concluded, a lot of the blame has to attach to Thomas Killigrew. There can be no doubt of his financial irresponsibility and outright dishonesty, amply documented by Harbage and all successors (Roberts included). Geoffrey Smith asks whether in the "final analysis" Killigrew was a "merry droll" who was a friend of Charles II but "essentially inconsequential" or alternatively "a disgraceful 'buffoon' and 'pimp' who deserved to be expelled from the court" (172). Roberts concludes by asking whether Killigrew was the "mercenary, hands-off bungler" previous scholars have found him to be, and argues for "an alternative, more complex and more human Thomas Killigrew," a cautious theatre manager "fatally attracted to short-term decisions that defeated his longer-term aims," and "never quite clear what level of involvement his role demanded of him" (89). The complex and human Killigrew strikes me as an irrelevancy. Despite its enormous advantages, the company ran on the rocks during his watch, eventually caming to a bad end.

Unfortunately, this book does not meet the standards of domain expertise and accuracy that one expects in an academic book. Here is an array of instances offered in the spirit of *caveat lector*. (1) The play in which Buckingham attacked Sir William Coventry in 1669 was not *The Rehearsal* but *The Country Gentleman* (80). (2) Dryden's *Marriage A-la-Mode* premiered in December 1671, not April 1672—using the California Dryden would have produced the right date (86). (3) To assert that the Duke's Company "performed Shadwell's *The Tempest* once more at the end of November 1674 before a break lasting until September 1676" (87) is nonsense. Given the radically incomplete performance calendar, we have no way of knowing how many times it was performed in that span—but given its vast popularity, probably several times. This statement is given as evidence that the Duke's Company was not doing as well as scholars have said, and it is false. (4) To say that Killigrew's accession to the post of Master of the Revels in 1673 after the death of Sir Henry Herbert "cemented" his "importance to theatre history" seems extremely odd (21). The surviving evidence suggests that Killigrew was ferociously aggressive about trying to collect all sorts of fees, but entirely uninterested in actually carrying out his censorship duties. No one in this collection cites Arthur F. White's long and still-standard 1931 article on "The Office of the Revels and Dramatic Censorship during the Restoration Period," which contains meaty and useful evidence on both Killigrew and his son Charles (who succeeded him in 1677). (5) Contributors to this book repeatedly refer to the King's Company as the "King's Men," a designation obsolete by November 1660 that fell rapidly out of use (e.g., 19, 158). (6) Sir William Killigrew published five not four plays (91).

(7) We are told on page 45 that Killigrew and Davenant "co-managed a company of actors" in June 1660" (not true), that the managers "split the

company" (also untrue) after a couple of months, with Killigrew moving to Bridges Street (not opened until May 1663) and Davenant to Lincoln's Inn Fields (not opened until June 1661). As *The London Stage* makes clear, a few performances were given in the Cockpit and the Red Bull in October-November, after which the King's Company began to perform at Vere Street and (rather later) the Duke's Company at Salisbury Court. John Freehafer's 1965 article on the formation of the patent companies is not cited anywhere in the collection, but it would have been a help. (8) One has to wonder how firm a grip the editor has on archival resources. Under "Abbreviations" we find "LC … Lord Chamberlain's Papers, British Library." The last time I checked, they were, as they always have been, in the Public Record Office, now termed "The National Archives" (not as here "The National Archive"—197). (9) Buckingham's version of *The Chances* was premiered in 1664, not 1667 (165). (10) the Harbage biography of 1930 is copiously cited (as it should be), but some other pertinent studies are almost ignored. Harbage's still-important *Cavalier Drama* (1936) is virtually ignored, and Dale B. J. Randall's meaty and useful *Winter Fruit: English Drama 1642-1660* (1995) goes almost uncited. (11) Too many names get mangled in the Bibliography (and elsewhere). D. F. McKenzie becomes D. Y. Judith Milhous becomes "Judith M. Milhous." Conversely Dale B. J. Randall becomes plain Dale Randall. Paul D. Cannan becomes "Cannon." Dates cannot be relied on. The fourth edition of the first volume of Nicoll's *History* is dated "1955" (45). The standard Pepys edition in eleven volumes (1970-1983) appears as 1971-83 (47) but also as 1973-81 (207). I note that Pepys is also cited via G. E. Bentley and from an edition of 1854. No part of *The London Stage* was published in 1963 (120). Gross typos are depressing: e.g., "Jabobean" (123).

Obviously most of these problems are trivial and mechanical, but cumulatively they erode the reader's trust in the authors' accuracy and confidence in their command of their subjects. More disturbing are cases in which lack of knowledge breeds misunderstanding. Philip Major, for example, says that Killigrew "was given the lion's share of the pre-civil war repertoire in 1660 (14). Actually, the *company* that Killigrew was allowed to take over apparently claimed the right to *all* English plays, on the basis of its being the direct continuation of the old King's Company to which Shakespeare had belonged. Major appears unaware of this connection, though it is proven in an *RES* article of 1991 that he cites (183 n. 29). The radically unequal right to old plays is an extremely important feature of the King's-Duke's competition, especially in the 1660s, and it has been studied in some detail in articles by Nicoll and Hazelton Spencer (1925), Gunnar Sorelius (1965), and myself (1981)—none of them cited. They could have been of use to more than one of the authors in this collection.

Where, one might ask, were the publisher's specialist referees? Killigrew does present a difficult case. This manuscript needed expert readings from specialists in Caroline, interregnum, and Restoration literature. Either the wrong people were asked or the readers exercised insufficient due diligence. I regret having to deliver this rather grumpy verdict. Killigrew himself is of no great importance, but the theatrical circumstances and competition after 1660 do

matter. I have genuinely learned some things from the chapters by Britland, Nevitt, Vander Motten, and Smith, and I am sorry not to be cheerier about the enterprise as a whole. A lot of the problem arises from a conceptual failure. Thomas Killigrew was not much of a playwright, evidently a pretty poor theatre manager (to whatever extent he was one), and neither a nice person nor a very interesting one. The best pieces here are contextual. To try to find Killigrew "key" to anything, or "important," or "influential" is misguided. The court, social, and theatrical world in which he was a conspicuous minor player are, however, of some significance and concern to us.

Robert D. Hume
Penn State University

Laura E. Thomason. ***The Matrimonial Trap: Eighteenth Century Women Writers Redefine Marriage***. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2013. Pp. 216, bibliography, index. ISBN: 978-1-611485264. Hardcover: $80.00.

Laura E. Thomason's *The Matrimonial Trap: Eighteenth Century Women Writers Redefine Marriage* offers scholars an engaging insight into the ways that women of the long eighteenth century viewed themselves as active participants in the marriage economy. Thomason's work presents case studies of women from 1650-1750, beginning with Dorothy Osbourne, a British woman of letters and wife of Sir William Temple, through Eliza Haywood, the prolific author, actress, and publisher, and touches on several other key female figures, including, Lady Mary Montagu, Hester Chapone, Mary Delany, and Sarah Scott. Thomason's purpose here, stately plainly and effectively, is to analyze how women, both before and after marriage, "used rhetoric to criticize [the marriage] system, to reshape their martial relationships as egalitarian friendships, and to present themselves as desirable wives" (1). The work begins with a thoroughly researched introduction, which provides a history of marriage during the period in question, weaving secondary materials from scholars including Amanda Vickery, Ruth Perry, and Eve Tavor. The methodology of the piece is refreshingly straightforward: she offers a close, critical reading of primary sources and places them into conversation with one another. This clarity of method married with a complexity of purpose is the hallmark of the introduction, and indeed the entirety of the work. Thompson brings a clear scholarly purpose to bear on substantive and provocative source material.

The chapter on Dorothy Osbourne merits special attention not only because it serves as the foundation of the chapters to come but also because of Thomason's deft examination of the Obsbourne-Temple courtship as a case study of how writing served as means of authority in the largely repressive and restrictive marriage system. The chapter begins with a vivid description of the publishing history of the letters, which, Thomason reminds us, were intensely private documents. This publishing history, while itself meaningful to the context of how marriages were brokered through writing, becomes all the richer when at the end of the chapter Thomason convincingly registers the fact that

Osbourne's marriage to Temple was, given the couple's class status, always a public affair. The public-private dichotomy of marriage is consistently questioned throughout the chapter as Thomason looks at the ways Osbourne's letters function as a "deliberate, rhetorical self-fashioning" (27). Perhaps most revealing, Thomason illustrates how Osbourne's consistent refusal of her brother's preferred suitors in favor of Temple, a man who her brother disliked for largely financial reasons, was a notable translation of the doctrine of maiden passivity into social resistance (37). Mirroring Osbourne's own use of tight syntactical maneuvering, Thomason employs close, critical reading of "love" and "passion" in the letters to unpack various rhetorical choices and keenly links them to contemporary discourses on marriage, especially Jeremy Taylor, a Church of England cleric and author (29-30, 32). Thomason's contextualization of Osbourne also comprises one of the most interesting notes of the chapter, in which Thomason deftly compares Richardson's Harlowes to the Osbournes (35) in order to underscore the economic realities of marriage and how these private affairs were most often familial and public.

Thomason deserves praise for bringing the words and works of women who are too rarely studied as deeply as they deserve. Her discussion of Sarah Scott's *Test of Filial Duty*, for instance, provides a sophisticated examination of Scott, her fiction, and her socio-political stances outside the more known—and *still* understudied—utopian novels *A Description of Millenium Hall and the Country Adjacent* and *The History of Sir George Ellison*. Thomason dives into the complexities of the compulsory marriage system while adjudicating Scott's personal and martial relationships. Likewise, her work with Chapone, the Bluestocking "intellectual moralist," provides a unique perspective on the book history of Richardson's *Clarissa* through a close reading of Chapone's own *Letters on Filial Obedience,* where she constructs a faux father-daughter relationship with Richardson in order to reinforce the importance of women's agency in rejecting an unwanted suitor. In the same vein, the chapter on Mary Delany offers a reading of her letters to Dr. Delany, her second husband, as a veritable treatise on the benefits of companionate marriage and the rejection of marriage as a strictly financial pursuit.

In addition to these lesser-studied authors, Thomason includes a chapter on Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and an afterword on Eliza Haywood. The Montagu chapter opens with a scene from the Kit-Kat club, where the young Montagu has been introduced to and intoxicated by Whig society—at the tender age of eight. This experience, Thomason argues, shaped Montague's understanding of self and of how power functions in high society. These lessons provide crucial context for understanding Montagu's subsequent correspondence with Lord Edward Wortley, undertaken in order to subvert her father's favored suitor, Clotworthy Skeffington. In what were highly salacious correspondences, Montagu, according to Thomason, created a series of self-images that helped to play the roles required of someone operating outside of the arranged marriage market, and thus mainstream society. Not only is this argument compelling, but the letters Thomason studies demonstrate the true power of the pen, as Montagu rhetorically catches and releases the Lord to prove both her passion and her humility. Despite several missed opportunities to emphasize other key aspects

of celebrity theory in the Montagu chapter, the textual work in the chapter does not suffer unduly. Moreover, the chapter on Eliza Haywood provides a provocative analysis of the ways women limited their personal and social agency by following the same moral codes that were used to protect their reputations, giving them social agency (129). The chapter surveys four works from Haywood—*The Female Spectator*, *The Wife*, *The Husband*, and *The Young Lady*—and largely serves as the culmination of the monograph. Thomason here brings to fruition many of the complex narratives from the introduction: women's use of rhetoric to critique marriage, ability to reshape marital relationships into friendships, and self-presentation as desirable wives. Haywood proves to be a successful vehicle for these arguments since her work advances many of the same themes, critiques, and criticisms of Thomason's own project.

Thomason's afterword makes concrete the specter haunting the preceding chapters: *Clarissa*. The Chapone chapter delves into the intricacies of the novel's publishing history and its relationship to the Bluestocking circle and 18th-century attitudes vis-à-vis marriage, but the afterword brings *Clarissa*'s literary ghost into sharp relief. Thomason closes her study by surveying the literary history from Richardson's Harlowes to Austen's Bennets to demonstrate a movement away from the arranged marriage model—which is critiqued, scrutinized, undermined, and shaped by the female authors whom Thomason explicates—to the companionate marriage model. In this short afterword, Thomason does not attempt extensive analyses of the works she discusses; instead, she reinforces the way these works of literature reflect the tight rhetorical control that authors exercised in private and public correspondences.

Thomason's study of marriage provides a thoughtful examination of how women writers consciously and meticulously honed through writing their identities as women and would-be wives. She demonstrates that these women harnessed the power of rhetorical restraint and audience analysis in ways that were sophisticated and used those skills to empower themselves in a system that was purposefully constructed to strip them of such agency. For a well-trod academic topic, Thomason extracts a refreshing analysis of how female writers employed remarkable rhetorical dexterity to spring the matrimonial trap.

Melissa Wehler
Central Penn College

Christopher D. Johnson (ed.). ***New Contexts for Eighteenth-Century Fiction: "Hearts Resolved and Hands Prepared": Essays in Honor of Jerry C. Beasley***. Newark: University of Delaware Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011. Pp. vi + 347; bibliography of Beasley's publications [355-58]; b/w frontispiece and colored portrait on cover; index. ISBN: 978-1-61149-040-4. Hardcover: $90.

Christopher Johnson was the ideal editor for this festschrift not only because he was student and colleague of Jerry Beasley, even playing music on

stage with him, but because he has many of Beasley's best qualities, presumably in part from the mentoring process but also from the congeniality and values that linked them when Chris Johnson was a graduate student at Delaware. Beasley had put Johnson to work helping him edit the British literature section of the *ECCB* and volumes of the Georgia Smollett. As Beasley gently improved contributions and led an English Dept., so Johnson has done the same. Donald Mell, Director of the University of Delaware Press, twice told me how impressed he was by Johnson's prompt, thorough, and professional production of this festschrift. Besides his own introductory tribute to Beasley and characterization of the volume and its contents, Johnson has gathered and edited 13 essays by "friends, collaborators, and former students" (many in all three roles) that "reflect the scholarly interests of Jerry's career," while moving forward in "new directions of inquiry." Beasley is aptly sketched in Johnson's portrait: "a warm, genuine person, entirely without pretense, . . . [whose] enthusiasm and good humor were contagious." Johnson's account of Beasley's scholarship stresses its grounding in bibliography (discovery of what's been written), examination of contextual materials and minor authors, close reading and explication, and clear prose—Beasley research led to "reliable starting points" for others. Johnson stresses the Janus-faced perspective of the volume—looking back toward Beasley's fields of inquiry and accomplishments, and stepping forward with new discoveries and arguments. He rightly plays up Beasley's nurturing role for half of the contributors and credits too the flourishing English Department during Jerry's tenure, one marked by strong historicism and textual scholarship, producing many critical editions (edited by J. A. Leo Lemay et al.). A copy of the festschrift ought to be passed on like a mace or gavel from departmental chair to departmental chair in Newark. The editor offers a special acknowledgement to Don Mell, without whom Johnson wouldn't have started the project.

The volume is sensibly organized. After the introduction comes a tribute to Beasley, then "three essays that address biographical concerns," eight essays that explicate texts, with those on Smollett gathered at the end; two treating *Roderick Random*, sequenced to place first the broader-ranging essay with fuller summary of the text; thereafter follow two more Smollett studies, the first on two medical satires employing the picaresque and the second on the *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, followed by the bibliography of Beasley's publications and appended list of other accomplishments, such as participation on editorial boards and at international conferences. The participants are half senior scholars of Jerry's generation and half from two younger generations whom he mentored (and all those younger scholars' essays are well argued and richly annotated—if the essays were all submitted for blind reviewing, nobody would judge which came from the senior scholars, which the younger). Fittingly for Beasley's festschrift, five contributed to the Georgia Smollett edition, at least eight have produced critical editions, and all have edited something. Also, biographical and other historical contexts are important in most of the critical essays, and two of the "biographical" essays criticize texts. Also, fittingly given Beasley's work on women novelists like Eliza Haywood, five of the essays involve women writers. The critical essays

focusing on novels frequently build upon, or at least reference, Beasley's criticism, as Johnson acknowledges (7).

The first contribution is Charles E. Robinson's personal tribute to Beasley, fittingly written by an old colleague sharing leadership duties in the English Department. Robinson praises the "team player" who would teach whatever seminar was needed whenever day or hour fit the schedule, and who filled in as acting chair for two plus years before agreeing to take the job formally for five more. He also records Jerry's musical career while in Newark, including his performance at the EC/ASECS in 1995, singing a "'Do Wah Diddy' that burlesqued *Clarissa*." Robinson's account of Beasley's scholarly productions stresses their utility, pointing out the great many copies of his bibliographies and critical studies in libraries—nearly 800 copies of *Novels of the 1740s* being recorded in OCLC's Worldcat.

The first essay in the "biographical" triad is O M Brack, Jr.'s "Tobias Smollett: The Life of an Author" (17-39). Brack founded the edition that has just been completed by the University of Georgia Press and that Beasley long co-produced with textual-editor Brack, enlisting editors, raising NEH funding, and demonstrating with an edition of *Ferdinand Count Fathom* (1988) the roles of the two collaborating editors. Brack begins by faulting Smollett's two recent biographers, Lewis Knapp and the indebted Jeremy Lewis, for neglecting "the enormous canon of Smollett's miscellaneous writings" (17). Brack calls for a new biography that "captures what it was like for Smollett to live the life of an author," delving into Smollett's relations with the booktrade, fellow writers, and the reading public (18). He wishes here to consider "some of the problems facing a biographer of Smollett" and suggest "how knowledge of the complete canon of Smollett's writings in the context of the history of the book can illuminate Smollett's life" (18). The essay begins by asking whether Smollett's complaints about the author's physical, mental, and financial hardship weren't exaggerations after the fashion of some "Scottish literary tradition" (19). Smollett's perspective is set besides Samuel Johnson's great acceptance of both professional authorship and its rewards. Brack slowly dispenses with critical blather about "hack" writing and then turns to a survey of Smollett's career, which occupies the latter half of the essay. This chronological survey identifies the great quantity and diverse nature of Smollett's production, calling attention to unstudied works like Smollett's contributions to the Modern Part of *The Universal History,* 44 8vo volumes, 1759- (the rapid survey also prepares for the four final contributions on Smollett's fiction and non-fiction).

The other essays, stressing biography initially, are Paula R. Backscheider's "Elizabeth Singer Rowe: Lifestyle as Legacy" (41-65); and Alexander Pettit's "The Headwaters of Ooziness (Richardson the Polemicist)" (67-85). Backscheider begins by introducing new theoretical views or "methodologies" of "life-writing"; this superstructure is never put to much use but may be important in her treatment of Rowe within her "in-progress book, 'Revising the History of the Novel.'" Backscheider's essay would show that Elizabeth Singer Rowe created a "lifestyle . . . that supported an identity as a writer" (41), and that her self-fashioned identity influenced "fiction, poetry, and the lives of women." The essay focuses first on Miss Singer's youthful career as a poet

(1694-1704), contributing to John Dunton's *Athenian Mercury* and then to miscellanies; and secondly on Mrs. Rowe's fictional depiction of heroines, especially *Letters Moral and Entertaining* (1728-1733). The bridge involves ESR herself as an independent, high-minded, talented, and attractive young woman pursued by her editor John Dunton and such fellow poets as Matthew Prior, a woman who chooses a sensible partner in Thomas Rowe. Thus, the exemplary heroines in her romances are in part reflections of her own ethos, and the independent autonomy in attitude and situation—akin to Rosalind's in *As You Like It*—that she enjoyed and her fictional formulations enjoy and that influenced later women writers and their created worlds (57). As for Rowe's legacy, Backscheider notes that "Moral and Entertaining" as a titular formula recurs after her use of it and that Rowe's prose was very often republished. Backscheider offers a seductive introduction to Rowe, demonstrating she deserves much more attention that she's received.

Pettit refreshingly attacks Richardson's personality and several of the early nonfictional tracts that Pettit has edited for the Cambridge edition of Richardson—he suffers the sort of exasperation and testiness that biographers frequently reflect at the end of their immersion. He forthrightly admits that he has been editing these works during the George W. Bush years, concluding when rightwingers were attempting to smear Barack Obama—Richardson recalls too much the Jerry Falwells raging on the American media. Pettit finds soothing Coleridge's characterization of Richardson's mind: "so oozy, hypocritical, praise-mad, canting, envious . . ." (68). Pettit focuses on passages reused in three anonymous productions, attributed to Richardson by A. D. McKillop and John Dussinger: *The Infidel Convicted* (1731), *The Apprentice's Vade Mecum* (1735), and *A Seasonable Examination of the Pleas and Pretensions of the Proprietors of . . . Play-Houses*. Pettit finds SR blameworthy for incorporating "bits from Addison" and others into the first and second works and for reusing parts of the first and second works within the second and third (68). He also compares Richardson's tactless, earnest persona with that of *The Craftsman*'s Caleb D'Anvers and compares SR's treatment of the linkage between unorthodoxy in religion and loose living with other more thoughtful writers'. Pettit does not tightly link the diverse charges against Richardson, and by the end the unrelenting indictments drove me to search for reasons SR might not want apprentices wasting their money and time on theatrical performances and might favor restricting the locations of theaters. Still, Pettit's attack invigorated my interest in SR, intensifying my ambivalence to a hard-working printer who was proud of his successes (as was Ben Franklin) but who in *Infidel Conflicted* could vilify a good Christian like Thomas Woolston.

A number of the essays are lengthy explications bringing contexts to bear to argue general intentions and themes and also to gloss specific passages. Robert Erickson's "Cleland's Gospel of 'Extasy'" (87-108) interprets *Memoirs of a Woman of Pleasure* as a "neo-libertine 'gospel' of sexual ecstasy," convincingly, too, for at least the novel's second half. Erickson looks "at Cleland's subtle intertextual adaptation of three important religious discourses: the representation of Nature and sexuality in Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the religious cultural phenomenon of the 16th and 17th centuries known as 'The

Family of Love,' and the Gospels of the New Testament" (87). The background on the Family of Love sect is very interesting, and the essay is unapologetically forthright in covering Cleland's beliefs about what every woman needs (what Fanny calls "that peculiar scepter-member, which commands us all"). At times I could hear Erickson in class making arousing connections between pornographic and sacred texts, leaving the students wowed.

Susan K. Howard offers another strong interpretative essay, also adding to an author's biography: "Transcultural Adoption in the Eighteenth-Century Transatlantic Novel: Questioning National Identities in Charlotte Lennox's *Euphemia*." She brings a command of several areas of historical scholarship (on attitudes toward Amerindians and their and the English attitudes to adoption, etc.), facilitated by her having edited this novel for Broadview (2008). I wished that the essay had spent several more pages examining the novel, without cutting back on the cultural context, all of which seemed pertinent. Howard never pushes too much, as on how Lennox likely was affected by her New York years.

Several more studies of novels by women follow. In "Jane Barker's *Exilius*: Politics, Women, Narration, and the Public,"127-43) Marta Kvande placed the novel into the context of Jacobite traditions and then carefully worked through political implications of the actions, characters, symbolism, and diction. Kvande's analytical summary will give those who haven't read *Exilius* a clear sense of this romance set in Rome and Egypt; she thoroughly explains how subplot after subplot reflected Jacobite values and sympathies—when I finished, I was a little irritated to hear repeated the caveat that the coded references to the Stuarts and dynastic politics might have been missed by many contemporaries (and I'd have also deleted at least one reference to Habermas's "bourgeois public sphere" [140], here contrasted with Jacobite-sympathizing coteries). But once again my curiosity was raised about an author I knew only in name.

Melissa Mowry's "Eliza Haywood's *Love in Excess* and the Personal Politics of Collectivity" (145-57) begins by distinguishing her view of Haywood's politics from that offered by Beasley in "Portraits of a Monster: Robert Walpole and Early English Prose Fiction" (1981). Beasley "found Haywood embracing an unvarnished Lockean politics that defended individual political rights against the insults of 'arbitrary power'" in *The Adventures of Eovaai* (1736). This position has been taken up by others since, but Mowry believes that even earlier, in *Love in Excess* (1719), Haywood offered candidly the political view that "the constitutive dissaggregation inherent in Locke's premise that the individual precedes various iterations of political collectivity as her period's defining political problem" (146). Her Haywood may not be as partisan as Manley but is "no less . . . political" (156). Mowry's account of the novel offers a few corrections to the Broadview edition along the way.

Mary Anne Schofield does not explicate any novel but offers a stimulating and useful survey of the growth and maturation of scholarship on Haywood: "A Brief Note on Haywood Scholarship . . .," surveying over 50 years of publications, detailed with 85 footnotes (159-76). Schofield uses as a benchmark the breaking down of the simplistic division of Haywood's career into an earlier licentious and a later prudential period, which David Erskine Baker and Clara Reeve had help codify in the eighteenth century—between the two Haywood

was slammed in Pope's *Dunciad*. This dualistic treatment was still strong in the 1960s and 1970s. During the 1980s new critical approaches, including feminist approaches, produced a new deal. Michael McKeon and Jerry Beasley brought new generic boundaries and taxonomies into the game. Schofield herself in four books treated Haywood as in the main line of narrative development, experimenting in authorial voice, narrative structure and point of view. Dale Spender in 1986 will pronounce her one of the most versatile and popular writers of her day. Haywood was treated as a major novelist by many in the 1990s, but there were still many playing off the early *Love in Excess* against the later *Betsy Thoughtless*, while attending to Haywood's audience, politics, encoded feminist themes, epistolary form, etc. In the 2000s *Fantomina* replaces *Love in Excess* as Betsy's usual dance partner; also Haywood is supposed more astute and self-reflexive. Now studies are often much more specific, examining Haywood and the law, or travel, or politics; Haywood's approaches to sex and gender are found more thoughtful; the commodification trope is played up; and integrating concerns throughout her corpus are stressed, as by both Kvande and Mowrey on political continuities; and Haywood is securely a moral thinker, looking for the "provenance of moral virtue" according to Jonathan Brody Kramnick (169). Haywood is now "generally accounted the most important professional woman writer" of the century (160). This essay nicely illustrated solid research looking back to provide the springboard for future work—without such reviews, many essays on Haywood could walk the same well trod path.

The next two essays both offer appreciations of Smollett's first novel, *The Adventures of Roderick Random*: Rivka Swenson's "Revising the Scottish Plot in Tobias Smollett's *Roderick Random*" (177-199); and Christopher Johnson's (the editor's) "Rescuing Narcissa: Monstrous Vision, Imagination, and Redemption in *Roderick Random*" (201-17). Swenson begins by sketching the sequence of demoralizing and enervating blows suffered by Scotland following the union of the thrones in 1603, leading to the reality and the myth of the traveling Scots and English hostility to the locusts swarming south. Swenson emphasizes Roderick as type of the "random" Scot on an epic-like journey out and back to the motherland, which triumphantly overturns the usual outcome for Scottish people. She gives a good two-page analysis of the structure: below the episodic or within the random life the hero experiences a series of "alienations" [or disintegrations] and "restorations" leading to the "resolution of three main plotlines (amatory, familial, and communal)" (187). Roderick's beloved Narcissa is the "catalyst" for the loser to aspire "to attain 'the character of a gentleman'" (190), and, after RR meets up with his father, Don Rodriquez, in Buenas Aires, now rich, the Telemachus and Ulysses types will return to revitalize their community. Swenson finds some allusions or parallels to Bonnie Prince Charles (191), which helps return the focus to Scotland at her close. Swenson's analysis is well referenced to alternative views and supportive comments. One disputed area in particular is Swenson's insistence that Roderick is too type-bound to develop; rather, he is restored to his "essential self" but "does not progress" (188), but a page later she admits "Roderick learns to look beyond . . . appearances." Nonetheless, on the whole she depicts Roderick as ruled from beginning to end by the dominant passions of pride and

resentment (189--which are often thought to be those of Smollett himself, the answer to why Smollett bristled at rather than basked in his identity as a professional writer). By contrast, exploring the treatment of imagination, Johnson focuses on Narcissa's role in Roderick's personal *growth*. Johnson's introduction begins by noting the eighteenth century's anxieties over the products of the imagination, using as a touchstone Mary Toth's fanciful delivery of 17 rabbits and drawing on Dennis Todd's and Geoffrey Sill's books on the role, dangers, and relations of the imagination. Johnson finds Smollett depicting not only women victimized by their excessive imaginations but Roderick as well. Narcissa's music can calm her aunt's hysteria and also, literally and figuratively, helps compose and regulate Roderick, whose distraught imagination is linked to the aunt's: "Narcissa becomes a force of transformation as she subdues Roderick's excessive imagination, nurtures his sympathy, and restores his vision and humanity" (202-03). Johnson thinks the flow of the narrative itself, whether disrupted or orderly, reflects Roderick's grip on his imagination. Johnson looks at the evidence for Smollett's crediting prenatal imprinting, a device he and other novelists employed, but concludes that it's safest to limit Smollett's belief that "physiological and psychological instability, the products of the imagination and the passions [could] disrupt the woman's reproductive capacity and endanger her life," as occurs with Miss Jenny and Miss Williams in the novel (205). Since women, especially celibate women, in Smollett's world [and Cleland's] are disposed to mental imbalance, Smollett has a "rhetorical challenge" in depicting Narcissa as credibly restrained but yet affectionate (207). Johnson's challenge is making credible and interesting Roderick's progressive transformation or rescue by Narcissa, as his "latent power of sympathy" and other virtues develop despite periodic disintegration into passion and imagination (211). Though Swenson is right about the mythic dimensions of Roderick, Johnson's conclusion is solid: "Inspired by Narcissa's restorative instruction [and "regulation of his body and mind"], he now recognizes the fundamental humanity of the people surrounding him" (213).

The last two contributions are studies of nonfictional works by Smollett related to the contributors' work on the Georgia Smollett. Leslie Chilton's "Smollett, the Picaresque, and Two Medical Sermons" (219-30) draws strength from her editing for the Georgia Smollett editions of Smollett's translations, particularly her edition of Le Sage's *The Adventures of Gil Blas de Santillane* (2011). Chilton notes how G. S. Rousseau and then Paul Gabriel Boucé rejected the characterization of Smollett's novels as picaresque narratives, but she wishes to examine the employment of that tradition in two early, little known medical works by Smollett: *Thomsonus Redivivus* (1746), defending Dr. Thomas Thompson (whose patient Thomas Winnington had died), against an attack by fellow Scot William Douglas, and then in *Don Ricardo Honeywater Vindicated in a Letter to Doctor Salguod* ["Douglas" backwards], again attacking Douglas after he had attacked both William Smellie and more immediately Dr. Richard Mead. Smollett's inspiration was in part Douglas's comparison of Thompson to Dr. Sangrado in *Gil Blas*. Smollett replies to Douglas in the persona of Dr. Sangrado. Chilton thinks Smollett's misrepresentations suggest he did not have a command of the novel as yet, though he would soon pick it up and translate it.

Chilton writes, “These works evidence Smollett’s emerging understanding of the function of picaresque characters and narrative and demonstrate that Smollett understood the picaresque tradition not as a model to be copied but as a set of rhetorical tools that could be used for a variety of purposes” (220). The volume concludes with James E. May’s “The Publication and Revision of Smollett’s *Continuation of the Complete History of England*, 1760-1771,” with its appendix “Descriptive Bibliography with Collations of Variant Readings for Lifetime Editions” (231-354). This study unloads the bibliographical and textual analysis of the *Continuation* originally intended for the Georgia Smollett and partly paid for by an NEH editorial grant obtained by Jerry Beasley in concert with Brack and May; later, after sales of the novels were disappointing, the projected history volumes were deemed unfeasible (what with the key-stroking, too expensive to produce relative to likely sales of the long work). The essay tracts the serial publication of the first edition, the role of advertisements and of the work’s many illustrations and maps; it distinguishes between the first proposed continuation in four octavo volumes and then the fifth added in 1765; and it reviews in detail the nature and modest extent of Smollett’s revisions for the second edition in two quarto volumes (on the revisions, see 251-58).*

I hope to have shown that this festschrift was well conceived to honor Jerry Beasley and is a valuable collection of studies offering “New Contexts for Eighteenth-Century British Fiction.” Both ends are related, of course: Johnson wisely selected contributors, but they took the invitation as an honor and put forth their best material and effort to raise a monument to their teacher and colleague. Most of the critical essays set forth and apply a productive context, and in many cases the explications develop that context or initiate another. The volume is of particular value to those working on women authors, particularly Haywood, and those working on Smollett. The volume has been well proofread by the editor and produced by the press.--James E. May

**Editor’s note*: The colleague who received our review copy was unable to review it due to ill health, so, though I contributed, I stepped in: I did so in part because the recipient of the festschrift, the volume’s editor, and all but a few contributors are long-standing members of East-Central ASECS. For a more impartial review, see Heather Ladd’s in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction’s* last issue (25.2 [Winter 2013], 455-57). Also, some individual essays are reviewed in fall 2013 issue of *The Scriblerian*. This review gives me the chance to correct several errors in my essay on p. 242, corrections sent in after the volume went to press. I conclude that “Non-lineal descent” of the text through the reprinted sheets “possibly” occurs in sheets “G and I” of Vol. 2 and occurs in sheet “I and possibly U and Aa” of Vol. 4. I should have said “in I and possibly G” in Vol. 2 and occurs in sheets “I, O, possibly U, and probably Aa” of Vol. 4. Three lines below this, in l. 23, I should have said “All noted in Volume 1 but L and all sheets of Vol. 2 but H and U.” Finally 14 ll. up, the text should indicate that there are 33, not 30, substantive variants in octavo reprintings of Vol 1.

Anne C. McDermott. *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers. Volume 5: The Eighteenth Century*. (Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers). Farnham, Surrey, UK: Ashgate, [December] 2012. Pp. 518; index. ISBN: 978-0-7546-5694-4. Hardcover: £185.

While the field of lexicography is severely contracting—there are fewer and fewer full-tine professional lexicographers—and lexicographic platforms are moving from print to searchable online versions, with some definitions even being crowd-sourced, lexicographers and dictionaries are not disappearing from study. In fact, lexicology—the study of dictionaries and those who write and edit them—is still interesting to academics: the number of works on this subject has held steady, between one hundred to two hundred per year, and treating a wide variety of linguistic, social, and now, computer science, topics.

The current volume is the fifth in a series on historical lexicography edited by Ian Lancashire; the series editor and the volume editors have done exceptional jobs of bringing together many foundational texts that scholars return to again and again. Such works are essential: they cannot be improved on, are exhaustive, or said it best, and, to paraphrase Rabbi Hillel, "all the rest is just commentary." The most foundational book of that kind for the 18th-century dictionary is *The English Dictionary* by DeWitt T. Starnes and Gertrude E. Noyes: it simply cannot be improved on. But, instead, what this anthology does is arrange in one large volume many of the most important articles, chapters, and essays previously published about lexicography during the 18th century, spanning almost one hundred years of secondary scholarship. Opening with a long and comprehensive introduction, the editor, Anne C. McDermott, does a masterful job of guiding readers through the complicated history and development of 18th-century lexicography, but, before so doing, McDermott starts with the impact of 17th-century dictionaries. This is a necessary move because, of course, there is no periodization in literature, and, as such, a diachronic look at lexicography sensibly must offer a richer history of how dictionaries developed over time and in relation to national, pedagogic, religious, and social events. Essential articles that provide context to this subject in general are Carey McIntosh's "Eighteenth-Century English Dictionaries and the Enlightenment" and Esther K. Sheldon's "Pronouncing Systems of Eighteenth-Century Dictionaries."

The way that eighteenth-century lexicography developed reflected the way the English language developed or at least the ways that lexicographers and pedagogues imagined it to be. During this period, as literacy rates rose, particularly in urban areas where books were published, authors of dictionaries decided that vernacular English was worthy of study. With increased focus on English as a legitimate language to study—as important as Latin, for instance, and as worthy of understanding as French, Italian, or Spanish—authors began to find ways to "fix" the language so that meaning could be agreed-upon. A key article on dictionaries of this early period, for example, is "John Kersey and the Ordinary Words of English" by N. E. Osselton. These early dictionaries, such as those by Kersey, show how English came to be studied independently of other languages. After a period in which dictionaries were little more than word lists,

glossaries, or even syllabaries, scholars felt the need to decide which were the best or most appropriate words to include and, perhaps as literacy rates were still relatively low, the words that came to be included were at first "hard" words, those that came from the new and specialized, scientific fields as well as loan words, archaic and modern, mainly from Romance languages.

This anthology depicts the movement of English lexicography from word lists and glosses to full-blown dictionaries that collected increasingly large numbers of obscure and specialized terms. The book is divided into several sections, showing how lexicography changed over time. The articles reflect the period's shifts and modes, moving from what we would today recognize as general dictionaries to books that were almost encyclopedic—indeed, McDermott mentions that this is the period in English reference book history when the encyclopedia began to have a function apart from dictionaries and more specific scientific texts. These dictionary writers and editors soon began a race to see whose would be the most comprehensive and offer the most uncommon—and later, the most useful—words to the gentry, to women, to clerks, to school boys, as well as to middle-class trades-people. The articles included here trace the growth and change of dictionaries, documenting how they began to almost burst with words by the first third of the eighteenth century, and then to gradually par down with the professionalization of lexicography. Attention is directed to Nathan Bailey's *Dictionarium Britannicum* (1730) and Benjamin Martin's *Lingua Britannica Reformata* (1749), as the most important dictionaries before Johnson's. Unsurprisingly, a large section of the book is devoted to Bailey, Martin, and Johnson—see especially David McCracken's "The Drudgery of Defining: Johnson's Debt to Bailey's *Dictionarium Britannicum*" and Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade's "Benjamin Martin the Linguist." It was during the second third of the century when lexicography became professionalized and lexicographers began to connect English linguistically and historically with Romance languages; dictionaries became a field of study, not necessarily or primarily written by school masters or ministers—as were many of the early works.

By the end of the eighteenth century dictionaries began to specialize; once there was a standard set by writers such as Bailey or Johnson, authors began to focus on dictionaries for general readers and dictionaries devoted to particular fields of study, or niche areas of language such as cant, jargon, or particular professions. Those dictionaries are represented by John Harris's *Lexicon Technicum* (1704), Thomas Dyche's and William Pardon's *A New General English Dictionary* (1735), and Francis Grose's *A Classical Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue* (1785). Specifically, works that treated those dictionaries are by Janet Sorenson and Julie Coleman, both writing on Grose.

The last important section in the anthology details one of the most important shifts in lexicography of the eighteenth century: the proliferation of pronouncing dictionaries. As lexicographers became more involved in etymology and historical linguistics, they branched out into current sound changes, so that dictionaries no longer simply compiled words or terms and their definitions, but also instructed readers in the proper way words were to be spoken or pronounced. Many of the authors of pronouncing dictionaries were

Irish or Scots: James Buchanan, William Kenrick, Thomas Sheridan, and John Walker—Walker especially had an impact on the way English, and later American, was pronounced. These authors had perhaps more of an incentive to present English in the most correct way possible as their audiences not only lived outside England, but they often lived outside the metropolitan regions of England and were striving to achieve social, educational, or commercial success. Articles that reflect the changing needs of dictionaries include "James Buchanan and the Eighteenth-Century Regulation of English Usage" by Bert Emsley, and "Walker's Influence on the Pronunciation of English" by Esther K. Sheldon.

The selection of chronological and thematic articles nicely reflects the changes in English social, economic, and pedagogic history. Moreover, the articles and essays retain their original typefaces and pagination, so readers can trust to this faithful reproduction without having to hunt down original sources for citations and page numbers. Additionally, though perhaps tangentially, the book's facsimile reproductions offer the added bonus of revealing trends in print culture and typography of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

While each section of articles is clearly delineated from the others, it would have been useful to provide a brief transition or preface at the start of sections. Additionally, being able to see passages from the original dictionaries (in facsimile, or transcription) would have added to the sense of the rich social and historical development of this reference work. Therefore, while the volume is exhaustive with respect to scholarly sources on early dictionaries and the trends and controversies surrounding them, the one thing that would make the book more successful would have been the inclusion of primary sources, the 18th-century dictionaries. Even so, what this book does provide to scholars of lexicography and lexicology is important, for the collection allows scholars to understand trends, fashions, conflicts, and the maturation of the modern dictionary and its contribution to the history of the book.

Rebecca Shapiro,
City University of New York

Peter Sabor (editor). ***The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*. Volume I: *1786*.** Pp. xlix + 343; 8 illustrations; appendix; index. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-19-926160-4. Cloth, $185.

Stewart Cooke (editor). ***The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*. Volume II: *1787*.** Pp. xxiii + 334; 5 illustrations; index. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-19-926280-9. Cloth, $185.

Frances Burney—novelist, diarist, correspondent, and dramatist—details her "proceedings" at the court of George III as Queen Charlotte's Second Keeper of the Robes in her court journals and letters (I, 1), which present rich material for students and scholars of the eighteenth century. While Burney had intended substantial cuts to her personal manuscripts for posthumous publication by her niece, Charlotte Barrett, who with other friends and relations cut down

Burney's court experiences to a single volume, general editor Peter Sabor and his colleagues present six volumes of Burney's court experiences unaltered and fully intact. The first two volumes, the first edited by Sabor and the second edited by Stewart Cooke, are the topic of this review. The next four volumes are forthcoming: volumes three and four, detailing the exciting year of 1788 when George III's "madness" first presented itself, are projected for release September 2014 for $350, edited by Lorna Clark.

The editorial efforts in the first two volumes are highly commendable. The first volume contains an introduction that sets the tone for Burney's first year at court, highlighting passages that typify Burney's tumultuous experience, as well as providing helpful context that frames all of Burney's time at court. The history of the manuscripts and earlier editions that Sabor delineates in volume one illuminates the scope of this project; much was erased in the editing process for the initial publication of Burney's court journals, but this current edition and the later volumes omit nothing and include all extant material. The introduction to the second volume, written by Elaine Bander and Stewart Cooke, emphasizes Burney's health issues as well as her continued adjustment to the intricacies of life at court. Both volumes provide extensive indexes that are categorized by people and events, all listed with page and footnote numbers as applicable.

These first two volumes, as surely will the next four, serve as a necessary addition to eighteenth-century studies. The social and cultural milieu of life at court, as well as society at large, are vividly detailed and re-imagined with Burney's observations and the meticulous, numerous (more than 850 in each volume), and helpful critical footnotes by Sabor and Cooke that illuminate concepts, terms, and people. A wealth of information presents itself within the journals and letters, highlighting etiquette, literature, politics, current events, astronomy, food, fashion, material culture, music, religion, and interpersonal relationships as integral to Burney's fully detailed experience at court. There is truly something for everyone in the field, and Burney's account is never dry, as the journals and letters possess the wit and depth present within her novels.

Things, as much as people, mark Frances Burney's journals and letters in her first year at court, a year about which she exclaims, "how full—how eventful—how turbulent!" (I, 324). From her Pocket Book—which she is "constantly filling" (I, 134) as she jots notes of her day to later flesh out and relate to her sister Susanna Burney Phillips ('Susan') and her close friend Frederica Augusta Locke ('Fredy')—to Queen Charlotte's Jewel Box—that the queen graciously allows Burney to also use for storage of personal books and letters when travelling (I, 192),—Burney's objects allow a window into the material existence that recreates Burney's emotional landscape for readers. Each object carries traces of Burney and those whom she loves, such as the letter box that her beloved father, Charles Burney, sent on July 19, 1786. Frances Burney describes the gift as a "delightful writing Box!" that "with what pleasure shall [she] think of who sent it" (I, 40). Items such as this allow Burney to hold onto the little agency and family remembrance that she is typically denied as a servant of the court. While she longs for more private time, including time with her family, which her long work days prevent, Burney can turn to these mementos, particularly familiar letters, to bolster her mood.

As a shy and sensitive woman, Burney found life at court difficult despite her respect and affection for the royal family, and her difficulties are frequently compounded by her superior Keeper of the Robes, Mrs. Schwellenberg, who never hesitates to reinforce Burney's lower status by insulting her as a "Nobody" (I, 93). Despite her supposed inferior position at court, Burney has experiences and interactions that hold great interest for the modern reader. The assassination attempt on the king, her experience with the "*wickedly* terrific" play *The Mysterious Mother* by Horace Walpole that "shocked & *revolted*" her (I, 273), amusing anecdotes about a secret attempt by courtiers to eat during the long hours of a royal function, and interactions with famous astronomer William Herschal and his telescope prove that Burney's powers of observation offer fascinating fodder for consumption despite her wishes for more solitude. Burney ends her first year at court, a year in which she feels largely a "spectatress" (I, 17) with the hopes of "quietly begin[ning] the Next year" (I, 324), though quiet is a rare commodity at the court of George III.

People dominate the second volume, and year, of the court journals and letters, as Burney has increasingly little time to herself, proclaiming, "I am so circumstanced, that I cannot be certain of spending even ten minutes in my own Room"(II, 127). While Mrs. Schwellenberg, the embodiment of "spleen & jealousy" by Burney's description (II, 193), is mostly absent from the volume due to the ill health that kept her confined to her rooms, Burney finds another tormenter in the "mischievious" and changeable Reverend Charles de Guiffardière, who takes any opportunity to tease Burney for his own amusement (II, 224). A great favorite of the royal family who "safely ventures upon whatever he pleases" (I, 110), Guiffardière too effusively praises Burney one moment and pushes her towards impropriety and embarrassment the next. He particularly delights in provoking her in regards to Colonel Charles Greville, an Equary whom Burney had no formal acquaintance with yet Guiffardière repeatedly attempts to have Burney include in coffee or tea, much to her discomfort and dismay. The social intricacies and dynamics of court often prove overwhelming, and the relation of these intimate details vividly imagines a complex microcosm that Burney has exclusive access to.

Frances Burney's journal and epistolary style is consistent with her novels. In an incident in which she seeks a chair to convey her back to her rooms in the palace (though she is confused as to *where* they are), the chair men are drunk from "drinking the Queen's Health till they knew not what they said, & could with difficulty stand!" (II, 32). Burney is terrified by the chair men's indisposition and attempts to carry her down steps, and then a gentleman stranger aids her, though they may not formally 'know' one another. The passage reads just like a page from *Evelina* with the pathetic highs and lows and comic tone. This richness of expression is sustained throughout the volume, leaving the reader anxiously awaiting the release of the forthcoming volumes in the series to see what else is in store for Burney's remaining four years at court.

Sara Tavela
Duquesne University

Mona Scheuermann. *Reading Jane Austen.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Pp. ix + 210; index. ISBN: 978-0-230-61877-0; hardcover: $95; ISBN: 978-0230340190; paperback, $28.

A new book by Mona Scheurmann always promises to be a good read, so this one seems aptly titled, *Reading Jane* Austen, which offers to place Austen's works within their historical and social context and, like all Scheurmann's work, is written in an accessible style.

Scheurmann states her thesis at the outset, that Austen's moral vision is stable and static, reflecting that of her society; she "writes from the core beliefs in her period" (2) and "those core beliefs (of moral and social values) are absolutely fixed." This message is oft repeated; the certitude with which Scheurmann presents her case (which allows little room for nuanced readings or controversy) mirrors aptly the certitude she attributes to Austen's world whose "ethical and social parameters," she believes, "are firmly set." Citing the "ubiquity of the conduct-book genre" (4), Scheurmann discovers in Thomas Gisborne's *An Enquiry into the Duties of Man* a discussion of moral "truths universally acknowledged," pointing to a source not only for Austen's famous opening line, but also for her absolute "certainty of moral perspective" (9). For Scheurmann, as for the reader of an Austen novel, she writes, "the social and moral grid is entirely clear" (2).

The study is divided into two parts, the first focusing solely on *Mansfield Park*, a novel of such moral earnestness that it provides a helpful framework for this reading of Austen. The first chapter presents the novel as "a series of set pieces in terms of moral situations" (13) that express Austen's views on female education, money and class. Scheurmann shows how the topic of estate "improvement" is used as a moral touchstone to delineate several of the characters. The second chapter considers the staging of the play and the thematic weight it holds. Dismissing the viewpoint that Edmund's and Fanny's disapproval of it is unnecessarily heavy-handed, Scheurmann insists on the inappropriateness of the choice of *Lovers' Vows*, and draws interesting parallels between the characters of Austen's novel and the play; for instance, Agatha (like Fanny Price) was taken into an upper-class home and falls in love with the young master, and Count Cassel (like Mr. Rushworth) is an unappealing suitor, albeit rich. In a third chapter, Scheurmann relates Hannah More's horror at "the state of the poor" (65) to Fanny's discomfort at her home in Portsmouth, and suggests that Austen's praise for the "civility" of the wealthy, cultured and leisured society of Mansfield Park should be taken at face value. As long as it is used responsibly, money is "desirable" at all levels (60) in Austen's novels, Scheurmann notes.

In part II, Scheurmann turns to three more Austen novels, allotting a chapter each (ignoring *Sense and Sensibility* and *Northanger Abbey* entirely). Beginning with *Pride and Prejudice*, she describes it as a courtship novel which "focuses at least as much on family relationships as it does on romantic ones" (87). The social and communal fabric is essential in Austen; each character is judged in terms of his or her "social position and moral measure" (89). Darcy's estate, run on principles of good order (no superficial "improvement" here)

establishes his moral gravitas and provides the setting for a renewal of his courtship – hardly a startling reading.

Somewhat more provocative is the chapter on *Emma* in which Scheurmann positions herself for the first time within the context of critical debate (elsewhere, she engages with other critics only in the endnotes). On the question of whether or not Austen should be seen as a conservative or feminist writer, she comes down firmly on the conservative side (which should come as no surprise), arguing on the basis of Austen's "unquestioned moral compass." Somewhat more controversially, Scheurmann denies any suggestion of snobbery in (or ironic undercutting of) Emma's attitudes, even towards Harriet, on the grounds that "Austen completely accepts a tightly drawn class structure" (120), adopting without question "the usual perspective for [her] time and place" (122).

The last chapter considers *Persuasion* as the "darkest" of the novels that "begins and ends on a note of faint fear," (135) and evinces a "strong sense of mortality" (143). Scheurmann does see a shift in emphasis from rigid class lines onto the value of the individual (though even this shifting does not detract from those absolute moral certitudes); the frequent references to war in the novel express a sense of unease and of vulnerability.

At this point in the critique, the reader may not be fully convinced. There is no evidence for the claim of absolute fixity of these moral certitudes during Austen's period (which would surely be unique in human history), but merely repeated statements that this is so. Given the turmoil and divisive political debates during this era, the assumption seems open to question. As well, the insistence on the uniformity and homogeneity of Austen's moral vision appears to be over-strained at times, given the complexity and nuance of her fiction. To paint with such broad strokes a writer of such depth and subtlety, whose work resonates through so many different eras and societies, seems somewhat inappropriate, even ironic.

But Scheurmann's argument acquires more depth in the last section on "Politics and History," which introduces a surprising twist. Exploring the historical period in which Austen came of age, from 1789 to the end of the Napoleonic wars, Scheurmann notes that England was a "jittery nation" (169) experiencing political, social and economic upheaval, and a sense of threat (both internal and external) (171). Awareness of this background brings Austen's work "into a sharper perspective." For, citing the "tremendous fear of change in Austen's social class," Scheurmann argues that "the seeming timelessness of her world, where social life and social conditions are delightfully static . . . is wishful thinking, a picture not of a world assured to those who inhabit such social grids but of a society that seems to be isolated from change" (174).

In other words, those moral certitudes presented earlier were not so fixed and static after all. When placed against a background of remarkable upheaval and change, they are symptomatic, not of a calm and stable society but of the opposite: a whistle in the dark, perhaps, the enunciation of values on the verge of being lost. (This section evokes the old critical debate over how much of the external world Austen leaves out of her fiction, but with a difference.) The novels are no longer to be read as an accurate reflection of their time, but rather as a form of wish-fulfillment, "escapist fiction" (171). Scheurmann's strategy

now becomes clear, and the over- insistence on the uniformity and stability in Austen's moral vision is explained. Exaggeration was needed to prepare for the surprise of this apparent *volte-face*, in which the grounds of the argument are shifted. The apparent stability is revealed as a brief but golden moment against a backdrop of chaos.

It is a clever turn, but we are not sure that it quite works, nor that the argument can be fully acquitted of inconsistency. Perhaps some statements about "Austen's world" – which seemed to mean her society – could be interpreted simply to refer to the world of her fiction, without making claims about the historical period. But there were certainly passages in the first part of the book that suggested otherwise. It is difficult to see, for instance, how Austen's period could be described as one in which there was "virtually universal agreement about the definition of morality" (3) when meanwhile, there was so much flux and diversity (not to mention bitter division) elsewhere. At a time of popular unrest, the growth of radical societies, and the spread of the movement for reform (so convincingly delineated in the final chapter), how could we have been told that, "like the vast majority of her contemporaries, [Austen] never questioned what she saw as God-given values. Her assumptions were her society's assumptions . . ." (9)—when that society was so deeply divided? How could it have been denied explicitly that she was on the opposite side of the spectrum from radical writers (like Godwin and Wollstonecraft)? And, finally, how could Thomas Paine's *The Rights of Man* be presented in the last chapter as "dangerous" in its radical ideology and its appeal to the working classes, "whose potential for revolt so frightened the upper classes" (183-185); whereas, at the outset (3), it was cited as evidence of the opposite, of that uniformity of vision found on both sides of the political spectrum in Austen's time? In light of all these contradictions, the reader could be forgiven for feeling somewhat misled.

However, if the reader feels at sea with this sudden *virage*, perhaps (as with *Emma*) the answer may be to go back and re-read the book in light of these later revelations. Mona Scheurmann's work is always surprising, for its bold provocativeness and sense of humour. The fresh tack at the end seems somehow fitting, a manoeuvre worthy of Captain Frederick Wentworth, and it creates a sense of irony reminiscent of Austen herself.

Lorna J. Clark
Carleton University

Kenneth R. Johnston. ***Unusual Suspects: Pitt's Reign of Alarm & the Lost Generation of the 1790s***. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xxi + 375; illustrations (16 in the text and 5 pp. of colored plates). ISBN 978-0-19-065780-3. Hardcover, c. $46.00; £32.

Unusual Suspects is an unusual academic study. As part of Kenneth Johnston's aim to reach a wider audience, he has written a colloquially-styled series of stirring and intertwined stories. He contextualizes these through citing

and summarizing the argument first demonstrated in Albert Goodwin's seminal survey *The Friends of Liberty: The English Democratic Movement in the Age of the French Revolution* (1979) and more recently re-concretized in John Barrell's *Spirit of Despotism: Invasions of Privacy in the 1790s* (2013). There was a widespread and viable reform movement (sometimes accompanied by radical ideas) in Great Britain beginning in the 1780s, which gained traction and embodiment in the 1790s in periodical publications, correspondence societies, mass meetings, and dinners and conventions featuring people who held no official state-sanctioned positions as important public figures. Johnston adds representative and random writers, scientists, artists and politicians whose life stories show how the movement was decimated by the legal powers, local and parliamentary agencies, hired violence, and hegemonic repressive techniques of William Pitt the Younger's establishment. In order to make concrete what is meant by hegemonic disciplining and its pervasiveness, he summarizes Steve Poole's "Pitt's Terror Reconsidered: Jacobinism and the Law in Two South-western Counties, 1791-1803" (Appendix 1).

Johnston focuses on the ruined, thwarted, or diverted writing and professional careers of seventeen writers: John Thelwall, William Godwin, Joseph Priestley, James Montgomery, William Frend, Thomas Beddoes, Helen Maria Williams, William Drennan, Robert Bage, Gilbert Wakefield, James Mackintosh, Samuel Coleridge, William Wordsworth, Robert Southey, Charles Lamb, Robert Burns, and William Blake. By "unusual suspects" (a phrase referring to the famous line "Round up the usual suspects," at the close of the 1942 movie *Casablanca*), Johnston says that he means to refer to "the large number of persons who were not tried for treason or sedition in 1790s Britain, but were penalized anyway for their liberal, reformist views and opposition to their government's unsuccessful and economically disastrous wars against Republican France" (xv). He also means more generally the people we don't much talk or write about, the less famous, those people whose names do not spring to mind when we talk of the new ideologies of the later 18th century. "Unusual suspects" also includes those not made infamous by slander. So in the first category we don't have an account of Thomas Paine nor in the second an account of Mary Wollstonecraft except insofar as Godwin wrote about her. Yet we have quite a number of variously indicted people, with accounts of how they were harshly punished--for example, a two page account of Thomas Holcroft (162-3, with mentions elsewhere). The problem with this negative definition is it fails to include his aim to make us realize what it means to say that "*there were more trials for sedition and treason in the 1790s in Great Britain than ever before or after in its history*" (xiv, italics his). In fact, he offers more than 32 lives, some told very briefly, some with a lingering suggestiveness, because it's crucial to his project that we experience this past from its own vantage point as reflected in individual complicated social, and psychological existences.

Johnston's strength lies in his not flattening out the particular psychological and social experiences and practical exigencies of all these people's lives. His book calls to mind Carolyn Steedman's powerful *Labours Lost: Domestic Service and the Making of Modern England* and *Landscape for a Good Woman*. Johnston concentrates on people whose lives and hopes were hit hard in indirect,

unexpected, and haphazard strategic acts that hegemonic cultures enact, such as written and uttered speech by people in control of various means of living, which lead to lost leases, jobs, and salaries, the inability to publish, the lack of space to work in, the destruction of a library, or inability to get a passport. He thus enables readers to better understand how repression works and offers a fresh, sometimes powerfully explanatory perspective on how his better known writers came to be "apostates" (e.g., James Montgomery and Southey, 64-72, 268-72) and their works erased and misread (Robert Bage and Charlotte Smith's novels, 115, 178-79). Johnston explains the puzzling mixing of the names of contemporaries and archetypal figures in Blake's *America* (315-22). He traces the wheels within wheels of elusive workings out. For instance, someone spies and writes a report on how Coleridge and Wordsworth with their family and reformist friends socialized with John Thelwall, and Coleridge writes John Chubb, a magistrate and merchant in Bridgewater, apparently seeking indirect help for Thelwall to settle there, while insinuating the risks in such a way as to enable Chubb to decline (236-43). We also witness open local ostracism, forced emigration, fomented mob action, and death from disease after enduring bad conditions in prison (e.g., Gilbert Wakefield, 200-1). We are able to re-interpret the more fortunate subjects' later careers when they could carry on projects more openly, such as William Frend's work against flogging, publishing a *Plan of Universal Education*, and a proposal to tax the income of the Church of England (94-95), and James Mackintosh's work in India to reform the penal law, police, and death penalty, and his helping to found the *Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals* (222-23).

A flaw in Johnston's book for some readers will be his aim to convince us that we are witnessing great romantic works in the making not realized, and glimpsing parts of a fully articulate romantic and revolutionary literature and art that did not happen. There is the cogent objection that we cannot know if something specifically wonderful would have happened if it did not; that if not ferociously obliterated (to the point of instituting income and in effect sales taxes to make massive expensive international wars, and arm counter-revolutionaries and *emigrés* returning to France), Wordsworth's "blissful dawn" would have jump-started people into creating representative district and more general suffrage (fundamental goals of the reformists) and an age of writing quite different from the vexed, conflicted, difficult and lonely one that Hazlitt caught the ambivalent nature of in his portraits of individuals in *The Spirit of the Age* (1825). Johnston's use of counterfactuals is qualified by his use of older and recent studies of the texts that ridiculed what marginalized writers achieved, e.g., in M. Ray Adams' s 1947 *Studies in the Literary Backgrounds of English Radicalism,* where the later or mostly unknown writings of Joel Barlow, Mary Robinson, John Dyer are analyzed; and John Bugg's 2014 *Five Long Winters: The Trials of British Romanticism*, where we journey through the prison literature of the era (48-108), and study novels like Smith's *Marchmont,* which explicitly dramatizes the experience of "surveillance, legal prosecution, and [manifestly unjust] imprisonment" (117).

Johnston's own book is itself a study of much realized, powerful writing and art--some of which have been neglected because not in accessible forms:

essays in periodicals that didn't last, pamphlets, and judicial arguments. He shows what gave rise to this writing so as to breathe vivid life into it, points out analogies in the McCarthy era in the US, and suggests that there are parallels in eras closer to us (I thought of the uses of law and the courts in the years since 9/11). He discusses William Frend's *Peace and Union,* in which Frend argues public worship is not necessary and that the execution of Louis XVI for treason was the legitimate right of the French government, for proportional representation of English electoral districts. In Frend's appendix, he eloquently imagines some overheard talk of ordinary women workers whose wages were cut by a quarter to pay for a war that did them no good. For this, Frend was prosecuted by the university, pronounced guilty, and told to leave the college. Johnston analyzes the arguments presented in the court where we see unproven claims for alarm become grounds for more alarm (87-94). Johnston can also suggest practical losses because this or that writing was ignored or marginalized, e.g., medical progress that could have been achieved and social amelioration described in pamphlets by Thomas Beddoes (still treated sarcastically in the *ODNB*, 103-9); as well as a much earlier understanding of what brought about the conditions of Ireland and what reforms were desperately needed in William Drennan's *Orellano, an Irish Helot* and correspondence (147-52). Drennan's letters were first made available in a scholarly edition in 1931 (144).

Johnston also distinguishes what we can call a peculiar kind of irony which more than says the opposite of what it intends or something other than is literally there: he shows us many texts where the writer goes out of his way to mislead the reader, to produce texts "that defy deciphering, even by those determined to do so" (303, citing a poem by Burns). In these we experience the inner life of an era where people dread being clearly understood. Texts include Lamb's "The Praise of Chimney-Sweepers," where he apparently celebrates the wretched lives and early deaths of young boys. He seeks to haunt us with what texts defamed or misrepresented and after their first reception actually recorded. In the case of Helen Maria Williams's eyewitness journalism (accused of naiveté or sentimentality) recording the phases of the French revolution over a number of years, he demonstrates while she maintained the value of revolutionary principles and celebrated the early phase of the revolution, she equally takes us through its calamities; for example, the massacre of people by drowning them, "twenty-three expeditions … drowning scenes … at first shrouded in the darkness of night … afterwards executed in open day … eight hundred persons of both sexes, and of different ages … when in the struggle [for life and air] their hands became untied, the murderers amused themselves with cutting them with their sabres" (129). He discusses the later revisions of texts published many years after they were first written (Wordsworth's *Prelude*); texts published anonymously so they could not help writers' career (e.g., Godwin's later writing) but also, it was hoped, could not endanger them (Rev James Porter's series of dialogues on William Orr's trial, though in this case both men were hanged). Johnston includes texts published posthumously and thus by someone else (much of William Drennan's most powerful poetry, 155-59, Wakefield's "Juvenal," reprinted in Appendix 2, poems by Burns, Blake's *The French Revolution*), and he shows texts published so many decades later and so

obscurely that it's almost as if they were not published at all--and he ponders what such texts published in a timely and substantial fashion could have done to careers (e.g., Wordsworth's 1793 *Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff*, 186, 203).

It would misrepresent Johnston's book and achievement not to describe his remarks on what could have been. The novel was a suspect genre. It was not allowed to develop in directions it could have, not just because of promising writers who stopped writing original novels (Mary Hays and Holcroft), or wrote them differently (in France, Madame de Stael), but because the limited forms and kinds of stories that novelists had to use in order for publishers to risk publication prevented development. At present the era's novels are often representatively studied as Jacobin and anti-Jacobin and for, as Marilyn Butler showed three decades ago (in the chapter "Novels for the Gentry" of *Romantics, Rebels & Reactionaries*) the emergence of conservative Austen and Scott paradigms as the respected norms in the pre-Victorian period. Johnston shows how effective was the continued ridicule of the *Anti-Jacobin* and *Quarterly Review* (e.g., 36-37, 161-62, 179, 260-61). I have read Stael's laments in her criticism that literature and the novel cannot be better than public opinion and culture will allow (in her *Essay on Fiction*) as about safe-guarding her personal life, but her arguments support Johnston's political contentions. I have attributed Radcliffe's silence after 1797 to her nervous distress at the ridicule and sexual exposure she felt, but her gothic books are best described as extremely liberal ("Girondist" would be the French word), and perhaps she and her husband's, William's, travel book, ought to be included in this book, for it was among what was silenced (see my "The Nightmare History of Ann Radcliffe's Landscapes," online at www. jimandellen.org/ LandscapeMemoryHistory.html).

Johnston's "Coda" is a reply to the imagined inevitable dismissals meaning "so what?": "there is nothing unusual in all this," "What did they expect?" or "They got what they deserved" (323-24). I'd put it, "the enemies of promise get at us all." Early on he defends Godwin's *Memoirs of the Author of the Vindication of the Rights of Woman* as "grief-work" importantly truthful about women's lives, against the anger of modern feminist and Wollstonecraft scholars for a culpable naiveté (34-36). It may be that Johnston has pulled the curtain up and down on segments of Burns's and Blake's life so that a particularly humiliating trick played on Burns (299-300), and Blake's terror at a being arraigned as a "public nuisance" (306-9) come out too emphatically. At the core of this book, though, is the belief that individual suffering and lives matter, and the conviction this is so, that ruin, hurt, envy, and loss are central prompts for humane reform, revolution, and human failure. Johnston tells the kinds of personal experience other scholarly writers might overlook or not tell frankly. He wants us to see how reform movements fail and to tell us to "recover what we can" (326). He seems to sustain a faith that, by knowing what happened, we can act more effectively on behalf of humane norms, social policies, and progressive art for many people "living around" us today (327).

Ellen Moody
Independent Scholar

Manushag N. Powell. *Performing Authorship in Eighteenth-Century English Periodicals*. (Transits: Literature, Thought, & Culture, 1650-1850.) Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012. Pp. xii + 291; bibliography [263-78]; illustrations; index. ISBN: 978-1-61148-416-8. Harcover: $85.

Manushag N. Powell begins with a strong case based on internet blogging for the relevance today of the personae created within eighteenth-century essay periodicals, literary periodicals made up largely by an essay and correspondence to the essayist. She explores the treatment of authorship within these periodicals, particularly as they employ personae, which she calls "eidolons," noting the use of the term for the editorialist's persona as far back as 1830, referring to the "projected image, the double, . .. simulacrum of a person," the "artificial projection" of the essayist, preferred by her to "persona" because "'eidolon' is more specific" (24). Powell discusses the "development of the narrative self" within periodicals (7) and attends even more to the theatricality of the persona's performance, noting relations of specific periodicals to theatrical performances. Powell notes that the essay periodical depends "deliberately on the public role of the authorial personality" (25), for content or for authority (argument by ethos) in critical pronouncements, such as those policing "the audience into behaving as an ideal English Society" (3). These essays and their personae "think out loud about what it meant to be a professional writer." The idealized persona performs for the audience, engaging their interest and assent. Powell is "searching for" the typical and the variant types of eidolons and their rhetorical efficacy and the importance to periodical continuity and longevity--a distinctive persona might provide strengths for invention and argument yet bring with it limitations. The personae are commonly single, older, and comfortably genteel, whether male or female, though females more often admit they write for money (62). Some, such as John Hill, are shown to falter by the unsuitability of their eidolons to their actual selves or to the positions taken in the essays.

Powell is studying *decorum* in the broadest rhetorical sense and the persuasive use of *ethos*, though rarely relying on those traditional terms in the book. Her vocabulary and her interests are suited to much current critical discourse: there's much talk about making money selling a commodity ("the commodity an author is selling is, in fact, identity" [66]), much attention to theatre and to women authors, and more effort to find agreement with secondary literature than to argue that so-and-so is wrong. The book is not an empirical or inductive survey of all the essay periodicals of the period--fewer than a dozen periodicals are examined in depth. Powell wisely avoids trying to cover Steele's, Addison's, and Johnson's periodical personae. While some claims, as the tendency of eidolons to provoke bodily injury, needed more empirical evidence, sometimes there are lists of supportive examples (57-58, 137-38). The book is a "site" for "exploration" more than a thesis-driven argument; it reflects broad reading in the secondary literature, including close attention to several unpublished dissertations (as by Tedra Osell and Kathy J. Ivey), and it sums up and re-integrates criticism with great finesse, though at the cost of much digression and some redundancy. I was initially annoyed by some jargon-laden

restatements of the obvious (28-30), repeated assertions (women read periodicals, 45, 58, etc. as indexed), some of the vocabulary (e.g. “trope” used as “topoi” and “common topics” once were [115.1, 131, 194]), some bloated sentences (10), and the tendency to repeat points, but in the end I was won over by all I had learned and Powell’s critical insights and sound judgments. I was won over, too, by prose style and persona--qualities of a successful periodical.

The five chapters are briefly surveyed at the end of the introduction (10-12) The first, “Author and Eidolon,” a broad discussion, functions much as the introduction, noting the propensity of the personae for self-reference, their explicit treatment of authorship, the life-span of the essay periodical (the genre’s dying by the 1760s [22]), the freedom and detachments allowed by employing a personae (26), the tension between being a moralist and an entertainer, between stability and instability in the masks donned, the value of anonymity (31), the eidolon as “window” on the public and private spheres (35-42), and connections between theater and the essay periodical, the persona performing before spectators (42-48). In this chapter and the book as a whole, Powell endeavors to show complexities, nuancing one half truth against another (e.g. eidolons need be anonymous and fluid yet also stable and recognizable; the recognition of the actual author can be useful but can be dangerous; eidolons courts but criticizes the public; they try to make money but deny such; the essay periodical “burned itself out fairly quickly . . . sort of . . . . continued to have power . . . “ [199], etc.). That propensity for qualification saves Powell from repeating the usual generalizations about the “public sphere” (168).

Unlike the more theoretical Chapter 1, the later chapters are structured with subsections examining periodicals and interactions, often conflicts, between them. Chapter 2 is “Early Periodical Cross-Dressing,” a chapter that despite a first section entitled “Lucubrations and Sexual Identity,” is more focused on representations of class than gender, for this term has now been stretched to include all sorts of qualities beside gender: “an author could cross-dress for class, sex, political view, age” (53). The most extensive and interesting material in this chapter concerns conflicts between periodicals, beginning with one between rival *Female Tatler*’s. The thrice-weekly original *Female Tatler*, whose eidolon is Mrs. Phoebe Crackenthorpe, was published in nos. 1 (8 July 1709)-18 by B. Bragge and thereafter by A. Baldwin; with Mrs. Crackenthorpe replaced by a committee of ladies for nos. 52-115 [29-31 March 1710] (ESTC P1870). The periodical has been attributed to both Delarivière Manley and Thomas Baker (Manley alone in the ESTC)--Powell doubts Manley would collaborate with a “radical Whig publisher such as Balwin” (60), though I would note that in 1709 literary London wasn’t yet severely partisan. When Bragge lost the periodical to Baldwin, he found an unknown substitute and went on publishing a counterfeit *Female Tatler*, here designated *FT2*, in numbers 19-44 (ESTC P1872, 17-19 Aug. to 14-17 Oct. 1709). After noting that Steele’s *Tatler* initially questioned Mrs. Crackenthorpe’s gentility (60-61), Powell shows that lack of gentility became the major point of contention between the rival *Female Tatlers*. Attacks between the two identically named periodicals were focused on class-related notions of gentility or respectability, with the counterfeit turning to punitive attacks on the original Crackenthorpe’s appearance, referring to a

engraved portrait atop the issues (68-69) and the claim that the Baldwin periodical was produced with the aid of papers that Crackenthorpe's servant Francis stole and took to Baldwin for publication (67). *FT1* attacks *FT2* back, using correspondents, thus unmasking "her." Powell notes how *FT2*'s responses employ masculine pronouns in self-references, and she notes that *FT2* is attacked more for a false representation of his class than his gender (72). Then Powell examines a subsequent conflict between *FT1* and the *British Apollo*, which has no eidolon. The *British Apollo* attacks *FT1* on gender as well as class grounds (74-75), and *FT1* takes the restrained posture of being above the lowly *British Apollo*. Both assert the other serial has falling popularity. *FT1* claims readers' contributions are written by its editor; the *Apollo* claims *FT1* is losing its readers (78). Powell has an interesting discussion of a poem in the *British Apollo* (9-14 Sept. 1709) alleging that Baker has been physically beaten for a slander in one of the *FT1* issues (and legal action is also claimed), but there is no hard evidence offered to corroborate what sounds like punitive satire. She concludes that class trumps gender but "performance trumps all" (84).

Chapters 3 and 4 concern aspects related to gender: "Performance, Masculinity, and Paper Wars" and "Femininity and the Periodical." The former treats papers wars around 1752 between papers by Henry Fielding, John Hill, Christopher Smart, and Bonnell Thornton, with a focus on authority derived from "high-born masculinity." John Hill, the author of "Inspector" columns in the *London Daily Advertiser*, 1751-53, finds himself caught out when he poorly extricates himself from a challenge by an offended reader in April-May 1752 (Mounteford Brown): "Hill was too much invested in, too much at one with, his eidolon, while the other main participants" were not (those being Fielding's Sir Alexander Drawcansir in *Covent-Garden Journal,* Thornton's Roxana Termagant in *Drury-Lane Journal*, and Smart's Mother Midnight). Powell follows this quarrel into satirical prints, poetry (as Smart's *Hilliad*) and theatricals (Smart's satirical *Oratory*, the revival of Fielding's *The Mock Doctor,* and William Kenrick's suppressed *Fun*); and she discusses how Hill's Mr. Inspector and eidolons in *The Tatler, The Connoisseur*, *The World, and The Gray's Inn Journal* could oppose dueling without losing the ethos of being gentlemen (111-15); then she concludes Chapter 3 with a focus on the relations of periodical eidolons and stage performance(s).

Concerned with the sources of authority for female essay writers, Chapter 4's most extended discussions involve personae created by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu for the short-lived and political *Nonsense of Common-Sense,* Eliza Haywood for her successful *The Female Spectator* (1744-46) and, shortly before her death, *The Parrot* (1746), Frances Brooke's *The Old Maid* (1755-56), and Charlotte Lennox's "Trifler" essays in *Lady's Museum,* which she co-edited with Hugh Kelly (1760-61). Interesting pages concern Brooke's conflict with *The Connoisseur*, the periodical as marked by "types of discourse . . . strongly marked as traditionally feminine" (168), Haywood's use of a parrot persona, with a step back to look at parrots in fables (170-82), and Lennox's young and serious eidolon's mixture of lecturer and coquette: "The Trifler," bent on educating women (183-92). Chapter 4 has the tightest focus and the most

coherent development of the chapters, with comparisons of female eidolons (their traits, methods, motives, goals, values) both within and between sections.

Chapter 5 has several topics related to death, the most central is the performance of death by some eidolons successful enough to have long enough lives for their deaths to be recognized or even sought by the fatigued essayists--such as the death of Mr. World, reported in its final number. Other topics related to death include the decline of the genre, imagery and themes related to death, claims that your rivals have died, the pressures that serials placed on authors, and topics treated in final numbers of essay periodicals. The diversity here, reflecting the author's broad reading, involves digressions to or at least movements to new threads to be woven into the discussion, with the whole tied up via summaries. To give an instance of digression, prior to speaking of the rival or counterfeit "Female Tatler," Powell slides into an account of "pirated editions" of *The Tatler*, quoting Steele at length (pp. 66-67), though not proceeding to identify the aborted piracy or piracies by H. Hills and J. Baker.

Although this is a critical study, not a history grounded in bibliography, Powell might have referred to and put to explicit use the ESTC when discussing the periodicals, especially rare and incomplete runs like *The Parrot* (1728) or periodicals that the ESTC attributes to others than she does (as *Female Tatler* I) --references above are mine. She notes the misdating of Penelope Aubin's death (225) without calling attention to the ESTC's use of the erroneous date. Yet sometimes the ESTC could offer corrections: e.g., Swift's first published poem wasn't the 1692 *Ode to the Athenian Mercury* (17) but the *Ode to the King* in 1691. The ownership of the publications and editors' relations with those printing and distributing them could be further examined: Powell remarks, "the bookseller was generally the more empowered member of the author-publisher relationship" (66), but this is never shown but largely developed with typical complaints by authors, as Fielding's "authors starve and booksellers grow fat." The documentation is good, even if there are a few places where footnotes are needed (on 62 for Sarah Prescott's remarks, on 122-23 for Horace Walpole's). Similarly, the book has few typos (I did spot "*Tater*" on 78, "seirously" on 211).

In conclusion, Powell develops a number of convincing points: how eidolons are central to the "consistency and continuity" of essay periodicals (197), how eidolons thrive on identity problems (223), and how they stake out "an authorial space in periodical discourse" but can be used against the author (129). She provides a sensible review and integration of what's been written in recent decades about essay periodicals and about authors and conflicts treated. The claims made for "class" in the depiction of eidolons seemed overstated at times (Baker doesn't seem so low class as claimed [76]), as does the risk of violence, and I'd have wished for more attention to the role of learning and of prose style in the authors' achievement of authority (though the latter is recognized repeatedly at a general level, as p. 135). The examination of eidolons' flexibility and rhetorical trickery will enlighten and entertain readers, who can compare such to those of satirists outside the periodical, such as Swift's in *A Tale of a Tub*--my sense is that students of satire have long identified artistry comparable to that found here in the essay periodical. The persuasive, ironic, and theatrical posturings shown in the periodicals should lead those

"working outside the periodical" to benefit from Powell's study, as Chantel Lavoie observes in her very favorable review for *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (26.2 [2013-14], 322-24). *Performing Authorship in Eighteenth-Century English Periodicals* makes working inside periodicals inviting and interesting.--J. May

Ellen Malenas Ledoux. *Social Reform in Gothic Writing: Fantastic Forms of Change, 1764-1834*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. Pp. x + 238; bibliography; index; 5 b/w illustrations. ISBN: 978-1-137-30267-0. Hardcover, $90.

Ellen Malenas Ledoux's *Social Reform in Gothic Writing* is a bold contribution to the field of gothic studies. Instead of looking through a reactionary lens, she approaches gothic texts with a "multi-genre approach," a "wide geographic scope" (6), and a reader-response lens. Ledoux is well grounded in gothic scholarship, and, while drawing upon the knowledge put forth by many, she furthers their ideas – or in some cases, breaks with them – and presents several political, social, and economic arguments about various texts from 1764 through 1834.

Throughout her book, Ledoux takes pains to qualify her wording, particularly with difficult terms such as "gothic." Ledoux helpfully qualifies that she is using the word to refer not to a genre but to a mode with some clearly defined aesthetic characteristics. She applies her definition to the works of Horace Walpole, Charlotte Smith, Ann Radcliffe, Eliza Fenwick, Joanna Baillie, Sarah Wilkinson, William Godwin, Charles Brockden Brown and Matthew Lewis. She also analyzes contemporary tensions and many historical documents and artifacts, ultimately suggesting that these authors were purposely attempting to shape readers' responses, and, by extension, the political climate, with texts that are "transformative" and have the ability to "disrupt, rather than reinstate ideological control" (6).

Gothic literature has the ability to evoke sympathy in readers. Ledoux argues that viewing characters, especially women and children, undergoing horrific torture, entrapment, and abandonment spurs readers to empathize and envision a better world. These sentiments yield political resistance and perhaps change. She further argues that readers' empathy ultimately converts to sympathy because these gothic authors use language to make readers feel as disgusted and trapped as their characters, thereby forcing readers to move beyond simple recognition to thought and action. To clarify her argument, she looks at how certain authors treat specific issues such as female economy and bodily freedom, institutionalized healthcare, and slavery.

Ledoux builds her language argument through an analysis of several of Walpole's writings, asserting that he intimately understood how to shape readers' understanding of political discourse. She also posits that Walpole used *The Castle of Otranto* to educate authors to use gothic elements to the same end. Ledoux is careful to note that Walpole was not using his literary platform to invite change, but to analyze the "procedures" as to how authors could use this new mode. Walpole realized that he could be much more effective through a

fictional mouthpiece than a political speech, leading Ledoux to claim "the narrative model Walpole creates applies beyond eighteenth-century English politics to describe human political behavior more generally" (37). She draws parallels between *Otranto's* and England's peasantry with regard to complacency, noting that fictional and real politicians have the ability to keep the populace complacent through fear. To support this notion, Ledoux turns to *The Mysterious Mother*, offering a nuanced political reading of the characters as fictionalized versions of King George III and his mother, and suggesting how fear works in literature and real life.

Using her theories about Walpole's works as a foundation, Ledoux explores texts from Smith, Radcliffe, Fenwick, Baillie and Wilkinson in her second chapter, claiming that they used Walpole's theory of art to shape readers' political beliefs with regard to issues affecting women. This chapter effectively moves the critical discussion of gothic beyond the notion that gothic usually means texts where women are trapped by and subservient to the patriarchy. Ledoux complicates that reading, positing that many female authors used the potential offered by gothic tropes to suggest that women of a certain class could be enfranchised, find equality and gain power. Another important thing to note in this chapter is that Ledoux attempts to move the field beyond Radcliffe's texts and their depiction of the gothic space as a site of victimization of women. Looking closely at Smith's *Emmeline* and Baillie's *Orra*, Ledoux suggests that Baillie and Smith offer "inspiration for a new feminine ideal" (60). With Smith, Ledoux invites a reevaluation of *Emmeline* with regard to "the feminist rhetorical potential of gothic space" (60). Emmeline uses the castle to evade her pursuers, and also uses the intricacies of space to strike fear in others. This reading counters what many critics have argued, proving that the typical reading of gothic space as rendering the female passive warrants a review. Ledoux continues her theory with Baillie's *Orra.* As the heroine finds security in her space, Orra creates a female community where women can exercise both their bodies and minds. Ledoux contrasts these heroines to Radcliffe's, showing how Smith and Baillie radically break with Radcliffe in terms of the representation of gothic space and female agency. She then turns to Fenwick's *Secrecy*, arguing that "Fenwick's deployment of setting is equally innovative" (69). An even more radical heroine, Sibella is educated alongside her brother and actively uses her body and mind to investigate threats to her safety. These heroines are all from somewhat privileged classes, though. Through her reading of Wilkinson's bluebook *The Castle of Montabino*, Ledoux explores the complications that arise specifically from class with Harmina, a lower class female whose journey through the gothic sphere would seem familiar to many readers. Through Harmina, and the aforementioned heroines, Ledoux suggests that female authors used the gothic not only to empower women, but also to show how class played a vital role in whether such empowerment could even be imagined.

Continuing with her power-of-language idea, Ledoux turns to Godwin's works, asserting that Godwin used the gothic form as a "reformist tool aimed at the popular imagination" (96) to "neutralize" some of the "political potency" of his arguments (97). Looking at *St Leon,* Ledoux traces the instability of the narrative, of characters' depictions, and of the meaning of language, noting that

Godwin forces the reader to question all, from the nature of appearances to what truth actually is or could be. She argues persuasively that Godwin specifically inserts historical figures and dates with incorrect timelines in order to showcase his larger idea that political injustices exist across a continuum. She spends a fair amount of time discussing Thomas Malthus' *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, arguing that *St Leon* was Godwin's attempt to counter Malthus' arguments, and to shift the emphasis away from economic back to a moral ground. In doing so, Ledoux claims that Godwin's "economic ideas are... radical" (120), and that with his ideas about labor as value, combined with the moral notion of "social equality," Godwin was actually gesturing "toward[s] eliminating social hierarchy altogether" (122). Ultimately, Ledoux contends that Godwin used the gothic mode because it enabled him to show readers the necessity of not accepting the economic and political climate – and their accompanying arguments – as truth.

Crossing the Atlantic, Ledoux explores Brown's novels, asserting that, like Godwin, Brown used *Arthur Mervyn* as a pedagogical tool to influence his readers to contemplate current events. More specifically, she looks at the novel to evaluate how Brown used the work to address the inadequacies of the healthcare system during the yellow fever outbreak in Philadelphia in 1793. She is conscientious in addressing Brown's shortsightedness with some aspects of his approach to reform; overall, however, Ledoux persuasively proves that Brown was indeed as radical as Godwin in believing that "if an author can cultivate moral sense in an individual reader, that sense can spread to the community at large" (131). Looking closely at Brown's portrayal of Bush-hill Hospital's response to yellow fever, Brown changes many details to "warp historical reality" to get "readers to reinterpret public policy imperatives" (137). Ultimately, Brown's portrayal underscores what Ledoux posits as his intention with the novel: to have caregiving "operate outside economic exchange" (146). Brown seems to hope for a society in which benevolence occurs simply because people are sympathetic to others. Thus he paints painfully graphic scenes of violent and hideous deaths hoping for a type of civic engagement where all will help because of a moral imperative. Brown may have been purposely ignoring evidence in order to support his thesis about benevolence over institutionalizing care; however, Ledoux interestingly qualifies that, by doing so, Brown reminds his readers of their "shared duty and democracy" (156), and attempts to build a type of civic altruism for when the next round of disease shall occur.

In the final chapter of her engaging book, Ledoux turns to Lewis' works with an eye toward reclaiming his reputation from one of sensational youngster to a more-nuanced author who seriously engaged in a moral questioning of slavery in *The Castle Spectre* and *Journal of a West Indian Proprietor*. With *Castle Spectre*, Ledoux explores the role of Hassan, a slave whose speeches berate all Europeans, holding them morally responsible for slavery. She investigates why Hassan's speeches were not censored by John Larpent, the Chief Examiner of Plays, speculating that Lewis had created such a spectacle with his ghost, wounded characters, and fabulous scenery that Hassan was simply overshadowed. However, in making the active choice to publish his play, and to make Hassan's words more pointed and racially charged, Lewis was

blatantly stepping into the abolition discourse on the side sympathetic to the slave. Perhaps most strange about this choice is that Lewis's family relied on their plantations for economic support. Ledoux suggests that Lewis purposely used various genres in *Journal*, and specifically gothic verse, as a way of containing the more problematic aspects of his stance. The mode was also a specific choice, as it allowed Lewis to be both public and private given that journals lend themselves to various tones, events, and recordings, and that their very nature is fragmented. Ledoux looks closely at the lyrics Lewis places in *Journal*, noting that at times he seems intent upon interpreting them incorrectly in order to avoid fully recognizing his hypocrisy. For example, Ledoux looks at "The Isle of Devils" rhetorically, concluding that, while others have used gothic imagery to evoke the horrors of slavery, Lewis's use of gothic narrative enables him to somehow explore yet contain these horrors. The very nature of the genre enables him to rationalize his seemingly contradictory positions.

It is at this point that Ledoux ends, and also the point at which the reader finds herself somewhat adrift. Ledoux's thoughtful text would benefit from a conclusion chapter, linking the works more and speculating as to how her theories play out beyond Lewis. That said, *Social Reform in Gothic Writing* is a compelling read, the five black-and-white illustrations are well-chosen and support Ledoux's ideas, and the book is well researched and carefully documented. Ellen Malenas Ledoux has contributed a worthwhile perspective to the burgeoning gothic debate.

Sharon L. Decker
Centenary College

Directory Changes and Additions

Black, Mellissa. mab0056@uah.edu; 571 County Road, #1105 / Vinemont, AL 35179

Bricker, Andrew. abricker@stanford.edu; English Dept. / McGill University / Montreal / Canada.

Bradbury, Jill. Now: 13605 Anndyke Pl., Germantown, MD 20874

Cahill, Samara Anne. SACAHILL@ntu.edu.sg; 14 Nanyang Dr. / HSS-03-73 / English / Nanyang Technological U. / Singapore 637332

Domingo, Darryl P. dphnrhnd@memphis.edu; English Dept. / Univ. of Memphis / 467 Patterson Hall / Memphis, TN 38152-3510

Edinger, William. email: edinger@umbc.edu

Higa, Jade. (grad. studies in English, Duquesne Univ.): 45-464 Hiipoi St. / Kaneohe, HI 96744

Hunt, Helen. 2480 Dongara Dr., #608 / Dexter, MI 48130.

Johnson, Erik. erikj09@standford.edu; 2675 Miller Ave., #6 / Mountain View, CA 94040

Jost, Jacob Sider. siderjoj@dickinson.edu; returning to: English Dept. / Dickinson College / P.O. Box 1773 / Carlisle, PA 17013.

Lambert, Elizabeth: new email: elizabethlambert7@gmail.com

Marks, Sylvia Kasey. new email: sm3390@nyu.edu [her university is now styled "NYU Polytechnic School of Engineering"]
McGuirk, Carol. (English Dept., Florida Atlantic U.) mcguirk@fau.edu; 51 SW 10th Terrace / Boca Raton, FL 33486
Phillips, Chelsea. (Theatre Dept., Ohio State U.) 1035 Madison Ave. / Columbus, OH 43205; c.lenn.phillips@gmail.com;
Rinkevich, Matthew J. MRink@udel.edu; English Dept. / Univ. of Delaware / Newark, DE 19716
Roby, Joanne. new email: joanneroby@ymail.com
Schneller, Beverly. Beverly.Schneller14@gmail.com. New address: 4400 Belmont Park Terrace # 167 / Nashville, TN 37215
Tavela, Sara. (Teaching Fellow, English, Duquesne U.) tavelas@duq.edu; 639a College Hall / Duquesne Univ. / Pittsburgh, PA 15282
Tierney, James E. new address: 1514 Cattail Way / St. Charles, MO 63303
Van der Goten, Thomas: thomas.vandergoten@ughent.be; Literary Studies Dept. / Ghent University / Rosier 44 / B-9000 Ghent / Belgium
Wisniewski, Kevin A. University of Maryland--Baltimore County

News of Members

In April we learned the sad news that **Van R. Baker** died 11 December 2013 at age 88 in the hospital at York, PA, long his hometown. Van Baker was one of only four who have served as Executive Secretaries to our society, following Leland Peterson and prior to Mary Margaret Stewart--I took over the editing of the newsletter in 1986 at Van's request—few would have refused: Van Baker was an officer and a gentleman and a helluva nice guy besides. Van had graduated from West Point in 1946 and returned there as an English teacher, also serving in southeast Asia and the Pentagon. Later completing his Ph.D. at Columbia (1968), with a dissertation entitled "Dryden's Military Imagery," he was for many years chair of English at York College, hosting a conference there for EC/ASECS in 1977. He co-edited with T. E. D. Braun and James Clifford a volume of papers from the meeting, *Teaching the Eighteenth Century* (Univ. of Pittsburgh, 1979)--Clifford had died by July 1978, when the newsletter published tributes to him. Van's interests were diverse, including Laurence Sterne, on whom he published four essays in the 1970s. His major scholarly accomplishment was *The Websters: Letters of an American Army Family in Peace and War, 1836-1853* (Kent State UP, 2000), "a history of the Mexican War told through the letters of an Army family." Van had been widowed in 1982 and remarried; he is survived by his second wife Louisa and a son, daughter, and stepchildren. His obituary on the web includes a photograph of him wearing that winning smile many of us will recall from conferences.

Paula Backscheider reviewed Daniel Watkins' *Anna Letitia Barbauld and 18C Visionary Poetics* in *Women's Studies* (42 [2013], 209-13) and also **Jennifer Airey**'s *The Politics of Rape* in *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* (32 [2013], 225-27). *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture,* vol. 43 (2014), contains Paula's "From *The Emperor of the Moon* to the Sultan's Prison" (1-26). Also here are **Joanne E. Myers**' "How Body Matters in Berkeley's *Siris*" (111-

35); **April London**'s "Sarah Fielding's *Lives of Cleopatra and Octavia*: Anecdote and Women's Biographical Histories" (137-51); and **Karen Bloom Gevirtz**'s "Tidying as We Go: Constructing the 18th Century through Adaptation in *Becoming Jane*, *Gulliver's Travels*, and *Crusoe*" (219-37). **Temma Berg**'s current project is "Anne Lister, Charlotte Brontë and Shirley." She presented "Looking at the Surface from the Depths" at the Phenomenology of Reading Conference at Temple U. last Oct., and "'Imagine my Surprise!': Anne Lister, Charlotte Brontë, and Shirley" at "The Brontë Sisters and their Work" Conference at the Middle East Technological U., Ankara, Turkey, in Dec. 2013. She recently published "The Brontës in Turkey" in *Brontë Studies*, 39:3 (2014): 225 - 31. Her essay "Thomas Rowlandson's Vauxhall Gardens: The Lives of a Print" is forthcoming in *Eighteenth-Century Life.* Congratulations to **Kevin Berland** on surviving his tenure as a "service provider" for Penn State--now he can live full time in Jersey City with Rebecca and tend his garden all the better. **Caroline Breashears** reviewed **Catherine Parisian**'s *Frances Burney's* Cecilia*: A Publishing History* (2012) in *SHARP News*, 22, no. 4 (Autumn 2013), 10. **David Brewer** and others taught the AAS Summer Seminar in Book History this past June with a focus on "Books in the Longer World of Objects."

Welcome to **Samara Anne Cahill**, who in early June hosted a conference at the Nanyang Technological U. in Singapore. At the meeting Samara spoke on Jane Barker and Jonathan Swift, and plenaries were offered by **Kevin Cope** ("Permanent Markers: The Monumental, the Marble, and the Sustainable in Enlightened Eras") and **Greg Clingham** ("Enlightenment Networking: Commerce, Culture, and Craft in the Writings of Sir George Macartney"). Samara joined EC/ASECS back in the spring after meeting **Brij** and **Frances Singh** at the SCSECS meeting in Texas. **Andrew Carpenter** has co-edited with his wife Lucy Collins *The Irish Poet and the Natural World: An Anthology of Verse in English from the Tudors to the Romantics* (Cork U. Press, 2014; 978-1-78205-064-3; 39 euros), pp. xiv + 418. The handsome volume has a 48-page introduction and then a lengthy bibliography prior to the texts, each with headnotes and annotations. Also, the Irish Manuscripts Commission published Andrew's edition of *Verse Travesty in Restoration Ireland: "Purgatorium Hibernicum" (NLI, MS 470) with "The Fingallian Travesty" (BL, Sloane 900)*, 2013 [2014?], Pp. xv + 240. Like the published *Irish Hudibras* (1689), these MSS are verse travesties of Book VI of the *Æneid*, with the "Fingallian" designed for English readers offering assistance with the rhyming Hiberno-English "Purgatorium." I'll try to provide an account of the edition in the March issue, aided with two articles that Andrew published formerly on these burlesque poems. **Vincent Carretta**'s *Phillis Wheatley: Biography of a Genius in Bondage* (2011), on which he spoke at our Baltimore meeting, was reviewed by Simon Hill in *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 36 (2013), 454-55; and by Phillip M. Richards in *Early American Literature*, 48 (2013), 493-99. Richards' very favorably review focuses on the book's aesthetic case for Wheatley, noting that Vince makes, for Vince's biographical and editorial work, an unusually strong case for the literary value of the author--though many of us will remember his presentation on the rhetorical art of Olaudah Equiano. Many in EC/ASECS contributed reviews to last fall's ***Scriblerian,*** an issue with more

combative and censorious reviewing than most, but some reviewers shine light on exemplary work. One of those reviews is Carretta's of **Eve Tavor Bannet**'s *Transatlantic Stories and the History of Reading, 1720-1810: Migrant Fictions* (Cambridge UP, 2011), which tracks the adaptations and alterations of text in a manner that is praised as a model for reception studies (46.1: 59-61). Another (on 45-46) is **Geoffrey Sill**'s fine review of G. A. Starr's *The Last of Defoe's Performances* (Pickering & Chatto, 2012), an edition of : *"Christianity Not As Old as the Creation* (1730), an anonymous critique of Deism and response to Matthew Tindall's *Christianity as Old as Creation*. Geoff finds that Starr, through his introduction and editorial annotations, "conclusively proves Defoe's authorship of the book," doing so by identifying "two score phrases and points of doctrine in this work that closely or exactly replicate tropes used by Defoe multiple times in previous works. The result is an excellent model for any future attribution studies." I can think of no journal that better teaches nuts and bolts of scholarship than *The Scriblerian*--in part because reviewers are willing to lay bare factual errors, trite conclusions, poor style, excessive reaching, and inadequate methodologies or scopes (and sometimes even the most distinguished scholars take it on the chin!). As ever, this issue also provides valuable accounts of research on minor figures (such as **Catherine Skeen**'s edition of William Dunkin's *The Parson's Revels*, 2010) and of Restoration-era authors, ideas, and historical events (such as Peter Hinds' *"The Horrid Popish Plot": Roger L'Estrange and the Circulation of Political Discourse* . . . , 2010).

Tita Chico, co-editor of *The Eighteenth: Theory and Interpretation,* has an introduction to essays on "Civil Society and its Discontents: The Good Life," in the first issue of 2014. This month when sending us her book review above, **Lorna Clarke** reported that her edition of *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, vols. 3-4: *1788*, has been published (pp. 776), and she was foregoing even a celebratory dinner on that score, hard pressed with another project. Lorna has less than a year to finish editing a volume of "Memoirs of the Court of George III," a 4-volume edition from Pickering & Chatto, with Alain Kensherve as another volume editor, Michael Kassler as General Editor, and Peter Sabor as a Consulting Editor. Two volumes of the memoirs contain unpublished texts, and all provide first-hand accounts of the English court from 1760s to 1820. The press release notes "Charlotte Papendiek's memoirs cover the first thirty years of George III's reign, while Mary Delany's letters provide a vivid portrait of her years at Windsor. Lucy Kennedy was another long-serving member of court whose previously unpublished diary" and the Queen's diaries are also included--those diaries are in the Royal Archives at Windsor Castle. Lorna told me how strange it felt to be walking around Windsor and past its guards after the visiting hours had ended. Lorna has also just published another substantial issue of *The Burney Letter*, Fall 2014, with a lead essay by Patricia Lowndes Jennings on her ancestor, the London publisher of *Evelina*, Thomas Lowndes, also an article on an ASECS panel honoring Margaret Doody by Misty Anderson, "The Inspiration for Charles Burney's General History of Music" by Peter Marchbank, several articles by younger scholars, **Kate Hamilton** and Jennifer Mueller on their work, and much besides. **Greg Clingham** is at work on a book entitled "The Dream of the Orient: China,

Commerce, & British Cultural Practice from the Qing to the Opium Wars," In May and June he was working on the MSS of the diplomat Sir George Macartney and those associated with the British embassy to China in 1792-94 at the Toyo Bunko Oriental Library in Tokyo. While in Japan he gave lectures on the career and writings of Macartney at several universities–Tokyo U., Waseda U., Tokyo Women's Christian U., and the U. of Osaka. **Clarissa F. Dillon** is baking 17C Dutch wafers on a hearth using barm, dried using 18C receipt, to make small beer; and she's giving hearth-cooking workshops at the 1696 Thomas Masseey House in Broomal, PA. She participated in the Mid-Atlantic Region conference of the Association for Living History, Farms, & Agricultural Museums, lecturing on "What! No Plastic? How Colonists Got What They Needed & Wanted," also offering the workshop "Children's Programs with Colonial Honey Drink." She gave a workshop at the symposium "Everybody Eats" at Gunston Hall, VA, in May, and presented "They Called It Women's Work" in April at Valley Forge. Her "The Phantom Gardener, or Who's Been Planting in My Beds" in the Thomas Massey House newsletter, *The Endeavor*. Forthcoming articles include "Next to Godliness: Laundry in the 17th & 18th Centuries" and another on "Tomatoes in the World of William Penn." **Clorinda Donato's** "The Stakes of Enlightenment: Censorship and Communication in 18C France" appears in *ECS*, 47 (2013), 69-73. **Yvonne Noble** writes that **Alan Downie**'s conference "Queen Anne is Dead" was a great success, with many interesting papers, including Alan's: "Alan gave a fierce paper condeming Habermas (and therefore those that elaborate on him) for very, very sloppy scholarship." Also there were **J. Paul Hunter** and **Hugh Ormsby-Lennon**.

William Edinger is writing two monographs on Wordsworth, Coleridge, and their relation to 18C taste-criticism. **Beatrice Fink**'s "Food for Thought," a review essay on two French "culinary authority" appears in this fall's *Eighteenth-Century Life*, where we find another by **Vincent Carretta**, "Black Seamen and Soldiers." The journal remains in the good hands of **Cedric D. Reverand** and review editor **Adam Potkay**. **John Fischer** was hoping to have the edition of Swift and Stella's word-book MS to press at the end of the summer. Congratulations to **Anna Foy** on the delivery during the summer of her second daughter (Irene Farrer Heenan joins sister Molly). Though he was not a member of EC/ASECS, we lament the passing, after debilitating illness, of **P. N. Furbank** (b. 1920), who died about the first of July. **Manny Schonhorn** relayed the news after hearing it from W. R. Owens, Furbank's collaborator on those important volumes and articles re-examining attributions in Defoe's canon. Those who know his work on Defoe might be surprised to examine his books on Samuel Butler, Diderot, Mallarmé, Poussin, Italo Svevo, and esp. his authorized biography of E. M. Forster, a hefty and detailed study applauded as a masterpiece--Furbank also completed recently an as-yet unpublished book on film. Owens posted a memoir of Furbank on line--obituaries appeared in all the major papers and are easily browsed. Manny remarked, "he was one of those giants of an earlier generation who modernized literature. They can't even imagine his range of interests. How quickly he became a loving friend and strangely enough at my age a mentor. I will miss him."

Jocelyn Harris's projects last spring were a monograph entitled "Satire, Celebrity, and Politics in Jane Austen"; a talk for the Philadelphia branch of the Jane Austen Society of North America's "Unfinished Jane Austen" meeting entitled "Love, Luck, and Money in *The Watsons: or. The Million-Dollar Manuscript*"; also for the Burney Society meeting in Montreal a paper entitled "The Subscription List to *Camilla*" and another for the JASNA there, "Burney and Austen." Her "Jane Austen: Anna Letitia Barbauld's Unseen Interlocutor," first presented at Chawton in 2012, appears in *Anna Letitia Barbauld: New Perspectives*, ed. by **William McCarthy** and Olivia Murphy (Bucknell, 2014; 404 pp.). "Philosophy and Sexual Politics in Mary Astell and Samuel Richardson," published in *Intellectual History Review* 22(3), Sept. 2012, reveals unexpectedly close personal connections that prove Richardson to be as radical as she. In "Jane Austen and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge" (*Persuasions*, 24, 2012), Jocelyn reveals that a wondrous new databases allowed her to find only the third instance of Jane Austen's name appearing in print in her lifetime. Boldly going further into the internet, Jocelyn has just set up a website: www.jocelynharris.co.nz. **Gabriella Hartvig**'s "*Ossian* Translations and Hungarian Versification, 1773-93" is among essays edited by Howard Gaskill ("Versions of Ossian: Reception, Responses, and Translations"), published in *Translation and Literature*, 22, no. 3 (2013), 383-400. **Ian Higgins**, one of the general editors of the Cambridge Swift (who must feel huge satisfaction, as **Claude Rawson** must, at the many superb editions brought out the past two years), presented "Jonathan Swift circa 1713: The Orthodoxy of the High Church Dean of Saint Patrick's" at the 12th Annual Dublin Symposium on Jonathan Swift, held at the Deanery, St. Patrick's Cathedral, 19 Oct.. Ian's article "Jonathan Swift's Memoirs of a Jacobite" will appear in *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788: The Three Kingdoms and Beyond*, ed. Allan Macinnes, *et al.* (Pickering & Chatto, forthcoming in November). Our thanks to **Jordan Howell** for producing in May a well detailed CFP for the Delaware EC/ASECS and distributing it broadly. Jordan reviewed Andrew O'Malley's *Children's Literature, Popular Culture, and Robinson Crusoe* (2012) in *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 38.1 (Winter 2014), 113-14. **Rob Hume** spent much of the past year working on a master plan for IT at Penn State and preparing his and **Judy Milhous**'s Panizzi lectures at the British Library for press. In March he described the lectures as "c. 500 pages of MS plus 112 illustrations," remarking that he dreaded "the thought of the image collection and permissions." **Sandro Jung** and **Kwinten Van De Walle**, with M. Lak, published "Humphry Repton's *The Bee* and Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery" in *ANQ*, 27 (2014).

Our condolences go to **Linde Katritzky** on the death of her husband Alan R. Katritzky in February. Educated at Oxford and Cambridge, he was a Distinguished Professor of chemistry at Florida since 1980, the year of his induction in the Royal Society, working there with hundreds of doctoral and post-doctoral students, publishing over 2000 articles and receiving over a dozen honorary doctorates. Linde and Alan have three daughters, a son, and many grandchildren, who we hope have helped her cope with her loss and difficult transition. Over the past few years Linde published "Literarischer Standort und satirische Norm, Religiosität in den *Nachtwachen*. *Von Bonaventura*" in

Euphorion, 108 (2014), 105-33; "Puppetry in 18C England and Germany in the *Nachtwachen von Bonaventura*, in *Arcadia*, 45 (2010), 48-67; "Zensur und Gegenstrategien: Gesellschaftskritik in Moritz August v. Thümmels Rokoko-Satire" in *Literature für leser,* 2010, 175-87; and "Sinn und Zusammenhang: Überlegungen zu Lichtenbergs Denverknüpfungen," *Lichtenberg-Jahrbuch*, 2010 (2010), 53-70. Linde has published much on the anonymous *Nachtwachen von Bonaventura* (1804) which is too inventive a comic and satiric fiction for one to have even a foggy notion of it without reading it--Kreuzgang, the watchman, a gothic narrator claiming descent from Satan, finds macabre humor in the follies he showcases. Well, this could be the year to take that bull by the horns, for Chicago has brought out *The Night Watches of Bonaventura*, a new edition and translation by Gerald Gillespie, who back in 1971 produced a dual-language edition (he's produced at least a new introduction for this edition in paperback and hardcover). **Deborah Kennedy** has published the essay "Jane Austen's Influence on Stephenie Meyer's *Twilight*," in the new book *Jane Austen and the Arts*, edited by Natasha Duquette and Elisabeth Lenckos (Lehigh UP, 2014: 131-146). Her essay "Dryden's Sweet Saint" was published in *Approaches to Teaching the Works of John Dryden*, ed. by Jayne Lewis and Lisa Zunshine (MLA, 2013). Deborah's book *Poetic Sisters: Early Eighteenth-Century Women Poets* (Bucknell UP, 2013) received a Choice Outstanding Academic Title award. **Anthony Lee** was working on William Dodd in March, producing a bibliography on him, and he is preparing to edit a collection of essays on Samuel Johnson and his circle (Burke, etc.).

Sylvia Kasey Marks reviewed M. O. Grenby's *The Child Reader, 1700-1840* (2011) in the Summer-Fall 2014 double issue of *Eighteenth-Century: Theory and Interpretation*, 55, nos. 2-3 (313-17)--this same issue has Lawrence Lipking's review of *Samuel Johnson after 300 Years*, co-edited by **Greg Clingham**. **Ashley Marshall** has been writing a book, that I believe Cambridge will publish, on "*Swift and History."* Also, this past year, the University of Delaware Press gave formal approval to the festschrift she edited for Ronald Paulson. Ashley has found time too to enjoy the western wilderness while teaching in Reno--she's been kayaking rapids and climbing rock out west. We're happy to welcome **Carol McGuirk** to our group, whom most will associate with Robert Burns and Scottish poetry. Her essay "Burns and Aphorism; or, Poetry into Proverb: His Persistence in Cultural Memory beyond Scotland" appeared in *Robert Burns and Transatlantic Culture* (2012). **Ellen Moody**'s presentation at the 2013 SHARP has been in part posted on www.Victorian.web ("Mapping Trollope, or Geographies of Power") and will soon appear as "Masculinity and Epistolarity in Andrew Davies's Trollope Films" [*HKHWR, TWWLN*] in *Upstairs and Downstairs: The British Historical Costume Drama on TV (From the Forsyte Saga to Downton Abbey),* ed. by Julie Taddeo and James Leggott (Scarecrow, 2014). A new Valancourt edition of Eleanor Sleath's *The Orphan of the Rhine* (one of the Northanger Novels) is forthcoming with her introduction and bibliography for it. Ellen is still working on an edition of Smith's *Ethelinde* for Valancourt and the book project "A Place of Refuge: The Jane Austen Film Canon." She will be teaching at two Oscher Life-Long Learning Institutes in the fall, "one at AU (Beyond Barsetshire: Trollope, Irish, European & Political

Novelist) and one at GMU (The Gothic).” She has completed her close reading of all Jane Austen's extant letters on her *Austen Reveries* blog. For the Victorian Web she reviewed Simon Heffer's *High Minds: The Victorians and the Birth of Modern Britain* and this fall will do two more, “one on censorship of film, the other "Fictions of Affliction" (an older book on disability in Victorian fiction).” “Exasperated” by the account of Anne Finch’s publications in the Palgrave’s *History of British Women’s Writing*, **Yvonne Noble** is tracking the appearances of Finch’s writings in print, much aided by the *Union First-Line Index*.

A number of members have published essays in *Topographies of the Imagination: New Approaches to Daniel Defoe*, ed. by Katherine Ellison, Kit Kincade, and Holly Faith Nelson and published by AMS in 2014: **Maximillian E. Novak**, “Daniel Defoe in the Footsteps of the Goddess of Reason” (51-68); **John Richetti**, “Second (and Third) Chances for Defoe’s Fictional Protagonists: Recovery and Realism” (15-30); and **Geoffrey Sill**, “Daniel Defoe and the Sentimental Novel” (3-13). From Nicholas Seager’s review forthcoming in *RES*, now on line, we learn that John’s essay treats *Moll Flanders* and *Robinson Crusoe*, and Geoff’s, *Colonel Jack*. Also, in our Sept. 2013 issue (p. 70), when I called attention to the e-journal *Digital Defoe*, I mentioned the publication of the fall 2013 issue (vol. 5) but failed to indicate the publication there of **Max Novak**’s “Imaginary Voyages in *Serious Reflections* and *A Vision of the Angelick World*” and of **John Richetti**’s “On Reciting *The True Born Englishman*.” The issue also contains, as one of five reviews, **Rachel Carnell**’s review of Leon Guilhamet’s *Defoe and the Whig Novel: A Reading of the Major Fiction*.” **Mary Anne O’Donnell** and Cynthia Richards have co-edited *Approaches to Teaching Behn’s* Oroonoko (MLA, 2014); contributors include **Erik Bond, Vincent Carretta, Karen B. Gevirtz, Laura J. Rosenthal**, and **Laura Stevens**--we expect to offer a review of the book in 2015. **Leah Orr**, who has begun a second year at Dickinson College this fall, published “Providence and Religion in the Crusoe Trilogy” in *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 38, no. 2 (Spring 2014), 1-27. This year’s *Swift Studies* (**Hermann Real**’s 29th volume) contains **Hugh Ormsby-Lennon**’s “Pinching Snuff: Dean Swift as Paralytic Gnomon in James Joyce’s ‘The Sisters’” (89-129), which Hermann writes brings in Beckett and others and is “all very entertaining, immensely erudite, eccentric, wild, studded with neologisms.” **Kate Parker** has co-edited with Courtney Weiss Smith the collection *Eighteenth-Century Poetry and the Rise of the Novel Reconsidered* (Bucknell UP, 2014), for which we have a review copy in need of a reviewer. Essays treat a number of major poets and novelists, Pope, Thomson, Richardson, and Haywood--Kate’s own contribution is “’The Battle without Killing’: Eliza Haywood and the Politics of Attempted Rape.” **Peter Perreten** spoke March 6th to the Old Eagle Garden Club in Berwyn, PA, on “The Garden in the 18th-century Landscape: From Parterre to Ferme Ornée.” Peter has volunteered to serve as assistant editor of *Native Notes*, a new journal focused on the Native Plant Garden at Hawk Mountain Sactuary. **Manushag N. Powell**’s *Performing Authorship in the 18C English Periodical*, reviewed above, receives a favorable and perceptive discussion from Erin Mackie in this fall’s *Eighteenth-Century Life*. **Elizabeth Powers**’s collection *Freedom of Speech: The History of An Idea*. (Bucknell, 2011),

reviewed here in Oct. 2012, was reviewed last year by W. G. Jones in *Journal of European Studies*, 43 (2013), 76-78, and by Paul McMenemy in *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 36 (2013), 312-13. Hightlights of **Hermann Real**'s summer included his and Erika's 50th wedding anniversary and the acquisition of Swift's own copy of Livy for the Ehrenpreis Centre. In June at the "Infinity and Beyond" colloquy chaired by Elizabeth Durot-Boucé in Le Havre, he spoke on one of his favorite authors: "Finite Infinity: or, Lord Chancellor Bacon and the Paradoxical Profile of Modern Man." **Frederick Ribble** published "Henry Fielding at the Bar: A Reappraisal," *Studies in Philology*, 110 (2013), 903-13.

Shef Rogers in March wrote of enjoying **Andrew Carpenter**'s recent visit to Dunedin, NZ, traveling with his wife (and co-editor) Lucy Collins. Shef added a little news of his own: "I am currently working mostly on NZ book history rather than C18 stuff, hoping to finish all that before going on leave in July for 6 months, during which I'll revise various pieces that I have given as talks, but not yet published. I'll attend SHARP in Antwerp in September and be in Europe from August through mid-December." He added, regarding developments at Otago: "The Centre for the Book rolls along with various visitors, including Nicolas Barker this May, and Dunedin put in a bid to become a UNESCO City of Literature last week. I am hoping the bid will succeed, but either way, the process has helped the city define how it wants to promote literature and draw together lots of disparate activities, all of which has been good for the profile of books." In October 2013, **Barbara Brandon Schnorrenberg** died at age 82 from complications of breast cancer. She was eulogized by **Martha Bowden** in a posting to the SEASECS listserv, appropriately, for BBS had been a loyal sister in that society, serving on the editorial board for its journal, *New Perspectives in the Eighteenth Century*. Martha writes, "She was first and foremost, a feminist historian, with a particular interest in women's place in the history of the Church of England in the eighteenth century . . . . she was foundational in establishing the Episcopal Women's History Project and participated in the Historical Society of the Episcopal Church." Martha adds, "Those of us who were fortunate enough to know her well remember her as being academically rigorous, collegially generous, and fiercely kind." Schnorrenberg published a articles in *EC Life, EC Women, Anglican & Episcopal Histor*y, and *SECC*--including studies of midwifery and of 18C medical men at Bath in 1981 and 1984 vols. She wrote many histories of parishes in the southern U.S. and was a faithful book reviewer.

Kathryn Temple's "What's Old is New Again: William Blackstone's Theory of Happiness Comes to America" was published in *The Eighteenth Century*, 55 (2014), 129-34. Cambridge UP this summer released **Dennis Todd**'s *Defoe's America* in paperback, thus cutting the price by nearly a quarter from hardcover (Cambridge UP, August 2010; xi + 229)--Amazon Kindle for $17 and the paperback this week for less. After a contextual chapter sharing the volume's title, the book is largely occupied with three chapters featuring close readings: ""Mastering the Savage: Conversion in *Robinson Crusoe*"; "Servitude and Transformation in *Colonel Jack*" and "*Moll Flanders* and the Misrepresentation of Servitude" (then comes a closing chpt: "Defoe, Cannibals, and Colonialism." The book is well reviewed on *Digital Defoe* by Noel

Chevalier, whose conclusion observes that Todd treats "how Defoe constructed 'America' as a fictional space into which he poured his enthusiasm for and ambivalence about colonialism, the possibility of redemption, and the true nature of humanity." In characterizing Defoe's treatment of America, Todd compares it with other accounts. **Eleanor Shevlin** and **Cheryl Wanko** will chair our 2015 meeting at West Chester U., one of the few thriving state universities in Pennsylvania, in part through their great commitment to teaching and service (they've over 600 English majors!!). Cheryl and Eleanor have smartly avoided conflicts with other organizations by moving us a little later than usual: to Nov. 12-14. **Linda Merians,** who deserves the last word, writes, "Needless to say, we owe Eleanor and Cheryl great, great gratitude. I'm sure it will be a fantastic meeting. Susan Beam's website for ECASECS will be posting program info."

Forthcoming Meetings, Exhibits, Announcements, &c.

We in **EC/ASECS** meet at the U. of Delaware, in Newark, 6-8 November, hosted by Matt Kinservik and his program committee. See the account on p. 59 of the March *Intelligencer* or the program at http://sites.udel/ecasecs2014/. Registration forms were posted in late August.

The conference "**Sensationalism, Sensuality, and Sensibility** in 18C Great Britain" occurs at the U. Sorbonne nouvelle, CREA XVIII, on 13 Dec.; proposals were due 20 Sept. to Dr. Bour at Isabelle.Bour@univ-paris3.fr.

The **Western SECS** meets 13-14 February 2015 at California Polytechnic State U. in San Luis Obispo, on California's central coast, with the theme "Race, Gender, and Empire" and a plenary by Brycchan Carey. The CFP came from Regulus Allen (English, Cal Poly) presumably the chair. The submission deadline was early this month (http://cla.calpoly.edu/wsecs2015.html).

The **South-Central SECS** meets 26-28 Feb. at Point Clear, Alabama, with the theme "Modernization in the Long 18C (or Resistance to It). Proposals are due 21 Nov. to conf. chair John Burke (jjburke@ua.edu). SCSECS meets in 2016 in Oklahoma City.

The **SEASECS** also takes place on 26-28 Feb., at the Hilton-University of Florida Conference Center in Gainesville, with the theme "Sentimentality and Seduction: Love in the 18C." Plenary speakers include Peter Sabor and Mary Sheriff. Proposals were due by 15 August to Laura Miller (seasecs2015@gmail.com) but the deadline for papers is 1 Nov. Rori Bloom (ribloom@ufl.edu) is in charge of local arrangements. for more, see www.seasecs.net.

The Edmund Burke Society of America holds its third conference, **"Edmund Burke and Patriotism,"** at Villanova U. on 27-28 Feb., with keynote lectures by David Bromwich (Yale), Michael Brown (Aberdeen), and Regina Janes (Skidmore College). There's a CFP and the deadline for proposals is 15 Nov. Contact the Society's Secretary, Ian Crowe at icrowe@bpc.edu.

ASECS meets 17-22 March 2015 in Los Angeles and the 14th congress of the **International SECS** occurs 26-31 July 2015 at Erasmus U. in Rotterdam, hosted by the University and the Dutch-Belgian SECS. The theme is "Opening Markets, Trade and Commerce in the 18C." Write info@ISECS2015.com.

"**Johnson and Shakespeare**," a conference marking the 250th anniversary of Samuel Johnson's *The Plays of William Shakespeare* will be held 7-9 Aug. 2015 at Pembroke College, Oxford, with plenaries by Jenny Davidson, Joseph Roach, and Henry Woudhuysen, and papers by Robert DeMaria, Jr., Jack Lynch, Peter Sabor, Howard Weinbrot et al. The organizers include Michael Bundock, Jim McLaverty, & Lynda Muggleston (send email to the last).

EC/ASECS meets at West Chester U. on 12-14 Nov., chaired by Eleanor Shevlin (EShevlin@wcupa.edu) & Cheryl Wanko (cwanko@wcupa.edu)

The British Library is running the exhibition **"*Terror and Wonder: The Gothic Image***," 3 Oct.-20 January, with 200 rarities tracing 250 years of Gothic imagination and exploring the fascination with the mysterious, the terrifying, and the macabre (admission £10). Various events accompany it. The Folger Library has mounted through 26 Oct. "Symbols of Honor: **Heraldry and Family History** in Shakespeare's England, curated by Nigel Ramsay and Heather Wolfe (free admission as ever). There's also an online exhibition.

Sylvia Kasey Marks called my attention to the on-going project headed by Mark Purcell to catalogue and list on COPAC the books in the 140 historic libraries owned by **The National Trust**. By mid November it had catalogued 155,000 of the roughly 230K/400K vols. (www.nationaltrust.org.uk)--National Trust locations have increased in the ESTC, and one can search there or on COPAC for "National Trust" copies, which, if unique, one can often argue the need to examine or photograph (libraries@nationaltrust.org.uk).

As was announced in its April newsletter, **The Children's Books History Society** has established a website at www.cbhs.org.uk, with pull down menus on the Society, its Darton award, study days, &c., and soon will post there an index to its newsletter. Congratulations to Pat Garrett and her colleagues!

The June 2nd issue of *The Nation* has an article by Scott Sherman ("The Battle of 42nd Street") on the defeat of plans to greatly alter the **New York Public Library**'s main research library but also on actions taken and costs run up prior to the cancellation of the "Central Library Plan" in May by Tony Marx, the Library's President. In secret, without consulting the groups that one would expect to be consulted, a dramatic plan was hatched to remove millions of books from the historic shelves and replace reading room shelves with computers, paid for in part by selling off two libraries. *The Nation* prefaces the article by noting that Sherman's articles in *The Nation* back in Dec. 2011 and Sept. 2013 were part of the effective opposition to the changes (citzens groups were formed and stepped up, like "Citizens Defending Libraries" and "Library Lovers League"). Increasingly power library administrators seem to be undermining the place of physical books. This comes up at the edges of another article by Sherman, "Under Pressure: Incrementalists and futurists battle over the mission of the university Press (26 May 2014)--also sent to me by Manny Schonhorn. Sherman provides a good overview of the recognized problems threatening university presses, made the more topical by the U. of Missouri's decision to shut down its press, though reversed after much criticism, and such other changes as the placing of Indiana UP under the control of "the Office of Scholarly Publishing" and the U. of Michigan Press "fully under control of that university's library." (Sherman notes "now, at least nineteen press directors

report to the head of the university library.") Libraries have big budgets and can share overhead costs, but some librarians aren't that supportive of physical books--implicit perhaps in the great change in budgetary priorities from paper to electronic acquisitions. Sherman covers such threats to the physical book as competition from electronic surrogates and the difficulties university presses have in breaking into digital formats but only glances at the effects of Amazon.

N. Many resources on the WWW have been examined in recent issues of *American Journalism*: "***The American Colonist Library***," a website created by Dr. Richard Gardiner of Columbus State U. is reviewed by Julia Hedgepeth Williams (30, no. 2 [2013], 290-91). That issue contains a review by Berkley Hudson and Elizabeth A. Lance of the "Duke U. Library Digital Collections" (292-94). Carol Sue Humphreys reviews ***Archiving Early America***, ed. by Don Vitale, an ongoing electronic data- and textbase posted on the WWW by Keigwin and Matthews Private Collection of 18C Historical Documents, 1995- (30: 145-46). Michael Stamm describes ***Media History Digital Library*** published by the non-profit Media History Digital Library at http:// mediahistoryproject.org, focused on 20C periodicals (31.1 [2014]: 147-49). Finally, Michael Fulhage reviews the "**Perry-Castañeda Library Map Collection**" published by U. of Texas at Austin at www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/ (30.4: 583-85). Roughly 20% or less of the quarter million maps in the collection have been digitized. The website's fields include "Historical Maps."

N. Christiane Pagel's "**Virtuelles Kupferstichkabinett: Druckgraphik** der Frühen Neuzeit online," in *Wolfenbütteler Notizen zur Buchgeschichte,* 37, nos. 1-2 (2012), 91-104. These materials from the Renaissance into the 19th century are accessible at www.virtuelles-kupferstichkabinett.de.

The ***Intelligencer*** **needs reviewers for the following**: Elizabeth M. Dillon, *New World Drama: The Performative Commons in the Atlantic World 1649-1849* (Duke, 2014), pp. xiii + 354, examining public performance in London, Charleston, New York, & Kingston; Julia Gasper, *The Marquis d'Argens: A Philosophical Life* (Lexington Books, 2014); pp. v + 297; Vol. 20 of *Goethe Yearbook* (2013); *Eighteenth-Century Poetry and the Rise of the Novel Reconsidered*, ed. by Kate Parker and Courtney Weiss Smith (Bucknell, 2014), pp. xxiv + 255, 9 essays plus Smith's introduction; Kevin Pask's *The Fairy Way of Writing: Shakespeare to Tolkein* (Johns Hopkins, 2013); Paula Radisich, *Pastiche Fashion and Galanterie in Chardin's Genre Subjects: Looking Smart* (Delaware, 2014), pp. xi + 193; Vol. 5: *The Index*, comp. by Hermann J. Real and Dirk F. Passmann to *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* (P. Lang, 2014), 307 pp.--a reviewer should have possession of and familiarity with Vols. 1-4 containing the letters; *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and Its Empire,* 17 essays ed. by Philip J. Stern and Carl Wennerlind (Oxford, 2014), pp. ixs + 404; and *The Miscellaneous Writings and Sterne's Subscribers, an Identification List*, Vol. 9 of The Florida Edition of Sterne, ed. by Melvyn New and W. B. Gerard (2014), pp. xxix + 592; index.

Cover illustration: The frontispiece in Volume I of *The Works of the Right Honourable Joseph Addison, Esq. In Four Volumes* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1721). 4to. It calls attention to J. A. Downie's article on Addison (pp. 12-15).