

“Monuments of Unageing Intellect”

by Melvyn New

Which one of us would not dream that it
might be said of his work of a lifetime:
“He wrote a few good footnotes”?
Simon Leys, *The Hall of Uselessness*.

Several years ago Janine Barchas wrote an review essay of the first three volumes of the Cambridge Edition of the Works of Samuel Richardson (*Eighteenth-Century Life*, 38.3 [2014], 118-24), entitled “First and Last,” a title reflecting the fact that the Cambridge *Works* will be “the *first-ever* annotated edition of this author’s complete output” (my italics) and her opinion that it will be the *last* such print edition. Perhaps this caught my attention because in the same year I had just published the ninth and final volume of my thirty-five-year project of a scholarly edition of Laurence Sterne’s works, and had opined in its introduction that “what a scholarly editor learns, and I believe my coeditors will agree with this, is that after the final volume of the Florida Sterne, nothing remains but to start over again. A new scholarly edition of Sterne’s works will perhaps not be undertaken for another decade or two, but if Sterne is to continue to be read, his work must be edited and annotated anew for different times and new readers.” Or, just as likely, her review caught my eye because I am a coeditor of four volumes in the Richardson project, a scholarly edition of *Sir Charles Grandison*. Whatever the reason, I found her essay-review captivating, if also disturbing, and was even temporarily persuaded by many of her cogent arguments against the seemingly endless proliferation of very costly scholarly editions in the electronic era.

Several years have now passed without anyone’s feeling compelled to defend these paper monuments, which continue apace; the Richardson project has been joined by the Cambridge Swift *Works* project, both now beginning to bear fruit, however fruitless; and Oxford University Press has just assembled its cast for a new scholarly edition of Pope;¹ Defoe has had two competing projects underway for a very long time, while Dryden, Smollett, Sterne, Fielding, and Johnson have all recently finished (or nearly so) their half-century projects. All to little avail, it would seem, because, as Barchas argues, the elaborate textual constructions of these scholarly editions are rendered ineffectual given the Internet’s capacity to produce on our screens accurate multiple texts at a keystroke, and thus enable the cross-checking, the vertical and horizontal collation that is the *raison d’etre* of these McKerrow-Bowers-Tanselle productions.

Perhaps I have read too many issues of the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer* and too many bibliographical essays by Jim May, its editor, but for the last dozen years or so they have combined to keep me substantially informed, by both general observation and specific details, of the many, many ghosts lurking in the machine, and thus the profound dangers awaiting scholars who rely solely on it. Professor May and other contributors to this newsletter could undoubtedly challenge Barchas’s certainties with a far deeper knowledge of the electronic world than this elderly scholar can muster, and I hope they will

eventually do so. Here I will simply offer a few personal observations about editing in general, annotating in particular, and the direction of the profession. I address the last, uncomfortable as it may be for the present generation, because scholarly editing does not take place in isolation but within an academic community that pays the bill--funding is always an issue.

In fact, let me begin in the middle of her review, a pregnant discussion of finances, the purchasing of books versus the purchasing of ECCO. It is without doubt a bargain to purchase ECCO if one has \$24,000 to \$330,000 on hand, depending on the institution's FTEs (300 libraries have plunked down the cash, Barchas indicates), but it is also important to keep in mind, first, that ECCO is being dished out in installments, and, second, that these 300 libraries worldwide represent perhaps five or six percent of the libraries in the world. Moreover, Barchas is a bit misleading when she writes that ECCO "includes all of Richardson's own versions of the CEWSR texts"; for *Grandison*, the first octavo and the third edition are available in the first installment (130,000 titles), but not the first duodecimo, which is in the second installment (50,000 titles). The University of Florida has been unwilling to buy it (\$7,000 to \$95,000, again depending on FTE's); the University of South Florida has that supplement, but it is not available to off-campus patrons (contractually restricted to sole user, I would imagine).² Similarly some fortunate institutions will pay for the Oxford On-Line Scholarly Editions (which includes the Florida Sterne); the University of Florida again is unable to purchase it. At present the library's "purchasing" budget has allocated approximately 10 percent for hard copies, the rest for electronic subscriptions, and it is still not enough. I think this is typical for all but a handful of research-oriented institutions, including the exclusivity contracts. And, for a brief contrast, our library can almost always procure a book for me through our intrastate system or ILL nationwide within a week--for loan-terms from a few weeks to a few months.

More to the point, perhaps, I suspect that nowhere in the academic world is humanistic education (as opposed to the so-called STEM curriculum) in a flourishing state. Thus, rather than buying on-line instruments for literary scholars--and for that much smaller group, eighteenth-century scholars--libraries will, with both logic and economics on their side, use their always limited resources to support programs (faculty and students) that are waxing rather than waning. And that means more and more investment will be made in those burgeoning STEM courses and profitable career-oriented majors (business schools are in a boom cycle), while one can only suggest selling one's shares in English departments.³

This situation does indeed offer a pertinent lesson concerning our inability to predict the future. After the troublesome 1960s, Humanities faculties became absolutely convinced that they could compete with the hard and (more particularly) soft sciences if our courses were more like theirs. Basically this entailed sweeping away dull classics (anything written before 1960), and bringing into the classrooms a different literature and pertinent ways of reading it, basically political, although often thinly disguised as anthropological or sociological. The result, absolutely evident, although we are still in denial, has been forty years of steady reduction in both tenure lines for humanities faculty and the number of our majors, a concomitant collapse in significant opportunities for employment, and, if our consciences ever catch up to our

reality, diminishing graduate programs. We might perhaps forecast a coming great revival of humanistic studies, but we might also extrapolate the present trends to suggest even further reduction of faculty, since the number of lines available will always be based on student hours.

Hence it is all too true, as Barchas suggests, that there is a continuing shrinking of the scholarly audience for scholarly editions--and scholarly journals and scholarly monographs; but so, also, as she fails to note, for the purchasing of \$40,000 programs supporting the humanities, given the competition for such programs by disciplines far more flourishing than our own. And if all this is true, there is also a continuing diminishment of the market for whatever products Barchas hopes to generate through and with her computerized texts, that is, the monograph or article or even textbook edition.⁴ Put another way, Barchas happily predicts a future for computerized scholarship, but, to use her own significant term for the Cambridge product, her scholarly community remains a "legacy" community, one she inherited and does not want to surrender to what seem to me the undeniable forces rendering her professorial role increasingly obsolete, with or without technology.

Obviously I cannot predict the future any better than she can: both of us are whistling in the dark (and perhaps past the graveyard), although when the electricity goes out I may be in the somewhat better position, not totally dependent on a now blank screen. For this reason alone, it would perhaps be a better strategy to turn our face toward the past, and query more intensely the idea of "legacy," beginning with what to me is the obvious fact that literature itself is a "legacy product." Every bit of the past is all part of that legacy, however, so the only significant issue concerns the value of the inheritance being passed on, whether big dollars or piddling amounts, whether "monuments of unageing intellect" or the flotsam and jetsam of the age. Barchas's "tens of thousands of eighteenth-century titles" on ECCO, each claiming equal attention on screens that indemnify against discrimination or evaluation, suggests the result, namely, a blossoming of critical essays (and books) in which the signs of Google-eyed inspiration are everywhere apparent. For example, one finds a bawdy play on "buttonholes" in *Tristram Shandy* and again in forty jestbooks; obviously, Sterne must be considered nothing more than just another in a long line of jestbook writers. Needless to say, pre-Google commentary could be equally foolish, but it should be pointed out that "technology" has not, and will not, save us from the inanities always lurking in our efforts to pass on to others what we take to be our monuments. More to the point, however, print copies do tend to single out those monuments, while the screen remains neutral.

Because much of Barchas's argument has to do with the technical end of textual production as manifested in the Cambridge titles she is reviewing (*Early Works*, ed. Alexander Pettit; *Pamela I* and *Pamela II*, ed. Albert J. Rivero), she really does not approach this issue of the projection of authors into the future, and I hope to be excused if I have taken her argument further than she intended. Indeed, I happily accede to many of her editorial criticisms, although it should be noted that the Cambridge Richardson guidelines were formulated fifteen years ago, when many of the platforms that make "technology" so inviting had not yet emerged. While we have followed those guidelines in preparing the textual apparatus for *Grandison*, we have not done so slavishly, although we have tried to maintain the uniformity of the total Richardson project, including

those volumes reviewed by her. To cite a significant example, while the general editors did begin with a policy of “strict categorical adherence to first-edition texts for all the works,” they eventually came to agree with our position that the octavo edition, a second state of the duodecimo first edition, should be used as copy-text for *Grandison*; this flexibility is noted on p. xiv of the “General Editors’ Preface” (“The exception here [to their strict policy] is the octavo edition of *Sir Charles Grandison*, which, though labelled the ‘second’ edition, was published simultaneously with the ‘first’ duodecimo edition”), in all three of the volumes Barchas reviewed, although not noticed by Barchas.

We were not successful, however, in persuading Cambridge to reproduce the graphic ornaments of the text, not even Richardson’s important divisions indicated by rows of asterisks, and the like; this was an unfortunate policy decision to which Barchas rightfully calls attention, an especially wrong decision, I would suggest, for an author who was also a printer.⁵ I also believe she is very much on target in believing that understanding Richardson’s artistry depends on a full engagement with his “corrections” in subsequent editions. That the general editors of the Cambridge Richardson have produced competing textbook editions of *Pamela* using different copy-texts--Peter Sabor, a Penguin edition (1980) based on the legacy 1801 edition (and including 1810 alterations), and Tom Keymer, an Oxford World Classics edition (2001), based on the first edition of 1740--speaks eloquently to the problem. In the case of *Grandison*, the issue is complicated by the fact that the dominating critical thesis concerning the novel for the past fifty years (it underlies Jocelyn Harris’s influential--and sole--modern edition) is that many if not all the changes Richardson made in subsequent editions were prompted by the advice of his coterie and his own lack of artistic interest, confidence, and vision. We have used the annotations, as often as was feasible, to make a contrary argument: Richardson, in full confidence of his own abilities, teased his coterie more often than not, took advice when he agreed with it as useful to his intentions and ignored it when he deemed it not. Within the limits of all but a variorum edition, we believe we have reexamined the problem of both his corrections and his artistry quite fully--perhaps, had the Cambridge edition been willing to tolerate what its general editors have called, I assume in compliment, the “Florida style of annotation,” we could have been even more generous with our commentary in this regard. Still, the fact is that the Cambridge guidelines (and funds) did not allow for the collation of multiple texts--vertical and horizontal--that a fully scholarly edition would offer. For that reason alone, one might suggest that, when the Humanities are again thriving and money pouring into our enterprise, the Cambridge Richardson will have to be redone--and most especially because of Richardson’s unique role as both author and printer. His continual editorial and print-shop reworkings in subsequent editions created hundreds if not thousands of significant editorial issues.

Less valid, I think, is Barchas’s suggestion that the “age of ECCO” allows scholars to view multiple versions and “choose freely and easily among” readings. If one’s own readings remained within the confines of one’s own study, this might make sense, but the validity of scholarly commentary, I believe, is established by a common text; we must know the text being quoted, and why it is being quoted, in order to judge the validity of an argument. This is perhaps more obvious when commenting on poems but no less true for novels. It

is bad enough when a scholar offers no indication of the text being quoted, or quotes from a student textbook left over from undergraduate days, but to suggest that we can eschew in our scholarly work reference to a text available to everyone seems to me an erroneous assumption.⁶

Similarly, what almost seems to be an offhand dismissal of textual accuracy (“Is the long *s* really such a hardship? Is the computer screen such a deal breaker?”) indicates to me a scholar who has perhaps never enjoyed the pleasures and pains of preparing a scholarly edition. A few examples of how and why each letter of each text matters might be pertinent if we still need to make a case for the importance of textual accuracy. In the first volume of *Grandison*, its second letter, the sexist Greville dismisses women of learning thus in the Harris edition: “A wife, a learned lady, I considered as a very unnatural character” (9). To my knowledge, in the past fifty years of commentary on the novel, almost always dependent on Harris’s edition, no one has ever questioned a sentence that seems to indicate a “wife” is unnatural. But Richardson’s text clearly has “A wise, a learned lady . . .” I am perhaps mistaken, but I do not think this would ever have been corrected without the impetus of a scholarly edition, and certainly not if the preparer of it was reading this 750,000 word text on-line. A different example is available in *Tristram Shandy*, where the first and all subsequent editions, including the Florida edition, have Le Fever looking up “wishfully” into Uncle Toby’s face (vol. 6, ch. 10); however, in a manuscript of the passage Sterne prepared for one of his patrons, a manuscript lost for many years in the bowels of the British Library and discovered anew only after (of course!) the Florida edition was published, the reading has Le Fever looking up “wistfully” not “wishfully,” almost certainly the better reading. Too many words in English change meaning by a single letter difference; the multiple re-readings (and re-readings against other texts) that is the standard practice of the scholarly editor still seems to me the most efficient way to produce an accurate text. Bibliographical description is a small but absolutely essential part of that editorial work; far more hours are spent valuably studying a text word for word. As for the manuscripts underlying some copy-texts (or portions thereof), Barchas’s “new technology” does not indicate how that will play into the demise of “legacy” editions, but surely it is a consideration of great import, as the Cambridge edition of Richardson’s correspondence is making absolutely clear.

Annotation is a subject Barchas barely touches in her discussion, but one that seems to me the very essence of the legacy scholarly edition. A stable text that is acceptable to the scholarly community and hence one that can sustain the commentary surrounding it (including commentary that deals with subsequent revisions) is vital to a scholarly community the members of which interact with one another; the lack of that stable text is equivalent, perhaps, to playing a game of basketball without a rim; everyone can claim a score. But once we install a rim, the game, the commentary, can evolve, and to my mind this commentary remains the most cogent reason for scholarly editions, our most effective means of preserving the legacy of literature for future generations. To be sure, we do have scholars today swinging from one digital text to another, feeling quite safe performing without a net. The better scholars, however, will want to know what has already been known, not necessarily all the commentary on a particular passage, but certainly all that might elucidate each moment of a text, at least in the judgment of the editor(s) at the time. Editors, like critics, are time bound; the

questions we ask today of a text are not the questions subsequent editors will ask. I have made this point often enough throughout the Florida edition of Sterne, including in the sentences quoted above from the final volume. And, indeed, thanks to the editors of *The Scriblerian*, I have been able to encourage additional emendations in a section titled “Scholia”--more than fifty new or improved annotations have been published therein. This steady accumulation of knowledge (to which Barchas’s “last” strikes a particularly discordant note) does suggest a fundamental truth gathered during years of scholarly editing: we are dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants.

Annotations provide the shared wisdom of a particular time so that scholars can accept or reject but need not repeat the labor; if every scholar reading *Tristram Shandy* had to piece together all Sterne’s borrowings from scratch, little useful scholarly work would ever get done, so busy would we be retracing what others had already accomplished. When I read in a scholarly essay that Tristram’s comment, “Great Wits jump,” means that wit is cavorting on the page, and hence is in support of the critic’s thesis of a cavorting author, I do feel compelled to point out that *jump* here means nothing more--and nothing less--than *agree*, as any scholarly edition would point out; the critic has wasted our time. Moreover, unless “technology” has changes in store for this mode of learning as well, annotation is the hallmark of every work that has endured through time, accumulating with it the commentary of generations of scholars, each generation building on the last. Authors earning commentary form a very exclusive society, based on discriminatory and selectivity practices that a “technology” offering us tens of thousands, indeed hundreds of thousands of texts can never account for. Out of those thousands, I picked Sterne’s works because I wanted to; computers, I hope, still cannot want anything, but when they can I hope they will also be able to explain, why I wanted to edit Richardson after Sterne--I still do not know the answer to that bit of non-computable eccentricity on my part. What I do know is that the more I learned about Richardson through the careful multiple readings of what is considered (perhaps unfairly) his weakest novel, the more he rose in my estimation, and the more I realized why he has endured in the canon and why it behooves us to preserve his words, carefully and precisely, for future generations.

In short, a legacy scholarly edition of *Grandison* is the way in which I personally tried to pass on part of my own legacy to the future. It is an option, of course, for anyone who wants to spend ten or twenty or thirty years of a scholarly career concentrating on one author, perhaps one work. And that is truly the most worthy canonical test, a test that every one of the 180,000 texts in ECCO can be subjected to: how few of them will find a willing “patron”? We build museums to ensure the endurance of our visual arts, we build concert halls and theaters to ensure the endurance of our aural arts, and we build scholarly editions to ensure the legacy of literature. Will any of these legacy institutions succeed in doing so down through millennia?⁷ Because I cannot read the future I do not know, but I do believe that without them, we would have nothing to give to the future except our present--and that dies the moment we do.

University of Florida (emeritus)

Notes

1. In the 1930s, when the Twickenham edition was organized, I am certain the editors could have had no inkling of the great burgeoning of higher education after WWII, nor that the New Criticism created an approach to literature that somehow held the attention of a generation of readers eager to read poetry as well as prose. The Oxford editors are equally unable to predict the future, but surely are aware that the market for a new edition of Pope's *Works*, indeed for any poetry, is shrinking dramatically. Nonetheless, for reasons I'll be suggesting, I applaud the decision; the task of literary scholars is not to predict the future but to help preserve the past, and that is done by refreshing for every generation (or perhaps every other) the presentation of authors who have gained the admiration of those willing and able to accompany them into the future.

2. Significantly enough, no further installments are planned, so, unless we are satisfied that there were only 180,000 works published in the period, we will have to persuade Cengage (the distributor of ECCO) that there is a sufficiently heavy demand to make their cost worthwhile. I doubt that argument can be made. Details of cost were kindly supplied by Matthew Hancox, Gale/Cengage District Sales Manager, 1/25/2017.

3. The business model on the supply side is also not promising. The failure of publishers like Ashgate is significant, as is the creation of larger and larger, less and less profitable conglomerates: investors in Pearson are looking at substantial losses; the company recently announced it was selling its stake in Penguin-Random House to pay off debts threatening its existence; Cengage (the distributor of ECCO) tentatively emerged from bankruptcy in 2014; and Broadview just circulated a letter alerting us to a campus (the canary in the coal mine?) that has decided its *Book Store* will sell only school-emblazoned clothing, and no longer books! University professors perhaps need to be reminded that corporate (and University) suppliers go where there is demand; a diminishing demand for humanities-oriented products will not be met by goodwill gestures to keep us afloat.

4. Needless to say, the present cost of scholarly editions is a cause for concern; the four volumes of *Grandison* will cost more than \$400 for the set, perhaps closer to \$500. Keep in mind, however, that that is a library's one-time purchase, and that it then becomes available through the very efficient interlibrary loan system to scholars across the country; few modern books are excluded from circulation. More important, perhaps, having a scholarly edition that sets out the present textual and annotative outlines for other scholars, subsequent textbook editions can follow: e.g., after the Florida editions, the editors published textbook versions of both *Tristram Shandy* (Penguin, 1997, 2d ed., 2003) and *A Sentimental Journey and Continuation of the Bramine's Journal* (Hackett, 2006); other publishers have also published editions reliant on the Florida editions.

5. In addition to Barchas's own fine work on visual print design, see Anne Toner, *Ellipsis in English Literature: Signs of Omission* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

6. Having paid little attention to the endless discussions of hacking during the 2016 presidential election, I can claim no knowledge in the field, but, if dictators can burn books, is it not possible that electronic texts can be tampered

with, erased, or altered, or simply shut down? And because that might be done with only a single key-stroke (If not yet, what brave new world awaits us?), it does seem far more efficient than trying to destroy (or proscribe) multiple copies of a work containing the same offending idea.

7. This does touch on one increasingly obvious point about internet resources, recently highlighted by Martha Bowden and Elizabeth Kraft, “*Tristrapedia or Tangled Web? Laurence Sterne and Tristram Shandy Online*,” *The Shandean*, 27 (2016), 135-49. Separating the resources available on “subscription-based sites” (with their advantages and disadvantages) from those available on “open-access sites,” they concentrate their attention on the *Tristram Shandy Web*, created some 15 years ago by faculty members from IULM (International University of Language and Media) in Milan. Of the several serious drawbacks with this site, including a “bibliography” Bowden and Kraft deem “scandalously inadequate”), the most telling is that it has not been updated since 2008. The detritus left behind on the web will require much future diligence to avoid, beginning with noticing the date of the latest upgrade.

Familiarity Breeds Contentment: Reviving the Strange When Teaching Eighteenth-Century Women Writers

by Catherine Ingrassia

[*Author’s note: The following text is a modified version of the plenary at the 2016 EC/ASECS, revised here to focus primarily on teaching eighteenth-century women writers, although of course many of the techniques could be used for any author in the period. In addition to information about specific pairings of texts and juxtapositions, I also include a list of the websites and databases referenced as well as some additional sources that may prove of use. Readers who have additional questions or comments are welcome to contact the author directly at cingrass@vcu.edu.]*

Scholars and teachers of eighteenth-century women writers might justifiably feel contentment in late 2016—anthologies, primary editions, *Orlando*—among many other resources—all make it possible to discuss women writers in greater depth than ever before—to make them familiar to our students. The centrality and influence of women’s writing during our shared period of study is (for the most part) accepted and generally recognized. The commonly termed “recovery project” of women writers over the last three decades has done significant work. Sophisticated theoretical, bibliographic, and biographical tools help scholars write women’s literary history (and women into existing literary histories) across a full range of genres. These developments coupled with the profound influence of feminist criticism on eighteenth-century studies has produced foundational work and reshaped the field. It’s difficult to imagine engaging in a critical practice that does not acknowledge women writers, so integral were they to the period as readers and writers.

And yet, has it become too easy to naturalize “women’s writing” as an umbrella category (or perhaps a box we tick on a syllabus) that erases the

differences that exist both within the idea of “women” and of “writing” in that category? Has the obvious and apparent value of bringing women’s writing out of the critical and textual wilderness over the last thirty years cost us anything in return? Is there any way in which our process of recovery constitutes a kind of domestication of women writers? And if, so what do we do in response? At what point do we need to disrupt our practices of reading and teaching women’s writing and “revive” the strange in our considerations of texts that might lose some of their power and meaning if they, or our interpretative frames, become too *familiar*?

In turn, how do we simultaneously make students increasingly at a remove from eighteenth-century literary culture and habits of reading familiar with texts they might initially consider “strange”? How do we also combat their understanding of “women writers” as a category that causes them to lapse into quick assumptions and easy generalizations? How do we help students resist the narratives and the preconceptions about women writers they might bring into the college classroom? Can we productively make these women writers “strange” within our classroom and our scholarship? And, in turn, does probing that particularly urgent relationship between the strange and the familiar, and the process of intentional estrangement, invigorate the scholarship and teaching of women’s writing of the long eighteenth century? What happens when we revive the strange, disrupt the categories, or challenge the habits with which we read and teach, to frustrate or eliminate the familiar and the domestic?

Johnson’s definitions of “strange” become powerfully relevant in thinking about women writers and the ways we teach them. They help resist some of the language historically used to discuss women writers or the generalization that students often bring into the classroom. Thinking playfully with such definitions can help us intentionally “estrangle” ourselves from women’s writing, and, in turn, help our students work toward more meaningful understandings of women’s texts and their role in the literary culture of the long eighteenth century. Johnson’s definitions prompt us to think about fresh elements of women’s writing—the degree to which such writing can be considered, in Johnson’s words, *Foreign; Not Domestic; Unknown; New; Remote; Unacquainted*. *Remote* urges us to think about provincial women writers, as Sarah Prescott has done, or the diasporic writers whom Juliet Shields discusses. *Unknown, new, or unacquainted* invite unfamiliar contexts for readings and rereadings, shedding the London-centric orientation for women writers or introducing writers on the edges of the canon.

While these definitions might direct us toward original approaches, it is the concepts of “not domestick” and “foreign” on which I want to focus. Speaking somewhat metaphorically, I want to urge that we leave the friendly confines of prose fiction and move into the “**foreign**” climes of other genres—poetry, drama, satire, journalism, or life writing in its many forms. Prose fiction’s dominance in our teaching (and largely research) has created an inaccurate imbalance in the perception that women wrote primarily novels. That is simply not the case, as James Raven and others have ably demonstrated. The naturalization of the novel is exacerbated by the decisions of publishing companies. Broadview, a wonderful and important press, is very candid about the fact that prose is the meat of their market—poetry and other genres simply

do not sell as well. Consequently we perpetuate the idea with our students that prose fiction dominated women's writing and reading habits.

Writers with whom students are most familiar—Aphra Behn, Eliza Haywood, Charlotte Lennox—wrote across multiple forms, handily spanning poetry, prose fiction, periodicals, and drama, often balancing the demands of the marketplace with the aesthetic value of different genres. Even writers whom we perceive of as writing primarily in one genre might surprise us. For example, the forthcoming Cambridge edition of the complete works of Anne Finch, edited by Jennifer Keith and Claudia Kairoff, with contributions from Jean Marsden, reveals Finch—commonly thought of as only a poet, also wrote plays. In addition to considering how individual authors wrote across multiple genres, we need to consider more astutely the range of genres in which women wrote and published so we can *upend persistent clichés about women and genre*. Women in fact did write satire, history, and political tracts, even if syllabi, commercial and anthologies, and some foundation critical work suggest otherwise.

In addition to upending the kinds of genres we teach, it's also important to offer the text in a form that will seem strange to a student. For example, when teaching women's fiction, it's useful to situate the text within print culture to the fullest degree possible. To that end, even when a modern edition is available, I often use or at least deeply engage with a facsimile version of the text. Our students are already quick to term any prose a 'novel,' often reading e-texts on their phones. Modern edited editions, anthologies or e-texts are of course wonderful to have, but they erase important bibliographic distinctions and also contribute to the text's over-familiarization. Further, strategically using advertisements for novels from eighteenth-century London newspapers reminds students that these narratives are products of popular culture, competing in a commercial advertising space.

Similarly, when teaching women's poetry, I often use an assignment that forces students to think about the different forms a poem takes, and how its meaning might be complicated with attention to the original vehicle of publication. To that end, I ask students to select a female poet from a list I provide and to search for the publication of her poems in the *Poetry of the Gentleman's Magazine, 1731-1800* database (www.gmpoetrydatabase.org/). After students identify a poem by their poet in the *Gentleman's Magazine* database, they then locate the poem in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, transcribe the poem, and then edit it with glosses and annotations. They also search ECCO to see whether the poem was subsequently published in a collection of poems, and also see whether the poem appears in a modern edition. These research and editorial exercises not only make students familiar with textual variants and the work of a scholarly editor but also remind them how context shapes our understanding of a poem (or any published text).

If the *Gentleman's Magazine* exercise reminds students that women published their work in various, often unexpected vehicles, it is also important to widely expand the frame for reading beyond the familiar and the stereotypically feminine: we must move, in Johnson's words, to the "**not domestick**." Too often scholars and teachers still focus on texts centered on women's domestic focus or courtship novels, when in fact women had a persistent engagement with a wide range of public topics beyond the traditionally feminine purview. As Kathleen Wilson reminds us, "far from being expelled from the new public

culture of the period, women, it seems, were pivotal creators and participants in it" (92). Women wrote of politics, theatre, travel, crime, slavery, fast days, inflation, elections—pretty much anything occurring in the public sphere—in part because women observed and participated in events in the public sphere. To insert women visibly into the world of eighteenth-century England, I often have students use specific databases that enable them to complicate their understanding of “women” and recognize how class, race, and geography shape their expectations and possibilities. For example, using the records from *Old Bailey Online* or *London Lives 1690-1800*, students can locate records related to women’s “criminal” activity and situate them within a world of economic limitations and draconian legal punishments. Such records expand the understanding of women’s experiences of the period. Using either the Bodleian’s or UCSB’s broadside/ballad archive in conjunction with the **formative women on women and ballads** by Ruth Perry or Paula McDowell enables students to think about women’s contributions to a non-elite, truly popular discourse and its importance in conveying news and information. Searching the *Legacies of British Slave-ownership* database, created by the Centre for the Study of the Legacies of British Slave-ownership at University College, London, reveals to students the number of women who had a financial interest in slave-ownership, providing the opportunity to reconsider both abolitionist writing by women at the end of the century and women’s complicated relationship with England’s colonial interests. Similarly, a tag search in *Orlando* for a term of interest (e.g. “prison,” “war,” “preaching,” or, in concert with the Legacies of British Slave-ownership database, “slave”) uncovers important and often ignored information about women writer’s participation in eighteenth-century culture.

For me, one of the most powerful examples of women’s non-domestic writing, and writing often regarded as surprising or strange, is women’s writing about war. The material reality of wartime made its effects nearly inescapable. Individuals were reminded daily that they lived in what Mary Favret terms “wartime,” the everyday state of war. While removed from actual military engagement, women bore the cultural and emotional weight of war: the restrictions on commerce, increasingly limiting governmental policies, the loss of sons, husbands, or brothers, or their return home as changed individuals. We see women writing about war in drama and fiction, of course, but I want to think for a moment about women writing poetry about war.

Some women wrote vividly about actual military conflicts. For example, following the Battle of Culloden poet Elizabeth Teft, celebrated the Duke of Cumberland’s [“the Butcher”] victory at Culloden, extolling how “his Nature more rapacious grew” and he was “more and more Voracious as he Slew” the defeated Highlanders. Teft wishes that “to a Sword I could transform my Pen” so she would be better able to “destroy the Treason.” Similarly Esther Lewis Clark, recounting the British defeat at the Battle of Val during the war of Austrian Succession in 1747, graphically summons the image of the battle field.

Of slaughter’d soldiers heaps on heaps arise,
And dying groans, and prayers pierce the skies;
The horse and rider both together slain,
Promiscuous strew with mangl’d limbs the plain;

From mingl'd heaps of undistinguish'd clay,
 A boiling, reeking torrent flows away;
 The gaping sluices pour a crimson flood,
 And foreign soils are drench'd with English blood.

Using these two poems in conjunction with London newspapers from 1745-46, with details of the trials of the rebels or advertisements for staged reenactments before the main production in theatrical houses, provides a vital sense of how popular culture vividly responded to this crisis. Adding excerpts from Eliza Haywood's brief, post-rebellion periodical *The Parrot* adds another layer of detail and removes a frequently taught author from her familiar surroundings.

Poet Mary Barber, despite often being characterized as a poet presenting “‘ordinary’ domestic life both in Ireland and in England,”¹ is a writer whose most effective and powerful poems actually depict the financial and emotional consequences of war. She deftly subverts the familiar elements of the domestic—a wife, mother, a home—and illustrates their unnatural manifestation in a world where the “thankless State” fails to provide pensions owed to widows of military officers. In a poem about an officer's pension-less and thus impoverished widow, the Widow is rendered unrecognizable to her children, completely undomesticated. “Wild as Winds” she “Rove[s] thro’ the Streets.../ With tatter’d Garments, and dishevell’d Hair.”² Homeless and “by cruel Treatment tir’d,” she sleeps, “A Stone thy Pillow, the cold Earth thy Bed” (ll. 16, 18). The poem concludes with a vision of soldiers, “*Britain’s* Martial Sons” (l. 20), hesitating on the battlefield, haunted by the image of their children hungry and their wives “into Prisons thrown; / and unreliev’d in Iron Bondage groan” (ll. 25-6). In the hands of the female poet, the familiar domestic unit is rendered strange when characterized in wartime.

Later in the century, Bristol poet Jane Cave Winscom writes a series of poems that condemn British foreign policy in connection with the “American War,” when the ministry “Fancy’d a thousand men or two / Could all AMERICA subdue” (ll. 31, 33-34). Winscom vividly describes the human cost to the British nation attempting to retain control of America: “But thrice ten thousand cross’d the main, / A million’s in the contest slain . . . AMERICA’s un-conqu’red still” (ll. 35-38). Similarly, her poem detailing the events of the Bristol Bridge Riot—a riot second only to the Gordon riots in terms of casualties—recounts the events of 30 September 1793 when the Herefordshire militia fired into a crowd of unarmed people gathered on and near the Bristol Bridge, killing eleven and wounding forty-five men, women and children. Winscom’s detailed poem about this startling event laments the shooting of innocent citizens, while remaining attentive to the untenable situation of the militia, compelled to fire as ordered or risk charges of insubordination and the punishments that follow. One of the most vivid images in the poem is the imagined military punishment of an insubordinate soldier who refuses to fire:

. . . with his arms to halberds ty’d,
 In streaming blood had soon been dy’d,
 While lash succeeding lash had flown,
 And stript the culprit to the bone!

The most graphic image of violence in the poem—the flogging of a soldier—might remind us of another, less well-remembered reference to a flogging by that most familiar and allegedly apolitical of authors, Jane Austen, the moment from Chapter Twelve in Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice* when Kitty and Lydia return to Longbourn and report the “information” from the militia stationed in the town of Meryton: “Much had been done, and much had been said in the regiment since the preceding Wednesday; several of the officers had dined lately with their uncle, a private had been flogged, and it had actually been hinted that Colonel Forster was going to be married.”³ That example, like the others I’ve just shared, might convince us to regard women writers as most decidedly not-domestic. Women’s poems about war are located in the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, individual poems in *ECCO*, and in collections of verse. For poems from the latter part of the century, Betty T. Bennett’s *British War Poetry in the Age of Romanticism, 1793-1815* also provides an extremely useful repository of materials searchable by author.

Some of Johnson’s other definitions for “strange” offer opportunities for taking a different approach to women’s writing. Thinking about **strange** as that which is **odd, irregular, or not according to the common way**, reminds us of women’s experimentation with genre. Scholars of prose fiction have long discussed the experimental nature of Haywood’s prose, and considered the prolonged sequences of embedded narratives that fill the novels of her biggest rival in the marketplace Penelope Aubin. In fact, I would suggest that sequence of narratives reminds us of the strangeness of the form and the degree to which we have naturalized twenty-first century habits of linear reading in a way that maybe doesn’t apply for first-generation readers. Women also experimented with poetic genres such as the ode (the most dominant poetic form) and kinds, such as the friendship poem. The irregular occurs on the level of meter. A striking example is Metabel Wright’s poem about the death of her newborn, which she writes in seven-syllable poetic form commonly known as “Nabby Pamby” as she flags in the title.

While I’ve briefly begun to suggest how we can create an “estrangement” in our teaching of eighteenth-century women’s writing, that effort of estrangement and resistance must continue. The moment scholars and students become comfortable, content, and overly familiar with the current understandings and the state of the field is the moment they risk losing a heightened awareness of strange and wonderful interpretative possibilities. While recovery as it was originally conceived may be nearing completion, scholars must still ask what remains to be done and how can we continue to move forward?

Certainly it is imperative that scholars continue to recover women writers’ texts and ensure their dissemination in affordable, accessible forms. Further, the extensive number of digitized texts on both proprietary databases such as Early English Books Online (EEBO) or Eighteenth-Century Editions Online (ECCO) and open-source resources such as HathiTrust or Google Books means students and scholars can increasingly find materials previously available only in archives and research libraries. Other databases and the search capacity they afford have also fundamentally changed the nature of scholarship. British newspapers found in the *Burney Collection of Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Newspapers* or the *Nichols Collection of Seventeenth and Eighteenth-*

Century Newspapers, court proceedings in *The Proceedings of the Old Bailey, 1674-1913* (see below), or poems and other content in the searchable *Gentleman's Magazine* database which enables the identification of often anonymous female contributors (see below), all allow scholars and students to gather data at a level of detail previously unimaginable. Women, often rendered invisible by earlier methodologies and cataloguing systems, become newly visible and populate these eighteenth-century cultural texts. No longer discursive ghosts, their presence waits to be revealed as they are more fully situated within the cultural, literary, and historical context.

All these resources facilitate the kind of high-level bibliographic work that more precisely and carefully locates women writers within print culture—work essential for scholarship on women writers to continue to move forward. Such focused scrutiny, common with generations of male writers, reveals particular modifications in women's commercial interactions, their narrative experimentation, and fine gradations of self-presentation within print culture. The availability of primary texts through digital and print resources should compel scholars and students to move beyond those authors and texts already widely familiar (although, to be sure, work on the canon of women writers is hardly exhausted). Writers across all genres warrant more attention both in their own right and in connection with their contemporaries. Scholars and students of women writers must not be content with the gains gotten heretofore—rather, they must push beyond the “canonized.” Requiring students to read facsimile editions available through ECCO or HathiTrust forces them to confront the typographical oddities, irregular punctuation, and non-standardized spelling that in turn forces them to read the texts differently and regard them as texts from a living culture very different from our own.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Bibliographical Appendix

Below is a list of some open source databases that I regularly use in my teaching to provide students with specific points of entry in to the culture of eighteenth-century England. This list is intended to be representative, not exhaustive; in fact, I welcome any suggestions from other databases colleagues have found particularly useful in their teaching of women writers.

Adverts250 project: <https://adverts250project.org>

Betty T. Bennett, *British War Poetry in the Age of Romanticism 1793-1815*:

<http://www.rc.umd.edu/editions/warpoetry/intro.html>

British History Online: <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>

Broadside Ballads Online from the Bodleian Library:

<http://ballads.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/>

The Grub Street Project: <http://grubstreetproject.net/index.php>

Internet Library of Early Journals, which includes the *Gentleman's Magazine*

(1731-1750): <http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/ilej/>

Legacies of British Slave Ownership: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk.lbs/Proprietary>

London Lives 1690-1800: <https://www.londonlives.org/index.jsp>

Old Bailey Online: <https://www.oldbaileyonline.org/>

The Poetry of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1731 – 1800: An Electronic Database of Titles, Authors, and First Lines:

<http://www.gmpoetrydatabase.org/db/index.php>

Transatlantic Slave Voyages Database: <http://www.slavevoyages.org/>

University of California, Santa Barbara English Broadside Ballad Archive:

<https://ebba.english.ucsb.edu/>

Notes

1. Bernard Tucker, "'Our Chief Poetess': Mary Barber and Swift's Circle Author(s)." *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (December, 1993), 31-44; see p. 32.

2. "On Seeing an Officer's Widow distracted, who had been driven to Despair, by a long and fruitless Sollicitation for the Arrears of her *Pension*," p. 234, lines 11-3.

3. Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, edited by Pat Rogers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 67.

Revisiting Patrick Colquhoun (1745-1820): 'one of the great Glaswegians of the Eighteenth century'

by Arun Sood

In early February 2016, I began work on a collaborative project between the University of Glasgow and Glasgow Life – an umbrella organisation that facilitates and promotes sports and culture in the Scottish city. As a postdoctoral intern, working with both museum curators and academic staff, I was tasked with exploring the neglected history of Kelvingrove House: the original home of Glasgow's municipal museum collections (demolished and replaced by the much bigger Kelvingrove Art Gallery & Museum in 1901). It was during this project, which culminated in the compilation of a museum resource pack, that I came to be fascinated by the life and historical legacy of a man who has previously been described as 'one of the great Glaswegians of the Eighteenth century'¹ – Patrick Colquhoun (1745-1820).

Patrick Colquhoun & Kelvingrove House

In 1782, Glasgow merchant Patrick Colquhoun acquired 12 acres of land from the son of Alexander Wotherspoon, writer in Glasgow, in order to construct a country mansion on the western fringe of Glasgow that came to be known as Kelvingrove House. Some 88 years later, long after Colquhoun had passed and the residential property changed hands four times, the estate was purchased by the Corporation of Glasgow, and converted into the city's first municipal museum in 1870. While, as I have established, this date marks the beginning of Glasgow's original municipal museum collections, my research

into the earlier, residential period of the house has proved to be equally fascinating – particularly with regards to Colquhoun.

Patrick Colquhoun is largely remembered for two main reasons. First, he was the founder of Glasgow's Chamber of Commerce in 1783 (during which time he was also Lord Provost); and second, he led and instigated pioneering police reform in London where he lived and worked from 1792 until his death in 1820. In addition to historiography, this dualistic legacy continues to be materially maintained by the portraits that still hang, hundreds of miles apart, in the Glasgow City Chambers' and The Thames Police Museum. Moreover, as recently as 2012, a Colquhoun Dinner was held in Glasgow; a tradition which began in 1938 to commemorate Glasgow's 'Illustrious Forebears' in commerce and industry. At the first Colquhoun Dinner, for example, the keynote speaker R. A. Maclean, praised Colquhoun for playing 'a leading part' in Glasgow's civic progress, particularly by 'developing the cotton industry.'² Later accounts described Colquhoun as 'one of the great Glaswegians of the Eighteenth century,' and he has also been commemorated by the University of Glasgow's Department of Economic and Social History through the Colquhoun Lectureship in Business History.

However, as socio-economic historians of Glasgow continue to probe contentious connections between eighteenth-century mercantile wealth and slavery, it is perhaps unsurprising that Colquhoun, and correspondingly his Kelvingrove country estate, should come under fresh scrutiny.

Colquhoun, Colonial Trade & Slavery

It is clear that Patrick Colquhoun's house and corresponding estate was an ostentatious symbol of his elite status and refinement. Yet questions remain over the extent of Colquhoun's – and by consequence his country estate's – links with slavery and colonial trade. Recent studies on eighteenth-century Liverpool and West Country merchants, for example, have revealed that profits from slave-produced goods often enabled proprietors of stately homes to play 'increasingly genteel roles as magistrates, MP's and patrons of the arts.'³ Was this also the case for Patrick Colquhoun, the 'great Glaswegian' and Lord Provost of the city between 1782 and 1784?

T.M. Devine has suggested that Colquhoun's Kelvingrove House was similar to James Buchan's (Glasgow-based) 'Virginia Mansion' and John McCall's 'Black House' in that it was an unmistakable indication of eighteenth-century mercantile wealth.⁴ While the juxtaposition of Colquhoun with these prominent Glaswegian 'tobacco lords' is significant, relatively little has been written about his early accumulation of wealth and involvement in the tobacco trade. A short 1818 early biography of Colquhoun, titled *A Biographical sketch of the life and writings of Patrick Colquhoun* and written by his son-in-law Grant David Yeats (under the pseudonym 'Iatros') outlines formative years spent in the colony of Virginia, for the purpose of following commercial views. The biography further states that Colquhoun returned to Scotland as tensions grew between Britain and America in the 1760s, and was later a principal contributor to a fund for raising a regiment for his majesty's service from the population of Glasgow. It's significant that Colquhoun spent time in Virginia during Glasgow's 'golden age' of tobacco and opposed the

American Revolution (which in effect cut out the need for Glasgow merchants).

According to Devine, there were six main Glasgow-based tobacco syndicates trading in North America: the Cunnighame group, the Speirs group, the Glassford group, the Buchanan-Jamieson group, the Thomson-McCall group and the Donald group. These groups could be broken down further into different sub-companies and individual partnerships. For example, within the Alexander Speirs group there were three companies: Speirs, Bowman and Co., Speirs, French and Co., and, crucially, Patrick Colquhoun and Co., thus revealing that Colquhoun directly profited from the tobacco trade, which of course, depended upon slave-labor.

It was also in Virginia that Colquhoun developed his interest in protecting the rights of Glasgow merchants involved in colonial trade, which would later manifest in his establishment of the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce. Crucial to remember, then, is that Colquhoun was hugely influential in protecting the rights of a close circle of 'elite' merchants who reaped the socio-economic rewards from slave-produced goods; first tobacco and then later sugar and cotton when trade interests turned to the West Indies after the American Revolution. In addition to the impact of the American War, which saw colonists finally usurp Scottish dominance of the tobacco trade, industrial developments in the cotton trade and other manufacturing industries meant that the crop was no longer the dominant commercial focus when Colquhoun established the Chamber of Commerce in 1783.

Colquhoun regularly lobbied in London on behalf of Glasgow's merchants and by 1785 he was the leading spokesman for British cotton manufactures whilst also acting as the London agent for the planters of St Vincent, Nevis, Dominica and the Virgin Islands. Colquhoun's involvement with West India Merchants' can be traced back as early as 1779. In the November 18 issue of *The Gazetteer and New Daily Advertiser*, for example, Colquhoun's name appears on a subscription list of a 'general meeting of the planters and merchants concerned in the island of Jamaica.' Colquhoun was one of eleven Glasgow-based merchants who contributed to a fund for 'a Regiment, which his Majesty has been graciously pleased to order to be immediately raised for service in the said island.' Colquhoun's relationship with West India merchants was to be longstanding, and it was in fact a group of London-based West India merchants who encouraged and funded his establishment of the Thames River Police between 1797 and 1800.

Stephen Mullen has recently developed the argument that a 'Glasgow-West India elite' assisted Scottish economic development 'as conduits of commerce and capital,' pushing towards a wider recognition of how 'chattel slavery assisted the Industrial Revolution through successive stages in the west of Scotland.'⁵ Although Colquhoun had moved to London by the time the Glasgow West India Association (GWIA) formed as an official organisation in 1807, their first meeting was held in the Tontine Tavern – a coffee house that Colquhoun was instrumental in establishing as the great rendezvous of the Glasgow business community. In addition to his professional links with individuals within the association and close working relationship with London-based West India merchants, it is clear that Colquhoun formed part of this 'elite' network of merchants.

Unlike several other West Indian merchants directly involved in trade,

Colquhoun does not appear to have publicly opposed abolition. However, his close links with the GWIA (who campaigned against emancipation); previous profiting from slave-produced tobacco in North America; and candid remarks about slaves and slavery in relation to economic profit clearly suggests his complicity with, even advocacy of, slave-based economic growth. In his *Plan for Establishing a Chamber of Commerce*, for example, Colquhoun pointed to a successful episode where Liverpool merchants had used their ‘combined strength’ to complete a ‘negotiation regarding the duty on slaves’ in which ‘a saving was established to the merchants.’⁶ Over a decade later, Colquhoun estimated – notably without condemnation – Britain’s imperial slave population at 1.15 million (in his 1815 pamphlet *Treatise on the Wealth, Power and Resources of the British Empire*). It is clear, then, that he deemed slave colonies a valuable, indeed powerful, imperial resource, and of course had directly benefited from a slave-based economy through both his involvement in the tobacco trade and business links with West Indian merchants.

Having established Patrick Colquhoun’s professional endeavours and situated him firmly among Glasgow’s late-eighteenth-century ‘mercantile elite,’ we might justifiably suggest that the very history of Kelvingrove House is inseparable from wider, admittedly complex, issues surrounding eighteenth-century mercantile wealth and ‘Scotland’s slavery past.’ We might also, then, think more carefully about the (suitability of) commemorative practices that continue to uphold Colquhoun as one of ‘the great Glaswegians of the eighteenth century.’

Visiting Fulbright Scholar, Georgetown University

Notes

1. *The Glasgow Herald*, March 29 1969.
2. *Colquhoun Dinner Papers, No. 1* (Glasgow: Glasgow Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1944).
3. Madge Dresser, ‘Slavery and West Country Houses’ in *Slavery and the British Country House* ed. by Madge Dresser and Andrew Hann (Swindon: English Heritage, 2013), p. 41.
4. T.M. Devine, *Glasgow: Beginnings to 1830* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), p. 164.
5. Stephen Mullen, ‘A Glasgow West India Merchant House and the Imperial Dividend, 1779-1867’ in *Recovering Scotland’s Slavery Past*, ed. by Tom M. Devine (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), p. 233.
6. Patrick Colquhoun, *Heads of a Plan for Establishing a Chamber of Commerce And Manufacturers In The City of Glasgow, comprehending the towns of Paisley, Port-Glasgow, Greenock, And The Places Adjacent* (Glasgow, 1782), p. 14.



Teaching, and Feeling, Poetry at Graeme Park

by Rodney Mader

“I think an old Family seat going to Decay is really a pensive Sight,” the poet Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson wrote to her friend Annis Boudinot Stockton in 1793, adding that “the Second Letter in a Sentimental Novel calld Julia Roubigne has a most Excelent Discription of that kind in it.” This note was appended to a passage in her long poem, “The Deserted Wife,” which narrates, among other things, her struggles to keep her family home, Graeme Park. The historic home in Horsham, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, has been going to decay for two centuries and counting, but, mercifully, it’s still standing. Graeme Park is about an hour’s drive from my institution, West Chester University, and I’ve taken students from four classes (undergrad and grad) to the site for what has consistently proven to be a vibrant learning experience. I recently asked some former students what they took away from the visit. Peter Connolly, a grad student who visited during a late spring snow squall in April 2016, remembers: “we were in the parlor reading passages from Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson’s “The Deserted Wife.” It would not be such a stretch to say that we went back to her if only for a few moments. It was her words, the snow, and the class ending. We were all close to her melancholy that Saturday.” Okay... I didn’t say it was a *joyful* experience... but it is always a moving one.

The classes that go to Graeme Park are seminars with fewer than eighteen students, and are focused on Philadelphia literary culture in the eighteenth century. We usually study Fergusson toward the end of the semester. The students know from her biography how much she loved Graeme Park and how hard she fought to keep it, initially because it was judged to be the property of a traitor, and later because she was impoverished. The story of her tribulations is gripping. In 1777, her husband of five years, Henry Hugh Fergusson, worked as commissary of prisoners for the British during their occupation of Philadelphia.

These actions resulted in a writ of attainder that meant, following the laws of coverture, that Elizabeth's home would become the property of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. For many years during and after the war, Elizabeth used all of her energy, intellect and social capital to contest the attainder. Fortunately, as a renowned poet and host of a salon frequented by Philadelphia's elite, she had many friends who helped her, and she eventually convinced the Commonwealth to recognize her ownership. But, as a result of these struggles, she alienated many of her friends, her husband repatriated to Great Britain, and her personal finances were all but exhausted.

Graeme Park was a fine seat. It was built, about twenty miles north of Philadelphia, by Governor James Keith in the 1720s, and bought by his son-in-law Dr. Thomas Graeme. Dr. Graeme improved the property considerably, putting in a deer park and gardens and updating the interiors to the latest Georgian style. Although most of the property was sold off over the centuries, the house still bears the mark of Dr. Graeme, and stands as one of the finest such interiors from Colonial Pennsylvania remaining *in situ*.

I volunteered at Graeme Park for many years, and served on the Board of The Friends of Graeme Park, so we have the run of the place when we visit. The students join in my delight as I am given the grand brass key to the front door by an employee of the Friends. It is weighty and antiquarian, although I suspect it dates from the early twentieth century. The students always want to hold it themselves, and sometimes want to turn the key in the lock; it is worth it for its satisfying clack. Once inside, I always fiddle with the key as we move from room to room, talking about the house and its inhabitants, and by the end of the visit my hands smell like pennies.

It's usually quiet and cold in the home at the time of year when we visit. With its high ceilings and large windows, it is a typical summer house, meant to stay cool well into June. It's not electrified, so entering each room involves opening the tall wooden shutters to let the light in, making every room a bit of an unveiling. What's discovered are Georgian rooms of decreasing levels of formality as we ascend. The first-floor parlor (illustrated on the cover) is the most stunning, with its pediments, dentil molding, and marble fireplace. The white paint of the parlor is thought to be original to the Graemes, evidenced by its having patinated to a cinereous green. Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson made her reputation as a poet and intellectual on the basis of her manuscripts as well as her mixed-gender salons during the 1760s-70s. Her oeuvre is Augustan; most of her work is in heroic couplets. Standing in the parlor, discussing prosody with the students, there is an automatic dawn of recognition connecting the symmetry and balance in evidence in the parlor to the order and regularity of heroic couplets. What's more, the fact that the parlor features a fake door, added solely for symmetry, helps to explain the ease of extending a line with an extra word, or reducing it with an ellipsis, in order to make it scan correctly. The parlor's neoclassical design is not only the architectural frame of the salon, but the cousin of the poems themselves.

I have died on almost every field trip. It enhances the experience. Students look out the second-floor window where Elizabeth stood while fretfully waiting to tell her father about her secret marriage to Henry. Elizabeth had been introduced to Henry by Benjamin Rush in the fall of 1771, and they married soon after in March of 1772. They kept the marriage from Dr. Graeme, who

objected to the union; among other reasons, Henry was eleven years younger than Elizabeth and none too promising. They lived separately for a few months until Elizabeth couldn't stand it anymore. She resolved to tell her father on September 4th, and watched from her bedroom window as he walked through the garden and suddenly dropped dead. I station the students at the window as I scurry out into the yard and begin the pantomime of walking through the garden. I clutch my chest, stumble a bit, lower myself to the ground, and expire. In the moment, students love the drama of it. Afterwards, I tell them what Elizabeth said about her father's death: that she was relieved she hadn't told him about the secret marriage to Henry, or else she would have blamed herself for his death. We talk about the complexity of that feeling and its articulation. I know that these sorts of antics aren't to everyone's taste, and I am well aware that I am, in part, satisfying my own performative inclinations. At the same time, though, this is a way to lock in the content; it's affective, kinesthetic, and synesthetic. Sean Ivins, who visited in Fall of 2010, attests to this: "For some reason I remember the smell of the house quite a bit... I will never forget huddling together around two old windows to see your glorious reenactment... And I will always remember the name, Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson."

Graeme Park is supported by the Friends group, having been all but abandoned by the Pennsylvania Museum and Historical Commission, who owns the site but provides no personnel. The Friends are mainly local people with an interest in history and a real affection for the home. School tours are offered at the house, and you can have your wedding photos taken there. There are Valentine's Day and Mother's Day events, and every year at Halloween, Ghost Tours, where the Friends recount tales of strange noises and the lovelorn woman behind them. I am not a big fan of this spiritualization of Elizabeth, but I appreciate the work of the Friends to preserve the home, and I am not willing to disrespect their methods. But I am interested in a different kind of haunting; the kind of haunting that comes as a visceral feeling when you connect to a historical figure whose work you have read and to whom you now connect to more deeply. I believe that many of my students get that feeling, and that they don't soon forget it. That haunting—the recurrence of a powerful feeling of connection to a person, place, and a body of work—is why I return to Graeme Park with students again and again. Travis Pearson, who also visited six years ago, puts it well: "The value of a trip like that, to me, is the opportunity to connect what we studied in class to something more tangible and historical. It's one thing to examine the writings and life of Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson in a classroom setting, but it's another to see the actual house she called home and the rooms where Fergusson hosted salons hundreds of years before. I think there is value any time you can look at a subject from a different perspective."

I am incredibly lucky that "my poet's" home is still standing, in pretty good shape, and within driving distance. If you're visiting the Philadelphia area, put Graeme Park on your itinerary (<http://www.graemepark.org/>); if you can work it into a trip with some of your students, even better. It's an important place, and, as Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson might have wished, it remains "a pensive Sight."

West Chester University

Editorial note: For the two photographic illustrations of Graeme Park, we gratefully acknowledge the support of the Prints and Photographs Division of the Library of Congress. The citations are as follows:

Northwest front - Graeme Park, 859 County Line Road, Horsham, Montgomery County, PA. Photograph. Historic American Buildings Survey. National Park Service. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA. <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/pp.print>. HABS Number HABS PA,46-HORM,1--1. Accessed February 28, 2017.

Interior, first floor, northeast room from northeast - Graeme Park, 859 County Line Road, Horsham, Montgomery County, PA, Photograph. Historic American Buildings Survey. National Park Service. Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.pnp/pp.print>. HABS Number HABS PA,46-HORM,1--4. Accessed February 28, 2017.

“The Dreams of Avarice”: Samuel Johnson and Edward Moore¹

by Anthony W. Lee

One of the choicest moments in Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* occurs when, in 1781, after the death of Henry Thrale, Johnson, as an executor of his friend’s estate, seeks to command a hefty profit from the sale of Thrale’s brewery:

Lord Lucan tells a very good story, which, if not precisely exact, is certainly characteristic: that when the sale of Thrale’s brewery was going forward, Johnson appeared bustling about, with an ink-horn and pen in his button-hole, like an excise-man; and on being asked what he really considered to be the value of the property which was to be disposed of, answered, “We are not here to sell a parcel of boilers and vats, but the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice.”²

This concluding sentence is one of the distinctly great Johnsonian utterances. It has the stylistic flair of his other memorable sayings: “when a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully,” or “these were the dreams of a poet doomed at last to wake a lexicographer.” In the “avarice” apothegm, Johnson poises a specific description with series of percussive phonemes, “parcel of boilers and vats,” against an abstract phrase suffused with soft vowels and smooth consonants, “rich beyond the dreams of avarice.” The semantic collision between the two phrases, one homely and concrete, the other hyperbolic and conceptual, is reinforced by Johnson’s deployment of structural parallelism and antithesis. We have here a near perfect example of the Johnsonian *bon mot*, a mini-text at once strong, witty, and aesthetically alert. One might be forgiven surprise, therefore, upon discovering that the phrase “rich beyond the dreams of avarice” is not original to Johnson. The standard Hill-Powell edition of Boswell’s *Life* does not flag the words with quotations marks or italics that would suggest an external source for Lucan’s anecdote, and it offers no footnote suggesting an attribution.³ Yet while the

expression is not Johnson's own creation, it is his *invention*, in the eighteenth-century Latinate sense of the word, which means "discovered" rather than "generated." In fact, the trope goes back at least to the Silver Age of Latin literature, there specifically, and thus some 1700 years before the brewery episode, to the words *inanis avaritiae somnia* written by the younger Seneca in his *De beneficiis*.

Perhaps Johnson was aware of this root source, one which we shall return later. However, a more recent intertext directly informs the remark recorded in *Boswell's Life*. Recently, when seeking to illuminate the topical allusions in Arthur Murphy's *To Mr. Johnson, AM: A Poetical Epistle*, a satirical imitation of Boileau's second satire, I became aware of the poet, fabulist, and dramatist Edward Moore. A friend to Thomas Francklin—the principal butt of Murphy's 1760 satire,—Moore is best remembered today for *The Gamester*, his contribution to the once-popular genre of domestic bourgeois tragedy. In Act three, Scene five of the play, the heroine, Mrs. Beverley proclaims: "You have not ruin'd me. I have no Wants when You are present, nor Wishes in your Absence, but to be bless'd with your Return. Be but resign'd to what has happen'd, and I am rich beyond the Dreams of Avarice."⁴ The following remarks offer to investigate more carefully this intertextual appropriation of Johnson's, and further, to use it as a spring board from which to explore the relationship between Johnson and Moore, one that has been neglected by all literary historians I have consulted. My examination exposes a number of points that students of both Johnson and the British eighteenth century should find of summoning interest, including the robust presence of Moore in the *Dictionary* and the possible verification of an admission to the Johnsonian canon.

Edward Moore and *The Gamester*

Edward Moore (1712-57) was a significant if minor English poet, playwright, essayist, and editor.⁵ He was brought up in a dissenting household, and the firm moral outlook ingrained from his early familial environment and education would later be reflected in his literary work. Seen *in toto*, his published writings sought to reform the morals and manners of society (an ethical trait that that Johnson would have found appealing). After the failure of his initial career as a linen factor, Moore turned to literature for his financial support. He wrote a libretto for the distinguished English composer William Boyce, as well as publishing some minor verses. His most prominent works include the 1744 *Fables for the Female Sex*, a resurrection of the popular genre practiced by John Gay earlier in the century. This book went through multiple editions and was translated into French and German. Moore's editorship, under the pseudonym Adam Fitz-Adam, of Robert Dodsley's periodical essay series *The World* (1753-56) was also a success, particularly among the fashionable elite to whom it was specifically addressed. Of Moore's three plays, the first, *The Foundling* (1748), and the third, *The Gamester* (1753), were triumphs of the stage—the latter despite the attacks launched by some of his literary enemies, including Tobias Smollett and William Shenstone. *The Gamester* remained popular on the boards in England and America until the mid-nineteenth century and was immensely influential in France and Germany.⁶ Three years after *The Gamester* was first staged, the last number of *The World* (No. 209, 30 December 1756) announced the conclusion of the series due to the untimely death of Adam

Fitz-Adam—a case of life ironically imitating art, as Moore himself fell ill and died a mere two months later, on 1 March 1757. While reasonably popular in his day, and a familiar name to many of the leading writers and wits of his day, including Lord Chesterfield, Lord Lyttelton, Oliver Goldsmith, Henry Fielding, David Garrick—and Samuel Johnson,—he is little read today, a descent into comparative oblivion largely due to the fact that one of the vital ingredients that contributed toward his contemporary success, an unabashed appeal to sentimentality, has grown insipid to modern tastes.

In *The Gamester*, the “dreams of avarice” scene falls almost midway through the play. The prodigal Mr. Beverley has brought his family to near ruin, due to the combination of his habitual excessive gambling and his naive susceptibility to the machinations of the play’s villain, Stukely, his seeming friend who in fact plots to destroy him. The “avarice” speech, spoken, as we have seen, by Beverley’s devoted and long-suffering wife, expresses her sincere conviction that the tiny domestic world she shares with her husband is the highest form of wealth conceivable to her. In a move of calculated dramatic irony, her speech falls just before Beverley frantically entreats his wife to give over to him her jewels, the last remnants of her fortune. She gladly does so, without a single note of reproach, thus emphatically contrasting Beverley’s mercenary and self-destructive ways with her loving patience and trust.

Comparison of this *Gamester* scene with the avarice anecdote in the *Life of Johnson* yields a stark contrast between Moore’s sentimentalism and Johnson’s mercantile pragmatism. The “bustling” executor’s “dreams of avarice” remark glowingly approves the use of financial investment to attain opulence. His Madison Avenue-style declaration appeals directly to the financial and material aspirations that Mrs. Beverley so firmly abjures. The conjunction of these polar oppositions invites commentary on at least two important fronts. First of all, it urges recognition that Johnson was well acquainted with poverty, such that he frequently would denounce those who sought to idealize that unhappy human state. Secondly, Johnson, while not properly a businessman—he put his own financial affairs under the handling of his friend, the bookseller William Strahan,—imagined that he would have been an excellent one. Just as he was pained at the thought of having missed his chance at becoming a lawyer, his knowledge of and readiness to theorize upon finance and economy marks a striking aspect of his character and personality.⁷ Hence, we may be permitted to discover in the “avarice” anecdote evidence for Johnson’s hard-headed, common-sense acknowledgment and expression of the material realities that condition human life.

Hester Thrale’s diary entry 1 May 1781 vividly captures the fervor of Johnson’s mercantile ardor:

If an Angel from Heaven had told me 20 Years ago, that the Man I knew by the Name of *Dictionary Johnson* should one Day become Partner with me in a great Trade, & that we should jointly or separately sign Notes Draughts &c. for 3 or 4 Thousand Pounds of a Morning, how unlikely it would have seemed ever to happen! . . . it would have seemed incredible: neither of us then being worth a Groat God knows, & both as immeasurably removed from Commerce, as Birth Literature & Inclination could set us. Johnson however; who desires above all other Good the Accumulation of new Ideas,

is but too happy with his present Employment; & the Influence I have over him added to his own solid Judgment and Regard for Truth, will at last find it *in a small degree* difficult to win him from the dirty Delight of seeing his Name in a new Character flaming away at the bottom of Bonds & Leases.⁸

Hester Thrale's independently sourced version corroborates the "certainly characteristic" authenticity of Lord Lucan's story found in Boswell: in both, we witness in Johnson's attitude an ironically corrosive antidote to Moore's sentimental intertext.

The humor of the moment seems to pass unnoticed by Boswell, who was evidently unaware of the allusion to Moore. However, from our later vantage, the application of this irony to the latter's play and to the lives of both Thrale and Johnson invites further scrutiny. In *The Gamester*, the words are uttered by a woman whose trust in her husband is about to be betrayed and cruelly manipulated, as he robs and abandons her, eventually committing suicide. In the Lucan anecdote from *Boswell's Life*, Johnson's characterization of the brewery sale references a woman, Mrs. Thrale, recently widowed, whose husband had also emotionally neglected and abused her. The irony is compounded and extended upon the realization that Thrale's death was apparently self-imposed—a slow suicide, as it seemed to concerned friends and family members, including Johnson himself. James L. Clifford writes in his authoritative biography of Hester Piozzi: "On Monday, April 2, 1781, Johnson, Baretti, and Sir Philip Jennings Clerke were guests at dinner, when their host ate so voraciously that it seemed to all an act of defiance [of his doctor's orders], and to Johnson, almost deliberate suicide."⁹ Two days later, Thrale died, with his wife and Johnson attending at his bedside.

Both Beverley and Thrale possessed loyal wives, women who suppressed their own needs and desires to satisfy the demands of their husbands. And in both cases, their spouses let them down: Thrale emotionally and psychologically (he was a notorious adulterer who distanced himself from his wife immediately after their marriage, wanting only a social trophy and a male son to carry on his name), and Beverley in just about every imaginable way.¹⁰ Johnson's intimacy with the Thrales, as a perpetual house guest at Streatham with his own bedroom, urges our recognition of his awareness of these intricate complexities.

As noted above, the "dreams of avarice" phrase was not original to Edward Moore. The first-century Roman Seneca the Younger wrote in his *De beneficiis*:

Evils that we will, that originate from our own character, that have in them nothing which can be put before the eyes, nothing that can be held in the hand—the mere dreams of empty Avarice [*inanis avaritiae somnia*]! Wretched, indeed, is he who can take delight in the huge record of his estate, in his vast tracts of land ... in huge herds and flocks ... in private palaces that cover more ground than great cities! (7.10.4-5)¹¹

If we calibrate this passage with the two later texts, Moore's and Boswell's, we find the ironies noted before even more sharply accentuated. Where Mrs. Beverley echoes Seneca's traditional moral observation, Johnson undermines it. Indeed, the details of greed that Seneca condemns closely map Johnson's own self-congratulatory bustle amidst the vats and parcels: "taking delight in the

huge record of his estate, in his vast tracts of land ... in huge herds and flocks ... [and] private palaces." The alignment of all three scenes exhibits ironies of explosive and expansive force. If he is directly (but silently) quoting Moore with the Senecan precedent in mind, then Johnson is playing a stage role fraught with mischievous irony, "a new Character flaming away at the bottom of Bonds & Leases" in a manner worthy of Garrick, to the audience of Lord Lucan and to Mrs. Thrale's bemused appreciation. We find then in this intertextual triad a verbal artefact constituted by the invisible—but not silent—interstices that unite Johnson (and Boswell) with Seneca and Moore. In this artefact, the three constituent elements are honored with their own innate integrity, before they are compressed into a larger unit that disturbs these integrities by decomposing and then reconstituting them into something fresh and new. While ultimately a reflection of the complex skein comprising the processes of literary history and production, this intertextual moment also rests upon a more tangible base, one that subsists in Johnson and Moore's friendship and the textual fruits this friendship bore in the *Dictionary* and the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

Moore and Johnson

Johnson's appropriation of the lines from *The Gamester* corroborate important connections between the two authors that, to my knowledge, no previous scholar has noted or developed. They were personally acquainted, having, on occasion, met socially, as a remark in one of Johnson's letters to Hester Thrale shows. In 1780 Johnson recalled a dispute between himself and the Whig writer William Melmoth, where "Poor Moore the fabulist was one of the company" (*Letters of Samuel Johnson*, III: 249). Johnson remembers this encounter of some thirty years earlier with vivid clarity—he recalls agonistically reducing Melmoth "to whistle," while his recollection of Moore is more tender. Tom Davies, the actor turned bookseller who facilitated the introduction of Johnson and Boswell, made his inaugural appearance on the London stage in the first production of *The Gamester* playing the role of Stukely—one Johnson very may well have seen in person.¹² Furthermore, many of Moore's pieces from the 1740s and early 1750s were published in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, an organ with which Johnson was at the time closely associated as editor and frequent contributor.¹³ Thus, both direct evidence and circumstantial clues point to a relationship at some level of significance.

It is likely that this personal association was forged and promoted by their common literary interests during this period. Johnson and Moore both attacked the contemporary prevalence of gambling—a vice that rivalled the sorrows of gin in deranging the social stability of the mid-eighteenth century.¹⁴ Also, Johnson's lifelong interest in the importance of "domestick privacies" would have fueled his interest in *The Gamester*. Moore, like John Hawkesworth and others in the early 1750s, started a periodical essay series in imitation of Johnson's *Rambler*. Moore's project, *The World*, was by choice tonally different from Johnson's; as the former himself notes: "My design in this paper is to ridicule, with novelty and good-humour, the fashions, follies, vices and absurdities of that part of the human species which calls itself the WORLD, and to trace it through all its business, pleasures, and amusements."¹⁵ Yet it was Johnson's pioneer periodical series that in part inspired Moore's own.¹⁶ Johnsonians will remember Moore's journal because of its role in the

legendary *contretemps* between Chesterfield and Johnson. It was the former's essays 100 and 101 in *The World* that precipitated the latter's furious rejoinder, the classic *Letter to Chesterfield*. In the event, Moore ran back and forth between the two combatting cultural icons, unsuccessfully seeking an honorable rapprochement.¹⁷ It is worth noting that Johnson's experience with Chesterfield was shared by Moore and his would-be patron, Lord Lyttelton, as Johnson recalls in the "Life of Lyttelton": "Moore courted his favour by an apologetical poem, called *The Trial of Selim*, for which he was paid with kind words, which, as is common, raised great hopes, that at last were disappointed."¹⁸

These interwoven biographical and literary tissues are paralleled and supported by even more important textual interstices. In his Preface to the *Dictionary*, Johnson vowed:

My purpose was to admit no testimony of living authours, that I might not be misled by partiality, and that none of my cotemporaries might have reason to complain; nor have I departed from this resolution, but when some performance of uncommon excellence excited my veneration, when my memory supplied me, from late books, with an example that was wanting, or when my heart, in the tenderness of friendship, solicited admission for a favourite name. (*Yale Edition*, xviii: 95)

He broke his vow on a few occasions, as when he quoted, "in the tenderness of friendship," David Garrick on at least three occasions, Samuel Richardson twice, and Charlotte Lennox a striking twenty times. His veneration "for a favourite name" doubtless compelled him to quote his beloved William Law at least twice.¹⁹ So there is perhaps no greater testament to Johnson's esteem for Moore both the writer and man than his quoting him in the *Dictionary* as an authority multiple times. In 1927 John Homer Caskey cited two instances; in 2006 Roger Lonsdale noted that there were six, without actually naming them.²⁰ I have located and identified five more than Caskey's pair, bringing the known total to seven. Here are the five new ones:

Fire, tenth definition of the noun, "The passion of love," *Fables for the Female Sex*, V (alongside Dryden, Shadwell, and Pope):

New charms shall still increase desire,
And time's swift wing shall fan the *fire*.²¹

Poacher, "One who steals game," *The Foundling* IV.iii:

You old poachers have such a way with you, that all at once the
business is done.

Rattlesnake, "A kind of serpent," *The Foundling* II.iii (alongside Grew, *Museum*):

She loses her being at the very sight of him, and drops plump into his
arms, like a charmed bird into the mouth of a *rattlesnake*.

Tutoress, "Directress; instructress; governess," *The Foundling* II.iii:

Fidelia shall be your *tutoress*.

Yes, first definition in the 1773 revised *Dictionary*, "A term of affirmation; the affirmative particle opposed to *no*," *Fables for the Female Sex* V (alongside Bacon):

Pray, Madam, are you married?—*Yes*.

The fact that three of the five citations above stand beside additional authorities affirms that Johnson's use of Moore was not merely an instance of his scrambling to find "an example that was wanting."

To round out the total, here are the two Caskey identified in 1927:

Fun, "[A low cant word] Sport; high merriment; frolicksome delight":

Gil Blas, Prologue:

Don't mind me, though, for all my *fun* and jokes,
You bards may find us bloods good-natur'd folks.²²

Sneak, first definition of the verb, "To creep slily; to come or go as if

afraid to be seen," *Gil Blas*, Prologue (after Shakespeare [twice], Dryden, and Isaac Watts):

Are you all ready? Here's your musick here:
Author, *sneak* off; we'll tickle you, my dear.²³

The source for these last two, the Prologue to Moore's second play, was, when staged in mid-February 1751, subjected to considerable adverse criticism leveled by the same camp that was to later excoriate *The Gamester*. In this instance, however, the criticisms (or the play's and/or production's own weaknesses) resulted in failure on the boards. The Prologue was reprinted in the February 1751 issue of *Gentleman's Magazine*,²⁴ and an anonymous defense of the play was published in this same issue, one attributed by Chalmers to Johnson.²⁵ Between the Prologue and the defense there of *Gil Blas*, there is enfolded (79-80) a reprint of *Rambler* 91, an allegory upon truth and falsehood that had been published on 29 January. Given these striking propinquities, we need to re-examine the passage more closely, with an eye to whether it was or was not informed by Johnson's pen.

Here are the last two paragraphs, which Arthur Sherbo and Donald Greene have tentatively identified as Johnson's on stylistic grounds, and which J. D. Fleeman notes as "plausibly Johnson's."²⁶

Perhaps indeed the ill success of this comedy is chiefly the effect of the author's having so widely mistaken the character of *Gil Blas*; whom he has degraded from a man of sense, discernment, true humour, and great knowledge of mankind, who never discovered his vanity but in circumstances in which every man would have been vain, to an impertinent, silly, conceited coxcomb, a mere *Lying Valet*, with all the affectation of a fop, and all the insolence of a coward. But tho' he was not at liberty to degrade *Gil Blas*, some applause is certainly due to him for having changed the character of *Isabella*. In the novel she is a woman of virtue, and *Aurora's* stratagem to deprive her of the affection of Don *Lewis* whom she tenderly loved, is so base and cruel, that a good mind regrets her success, and a bad one is encouraged to imitation: But in the play she is a prostitute, that needed only to be known to be hated, and *Aurora* is no more than an instrument in the discovery of her true character.

By the additions of two principal characters, Don *Gabriel* and Don *Felix*, and the incidents which they produce, the story is greatly improved; and by *Aurora's* passing for a twin brother rather than a cousin, the deception is carried on with greater probability. Upon the whole the author appears to

have intended rather entertainment than instruction, and to have disgusted the pit by adapting his comedy to the taste of the galleries.²⁷

If Johnson did write or revise these paragraphs, they would join the canon of other dramatic criticism Greene has identified, such as of Moore's last play, *The Gamester* (*GM*, February 1753), William Mason's *Elfrida* (*GM*, May 1752), and Philip Francis's *Constantine* (*GM*, April 1754).²⁸ The authoritative attribution based on internal evidence offered by Chalmers, Greene, Sherbo, and Fleeman, as well as the external evidence found in the February 1751 *Gentleman's Magazine* noted above, urge us to accept the two final paragraphs as either being directly written by Johnson or as betraying his vigorous editorial reshaping.

The various points raised above seem indisputably to confirm Johnson's awareness of and interest in Moore's poetical and theatrical projects. His support for Moore, moreover, is likely to have been accelerated by the general awareness that Moore was, for much of his life, a distressed poet in need of assistance. Johnson's aid to such unfortunates is legendary. Such sympathy would have been unlikely to wane a few years later when Johnson's intimate friend, David Garrick, agreed to stage *The Gamester* at Drury Lane and play the lead role, Beverley, himself (Caskey, *Edward Moore*, 93-4).

However, Johnson and Moore moved in quite different literary circles, and the greatest divergence between them can be located within the intertextual entanglements explored above. Moore was a popular writer who embraced the dominant literary culture of his day, sentimentality. Johnson, ever the hard-headed realist, willing to be unpopular—in the last *Rambler*, he writes “I have seen the meteors of fashion rise and fall, without any attempt to add a moment to their duration” (*Yale*, v: 316)—resisted this “fad” and remained an obstinate champion of the sober and restrained literary values he inherited from Dryden, Swift, and Pope. It is in turning Moore's weepy sentimentality on its head and extolling “the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice” in a vigorously material sense that we see the intrinsic caliber that distinguishes the two writers. Both experienced the pangs of poverty, but Moore used his literary voice to gloss over them with illusory clichés clinging to a stale popular morality. Johnson used his own voice—and co-opts Moore's voice as well, through intertextual mimicry—in order to put important facts of human existence on a firmer and more realistic footing. In Moore's play we have a flimsy fantasy of an attractive but suspect unconditional love; in Johnson's intertextual appropriation we witness the dreams of this sentimentalist at last awakened to a sober Johnsonian assessment of human nature.

University of the District of Columbia

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was read at the Johnson Society of the Central Region's meeting at Northwestern University in March 2106. I thank conference host Professor Vivasvan Soni as well as the audience present at the reading for their helpful questions and comments; I am also deeply indebted to Christine Jackson-Holzberg for reading and commenting on earlier versions.

2. *Boswell's Life of Samuel Johnson* (ed.) G. B. Hill; rev. L. F. Powell, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (Oxford, 1934-64), 4: 86-87. The estate was eventually sold for £135,000 (more than £5,000,000 in today's currency). For details of the sale, see James L. Clifford, *Hester Lynch Piozzi (Mrs. Thrale)*, 2nd ed. (1968; reprinted, New York: Columbia U. Press, 1987), pp. 200-202.

3. My thanks must go to Professor Thomas Bonnell, who is currently finishing the last volume of *The Yale Edition of James Boswell's Life of Johnson an Edition of the Original Manuscript in Four Volumes*, for checking this for me. The anecdote appears to be based upon private conversation. Charles Bingham, 1st Earl of Lucan (1735-1799) was an Irish politician and member of the Literary Club. For Johnson's intimacy with Lucan, see *Boswell's Life*, 4: 326, 540-41; *The Letters of Samuel Johnson: The Hyde Edition*, ed. Bruce Redford, 5 vols. (Princeton, 1992-94), 3: 213, 251, and 253.

4. 2:7.15-18, Edward Moore, *The Foundling, A Comedy and The Gamester, A Tragedy*, ed. Anthony Amberg (Newark: U. of Delaware Press, 1996), p. 227. In a note to these lines in his edition (p. 325), Amberg points out the connection to Boswell's anecdote (I discovered the connection before picking up Amberg's book), as well as quoting lines from Lillo's *Fatal Curiosity* (1737), "I have wealth / Enough to glut ev'n Avarice itself" (2.1).

5. Some of the sources used in this paper include: Patricia Demers's entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; *The Plays of Edward Moore*, ed. J. Paul Hunter (New York, 1983); Edward Moore, *The Gamester* (1753), introduction by Charles H. Peake and bibliographical note by Philip R. Wiklund (Ann Arbor, 1948); John Homer Caskey, *The Life and Works of Edward Moore* (New Haven, 1927; reprinted Hamden: Archon, 1973) [cited as "Caskey"]; Alexander Chalmers, "Historical and Biographical Preface to *The World*," in *British Essayists* (London, 1803), 26: ix-liii [cited as "Chalmers"]; Arthur Murphy, *An Essay on the Life and Genius of Samuel Johnson* (1792).

6. For the popularity of the play, see *Life of Garrick*, 1: 232-35, *Biographia Dramatica*, 3 vols. (1812), 2: 257; for Diderot, see Donald Schier, "Diderot's Translation of 'The Gamester'" *Diderot Studies*, 16 (1973), 229-240.

7. See John H. Middendorf, "Johnson, Wealth and Commerce" in *Johnson, Boswell and their Circle: Essays Presented to L. F. Powell*, ed., M. M. Lascelles, et al (Oxford, 1965), pp. 47-64 and Peter Mathias, "Dr. Johnson and the Business World" in Peter Mathias, *The Transformation of England: Essays in the Economics and Social History of in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1979, 2006), pp. 295-317. For Johnson's legal aspirations and skills, see E. L. McAdam, Jr., *Dr. Johnson and the English Law* (Syracuse, 1951) and J. T. Scanlan, "Samuel Johnson's Legal Thought" in *Samuel Johnson After 300 Years* ed. Greg Clingham and Philip Smallwood (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 112-30.

8. Hester Thrale [Piozzi], *Thraliana: The Diary of Mrs. Hester Lynch Thrale (Later Mrs. Piozzi), 1706-1809*, ed. Katherine C. Balderston. 2nd ed. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1951), 1: 492.

9. Clifford, *Hester Lynch Piozzi*, 198. When his eldest daughter Queeney found him lying on the floor the following day—after having eaten an enormous dinner—struck with an apoplexy, he replied to her anxious solicitation, "I chuse it; I lie so o'purpose" (*Thraliana*, 1: 489).

¹⁰. For a description of Hester Thrale's unhappy marriage, see Mary Hyde, *The Thrals of Streatham Park* (Cambridge, MA, 1977), pp. 18-19, and Clifford, *Hester Lynch Piozzi*, pp. 97-99.

11. Seneca, *De beneficiis*, trans. Richard M. Gummere, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1970), 3: 480-83.

12. The play opened on 7 February 1753 and had a run of ten nights (Caskey, p. 93). There is no evidence to suggest that Johnson was anywhere but London during this time, where he would have been continuing work on his *Dictionary* and helping his friend John Hawkesworth with *The Adventurer*: see *Boswell's Life*, 1: 251-3; James L. Clifford, *Dictionary Johnson: Samuel Johnson's Middle Years* (New York, 1979), pp. 110-13; and Norman Page, *A Dr. Johnson Chronology* (Boston, 1990), p. 11.

13. See Donald Greene, "Some Notes on Johnson and the *Gentleman's Magazine*," *PMLA*, 74 (1959), 75-84; Arthur Sherbo, "Samuel Johnson and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1750-5" in *Johnsonian Studies*, ed. Magdi Wahba (Cairo and Oxford, 1962), pp. 133-159.

14. See Richard B. Schwartz, *Daily Life in Johnson's London* (Madison, 1983), pp. 74-6. For Johnson's remonstrance against gaming, see *Rambler* 15, § one, *Idler* 39, etc.

15. *The World* No. 1 (4 January 1753), *British Essayists*, 26: 6;

16. Cf. Chalmers, "Biographical and Historical Preface," *ibid.*, 26: xii-xiii.

17. Caskey, pp. 137-38. For Johnson's early biographer William Shaw's account of Moore's attempted intervention, see *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Late Dr. Samuel Johnson* in Arthur Sherbo, ed., *Memoirs and Anecdotes of Dr. Johnson* (London, 1974), p. 36.

18. Samuel Johnson, *The Lives of the English Poets*, ed. Roger Lonsdale, 4 vols. (Oxford, 2006), 4: 186. However, as Chalmers takes pains to note, Johnson's view here might well be jaundiced by his own bitterness: see Chalmers, "Biographical and Historical Preface," pp.26: xvi-xvii.

19. See *Yale Edition*, 18: 95, n. 9. For Lennox, see Charlotte Brewer, "A Goose-Quill or a Gander's?": Female Writers in the Dictionary" in *Samuel Johnson: The Arc of the Pendulum*, edited by Freya Johnston and Lynda Mugglestone (Oxford, 2013), p. 124.

20. Caskey, p. 72; Samuel Johnson, *Lives*, iv: 509, n. 7.

21. Only the last of these two lines is cited faithfully according to Moore's 1744 text, while the first virtually summarizes the preceding page of the fable, where the wife addressed is advised that they should "study to improve / The charm, that fix'd your husband's love" in the first place, it being "harder far ... to keep the conquest, than subdue" (p. 27). Interestingly, perhaps, the advice to the young married woman forms an extended simile devoted to the relationship between, as the title of the fable shows, "The POET, and his PATRON."

22. Moore's own text (1751) shows "The Bard may find"

23. Another possibility that might have constituted an eighth quotation is found under the entry for "giggler," defined as "a laugher; a titterer; one idly and foolishly merry," taken from the Epilogue to Edward Moore's *The Foundling*: "We shew our present, joking, giggling race; / True joy consists in gravity and grace." The couplet, however, is correctly attributed to Johnson's friend David Garrick. Nonetheless, the contiguity with Moore's play only reinforces the connection this paper stresses.

24. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 21: 85. Caskey attributes the Prologue to Garrick (p. 77), but it was published under Moore's name in the 1756 *Poems, Fables, and Plays*, by Edward Moore.

25. Chalmers, "The Life of E. Moore," p. 194 and Boswell, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. Alexander Chalmers, 9th ed. 4 vols. (London, 1822), 1: xxxv. Five years earlier, in his *Account of the Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson*, Richard Wright wrote: "In the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February 1753, p. 81, is inserted the thirtieth number of the *Adventurer*, dated February 17, 1753, which was written by Dr. Johnson. In the same *Magazine*, the account of the Tragedy of the Gamester seems also to have been written by him" (London, 1805), p. 51 n.

26. Sherbo, "Samuel Johnson and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1750-55," 139; Donald Greene, "Was Johnson Theatrical Critic of the *Gentleman's Magazine*?" *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 3 (1952), 158-61; David Fleeman, *A Bibliography of the Works of Samuel Johnson*, 2 vols. prepared for press by James McLaverty (Oxford, 2000), 1: 322 (entry 51GM21).

27. *Gentleman's Magazine* 21 (February 1751), 78; Chalmers, "The Life of E. Moore," p. 194.

28. Greene, "Was Johnson Theatrical Critic of the *Gentleman's Magazine*?" p. 159 *passim*.

Henry L. Fulton. *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802: A Life in Medicine, Travel, and Revolution*. Newark: University of Delaware Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015. Pp. xxi + 788; frontispiece; 17 illustrations; index; tables. ISBN 9781611464938. Hardcover, \$158.

The subject of Henry Fulton's voluminous new biography epitomized many ideals associated with the Scottish Enlightenment, as well as those concerning revolutionary social and political events occurring at the end of the eighteenth century. Dr. John Moore was widely known in his day, not only for his capable work as a physician but also for his novels and travel writings; his works attracted the attention and admiration of British contemporaries like Robert Burns, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and Lord Byron. Despite his considerable reputation and influence during his lifetime, Moore had been a neglected figure in literary and historical studies before Dr. Fulton began his critical and biographical works on the doctor. The labor of many years, Fulton's biography is the first in-depth assessment of Moore's life and works, providing a much needed account of the doctor's influence and importance during a critical period of British and continental European history.

Fulton notes in his Preface that writing a person's first biography is "rather like assembling a jigsaw puzzle, trying to fit seemingly disparate pieces together, though never finding them all, but trying to end up nevertheless with a reasonable result" (xi). Fulton's biography assembles the pieces of Moore's life with admirable clarity and depth, offering extensive analyses of its various phases; throughout the biography, one finds many intriguing portrayals of Moore and his milieu based on primary research and the author's extensive knowledge of his subject. Moore's relevance during his life derived from a number of factors; as Fulton notes, "Moore is fairly representative of the

Scottish Enlightenment as it developed in Glasgow” (xii). He further states that “no Scottish figure of the eighteenth century was more involved in France than Moore was” (xi), citing the doctor’s six trips to France, his fluency in French, and his focus on French affairs in five of his works. In addition to these factors, Moore was famously the recipient of a lengthy autobiographical letter by Robert Burns, still regarded by many critics and readers as the best most candid account by the poet; Burns held Moore in high esteem throughout his life, delivering high praise for the doctor’s writings (especially the novel *Zeluco*).

Fulton’s detailed and shrewd biography provides much insight not only into Moore’s eventful life but also offers commentary on the tumultuous periods during which he was active in literature and political affairs. In chapters such as the third on Moore’s medical training in Glasgow, one encounters a wealth of information concerning medical developments in Scotland, described by Fulton as the site of a “medical renaissance” (47). Moore’s training during this critical period of development involved not only practical medical knowledge but also the cultivation of a distinctively social persona: “Moore was expected to cultivate the sensibility, manners, and appearance that would enable him to mix freely and comfortably with all ranks of society” (49). He clearly learned this key element of his training, becoming a skilled interlocutor in “all ranks of society” later in life. At the same time, the adult Moore told his children that he “hated” medicine and surgery and “never fully conquered his reservations about his chosen profession” (47). Fulton’s account of medical training in Glasgow is fine social history, especially in its analysis of doctors’ being “distinctly middle class” (48). His chapters five and six (on Moore’s medical establishment and practice) are particularly instructive, with glimpses of the doctor’s nascent literary efforts and his friendship with Tobias Smollett; of the latter, Fulton remarks that “both had been bred to medicine with qualified enthusiasm; one had given it up for the risks of a self-supporting literary career, and the other would eventually follow him to London to try to do the same” (116).

Ensuing chapters reveal the development of Moore’s social persona as much as his medical career; for instance, the focus in chapter eight on “the Hamilton cause” recounts Moore’s travels with the Duke of Hamilton during his Grand Tour, during which the doctor was charged not only with tending to the Duke’s health but also tasked to “encourage and develop the duke’s moral and intellectual capacities” (212). Moore was decidedly challenged in this endeavor, for his charge “had been indulged and spoiled too long by a dotting mother to marshal the personal resources to improve himself” (216). The trip itself, considered by Fulton “to be the lengthiest of the eighteenth century” (260), was a stressful one for the doctor, who continually had to attend to the Duke’s increasingly improper behavior; they had to leave Geneva due to the Duke’s “passionate attachment to two young women” (267). Their stay in Italy proved to be much more positive for both men, for Fulton notes that “the duke’s ego was gratified: he did not have to return to London with any reservations about his years abroad. The doctor collected material for two more books, one his masterpiece,” *Zeluco* (311). Collecting material was indeed a beneficial side effect, for Moore would gain his initial renown as a travel writer. Fulton observes that the grand tour he taken with the Duke “did not conclude; it just faded away” (336). The financial aspects of this tour are explored in great depth by Fulton, who records Moore’s frustration in trying to get paid for his time and

efforts: “he certainly protested any attempt to settle for less than £500 in salary and a £300 annuity for life” (340). Eventually he was able to come to an agreement, but the experience left him rattled; he was forty-seven at the end of the tour, and his family “may have been no better off financially” than when he left (342). Fulton remarks that at this juncture in his life, Moore “felt trapped” and started to believe that a major change in his life was necessary (342).

Subsequent chapters examine Moore’s move to London, one that many fellow Scots had embarked upon to forward their careers. He hoped to live there without the need for income from a medical practice, relying on his savings, the Duke’s annuity, and future earnings from his writing (349). His moves throughout the city—from Clarges Street to Clifford Street in chapters eleven and twelve—are amply discussed, with useful attention to his encounters with literary society and the publication of his best-selling *A View of Society and Manners in France, Switzerland, and Germany* (1779). Fulton states that this book and its sequel “marked [Moore’s] entrance as a published participant in the Scottish Enlightenment, in particular with his critique of foreign political institutions and the correlation he observed between religion and commerce” (361). Moore’s growing interest in national politics was stoked by his friendship with Edmund Burke, as was his connection to elite social circles through connections with the Duchess of Devonshire and Sir Joshua Reynolds. Moore’s literary productions at this time were expanding as well, with the novel *Zeluco* appearing in 1789. This work occasioned almost equal parts acclaim and disapprobation, as critics recorded a range of responses to the novel’s titular anti-hero. *Zeluco* is a “man of intense egoism, selfishness, and cruelty, whose lack of self-discipline and consideration for others ultimately results in a wretched existence for those near him and, most of all, for himself” (465). Given these attributes, it is not difficult to see the allure of such a character for readers like Burns and Byron, both of whom were attracted to liminal outsiders. However, Fulton comments that such an approach involves much reading against the grain, for “the novel is clearly a product of its didactic age in its ironic undercutting of the protagonist” (469). This crucial repositioning is necessary to account for Moore’s own perceptions of the momentous social changes occurring around him, most obviously in America and France.

Moore’s attitudes toward the latter country are found scrupulously recorded in Fulton’s remaining chapters, which narrate the doctor’s experiences in France after arriving in the late summer of 1792. This was a dangerous moment for such visits, for “the city was excited and potentially violent because of certain developments that had taken place in the Jacobin Club and the Commune” (535). There were other British visitors at this time whom Moore met, particularly Helen Maria Williams; like Moore, she would publish valuable commentary on the French Revolution and its progress at this point in history. Moore was an astute critic of its developing ironies, which he predicted would have “some bad effects on the minds and conduct of a people of so much vivacity as the natives of this country” (qtd. 539). Moore’s thoughts and reflections on the Revolution in chapters seventeen and eighteen are rewarding reading for anyone interested in French and continental European history; they reveal the doctor’s growing unease with the bloody turn in revolutionary politics that left him “deeply disturbed” (579). Fulton also examines Moore’s activities during the war years of the 1790s, including his friendship with William

Godwin and the publication of his novel *Edward* in 1796. This period marks a decline for Moore, for this work was not successful, nor was his earlier account of the French Revolution. In addition, Moore was disappointed with his estranged relationship with his adult sons, in which he saw “a loss of esteem in the eyes of his sons, probably arising from affectionate bond between them and their mother” (679). Fulton ends his biography noting the decline in Moore’s health in 1800 and his increasing financial worries (including drawing up a contentious will), as well as his friendly relationship with Burns’s first editor James Currie. Moore died peacefully in his sleep in 1802, with his family by his side. Of his eventful life, Fulton concludes that “it is only now that Moore can be recognized in his own right for his distinguished life and work, as he was in his own day” (714). Fulton has indeed succeeded in bringing the life and work of Dr. John Moore back to light; this biography is a major work in the fields of biography and social history, and it will serve as the definitive life of Moore and his intellectual and political milieus for years to come. Fulton is to be highly commended for the care and attention that went into this invaluable work of scholarship, and readers will be rewarded for his efforts to recover the cultural legacy of a major neglected writer and thinker of the Scottish Enlightenment.

Corey E. Andrews
Youngstown State University

Laurence Whyte. *The Collected Poems of Laurence Whyte*. Edited by Michael Griffin. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016. Pp. xviii + 374; 2 appendixes; bibliography; index. ISBN 978-1-61148-721-3. Cloth, \$105.

For several years, Michael Griffin of the University of Limerick has been producing valuable work on eighteenth-century Irish poetry in English. His edition of the *Selected Writings of Thomas Dermody* (Field Day 2012) brought an intelligently chosen and edited selection of the poems and prose of this remarkable Irish writer to scholarly attention and his more recent work, on Goldsmith, resulted in a fascinating book *Enlightenment in Ruins: The Geographies of Oliver Goldsmith* (Bucknell University Press, 2013). Goldsmith has always been a problematic writer, shifting genres and personae with dizzying dexterity, hard to pin down to any culture or mode of writing; but Griffin’s excellent introduction to that book explores Goldsmith’s roots in the Irish rural midlands and re-establishes the importance of Ireland as the landscape brooding in Goldsmith’s mind all his life. He describes Goldsmith’s Jacobitism as being of the ‘rural, lower-class, high church strand’ found in the Irish countryside in the generation after the Hanoverian succession, and emphasizes the significance of an Irish upbringing for a writer who – like so many of his countrymen – travelled widely if aimlessly before ending up in London. Griffin compares some elements of Goldsmith’s story with that of Laurence Whyte, a hitherto little-known poet from the same part of the Irish midlands as Goldsmith but one who, a few years ahead of Goldsmith, migrated from the country to the town, in Whyte’s case to Dublin; both men made their

livings in English-speaking communities, Goldsmith as a writer, Whyte as a teacher of mathematics. For both men, as Griffin maintains, the landscape and culture of the rural backwater that is the borderland between counties Longford and Westmeath remained significant and memorable, and the modern reader who wishes to understand either writer needs to be aware of the tensions that men such as Goldsmith and Whyte lived with: tensions between the Irishness of upbringing and the Englishness of the adult environment, between poetic and professional imperatives, and between cultural and scientific spheres.

Laurence Whyte seems to have enjoyed writing poetry all his life, much of it inspired by his daily life; he loved music and wrote enthusiastically about the musical society to which he belonged; he loved teaching, and wrote poems for children and celebrations of his fellow mathematics teachers; he knew about farming in Co. Westmeath and wrote with great energy about the activities of an Irish farm and about the troubles and tribulations affecting those working the land between from the reign of Queen Anne to the 1730s. His years in Dublin made him highly sympathetic to those who got into trouble with money-lenders, and he wrote eloquently about dunning and those paid to collect debts. He wrote on local politics, on drinking, on famine, on plenty, on the births and deaths in families he knew, on food, on fashion, on wit, on getting old and even on toast and butter. The range of his poetic output is remarkable and, though much of what he wrote could be seen as light verse, he addressed serious problems with wit and intelligence – which is why anyone interested in Irish life in the first forty years of the eighteenth century will find his poetry not only entertaining but full of valuable information.

Among Whyte's favourite subjects are the activities of the Dublin 'Charitable and Musical Society' of which he was an enthusiastic member. The volume contains a (not very distinguished but very interesting) poem celebrating the first performance by the musical society of Handel's *Messiah* in 'Mr Neal's new Musick Hall in Fishamble Street, Dublin,' perhaps the most significant event in the musical life of eighteenth-century Dublin. The music hall itself is the subject of one of Whyte's 'Poetical Descriptions' in which he, disarmingly, praises the architecture, 'The Cornice, Dentills, and the curious Mould / The Fret-Work and the Vaulted Roof . . .'. Nothing remains, alas, of this 'lofty Fabrick,, though local choirs still perform the *Messiah* on the site every April.

Many of Whyte's poems contain references to Dublin residents (particularly if they were mathematicians), to local landowners in Co. Westmeath, to places or events in the Irish countryside or to activities unfamiliar to us now: Griffin proves an excellent guide to Whyte's world giving us, among other things, a full explanation of exactly what was involved in the practice of dunning and a helpful introduction to Whyte's 'Dissertation on Italian and Irish Musick'. He also indicates the significance of one of the longest of Whyte's poems, a piece whose full title is: 'The Parting Cup, or, The Humours of *Deoch an Doruis*, alias *Theodorus*, alias Doctor *Dorus*, an old *Irish* Gentleman famous (about 30 Years ago) for his great Hospitality, but more particularly in *Christmas* Time. In Four Canto's.' The poem carries an enticing epigraph *Parum Vini acuit Ingenium, Ergo Multum*, which Griffin translates as 'A little wine sharpens ingenuity; therefore, drink plenty'.

This cheering epigram leads one into one of the most memorable poems of the Irish eighteenth century. 'Deoch an Doruis' is the name (derived from the

Irish for ‘a parting drink’ – i.e. ‘one at the door’ or ‘one for the road’) that Whyte gives to a venerably patriarchal old farmer representative of the race of generous, self-sufficient farmers that Whyte remembers (or thinks he remembers) from his youth. The poet views (perhaps through rather rose-tinted spectacles) the life of the farm as it has been over the previous forty years. The farm household, as it was in the days of Queen Anne, is described in detail and we also learn how the younger generation was brought up; ‘Deoch an Doruis’

... taught his *Sons* to hold the Plow,
 To sow the Seed, to reap and mow;
 To take the *Area* of a Field
 Before it was manur’d or till’d;
 They read the *Irish, Latin* spoke.....

As for the girls, their mother

. . . often made them labour hard,
 To brew and bake, to spin and card,
 To dress a dish or two of meat,
 Fit for the *Squire* himself to eat.

The family was brought up to respect its Irish roots and its current situation. Unfortunately, towards the end of the poem, the farmer entertains his landlord to a lavish (and alcohol-fuelled) meal: as a result, the squire decides that the rent of the farm is obviously far below what it could be, and raises the rent. Things go from bad to worse and, in the end, the farmer and his family are forced off the land, ending up homeless. The economics of farming in Ireland over the period from the reign of Queen Anne to that of George II are spelled out in detail and, though Whyte is clearly exaggerating the situation and seeking to play the emotions of his reader, the injustices of Irish rural life in the eighteenth century are spelled out in detail. The landlord class come in for a roasting, since, while the farmer and his family are forced to beg at the roadside, the squire’s sons are able to ‘range abroad’ to London and Paris, enjoying ‘Balls, and Plays, and Masquerades.’ Though the picture Whyte paints is probably exaggerated, Griffin points out that it reflects a widespread perception of the state of Irish rural life in the first half of the eighteenth century. At any rate, the poem is highly entertaining and I am delighted that it is in print again.

This is an excellent edition of an important poetic voice from the Ireland of Swift, Goldsmith and Sheridan: however, the volume is of interest also to those concerned with the Dublin print trade. The title page of the 1740 edition shows an unusual, intercultural and interdenominational cross-section of Dublin publishers to have been involved; one of those selling the book was Whyte himself from his house in Rosemary Lane. But this edition – and the subsequent enlarged reprinting of 1742 – also boasts a fascinating list of subscribers, protestant and catholic, rural and urban, upper, middle and lower-class; a particularly useful inclusion in this edition is an appendix in which Griffin lists and gives details of the subscribers, adding to comments on the list already made by Toby Barnard, Kevin Whelan and others. Whyte’s list is indeed a fascinating assemblage of a cross-section of mid-eighteenth century Irish book-purchasers.

My one substantive criticism of this edition is that we do not have facsimiles of the various title pages – the 1742 title page establishing (correctly) that that volume contained sixteen poems not in the 1740 printing. I wish, also, that publishers would not use the extreme left margin as a guide for printing eighteenth-century poetry which is always, in its contemporary printing, properly spaced on the page. But these are quibbles. On the whole, one can only welcome this edition, congratulate Bucknell University Press and Michael Griffin and hope that both will continue the valuable work of making available, in well-edited editions, the work of Ireland’s eighteenth-century poets. It is sad that the price of this particular volume is so high but, still, I would strongly recommend every self-respecting scholar of Ireland’s eighteenth century to try and get access to it.

Andrew Carpenter
University College Dublin (Emeritus)

Christopher R. Miller. *Surprise: The Poetics of the Unexpected from Milton to Austen*. Ithaca, New York, and London: Cornell University Press, 2015. Pp. viii + 269; index. ISBN-10: 0801 453690. Hardcover, \$49.95.

Like its narrative counterpoint of suspense, surprise assumed a particular depth and richness in the eighteenth century, conveying violence and pain (and human vulnerability) on the one hand, but turning into a sought-after state of aesthetic pleasure and a springboard for artistic ingenuity on the other. This illuminating study traces the complex impact of surprise in a series of canonical literary texts, but also in the culture at large. The centrality of the term (and related ones such as “wonder” and “astonishment”) to eighteenth-century aesthetics is familiar, but Christopher R. Miller is more interested in exposing the ways that surprise unsettles conceptual boundaries within literary texts, and how it sheds light on the period’s key ethical and epistemological questions. He also scrutinizes the formal innovations devised by authors as means of representing and eliciting the emotion of surprise and the dynamics of suddenness.

The premise for Miller’s study is a statement about the lexical history of “surprise,” its evolution from a physical register to a mental one: in the late Middle Ages the denotation of the term shifted from “military assault, seizure, rape, or disturbance” to cognitive and affective meanings. His astute readings attend to the ways that all possible meanings of “surprise” reverberate within texts, reflecting a sharp tension that takes distinctive forms in the work of every author he studies: the relation of external, “concussive” forms of surprise (as an event, as something that happens to someone) to internal, psychological forms (as an emotion and a thought process). Miller derives much from this tension in his readings. In the fluid relation he reveals between internal and external models, a thought or a feeling can be experienced both as a surprising event that happens to the self, and as a current that flows from within it.

Such transpositions add fine nuances to the account of moral freedom in *Paradise Lost*, where Miller begins. He argues that Milton’s “fine-grained

attention to the emotional, corporeal, and cognitive life of his characters” allows for a fuller understanding of surprise than the rational usage of God, who insists that Adam be warned about Satan lest he pretend to be surprised by his own fall. The element of uncontrollability associated with surprise, its reminders that “personal experience is nothing less than some sort of irreducible imponderable,” comes to embody a degree of resistance to religious symbolization, which exists alongside models of surprise that uphold the workings of providence and divine grace. The genre-crossing capacity of his approach allows Miller to construct a satisfying pathway from Milton’s epic to novels by Defoe, Richardson, Fielding, and Austen. Linking allegory’s interplay of literal and figurative meanings to the duality of surprise in *Paradise Lost*, he traces “the allegorical structures of realist fiction,” along with providential and postlapsarian forms of surprise. The application of his flexible model to Romantic poetry (Wordsworth and Keats) in the final two chapters is a genuine extension of the argument that surprise is “both an emotion and event,” by virtue of which Miller sees it “dwell[ing] at the crossroads of lyric and narrative.”

The emphasis on the dual nature of surprise is integral to Miller’s treatment of narrative poetics: as he points out, “surprise” can refer to both “a character’s or reader’s reaction and a discrete episode or development.” He is particularly interested in the shifting dynamics of characters and readers, as they experience and observe surprise. While readers may identify with characters and experience their reactions vicariously, as in the case of Richardson’s *Pamela*, they also sometimes gain “critical distance” on the characters’ states of surprise, as Miller demonstrates in his account of *Paradise Lost*. (He challenges Stanley Fish’s argument that the reader is “surprised by sin” in the same way that the characters are). In Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews*, surprise is manifested as a visual, even cinematic phenomenon: hypocritical characters such as Lady Booby turn into ekphrastic spectacles when surprise renders them speechless. At such moments, what readers “discover” (in accordance with Fielding’s opening theory) is an instance of the ridiculous, as opposed to emotional common ground. Thus Miller demonstrates that surprise mediates a variety of relations between characters and readers, entailing ethical perspectives that range from sympathetic fellowship to satiric scorn.

While the book’s trajectory of surprise’s intellectual and literary history is insightful and comprehensive—it starts with an intellectual history that traces the concept from Aristotle to modern psychological theories of emotion, features close readings of texts from 1667 through 1819, and concludes with an epilogue about variants of surprise in Modernist writing,—the one chapter that does not measure up to the others in freshness or relevance is the account of Richardson’s *Pamela*. The argument that the novel’s structure (the shifting of plot dynamics and tone once the heroine accepts her would-be seducer as a husband) represents a “purification of surprise” does not appear to break new ground in Richardsonian readings. Given that the term itself does not appear with great frequency or receive particular thematic attention within the pages of *Pamela*, Richardson’s first novel does not fulfill Miller’s thoughtful opening dictum that “surprise” is a “ubiquitous and pertinent key word,” so well as his other chosen texts do. A better selection from Richardson’s oeuvre would have been *Sir Charles Grandison*, in which surprise (particularly the type wrought by exemplary virtue) is a key affective component of the relationship between the

hero and Clementina della Porretta. It is also an innovative narrative dynamic, crucial to Richardson's conception of the novel being released in installments. In a letter to Alexis Claude Clairaut, on 5 July 1753, Richardson designates his plan to release *Grandison* "at three several times; because there are some few Surprises in different Parts of it, which, were the Catastrophe known, would be lessen'd, and take off the Ardor of...Readers" (*Selected Letters of Samuel Richardson*, ed. John Carroll [1964], 236-7). Such a perspective would contribute significantly to Miller's analysis of narrative form. Still, his work succeeds in demonstrating that surprise is a "presiding spirit" of 18th-century literature, with a complex history and a challenging presence in multiple genres.

Martha J. Koehler
University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg

Louise Curran. *Samuel Richardson and the Art of Letter-Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. 282; b/w illustrations. ISBN 13: 978-1-107-13151-4. Hardcover. \$99.99

The sobriquet of "sober, academic study" given to Louise Curran's new monograph entitled *Samuel Richardson and the Art of Letter-Writing* by Adelle Waldman in the May 16, 2016 issue of *The New Yorker* is at its heart correct, despite the tone of the article's brief reference to Curran's text. As a book analyzing the rhetorical strategies, style, and subjects of Richardson's extensive personal communication and revealing how very seriously the author took himself and his writing, both fictional and real, Curran's work is indeed sober and academic. But this is not unexpected from a Cambridge University Press edition, nor is the sober and academic off-putting to we sober academics. In fact, given that she is not the first to work with Richardson's correspondence, and that various pieces of that correspondence have been available for public consumption for over two hundred fifty years, some circulated by Richardson himself, it is surely unsurprising that Curran finds there is little spectacle in the collection of Richardson's epistles and indices buried deep in the bowels of the Victoria and Albert Museum's archives to astonish and amaze the reader.

Instead, Curran eschews spectacle, and, just as Richardson's novels explore the deeper interiorities of his characters—sometimes painfully deep,—she engages with his letters as an intricate part of his overall oeuvre. She suggests that in order to understand the man and his art without considering his personal correspondence with his ideas about writing and authorship is to miss just how far fictional and real writing were entwined for Richardson: "No discussion of Richardson's letters can avoid certain facts of his characters as expressed through them: the self-consciousness, vanity, coyness, and other kinds of awkwardness assumed or real. Any attempt to extricate details of his art from his life as represented in his correspondence fails to recognise that these letters are not merely a reflection of Richardson's experience but concomitantly a statement of his intellectual and ethical approach to all kinds of writing" (194). Yes, Richardson's letters are heavily weighted with dialogues and examinations of his own fictions. This fact will not come as a shock to anyone who has encountered even the briefest introduction to Richardson's works, and to

completely ignore the presence of his meta-criticisms in constructing such a “sober, academic study” as Curran’s would be folly. As such, Curran explores Richardson’s self-critiques at the level of serious theoretical conversations that, rather than develop through the model of philosophical treatises, are envisioning via the genre of familiar letters what exactly it meant to compose novels in the 1740s and ’50s, and what it meant to be “an author.” Richardson sees himself, Curran argues, as engaging with not only his own work, but the productions of his correspondents as well, in order to construct an epistolary text, of which he himself is a part. He is not simply the editor; he is also the edition.

In Chapter One, Curran argues the Richardson’s correspondence regarding both *Pamela* and *Pamela II* is concerned with the creation of a particular style, one that can reconcile the “naturalness” of Pamela’s voice, for which he was praised, with the notion that literature must be comprised of a higher form of language than the lower-class accents of the titular character. Relating the choice of audience to rhetorical style, Curran utilizes Richardson’s letters to and from Lady Bradshaigh to highlight the discrepancies between Pamela’s voice and her education. She notes that Richardson insists Pamela is “finding ‘a Style’ rather than assuming one” (19). Through his real-life epistolary exchanges, in conjunction with his fictional productions, Richardson himself is conducting a similar exercise, working out his own sense of voice and style. His question of how to demonstrate the rhetorical power of the familiar letter underpins not only his fiction in *Pamela* and his earlier, less famous letter-writing manuals, but his personal correspondence as well.

Chapter Two concerns Richardson’s discussions of “character” and the “character of authorship” with his most famous correspondent, Lady Bradshaigh. Curran argues that Richardson’s own distribution of his epistolary exchanges with Lady Bradshaigh among his coterie merges the private familiar letter with the public, avoiding the formality of publication in such a way as to suggest that “writing letters was always in some sense an act of authorship,” and that letters always possessed the “possibility of public consumption” (53). What made “the author,” therefore, did not depend on publishing texts, but rather simply writing and sharing them. In discussing *Clarissa*, these correspondents opened the potential for intimate conversation and implicit authority over texts both fictional and real. And just as Lady Bradshaigh played an essential role in aiding Richardson’s composition, so too do the other women with whom he corresponded, Curran argues in Chapter Three. Naming the process by which Richardson writes to women as “patchwork,” or the piecing together of texts to create a larger whole from discrete fragments, she weaves together a sense of Richardson as a letter-writer who structures his authorial persona based on the audience of his writing. Though he corresponds with members of the Bluestocking circle, his tone in those letters reveals his hesitation over how to approach them. Because he is so influenced by the input of those who write to him, Curran suggests that Richardson participates in a process of co-authorship. By encouraging those women who wished to inspire a sequel to *Sir Charles Grandison*, comprised of letters written only by the female characters, Richardson embraces a view of the text and letters as inherently multi-authored.

Curran shifts from a contemplation of women’s reactions to Richardson’s publications to how men could be influenced by them in Chapter Four. According to Richardson, the ways in which readers benefited from texts was

distinct according to sex: men needed to glean information from the text (preferably through some categorical genre: dictionaries, indices, and so on—which, given that Richardson himself attempted to index his own correspondence, as Curran discusses in Chapter Five, seems revealing about the man himself—while women engaged with the text through interpretation. Thus, after constructing female protagonists for nearly a decade, Richardson turns to his “good man.” His correspondences, Curran says, reveal the ways in which he considered the influences and morals of Sir Charles Grandison. This in turn resulted in Richardson’s self-awareness that his own letters could help promote the types of morality his fiction was working to construct. Whereas his letters to women tended to deal with his texts and female comportment, both in and out of the pages of his novels, his network of male correspondents focused on the use of letters “as a pedagogical and ethical mode of writing” (154). That mode never seemed complete to Richardson, Curran suggests in the final chapter, as he continued to read and re-read his own personal writing, organizing and revising his letters while he simultaneously edited his novels. This compulsion highlights the status of letters, in any genre, as always in flux. Curran paints a picture of her subject where, like the characters he created, Richardson seems always to be interpreting and re-interpreting the productions of his own hand.

Though Curran’s intent is not to analyze Richardson’s fiction, she concludes her study of Richardson as letter-writer by reminding her reader how deeply connected his fiction and correspondences are: to examine his personal writings, so concentrated on the process and analysis of his novels, forces us to engage with those texts in order to fully understand his letters. To read one is to read the other in many ways. In reminding us of that fact, Curran broadens our understanding of the expanse of Richardson’s work. The sheer number of epistolary texts Richardson produced over the last twenty years of his life, and with which Curran engages, is staggering. Louise Curran has cracked open a vault of epistolary treasures, and her thorough examination of Samuel Richardson’s letter writing inspires others to engage with the artifacts of a man devoted to the construction of the epistolary form. This text will be influential to anyone interested in Richardson, his novel, or letters in general.

Courtney Hoffman
University of Georgia

Martha F. Bowden. *Descendants of Waverley: Romancing History in Contemporary Historical Fiction.* Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2016. Pp. xxvi + 243. ISBN 978-1-61148-782-4.

In second half of the 20th century, there has been an extraordinary resurgence of historical fiction, accompanied by a virtual library of critical studies. I incline to the view that historical romance is a distinct kind, aligned to fantasy rather than realism, its emphases and structures akin to writing marked by women's perspectives (see Jerome de Groot's *The Historical Novel*, Helen Hughes's *The Historical Romance*). While Bowden collapses such distinctions, at the same time she exploits them in order to study the fusing of history (as written by professional historians, biographers, sociologists, anthropologists,

lawyers) with her own somewhat subjectively mapped genres of fiction. Her book moves circuitously, offering a useful history of the development of the genre, especially out of Walter Scott, whose *Waverley* and *Woodstock* she analyses at length brilliantly (100-112), and a history of much older (18th century) and recent (20th century) criticism of the novel (6-15, 36-55). Her book works to raise the status of historical romance and history by displaying her texts post-modern, post-colonial insights, and their entertainment and pedagogical value all the while they remain persuasively historically accurate. Paradoxically, one of her central observations about the nature of historical fiction is that it must cope with and takes advantage of the unknowability of the past (11, and *passim*).

It's remarkable that amid the cornucopia of studies (which include historical film and film adaptations of historical and older books), Bowden's book offers many innovative insights. She repeatedly returns to a point of view central to her evaluative criteria: to make an effective text and succeed in holding the reader, the novelist must combine familiarity with authenticity deftly. Her phrase "the romancing of history" refers to those many endemic textual moments where a present time, conception, and talismanic and ordinary objects intersect with a past in ways that enable readers to experience history as if they are there, are participants in what's happening. From its inception teaching people history has been a motive for writing historical fiction (and putting on historical plays, nowadays making historical films), so making a text that comes out of erudition appealing has been crucial in what is chosen to be presented. Very early catering to and exploring the nature of the imagined readers' and viewers' national or regional identity emerged as central concerns. Bowden traces fascinatingly how these novelists mix true realities then and now (say time) with fictionalizing techniques (e.g., richly subjective world historical characters), especially those using allusion and intertextuality (to music, plays, once or still extant historical paintings and relics, memoirs).

One source of her originality is her stance that anachronism is an unimportant price to pay for putting a marginalized (subaltern) person then and now (slave, woman, servant, African) into the public high ranking European and colonialist past. It does not matter that in her novel *The Winter Queen*, Jane Stevenson defies probability that Elizabeth of Bohemia should have a black African prince for a lover when the historical record suggests that she might well have had a white courtier and (at different time) the wealthy son of a Mayor of London (80-83, 117-19; cf. Josephine Ross's historical biography, *The Winter Queen* [NY: Dorset, 1979], 128-29, 152). It was therefore to this reader disappointing that feminist perspectives were omitted in a book rich in heroine texts, from fictionalized Queen biographies and biographies of Marie Antoinette to Jacqueline Winspear's *Mabel Dodds* series (144-45, 164-65). While the singled out longer set pieces of criticism are given over to men's texts: *Iain Pears's An Instance of the Fingerpost*, Barry Unsworth's *Sacred Hunger*, Julian Barnes's *History of the World in 10 and 1/2 Chapters* (25-31, 88-96, 199-206), overall far more women's historical fictions are made to yield unexpected riches, i.e., Hilary Mantel's *Wolf Hall* and sequel, Emma Donoghue's *Life Mask*, Susan Sontag's *Volcano Lover* (19-20, 119-24, 171-75). We have a plethora of analyzed and cited great-great-great grand-daughters of Lee's *The Recess* whose "slippery text" is analyzed (see her citation of John Frowe, 54, 55, and 57) also

to show us “the historical novel is derived from the gothic” (the two share characteristics).

Bowden's text is a thicket of intriguing historical romances. The issues treated range from disabled characters, to characters suffering under severe psychological distress and in retreat; these "sites" (characters, moods, events) are placed in worlds where we move through different levels of institutions, and metaphoric layering of people, e.g., Rose Tremain's *Restoration* (59-65). The modern recreation of say a memoir or post-text (sequel) can give us the reading we would give the story today – by, for example, removing all false idealisms and unreal powers given protagonists in early texts. Post-modern historical novels can therefore speak to us the way little else does. Caryl Phillips's *Cambridge* and *Crossing the River* (not covered by Bowden) include a precious historical document, the scrap remnants of a past that have survived, and Phillips's novels produce a take on this material that is sustaining and comforting today to those who still suffer from contemporary re-formulations of slavery and attempted genocides (in prisons, through torture, from armies and bombs).

Beyond the specifics of literary-historical connections and actual texts, she includes theoretical perspectives I found fruitful for understanding further historical texts and films. Bowden refers us to Amy J. Elias's theoretical *Sublime Desire: History and Post 1960s Fiction*. Elias's book examines tales based on the unknowability of a given incident or time where there is an intense desire on the part of a specific readership to go back and retrieve the past, to experience it intimately. This is therefore why we find many post-modern historical novels contain embedded narratives from long ago e.g., A. S. Byatt's *Possession* (133-35), with their ironic parallels and self-reflexivities (13-15). Beyond say recreating the novel of a 19th-century document from an abysmal starved life in Ireland, as in Nuala O'Faolain's *My Dream of You* (not referred to by Bowden or Elias), there is a desire for some grand famous experience centered in an event that in the fiction erupts unspeakably and re-erupts again and again. Elias suggests this pattern is a reaction formation against the trauma of history: the event is continually deferred, it is awesome, strange, beyond comprehension, with an emphasis on the irretrievable for all involved. This is useful for understanding the power of some time-traveling tale, e.g., Diana Gabaldon's use in her *Outlander* series of Culloden, a series of scenes of dramatized slaughter deferred from book to book (not referred to by Bowden or Elias).

Bowden has some *bêtes noires*. She is unfair to the much respected and influential *The English Historical Novel; Walter Scott to Virginia Woolf* (John Hopkins Press, 1971) by Avrom Fleishman ; Fleishman is not as inflexible about his well-argued definition of historical fiction (as distinct from historical romance and fantasy) as Bowden implies (xvii, xix, xxiii, 128, 130): Fleishman uses the opposing point of view to Bowden's about the later Victorian novelists in order to study telling departures from historical realism, and his last section includes an extraordinary section on Woolf's *Orlando* and (written at the end of Woolf's life, a time of despair over the war) her experimental *Between the Acts*. The bombing had driven her and Leonard into the country and Woolf tells of a self-reflexive pageant set in three eras, all put on by local people. Fleishman shows how history is conceived of as fragments of historical experience recorded in books, scattered relics, local memories and graves within a continuum of time (Fleishman 233-55). The “anti-foundational” recent

historicism and fiction identified by Bowden as “undermining all enlightenment ideas” and taking on unusual perspectives, e.g., from the periphery (157-58) is bypassed by Woolf, though not argued for explicitly, as in Graham Swift's *Waterlands* (not cited by Bowden): one can define and defend humane civilized behavior without hypocrisy or justifying the barbaric.

This book resembles an encyclopedia, something for everyone, with intriguing comments and examples as we go along. The first long section (on the history of historical fiction and its nadir), dwells on the ambiguity of the term “romance” and its usefulness as a subgenre for emotional, creative and gothic texts. In its second section about the creation of authenticity through intertextualities, we learn how what characters read in historical novels matters; here there is a section on ekphrasis and the importance and uses of archaeology. The third and last section covers the large variety of forms that historical novels take, from young adult books to uses of the supernatural and magicians, e.g., Susannah Clarke's *Jonathan Strange and Mr Norrell* (192-94). I was particularly taken by Bowden's attention to what gives us pleasure when we read; to myth-making; to creations of appropriate language; to how we can end up feeling we know less for sure about a period than we started out with. She instances the famous Japanese film, *Rashomon*: in this last revealing film we find that we reach the past, history, only in “glimpses” (58). Bowden's many analyses of Scott across her text are particularly felicitous. She is willing to counter important publishers' decisions: she argues that the new Edinburgh edition of Scott's novels omitted crucial material that became part of his novels when they cut his later appendices: Scott himself was responding to pressure from his publisher, and for *Kenilworth* we need Scott's antiquarian's report, which included the ballad about Amy Robsart and the mode of her death that inspired the novel (157-59).

Ellen Moody
Alexandria, Va, Independent Scholar

Minutes of the ECASECS Business Meeting Saturday, 3 November 2016

President Eleanor Shevlin (West Chester University) called the meeting to order, our membership sustained by a delightful luncheon in a rather grand meeting room of the student union of Mary Washington University. Because we are composed of both grateful and polite members/colleagues, we expressed our pleasure for the wonderful meeting organized by the gracious team of organizers led by the always delightful Marie McAllister through raucous applause (well . . . ok, ok, very warm; we are, as I mentioned, a well-behaved lot of academics on the whole). One of the pleasures of meeting in an “ancient” place like Fredericksburg is touring various fascinating colonial sites, including the University's eponymous “patron's” house—a gift of her doting son George (yes, THAT George). Plus, the conference hotel was in the middle of historic F'burg. What a treat, supplemented by exquisite weather. How do you do it, Marie?

President Shevlin—just kidding—Eleanor summoned Emily Kugler of Howard University to report on the next annual conference, which she is

organizing, scheduled for 2-4 November 2017. The meeting's theme, an appropriate "Capital Culture and Cultural Capital," anticipates a rich vein for prospective panels and papers. See the website at <http://ecasecs2017.wordpress.com> at for information about the conference and submission of panels and papers. Emily has lined up Tara Ghoshal Wallace, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Professor of English at George Washington University for the plenary speaker. Mark your calendars.

Catherine Parisian, Chair of Affiliate Societies for ASECS, spoke briefly to invite us to our national's annual meeting held this coming year in Minneapolis from 30 March to 2 April, and she promised us there would NOT be any snow, despite Minnesota's reputation. She reminded us that, although all who attend must be members of ASECS, ASECS does have a generous fellowship program to encourage attendance and participation, especially for financially challenged graduate students (or is that a redundancy?). Please consult the ASECS website for further details, and do notice the participation of a significant bunch of ECASECers in the program.

Joanne Myers, chair of this year's Molin Prize Committee, announced seven submissions for the prize, with the winner to be announced in the next issue of the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*. [See below.]

Next to receive Eleanor's summons to the podium was Jim May, who urged EC/ASECS members to make the newsletter reflect their diverse interests by submitting notes, pedagogical articles, and reviews of conferences, concerts, books, plays, and exhibits. "We need broader coverage!" Jim invited our more "mature" members to think of writing descriptions of their projects, particularly if they are looking for collaborators. As for younger members, he would be happy to print their dissertation abstracts. Contact Jim at jem4@psu.edu.

At some point around here, Eleanor or Linda Merians, Executive Secretary, dragged a reluctant incoming Executive Secretary Peter Staffel to the podium so that Eleanor could finish her lunch. Because Susan Beam had to leave the meeting early, Peter invited members to check out our website at <http://www.ec-asecs.org/welcome.html>. We are SO grateful to Susan for being our excellent web wizard and for bringing us closer to the modern era by creating a Facebook page for EC/ASECS and giving us a welcome presence on other social media.

Eleanor again wrested control of the podium and, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, presented the slate of nominees for 2017: Eugene Hammond for President, Matt Kinservik for Vice President, Ellen Moody for Elected Board Member, and Peter Staffel for Executive Secretary. The nominees were voted in by generous applause, which drowned a series of sighs of relief from various members who once again dodged the nominating bullet and gasps of disbelief from others that Linda Merians, who we all thought had signed on for Executive Secretary for Life, had tricked us into accepting a pale shadow of herself as a replacement for the irreplaceable. ["What have I done," both she and Peter were heard to murmur.]

This year our Society presented the Leland Peterson Award to newly retired but as active as ever Professor Geoffrey Sill of Rutgers University. Peter and Eleanor were pleased to do the honors—a certificate of gratitude and a bottle of excellent plonk purchased from a fancy wine shoppe in downtown colonial Fredericksburg. Geoff spoke movingly about how much EC/ASECS

means to him, as well as his fond memories of Leland. A worthier recipient couldn't have been chosen.

Linda Merians gave her final summary in regard to our membership (about 400) and finances (very healthy). The organization is in good shape; see the financial report below. Linda thanked Peter for his willingness to serve as Executive Secretary. She knows (read "hopes") he will do a fine job, and she pledges a smooth transition. She received a well-deserved ovation for her long and faithful service. Peter vows to explore how we might create a PayPal account so that members don't have to write checks any longer! [When the word "checks" was bruited about by the more venerable members of the society, younger brows were furrowed and lips whispered, "Checks?" It's time, Ladies and Gents, to move another step closer to the late 20th century.]

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Staffel

Executive Committee: 2017

President: Eugene Hammond
Vice President: Matt Kinservik
First Past President: Eleanor Shevlin
Second Past President: Sandro Jung
Web Wizard: Susan Beam
Newsletter editor: Jim May
Past and Future Conference Chairs: Marie McAllister (2016), Emily Kugler (2017), Eleanor Shevlin (2015), Cheryl Wanko (2015), Rodney Mader (2015), Don Mell (2014), Matt Kinservik (2014)
Elected Board Members & Molin Prize Judges: Joanne Myers (2017); John Heins (2018); Ellen Moody (2019)
Exec. Sec't: Peter Staffel (staffelp@westliberty.edu)
Molin Award Winner: Sophie Capmartin

Financial Report, January 1, 2016-December 31, 2016

We have approximately 400 members. Thank you so much for your continuing membership. For calendar year 2016, you will see that, as in previous years, our expenses were related to the annual meeting, postage, the newsletter, office supplies, and bank charges.

We are deeply grateful to James L. West, III, Director of Penn State University's Center for the Study of the History of the Book, and to the Robert D. Hume, Penn State's Evan Pugh Professor, for providing considerable support for the publication of the *East-Central Intelligencer*. Our good friends there support about half the printing expenses for one issue of the *ECI*.

What follows is a report of our money in and out from the NYC-based EC/ASECS account for the 2016 year. As we are in the process of transitioning all the EC/ASECS records over to Peter, this report marks Linda's last act as Executive Secretary! It has been an honor and a privilege to serve our beloved EC/ASECS for so many years.

Revenue received in 2016:

Bank interest, \$3.60
 Conference registration, \$8,710 (this includes some membership dues)
 Membership dues, \$2,080.02
 Reimbursements, \$343.43 (from Marriott and Jim May for postage)

Money out from NY Bank Account in 2016:

Bank adjustment and charges, \$350.14
 Conference expenses, \$7,386.86
 Molin Prize (for 2015), \$150.00
 Newsletter printing, \$1,473.41
 Office supplies (envelopes, labels, checks, copies), 396.82
 Postage for *ECI*, dues letter and other mailings, \$1,886.91
 Website expenses, \$208.67
 Money sent to Peter Staffel to open new account, \$6,000.

NY account closed on December 30, 2016: 1,099.97 sent to Peter Staffel.

Respectfully submitted,
 Linda E. Merians

Sophie Capmartin wins 2016 Molin Prize

The 2016 Molin Award is given to Sophie Capmartin of Tulane University (French Literature and History). Her paper, delivered at the EC/ASECS annual meeting in Fredericksburg, VA, is titled “A Strange Embassy: Five Native Americans at the Court of Louis XV.” Capmartin’s paper analyzes the 1725 reception in Paris of a delegation of five Louisiana Indians. At the time, the French government urgently felt the need to affirm diplomatic ties with native tribes in order to strengthen their colonial presence in North America and resist Spanish and English incursions. Moreover, the government was seeking to promote the viability of their colonial enterprise to an increasingly skeptical French public. These needs, however, created representational difficulties in a culture accustomed to depicting native peoples as “savages.” Further complications were created by a competing desire to impress the delegates with the spectacle of French power. Capmartin’s paper links journalistic accounts of the delegation with contemporary travel literature to suggest how the chiefs’ visit was framed as an exotic glimpse of a barbarian culture. Yet simultaneously, she shows, the French government’s need for the chiefs’ support creates in these accounts a countervailing pressure. We see, she notes, how “the traditional European gaze on exotic subjects is reversed,” such that we can see “the Indians gazing curiously at French civilization.” The Louisianans’ quoted remarks show them taking displays of French power very much in stride, linking their own reverence for the sun with the symbolism of the French monarchy. In Capmartin’s analysis, this ambivalent representation of the delegation portends nothing less than the impending crisis of the monarchy. The committee – comprised this year of Marie Wellington, John Paul Heins, and chair Joanne Myers – was impressed by the extensive archival research in Capmartin’s paper

and the argument's ability to address the historical complexities of the native-French relationship. Overall, the committee was impressed by the range and strength of the papers presented by graduate students at this year's meeting and looks forward to welcoming these scholars back in future years.

The Molin Prize is so named as a tribute to Eric Sven Molin, one of the founders of EC/ASECS, who regularly enlivened our meetings--there will be a session in memory of Eric at the fall 2017 meeting (contact John Radner). Eric was a much beloved colleague and teacher, providing great encouragement and assistance to graduate students, particularly those working in English with him at George Mason University. After his death in 1987, the Molin Prize was created to reward and encourage excellence in scholarship by graduate students at our meetings. The Prize, which carries a small cash award (\$150), is only given when the judges (drawn from our executive board) feel there is a graduate student paper (sometimes two) of high excellence, both in content and presentation. Contestants must be physically present to read the paper at the conference since a part of the committee's evaluation will be on the actual presentation and the way in which the contestant fields questions after the talk. The paper must be unique: one cannot recycle a paper previously presented elsewhere. After the conference, contestants must send each committee member a copy of the paper in full (and with endnotes), typically by December 1. (A summary of the talk as part of a roundtable or panel discussion is unacceptable.) Graduate students interested in submitting their papers for consideration in the 2017 Molin Prize competition should keep an eye on the Society's website and the next *Intelligencer's* conference coverage for special instructions (see too the useful tips offered to candidates in the October 2011 *Intelligencer* [27]).

Joanne Myers, Molin Committee Chair
Gettysburg College

2017 EC/ASECS Washington, D.C.

The annual meeting of the East-Central/American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies will be held on 2-4 November 2017 at Howard University, in Washington, D.C. Inspired by the location, the meeting's theme, "Capital Culture and Cultural Capital," invites papers on any aspect of the many meanings of capital and culture, such as "the spatial and geographic meanings of capital: as seats of government and metropolitan centers; spaces within capitals (neighborhoods, coffeehouses, . . .), also the people who populate, represent or are at the margins of these spaces; and, capital as finance, money, and trade: the literary and figurative role of the monetary, bubbles & busts, high vs low culture; propaganda and distortions from the capital; conflicts involving the press, charlatans and dupes; the mob; etc. [see p. 49 of the last issue for a fuller text]. As ever, the conference chair welcomes papers from all fields as well as papers unrelated to the theme. Proposals for papers and completed panels are due 15 June to conference chair Emily MN Kugler (English, Howard University) and her program committee; submit them to ECASECS2017@gmail.com. Our keynote speaker is Tara Ghoshal Wallace, Professor of English and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies at George Washington U,

author of several books including *Imperial Characters: Home and Periphery in Eighteenth-Century Literature* and *Jane Austen and Narrative Authority* (Macmillan 1995)--see notes on members below on Dr. Wallace. For information on lodging, etc. see the website: ECASECS2017.wordpress.com.

Amy Prendergast Wins 2017 Elias Irish-American Research Fellowship

ASECS has awarded the A. C. Elias, Jr., Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship for 2017 to Amy Prendergast, Teaching Fellow in the School of English, Trinity College Dublin. Her proposal was entitled "Cultural Encounters and Recordings of the Self: Irish Women's Diaries, 1796-98." The Fellowship provides Dr. Prendergast with \$2500 to support travel to examine MSS at Yale's Beinecke Library and at the Irish Institute of Boston College. She will do research for a monograph provisionally entitled "Women's Diaries in Ireland, 1760-1820: Narrating Society, Negotiating Selfhood." Her principal target involves an unpublished anonymous diary of an Irish woman who travels to Bath the winter of 1796/1797. She will be comparing it to a published diary by another Irish woman who traveled to Bath that same winter. These two sources will aid a larger inquiry into "identity construction as well as nation formation."

Dr. Prendergast, who resides in Dublin, has been teaching English at Trinity College Dublin for several years, first as an adjunct instructor and last year as a Teaching Fellow. She took her B.A. in English and French at the National U. of Ireland at Galway in 2007; her Master's at Queen's U., Belfast, in 2008, and then her Ph.D. from Trinity College Dublin in 2012. Her dissertation was revised and published as *Literary Salons across Britain and Ireland in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). Her other publications include articles in *Eighteenth-Century Ireland* in 2011 and 2016. During 2015-16 she worked as a research associate at Marsh's Library in Dublin, transcribing and translating from the French the diary of the first keeper of Marsh's Library ("The Diary of Élie Bouhéreau"). Thus, remarked one reader, "Her publications and presentations testify to the depth of her background in the cultural history she wishes further to explore." The fellowship's evaluators all praised the "high calibre and positive review" of her publications and noted that Prendergast brings a proven proficiency to the documentary work proposed. All praised her selection of a new, "intriguing" project and the identification of materials that will enable her to make a significant contribution to the study of 18C Ireland and a "major impact on the scholarship of women's writing in Ireland."

ASECS's A. C. Elias Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship, with \$2500 in annual funding, supports "documentary scholarship on Ireland in the period between the Treaty of Limerick (1691) and the Act of Union (1800), by enabling North American-based scholars to travel to Ireland and Irish-based scholars to travel to North America for furthering their research." Projects conducting original research on any aspect of 18C Ireland qualify for consideration, but recipients must be members of ASECS who have permanent residence in the United States or Canada or be members of its Irish sister organization, The Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society, residing in Ireland. Prize winners are chosen by an independent jury of three scholars from different disciplines, after each is seen by readers in the applicant's field. The Elias Irish-American Research Fellowship was established in 1993-1994 by the late A. C.

Elias, Jr., an independent scholar, long a member of EC/ASECS--it was renamed in 2013 to honor Elias's scholarship and assistance to the community of scholars. Applications for the next Elias fellowship are due on 15 November 2017 to Dr. Jason McElligott, The Keeper, Marsh's Library, St. Patrick's Close, Dublin 8, Ireland (jason.mcelligott@marshlibrary.ie)--Dr. McElligott replaces Dr. Máire Kennedy,,--and Dr. James May (jem4@psu.edu; 694 Coal Hill Road / Clearfield, PA 16830 / USA). Applications consist of the coversheet downloaded at the ASECS travel-fellowship website, a short C.V. (1-3 pp.), a description of the project (3 pp. or less, treating its contribution to the field and work done and to be done during the proposed research period), a one-page bibliography of related books and articles, a short budget, and two signed letters of recommendation. Please try to submit all the materials but the letters as one Word file or PDF. If the two letters of support cannot be supplied as PDFs of signed letters, the original copies should be mailed to one of the trustees.

The Festschrift for Jim Spring Borck, one of AMS Press's Last Books

Jim Springer Borck died Valentine's Day 2007. He was long the general editor of the *ECCB: Eighteenth Century Current Bibliography* and brought humanities computing know-how at LSU to the assistance of such projects as the Georgia Smollett edition. Prior to a debilitating accident and ensuing medical problems, Jim edited at least fifteen *ECCB* volumes through that surveying 1992 and contributed to the 1993 volume, published in two parts. Jim was a good-looking, good-humored charismatic storyteller, who garnered the assistance of many talented scholars and brought graduate students into the edition as assistant editors and reviewers. There's no portrait of Borck in the book, but there's a good one in b/w on google images (under "Doc Yoder's Mentors"). We ran a series of eulogies to Jim in the *Intelligencer* of May 2007 (21.ii:21-23). He was so integral to 18C studies that he belonged to ours and all the regionals: if ASECS had a service prize like our Leland D. Peterson Award, "Jim Springer Borck" should be on its plaque. The grounds for that acclaim are clearly set forth by **Kevin L. Cope** and **Cedric D. Reverand, II**, in their introduction to the festschrift they edited to honor Jim's accomplishments, which appeared in February from AMS Press after long delay. The volume is entitled *An Expanding Universe: The Project of Eighteenth-Century Studies: Essays Commemorating the Career of Jim Springer Borck* (Norwalk, CT: AMS, 2017; pp. xix + 390; illus.; index; ISBN 978-0-404-67009-2; \$64.50 on Amazon). Kevin Cope and Ric Reverand define well what made Jim Borck indispensable to 18C studies for over a decade. The profusion of 18C scholarship had overwhelmed old methods of compilation and individual management, and the annual *ECCB*, which had long since overgrown its place as a special issue of *Philological Quarterly*, might have ceased to provide a good survey of references and reviews for our field. In the words of Kevin and Ric, Jim Borck met the "daily barrage of review copies and journal registers" with an "army of electronics-aware, keypunching student workers" and "cartloads of motherboards and monitors" (xiii). Borck "pioneered the integration of human resource management skills with office automation and with traditional bibliography, mentoring dozens of student assistants while laying the foundations of electronically assisted publishing." His office at LSU,

which resembled a “Strategic Air Command outpost,” was an Amazon-like clearing house served by “as many as five graduate and countless undergraduate students” who coordinated “‘input’ from about three dozen contributing editors” (xiv). He met the expansion of 18C studies with an expanded team put together at conferences. Kevin and Ric also offer a good recollection of the demands made on this networker at conferences, where he sought to maintain and gain editors and was in turn peppered with questions: “he never attended a conference panel or heard a conference paper owing to a cascade of invitations and consultations that ran from morning until night . . . Borck was inevitably seated at a dining table or snared at a reception or glued to the advisor’s bench, fielding nonstop questions from a diversely motivated ensemble of authors seeking *ECCB* reviews of their books, reviewers seeking extensions of their due dates, . . . crackpots eager to solicit support for this or that scholarly scheme.” When he buttonholed me to compile Section I, he said, “Let’s get out of here” and take a long walk. And I recall too that he sometimes brought one or two computer specialists along with him to ASECS to advise and explain things.

Relating the volume’s contributors and contributions to Jim Borck’s life and projects, the introduction groups the essays into four sections and sums up and connects the essays one to another. Topical and transitional statements are artfully seamless. The contributors include Jim’s former LSU students, including Robert Dryden, Kit Kincade, Matt Landers, and Phyllis Thompson, old friends like Carol Houlihan Flynn and Tom Preston, and colleagues who worked with Jim on the *Clarissa* Project, the Stokes Newington Defoe edition, and the Georgia Smollett, like **Maximilian Novak** and Irving Rothman, as well as those contributing to the *ECCB*, like John Burke, Patricia Craddock, **Henry Fulton**, Jim May, Alan T. McKenzie, editors Cope and Reverand, and then grad student Robert Dryden, who rose to become “Associate Editor” of *n.s.* 18 surveying 1992. The essays contributed by EC/ASECS members include **Ric Reverand**’s “Joshua Reynolds, Richard Brinsley Sheridan, Sarah Siddons, and the Battle of the Tragic Muses” (241-68); **Henry Fulton**’s “Fixing the Horizons of Temperament: John Moore’s Memoir of Smollett (1797)” (329-40); **Jim May**’s “Both Foe and Friend: Edward Young’s Good-Natured Ethos in *Love of Fame, The Universal Passion*” (343-59); and **Maximilian E. Novak**’s “The ‘Nothingness beyond Our Own Circle’: Circles, Sets, and Jane Austen’s Fiction” (361-82). I’ve not read all the volume, but know that at least the opening essays by Tom Preston comparing Scots vernacular to the blues and Carol Houlihan Flynn’s on the Scot’s accent (and other 18C accents) in English fiction are very interesting. The essays treat a range of major figures and types, with Kit Kincade’s analyzing the character Edward Ferrars in Austen’s *Sense and Sensibility*, Irving Rothman and a team of colleagues’ estimating Defoe’s contribution to *Robert Drury’s Journal*, Patricia Craddock on science in Gibbon’s *History*, John Burke on Dryden and Milton, Robert Dryden on pirates, Matthew Landers on “organizational similarities between anatomical and encyclopedic modes,” and Phyllis Thompson on women’s medicinal receipt books and medicines--a studious examination 47 pp. in length, with tables.

I apologize for trumpeting a book to which I contributed, but with the death of **Gabriel (Gabe) Hornstein** and at least the present temporary closure of AMS Press, this tribute to Jim Borck is an orphan unlikely to be reviewed.

Gabriel Hornstein and AMS Press, the Foundation of Scholarship

Gabe Hornstein, at 81 years of age, died on 17 February 2017 in Westport, CT. He'd been in ill health for several years, and the press's output fell behind more than usual, but his movement of AMS to Norwalk, CT, in 2016 inspired hopes that the press would become reinvigorated. Now the editors of the many annuals published by AMS will be pondering their future, perhaps seeking out new presses (while asking importuning contributors to be patient), and our hopes and encouragement go out to those editors. Including book review editors, I'm speaking of many colleagues in 18C studies (EC/ASECS members' names emboldened): **Kevin Cope** and **Scott Paul Gordon** (*1650-1850*) and Kevin's *ECCB* sub-editors **Bärbel Czennia**, **Gloria Eive**, **David Venturo**, myself, and many others; also **Jack Lynch** and **J. T. Scanlon** (*Age of Johnson*), **Al Riviera** and **George Justice** (*The Eighteenth-Century Novel*), **Linda Troost** (*Eighteenth-Century Women*), Jeffrey Burson (*Eighteenth-Century Thought*), Brett McNelly and **Sam Cahill** (*Religion in the Age of Enlightenment*) and Wayne Franklin et al. (*Literature in the Early Republic*). In all AMS Press published 17 annuals, with titles as diverse as *Dance* and *Readings on Equal Education!* Remember that at least the 18C studies journals have provided reviews, too. To these should be added the 16 AMS monograph series, including *Studies in the Eighteenth Century Culture*, with 75 volumes, among which were the volumes of the Stoke Newington Edition of Daniel Defoe. Colleagues like Irving Rothman, **Manny Schonhorn** and **Max Novak** put a great deal of effort into editions of the three *Robinson Crusoe* volumes, which now, like many other typescripts, sit at the dormant press. The closing of AMS Press jeopardizes the publication of dozens of book manuscripts and many hundreds of essays--perhaps a thousand scholars in diverse fields have taken a personal hit. We must hope that, when the estate is settled, some new Maecenas inherits or purchases the publishing house and brings it back to life--or at least acquires many of its copyrights and its book inventory.

AMS Press dates back to 1889, and under Gabe Hornstein it had published dozens of scholarly monographs before he took eighteenth-century studies under his wing around 1980. AMS began publishing the new series of *ECCB* in 1981 about the time it began publishing annuals (it began publishing *Dickens Studies* by reprinting its initial volumes in 1980). Through AMS, Gabe truly patronized our field, putting a library into print--imagine his study's shelves if it held all the volumes he published! And he paid for quite a few receptions at annual meetings, too, which he attended years ago--on which occasions he often took a dozen people out to dinner. These were not business transactions, but he took great pleasure, laughing at Jack Lynch's wit, listening closely to a story by **Barbara Benedict**, etc. When engaged, he could be engaging, and he put hardbound annuals in research libraries around the world. But his service to scholarship diminished over time. Kevin Cope and co-editor Robert Leitz produced their volumes of *ECCB* for 1994-2010 without the subvention that Jim Borck had received to hire assistants and run an office. AMS could be tight-fisted about providing contributors' offprints and copies, sat on some contracted book manuscripts for more than a couple years, declined our recent requests for review copies, and jacked up the prices of annuals to rates that threatened their viability, as \$205 for *The Age of Johnson* and \$465 for the *ECCB*. Gabe may

have sent out Christmas cards annually up to last year, but he was increasingly furtive and disengaged. (Not that a man well past retirement age shouldn't become so.) In 2012 Kevin Cope and Robert Leitz, with funding via the Noel Foundation of Shreveport, held a micro-conference in New York City called "Pen, Ink, and Achievement: Gabriel Hornstein," trying to strengthen Gabe's commitment to 18th-century studies and the *ECCB*. Gabe talked of his early career, of buying up remainders, dealing scholarly and scientific journals to new libraries around the world, and producing facsimile editions, such as of Samuel Richardson. His most colorful story involved the disposal during several weeks in March 2001 of the magazines stacked up in the eight-story Abraham Magazine Services' building on 13th Street--the business was leaving NYC, presumably then for the Brooklyn Naval Yard, and was throwing out "old magazines by the ton," which a crowd outside, night after night, picked through. Gabe lamented to the *New York Times* (25 March 2001) that due to digitization and microfilming, there was no market for the magazines and journals.

Whether that conference paid off or not, Gabe by 2015 was laid up with medical problems, and he apparently died without setting in place safeguards to keep the press operating--the few employees AMS had were unemployed within a month of his death--hopefully only temporarily. Our excessive dependence on AMS ultimately led to more expensive and slower scholarly production and exchange, and it retarded the exploitation of internet distribution (Kevin Cope had tried to get Gabe Hornstein to accept the necessity of online distribution for the bibliography). Kevin will hold a meeting at ASECS this spring to talk about the *ECCB* and brainstorm regarding its future possibilities and prospects. We hope that attention is drawn to the need for ASECS to budget for and to provide a good electronic archive, which could house a bibliography like the *ECCB* at a modest subscription. I suspect that we'd profit from what the dix-huitièmistes have set up in France, and SHARP's website may provide other suggestions.

If the losses are great, the benefits Gabe brought to the scholarly community were, too. Nobody lives forever. We ought to celebrate Gabe Hornstein--he had quite a roll. But to focus only on 40+ years of published titles is, in a selfish way, to lose track of the man, the octogenarian who set up a new office intending to publish scholarship for years to come. **Manny Schonhorn**, of Gabe's generation and a fellow New Yorker, knew Gabe for several decades, in part as a sort of liaison for the Defoe editors. He captured for us some of what was special about Gabe Hornstein and distinguished him from many other publishers: "Gabe's belief in sound scholarship and his untiring support of and respect for his authors should have been the model for the industry. We should remember his graciousness, his generosity, and his genial conversation to all of his authors when they visited New York or he attended conferences. He was a host in this age of absent civility that cannot soon be replaced. As a recipient of his generosity whenever I visited him in NYC, I cannot say too much of his generosity and respect for us all. Abrupt he might have been, a careful businessman he was, but no publisher I have ever had in all my years was a greater and more genuinely honest supporter of scholarship than he. No hypocrisy, no superiority, no arrogance, no dissing of any of us. He believed at every moment the worth of what we were doing, and he was humbly proud to be able to do whatever he could for us."

A Tribute to Nora Crow, Teacher and Critic

Back in May 2016 **Nora Crow** died at her home in Northampton. She retired in 2015 from Smith College after teaching there since 1971. Former students have written many glowing tributes (I don't exaggerate) at her obituary page on the web, the refrain being that she was "the best" or "my favorite" teacher at Smith. Most comment on how tough her classes were, what a nit-picker she was about grammar when marking papers, and how in class she was "engaging, witty as hell, and spectacularly useful." I'll quote a few sentences from students who took her class "Writing Essays *New Yorker Style*": "Crow makes her students work hard, but all the work is worth the level of discussion and lecture in her classes. She brings a sharp analytical mind to every text and offers excellent constructive criticism on student papers"; and "She doesn't hesitate to let you know what does and doesn't work in your writing, and that honesty is what has helped me grow as a writer. She does not take any BS." While Crow may have published only one book (*The Poet Swift*, as Nora Crow Jaffe, 1977) and the MLA lists nothing for her after her *DLB* entry on Swift in 1990, she participated in several Münster Swift Symposium and regularly reviewed books and articles for *The Scriblerian*. To read those reviews is to know that her students have accurately drawn her character.

Professor Crow evidently was conscious of her critical posture, for back in the Spring 2007 *Scriblerian*, she began a review praising a faulty essay for an erudite contribution with the reflection: "In my long and godless career as a reviewer, I have never before felt compelled to call an article 'learned, wise, and noble.' Usually, I fasten on the poor copyediting and the loose writing as evidence that the author is a miscreant and a wastrel and read the substance with a jaundiced eye" (39.2: 163). I have appreciated how she would praise some junior scholar's first noteworthy publication while also slamming a senior scholar's bestseller. In the 2016 *Scriblerian*, she makes fun of Leo Damrosch's *Jonathan Swift: His Life and His World*, beginning, "In the Prologue to this book, Mr. Damrosch takes pains to distinguish himself from Irvin Ehrenpreis, author of the monumental, three-volume biography . . . Mr. Damrosch need not have bothered . . . [his book] could scarcely be confused with Ehrenpreis's serious and authoritative work" (112). Then she catalogues for over a page oversimplifications and mistakes. Thinking about Professor Crow's reviews led me to recall the general level of wit in *The Scriblerian*'s reviews. I have marked on the covers delightful zingers, as in 31.1 (Autumn 1998), where I flagged the lead sentences of two reviews: "Somebody is always trying to get into Richardson's bedroom" and "James Jurin, physician and secretary to the Royal Society, was the man--or, physician--who killed Sir Robert Walpole. At least, Walpole believed so" (34, 110). Just one more: the Autumn 2000 issue begins "The long arm of Jürgen Habermas reaches out to deaden another text."

Some Thoughts from on Wing and the ESTC from Carolyn Nelson (co-compiler of the *Wing Short-Title Catalogue*)

I was amused at your suggestion [in Comparative Remarks on Wing and ESTC in the last issue] that booksellers prefer to cite Wing rather than ESTC because there usually are fewer library copies listed--I'm sure you're right!

I have my set of Wing behind me in my office, but I'm embarrassed to admit that I almost always look up the ESTC entry online rather than consult the relevant Wing volume--it's faster, and gives fuller information. My needs have changed, though--I don't often have to search for earlier or later editions of the volume in question, except when ascertaining that there was no earlier edition. Where I think Wing has an advantage over ESTC is the ease with which one can check a Wing author's entire run of editions of frequently reprinted works 1641-1700 at a glance, ordered by title and publication date (minus any edition(s) we didn't know about).

Of course the shortened titles, dashes and [anr. ed] notations conceal a host of differences in wording, spelling, and punctuation, but the Wing lists make a good starting point when there are more than (say) twenty editions of a work. It's frustrating, when one needs a chronological listing of editions, to have them wildly out of sequence in the ESTC, just because the tenth word in a long title has a comma rather than a period after it.

The Uniform Title field was perhaps meant to remedy the situation when ESTC was set up, but it wasn't consistently used by the keyboarders of the individual records. Thomas Otway's play *The Orphan* . . . was intended to be listed with "*Orphan*" as the uniform title, but the field is added to only four records among the myriad of 17th and 18th century editions. "*Hamlet*" is given a uniform title field in only twenty-three records. In any case the records are listed in the same way--alphabetically by full title and only then by year--regardless of whether you search on Uniform Title in the Advanced Search menu, or simply by keyword.

Generally speaking, though, I do agree that the ESTC is almost always to be preferred over Wing. Donald Wing was content to offer the reader what he called "enumerative bibliography," with just enough information to distinguish one entry from another, following the general guidelines of the original STC, and we at the Wing Revision weren't able to go much beyond extending some of the criteria for making such distinctions, and doing our best to sort out the individual copies from entries that had been lumped together in the first edition.

STC and Wing were provisional forerunners to ESTC, but (as you point out) ESTC benefited from them, as perhaps some future even-more-comprehensive and detailed online bibliography will benefit from ESTC.--C.N.

Feedback on ESTC from John Lancaster

John Lancaster, responding to my article in the last issue on Wing and ESTC illustrated with entries for particular books, hypothesized that the two different 1711 records mentioned for *The History of the Five Wise Philosophers* suggested that the 137-p edition (T225915) is perhaps the 128-p. 1711 ed. (T87901) "followed by gatherings B-G of the 1700 edition," noting that the entire first gathering (not just the first five leaves) is the same in the two items. But "only comparison of the Oxford copy [of 1711] with the Chicago copy of the 1700 edition would tell whether my bet would be won." And that says a lot about how the ESTC need be corrected--one is continually confronted by the need to compare copies in separate records. John, co-editor with Keith Maslen of *The Bowyer Ledgers* and former editor of *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, has for a number of years been retired from being the head

of special collections at Amherst College and has for years been volunteering time to catalogue rare books at Smith College into the ESTC (it's rare books room is named to honor his deceased wife and its former curator, Ruth Mortimer). John has a commitment to the ESTC that leads to his fixing problems like those I noted, after first checking with libraries that have "a stake in the records."

Regarding the ESTC, John notes that some contributing libraries download into their catalogues ESTC records that, when later corrected, remain in the earlier uncorrected form in those library's catalogues. A similar set of problems have arisen on OCLC where ECCO copies are listed (whose citation pages are often more erroneous than current ESTC records). John encouraged me to contribute descriptions of editions I own that are not recorded in the ESTC, which will record them as being in a private collection. ESTC will create a location record for such individuals and also note whether one wants one's ownership revealed on inquiry--I had not known I could ask who owned a book said to be held by a private collector.

John writes that **Smith College** is about to fully reconstruct its **Neilson Library** and add to the shell of the old library a rare books cube designed by Maya Lin, whose mother was a Smith graduate. The new library will have fewer books, shipping many to an annex under construction, and better digital resources. Construction for the roughly \$100 million project will begin in late 2017 or early 2018.

Comparative Remarks on Project MUSE and JSTOR

The *Intelligencer* has scrutinized a number of online bibliographies but said nothing about Project Muse and JSTOR, which many at subscribing universities use to discover and access scholarship--and some outside academia may be buying downloads of articles or even books from them. One can use multiple fields and filters to search Muse and JSTOR as well as browse journals lists. I fail to find good comparative studies of the two services, but, having spent a great many days the past couple months using Muse and JSTOR, I'm prepared to offer some half-assed generalizations about the two, in part as encouragement to put them to use.

Project Muse was founded as a non-profit in 1993 by Johns Hopkins U. Press in conjunction with the University's Eisenhower Library. It seems to have particularly flourished in the past decade or two, adding e-books in 2012 (by partnering with University Press Content Consortium) and having now 2500 subscribing libraries. The non-profit JSTOR, headquartered in Ann Arbor and NYC, started a couple years later at the U. of Michigan, arising out of the concern of William G. Bowen, then President of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, to help college libraries gain access to scholarship and reduce the need for storage. In 2009 JSTOR merged with ITHAKA, home to Porico, "a digital preservation service for e-books and e-journals, a ITHAKA S&R (its research services division). In 2011 JSTOR added books. Both Muse and JSTOR have advisory boards, Muse's having seven members and including Professor Neil Fraistat of Maryland and Patrick Alexander, Director of Penn State U. Press, JSTOR's having 15 members, most being library administrators. Both services deal only with institutions (but an institution might license access

for its alumni, etc.). Both have multiple subscription packages (“tiered-pricing structures”)—one might, depending on one’s university’s package, be able to see that an article is within the service but not be able to read it. Muse, for instance, has subscriptions that provide ownership of e-books or just access, and these contracts vary depending on publication years accessed—furthermore, schools can buy books in 14 subsets. E-books that have been purchased from Muse can be searched by chapters and their texts downloaded or printed. This was not possible on JSTOR as recently as 2013, when Norm Medeiros noted it was to JSTOR’s disadvantage (“Race to the Top: Project MUSE, JSTOR, and the Quest for Ebook Supremacy,” *OCLC Systems and Services* [29.2:52-54]). Much keener on marketing than JSTOR, Muse has a “news” page that reports on developments, as new journals, mobile phone access, and the use of shibboleths to allow access without passing through one’s institutional system.

Both services show varied content depending on the journals’ contributing content—as JSTOR warns us, only a small percentage of the articles it carries contain abstracts. Often one is able to examine an article’s first page when no abstract is available. Note that there are categorical distinctions in the journals on Muse, some being only “hosted” by Muse. Finally, only certain years of any particular journal are available on the two services. Both have browsing lists indicating what years of journals are available. Muse gives dates under the title in its journals browsing list. These American services are in competition with other company’s providing scholarly articles, such as EBSCO (a great provider of high schools—it recently contacted the *Intelligencer* about vending our articles), and, outside the country, such as the British Library, Brill online, Dialnet at U. of La Rioja (Spain), Elsevier in Amsterdam, and the publishing giant Taylor & Francis and both Cambridge and Oxford university presses.

My sense (relying on google access) is that JSTOR is especially valuable to scientists and scholars, particularly those outside English-language studies, for journal publications in 1980-2000, and that it has lost content to Muse in the past decade; certainly it is slower to mount newly published content. That’s suggested by using title-word searches for articles. (Searching by content words from digitized texts greatly inflates results with listings in Muse for such “articles” as the ASECS patrons list in *ECS* and *SECC*.) Consider these totals for searches of articles by title-words “wissenschaft” and “bibliographie” in JSTOR: “wissenschaft” in 1980-1999: 195; in 2000-2015: 166; for “bibliografie” in 1980-1999: 453; for 2000-2015: 198. The lack of recent material on some 18C authors can also be shown: for Wollstonecraft since 2013 JSTOR has five hits from four books, with no journal articles; in 2010 three hits for journal articles (*MP*, *Studies in the Novel*, *Wordsworth Circle*); for Voltaire in 2010: five hits: *RHLF*, *Arab Studies*, *Dalhousie French Studies*, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, and *Romanische Forschung*. For Voltaire in 2013, four hits in journals, 2 in *Agni* and one in *Revista di Critica Letteraria Latinoamericana* and *Estudios de Asia y Africa*. The comparable data for Project Muse shows its weakness for journals of 1980s and 1990s, but its expansion over time. For “wissenschaft” in 19880-1999 it has 7 journal articles, for 2000-15, 33; for “bibliographie” 1980-1999, 18 hits, for 2000-15, 25. Project Muse for “Wollstonecraft” in 2013, 2014, and 2015 has 3, 3, and 4 articles. For Voltaire in 2010, 7 articles; in 2013, 5 (tho’ 4 are from *French Studies*). The ascendancy of Project Muse is suggested by articles with “eighteenth century” in the title.

JSTOR for title-word “eighteenth century” in 2013 finds 38 journal articles, from journals such as *Eighteenth Century: Theory & Interpretation*, *Year’s Work in Modern Language Studies*, *Library Quarterly*, *William & Mary Quarterly*, *Central European History*, *Music in Art*, *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society*. But JSTOR holds only 8 and 10 journal articles in 2014 and 2015 with “eighteenth century” in the title. (These 2014-15 articles are in issues of *YES*, *MLR*, *WMQ*, and *Studies in the Novel*--and less familiarly known--*Journal of the Canadian Art Historians*, *Social Scientist*, *American Antiquity*, *The Great Circle*, *Proceedings of the Harvard Celtic Colloquium*, *Revue d’art canadienne*, *Journal for the Study of Religion, Region, Journal of Korean Religions*, and *Anglican Episcopal History*. Project Muse has title-word “eighteenth century” in 83, 98 and 99 articles dated 2013, 2014, and 2015. Muse acquired a number of journals as of 2015, such as *Canadian Journal of History*, *Marvels & Tales*, *Studies in American Humor*, and *WMQ*.

Project Muse begins its runs of major 18C journals in the following years: *EAL* 2000, *EC:T&I* 2006, *ECF* 1988, *ECL* 1996, *ECS* 1995/96, *ELH* 1993, *Library* 2006, *Music and Letters* 2004, *Restoration* 2008, *SECC* 1991, *SEL* 1999, *Studies in Bibliography* 2002, *Scriblerian* 2011, *SP* 2003, *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 2007--it has issues as recent as 2017 for the first seven journals listed. It has a few runs reaching back to the 1980s, as *Women in German Yearbook*, 1985-2016. Usually journals continue on Muse once started, but there are exceptions, as for *Scottish Historical Review*: only 2006-08. **JSTOR**, usually reaching back earlier but not as far forward, holds the following runs: *EAL*: 1968-2013, *EC: T&I*: 1979-2013, *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*: 1986-2013, *ECS*: 1967-2011, *ELH*: 1934-2011 *M&L*: 1920-2011, *MLR* 1905-2016, *MP*: 1903-2015, *PBSA*: 1909-2015, *PMLA*: 1889-2011, *Restoration*: 1977-2013, *RES*: 1925-2011, *RHLF*: 1894-2011, *SEL*: 1961-2011, *SB*: 1949-2007, *SP*: 1906-2013, *TSWL*: 1982-2011. Note JSTOR lacks *ECF*, *ECL*, *Library*, *Scriblerian*; Muse lacks *EC Ireland*, *MP*, *MLR*, *PBSA*, *PMLA*, *RHLF*, and hundreds of journals in JSTOR: JSTOR has 17 journals with titles falling alphabetically between *Storyworlds* and *Studies in American Fiction*, sequential titles in Muse’s list. Muse has 7 journals beginning with some variant of “history”; JSTOR has 41. Both lack important serials for 18C studies, e.g.: *Age of Johnson*, *Achtzehnte Jahrhundert*, *Dieciocho*, *Dix-huitième siècle*, *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, *Notes and Queries, 1650-1850*, *Recherches sur Diderot et sur L’Encyclopédie*, *RECTS*, *SVEC*, *Swift Studies*, and *TLS*.

After you’ve clicked on an article title in JSTOR, it provides fuller publication info, topics or key words for articles, and often the first page of the article. The topics listed are not all accurate. I had a laugh last week at JSTOR’s expense on finding that most of the listings for German articles that came up in searches of “eighteenth century” and “publishing” and “censorship,” etc., had “hats” and other odd objects as supposedly major topics in their contents. Besides hats, Jan Wim Wisselius’s “De briefwisseling tussen Johann Christoffer Wolf en Willem Suvenhuisen (1720-1727)” was also about “toes.” Several articles on hats were also about “cinerary urns,” including an article by Christine Haug on “Der Buchhändler Johann Georg Esslinger (1710-1775) in Frankfurt am Main und sein Handel mit Geheimpliteratur”: JSTOR says it’s about “Former Slaves, Cinerary Urns, War, Gait, Christianity, Literature, Hats.” An article by

Annett Volmer that's on the journal tradition and French influences on 18C Germans has the topical heading "mallets" in addition to hats and cinerary urns!

Journals on Muse tend to be known to American 18C literary scholars; whereas those on JSTOR include many they don't tap. I added a hundred articles last month to my BibSite bibliographies of authorship, publishers, journalism, censorship, etc., using JSTOR. For instance, on JSTOR I found Heather Haveman, Jacob Habinek, & Leo Goodman's "How Entrepreneurship Evolves: The Founders of New Magazines in America, 1741-1860." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 57.4 (2012), 585-624--probably a good source, for Princeton published Haveman's *Magazines and the Making of America: Modernization, Community, and Print Culture, 1741-1860* (2015).--James E. May

BIESES: Bibliografía de escritoras españolas

This *Bibliography of Spanish Women Writers* is edited by Nieves Baranda Leturio, and many others, housed in Madrid, and funded on three-year grants by Spanish federal ministries. It is an open-access electronic resource posted at www.bieses.net (or try <http://www.uned.es/bieses/>). The first three three-year grants from the Ministry of Education were for a project entitled "Bibliography of Spanish Writers: Middle Ages to Eighteenth Century," with Baranda Leturio as principal investigator (2004-2012); then came an assessment grant; the most recent grant is from the Ministry of Commerce and Competitiveness for a project entitled "Escritoras españolas de primera modernidad: Metadatos, visualización y análisis." The site has an English-language mode providing explanatory texts and headings in English. The site offers a wealth of texts for modern scholarship and for early texts, many digitized and in photofacsimile; also bibliographies and links to electronic resources, such as the Biblioteca Digital Hispánica. Thus, within the alphabetized menu of authors for those beginning with "J," under Juana Inés de la Cruz (Sor Juana, 1651-1695), among many accumulated resources, one finds the link to the Biblioteca Digital Hispánica and clicking the link leads to crisp color photographs of entire early editions of her major works. The home page has such pull-down menus as "Know Bieses," "Bieses Resources" (with bibliographies and texts as PDFs and digitized editions), and "News" as of congresses and publications. There is also a link lower down on the home page to lists of authors and also to query hints ("sugerencias de consulta"), which notes that diacritical marks must not be used.

The 2016 Double Issue of *The Scriblerian*

The Scriblerian, 48, no. 1-49, no. 2 (2016), was published in early December (prior to an earlier publication on Project Muse online). Founding editor **Roy Wolper** credits **Mel New** with integrating the two issues into a 228-page volume, and two of its other principal editors pay EC/ASECS dues, **W. B[lake]. Gerard** and **E. Derek Taylor**, as do over a dozen of its contributing editors. It is often witty, frequently corrective, and always informative. *Scriblerian* helps me fight off the despair that I cannot keep up with the profusion of scholarship on the few topics I'd like to lay claim to. And I appreciate the characteristic candor of its reviewers, the willingness to warn us that there's nothing new in particular books or that someone has gotten

numerous facts wrong. The expertise among reviewers and editors place published claims in perspective, as when the reviewer of Nathalie Zimpfer's "The Stapfer Fragment: Variations on an Attribution ([Part] II)" in *The Shandean*, 25 (2014), identifies what's new and significant in the case for attributing a MS to Sterne or Paul Stapfer (76-77). Some reviews offer more general reflections of value, as that Bucknell should encourage collections of essays to use parenthetical references more--this in a review of a book with 108 endnotes "at least half of which should be citations within the text" (75). There is the delightful take-down of Damrosch's Swift by Nora Crow which I mentioned above in eulogizing her. Here too we learn of important research done in Holland regarding Aphra Behn's stay there, employed by J. P. Vander Motten and René Vermeir in their critical essay "'Reality and Matter of Fact': Text and Context in Aphra Behn's *The Fair Jilt*," *Review of English Studies*, 66 (2015), 280-99. And we hear that the late Bill Overton argues for Behn's virtues as a translator in a 2015 *Women Writers'* article on her version of Tallemant.

The issue surveys many articles on Defoe, Fielding, Richardson, and Sterne. One of special importance is **Frederick Ribble's** "'In the Footsteps of Henry Fielding': A 'Lost' Letter from Ryde." *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 63 (2012), 431-43 (reviewed on pp. 39-40). Besides making several important points relative to Fielding and the publication of his *Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*, Ribble transcribes an unsigned letter to Samuel Richardson from Ryde, where Fielding stayed before his journey to Lisbon, correcting its earlier published text and arguing that it may have been written by Richardson's nephew James Leake, Jr. Note, too, Howard Weinbrot's strong counter-argument against Michael McKeon's case for the secularization of England after the Restoration (102-03), with the adoption of "empirical skepticism" and "Puritan ecclesiastical reforms," offered in the festschrift for Ronald Paulson edited by **Ashley Marshall**, *Representation, Heterodoxy, and Aesthetics*, 2015. Weinbrot offers a page of details showing "The High Church did not go gentle into what they thought a dark night." This is one of many reviews that showcase major issues around which a graduate seminar could be built. Of course, lots of our members belong to the *Scriblerian* society. The 2016 issue includes reviews by **Martha Bowden**, **Andrew Carpenter**, **J. A. Downie**, **John Dussinger**, **W. Blake Gerard** (several), **Raymond Hilliard**, **George Justice**, **Deborah Kennedy**, **Leah Orr**, and **Mel New** (several)--and many of the unsigned reviews are by members on the editorial board. Well proofed and produced, *The Scriblerian* is both inexpensive and indispensable for English studies 1660-1770. Faculty who have promising students working in this period should purchase them a two-year subscription that's offered grad students for \$15 (send it to **W. B. Gerard**, English Dept., POB244023, U. of Auburn at Montgomery AL 36124)--learning to write a good book review is part of their apprenticeship.

Additions and Corrections to the Directory for March 2017

(The last directory published is in the October 2015 issue.)

Andrew Black, Andrew: 1300 Kirkwood Dr. / Murray, KY 42071-3219

Brylowe, Thora: 104 Pine Way, Broomfield, CO 80020-2909.

Carlile, Susan. more address: Susan.Carlile@csulb.edu; English / Calif.

State U.--Long Beach / 1250 Bellflower Blvd / Long Beach, CA 90840

Lauren Duval, Lauren: 1819 Gales St. NE / Washington, DC 20002-7213
 Evans, Mary. email addresses: mevans@hvcc.edu; mevans@albany.edu
 Hammond, Eugene. new address: English Dept. / Stony Brook Univ. /
 Stony Brook, NY 11794-5350
 O'Hara, Kimberly: 25912 Racing Sun Dr. / Aldie, VA 20105-5863
 Phifer, Sondra (was Tannenbaum): 43-19 41st St., #A2 / Sunnyside, NY 11104
 Sagal, Katie. new address: 1560 D. Hunt Dr. / Normal, IL 61761
 Scheibert, Beverly Jerold. bvjerold@gmail.com; new address:
 100 Middlesex Blvd., Unit 308, Plainsboro, NJ 08536
 Schuetze, Sarah: 828 Gross Ct. / Green Bay, WI 54304-2518
 Temple, Kathryn: 4946 Bonnie Wood Dr. / Shady Side, MD 20764-9675

News of Members

Note that the contents table for the *Intelligencer*, posted at the newsletter archive by **Susan Beam**, now includes the contents of the October 2016 issue--you may find it handy to search that table for something you once read in the newsletter. In another month Susan will post the October 2016 issue with open access in the newsletter archive--where it joins others since 2008 (www.ec-asecs.org). Note that **Jim May's address, thus the *Intelligencer's* address**, will change this July to 1423 Hillcrest Rd. / Lancaster, PA 17603. Now a pensioner, he'll be taking sanctuary in a city which was the U.S. capital for one day before the Continental Congress wisely took to York, adding distance from the British. Lancaster was one of the first inland cities in what is now the United States. The new house is a short walk from Franklin & Marshall.

Paula Backscheider's essay "Frances Brooke: Becoming a Playwright" appears in *Women's Writing*, 23 (2016), 325-38. In *Scriblerian's* double issue for 2016 we find Paula's book *Elizabeth Singer Rowe and the Development of the English Novel* reviewed by Madeleine Marshall (159-61). In the 2016 issue of the e-journal *Digital Defoe*, Paula reviews *Queen Anne and the Arts*, edited by **Cedric Reverand, II**, and James Winn's *Queen Anne Patroness of the Arts* (Oxford UP, 2014). This issue of *Digital Defoe* posted at www.digitaldefoe.org/category/issues/issue-8-1-fall-2016/ is edited by Adam Sills and Christopher Loar, with Jason Pearl as book-review editor. The 2015 volume of *Yearbook of English Studies*, vol. 45, was devoted to "The History of the Book," and edited with an introduction by **Sandro Jung** and Stephen Colclough. It contained essays by four of our members: **Barbara M. Benedict**, "Choice Reading: Anthologies, Reading Practices and the Canon, 1680-1800" (35-55); **Thomas F. Bonnell**, "Furnishings: English and Scottish Poetry Series in the Late 18th Century" (109-36); Sandro Jung, "Thomas Stothard, Milton, and the Illustrative Vignette: The Houghton Library Designs for *The Royal Engagement Pocket Atlas*" (137-58); and **Jack Lynch**, "Generous Liberal-Minded Men: Booksellers and Poetic Careers in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*" (93-108). The 2016 *YES* volume had a kindred theme: "Writing the Americas, 1480-1826." Edited by Robert Lawson-Peebles and Kristin A. Cook, it contained **Eve T. Bannet's** "Enlightenment and the Transatlantic Text Trade." *Yearbook of English Studies*, (127-44), and **Carla J. Mulford's** "Print Journalism and Benjamin Franklin's Scientific Politics" (181-97). Looking up Eve's email address the other day at the U. of Oklahoma's website, I learned that she is George Lynn Cross Professor

of English, and came upon this delightful piece of advice to students: Dr. Bannet “assigns a fairly heavy work load in all her classes.” I’ll bet she does.

Congratulations to **Lisa Berglund** for taking over as the Executive Secretary of ASECS this July. In December Lisa published “Why Should Hester Lynch Piozzi Be Doctor Johnson’s Mrs. Thrale?” in *Names: A Journal of Onomastics* (2016), 64:4, 189-201. And congratulations, too, or better yet, “thank you,” to **Jill Marie Bradbury**, who takes on the duties of ASECS Treasurer at the same time. Jill reviews James Arbuckle’s *Selected Works*, edited by R. Holmes, in the double issue of *Scriblerian* (138-40). **Martha F. Bowden** co-authored with Elizabeth Kraft “Tristrapedia or Tangled Web? Laurence Sterne and *Tristram Shandy* Online” in *The Shandean*, 27 (2016). They examine Sterne at multiple websites, or text-sites, and come away favorably impressed (while also pointing out some less useful matter floating above). **Toni Bowers** wrote the “Afterword” and **Rachel Carnell** contributed. “*The Adventures of Rivella* as Political Secret History” (15-30) to *New Perspectives on Delariviere Manley and Eighteenth-Century Literature: Power, Sex, Text*, ed. by Aleksandra Hultquist and Elizabeth J. Mathews (Routledge, 2017). Palgrave recently published **Caroline Breashears**’s *Eighteenth-Century Women’s Writing and the “Scandalous Memoir”* (2016; 121 pp.). Caroline traces the evolution of the subgenre via Lady Vane, Mme de La Touche, Catherine Jemmat, Margaret Coghlan, et al. **Susan Carlile** presented several papers last year: “Intellectual Fertility: Linneaus, Women, and English Poetry” at the WSECS in February at Santa Barbara; and “Charlotte Lennox and Natural History” at ASECS in Pittsburgh; also at the ASECS, she spoke in the roundtable colloquium “‘Less of the Heroine than the Woman’: Parsing Gender in the British Novel.” Last July she spoke on “Charlotte Lennox, Shakespeare, and the Independent Mind” at Chawton House in Hampshire. She contributed “Charlotte Lennox” to *The Encyclopedia of British Literature 1660-1789*, ed. by **Jack Lynch** and Gary Day (2015). Susan’s book “Charlotte Lennox: An Independent Mind” is currently being copyedited for the U. of Toronto Press.

Moyra Haslett reviews **Andrew Carpenter** and Lucy Collins’s *The Irish Poet and the Natural World* in the double *Scriblerian* (142-43). Andrew has reviewed John Stubbs’ *Jonathan Swift: The Reluctant Rebel* in the *Dublin Review of Books* and has edited *The Poems of Olivia Elder: A Voice from 18C Ulster*. In an essay entitled “Dreadful Acts of Liberty” **Vincent Carretta** reviews Marcus Rediker’s *The Amistad Rebellion in Eighteenth Century: Theory & Interpretation* (56:517-20). **Arthur H. Cash**, whose two-volume biography is still the best account of Sterne, died in December at age 94. He’d taught for 40 years at SUNY New Paltz and attended the Columbia seminars, where he had many friends. **Logan Connors** edited a double-issue of *Restoration and 18C Theatre Research* (29.1-2) with the focus “Writing against the Stage: Anti-Theatrical Discourse in Early Modern Europe,” the issue beginning with his “From Anti-theatre to Anti-Theatricality.” **Kevin Cope**’s 23rd volume of *1650-1850* appeared in October, with a thematic focus on motion, evident in Bill Overton’s “Motion in (18th Century) Poetry” and Kevin Hayes’ “Thomas Jefferson, Travel Writer.” Also present are Kevin’s “Drifting Unguided or Involuntary Motion and the Enlightenment Sense of Direction”; **Bärbel Czennia**’s “Cook’s Ark: Animals on the Move in the Service of Empires”; and **Mascha Hansen**’s “Social Mobility and Personal Displacement: Queen

Charlotte between England and Germany.” In Fredericksburg, we learned that Kevin continues to chair the faculty senate in the Louisiana State U. system--he must be a good advocate for its faculty to be repeatedly elected. *The Citizens of the World: Adapting in the Eighteenth Century* edited by Kevin and **Samara Anne Cahill** (Bucknell, 2015) is reviewed by James Mulholland in the 2016 *Digital Defoe*. In the Summer 2016 *ECF*, **JoEllen DeLucia** reviews *The Cambridge Companion to Women’s Writing in Britain, 1660-1789*, edited by **Catherine Ingrassia** (28.4: 762-65). **Al Coppola’s** *The Theater of Experiment: Staging Natural Philosophy in Eighteenth-Century Britain* was published by OUP in 2016 (pp. x + 265), in part an examination of the fun made of virtuosos.

J. A. Downie has edited *The Oxford Handbook of The Eighteenth-Century Novel* (Oxford UP, Sept. 2016), 580 pp.; \$150. The collection of 34 essays is billed by OUP as “The first book professing to survey the 18C English novel in its entirety,” and they mean the “long” 18C, from the late 17C through the first three decades of the 19C. For instance, Robert Folkenflik’s well-illustrated survey is entitled “The Rise of the Illustrated English Novel to 1832,” and John Feather’s survey of the book trade’s involvement reaches to 1832. The volume has a Part I covering 1660-1770 and a Part II covering 1770-1832, each with an epilogue by Downie. The sort of topics covered will be suggested by noting the titles of essays by EC/ASECS members: “‘Labours of the Press’: The Response to *Pamela*” by **Peter Sabor**; “Samuel Richardson and the Epistolary Novel” by **John Dussinger**; “‘Male’ and ‘Female’ Novels? Gendered Fictions and the Reading Public, 1770-1832” by **Barbara Benedict**; “Reviewing the Novel” by **Antonia Forster**; “Developments in Sentimental Fiction” by **Geoffrey Sill**; and “‘Pictures of Domestic Life in Country Villages’: Jane Austen and the ‘Realist’ Novel” by **Jan Fergus**. (Other essays of special note are Pat Rogers’ on social structure to 1770 and the late W. A. Speck’s on the same 1770-1832, Gillian Dow on French translations, W. R. Owens on “Religious Writings and the Early Novel,” Tim Parnell on Sterne, and Thomas Keymer on the Restoration novel.) All the essays will enter the text-base called Oxford Handbooks Online.

In *Philological Quarterly* last year appeared **John Dussinger’s** “Johnson’s Unacknowledged Debt to Thomas Edwards in the 1765 Edition of Shakespeare (95.1:45-100), with five tables with comparative quotations. John demonstrates that contemporary criticism of Johnson for failing to credit many fellow Shakespeareans was justified. **Gloria Eive** is editing *Incontri Internazionale di Studi sul Compositore Faetino Giuseppe Sarti--Gli Atti* and contributing articles to the *Grove OnLine*, as for Paolo Alberghi. The collection on arts & lit, *Visions and Realities*, edited by Gloria, is overdue from Cambridge Scholars. *Stage Mothers: Women, Work, and the Theatre 1660-1800*, edited by **Laura Engel** and Elaine McGirr is reviewed in *Theatre Journal’s* March 2016 issue. **Robert Erickson** continues working on a study of “Ectasy & Rapture 1660-1800.” **Mary Evans** is working on her dissertation, “The Itinerant in the 18th-Century Novel.” She spoke on Sterne’s *A Sentimental Journey* on a panel regarding probability at the Pittsburgh ASECS, and then at the NEASECS in October presented “Women Who Riot: Arabella’s Vocation in *The Female Quixote*.”

Panthea Reid, wife of our late member **John Irwin Fischer**, publishes in May a memoir of her and John’s loving marriage and his fatal illness: *Body and Soul: A Memoir of Love, Loss, and Healing* (Wild River Consulting and Publishing). Besides being a celebration of John’s life and a memoir of John and

Panthea's scholarly lives (they were at LSU together for over a quarter century, where John was the first chair voted in by the department and the director of graduate studies), it's a grief memoir with warnings about unsatisfactory medical care and encouragements to get opinions outside the confines of one's regular doctors. Panthea, the author of biographies of Virginia Woolf and Tillie Olsen, has written a very engaging narrative with remarkable self-scrutiny and honesty. She recounts repeatedly John's good-natured humor (he could be very funny), and the healing section has a delightful account of taking African safaris with daughter Hannah. BTW, after John's death, Panthea prepared for the press the Word-Book that Esther Johnson (Stella) had copied from Swift's dictation, which A. C. Elias, Jr., and John Fisher spent years annotating and researching. It will be published by Delaware soon. Panthea then sold their home in Princeton and moved to Blacksburg, where she lives in a natural landscape close to family.

In the last issue I fit in a short tribute to **Robert Fleck, founder of Oak Knoll Press** and Oak Knoll Books, and his son Rob wrote back with thanks on receiving a copy. It occurred to me then that I should have said more, adding: Scholars take publishing houses for granted--they are huge enterprises or arms of universities for the most part, but once there was no Oak Knoll, there was no big warehouse for all the books about books, no publisher to be the American partner of the BL, HES/DeGraaf, etc., and accordingly less scholarship was published--and it would then have been unlikely that a book like David Pearson's on binding would get to a second edition. Robert Fleck and Oak Knoll played an important role in the flowering of book-history scholarship.

We're very happy to be able to offer **Corey Andrews's** detailed review of **Henry Fulton's** career-length biography (his own and his subjects): *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802: A Life in Medicine, Travel, and Revolution* (2015). Corey's account joins a number of favorable reviews. **Richard Sher** in the Spring 2016 issue of the *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* remarks that "Fulton is careful to treat all aspects of Moore's career with equal care, opening up to the reader a huge swatch of eighteenth-century British and European culture" (90: 152). Sher stresses that Moore, as a Scot living overseas and in London, as a physician and successful travel writer and novelist, required a great range of study from a biographer. Henry has been driving over from Central Michigan Univ. for EC/ASECS's meetings from our first decade--despite generous ministerial and college service. I mentioned above that he has an essay in the Borck festschrift, appropriately so, for Henry has been helped edit and compile *ECCB's* section on philosophy and religion for three decades. Good citizen that he is, Henry would gladly work with a younger scholar working on Moore or more generally Scottish authors or doctors or travelers, sharing with them his archived resources and perhaps enlist them in concluding his own unfinished publication projects.

Looking over the *Journal of Moravian History*, whose volumes since 2012 are on Project Muse, I stumbled upon four by **Scott Paul Gordon**. Scott had given me a short walking tour of the Moravian blocks in Bethlehem when EC/ASECS met there, but I had no idea he has distinguished himself in the community's history. This past year, with Robert Paul Lienemann, Scott published "The Gunmaking Trade in Bethlehem, Christiansbrunn, and Nazareth: Opportunity and Constraint in Managed Moravian Economies, 1750-1800" (16 [2016], 1-44). Scott's historical range is impressive: "The Paxton Boys and the Moravians: Terror and Faith in the Pennsylvania Backcountry" (14 [2014], 119-

52) and also “Glad Passivity: Mary Pentz of Lititz and the Making of a Moravian Woman,” on the diarist, accountant and guide of a women’s home in Lititz (13 [2013], 1-26); and “Patriots and Neighbours: Pennsylvania Moravians in the American Revolution” (12 [2012], 111-42). We look forward to hearing from **Gene Hammond** about his travels from Viet Nam, Myanmar, Indonesia, and New Zealand following his teaching stint in Korea in the fall. **Courtney Hoffman**, in the Ph.D. program at Georgia, besides producing a good review for this issue, has an essay out *Outlander* appearing in the collection *The Cinematic Eighteenth Century*, due this summer from Routledge. **Robert Hume**’s “Theatre Performance Records in London, 1660-1705” appears in *Review of English Studies*, 67, no. 280 (June 2016), 468-95. **J. Paul Hunter** contributed an introduction, “*The Rape of the Lock* after 300 Years,” to *Anniversary Essays on Alexander Pope’s The Rape of the Lock*, edited by Donald W. Nichol (2016).

Jacob Sider Jost will be a Junior Fellow at the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies in Freiburg, Germany for 2017-18, thus missing our fall meeting. This summer Jacob will be working with a student researcher on a “digital humanities project that organizes biographical and bibliographical information about poets active in Britain in the 1730s.” He’s planning to make the information freely available via his academia.edu site and plans to send an account of the project for the fall *Intelligencer*. In the double-issue of *Scriblerian* (2016), Jacob reviews Siraj Ahmed’s *Still Birth of Capitalism: Enlightenment Writing and Colonial India*. In that same issue **George Justice** reviews **Manushag Powell**’s *Performing Authorship in 18C English Periodicals* (120-22), and **Deborah Kennedy** reviews Stephen Bending’s *Green Retreats: Women, Gardens and Eighteenth-Century Culture* (168-70). Also, in the Fall 2016 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Deborah published a review of *Elisabeth Louise Vigée Le Brun (1755-1842): The Portraitist to Marie Antoinette* (50: 117-20), an exhibition on display in Ottawa in 2016, following its appearance in New York (covered here by **Linda Merians** in March 2016). That fall’s issue of *ECS* is the first of its 50th volume, leading to an introductory note by its new editor Steve Pincus, pledging to continue to steer the journal away from a preoccupation with Anglophone studies and to span the globe and cover more non-literary topics. The issue has a group of reflective tributes to the late **Srinivas Aravamudan**, recently President of ASECS. Among the issue’s reviews is **W. B. Gerard**’s of *Sterne, Tristram, Yorick: Tercentenary Essays on Laurence Sterne*, ed. by **Melvyn New**, Peter de Voogd, and Judith Hawley. The winter 2017 *ECS*, focused on cities, has essays on Charleston, Saint-Dominique, Istanbul, and London, plus four reviews. **Katharine Kittredge** published “For the Benefit of Young Women Going into Service’: Late 18C Proto-Young Adult Novels for Labouring-Class Girls” in *Women’s Writing*, 23.1 (2016), 106-26.

Anthony W. Lee published “‘Sudden Glories’: Johnson, Hobbes, and Thoughts on Falkland’s Island” in *Notes and Queries* this year. Tony looks closely at allusive language in Samuel Johnson’s *Thoughts on the Late Transactions Respecting Falkland’s Island*, a 1771 tract “defending the North Administration’s pacifist policy toward Spain.” Johnson scoffs at how after a “ten years war” “we are recompensed for the death of multitudes . . . by contemplating the sudden glories of paymasters and agents . . . whose palaces rise like exhalations.” Tony tracks that phrase “Sudden glories” back to Hobbes via Addison and also “rise like exhalations” back to Milton, thus enriching the

reading of Johnson's remarks. Tony contributed to the Sept. 2016 *Johnsonian News Letter*: "Celsus, Mrs. Thrale, Dr. Johnson, and the Other Doctor: An Intertextually Reconstructed Case History" (67.2:6-19). Tony reconstructs details of Johnson's fever in May 1773 while searching his reading of Celsus and others on fevers. It has the amusing perspective of Johnson's physician confronted with a stubborn patient who would be his own physician. The article ends with a detailed time-line of Johnson's illness and health (late April-early August) as can be gleaned from journal and letters. *Notes and Queries* has accepted Tony's "Two Allusions in Samuel Johnson's *The False Alarm*." Tony is preparing for submission two collections of essays, each with essays by EC/ASECS members. One headed to Bucknell has the title "'Solitude to him was horror': New Essays on Johnson's Circle" and contains essays involving Boswell by James Caudel, Boswell, Beauclerk & Langton by **John Radner**, Piozzi by **Lisa Berglund**, Burney by **Marilyn Francus**, Burke by **Elizabeth Lambert**, Seward by Claudia Thomas Kairoff, and Gibbon by F. P. Lock. The other volume "explores Johnson's inexhaustible fecundity." It is "divided into two sections, 'Re-Reading Specific Texts' and 'Re-Mapping Larger Themes and Issues.' . . . distinguished between interrogating particular texts—the *Dictionary*, the *Lives*, etc.—and general themes—Johnson and climate change, Johnson and 'osmology.'" It has essays by Tony, **J. T. Scanlan**, **Steven Scherwatsky**, **John Richetti**, **Emily Friedman**, Thomas Curley, Lynda Muggleston, and Adam Rounce. Tony had already edited a collection on mentoring and knows how to do a first-rate job organizing and submitting a collection--those thinking of editing a collection for the first time should ask for his advice. **Jack Lynch's** *You Could Look It Up*, published last year by Bloomsbury Press (453 pp.; \$30) is reviewed by Robert DeMaria, Jr., in *Dictionaries*, 37 (2016). DeMaria calls it a "romp through the annals of reference books," noting that it has 25 chapters (each with a half chapter) that treat 50 reference books grouped in pairs, ranging widely (including such works as the *Guinness Book of World Records*, *Brewer's Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, Thomas Browne's *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, J. Elmer's *Tables of Weights and Prices* (1758), and Johnson's *Dictionary*). Jack reviewed Seth Rudy's *Literature and Encyclopedism in Enlightenment Britain* (2015) in the Spring 2016 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (28.3:587-90).

We thank **Rodney Mader** for providing us with an account of Graeme Park, a relic of the 18C in our region. Rodney had spoken of taking English classes there at the pedagogical session in Fredericksburg, a session with thought-provoking presentations by **Lisa Berglund** and **Eleanor Shevlin** & her three undergraduate students. For Rodney's account above, his and other interesting sessions, the plenaries by Eleanor Shevlin and **Catherine Ingrassia** (above), the memorable strolls on the Mary Washington campus and local streets in town, **we thank our host Marie McAllister**. Early this month Rodney was out in Tulsa, participating in the **Society of Early Americanists'** 10th biennial meeting, hosted by **Laura Steevens** (she's president for 2015-17 and predictably doing a great job). The Society of Early Americanists is sponsoring three sessions at the American Literature Association's meeting in Boston in May: two are titled "**Fake News in Early America**," one subtitled "Hoax, Rumor, and Power in the Colonies" and the other "Information Networks in the National Public Sphere." The third session is the roundtable "Teaching Early American Literature in the Age of Trump." One paper begins "Building a Wall:

Putting Structure in . . .” Obviously more than humor is involved: there’s widely shared outrage, fear, and disappointment. Many humanities teachers, especially those teaching reading and writing, wonder if their efforts to promote critical reading and critical thinking have failed. And now more serious enrollment and budgetary problems will face colleges. EC/ASECS’s Washington venue in the fall is a good occasion for adding contemporary reference to our sessions.

Ashley Marshall’s review essay “The Epistolary Canon of the ‘Man of Mercury,’” in *Eighteenth-Century Life* (39, no. 3 [Sept. 2015], 65-75), examines Adrian Lashmore-Davies’s edition *The Unpublished Letters of Henry St. John, First Viscount Bolingbroke*, 5 vols. (Pickering & Chatto, 2013). Ashley’s *Swift and History: Politics and the English Past* is reviewed by Matthew Gertken in *Cambridge Quarterly*, 45.1 (March 2016), 85-61--in an essay entitled “‘Chiefly Disgusted with Modern History: Swift and the Past’” (one of the few review titles in the journal that suggests its subject). Ashley’s first book, *Practice of Satire in England*, has come out in paperback. Her article “Robert Harley and the Politics of Daniel Defoe’s *Review*, 1710-1713” is forthcoming in *1650-1850*. Ashley and **Rob Hume** have an essay on “Marvell and the Restoration Wits” coming out at some point in the *Oxford Handbook of Andrew Marvell*, and her “Thinking about Satire” will appear in Paddy Bullard’s *Oxford Handbook of Eighteenth-Century Satire*. Ashley will speak on Swift’s *Examiner* at ASECS, and offer something different about *The Examiner* at the Münster Symposium on Swift in June. Ashley has a well deserved sabbatical in 2017-18, when she hopes to finish a MS on political journalism in London, 1695-1720. **Jim May** (who doesn’t like following Ashley Marshall in the queue) contributed “Scribleriana Transferred: Booksellers’ Listings in 2015 and Recent Library Acquisitions” to *Scriblerian*, 48.2-49.1 (2016), 191-99. **William McCarthy** published “Editing Samuel Richardson by Tug-of-War: Anna Letitia Barbauld and Richard Phillips in 1804” in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 29.2 (Winter, 2016-17). Last fall at the Canadian SECS’s meeting in Kingston Bill presented “Anna Letitia Barbauld’s Secret Politics, and a New Attribution.” And last June he spoke at the 16th British Women Writers Conference, in Athens, on “What Should a Barbauld Edition Do, and Why Should It Do It?”

Ellen Moody reports that she is now in the second series of articles on women artists for the blog *Austen Reveries*, having now covered some 26 women artists! She is projecting, or imagining, an anthology called “The Anomaly” about single women in the 18th century (“living alone, all types”) and also about a literary biography of Winston Graham--she been writing on the Poldark books and films and working towards writing on film adaptations of the Tudor period, as well. Ellen’s big news is that, after a long wait, her edition of Charlotte Smith’s *Ethelinde, or the Recluse of the Lake* was published by Valancourt Press in its Classics series (Pp. 618; \$24.99). It’s a “Very pretty, attractively packaged book”-- “Selling like hot cakes!” This is a pardonable exaggeration, for the paperback is the first affordable scholarly edition ever. Ellen published “**On Inventing** [or was it “Living in”?] a New Country: Trollope’s Depictions of Settler Colonialism” in *Antipodes: A Global Journal of Australia/New Zealand Literature*, originally presented at the U. of Leuven during September 2015 at the Bicentennial Trollope Conference. Last year Ellen went to the Chawton Library in England to participate in the conference “Placing Charlotte Smith,” where she presented “A Peculiar Kind of Women’s

Text: The Post-Colonial *Ethelinde* and *The Emigrants*.” For the conference on Jane Austen and the Arts at Plattsburgh, NY, this month, Ellen wrote “Ekphrastic Patterns in Jane Austen.” **Carla Mulford**’s *Benjamin Franklin and the Ends of Empire* (2015) was reviewed favorably and at length by Eliga H. Gould in *Early American Literature* in 2016 (51: 501-05). Calling it a “splendid” study, “fresh and illuminating,” Gould notes that Carla’s focuses on: “the physical world of texts and documents that Franklin inhabited as well as his “‘mental world’--that is, the set of principles and ideas that he gleaned from what he read and that he developed in what he wrote.” Carla’s attention to BF’s reading leads to a “remarkably comprehensive account of Franklin’s thinking about the British Empire.” Gould concludes that “Mulford brings Franklin the thinker back to life in ways that no other recent biographer has managed to do.”

Maureen E. Mulvihill (Princeton Research Forum, NJ) was a guest writer for San Francisco’s Rare Book Hub, the premier (online) global archive of rare book sales (7 million records, 19thC -). The Hub posted her three-essay guest series, *Old Books / New Editions* (Oct., Nov., Dec., 2016), on recent editions of Anne Killigrew (“Poet, Interrupted”); Hester Pulter (“The Book of Hester”); and Margaret Cavendish (“Galactic Duchess”); each essay, 20+ pp, with an annotated Gallery of Images, includes close scrutiny of the new editions’ engagement with Book History and the principles of Scholarly Editing (for links, google *ASECS Weekly Announcements*, its Recent Books & Special Publications). Also in 2016, *Fine Books & Collections* magazine published a handsome feature article on the Mulvihill Collection, with photo and factual information on the collection’s history, range, and market value. Earlier in 2016, Maureen’s essay, “Shaking Hands with Jonathan Swift?” (*Irish Literary Supp.*, Spring 2015), assessing the recent *Damrosch Swift*, was hosted online, with images, by the WB Yeats Society of New York and also listed in Hermann Real’s *Swift Stds* (2016). As former VP (2012-2015), Florida Bibliophile Society, Maureen designed the new logo and redesigned the website. She also brought in many distinguished speakers & subjects; e.g., the visiting Schoenberg MSS Collection at Penn (April, 2015 event). In April, 2017, Maureen will be a guest speaker, “Old Books Still Matter,” at the Selby Library, Sarasota, FL. Her essay “Mary Tighe, Pride of Wicklow,” discussing new work on the poet, will run in the Autumn 2017 *Irish Literary Supplement*. Recent additions to the Mulvihill Collection include broadsheets of the *1916 Irish Proclamation* (gift of Maureen Cech) and *Sonnet XI* by The Old School Press; and a large-format print of Blake’s cover illustration of Gray’s *Ode on the Death of a Favourite Cat*, marking the recent passing of her favorite cat: Kidd Stretch of Brooklyn. She is at work on Irish women’s political writings & response, c1603-1801.

Joanne Myers, who chaired the Molin Prize committee for a second time (see her report above), has a sabbatical for the entire forthcoming academic year, when she is hoping to be living in Hereford--where her husband hopes to “benefit from the locals’ cider expertise.” **Mel New** noted in a letter at the end of November that “a new Sterne letter has turned up, 3 pages, written in 1752, a year in which no other letter survives; a young Yorkshire historian going through church archives found it--Sterne to the Dean of York on church business.” It’ll appear in *The Shandean*. Mel reflected, “So much for the Florida ‘definitive’ edition of *Letters*. The Florida edition has, by the way, been added to the Oxford Scholarly Editions on line.” **Yvonne Noble** continues to work on

Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea. Last October she spoke on “Anne Finch and the Longleat Tapestry: A Wider Context” at the sixth Aphra Behn Europe meeting (“Gender Cartographies”) held at the Universidad de Huelva (Spain). At the BSECS in January she considered Finch’s “Friends, Allies, and Enemies” (the conference theme) as background to several often-anthologized poems. This month Yvonne is giving a paper on Finch’s appearances in print at the conference on “The Reception, Reputation, and Circulation in the Early Modern World” at the National University of Ireland in Galway (where there is an ongoing research project on the “Reception and Circulation of early Modern Women Writers, 1550-1700” [see its website]). The **Women’s Studies Group 1558-1837** that Yvonne founded has now reached its 30th year! The WSG meets nowadays at the Foundling Museum in London on Saturdays, three times a year for papers (this year four times), and once in the spring for a workshop with a senior scholar as a keynote speaker (this coming May it will be Karen Hearn, a specialist in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century pregnancy portraits). Another annual event is an “outing,” which this spring will be to the archives at the Globe Theatre, where an old WSG member is now the librarian. Actually, Yvonne writes, “This year we have already had another outing, to *She Ventures and He Wins* in the festival of Restoration woman playwrights at the Rose Playhouse.” For info on the WSG, see www.womensstudiesgroup.org.uk.

Maximillian Novak’s *Transformations, Ideology, and the Real in Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe and Other Narratives: Finding the Thing Itself* (2015), a collection of mostly published pieces, including seven on *Robinson Crusoe*, is reviewed by Brian Cowan in *ECF*, 28.2 (Winter 2015/16) and by Nicholas Seager in the 2016 *Scriblerian*. Seager, who thinks the essays “hang together surprisingly well,” says they “situate Defoe as an experimental novelist,” present Defoe “as an artist of ideas,” and explore both his realism and his symbolic use of the world. Max’s “Defoe’s Role in *The Weekly Journal*: Gesture and Rhetoric, Archive and Canon, and the Uses of Literary History in Attribution” appears in *Studies in Philology* (113 [2016], 694-711). **Manny Schonhorn** tells me that the Clark Library has named its meeting room for scholarly conversations the “**Maximillian Novak Lounge**,” in honor of the Clark’s longstanding if undesignated “scholar in residence.” (The Clark reopens with improvements early next year.) Max’s review of *Reflections on Sentiment: Essays in Honor of George Starr* appears in the 2016 *Digital Defoe*.

Peter Perreten will present a paper in June at the 12th biennial conference of the Association for the Study of Literature and the Environment in Detroit at Wayne State U. The paper is entitled “A Fable from Yesterday for Today: Silent Spring, 1684.” **Manushag Powell** and Frederick Burwick published *British Pirates in Print and Performance* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2015). It’s reviewed by Jacob Crane in the fall 2016 issue of *ECF*. **Adam Potkay** published “Pity, Gratitude and the Poor in Rousseau and Adam Smith,” *SECC*, 46 (2017)--it’s a companion to “Contested Emotions . . .” (*PMLA* 130:5 [2015]). His “Hume’s ‘Of Suicide’ and its French Reception: Necessity and Native Liberty” will appear in *When in the Course of Human Events: Essays on 1776 in America and Beyond*, ed. by Will Jordan (Mercer UP, 2018). Adam’s most exciting news is that he’ll be the Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Professor of Distinguished Teaching at Princeton’s Center for Human Values during 2018-19. Adam writes, “it’s a home-coming for me, as I grew up down the road in Trenton.”

Among many antiquarian lists **John Price** sent out via email the past year (including a miscellaneous list this month), one of the most focused was the October list of Samuel Johnson titles, mostly uncommon imprints and a few more familiar editions, as the second edition of *Prayers and Meditations*. John would happily send you his periodic lists on PDFs--they are well illustrated and always informative (books@jvprice.com).

Claude Rawson's collection *Swift's Angers* (Cambridge UP, 2014), a collection of 11 essays, 8 being revised versions of earlier publications, is very favorably reviewed by **Andrew Carpenter** in *Scriblerian*, 48.2-49.1 (2016), 110-12, concluding that the essays show Claude has been "the most consistently brilliant Swiftian of our age." Andrew commends the introduction as the best of the new material and in general praises the breadth of reading brought to interpretive insights. Andrew thinks the titular focus is apt, for "Swift's anger, Mr. Rawson maintains, besets our thinking about him" (he adds, "Mr. Rawson has little time for those who soften Swift's anger into mere 'irony' and . . . reduce his anger to satiric posturing"). **Hermann J. Real** took to the printers the 32nd volume of *Swift Studies*. It begins with a lengthy, well researched essay by **James Woolley** and Daniel Cook entitled "Charles Ford's Library: New Light on Swift and Arbuthnot" (9-44). Hermann himself co-authored two pieces for the volume: one with Kirsten Juhas, his colleague at the Ehrenpreis Centre, who again co-chairs with him the Münster Swift Symposium (in June): "Never-Sleeping Goddesses, Pocky Queens, and Degenerating Flowers: Swift's *The Lady's Dressing Room*, ll. 119-144" (pp. 101-116), and another with Ulrich Elkmann, also on the Ehrenpreis staff: "Gulliver Travels to Several Remote Nations of the World: A Bibliography of Translations into Remote Languages" (117-132). That bibliography will be good fun for bibliophiles and show the enormous global impact of *Gulliver's Travels*, for the Centre has received and purchased copies of editions published from central Africa to Mongolia. The issue also contains Matthew Gertken's "Swift, Mottraye, and Charles XII of Sweden" (45-78); Howard D. Weinbrot's "Jonathan Swift: Defeat, Isolation, and the Price of Failed Norms" (79-100); and Dirk F. Passmann's "The Drapier, Gregorio Leti, and Pierre Bayle" (33-136). As ever, Hermann's prefatory survey on Swiftiana and news from the Centre will be full of heart and wit.

John Richetti's "Empiricist Philosophers and Eighteenth-Century Autobiography" appears on pp. 148-62 of *A History of English Autobiography* (Cambridge UP, 2016), a hefty collection of essays (pp. xvi + 437) edited by Adam Smyth, who contributed an introduction and the chapter "Money, Accounting, and Life-Writing, 1600-1700: Balancing a Life." Also included is Robert Folkenflik's "Written by herself: British Women's Autobiography in the Eighteenth Century" and Duncan Wu's "Romantic Life-Writing." John Richetti also contributed "Passion in Declamation and Dialogue: How Eighteenth-Century Verse Can Work" to *Reflections on Sentiment: Essays in Honor of George Starr* (Delaware, 2016), 185-204--nobody has promoted reading 18C verse aloud at meetings as John has. In that same festschrift we find **Geoffrey Sill's** "George Starr's 'Notes on Sentimental Novels' Revisited" and **Barbara Benedict's** "The Sentimental Servant: The Dangers of Dependence in Defoe's *Roxana*."

Laura Rosenthal is taking over as the editor of *Restoration*. *Restoration* provides articles, reviews, and an annotated bibliography of published research twice a year--it has been the locus for important studies of English literature

published in 1650-1715. In the Spring 2016 issue, then editor Misty Anderson, takes a final bow, after editing the journal at the U. of Tennessee since 2003. Now under Laura it will move to Maryland. *Restoration* was founded by Jack Armistead in 1977 and edited thereafter in 2001-02 by J. Douglas Canfield, prior to his death and Misty's tenure. **Beverly Schneller** published "John Hill and His Publisher, Mary Cooper: A Case Study" in *Fame and Fortune: Sir John Hill and London Life in the 1750s*, edited by Clare Brant and George Rousseau (Palgrave Macmillan, 2017; xvi + 304; 30 illus.). Beverly's essay treats the interdependency of Cooper and Hill and her assistance in his publishing career. The volume offers essays from a conference at King's College, Oxford, in 2005, most of which treat the intellectual milieu of London in 1750s, its "metropolitan transformations." The ebook version is less than a third the price of the printed book (\$109), which is interesting in that American monographs have been priced in recent years such that the printed and electronic versions are nearly the same price. **Rebecca Shapiro's** *Fixing Babel: An Historical Anthology of Applied Lexicography* was published by Bucknell U. Press (650 pp.; 978-1-61148-809-8; \$150--and \$149.99 as an e-book!). It begins with a foreword by fellow student of lexicography, **Jack Lynch**. Rebecca's anthology offers texts from Robert Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* in 1604 to Noah Webster's *Dictionary* in 1824, with a focus on trends in lexicography. Her introduction stresses that English authors of 17C-18C dictionaries "aimed to teach practical ways for their users to learn English, improve their language skills, even transcend their social class." Rebecca will be at ASECS this month helping at the "Doctor Is In" helpdesk providing advice to young and mid-career scholars. We also hear that the mentoring program run by ASECS's Grad Student Caucus had more mentors volunteer than it has mentees.

The Summer-Fall 2016 issue of *Folger Magazine* has a lengthy and well illustrated account of the exhibition that **Kristina Straub** curated with Janine Barchas and Georgianna Ziegler: "Will & Jane: Shakespeare, Austen, and the Cult of Celebrity" (it closed 6 November). The magazine illustrates exhibited texts, clothing, paintings, figurines, pillboxes, a darning egg--as well as professors Barchas and Straub, fittingly, given the respect shown for celebrity status. I think of Barchas and Straub both as acute and learned authors, so I was surprised to find they look like friendly, good-natured women. Perhaps Susan Beam's Facebook page for EC/ASECS will provide more photographic recognition of our colleagues--though probably many EC/ASECSers don't use Facebook. My sense is that 18C scholars, at least our group, aren't much on cameras--and it doesn't help that the current editor of the newsletter is a dinosaur who should be replaced by younger, tech-savvy scholars who enjoy meetings (please contact the board). Other groups' newsletters, especially e-newsletters, illustrate articles and record conferences with photos. I recall being amazed when at the Dublin Enlightenment Congress Arch Elias pulled out a camera and had some friends gather for a photo. I'm speaking mostly in regret, as my friends are all decrepit now, too old in body to reflect their youthful intellects! But it would help us with membership if some people were to give a fact to EC/ASECS. Or better yet generate some fake news and give nonmembers appealing images of Easy-Sex beauties at the pool during our last meeting or country dancers in period costume while others clap and raise bottles of wine. It should be advertised that John Price will be giving away 18C copies of Johnson to all attending our next meeting and that there will be a séance

to raise Elizabeth Carter. Certainly someone should announce that we are hoping to meet jointly in 2019 with the Asociación dieciochista in Havana.

Dennis Todd has an important announcement that I hate to bury in news of members: “Almost thirty years ago, when I was working with the papers of James Douglas held in the U. of Glasgow Library, I came across the three confessions of **Mary Toft**, the woman who made quite a stir in 1726 with her claim that she had given birth to seventeen rabbits. I made a transcript of the confessions, but I lost it when I made a series of moves. Recently, cleaning out a closet, I found the transcript and posted it online: tofts3confessions.wordpress.com.” (Colleagues could have good conference chatter over losses of this sort and the mystifying failure to find things we know ought in our archives.) **Robert G. Walker** reviewed *The Great Mirror of Folly: Finance, Culture and the Crash of 1720*, edited by W. N. Goetzmann et al., in *Scriblerian*, 48.2-49.1 (2016). **Tara Ghoshal Wallace** will give the plenary at our 2017 meeting. Tara is a Professor of English and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies at George Washington U. and the author of *Imperial Characters: Home and Periphery in Eighteenth-Century Literature* (Bucknell, 2010) and *Jane Austen and Narrative Authority* (Macmillan, 1995). Tara’s work reaches from the Stuarts to Sir Walter Scott and often delves into issues of gender, imperialism, history, and monarchy. Tara’s essay “‘To one thing constant’: The Passion of Pope’s Eloisa” appeared in the Winter 2015 *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* (56.4: 411-26), and she participated in a roundtable entitled “Jane Millgate: The Making of Scholarship,” published in *Scottish Literary Review*, 7.2 (2015), 1-12.

Forthcoming Meetings, Events, Prizes, Resources, Publications, &c.

The National University of Ireland at **Galway** is hosting the conference “**Translation Meets Book History: Intersections 1700-1900**” on 25-26 May 2017. Dr Alice Colombo (alice.colombo@nuigalway.ie) and her co-organizers wish to delve deeper into the convergence of bibliographic and comparatist linguistic interests. See <https://intersections2017.wordpress.com>.

“**Swift 350**,” an international conference marking the 350th anniversary of the birth of Jonathan Swift, occurs 7-9 June 2017 in Dublin, principally at Trinity College. Go to the web or see p. 64 of the last *Intelligencer* for more.

The **Seventh Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift**--In Celebration of the 350th Anniversary of the Dean’s Birthday--will be held 11-14 June 2017 in Münster, Germany. The conference is organized by Hermann J. Real and Kirstin Juhas and colleagues at the Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies. Direct inquiries to realh@uni-muenster.de and juhas@uni-muenster.de. See the Ehrenpreis Centre’s website for details and p. 64 of the last *Intelligencer*.

SHARP’s annual meeting, entitled “Technologies of the Book,” will be held in Victoria, British Columbia, 9-12 June 2017, and its 2018 meeting will be in Sydney, Australia, on 26-29 June. (See www.sharpweb.org.)

The 30th annual conference of the **Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society** (ECSSS) occurs at the World Congress of Scottish Literature from 21 to 25 June 2017 in Vancouver, principally hosted by the Centre for Scottish Studies and the English Dept. of Simon Fraser U., organized by Leith Davis. Key themes are “indigenous/Scottish relations and transpacific/Scottish connections. For more, see [https:// dialoguesanddisaporas.wordpress.com](https://dialoguesanddisaporas.wordpress.com).

The 15th annual **International Conference on Books, Publishing, & Literature** will be held 7 July 2017 at Imperial College London.

The annual **Print Networks** conference in Britain will be held 21 July 2017 at the Birmingham City U. with the theme “Print, Politics, and Publishing: The Role of the Provincial Press” (deadline for submissions was 1 March).

The next biennial conference of the **Charles Brockden Brown Society** will be held at University College Dublin, hosted by the Clinton Institute for American Studies, on 5-7 October 2017 and entitled “Migration, Disaspora, Circulation, and Translation.” See www.brockdenbrownsociety.ucf.edu.

The **Canadian Society for 18C Studies** (CSECS) meets jointly with the **NEASECS** in Toronto on 18-22 October 2017, with the theme “From Cosmopolitans to Cosmopolitanism. See <http://sites.utoronto.ca/tec/csecs-scedhs-2017>. The CSECS then meets on 10-13 Oct. 2018 in Niagara Falls.

Our **2017 EC/ASECS** meeting will occur at Howard University on 2-4 November, Thursday to Saturday, chaired by Emily Kugler (emily.kugler@howard.edu). See the article above (and in the last issue) on the conference.

The **Kislak Center for Special Collections**, Rare Books and MSS and the English Dept. of the U. of Pennsylvania are co-sponsoring “*Jonathan Swift in the 21st Century*” on Feb. 23-24, 2018. The “conference seeks to reconsider Swift and his works through a contemporary lens, exploring how they have traveled across three centuries and around the world. We invite papers that will think of a Swift for the 21st century, keeping in mind our interests and concerns. Papers that map potential new directions for Swift studies are particularly welcome.” Topics offered as samples include nationalism, secrecy, class & society, colonialism, post-colonialism, imperialism, “gender and sexuality,” “publishers & censorship,” Swift in translation, political satires, film, etc. There will be a rare-books exhibition at Penn’s Kislak Center, which holds such collections as the Teerink Collection, the Denison Collection (illustrated editions of *Gulliver’s Travels*), and books known to have been read by Swift or been part of his library as well as “many Dublin imprints, from the independent Swift scholar **Archibald Elias**.” The exhibition, *A Raging Wit: The Life and Legacy of Jonathan Swift*, will open in mid-February 2018 and run through May.

The **Society of Early Americanists** will hold a special topics conference on Religion and Politics in Early American in St. Louis on 1-4 March 2018, sponsored by Washington U., St. Louis U., etc. Panels and individual papers are sought, sent by 26 May 2017 to Abram Van Engen at religion.politics.2018@gmail.com. SEA holds biennial meetings, with the next in 2019.

The next “**Money, Power and Print**” colloquium on the Financial Revolution will occur in Stiegen, Germany, 7-9 June 2018. Proposals are sought on four themes by 15 April 2017. Contact Anne Murphy: a.l.murphy@herts.ac.uk.

The **International Society for 18C Studies** (ISECS) has updated its directory at www.isecs.org under “ISECS-direct.” See p. 65 of the last *Intelligencer* for ISECS news in 2016. The **next Congress, on “Enlightenment Identities, is 14-19 July 2019 in Edinburgh** organized by the British SECS, the U. of Edinburgh, and ISECS. See www.bsecs.org.uk/isecs2019/.

The **Library of Congress’s** Jefferson Bldg. is showcasing one of seven extant copies of Abel Buell’s *New and Correct Map of the United States*, the first map of the independent country, made and published in Connecticut in September 1783 (on loan from David Rubenstein)--DLC has a good online

exhibit for it. The **Folger Shakespeare Library** has on display through 30 April “500 Years of Treasures from Oxford,” curated by Peter Kidd, which showcases Corpus Christi’s holdings from the Middle Ages and Renaissance. **Delaware’s Morris Library** through 3 June exhibits the gifts of Mark Samuels Lasner: “Victorian Passions: Stories from the **Mark Samuels Lasner Collection**.” The **Huntington’s** Scott Gallery’s new Fielding’s Wing has an inaugural exhibition titled “**Becoming America**” with 200 works of painting, furniture, ceramics, needlework, etc. Incidentally, the Huntington in 2016 acquired physician Lawrence D. Longo’s Collection in Reproductive Biology, nearly 6000 items, 15C-20C, showcased in the fall *Huntington*. The new **Kislak Center**, quartered with Rare Books on the 6th floor of Penn’s Van Pelt Library, has been holding many exhibitions and conferences (usually one with another). Until 19 May it offers “Expanding Earth: Travel, Encounter, and Exchange,” for which a related conference occurred 2-4 March. Penn is hosting a conference 30 March-1 April on “American and Muslim Worlds c. 1500-1800” at the library and other venues. The Kislak Center is involved in “In Quarto: A Symposium on Formats & Meanings in Early Modern England and Spain,” and it mounts “The Hispanic Roots of U.S. Anthropology” from 8 May to 7 July. The Library Company of Philadelphia, Penn State, and Rutgers all have exhibitions on World War I. The **Pierpont Morgan Library** exhibits until 28 May “I’m Nobody! The Life and Poetry of Emily Dickinson,” with valuable loan items. The Morgan is also showing “Treasures from the Vault” through 9 July. The U. of Toronto’s **Fisher Library** this fall mounts “Flickering of the Flame: The Book and the Reformation.” **The U. of Virginia’s** Small Special Collection Library continues to offer on permanent exhibition The Albert H. Small **Declaration of Independence Collection**, the largest collection of MSS related to and early printings of the *Declaration*. The National Gallery of Art in Washington has through 16 July the “Woodner Collections: **Master Drawings** from Seven Centuries.” The Muscarelle Museum of Art at the **College of William and Mary** exhibits thro’ 14 May “Written in Confidence: **The Unpublished Letters of James Monroe**” (President, 1817-1825), offering 12 of 30 unpublished letters recently acquired by W&M’s Special Collections.

One of the best 18C exhibition within driving distance of our region is the **Lewis Walpole Library’s** *The Land Without Music: Satirizing Song in Eighteenth-Century England*, mounted until 29 September and curated by Amy Dunagin. Yale has published a 22-page well-illustrated brochure of the same title for the show, edited by David Baker, listing prints (many colored) by Blake, Cruikshank, Gillray, Hogarth, Rowlandson, James Watson and others. Google up Walpole.library.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Song_booklet_v5.pdf. The exhibition, bringing “together satirical prints and documents pertaining to English music makers and listeners, . . . explores English attitudes toward Music as lascivious, feminine, foreign, frivolous, and distinctly un-English.”

The National Air & Space Museum, at its Steven F. Udvar-Hazy Center in Chantilly, VA, displays throughout this year “Clouds in a Bag: The **Evelyn Way Kendall Ballooning and Early Aviation Collection**,” which Kendall collected from the early 1920s to the 1960s, whose 1000 objects include 18C materials. At the Center you can see big planes like the Enola Gay and French Air Concorde.

The **Goethe Society of North America** has two annual prizes: the GSNA Essay and the Richard Sussman Essay. The deadline for nominations or self-

nominations for both annual prizes—is drawing near. Please submit a copy of the essay (electronic version preferred) by April 15, 2017 to Catriona MacLeod. See the website for award & eligibility info: <http://www.goethesociety.org>.

30 September 2017 is the next deadline for the Bibliographical Society of America's triennial **William L. Mitchell Prize for Bibliography or Documentary Work on Early British Periodicals/Newspapers**. The March 2016 *Intelligencer* carries an account of the 2015 prize, to Simon Macdonald for the essay "English-Language Newspapers in Revolutionary France" (2013). The Mitchell Prize, with a \$1000 award, honors Bill Mitchell, retired curator of the Bond Collection of 18th-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals as well as the Edmund Curll Collection at Kansas's Spencer Research Library. Late Spencer Librarian Alexandra Mason promoted it to encourage scholars engaged in bibliographical scholarship on 18C periodicals published in English or in any language but within the British Isles and its colonies. The competition is open to all without regard to membership, nationality, and academic degree, requiring little more than the submission of a C.V. and three copies of printed work (or one electronic copy) and access and instructions for internet publications. For info (and an account of former prize-winners), see the BSA's website (www.bibsocamer.org). Direct questions to Jim May (jem4@psu.edu).

In the Dec. 2016 *Children's Books Historical Society Newsletter* (no. 116) we read, "The **Digitization of the Osborne [Collection] books** is proceeding satisfactorily; over 1,500 books can now be viewed online, including some of the most popular classifications: fairy tales, myths, legends, nursery rhymes and poetry. Anyone can visit this digital resource by opening the website, 'www.torontopubliclibrary.ca and clicking on 'Digital Archive.' It can then be searched by author, subject or title and complete texts can be viewed on-line."

In a prefatory note to vol. 46 (2017) of *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*--available on Project Muse,--**Eve Tavor Bannet**, editor to 2019, and her successor Roxanne Wheeler, announced that hereafter the annual will begin with the ASECS Presidential Lecture and the Clifford Lecture and then introduce some panels or forums from the meeting. These changes are done to "disseminate the plenary talks to members unable to attend ASECS and considerably enrich the journal." (One wonders why these two arguments don't make a stronger case for placing the lectures into *Eighteenth-Century Studies*.) The reproductions of panels will involve revised papers of under 5000 words with the panel chair's introduction. Two such panels appear at the start of *SECC* 46. There are four essays on "Transnational Quixotes and Quixotisms: Circulation, Migration, Appropriation" introduced by Catherine M. Jaffe. Then four essays on "The Habsburgs and the Enlightenment" introduced by Rebecca Messbarger. The remainder of the volume holds only six essays, among which is Adam Potkay's "Pity, Gratitude and the Poor in Rousseau and Adam Smith" and Jeff Loveland's "A *Laissez-Faire* Encyclopedia? A Comparative View of Diderot as Editor of the *Encyclopédie*." So, it will become more difficult to place a revised paper in *SECC*, but it is still a prized journal for published work.

Breon Mitchell posted "Annotated Bibliography of Bilingual Dictionaries and Vocabularies on the Languages of the World Held at Indiana University, Bloomington" (2016) on *Bibsite*, the Bibliographical Society of America, open online resource with PDFs: <http://bibsocamer.org/bibsite-home>. Also in 2016 Lenore Coral updated her "British Book Auction Catalogues, 1801-1900." In

2017 Jim May greatly expanded his bibliographies there of studies of authorship (now 430 pp.), children's lit, engraving, and journalism, and this month posts for the first time studies in 1985-2016 on **publishers & publishing** (c. 225 pp.).

Notes on journals: In *Book History*, 19 (2016), Matthew D. Eddy's "The Interactive Notebook: How Students Learned to Keep Notes during the Scottish Enlightenment" argues "**student lecture notebooks** were a . . . scribal media" that were bound, bought, sold, edited & annotated, and pirated. The Spring 2016 *Journal of the Early Republic*, introduced by Ann Johnson, is on "Science in the Early Republic" (36.1:1-123). *William & Mary Quarterly*, 74, no. 1 (2017) has a forum of four essays on "Quakers and the Lived Politics of Early America." *Restoration and 18th-Century Theatre Research* is publishing articles and focusing issues on theatre outside the English-speaking world. *The Shandean* posts at its website (The_Shandean_all_volumes_1-27.pdf) the contents of vol. 27 (2016) with summaries of articles, and then lists the contents of all previous issues. The *Keats-Shelley Review*, 30.1 (2016), 15-20, has curator David McClay's "Introduction to the **John Murray Archive**"; McClay edits *The John Murray Archive* at the NLS, <http://digital.nls.uk/jma/index.html>. Focused on Mme de Genlis, Vol. 7.1 (2013) of *RELIEF: Revue électronique de littérature française* includes Melanie Conroy's "Reviving the Art of Sociability: Madame de Genlis's Post-Revolutionary Salon at the Arsenal" and Alla Polosina and Alicia C. Montoya. "Trois lettres et one notice de Madame de Genlis conservées dans les bibliothèques russes. *Huntington Library Quarterly*'s fall issue focuses on "Forms of Address: **Five Hundred Years of Letters**" (79.3: 343-532). Edited by Linda C. Mitchell, it includes her essay "Entertainment and Instruction: Women's Roles in the English Epistolary Tradition," Rachel S. King's "Manuscript Newsletter and the Rise of Newspapers, 1665-1715," etc. *Studies in the Literary Imagination*'s second 2014 issue, entitled "Novel Genders: **Women Writing Women** in the 18C," edited by Kristine Jennings, addresses changing definitions and ideals of femininity. The E-journal *Authorship* (www.authorship.ugent.be) ed. by Gert Buelens in Ghent, posted two issues for Vol. 5 in 2016, including Ruth Knezevich on "Publishing at the Request of Friends": Alexander Ross and James Beattie's Authorial Networks in 18th-Century Aberdeen," Kate Ozment's on "Paratextual Marketing in Delarivier Manley's Early Career," and Patricia Tarantello on Ben Franklin's self-representations. The journal got off the ground fast, with Margaret Ezell in 2014 contributing "Dying to be Read: Gallows Authorship in Late 17C England." 2015 issues offer Mark Vareschi on Defoe and anonymity and William Mari on "James Ralph's Claims to Authorship." The January 2017 *Eighteenth-Century Life* is devoted to poetical miscellanies, ed. by Abigail Williams & Jen. Batt.

The *Intelligencer* needs reviewers for two books: Anton M. Matytsin, *The Specter of Skepticism in the Age of Enlightenment* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2016). Pp. xiii + 361. On continental philosophers' responding to skepticism with tougher standards for truth and greater limits on human understanding. (Treats Bayle, Crousaz, Huet, Descartes, Locke, Newton, and Voltaire.); and Xavier Bray, with contributions from Manuela Mena Marqués, et al., *Goya: The Portraits* (London: National Gallery, distributed by Yale UP, Dec. 2015), pp. 270; large format, color illus.: "a landmark overview of Goya's finest portraits."

Cover illustration: parlor of the Graeme House--see p. 22 for caption & credits.

