

Editing Swift: Problems and Possibilities

Presidential Address, 9 November 2013

by James Woolley

At a conference whose theme is “Retirement, Reappraisal, and Renewal,” you could expect the presidential address to sound that note. On Thursday evening, we discussed the fact that the root sense of the verb *to retire* is a military one: “to retreat.” So I confess that I intend to *retire* from the topic of retirement, but I *will* touch on reappraisal and renewal, and I’ll do that in the course of talking about editing. I’m speaking about Swift not because the problems and possibilities of editing him are unique, or uniquely important, but because this is the case I’m best acquainted with. From my comments, you may be able to extrapolate to problems and possibilities closer to your own scholarship and teaching.

I’ll say a bit about editing in general, before I turn to the matter of editing Swift’s poems, which I’m now doing; and I’ll conclude with comments about editing and teaching.

When I speak of editing, I mean making not a monument but an instrument, a scholarly edition—what is sometimes called a critical edition, one of the oldest enterprises of humanities scholarship and one that is currently taking on a new face. Editing exists because texts are unstable, tending to become corrupt; because as the past recedes, readers inevitably come to lack cultural knowledge that the text’s original audience would have had; and because scholars develop new knowledge. You turn to a scholarly edition for an accurate text, for a text situated in the history of the work’s composition, revision, transmission, and reception, and for a commentary that connects the text’s words and implications to the contexts out of which those words and implications emerged and into which they were intended to speak.

If editing is a collection of problems for the editor, those problems typically include

- ascertaining authorship
- finding all the printed and manuscript versions of a work
- comparing the versions to discern the history of the work’s transmission
- in this comparison, distinguishing meaningful variation from noise
- presenting the most important version
- showing where and why that version differs from the others
- understanding the text’s diction, its syntax, its tropes, its intertextuality, and its contextuality; and
- making this information accessible, intelligible, and durable.

The editor of Swift additionally confronts the fact that, because Swift was a popular and controversial figure, there are for some of his works a substantial number of early manuscripts and printed editions to take account of. He published nearly everything anonymously, or pseudonymously, so that attribution can be difficult. And because much of his writing refers to actual

people, places, and events, recovering these contexts can prove a challenge, and assessing how specific these references are *has* been a challenge with some of his works, famously including *Gulliver's Travels*.

There are currently two big editions of Swift's works in progress, the Cambridge Edition and the *Online.Swift*, a project of the Ehrenpreis Center for Swift Studies in Münster, Germany. *Online.Swift*, an edition of all Swift's prose other than the correspondence, began to appear in 2011.¹ The extensive commentary gives particular attention to Swift's sources. It is remarkable how little we still know about what Swift actually read, beyond some very obvious sources like Horace, Ovid, Virgil, Lucretius, the Bible, Milton and a few others. We get clues, though, when an annotator uses one of the books Swift owned and repeatedly hits paydirt. Our EC/ASECS colleague Hermann Real, who leads the *Online.Swift*, has told me that in annotating Swift's *Discourse of the Contests and Dissentions*, he found that Swift was using a reference set that ever since 1746 it has been public knowledge that Swift owned, namely the *Histoire du monde* that Urbain Chevreau published in The Hague in 1698. I would guess that Professor Real was the first scholar ever to test whether Swift used that history. It's not common, and yet you can test it yourself, because it has been digitized, and mounted on the web, by the Bavarian State Library (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek). What else might we learn about Swift from reading Chevreau—and what else might we learn from reading other books Swift owned? *Online.Swift* may tell us.

Now as for the Cambridge Swift, the project I'm part of, it began to appear in 2008; when complete, its seventeen volumes will include Swift's verse and all his prose except his correspondence.² The general editors for the Cambridge Swift are Ian Gadd, Ian Higgins, James McLaverty, Claude Rawson, Valerie Rumbold, and Abigail Williams. The Cambridge Edition has an affiliated electronic archive for Swift's prose works, the *Jonathan Swift Archive*.³ This *Archive* is not yet complete, but electronic texts of most of Swift's prose are available. The prefatory notes are expertly done, and, for a few works, you can compare two versions; so, even in its unfinished state, the *Archive* is worth a visit.

Between the Cambridge Edition and the *Online.Swift*, there is not yet much overlap, and they are both eminently citable in preference to the Herbert Davis edition of Swift's prose works. Veterans, who can recall how difficult and chancy it was, in the days of paper library catalogs, to locate anonymous eighteenth-century pamphlets in the major British and Irish research libraries, will not want to fault Herbert Davis or Harold Williams for what they achieved, long before the dawn of the digital humanities. But now we expect our editors to do more.

Against that background, let me say something about Swift's *poems* and the problems and possibilities *they* present. For the Cambridge Swift, my fellow EC/ASECS member Stephen Karian and I are preparing a four-volume edition of Swift's poems, and we're also working on a complementary digital edition that we expect to make freely available on the web.

Swift's poems are primary sources for scholars working on eighteenth-century British or Irish social and economic history, anthropology, linguistics, cultural studies, leisure activities, musicology, political and religious controversy, nationalism, censorship, and material culture. Swift was the first major English-language poet to spend a lifetime mostly in Ireland, and his poetry explores, extends, and provokes eighteenth-century Irish political and cultural debates. As Margaret Anne Doody has noted, Swift's poems had particular significance for women poets. She writes, "Much of the poetry written by English women during the middle and later eighteenth century exhibits an awareness of Swift and a sense of his importance as a model."⁴ Our edition will offer fresh insights into these intercultural connections and equally into the work of Swift's literary contemporaries, some of whom are just beginning to be properly read and understood: Mary Barber, Laetitia Pilkington, Matthew Pilkington, William Dunkin, James Arbuckle, Thomas Sheridan, Patrick Delany.

Our two editions, the paper and the digital, stem from the Swift Poems Project, a digital archive which has been under development for about twenty-five years and at various times has drawn on the collaboration of several other EC/ASECS members, including Don Mell, the late Arch Elias, John Fischer (who's still an active collaborator), and Jim McLaverty. There have been over forty editorial assistants, mostly students, and we have as partners a team of digital humanities specialists who are Lafayette College librarians.

Our editions draw on over 250 libraries and private collections worldwide and will be based on over 20,000 poem texts (counting one poem in a volume as a "poem text"). About a fourth of the 20,000 are not listed in any bibliography of Swift's writings, and most of them have not been taken account of in previous editions of Swift. Alex Lindsay's catalogue of Swift manuscripts lists 384 manuscript poem-texts; we have identified over 1,200 more.⁵ Though few of these manuscripts are in Swift's handwriting, they preserve, in numerous previously unsuspected instances, a poem version not represented in any printed text. Some of these manuscripts, moreover, contain contemporary annotations that supply sometimes crucial evidence about a poem's authorship, date, or occasion.

An edition on paper is more comfortable and convenient to handle; you can't very well hold your place with your thumb in a digital edition while you flip to a different poem, you can't very well riffle through hoping to spot what you faintly remember as being on the lower right-hand corner of some page, you can't so conveniently tuck in clippings and offprints, and you can't collate other copies using an elaborate system of colored pencils, as Arch Elias loved to do. And the permanence and durability of the codex are well established.

The permanence of digital products is asserted but not proved. But a digital edition can be expected to offer superior access to information and to obviate the (fair) criticism that a conventional scholarly edition's record of textual variation verges upon illegibility. Our digital product is designed to allow the user to compare two texts of a poem, or many texts of a poem. We expect to provide links to web resources, both free ones such as *ESTC* and *Google Books* and, for

those who have licensed them, *ECCO*, the *Burney Newspapers*, and others. Our digital pages can be read, I'm told, on hand-held devices, which may facilitate some kinds of work in libraries, bookshops, and classrooms. The printed edition will function as a handy user's manual to the digital edition.

The digital edition will provide access to two large bodies of texts that will not fit in the printed volumes and are otherwise generally difficult to access: first, poems to Swift or about him, often responding to his work as a poet; and second, the apocrypha of poems misattributed to Swift over the centuries. These 900+ poems enable the user to trace the idea of "Swift," especially as shaped by conceptions of him as a poet.

Our digital edition, the *Jonathan Swift Archive*, and *Online.Swift* all produce, or will produce, XML-encoded files that conform to the specifications of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI). Most of the labor of producing these XML transcripts will never need to be done again; future editors can correct them if necessary, re-collate them, and add additional transcripts from additional versions or additional copies of the same versions.

XML texts are already downloadable at the *Jonathan Swift Archive*. Digital humanities researchers—you, for instance, or one of your students—could take those texts, or a subset of them, and add tags marking lexical, syntactic, metrical, or bibliographic features susceptible to computational analysis. Such analysis could then shed new light on, for instance, the development of Swift's style, or the relationship of a poem's diction to its genre, and could help develop a truly fact-based profile of Swift's style that might *possibly* illuminate some persistent attributional questions.

I'd like to emphasize, in short, that although Swift was writing three centuries ago, we are far from exhausting research problems and that the editing now going on can be expected to generate many more topics for scholars to chew on.

Finally, teaching. I share the view, expressed in yesterday's session on "Teaching the History of the Eighteenth-Century Book," that editing is a form of humanities scholarship that students could be practicing. Short editing projects are well within the capacity of graduate students and even of undergraduates. One of the best parts of editing is annotating, and students learn a great deal from annotation projects. A simple assignment would ask students to annotate a single word, a keyword, by finding multiple instances of it in texts from the adjacent decade or so, using *Google Books*, *HathiTrust*, and, if the text is in English, from *ECCO*, the *Burney Newspapers*, *Early American Newspapers*, the *American Periodicals Series*, the *Digital Evans*—whatever you have available—and drawing conclusions based on contemporary usage. For English-language projects, don't forget, either, the testimony recorded in Old Bailey trials at *Old Bailey Online*, which preserves vernacular language of a freshness extraordinarily valuable to someone annotating demotic plays, novels, or poems.⁶

Further, there is the possibility of contextualizing written texts with visual art. Swift's poems make frequent reference to stories in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

Did he know Ovid *only* from the written texts? Suppose you are teaching Swift's "Baucis and Philemon"—a great teaching text, by the way—and suppose you assign students not only to read the poem, and not only to read a translation of Ovid's story, but also to use *ARTstor* to find representations of the Baucis and Philemon story in the visual arts—a multidimensional comparison.⁷ This will be a fruitful exercise even if you give it no chronological parameters. But suppose you ask the students to confine themselves to paintings, drawings, engravings, and sculptures early enough that Swift could have seen them before he wrote his poem about 1706. And suppose they do that, and find, in one or more engravings, details that aren't in Ovid but are in Swift. What will that mean? It might mean that they, and you, have discovered a previously unnoticed source for Swift that somebody should examine more intensively. So far, we know almost nothing about Swift's exposure to the visual arts, and more is surely knowable.

I've been suggesting that editing can produce new knowledge and that editing projects may enable the student to teach the teacher. Let me close on a less earnest note, suggesting a more hedonistic reason for editing. In my project, we've written about 5,000 of the 8,000 annotations we need to write, so I think by now I'm qualified to say that a big source of pleasure for the annotator is variety. I've recently had to find out about

- early morning street lighting in London
 - conventions of fair play in boys' boxing
 - how bricks were made
 - Mexican silver coinage
 - sunspots
 - the life cycle of the silkworm; and
 - the social function of ladies' dressing rooms in Dublin townhouses.
- Any of these topics takes an English professor exhilaratingly beyond his disciplinary boundaries and into some of the same territory that we enjoy in interdisciplinary conferences like EC/ASECS. Among other things, then, editing is a pleasure, and it's one we can share with our students.

Lafayette College

Notes

1. *Online.Swift*, ed. Kirsten Juhas, Dirk Passmann, Hermann Josef Real, and Sandra Simon (Münster: Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster, 2010–), <<http://www.online-swift.de/>>.

2. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift*, 17 vols. projected (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008–). Five volumes have appeared: *English Political Writings, 1711-1714*, ed. Bertrand A. Goldgar and Ian Gadd (2008); *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*, ed. Marcus Walsh (2010); *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. David Womersley (2012); *Parodies, Hoaxes, Mock*

Treatises, ed. Valerie Rumbold (2013); and *Journal to Stella*, ed. Abigail Williams (2013). These volumes belong on the shelves of college and university libraries.

3. *Jonathan Swift Archive*, ed. James McLaverty et al. <<http://jonathanswiftarchive.org.uk>>.

4. Margaret Doody, "Swift among the Women," *Yearbook of English Studies* 18 (1988): 77.

5. Alexander Lindsay, "Jonathan Swift 1667-1745," *Index of English Literary Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part 4* (London: Mansell, 1997).

6. Tim Hitchcock, Robert Shoemaker, Clive Emsley, Sharon Howard and Jamie McLaughlin, et al., *The Old Bailey Proceedings Online, 1674-1913* <<http://www.oldbaileyonline.org>>, version 7.1, 2003-13).

7. *ARTstor Digital Library*, <<http://www.artstor.org>>.

In Retirement, Contemplating what EC/ASECS Is Or has Become

As this is the first event of the 44th annual conference of the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, I should like, before I begin my paper, to take a minute to pay tribute to Jim Moody, our webmaster emeritus and a very valued member of our Society, whom we lost to cancer last month, and to offer condolences to his wife Ellen, another highly valued member. Those of us who knew Jim always looked forward to seeing him at our meetings, for he was extraordinarily talented, extremely knowledgeable on a great variety of subjects, not only literary, and a gifted conversationalist whose great strength was that he was also a very good listener. He had a wonderful sense of humor and was a most kind, gentle and generous man and the most devoted of husbands. It is people like him who make ours such a fine Society to belong to. There will be other occasions in the next couple of days to recognize Jim's contributions more fully. Here I only wish to say that his loss will be felt by all.

When yet a boy, Alexander Pope wrote in praise of a retired life where, bounded by a few paternal acres and unconcerned with affairs of the world, he could spend his time in study and ease. Well, now a retired septuagenarian, I decided recently to spend some hours in the pleasurable contemplation of the few acres you and I hold in common, metaphorically speaking, and I refer, of course, to our East-Central Society for 18th Century Studies, to see what we are or have become in the past decade, from 2003 to 2012, and what that may reveal about our discipline and our profession of it. The first thing that struck me is that we have become big. In 2003, 49 papers were presented, including the plenary and the presidential address but excluding participants in roundtable discussions. Today on average we have 90 presentations. Our largest conference in this past decade was at Bethlehem, PA in 2009, when 108 papers were read.

One reason we've grown is that several graduate students and young assistant professors have joined us. This is an indication if not proof that the

profession may be growing and jobs opening up. It is certainly proof of our commitment to younger scholars—the Molin Prize, awarded since 1990 to the best paper by a graduate student, is one of the first to have been instituted by a regional affiliate of ASECS. As we old fogeys retire or die off, it is good that our Society can boast of several middle aged and young members. Of course, budget cuts and the changing interests of students mean that universities are offering fewer courses in the 18th century, and some of those that were year-long courses have shrunk to being only a semester long. For all that, straws in the wind suggest that more young people seem to be opting for eighteenth-century studies. Ms. Vickie Cutting of ASECS informs me that in the last decade or so the number of graduate students who are members of ASECS has gone up from 312 to 381; and though Linda Merians, our Executive Secretary, does not have exact figures, she too thinks that some of the increase in our membership that has taken place is on account of more graduate students joining our Society. Their motivations are various. Some join to compete for the Molin Prize, others because their graduate advisors, who are among our senior members, advise them to. Not all who join, stay. But several do, and a few of them now rank among our stalwarts.

Though bigger, we're not so huge that the individual gets lost in the crowd. Though it can no longer be said that we all know one another, senior people continue to provide friendship and mentoring to newer members, and the newer members, in turn, refuse to let the older members' achievements be forgotten. In 2007 we held an informal though informed discussion on sexual motifs in the 18th century in commemoration of Eric Molin because this subject had interested him. In 2011 we had a luncheon in honor of Roy Wolper, the long-time editor of *The Scriblerian*, and last year we honored Don Mell and the recipients of the Leland Peterson award as well as helping launch Sandro Jung's new poetry journal and George Rousseau's book on Sir John Hill.

Because, to the extent possible, we hold our conferences in places associated with eighteenth-century history, several of the larger topics and themes that have been examined at our conferences have had a relationship to the place where we were meeting. This has given our scholarship a somewhat topical flavor. At Annapolis in 2005 a whole session was devoted to that town's 18th century history, while the program cover reproduced a painting by Charles Willson Peele depicting Nancy Hallam, the actress-daughter of the founder of the American Company of Comedians, which often performed in Annapolis, as Fidele in *Cymbeline*. The focus of the Gettysburg conference the following year was on civil conflicts in our period, and the program cover reproduced George Trumbull's painting of Gen. Burgoyne surrendering to Gen. Gates at Saratoga, on which there was also a paper. In Bethlehem, which has Moravian roots, we examined, in 2009, the Sacred and Secular and heard a large number of papers on religion.

We have been fortunate in our choice of plenary speakers. John Sensbach's talk in 2009 on women and religion in the African diaspora was a model of primary research. But some of the best plenary speakers have been our own

members: Rob Hume in 2006 on the economics of culture in London from 1660 to 1740, or Vin Caretta the following year on Equiano and the abolition of slavery. More remarkable has been the uniform excellence of our presidential addresses. To single out just a few, Marie McAllister tied up the buying and restoration of her 18th century house, which turned out to be not quite 18th century, with pedagogical concerns. Kevin Berland spoke learnedly on the 18th century's growing interest in exploring caves and caverns, Sayre Greenfield was fascinating on online research and Shakespeare, and Doreen Saar had us in stitches and left us greatly enlightened about what George Washington had for lunch after his first inaugural, and whether there was any lunch at all. Geoff Sill's talk on sacred and secular gambling by Moravians was a brilliant demonstration of how the local and topical can be addressed with wit, scholarship and zest, and Linda Troost, speaking equally engrossingly in Pittsburgh on the undead 18th century, brought out the continuing relevance of the 18th century to modern culture by examining the myriad of ways in which Jane Austen has been made a culture icon, including her assimilation into the world of zombies and the new Gothic.

We take the length of the long eighteenth century quite seriously. While considering influences on our period, papers have devoted significant attention to the later Milton and Marvell and even some to Shakespeare, and our inquiries extend well beyond 1800, there having been two papers on Sir Walter Scott as well as on Leigh Hunt, William Hazlitt, and S.T. Coleridge. A discussion of Sir John Malcolm has taken us to at least 1830.

Largely as a reflection of our members' interests, there are certain areas and approaches that we tend to host most years. The spoken as well as the written word has always had significance to us. We value not only the intellectual quality of presentations but also the way they are delivered. The Oral-Aural experience is staged every year, when audience members are invited to read aloud an obscure 18th century poem, or a part in a play, usually a bad play, without any prior rehearsing. In recent years there has been one session when half a dozen members have read or recited poems of their choice from our period in order to bring out aspects not always clearly noticeable when the poem is studied silently, and then discussed ways in which this oral presentation can have pedagogical benefits. The liveliness of delivery as well as the willingness to engage in discussion and the speaker's self confidence are taken into account when awarding the Molin Prize.

Therefore it is somewhat surprising that no one has yet presented a paper or proposed a panel on the medley of accents and voices that must have been heard in 18th century Britain, or perhaps even just London. It is, of course, extremely hard to know how a person enunciated a word two or three hundred years ago or how a voice sounded, and perhaps equally hard for us to try to reproduce those sounds today. But it is somewhat puzzling that no one has yet looked into such evidence as exists—rhymes, metrics, dictionaries, other references-- about how people in our period spoke.

Every year we have one, sometimes two sessions, on bibliography, textual

criticism, and the history of the book. Every year there is a roundtable where the latest in Swift studies is discussed. In addition, people get together most years to talk informally about their own current research and to share discoveries. Pedagogical concerns occupy at least one session most years, and a theme is examined in detail in more than one session. Thus the Lisbon earthquake took up four sessions in 2003, and Anglo-French wars were studied in 2006, as was religion in 2009, liberty in 2011, and infamy in 2012. We were among the earliest of the regional affiliates to investigate the possibilities of the new technology in 18th century research, and most years this past decade we have had papers on one aspect or another of the problems and possibilities of researching and teaching online.

Other old chestnuts remain popular. 2009 saw special attention being given to Samuel Johnson on the tricentennial of his birth, but he has never been absent from our discussions. Pope has figured less frequently, but last year in Baltimore we devoted a whole and, I must say, very successful session to him. The same can be said, perhaps more emphatically, of Defoe, since he inspires papers every year and sometimes whole sessions. Questions of attribution and the recovery of his texts and characters drew a big crowd in Pittsburgh. Richardson, Fielding, Smollett and Sterne receive plenty of attention; John Gay, some though not that much. There have been papers on the poetry and the illustrations of James Thomson at more than one conference, the latter largely thanks to Sandro Jung and his graduate students, all of whom we have been privileged to have as members for some years. Nor have Matthew Prior and Edward Young gone unrepresented. Aspects of American history and political thought figure quite prominently at our conferences, and religion in one form or another is always cropping up, whether in discussions of 18th century Moravians, or fears of Roman Catholicism in England, or south Indian priests traveling to Rome to plead for a locally appointed archbishop. There have been papers on the history of the periodical press and history as seen through it. The theme of Nature and land-based activities has seen a slew of presentations that theorize Nature or offer perspectives, sometimes from an eco-critical point of view, on gardening, landscapes, agriculture, or the economics of cultivation. The Gothic in the 18th century has invited frequent scrutiny, as have the Scots. Restoration and 18th century drama are well represented in our programs, with a plenary addressing theatre history as seen through account books. Finally, eating and drinking, hunting and sport, clubbability and friendship in the 18th century, have received attention in more than one conference.

Thus we have maintained a reasonable sense of continuity with the way the 18th century was professed in the past. A Pottle or Wimsatt, visiting us from a generation or two ago, might wonder at the absence of attention to Dryden and Boswell, but he would recognize the period as he had professed it, though the questions being raised, the issues being explored, or the conclusions being reached might cause some surprise. What will truly astonish him, however, is likely to be the extent to which the canon as he knew it has been, not abandoned or subverted, but expanded. This expansion has come largely in the form of

much greater attention being paid to women writers and women's issues. We study these writers for their own sake, but are also interested in understanding what it meant to be a woman in the 18th century, the seeming privileges and real tribulations involved in daily life for different classes of women, and the extent to which women of intellect and creativity were able to fashion meaningful lives for themselves. In 2003 we discussed four women. Frances Burney was one, and the other three were French: Mme. de Genlis, Mme. Roland, and Mme. de Stael. Burney has been a near permanent fixture in our programs since then, and many others have joined her: Mary Robinson, on whom there were two papers in 2009, Ann Flaxman, Eliza Haywood, Sarah Fielding, Margaret Fuller, Aphra Behn, Joanna Baillie, Anne Finch, Ann Yearsley, Phyllis Wheatley, Jane Cumming, Susanna Centlivre, Charlotte Lennox, Maria Edgeworth, Hester Thrale Piozzi, Amelia Opie, Felicia Hemans, and, most recently, Delarivier Manley and Elizabeth Singer Rowe. This list is not, by any means, complete, but it gives an idea of the extent to which the attention of our Society has shifted to women writers.

Nor is our attention confined only to the aesthetic and literary in women writers. We have had papers on family life, women's bodies, women giving birth, on motherhood, race and sexuality and prostitution, 18th century fashions, fashioning and self-fashioning, women as travelers and letter writers, actresses both on and off stage, professional women, transgressive women, women as wives and daughters, Indian women in the 18th century, women who were reviled in their lifetimes or gained infamy, and women who won fame.

This phenomenon, while welcome, is not surprising, for more women than men have been going for graduate studies in English and the liberal arts in recent years, and so the number of women in our Society's membership has also grown. Jim May tells me that since 2006 at least 55% of our papers have been by women. The numbers were 47 out of 81 at Penn State in 2011, and 57 out of 100 last year in Baltimore. Does this have implications for the kind of sessions that should be proposed in future if we are to continue encouraging larger numbers of graduate students to attend our conferences? Will more sessions on women writers and feminist issues draw a bigger crowd? I cannot answer these questions but raise them for your consideration.

Many topics besides feminism have been addressed which would have been unlikely a generation or two ago. There have been papers on scientific expeditions into equatorial Pacific regions, slavery, migrations, alcoholism, Quaker networks and the book trade, science and medicine, children in the 18th century, capital punishment, piracy, smuggling, and archeological digs at 18th century sites in New Jersey. One paper has sought to recover queerness in Joanna Baillie, while another, examining the continuing influence of the 18th century on the 21st, linked "postmodern" works like John Barth's *The Sot-Weed Factor* and Thomas Pynchon's *Gravity's Rainbow* and *Mason and Dixon* to features in our period.

Music in the 18th century has sometimes been discussed at our conferences. I don't remember any papers on Bach or Thomas Arne, but there have been

others on Mozart, C.H. Graun, the German opera, Gluck's *Armide*, Beethoven's *Fidelio*, and Rameau's *Les Indes Galantes*. There have, however, been a number of papers on musical publishing and copyright.

The expansion of the canon, the redefinition of our critical focus, and the great wealth of questions we have begun asking of the far greater number of texts than were readily available a generation ago, has inevitably led to the overshadowing of figures who were once quite prominent. Thus we have had no papers this past decade on Gray or Collins or McPherson or Crabbe or the early Wordsworth, only one on the Wharton brothers, Joseph and Thomas, and one, too, on William Cowper. Again, though illustrations in Thomson's *Seasons* have been discussed, art criticism has been conspicuous by its absence.

What does this tremendous variety of topics and themes, as also some glaring gaps, tell us about ourselves and our profession?

1. While our interests are primarily literary, we have expanded our concerns into the whole arena of 18th century life, so that our studies range beyond the arts or theology and philosophy solely to all areas of culture--not only popular art, but also the business of getting, spending, nurturing, swindling, worshipping, fighting, loving, living, and dying.

2. This is made possible, in large part, by the accessibility of ever-growing databases and other online resources, with the result that we are going to more and more *recherché* or obscure primary texts for our research. Indeed, sometimes there are references in papers to works that no one in the audience is familiar with.

3. European, especially French and to some extent German literature, remains within our ken, but we have not focused much on writing from other parts of Europe, especially south-eastern and central Europe. However, EC/ASECS is no longer Eurocentric, since India and China have received a certain amount of attention. And, of course, America is very well represented.

4. No one critical approach predominates. We have our postmodernists and postcolonialists, new historicists, old historicists, culture critics including students of material culture, biographers, bibliographers, intertextual or transnational readers. However, so far this decade, except for one paper, no one has explored GLBT issues in the eighteenth century, or ventured into the fields of disability studies and animal studies. My guess is that it is only a matter of time before we begin to have papers on these topics

5. Still, by and large our presentations take a thematic approach, and focus upon a single author or even text. Some papers, it is true, do just that and little more. But the best papers in this genre offer close readings which are theoretically informed, historically aware, well researched, written to be spoken and heard, and while focusing upon a small area, they also raise issues of larger concern. They don't rest content with examining the life of the mind of an author or authors, but go beyond to an examination of the lived life, with implications for the lives of us in the 21st century. They give us novel insights not just into what Johnson, say, or Austen thought of issues, but also how that thinking may have affected the lives they led, and what it may tell us about how we may lead

our own.

Do I have any predictions for the future? Historians don't predict. But we can speculate in the Q-and-A session.

Brijraj Singh

Emeritus, Hostos Comm. College of CUNY

The Trampling-upon-the-Crucifix Episode, Again

by Hermann J. Real

Ah! Socrate. Je sçavois bien que vous aviez
une manière particulière de raisonner.
Fontenelle, *Nouveaux Dialogues des Morts*

Before his return to England at the end of his Third Voyage, Gulliver, passing himself off as “a Dutch Merchant,” proves provident enough to petition the Japanese Emperor to be excused from “the Ceremony imposed on [his] Countrymen, of *trampling upon the Crucifix*.” This request raises the Emperor’s suspicion, Gulliver ostensibly being the first of his “Countrymen who ever made any Scruple in this Point,” and he begins “to doubt whether [Gulliver] were a real *Hollander* ... but rather suspected [he] must be a CHRISTIAN.” Nevertheless, in the end, the Emperor complies “with the *singularity* of [Gulliver’s] Humour,” so that the traveller is spared the ceremony before boarding “the *Amboyna* of *Amsterdam*,” the Dutch merchantman which takes him back to Europe.¹

From its inception, the Trampling-upon-the-Crucifix episode has scandalized readers, the majority of Swift’s critics deeming it not only offensive and repellent but also expressive of an inarticulate hostility towards the Dutch,² variously attributed to the Dean’s anger at Dutch politics, trading, and religious tolerance, as well as an amalgam of them all and all anathema to Swift.³ “Il y a certainement un peu de mauvaise foi chez Swift,” one of the annotators states, “quand il admet comme un fait indiscutable que les protestants bataves payaient leur droit d’entrée dans l’Empire du Levant par une insulte à l’emblème catholique.”⁴ Another chimes in: “The fury of Swift’s satire on the Dutch ... is explained by his persistent hostility for dissenters and the toleration principle” practised by the Calvinist-Presbyterian Hollanders.⁵ A third group, finally, has charged the Dean with falsifying the historical evidence. “The picture trampling (*e-fumi* or *fumiye*) of old Japan was one of the methods used in the detection of Christian converts,” Swift’s late-nineteenth-century editor, G. Ravenscroft Dennis, claims, “but there is no proof that it was ever imposed on the Dutch.”⁶ Although this stance implies that the ceremony as it is presented in *Gulliver’s Travels* is an insidious concoction of Swift’s, a welcome, if perhaps not quite motiveless, piece of anti-Dutch propaganda, it is the most frequent explanation

followed by annotators and critics, echoing virtually down the whole of the twentieth century.⁷ Needless to say, it is a far cry from the truth.

Historical evidence confirms that the Japanese not only forced suspected Christian converts to undergo the humiliating process of (*j)efumi*,⁸ they also made Dutch traders perform the rite. From a scholarly point of view, presumably the most reliable, because autoptic, source is *The History of Japan, Giving an Account of the Ancient and Present State and Government of that Empire*, by the Lemgo physician and natural scientist Engelbert Kaempfer (1651-1716).⁹ Although Kaempfer's incomplete autograph, in German, of his *History* was not ready for publication, it was finally purchased after some hard bargaining by the noted collector Sir Hans Sloane, at the time President of the Royal College of Physicians and soon to be President of the Royal Society, in London during the summer of 1724 from Philipp Heinrich Zollmann (c.1683-1748). A native of Saxony with a remarkable proficiency in half-a-dozen languages, Zollmann had become First Assistant Secretary for Foreign Correspondence of the Royal Society in April 1723, and as a member of the royal party on the occasion of King George I's visit to Hanover in August 1723, he purchased Kaempfer's manuscript account of Japan from the traveller's heir, intending to translate it into English. However, when shortly after it turned out that Zollmann's new diplomatic appointment as secretary to the British ambassador-designate to Sweden, Stephen Poyntz, left him no time to complete the work, he abandoned the project and sold the manuscript to Sloane.¹⁰ It was subsequently 'translated' into English, that is, paraphrased and adapted, revised, modified, and supplemented in numerous ways, throughout the whole of 1725, and possibly several months of 1726, by Sloane's young, and inexperienced, Swiss secretary Johann Caspar (Hans Kaspar / Jean Gaspard) Scheuchzer (1702-29),¹¹ and published in London in two impressive folio volumes in May of 1727,¹² six months *after* the publication of *Gulliver's Travels* on 28 October 1726.¹³

Terminus post quem, then, for any *potential* access to the manuscript in London is the summer of 1724,¹⁴ at a time when Swift had interrupted his work on *Gulliver's Travels* because of his involvement in the Dublin controversy about Wood's Halfpence and when Book Three, including its (*j)efumi* episode, had still to be written. While Swift was active in Dublin politics, Scheuchzer was slogging away in London on a manuscript he found demanding to lick into publication. *Terminus ante quem* is August of 1725, when Scheuchzer, as Sloane informed Zollmann in a letter, was still labouring "very hard in getting thro Kempfer," having finished only "about 2/3 of it."¹⁵ At that time, however, *Gulliver* was "substantially complete,"¹⁶ with the Dean busying himself, as he told Ford in August and Pope in September of 1725, with "Transcribing [his] Travells, in four Parts Compleat newly Augmented, and intended for the press."¹⁷ To be sure, there is a very remote chance that it would have been possible for Swift to have seen Sir Hans and young Scheuchzer between mid-March and 15 August 1726, when he was in London, intermittently, to arrange for the publication of *Gulliver's Travels*.¹⁸ But that would necessitate assuming, first, that Swift continued working on his masterpiece virtually until delivery of

his transcript to Benjamin Motte, Jr,¹⁹ second, that he continued tampering with a text he had earlier described as “in four Parts *Compleat*,” and, third, that while in London he sought, and established, contact with Sloane, a man he is bound to have heard of because of his reputation but whom he does not seem to have known in person.²⁰ It is safe, I think, to rule out the Dean’s knowledge of Kaempfer’s *History*, notwithstanding all learnedly elaborate speculations on Swift’s access to the manuscript *before* the publication of his masterpiece.²¹

What is more, there is no need to suppose that Kaempfer’s *History* was the *only* source from which Swift could have drawn material for the Trampling-upon-the-Crucifix episode; in fact, there are a fair number of them. After Kaempfer’s *History*, the most frequently cited one is an imposture, the *Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa, an Island Subject to the Emperor of Japan* by George Psalmanazar, a self-proclaimed “Native of the said Island” actually born in France or Switzerland, which was first published in 1704,²² and which, like Kaempfer’s *History*, ‘testifies’ to (*jefumi* practices,²³ “The *Hollanders*,” Psalmanazar affirms, were granted permission by the Japanese Emperor “to trade into *Japan*,” upon the condition, among others, “That they should trample upon the Crucifix,” a condition, he concludes in great seriousness, which has “been hitherto very exactly observ’d.”²⁴ Even so, it may be doubted that Psalmanazar qualifies as a source for Swift, for a whole number of reasons:

First, the *Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa* was neither in Swift’s library nor in that of his crony Thomas Sheridan at any stage of their lives.²⁵ Admittedly, a copy of the first edition of *An Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa* would have been available to Swift in Marsh’s library, of which the Dean was *ex-officio* governor,²⁶ but the first edition does not yet contain the notorious Chapter XXVII which the Dean utilized and reconfigured in *A Modest Proposal*.²⁷

Second, there is no evidence throughout the whole of Swift’s works that he ever read it.²⁸

Third, the Dean’s one reference to Psalmanazar in the whole of his works dates from *A Modest Proposal* (1729), four years *after* the publication of *Gulliver’s Travels*.

Fourth, this only reference does not bespeak an assured knowledge of the work, the *Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa*, but of the man, the notoriously lionized impostor Psalmanazar, relayed through a friend of an unreliable narrator, the ‘mad’ Modest Proposer: “BUT in order to justify my Friend; he confessed, that this Expedient was put into his Head by the famous *Salmanaazor*, a Native of the Island *Formosa*, who came from thence to *London*, above twenty Years ago, and in Conversation told my Friend.”²⁹ This account is faulty on several counts, such as the (presumably phonetic) spelling of the name and the dating (1708 rather than 1703/4). Last but not least, in 1729, the ‘famous’ Psalmanazar is still referred to as “a Native of the Island *Formosa*,” although his hoax had been blown and identity revealed as early as 1708.³⁰ All this suggests that whatever scanty knowledge Swift may have had of

Psalmanazar was based on hearsay only.

Fifth, the fake Formosan's account of Japanese (*jefumi*) practices was not rooted in any personal experience, but was pilfered from written sources, such as a 1704 English rendering of Francis Gemelli Careri's *Giro del Mondo*, originally published in 1699,³¹ and any of these is as good a guess as the *Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa*. Paradoxically, "Psalmanazar himself could always use this other knowledge about Formosa, factual or otherwise, to defend his own forgery."³²

Given the Dean's penchant for beating his satirical enemies at their own game,³³ it is safer under the circumstances to search for Dutch sources containing a description of Dutch apostasy, and indeed such Dutch sources do exist. One is John Ogilby's *Atlas Japannensis* of 1670, which is a close translation of a Dutch original,³⁴ and another is by Gulliver's "worthy Friend" Herman Moll (p. 284 [IV, xi, 3]), who was not only an eminent Dutch cartographer but also the compiler of geographical reference works like *Thesaurus geographicus*, which is the second part of *The Compleat Geographer: or, The Chorography and Topography of All the Known Parts of the Earth*, and which went through at least four editions before the publication of *Gulliver's Travels* in 1726.³⁵ Admittedly, neither Ogilby nor Moll were on Swift's library shelves but Thomas Sheridan, with whom the Dean spent some considerable time at Quilca when he was engaged in writing *Gulliver's Travels*,³⁶ owned the third edition of Moll's *Compleat Geographer*.³⁷ Moll reports that,

Of all Heathen Countries where Christianity has ever been preach'd, [Japan] is the most destitute of Christians. And so jealous they are, that no *Europeans* whatsoever, but the *Dutch*, are permitted to Land there. These indeed ... dare not make the least Shew of Religion, not even so much as to say Grace to Meat. And in regard that they contemn the Pictures, Crosses, Rosaries, and other Superstitions of the Jesuits, and trample on what those knelt to, the *Japonese* are content to take their Answer: *That they are Dutchmen*, and believe them not Christians.³⁸

Dutch willingness, then, to desecrate one of the foremost symbols of Christianity in exchange for commercial advantages is neither a malicious invention of English anti-Dutch propaganda nor a wilful fabrication of Swift's; it is, on the contrary, testified to by the Dutch themselves.³⁹

But there is more than meets the eye. Suspicion is raised by the fact, hitherto unknown but a fact nonetheless, that the custom of trampling-upon-the-crucifix is a feature not only of seventeenth-century Japanese politics, to a large extent after self-imposed isolation in the late 1630s, but also of European Christianity, more particularly its sixteenth-century *Hexenwahn*, or witch craze, which is "based upon a new notion of witchcraft that can be termed Satanism or diabolism."⁴⁰ A case in point is the *Compendivm Maleficarvm*, first published in 1608 with the imprimatur of the Holy Office, and republished in a much augmented edition in 1626. *Compendivm Maleficarvm* is a demonological manual, which was compiled by an Italian monk, Brother Franciscus Maria Guaccius (Francesco Maria Guazzo), from a great variety of sources and which,

much in the style of the more frequently printed and widely influential “encyclopaedia of demonology” *The Hammer of Witches (Malleus Maleficarvm)* by the two German Dominicans Heinrich Kramer and Jakob Sprenger (1486/7), is an attempt, as Guazzo’s Latin subtitle makes clear, to identify “the witches’ most execrable works against Humankind [nefandissima in genus humanum opera venefica],” an obvious presupposition for a mandate to persecute them as apostates and/or heretics. In one of the chapters of Book One, Father Guazzo elaborates his doctrinal views on witches’ pacts with the Devil (variously referred to as “dæmon,” “diabolus,” and “Princeps”), distinguishing two types: a “silent, or tacit one [tacitum]” and an “expressed, or explicit one [expræssum].” This latter is publicly proclaimed (“coram testibus”), and at it, “the Devil may speak and be heard at times [aliquando diabolus loquitur, & auditur].” In what follows, the *pactum cum diabolo* is illustrated both by a catalogue of examples, which in the aggregate amount to an inverted Confession of Faith (“nego Creatorem cæli, & terræ, nego baptisma, nego adorationem Dei,” etc.), and an act of apostasy in four steps (Apostasia, Professio, Votum, Iuramentum), involving, among other things, the active desecration of the sacraments and the cross as well as images of the Virgin Mary and the Saints, all confirmed by the solemn oath never to return to the Christian faith again: “Deinde Ecclesiastica Sacramenta cuncta projicere, pedibusque proprijs conculcare crucem, & imagines B. Mariæ Virg. & aliorum sanctorum.”⁴¹



In a similar manner, as the *Malleus Maleficarvm* testifies, in diabolic assemblies like the Sabbat, heretical sectaries, at the devil’s command would renounce “Christ in graphic fashion, trampling on or otherwise abusing the host.”⁴²

Likewise, people thought to be ‘possessed,’ or ‘demoniacs,’ one way or another – in modern terms, patients probably displaying behavioural symptoms such as depression (melancholy, spleen), hysteria, or epilepsy – during exorcisms, the ritual of ‘dispossession,’ would insult the Virgin Mary, condemn the sacraments, spit on crucifixes, and trample on the Eucharist, both in the Old and the New Worlds.⁴³

On the other hand, it is remarkable that Japanese historians should have failed to find any evidence authenticating the *Japanese* origin of the (*j*)*efumi* ritual. The claim, one of them writes, “that it was none other than the Japanese themselves who *devised* this ceremony to discover and punish Christians is *not* based on any Japanese historical record.”⁴⁴ However, if acts like the trampling-upon-the-crucifix (or treading on the host) are not of Japanese but European provenance, the evidence allows only of one conclusion: the ritual was brought to, not devised in, Japan by Christian missionaries. The first to arrive in the late 1540s were the Jesuits, who under the leadership of St Francis Xavier and Father Alessandro Valignano “had converted 220,000 Japanese (approximately 3 percent of the population) towards end of the century.”⁴⁵ By this time, the Jesuits had been joined in their missionary activities by the Franciscans and the Dominicans.⁴⁶ For motives only known to themselves, the missionaries appear to have carried their expertise in devil worship, and its methods of detection, in their baggage, and they appear to have inaugurated, and practised, (*j*)*efumi* in Japan. I have been unable to trace any incontrovertible evidence of this, it is true, but violence in general was part and parcel of the missionary methods.⁴⁷ The ‘justification’ for this would be that the Fathers may have had reasons for suspicion and, by implication, for harassment and persecution within the fold. Not only was conversion frequently dictated by (devilish) self-interest; after all, mass conversion was also the result of necessity, with vassals simply following the example set by their lords: “In order to prevent the people from falling back into Buddhism all temples were destroyed ... and it is doubtful whether all converts had the inner disposition needed for the sacrament.”⁴⁸ Similar arguments applied to cases of demoniacs ‘simply’ suffering from personality disorders, of whatever kind, which would call for exorcism. Since these “rarely took place in complete privacy,” they are likely to have attracted observers;⁴⁹ a fact which may perhaps explain why the “malicious Rogue of a Skipper” in denouncing Gulliver to a superior officer for not having trampled upon the crucifix insists on the publicity of the ritual (pp. 216-17 [III, xi, 4-5]).

If any religious order was intimately familiar with ‘Christian’ demonology, it was the Jesuits. Historians assure us that Jesuit missionaries were not only “the evangelists of the sixteenth-century Counter-Reformation,” they also “carried the craze with them” wherever they went,⁵⁰ and what applies to Europe is not to be ruled out for Japan’s Christian community either. When the missionaries were eventually forced to leave Japan in 1639, as the Christian century and the years of restricted toleration were over,⁵¹ the Japanese turned the very technique, which they came to call (*j*)*efumi*, picture treading, against their former spiritual guides in order to smoke out any remaining hidden believers, priests, among

them, particularly after the more usual methods of persecution – maltreatment, banishment, execution, and torture – had failed.⁵² It is no coincidence that (*j)efumi* as “a special method for discovering Christians” was introduced by the Inquisition Office, set up in 1640 by the Edo shōgun, after the country had been closed. “The persecutors knew perfectly well,” a historian of the Church in Japan states, “that the act of trampling on a sacred picture ... was considered as a formal denial of the faith.”⁵³ In fact, it had been the European missionaries themselves who taught the Japanese authorities that (*j)efumi* was a decidedly anti-Christian ceremony, and it confronted converts, as well as all European Christians subjected to it, with an impossible alternative: either to refuse or to apostatize. All who refused gave themselves away. By hindsight, it seems a bitter irony that the persecutors in going about their cruel business only needed to avail themselves of any of the sacred images or devotional objects, such as the crucifix, imported by the missionaries themselves and at first avidly collected by the Japanese, Christian and non-Christian alike, during the heyday of cultural and religious transfer.⁵⁴

All this evidence adds another rather unexpected twist to the satirical screw. By consenting to trample upon the crucifix, the Dutch merchants testify to their determination not so much to commit an unchristian act in exchange for trading privileges but to their willingness to take part in a satanic ritual (of European provenance), which symbolically registers their Devil worship and, by implication, their renunciation of God, the greatest of all possible sins, for lucre’s sake.⁵⁵

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

Notes

1. All quotations are from the edition of Herbert Davis, *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726): *With an Introduction by Harold Williams* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965 [1941]), pp. 216-17 (III, xi, 4-5), and are given in parentheses within the text.

2. See, for example, J. Kent Clark, “Swift and the Dutch,” *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 17 (1953-54), 345-56; Ellen Douglass Leyburn, “Swift’s View of the Dutch,” *PMLA*, 66 (1951), 734-45.

3. See, for example, *Gulliver’s Travels: Complete, Authoritative Text with Biographical and Historical Contexts, Critical History, and Essays from Five Contemporary Critical Perspectives*, ed. Christopher Fox (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1995), p. 201; *Gulliver’s Travels*, ed. Clement Hawes (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004), p. 214n; *Los viajes de Gulliver*, ed. Pilar Elena (Madrid: Cátedra, 1992), pp. 377-78. See also Anne Barbeau Gardiner, “Swift on the Dutch East India Merchants: The Context of 1672-73 War Literature,” *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, 54 (1991), 235-52.

4. Jonathan Swift, *Voyages de Gulliver: traduit et annoté par Jacques Pons d’après l’édition de Émile Pons* (Paris: Gallimard, 1976), p. 431.

5. Martin Kallich, *The Other End of the Egg: Religious Satire in "Gulliver's Travels"* (Bridgeport, CT: Conference on British Studies, 1970), p. 58; echoed by Karl D. Chambers, "Swift and the *Trampling Dutch*," *Christian Scholar's Review*, 3 (1973), 51-54.
6. *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. G. Ravenscroft Dennis, in *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Temple Scott (London: G. Bell, 1914), VIII, 225-26n1; endorsed almost verbatim by Harold Williams, ed., *Gulliver's Travels: The Text of the First Edition* (London: First Edition Club, 1926), p. 484.
7. *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. A. B. Gough (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961 [1915]), p. 409; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Arthur E. Case (New York: Ronald Press, 1938), p. 234n4; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Paul Turner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 349; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Angus Ross (London: Longman, 1972), p. 318; *Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings*, ed. Louis A. Landa (Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 1976), p. 515; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. A. L. Rowse (London and Sydney: Pan Books, 1977), p. 295; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Robert DeMaria (London: Penguin, 2001), p. 291; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Allan Ingram (Peterborough: Broadview, 2012), p. 273n1.
8. For an account of the historical origins of (*j*)*efumi* in the late 1620s, increasing use after 1640 as well as the Japanese motives for introducing it and its various types, see Takau Shimada, "Possible Sources for *Gulliver's Travels*," *Philological Quarterly*, 63 (1984), 125-30.
9. For an excellent survey of Kämpfer's life and journey to Japan, his stay at the Edo (Tokyo) Shōgun's court and his collection of all things Japanese, see the superb exhibition catalogue, in German and Japanese, commemorating the tercentenary of Kämpfer's landing in Japan on 25 September 1990, *Engelbert Kämpfer – ein Deutscher sieht das Japan der Genroku-Periode* (Tokyo: National Museum of Ethnology, 1990). I am grateful to Professor Fumiko Takase, Kobe College, for making this catalogue available to me. I have also profited from Detlef Haberland, *Von Lemgo nach Japan: das ungewöhnliche Leben des Engelbert Kaempfer, 1651 bis 1716* (Bielefeld: Westfalen Verlag, 1990), pp. 55-79.
10. See Derek Massarella, "Philip Henry Zollman, the Royal Society's First Assistant Secretary for Foreign Correspondence," *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, 46 (1992), 219-34 (pp. 224-25).
11. The most detailed and thorough account is Wolfgang Michel, "Johann Caspar Scheuchzer (1702-1729) und die Herausgabe der *History of Japan*," *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques*, 64 (2010), 101-37 (pp. 115-16, 119-23), with a full bibliography at the end.
12. I am indebted in this, and in what follows of the publication history of Kämpfer's *History of Japan*, to Gerhard Bonn, *Engelbert Kaempfer (1651-1716): der Reisende und sein Einfluss auf die europäische Bewusstseinsbildung über Asien* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2003), particularly pp. 73-83. Sloane's imprimatur is dated 27 April 1727.
13. See David Woolley, "The Stemma of *Gulliver's Travels*: A Second Note," *Swift Studies*, 17 (2002), 75-87 (p. 77).

14. Earlier, before the summer of 1724 when he sold Kaempfer's manuscript to Sloane, Zollmann was working in Paris as secretary to the British ambassador, Sir Horace Walpole (Massarella, "Philip Henry Zollman, the Royal Society's First Assistant Secretary for Foreign Correspondence," p. 224).
15. Quoted from Bonn, *Engelbert Kaempfer (1651-1716)*, p. 77.
16. Ehrenpreis, *Dean Swift*, pp. 442-44.
17. *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 586, 606. As David Woolley points out in a footnote, the transcription of Swift's "Compleat newly Augmented" text "would involve the transcribing about 120,000 words" (II, 606 and n4).
18. Sir Harold Williams, *The Text of "Gulliver's Travels"* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1952), pp. 1-30.
19. See Michael Treadwell, "Benjamin Motte, Andrew Tooke and *Gulliver's Travels*," *Proceedings of The First Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, eds Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1985), pp. 287-304.
20. The only (inconclusive) reference to Sloane in Woolley's edition of Swift's *Correspondence* occurs in 1709 (I, 253 and n2).
21. For this very common, if factually often inaccurate, assumption first proposed by J. Leeds Barroll, "Gulliver in Luggnagg: A Possible Source," *Philological Quarterly*, 36 (1957), 505-8, see John A. Dussinger, "'Christian' vs 'Hollander': Swift's Satire on the Dutch East India Traders," *Notes and Queries*, 211 (1966), 209-12; Chambers, "Swift and the *Trampling Dutch*," p. 52; Maurice Johnson, Kitagaki Muneharu, Philip Williams, "*Gulliver's Travels* and *Japan: A New Reading*, Moonlight Series no 4 (1977), pp. 21-27; Elizabeth R. Napier, "Swift's 'Trampling upon the Crucifix': A Parallel," *Notes and Queries*, 224 (1979), 544-48; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Turner, p. 349, and, more recently, Robert Markley, *The Far East and the English Imagination, 1600-1730* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 2006), pp. 254-55.
22. Psalmanazar has met with a great deal of interest in recent research, and as a result, the literature on him is already considerable. See, among others, Daniel Eilon, "Gulliver's Fellow-Traveller Psalmanaazaar," *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 8 (1985), 173-78; Richard M. Swiderski, *The False Formosan: George Psalmanazar and the Eighteenth-Century Experiment of Identity* (San Marino: Mellen Research University Press, 1991), pp. 21-25, 44-102; Michael Keevak, *The Pretended Asian: George Psalmanazar's Eighteenth-Century Formosan Hoax* (Detroit: Wayne State U. Press, 2004), pp. 1-16.
23. See, in addition to Elizabeth R. Napier, "Swift's 'Trampling upon the Crucifix': A Parallel," pp. 546-47, the same author's "Swift, Kaempfer, and Psalmanaazaar: Further Remarks on 'Trampling upon the Crucifix,'" *Notes and Queries*, 226 (1981), 226; Shimada, "Possible Sources for *Gulliver's Travels*," p. 128
24. *An Historical and Geographical Description of Formosa, an Island Subject to the Emperor of Japan: Giving an Account of the Religion, Customs, Manners, etc. of the Inhabitants*, 2nd ed. (London: Mat. Wotton, et al., 1705), pp. 159-65 (164-65).

25. Dirk F. Passmann and Heinz J. Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift: A Bio-Bibliographical Handbook*, 4 vols (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 2003), II, 1539; IV, 270.
26. Muriel McCarthy, *Exhibition Catalogue: Travel Books and the Age of Discovery* (Dublin: Archbishop Marsh's Library, 1983), p. 51.
27. Eilon, "Gulliver's Fellow-Traveller Psalmanaazaar," pp. 173-74.
28. Readers will assume from this statement that I question most of the evidence adduced by John Shufelt in "The Trickster as an Instrument of Enlightenment: George Psalmanazar and the Writings of Jonathan Swift," *History of European Ideas*, 31, no 2 (2005), 147-71.
29. *Irish Tracts, 1728-1733*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971 [1955]), p. 113.
30. Jack Lynch, "Forgery as Performance Art: The Strange Case of George Psalmanazar," *1650-1850: Ideas, Aesthetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era*, 11 (2005), 21-35 (pp. 24-25).
31. Takau Shimada, "Possible Sources for Psalmanazar's *Description of Formosa*," *Notes and Queries*, 228 (1983), 514-16.
32. Keevak, *The Pretended Asian*, pp. 21-25 (24).
33. See, for example, Hermann J. Real, "'A Dish plentifully stor'd': Jonathan Swift and the Evaluation of Satire," *Reading Swift: Papers from The Second Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, eds Richard H. Rodino and Hermann J. Real, with the assistance of Helgard Stöver-Leidig (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1993), pp. 45-58 (53-54).
34. See Thomas Dacosta Kaufmann, "Designed for Desecration: *Fumi-e* and European Art," *Toward a Geography of Art* (Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 2004), pp. 303-51 (310).
35. See Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken, "Swift's 'Trampling upon the Crucifix' Once More," *Notes and Queries*, 228 (1983), 513-14; Dirk Friedrich Passmann, "*Full of Improbable Lies*": "*Gulliver's Travels*" und die *Reiseliteratur vor 1726* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1987), pp. 266-70, and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Interpreting Cultural Transfer and the Consequences of Markets and Exchange: Reconsidering *Fumi-e*," *Artistic and Cultural Exchanges between Europe and Asia, 1400-1900: Rethinking Markets, Workshops and Collections*, ed. Michael North (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 135-61 (144-45 and n48). For some visual evidence of objects used for desecration, although admittedly not crucifixes and of a somewhat later date, too, see Kaufmann, "Designed for Desecration: *Fumi-e* and European Art," pp. 314-36.
36. See, for example, *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, II, 588; see also II, 424n2.
37. Passmann and Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift*, IV, 262.
38. *The Compleat Geographer*, 4th ed. (London, 1723), p. 129.
39. The editor of the recent Cambridge edition of *Gulliver's Travels* misses this point (see *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. David Womersley [Cambridge: Cambridge

U. Press, 2012], p. 324n9).

40. Henricus Institoris, O.P., and Jacobus Sprenger, O.P., *Malleus Maleficarum*, ed. Christopher S. Mackay, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 2006), I, 46. I am also indebted to Hugh Trevor-Roper, "The European Witch-Craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," *The Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1999 [1967], pp. 83-177 [93-96]), and Keith Thomas's illuminating chapter on "Witchcraft," in *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1973), pp. 515-698 (521-25).

41. Franciscus Maria Guaccius, *Compendium Maleficarum* (Milan, 1626), pp. 33-36 (my emphasis). In the 1608 edition, the image is on page 14.

42. Hans Peter Broedel, *The "Malleus Maleficarum" and the Construction of Witchcraft: Theology and Popular Belief* (Manchester: Manchester U. Press, 2003), pp. 122-66 (124, 128).

43. Brian P. Levack, *The Devil Within: Possession and Exorcism in the Christian West* (New Haven: Yale U. Press, 2013), pp. 14-15, 105-7, 115-29, and *passim*.

44. Shimada, "Possible Sources for *Gulliver's Travels*," p. 126 (my emphasis).

45. Markley, *The Far East and the English Imagination, 1600-1730*, pp. 241-68 (246-48).

46. For the details, see Joseph Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan: From its Beginnings to the Early Meiji Era, 1549-1873*, 2nd ed. (Tokyo: Oriens Institute for Religious Research, 1973).

47. Levack, *The Devil Within*, pp. 103-5.

48. Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan*, p. 35.

49. Levack, *The Devil Within*, p. 83.

50. Trevor-Roper, "The European Witch-Craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," pp. 127-28, 144-45.

51. See, in addition to Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan*, pp. 161-200, C. R. Boxer, *The Christian Century in Japan, 1549-1650* (Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1951), and, more recently, Markley, *The Far East and the English Imagination, 1600-1730*, pp. 242-43.

52. Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan*, pp. 120-21, 130-33, 139-43, 164-74, and *passim*.

53. Jennes, *A History of the Catholic Church in Japan*, pp. 166-67.

54. Kaufmann, "Interpreting Cultural Transfer and the Consequences of Markets and Exchange: Reconsidering *Fumi-e*," pp. 140-41.

55. I am grateful to my 'people' at the Ehrenpreis Centre, Ulrich Elkmann and Eva Schaten, MA, for numerous kinds of bibliographical and electronic support, and to Dr. Kirsten Juhas and Dr. Dirk F. Passmann for their benevolent criticisms.

Interwoven Globe: The World-wide Textile Trade, 1500-1800

I hope that some readers were able to see the mega exhibition of textiles at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, which opened on September 16, 2013, too late for the last issue of *The Intelligencer* to carry a review, and closed on January 5, 2014, shortly before this issue was readied for press. It can be described, very baldly if not inaccurately, as a display, largely from the museum's own collection, of textiles, whether woven, embroidered, painted, dyed, or printed, that were traded round the world from about 1500 to 1800, but have remained largely unseen till now because museum authorities did not quite know what to do with them. In the catalogue to the exhibition, Amelia Peck, the editor, says that it was while searching for the provenance of a particular textile that the idea dawned of bringing together collections from different branches of the museum under the theme of an interwoven world. What eventually went on display was, in fact, nothing less than an investigation into the history of international trade, art, fashion design, fabric and dye-related technology, shipping, and the hybridity of all cultures.

Asian nations had been trading textiles with one another well before the Europeans arrived, and the Indians and Chinese in particular had mastered the art of producing fabrics that would appeal to the tastes of the nations that imported them. Indeed, Indian textiles had become a kind of currency for use in the spice trade. The exhibition had two magnificent 14th-century Gujarati textiles for export to Indonesia, showing an elephant procession and stylized but identifiable Indonesian flora in a recognizably Indonesian jungle. The technique used, *patola*, where the threads are pre-dyed and the warp and woof patterns emerge only when the weaving process is completed, is still commonly used in Gujarat. Another export meant for Sri Lanka showed a Saivite devotee gathering flowers. In the meanwhile the Chinese were exporting fabrics with the Tree of Life motif, showing the tree in the center with blooming flowers branching out on either side, to India where it became so popular that the Indians adopted it as their own.

With the opening up of sea routes between Europe, India and Iberoamerica, the textile trade became fully global, as the exhibition proved. Appropriately, then, the first hall had a wall-sized blow-up of a 1647 picture of a ship of the Dutch East India Company being worked on by carpenters who were dwarfed by it. Then followed eight rooms devoted to different nations, India, China, Peru and Mexico, Persia, the European countries, and the United States.

Indian weavers, painters and designers proved particularly adept at creating just those kinds of fabrics and motifs which would appeal to the specialized export market. Thus there was a 17th century Gujarati bedcover made for England of cotton embroidered with silk. The rather fanciful peacocks and tigers were Indian, while the spiraling vines were meant to recall English embroidery and would therefore appeal to the English buyer. A Bengali cape of *tussar* silk, meant for export to Portugal, showed deer and hunters on elephants, but the human figures and their clothes, including their hats, were European. Other

capas had Biblical or classical as well as Indian designs. A Bengali wall hanging, also meant for Portugal, depicted a gate which was erected in Lisbon for the entry of Philip III of Spain when Spain and Portugal shared a common ruler. The gallery note to this item suggested that Indian weavers would have got the design from a 1622 book in which the gate was pictured, and stated that on top of the gate they had placed *Discordia* framed by the Dutch coat of arms, symbolizing Holland's struggle for independence from Spain in the second quarter of the 17th century. The human figures engaged in different acts were dressed in European clothes and hats. But several of their faces were dark, their musical instruments, as also their poses and bearing, Indian. The total effect was complex and enigmatic.

Indian cottons, whether tie-and-dye with their colorful, abstract, floral motifs, or chintzes (the word is a corruption of the Hindi *chhint* =print), or calicos (from Calicut, modern Kozhikode), or painted fabrics, were cheap, lightweight and washable, and proved enormously popular. Indians also produced the kind of designs that Europeans wanted, especially the Tree of Life against a white background. They used other motifs too, like roundels, that were being explored in Europe. So great was the European demand for Indian material—it is estimated that in the 1680s 83% of goods carried on East India Company ships consisted of fabrics—that Britain and France banned their import at the beginning of the 18th century. Consequently, European manufacturers started producing fabrics in imitation of Indian patterns and techniques to meet the local demand, and some of them became quite successful. In particular, Christophe-Philip Oberkampf of France became such an expert at reproducing Indian chintz designs on white cloth of Indian manufacture that people couldn't tell whether the work was French or Indian. Also displayed were nine tapestries "in the Indian manner" made by the English weaver John Vanderbank of the late 17th and early 18th centuries, which he gifted to Queen Mary. The figures and flora were distinctively Indian, but the pagoda was Chinese.

Chinese fabrics, also enormously popular, were never banned in Europe, though Chinese fabric makers, painters and embroiderers, who started large-scale production for export to the West shortly after the Portuguese established contact with the Ming dynasty in the 16th century, were as expert as the Indians in catering to European tastes and created the same kind of hybrid motifs that the Indians did. On exhibit was a Chinese white-on-blue damask weaving made for the Hapsburgs with a stylized double-headed eagle as well as elephants. In another, this one gold on red, there were birds and eagles, but also urns pierced by arrows, possibly an emblem of Augustinian missionaries. Perhaps the most remarkable of this genre was an embroidery of Helen's abduction. Meant for export. and based on a European theme, the work is Chinese, but the artists, according to the note accompanying the work, were Japanese-trained, as evidenced by chemical analysis of their pigments. The faces and the architecture painted on the cotton fabric were European. But the embroidered parts included Chinese art-inspired waves and animals. The notes to other hangings pointed out that the style adopted by the Chinese in them was the European "bizarre" style,

depicting bush vegetation and fantastic architecture. But the craftsmen used golden paper-wrapped thread, a typical Chinese feature.

Some displays represented a more complex form of hybridization. Indian tye-and-dye fabrics were exported to China, where they were used as borders on coverlets (one instance was on display) with a dragon center and hunters in the corners in European dress, but with Chinese features. The embroidered parts of this 17th-century fabric that was meant for export to Europe were executed in silk paper-wrapped thread. Similarly, a south Indian fabric that used paint as well as embroidery, and was described by the museum notes as “chintz,” and was meant for export to Holland, tried to capitalize on the growing Dutch taste for chinoiserie by “orientalizing” the flora and fauna, that is, portraying them in the Chinese style as understood by Indian artists. Here, as in the embroidery depicting the abduction of Helen, we see blended together traditions and techniques not just from two but three or more cultures. Indeed, a theme that the exhibition brought out clearly was the creative interweaving of the cultures of many nations that took place in the conduct of an international trade in fabrics.

One of the most striking items on display was a Chinese double-sided hanging, yellow in front and red at the back, but with identical images on both sides. The bold outline of flowers showed Indian influence as well as European taste, but the exquisite workmanship was Chinese. The embroidery was so fine that even a close-up view did not reveal the thread or needlework, but the whole seemed almost painted with long, straight, single strokes of the brush. Incidentally, the tradition of double-sided embroidery still thrives in China.

Persian silks started reaching world markets through the Armenians, who had been specially settled in Isfahan by the Safavids to boost trade. Iranian patterns inspired Italian church vestments, of which several splendid examples were on view. Indian and Chinese cloth was used for these vestments too, while Chinese cloth made for Europe was also converted into Buddhist vestments in Japan.

One of the great revelations of the exhibition was the textile traditions of Mexico and Peru. South American fabrics were more representational than Indian or Chinese, which could be quite abstract, and their colors were also more explosive than the subdued yellows and other pastels of India, contrary to the popular view today that Indian colors are dazzlingly bright. Soon after the Spanish conquest high-born native women began to marry Spaniards, and many of these couples commissioned tapestries from Spain that used Incan and even Chinese themes, with dyes imported from there as well. Chinese textiles came to the New World on ships from Manila that sailed to Lima in Peru and Acapulco in Mexico. In turn, textiles from Mexico and Peru, besides being consumed at home, started being exported to Europe and North America. Immigrant Spanish artists set up workshops in Mexico to train local weavers, and a lot of material with Christian-inspired themes was produced for the church. Local artists were also encouraged to weave noble Spaniards’ coats of arms, a tradition they had already mastered by weaving Incan kings’ symbols of authority. One such embroidery was dated 1771 and combined vine and flower motifs with lions,

birds, and a double headed eagle. Birds there are a-plenty in Iberoamericana, and the eagle may have been the Hapsburg symbol imported from Europe. The lions, not very realistic, displayed an Asian, more specifically an Indian influence. Another tapestry combined Old Testament figures and classical themes with a depiction of native life, while an incongruous blue circle in the middle seemed, as the museum's notes said, to reinterpret a Chinese symbol. Yet another hanging showed men and women in Spanish dress, stylized peacock feathers, and a unicorn. There was no dearth of eclectic influences here: from the start, Mexican and Peruvian textiles, like Indian and Chinese textiles, represented a hybridity made up of influences from all round the globe while remaining true to the cultures that produced them.

The Indian, Chinese, Persian and other fabrics in the exhibition were, for the most part, anonymous, many the work of several hands. This was not always the case with those from Mexico and Peru. One wedding coverlet gave the name of the maker (Dona Rosa Solis y Menendez), the place of making (Merida), and date (4 January 1786). The cloth was Mexican, the embroidery thread Chinese silk, and the dyes both south American and European. Again, while many (though not all) Indian and Chinese textiles depicted generalized scenes, south American designs tended to be more specific, though it is not possible with certainty to identify all the personages or actions. There was, thus, a shawl which showed people boating, garden scenes, a Jesuit priest, people in European as well as Inca dress, a horse carriage, and an internal banqueting scene. The suspicion is that individual events or persons were being depicted, but it is impossible to be sure.

Because the textiles represented the period 1500-1800, which saw the beginnings and eventual triumph of European colonialism as also a lot of internecine European warfare, the organizers of the show decided to put on display works that deal with this rather sad and bloody part of history as well. It was a well intentioned and perhaps natural part of the show, but also the weakest. A crowded Gujarati tapestry in silk depicted a battle between the Portuguese and the Hapsburgs. An English cotton print was given over to depicting scenes from the life of Capt. Cook, including his death. Perhaps the most impressive item in this genre was a south Indian cotton painting and dyed work depicting the English conquest of Pondicherry in 1760-61. The English officers were mounted, while Indian soldiers, both Hindu and Muslim, who could be distinguished by their uniforms, formed the infantry. There were cannons, swords, spears and trumpets of various kinds. The French seemed to be getting the worst of it and were in some disarray.

A Tree of Life silk and satin embroidery from China, circa 1750-1800, rounded off this remarkable exhibition. The Tree of Life theme originated in China, from where it was exported to India. In turn, Indian craftsmen exported huge numbers of fabrics with this motif to England where it became enormously popular and came to be identified, in fact, with Indian textiles. The taste spread to the young United States, and the Chinese hanging would seem to have been made for export to that emerging market. Thus not only did the exhibition, at its

close, acknowledge the emerging presence of a new market for Asian goods, but by accentuating the Tree of Life design brought an important theme which spread round the world back to the country of its origin.

Finally, a few generalizations may be offered and some questions posed that the exhibition raises. We may think of globalization as a contemporary development, but it is at least five hundred years old if not older. Far from being cut off from one another, artists in widely separated parts of the world knew what was going on elsewhere and what tastes prevailed, and, by catering to those tastes and adding something of their own, they not only expanded their markets but also helped to fashion the tastes of other countries. The exhibition brought out clearly that there is no such thing as the purely Asian or European or American. Each culture forms an indispensable part of the other: the globe is truly “interwoven.”

“The Interwoven Globe” presented not only an intellectual but also a sensuous experience of the highest sort. It was a veritable feast for the eyes, but the rich textures also excited the sense of touch. One could almost *feel* the texture of the rich damasks or the fineness of Indian muslins, so gossamer-like that it is said that whole bolts could be folded into a matchbox. Seeing this material used in splendid dresses for Western women produced its own aesthetic pleasure since the material could not be cut but had to be ingeniously folded into layers to form the dress. It was also interesting to note that centuries-old traditions of weaving and dyeing continue to be practiced in modern India and China, and that after the interregnum of the 19th and 20th centuries these countries, together with other Asian and Hispanic-American nations, have once again become the suppliers of fabrics to the world. What was equally fascinating—and the exhibition did not draw attention to this—was the way in which textile designing has had repercussions in other areas of human endeavor as well. Just as an example, Henry Noltie has pointed out, in his 3-volume *Robert Wight and the Botanical Drawings of Rungiah and Govindoo* (Edinburgh: Royal Edinburgh Botanical Gardens, 2007), that these early 19th-century Indian botanical artists depicted their leaves and flowers in a style that they had learned from the calico printing traditions of south India. Looking at the large number of spectacular *palampores*, the term normally used to describe bed covers or wall hangings, on display, this fact became quite obvious. [See the cover illustration for an example of a *palampore*.]

For all that, I could not help noticing a few lacunae. One of the great textile producing nations of Asia was Indonesia, but there was nothing on display from there, although some instances of Indian exports for the Indonesian market were exhibited. More important was the fact that Europe was shown as the consumer, seldom the exporter, except insofar as Britain re-exported some imported goods to the American Colonies and some European nations tended to trade among themselves. One of the very few examples of a European export to Asia was a woolen fabric for Japan, where sheep were not reared, and where it was used as a novelty item to form part of the samurai’s fancy uniform. Why did Europeans import so much from Asia but export so little? Granted, Europe was hardly in a

position to export cotton products to India and China, the great cotton producing and exporting nations of the world. And it would have made no sense to export woolen fabrics to India because of the climate. But surely they would have done well in China? Above all, tapestries made out of wool, in which Europe excelled and of which the exhibition had some French examples commissioned by Louis XV!, would have found a ready market among Indian and Chinese noble families. Another European specialty was lace. But, again, there were no lace items on display that could have been meant for export. It was not clear from the exhibition why Europe, between the years 1500 and 1800, was essentially a consumer of textiles produced in Asia and South America and kept its own products for a domestic market.

The sumptuous catalogue that accompanies the exhibition is unlikely to be surpassed. Magnificently got up, printed *de luxe* and bound in Italy, and distributed by Yale University Press, it is divided into three parts. The first consists of nine scholarly essays on themes related to the exhibition, but they go beyond what the exhibition displayed, since they include a discussion of paintings as well as textiles in other museums. The second is essentially a commentary on most of the works displayed in the exhibition. The third consists of a glossary, a most thorough bibliography, and an index. The catalogue has to be the starting point for anyone who wishes to pursue the subject in any depth.

Brijraj Singh
Bsingh1029@aol.com

John C. Greene. *Theatre in Dublin, 1745-1820: A History*. Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2011. 2 vols., 708 pp. ISBN 978-1-6114-60667 and 978-1-6114-61008

John C. Greene. *Theatre in Dublin 1745-1820: A Calendar of Performances*. Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 2011. 6 vols., 4672 pp. ISBN 978-1-61146-6108-4, etc.

In eight sturdy folio volumes, John C. Greene has provided a solid body of knowledge about a field of study too often passed over as tangential or neglected altogether. English theatre history has long been healthily established: consider the invaluable *London Stage*, the biographies and biographical dictionaries, the impressive work with material evidence by Judith Milhous and Rob Hume and their school of archaeo-historicists, and an ever-abundant flow of fine studies on English actors, actresses, playwrights, singers, and managers. From such accounts we do discover something about Dublin—that the greatest of the English actors, David Garrick, spent time on the Dublin stage—indeed, according to Arthur Murphy it was a Dublin writer who first named Garrick *Roscious* (*The Life of David Garrick* [1801], I, 39). And we also learn that

Dublin's actors—Spranger Barry, George Anne Bellamy, Thomas Sheridan, Charles Macklin, James Quin, Peg Woffington, and others—were essential to the London stage. Clearly there existed a kind of fluidity of movement between the two capital cities, but for the most part theatrical historians have focused on London, and not nearly as much work has been done on the Dublin stage in its own right. Greene's eight volumes will do much to adjust this oversight. Put another way, Greene has provided ample evidence to correct the impression that there was good theatre in Dublin because Garrick went there. Instead it could be argued that Garrick went to Dublin because there was already good theatre there.

So, how often does a reviewer get to use the term *magisterial* for work that really merits the designation? John Greene's double contribution to theatre history—two volumes covering seventy-five years of Dublin theatre, and six calendar volumes documenting the performances in Dublin venues with evidence exhaustively drawn from newspapers, memoirs, correspondence, and public records, sometimes day by day—deserves the highest praise and admiration.

The two historical volumes are much more than an introduction to the copious detail of the calendrical volumes—they constitute a stand-alone scholarly authority on the subject. First, Greene introduces his readers to the wealth of Dublin venues, the theatres, music halls, and pleasure gardens. Besides Smock Alley, the best-known and longest-running of the Dublin theatres, there were ten others, some active for decades and others only intermittently. Greene provides historical summaries of each theatre with maps and floor-plans, discussing the layout of the stage, greenroom, pit, boxes, and other features of the interior, heating and cooling, and renovations. Theatrical and musical entertainments were also offered at Dublin's six music halls and seven pleasure gardens, and Greene covers these venues with equal thoroughness. Handel's season in Dublin is well-known—the *Messiah* was premiered at the Fishamble Street Music Hall and Theatre in 1742—but there are other riches in store here for the historian of the international market for composers, musicians, and dancers. The most successful of Dublin's pleasure gardens, the New Gardens, benefited from its connection to the Lying-In Hospital's Rotunda and Assembly Rooms, as Brian Boydell demonstrated in his 1992 *Rotunda Music in Eighteenth-Century Dublin*. Greene adds to Boydell's overview many telling details of finance, management, and the public's estimation of the facilities appearing in Dublin newspapers. Here, too, the illustrations are superb, from perspective views to the depiction of a balloon ascent from Ranelagh Gardens.

Following this introduction to the venues, Greene turns to an account of the Irish regulation of the theatre. From the Restoration onward, theatre fell under the domain of a royally-appointed Master of Revels, a position held briefly by Sir William Davenant, who was succeeded by John Ogilby and Thomas Stanley, and then others, usually in the train of the viceregal Lord Lieutenant. While the language of the Master of Revels' patent established sole right to build theatres and present plays, medieval precedent granted the Lord Mayor of Dublin the right to a "City Theatre" and the licensing of performances. Some theatrical entrepreneurs opened venues without gaining permission from the rival

authorities, such as the Italian rope-dancer Signora Violante's booth, where in 1730 popular performances shrank the Theatre Royal's audience, leading the mayor to order the booth closed. Operating a theatre in Dublin could be a lucrative enterprise, so it is not surprising that proprietors pursued a monopoly. Thomas Sheridan feared that Spranger Barry's plan to open a rival theatre in Crow Street would hurt his Smock Alley enterprise, and in 1757 unsuccessfully sought a parliamentary ruling granting his company exclusive production rights, arguing that Dublin could not support rival theatres. Greene's succinct account of the long-running dispute between the two companies is supported with extensive documentary evidence: pamphlets, articles from the *Hibernian Journal* and other papers, and petitions to parliament. The issue of establishing a monopoly led to the Stage Act of 1786, resisted by many anti-monopolists but passed and signed into law. But it neither eliminated the office of Master of Revels nor stopped the Lord Mayor from claiming his traditional rights. Authority over copyrights and performance rights was contested throughout the period, for English and Scottish laws were not binding in Ireland. Readers interested in the history of such matters will find Greene's account of playwrights' attempts to protect their interest fascinating.

Greene next turns to the life of the Dublin theatres, providing substantive accounts of the theatrical season, its openings and closings and summer seasons, the days of the week when performances occurred, nightly opening, curtain, and closing times, command performances, advertising, and benefit performances. This last category is especially rewarding, for it lays out how much the house charged for a benefit, how benefits were allocated, how benefit plays were chosen, and the categories of beneficiary—performers, house personnel, authors, charities, and the Irish Theatrical Funds. Equally detailed is the explanation of theatre finances, covering the category and price of admissions, house charges, tickets, income and expenses per night and per season, subscription and debenture. Greene even devotes attention to the problem of servants keeping places in the theatre for their masters.

Chapter 5 surveys theatre managers, from Thomas Sheridan, Benjamin Victor, Spranger Barry, and Henry Mossop at mid-century to Frederick Edward Jones running well into the nineteenth century. Chapter 6 concerns the Dublin repertory, discussing the popularity of main pieces and after-pieces, preludes, interludes, musical entertainments (comic opera, burletta, Italian opera), melodrama, and "hippodrama" and canine drama—horses and dogs. Among the plays presented on the Dublin stage were the first performances of new works, new plays from the London stage, revivals, stock plays, works of Irish interest, and classics (especially Shakespeare). Chapter 7 is a comprehensive account of scenery, scene shifting, curtains, stage machinery, lighting, makeup, and props.

Chapter 8 establishes the nature of theatre companies in Dublin, the status and reputation of actors and acting in general, the composition of a "typical" company, the presence of "stars" from the London stage and elsewhere, the use of "new" actors, employment of women, terms of employment and salaries, rules and forfeits, and summer contracts. Greene covers singers, dancers, and

musicians with similar detail, and furnishes an exhaustive chronology of popular songs and performers. He also chronicles specialty performances undertaken by Dublin theatre companies or contract performers: fireworks, illuminations, “equilibres,” monologues, medleys, mock trials, imitations, recitations, animal acts, masquerades, transparencies, processions, and the presentation of miscellaneous curiosities.

Capping the *History* is a chapter investigating the character of the Dublin audience. Greene meticulously analyzes the composition of the audience, the capacity of and average attendance at the theatres, and the ratio of protestants to catholics in the audience, the audience’s attraction to material of Irish “nationality,” the presence of women in the audience, the sometimes turbulent relation of audience and management, the audience’s influence on the choice of repertory, the problem of morality and profanity on stage, the impact of wealthy playgoers, audience taste or lack thereof, and audience conflicts. The latter includes “Badinage between audience and actors,” minor disruptions, and a full account of political theatre and “Full-blown Riots” such as the Kelly and *Mahomet* riots during Sheridan’s tenure at Smock Alley. However, though many authors have covered such matters, Greene wisely counsels “it should be remembered that such disturbances were actually rare,” for there were only four disorders in seventy-five years sufficiently grave to warrant cancelling more than one night’s performance (527). Finally, like an unexpected prize in a holiday pudding, there is a delightful appendix, a chronological survey of “Stage Irishmen” active between 1745 and 1820.

As for the six-volume *Calendar of Performances*, it is not easy to capture within the limits of a book review the extraordinary conception and design or the invaluable potential of Greene’s opus as a research tool. A brief look at the way he covers one season must suffice until the reader gets his or her hands on the set. In the 1745-1746 season, during the Jacobite rising in Scotland and England, only the United Aungier Street-Smock Alley company was consistently active. There was one performance at Capel Street, and the Crow Street and Fishamble Street music halls and the Philharmonic Room offered musical performances. Sheridan and Garrick jointly managed the United Company; the company included Spranger Barry and George Anne Bellamy. Greene registers seventy-five documented performances of thirty-eight named main-pieces and thirteen after-pieces, one concert, and twenty command performances, most of which were ordered by Lord Chesterfield, then Lord Lieutenant. The performers in the United Company are listed, as well as singers, dancers, musicians, the equilibrist, and box-keeper. The repertory is inventoried with detailed notes. All through these lists Greene provides such detailed information as actors in their Dublin Debuts, the first Dublin performance of plays, revivals, world premieres in Dublin (such as *Don Sebastian*), and plays of special Irish interest. Comparing the Dublin and London seasons, Green charts the number of new London plays this season, their venues, the total of these plays performed in Dublin, and the occasions when the premiere performances occurred in Dublin before the London.

Then follows a calendar of the single recorded performance at Capel Street, and the performances of concerts, oratorios, and choral works at the music halls, and the plays performed. For example, on November 4, at the Aungier St. Theatre the United Company presented *Tamerlane* at the command of Lord Chesterfield, on the occasion of William III's birthday. Sheridan played the title role, Barry played Bazajet, an unnamed gentleman—the “first time of his appearing on the Stage”—played Moneses, Mrs. Furnival played Arpasia, Mrs. Elmy played Selima, while Mrs. Storer delivered the prologue and sang. Greene refers the reader to a satire on the joint managers, “A Poem on Mr. Sheridan and Mr. Barry,” cited in Faulkner's *Dublin Journal*.

All this is provided in the entry for a single day. Later in the calendar, during especially active seasons, a day's entry could be much more extensive. All through these volumes Greene collates a myriad of sources—newspapers, period memoirs and correspondence, playbills, tickets, correspondence, theatrical histories, modern authorities, and much more—illuminated with Greene's commentary, always deliberate, brief, and to the point. Readers browsing through the entries for this season might have occasion to note the frequency of command performances during Chesterfield's regency, possibly one of his many techniques for encouraging public demonstrations of Irish (or Anglo-Irish) loyalty as the Forty-five raged on across the Irish Sea.

Occasions for further research on the history of theatre, print, the lives and working conditions of actors and authors, and the intersections of Irish culture and politics abound in these volumes. John Greene's valiant persistence during more than two decades of collecting, arranging, analyzing, connecting, and explaining an almost unimaginably vast array of material has paid off richly, and those of us who labor in such fields are greatly in his debt.

Kevin Joel Berland
Penn State Shenango

Paul E. Kerry, and Matthew S. Holland (editors). *Benjamin Franklin's Intellectual World*. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2012, Pp. xxii, 195, bibliography, index. Hardcover: \$65. ISBN: 978-1611470284; and:

W.A. Speck. *A Political Biography of Thomas Paine*. (Eighteenth-Century Political Biography Series, 11.) London: Pickering & Chatto, 2013. Pp. 288, bibliography, index. Hardcover: \$99. ISBN: 978-1-84893-095-7.

Studies, including biographies, illuminating the life and work of all the figures in the America's founding generation became a major growth enterprise. Beginning with the bicentennial of the Declaration of Independence in 1976, followed another bicentennial--that of the United States Constitution--in 1987, the number of works published over the past 35 years could fill a small college

library. The life and work of Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Paine have become a perfect part of the trend, which, like many things that are satisfying: sometimes too much is just that, too much. The Franklin trend got underway full steam and in a brisk fashion well before the tercentenary of his birth in 2006. New biographies began appearing as early as 2000, and studies of his life, work, thought, contacts, and whatnot seemed overwhelming. The same appears to be true of Paine. Beginning around 1994 with new assessments, writers have bombarded the publishing world with manuscripts containing new interpretations almost every two years. I know how popular among historians and political scientists these two men have been and remain because I have been on this ride: I have written on both fellows.

And now before us we have two brand new books: a collection of excellent essays derived from a conference held at the University of Cambridge in 2006 to celebrate Franklin's birth and a new "political" biography of Paine.

First, the collection: the contributors are all mostly well-known eighteenth-century scholars of American studies, political thought, history, and politics. The conference must have been not only lively but fascinating because the majority of the essays do what most collections fail to do: they break new ground in our understanding of this very complex personality. Two essays clearly play off on another: Jerry Weinberger, whose book on Franklin (yes, published during all the tercentenary hullabaloo) was on the same subject as his essay, argues that we can "unmask" Franklin to get to the real man, whereas Michael Zuckerman disagrees by showing how Franklin moved easily in the backwater world of America to the upper echelons of London and the aristocratic foolery of Paris and Versailles.

Carla Mulford is working on a portrait of Franklin for a larger study that focuses on his view of the ends of empire, especially as it contributed to his ideas of a liberal polity. I was a bit surprised that she did not link this concept to Jefferson's vision of "an empire of liberty," which was the first thing I thought of when I read her essay ("Early Modern Imperialism: Traditions of Liberalism and Franklin's Ends of Empire"). Perhaps, she will do so in the longer study. If Mulford's vision is imperial, Neil York's is microcosmic. York focuses on a curious letter Franklin received in Paris just as he was working to consolidate French support of the American cause in 1778: the letter, signed "Charles de Weissenstein," argued that it was in the interest of both America and Britain to end the war. Franklin ignored the letter, though he mentioned it to the Comte de Vergennes, the foreign minister with whom he was working on the treaty with France. Who the devil was this guy? And what was he up to? It all makes for interesting reading and a fascinating mystery.

Paul Kerry and Jürgen Overhoff probe Franklin's German connections. Now, this is something I had not really thought about, and after I read their work, I wondered why and how I had missed this part of his life. Overhoff raises the interesting question of just where and how did Franklin's ideas of federalism develop, and his answer is that he possibly derived it from the German federation, the Holy Roman Empire itself with its separate states and

independent cities. Kerry delves into the relationship between Franklin and Goethe, though he at once admits the two never met. Simon Newman, who has long studied working-class America, and Douglas Thomas investigate Franklin's lifelong role as a printer, which was precisely the framework of his self-definition. (Thomas, I might add, appears to have been the only non-scholar among the conferees; he is actually a graphic designer, which I would argue, if I could be forgiven for being anachronistic for a moment, Franklin would have become in the twentieth or twenty-first centuries).

Finally, Benjamin Park seeks a localized Franklin connection with Richard Price, while and Lorraine Smith Pangle looks for one farther away: this time with Socrates. Park would have us believe that Franklin and Price agreed that America was, as Lincoln later put it, the last best hope on earth, while Pangle strays into territory she occupied in her earlier work on Franklin's political thought to link him to a long-dead philosopher, or at least Plato's version of him. She seems more interested in parallels than actual dead-on comparisons because I, for one, do not recall a full-blown discussion by Franklin on ancient philosophy, much less Socrates. Perhaps the final decision should be left to Kevin Berland who knows more about the whereabouts of Socrates in the eighteenth century than anyone I know.

Meantime, W.A. Speck, one of Britain's most distinguished historians who has published many fine works of history for over four decades, claims in his new political biography of Thomas Paine that his main goal is to avoid speculation about the man. This goal is especially true regarding Paine's early life, about which little is known. For almost two centuries, the basic foundation of our knowledge of Paine until he arrived in America in 1774 when he was 37 years old came from a 1791 biography by George Chalmers, published under the pseudonym Francis Oldys. The biography was clearly a hack job, hostile and mean spirited, possibly commissioned and paid for by Paine's British enemies. While Speck claims that he will not accept as true some of Chalmers' invectives against Paine, he does use this scurrilous biography almost excessively, something that mars what is otherwise an excellent and fair treatment.

Speck tells us in the very beginning that not a shred of evidence proves that Oldys was paid to write his work (p. xiii) but then later says maybe he was in fact commissioned to do so (p. 108). Moreover, Speck asserts that he does not use speculation-like phrases that previous scholars have employed, like "he must have" or "he might have." In searching the archives and original sources, he finds nothing about Paine's views of the powerful Grafton family that essentially ruled the region where Paine was born and grew up, whereas earlier biographers have claimed that his experiences as a lad in region ruled by the Graftons turned him into a democrat. He also says there is no proof that Paine's well-known plea to Parliament on behalf of the low-paid excise tax collectors, of which he was one, may ever have reached Parliament at all. He suggests that he may never have served as editor of the *Pennsylvania Magazine* because no contract with its owner, Robert Aitken, has ever emerged. He also suggests that no evidence proves Paine wrote the 1775 essay on African slavery so often attributed to him.

Then again, Speck does speculate without using those forbidden phrases (such as “he must have”). One controversial issue among Paine commentators was his relationship to Methodism (I do not believe the religion was compatible with his thinking, ever). Speck speculates that “it *could be* that he retained an adherence to Methodism when he moved to Sandwich”; however, he advances no evidence to suggest this was true (emphasis added, p. 9). He argues that the now-and-again attribution of the Declaration of Independence to Paine, not Jefferson, is baseless but then adds that when Jefferson later referred to the Declaration, “it is not fanciful to *speculate* that Jefferson was echoing the title of Paine’s pamphlet” (emphasis added, p. 32). Later, he speculates that Paine “suffered from manic depression and bipolar disorder as it is now termed” (p. 88). On Paine’s drinking and general intoxicated state, which we know basically from those who hated or feared him like George Chalmers, Thomas Chapman, and Gouverneur Morris, Speck surmises that “it seems that Paine took to drink at this time [in 1792] when he was being hounded by the authorities” (p. 119), but he does not know this for certain. He continues, speculating that in responding to the critics of the second part, some of his writing “read as if they were inspired by drink” (p. 123)—maybe, maybe. Speck claims Paine’s friends’ “testimony” affirms this conclusion, but neglects to say who these “friends” were (not Chalmers, Morris, or Chapman certainly, see also pp. 170-71; 174; 193; 195; 203).

Speck is on firmer ground when he attributes Paine’s affinity to ingest alcohol during the Terror just before his own arrest in December 1793 (p. 135). On the timing of the completion of *The Age of Reason*, Part One, which Paine said occurred at the same time, but Speck says it was already being translated into French earlier that year—Speck speculates that “it can only be surmised” that Paine feared he would lose the support of the Dissenters (p. 136). Paine’s goal, he argues, was actually to save true religion from the atheists in light of the innovation of the new revolutionary calendar and the closing of the churches in Paris in November of that year, if not the rise of the Cult of Reason there in 1793. Among other curiosities of this book is its style, especially the colloquial and even slang that Speck sometimes resorts to: it just does not make sense for someone of his caliber to write as if he is speaking to teenagers in a scholarly study. Early on, he addresses Paine’s income and speculates (again) that “he appears to have lived comfortably, *if not high off the hog* (emphasis added, p. 7); when Paine left Sandwich, says Speck, it was “his moonlit flit” from there (p. 10); when Paine was dismissed a second time from the excise service, it was “by throwing Paine to the wolves” (13); he refers to Paine’s second (failed) marriage as being “on the rocks” (p. 23); when Paine finally decided to immigrate to America, he did so because, “in the words of Bob Dylan, ‘when you got nothing, you got nothing to lose’” (Bob Dylan? p. 26); when Paine faced criticism for *Common Sense*, “Paine was put on the back foot by this” criticism (p. 48). Perhaps as unnerving are the many short statements ending in exclamation points: on Paine’s religious views, “so much for Paine being an atheist!” (p. 59; 171-172); on Paine’s comment about General Washington’s encounter with the

British General William Howe, “Howe had fallen into a trap cunningly laid for him by Washington!” (p. 62); after Paine resigned as secretary to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in 1779, “Paine lay low and licked his wounds!” (p. 70; in advocating the states pay through taxes a greater amount of money to support the new United States, especially Rhode Island, “the gloves were off in the fight with the critics of the scheme!” (p. 87).

On a positive note, Speck makes two very important points early on. First, he argues far more than any other commentator Paine’s loyalty to the Crown until April of 1775. As a British patriot, he longed, like many Americans, for reconciliation in his belief and (pious?) hope that American leaders could negotiate a reasonable settlement with the King and Parliament. The battle at Lexington and Concord changed all that. Within a few months, he was writing in favor of separation. A loyal British subject he was no more. Second, from an ideological perspective, Paine was no Country Whig. That would have meant that he had to extol the British ancient constitution, the Revolution Settlement of 1689, and the emergence of Parliament, none of which appears anywhere in his writings. Paine’s view of monarchy and aristocracy in *Common Sense* (1776) clearly demolished the idea he had any relationship with the Country Whigs, the position of several earlier commentators (I admit I once harbored a version of that view). The whole point of the pamphlet was that it was common sense to separate because reconciliation had long past the breaking point: the King the previous summer had declared the colonies in rebellion and had already sent troops, warships, materiel, and whatnot to America to force it back under his authority.

This position underlay Paine’s radicalism. Speck emphasizes Paine’s view of a strong, central United States government, even in *Common Sense*, something he reiterated on his return after many years in absentia to America in 1802 (p. 169). In that sense, he was a Federalist with republican leanings. On the other hand, Speck does not delve deeply enough into Paine’s decision to return to Europe in 1787 in the context of his growing radicalism. Like many biographers, he attributes it to Paine’s disillusionment with Congress and the states in their inability to acknowledge his contributions to the Revolution. Missing here are some treatment of Paine’s letters to Nathanael Greene, with whom he had served during the war, which indicated that he had an ulterior purpose to return to Europe: to stimulate revolutions there, especially in Britain.

Moreover, Speck does not give a full picture of the close relationship that later developed between Burke and Paine when Paine toured the ironworks and visiting Burke at Beaconsfield. He depicts some of this relationship, but he does not deal with one of great ironies of history: how Paine actually fed information to Burke about the “progress” of the French Revolution from dispatches he received from the American minister in Paris, Thomas Jefferson. Burke used this information for his own purposes in his biting critique, *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Nor does Speck recognize (or speculate) how Paine moved so easily in the highest societal circles in both Britain and France, despite his attacks on aristocracy, wealth, rank, and privilege.

Speck's treatment of the publication of the second part of *Rights of Man* is fine as far it goes, but it is incomplete. He recounts the encounter Paine had with his first publisher, Thomas Chapman, who wanted to own the copyright to the work, but, when Paine refused, Chapman eventually raised the offer to £1,000, an extraordinary amount; Chapman then gave up the project (p. 114). Two earlier biographers, David Freeman Hawke and John Keane surmise (speculate?) that the ministry or police pressured Chapman to return the manuscript unpublished. Speck claims, however, that it was Chapman himself who made this decision because he thought the work was seditious libel. As Paine himself noted, however, Chapman pointed to a particular point in the manuscript well beyond Paine's attack on King and Parliament. So, perhaps Keane and Hawke's speculation makes more sense than Speck's view that Chapman's decision was out of fear not principle.

In dealing with *The Age of Reason*, Paine's analysis of British finances, and *Agrarian Justice*, Speck offers the standard interpretation. It is reasonable, readable, and thankfully devoid of the speculation and stylistic curiosities that plagued the earlier parts. Overall, however, he does not seem to notice the one great irony in Paine's political thought, which undermines its integrity, while Paine resided mostly in France from 1787 to 1802. Paine argued all of his life that monarchy and aristocracy, aside from being oppressive to the common people, engaged in ruinous wars and high indebtedness. His own French allies, the Girondins, led by Jacques-Pierre Brissot and the Rolands (unmentioned here), however, were the warmongers *par excellence* of the French Revolution, not Robespierre, St. Just (whose name was not given in full, Louis-Antoine de St. Just), and the Jacobins. Republicans, not monarchs and aristocrats, started the French revolutionary wars that plagued Europe until the 1815 Congress of Vienna, which opened the way for the settlement of Europe that lasted until 1914.

Overall, Speck's "political" biography brings out the important points in Paine's career and is an admirable, if slightly inadequate, treatment in terms of style and speculative conclusions. We can, of course, expect to see more books and articles on both Franklin and Paine in the coming years. Jonathan Clark's new Paine biography will undoubtedly appear in the very near future as will Ed Grey's treatment of Paine and the Nootka Sound controversy. Jill Lepore has just recently published a study of Benjamin Franklin's relationship with his sister Jane (known as Jenny). Moreover, we can look forward to Carla Mulford's book-length study of Franklin and empire along with a forthcoming new dual biography of Benjamin and William Franklin prepared by biographer, Daniel Mark Epstein, and so it goes, on and on and on.

Jack Fruchtman, Jr.
Towson University

John Radner. *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013. Pp. 413. Hardcover: \$45.00. ISBN: 978-0-300-17875-3.

As I read John Radner's *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship*, I could not help but think of the Boswell-Johnson wars that took place during the 1970s and '80s. In a real sense *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship* brings these arguments full circle. A recap of the dispute is in order for those too young to remember that time when Boswellians and Johnsonians argued their respective cases in print and at annual conferences. In fact, when the subject of a conference session was Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, you could guarantee a full room and a lively exchange that at times became, shall we say, "heated."

To summarize: Donald Greene and Frederick Pottle were the two primary authorities in the matter. Greene, an authority on Johnson's politics, was editor of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* and *The Johnsonian Newsletter*. Pottle was Chairman of the Editorial Committee for the Yale Editions of the Private Papers of James Boswell and could be said to have lived with Boswell for some fifty years.* Perhaps the issues can be stated most succinctly thus: Boswell's *Life of Johnson* is autobiography rather biography because Boswell's attitudes and values ultimately displace those of Johnson; the *Life* is a misleading guide to Johnson's life and thought. In short, the argument was that Boswell, having been in Johnson's presence only some 420 days out of the 21 years they knew each other, did not know him well enough to write a comprehensive biography. In addition, the way Boswell handled his material resulted in a dichotomy between the "authentic Johnson" (Greene's term) and Boswell's portrayal of Johnson. In all of this, the friendship between Johnson and Boswell did not come into play. Central to the issue were two neglected facts: there was a long-term relationship between the two men before Boswell decided to become Johnson's biographer, and Johnson cooperated by giving Boswell details of his life and sharing with him deeply personal events. Consequently, by focusing on the dynamics of an ever-changing relationship between Johnson and Boswell, John Radner's approach is an illuminating one.

In the course of Radner's work all of the issues raised by Pottle, Greene, and other scholars on both sides of the dispute are given place, but they are not discussed in the context of an argument. For example, the last three chapters of the book deal with the ways that, indeed, Boswell did write himself into Johnson's life, but we come to this discussion having seen how the friendship between Johnson and Boswell developed and changed over time. When they met in the spring of 1763, the twenty-three year old Boswell's request "will you take charge of me?" elicited the fifty-four year old Johnson's declaration "My dear Boswell, I love you very much." Twenty-one years later, when Johnson died, the friendship had developed in different ways and had changed dramatically. Boswell, in Scotland, was suffering with perhaps the worse depression of his life so that, when he heard of Johnson's death, he felt "just one

large expanse of stupor.” For his part, Johnson died speaking tenderly of Boswell but was still apprehensive about his friend’s long-term emotional stability and did not mention him in his will. In effect, any discussion, pro or con, of Boswell’s *Life of Johnson* needs to consider the ways time and the shifting contexts of the Johnson/Boswell relationship worked both to produce and to influence Boswell’s work.

At the conclusion of *Johnson and Boswell* Radner writes of the story he has told: “[one] that I hope reaches through its specificity into the dynamics of most sustained friendships, with their breaks and reconnections, their silences and fresh intimacies, their continuities and transformations.” In order to turn the reader’s gaze in this direction, Radner had to pull together “everything Johnson and Boswell wrote to and about the other,” then identify the special dynamic of a given period in their friendship as well as take into account what contemporaries wrote about them. Stating the obvious: this is a significant amount of material to work through if one is including all that both men wrote and all that contemporaries wrote about them. And Radner leaves no doubt that he has mastered this labyrinth as he leads the reader through the material, making connections clear, qualifying when needed, and acknowledging the limitations of interpretation. There is also an appendix that provides a table listing the key events in the lives of both men from 1709 to 1795, the number of days they were together, and listing by date and writer the number of letters they exchanged.

Mastering the details is one accomplishment; putting them, year by year, into a coherent whole is another. This approach could have resulted in a slow march through a plethora of dates and events. Avoiding this pitfall, Radner begins and ends each chapter with a brief framing discussion before detailing the ways Johnson and Boswell exchanged roles, competed on several levels, collaborated, became dependent upon the other in turn, and time and time again renegotiated the relationship. In fact, what becomes clear in this examination are the ways Johnson collaborated with Boswell in writing his biography.

Yet there is a problem with the evidence. When the number and extent of Boswell’s journals and letters is set against Johnson’s autobiographical writings and correspondence, the weight is on Boswell’s side. Radner recognizes the “limitations of evidence” with respect to Johnson and does not dodge the implications. When discussing an incident for which there is no evidence for Johnson’s reaction, he uses such qualifications as “I suspect” or draws on a similar situation where Johnson’s reaction or response is documented. Nevertheless, there were times when this reader wondered if the discussion had shifted to focus on Boswell’s point of view. I don’t think that anyone could claim that Radner is not as objective in his analysis of the relationship as it is possible to be, but, seen under the microscope of friendship, Johnson’s portrait takes on a different hue. It brings to the fore his temper, his passive aggressiveness, and that verbal lunge for the throat when in uncomfortable situations. The portrait of Johnson in this work is not Walter Jackson Bate’s Johnson in *Samuel Johnson* (1977) and *The Achievement of Samuel Johnson* (1955): the moralist who lived a life of courage in the face of overwhelming

depression and physical pain--dare I say a kinder, more sensitive Johnson? In considering this reaction I had to admit that, perhaps like many others, I had come to *Johnson and Boswell* with my own preconceived notions of both men. And we have to admit revisionist thinking can be the more realistic view.

John Radner has written an important book, one that makes a substantial contribution to biographical studies. Sometimes we tend to use the word "contribution" lightly, but in this case it is more than warranted. *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship* is a work many years in the research and writing; in addition to being packed full of information and insight it is also extremely readable, artistic in execution as well as scope. And, while there is never the last word on any subject, it is safe to say that Radner's book will be required reading for future writers on Johnson, Boswell, the *Life of Johnson* in particular, and for anyone writing the biography of a relationship.

Elizabeth Lambert
Emerita, Gettysburg College

**Reviewer's note:* The two scholars confronted the primary issues of the debate in a volume edited by John Vance: *Boswell's Life of Johnson: New Questions, New Answers* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985). See Donald Greene's "'Tis a Pretty Book, Mr. Boswell, But---'" and Frederick Pottle's "The Adequacy as Biography of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*."

Kirsten Juhas, Hermann J. Real, and Sandra Simon, editors. *Reading Swift: Papers from the Sixth Munster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*.

Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2013. Pp. 672; illustrations; index; summaries. ISBN: 978-3-7705-5430-0. Hardcover: 118 euros.

Reading Swift accomplishes what not all edited volumes of conference essays can claim—scholarly value. The thirty-five essays, derived from the symposium lectures in June 2011, are assembled in eight chapters: biographical issues, bibliographical and textual studies, *A Tale of a Tub*, historical and religious issues, "Irish Vistas," poetry, *Gulliver's Travels*, and "Reception and Adaptation." One might easily identify the controlling thesis linking these essays as an argument for the current vitality of Swift studies, where many papers reward a re-reading and reflection.

John Irwin Fischer's "But Who Shall Arbitrate on Stella's Hand" explains the origins of a manuscript book, a Vocabulary of 2,000 "hard words" compiled by Swift for Esther Johnson and copied by her from his manuscript. With the lead essay in the biography section, Fischer argues convincingly how this obscure and inaccessible element within the canon suggests how much we know about Swift and yet what may remain unknown and worthy of further research. In this case, the vocabulary manuscript often changed owners, and in the early twentieth century Harold Williams became involved, as well as a wealthy

American collector. Finally, A.C. Elias purchased the Vocabulary in 1976, leaving it at his death to Trinity College, Dublin, while inviting Fischer in 2008 to carry on the project of publishing the manuscript. The combination of biographical details, disciplined research, and indispensable funding—all seem reminiscent of another more famous eighteenth-century literary odyssey, the Boswell papers.

In another fascinating glimpse into Swift's character, W.B. Carnochan's "*Fidus Achates: Swift and Charles Ford*" focuses on the long friendship between the two men with special emphasis on the challenges both emotional and intellectual of being Swift's friend. Ford becomes editor of *The London Gazette*, the Tory ministry's voice, and as Swift's "most trusted friend," he copy edits various political texts, serves as Swift's agent to the London printers, and becomes a co-conspirator with John Gay in the publication of *Gulliver's Travels*. Carnochan wishes Ford could have served as Boswell to Swift, and I regret this missed chance too, but what this essay also encourages us to do is re-read the sixty-nine Swift and Ford letters in the Woolley edition. "Concern and solicitude [do] make good medicine" (55).

The bibliographical and textual section offers two exacting essays focusing on the printing and publishing history: Ian Gadd's "'At four shillings per year, paying one quarter in hand': Reprinting Swift's *Examiner* in Dublin, 1710-11" and Jim May's "The Duodecimo editions of Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* ('1711') and *A Complete Key to the Tale of a Tub* (1714)." Both essays reflect the industry and great skill required for this kind of specialist textual scholarship. Gadd searches out the *Examiner* editions, reprinted in Dublin, that Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley were reading and notes the more than sufficient Irish interest in these political essays. He intends on answering which edition "exactly [they] got in Dublin in January, 1711." What adds to the intrigue of Gadd's search is his recalling Swift's frustration with the whole effort, and his anxiety at being caught between Harley and St. John's ongoing competition for power. Gadd discloses that in Dublin many of the numbers were reprinted in multiple settings.

May sorts out the complicated relationship in the printing of four small duodecimo *Tale* editions dated "1711," and of three duodecimo editions of Edmund Curll's *A Complete Key*, attending to the roles of Curll and also John Nutt and Samuel Richardson, both identified here as printing editions of the Key. With reference to exact pages and the ornaments used by printers, analyzing the various ones used in other writers' work (Defoe, for example), May "can date [a particular] edition by studying the circle of radiance about the sun" in one ornament (112). May's detective work seems nothing less than amazing, and persuasive, as each variant in the edition is noted and explained to anyone's satisfaction. We also have the essay's footnotes and an all-inclusive bibliographical appendix, extensive and learned, pointing scholars to new ideas and facts.

Clive Probyn has said elsewhere (*The Art of Jonathan Swift*) that Swift's first book, *A Tale of a Tub*, "is a key to Swift's complexity as a satirist and a reason for his continuing fascination." J. A. Downie enjoys the sophisticated

game of explaining “The Topicality of *A Tale of Tub*” in the lead essay to this next section. What are the origins and influences in the pamphlet literature during the key years, 1696-97, particularly when we recall “the greatest part” of the book was finished in 1696. Downie argues with conviction “too much has been discounted,” so why not review all the facts and determine to what degree the *Tale* is a topical work of the late 1690s. Three reasons make this a worthwhile point: Swift was a frequent visitor to London during the period often on Temple family business; what Swift calls his “apprenticeship in London” when “he set up for [him]self with good success,” and his excellent knowledge and connections with London booksellers and publishers while Temple’s secretary. This intimacy with the world of books and scholarly discussions in the Temple household influenced Swift during his writing *A Tale*.

In a topic heading of such varied possibilities as “Historical and Religious Issues,” the editors can present papers like Christopher Fox’s discussion (“Swift and the Passions of Posterity”) on the English Civil War and how in Swift’s mind the Scots Presbyterians were complicit in causing that conflict—they “were now targeting Ireland.” Ashley Marshall’s “Swift’s rhapsodical Tory-book’: The Aims and Motives of *The History of the Four Last Years of the Queen*” explains why this work was called failed history or even failed propaganda. She suggests neither view seems correct, but instead serves as a statement of Tory principles for Tories and a defense of Oxford’s leadership. Though the *History* was not published during Swift’s lifetime and possibly written in hopes of preferment, Marshall, after clarifying the value for understanding this work, does a thorough analysis, focusing on the Genesis, Composition, and the Problem of the Title; Contents and Presentation; Aims and Motives; and Swift’s *History* in Perspective. Marshall has made a convincing case—the *History* “is not a botched job,” and “probably the most important piece of [psychological] writing Swift ever produced (223).”

The religious issues chapter of *Reading Swift* also presents Ian Higgins’ “A Preface to Swift’s Test Act Tracts” interpreting these tracts as significant for those studying Swift’s religious principles and his position on freedom of conscience. He extends the discussion into how Swift’s “ecclesiological position” has importance throughout *Gulliver’s Travels*, and how the argument over the Test goes to Swift’s concerns about hypocrisy in religion. Higgins urges a point here useful for those who teach eighteenth-century literature and political history: “For Swift being *right* in religion is more important than being *sincere* in one’s belief” (241). This goes to our understanding of Dissenters’ views, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and notions of good government.

“Irish Vistas” implies how Swift might have viewed the natural world, and Andrew Carpenter’s “The Birds and the Bees: Ecopoetry in Swift’s Irish Circle” looks at how the Pilkingtons, Mary Barber, Thomas Sheridan, and Patrick Delany were able to do so, though apparently Swift showed “little interest” in nature. The Irish relationship with the natural environment. Carpenter decides Swift’s “A Description of a City Shower” and “*Carberiae Rupes*” [Carbery Rocks], a Latin poem of his trip to southern Ireland, can be defined as ecopoetry,

but the other poets were writing about more than nature, especially the nature of human interaction. Though he does not amplify (but does reference) the argument from Carole Fabricant's *Swift's Landscape* (1982,1995) concerning antipastoralism and the demythologizing of the Arcadian and New World myths, or the "built" environment has often been noted by those writing in Gaelic, but poets writing in English emerge mainly during the 1580s and into the early nineteenth-century. he does agree that Swift's views on the landscape about him seem continuously "unpleasant" and un-Edenic. No Swiftian surprises here, but knowing more about these other Irish poets adds an unexpected pleasure to this section of the book.

James Woolley's "Swift's Most Popular Poems" focuses on the reputation and fame of these poems during the eighteenth century—this essay has much to do with explaining the Swift Poems Project, a complementary digital archive under construction for later publication with the poems edition in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift*. The Poems Project, prepared by Woolley, John Irwin Fischer, and Stephen Karian, catalogs all the poems in manuscript and print, providing essential textual information on manuscript texts often previously unknown to scholars. The results will show a poem's textual history, including revisions and lead to an understanding of which poems were popular and why. Also, teachers and scholars of Swift now have an additional eighteenth-century canon to compare with the modern canon. The possibilities for new research and teaching extend the opportunity for weighing popularity versus artistic merit, and Woolley ends with a recommendation for adding to the contemporary Swift canon of most anthologized poems another ten poems that pleased eighteenth-century readers in hopes we might devote more scrutiny to them today.

Dirk Passmann and Hermann Real consider one of these popular poems in their essay "The Humble Petition of Francis Harris: A Case of Sexual Extortion at Dublin Castle?" This occasional poem written during the two-year period when Swift was living with the family of the Earl of Berkeley as their chaplain shows him cunning, witty, humane, and able to transcend a familiar literary theme for a substantive note on a below-stairs life. As Fintan O'Toole (*NYR*: December 19, 2013) said recently, Swift is "a connoisseur of human foibles," and this essay admits similar intent, but what makes this a different piece is the writers' realization that these "seemingly innocent lines do in fact vibrate with sexual innuendo." Acknowledging other critics' commentary on the poem—see Jaffe (*The Poet Swift*) and Fischer (*On Swift's Poetry*)—Passmann and Real using "new lexicographical tools" take a deeper dive into the language and double entendres throughout the poem. Whether these tools are in fact "new" is a matter for others, but clearly their analysis of this masterpiece provides the richest information available for a student or scholar.

Stephen Karian's "Who Was Swift's 'Corinna'?" effectively traces all the current evidence on the poem, including the most important discussions over the last fifty years and decides on Swift's true satiric target. Delarivier Manley is no longer the leading suspect, but now it appears Elizabeth Thomas (1675-1731), a

minor poet who had sold some of Pope's letters to Edmund Curll, was Corinna. Thomas remains best known for her appearance in *The Dunciad* (1728), as "Curll's Corinna," when Pope took his revenge. Swift wrote his poem "out of sympathy" for his friend Pope, a departing gift as the Dean left for London. Karian's detective work is exhaustive, finding doubts with earlier editorial work, selecting a proper date for the poem's composition, analyzing the poem's satiric notes, and reconsidering this poem in comparison to others Swift was writing in 1727. Though neither on the list as one of Woolley's ten "particularly attractive poems" worth more scrutiny, nor one of the most popular Swift poems during the eighteenth-century, Karian has left us with a couple of charming questions: is this poem an inverted Stella birthday poem? Is Swift hinting at an important contrast between two types of female authors: Curll's disgraced crew or his own respectable women friends?

In the long-awaited section on *Gulliver's Travels*, Barbara Benedict leads off with an unexpected analysis of the collecting of objects as a cultural trope, one fundamental to the *Travels*: "Material Ideas: Things and Collections in *Gulliver's Travels*." Swift uses the pursuit of objects, things, as a metaphor for the emptiness of his culture, and Gulliver's fascination with things adds to the turmoil he creates or amplifies in each voyage. Benedict traces examples of confusion and symbols of ridicule within Books One and Two, examining Gulliver's objects: the contents of his pockets, his curiosity cabinet on Brobdingnag, and clothes from a "mouse's skin." The activity of collecting becomes more than the acquisition of goods but should be understood as "the imperialistic colonization of peoples" and the "parody[ing] of high-art collections of treasures acquired by princes." Extending the discussion to textual collections and Swift's rhetorical devices, Benedict remains focused on the excesses of culture and how Swift illustrated these. This is a difficult essay but the writer never loses sight of her thesis: Swift locates us in "a world where materiality replaces morality and accumulation ousts discrimination."

Appropriately, no collection of essays on Swift should prosper without its own discussion on Book Four: Ann Cline Kelly provides a lively discussion in "Swift's Versions and Subversions of the Fable Genre: Context for Book Four of *Gulliver's Travels*." Since Book Four, according to Kelly, depends significantly on the Aesopian beast fable (talking animals), we can learn more about what Swift intended from a study of Aesop's fables and his reactions to other writers' fables. Her discussion covers some familiar ground but, nonetheless, is especially worthwhile in connecting Book IV with the canon of Aesopian fables and identifying those that would have been familiar to Swift. She addresses the looming question of why Swift chose a horse for his central figure, investigating and sifting earlier commentary concisely and providing a credible answer. In the early literature, the horse proves an uncertain sign for what a writer might intend, shifting from power to weakness, nobility to self-interest, and arrogance to humility. Influenced by La Fontaine's fables and L'Estrange's collection, Swift found the attitude toward the horse changed, moving "sympathies...with the non-human creatures and against the humans who enslave them." Closing with a

series of questions, Kelly surveys how the Houyhnhnms are understood today, the uncertainty of the “animal” point of view in the fable, and Swift’s stated unhappiness in working out the tension between the moral and the construction of a fable.

Finally, the Reception and Adaptation section has much to recommend to the reader who seeks Swift in the mind and attitudes of writers like Johnson; Sterne; Smollett; Burney; Edgeworth; Fielding; William Cobbett, the Victorian political journalist; and writers engaged in the serialization of prose fiction. Gabriella Hartvig’s “Hungarian Scholarship in the Period of Censorship” examines reports archived in Budapest from 1950-1970 involving censorship deliberations over proposed translations of Swift (three concerning *Gulliver’s Travels*). Peter Sabor’s “‘The greatest Master of Humour that ever wrote’: Henry Fielding’s Changing Views of Swift” traces the inconstant opinion Fielding held for his contemporary, often placing him on a pedestal but then deciding the Greek satirist Lucian deserved higher ranking. The fact that Swift seems to have held Fielding in little esteem does not alter Sabor’s point of when and how the latter writer discussed the older man. Early evidence in Fielding’s work suggests he was not actually keen on praising Swift, though he made reference to Lemuel Gulliver in *The Masquerade* (1728), and Sabor reviews different interpretations of critics during the past twenty years who have argued whether Fielding’s use of the pseudonym “Scriblerus Secundus” was out of respect or more likely mockery. Shifting from playwriting to journalism and novels, Fielding’s mention of Swift becomes “uniformly positive” after 1745. As a corollary here, Sabor makes useful remarks about the role of ongoing research into works attributed to Fielding and the dangers a biographer faces when settling on what seemed his subject’s work, and now no longer proves to be true.

These volumes, the revised papers from the Munster Symposium, have become legendary within Swift scholarship, and this latest publication serves as a touchstone for current work and thought on the writer. Though I could not discuss each essay, overall they exhibit excellent craftsmanship, exhaustive research, extensive footnotes, and a comprehensive understanding of the social, political, and cultural milieu of the period. I would add here a characteristic of the entire *Reading Swift* volume that is in part a credit to the editors: these essays exhibit some of the finest examples of content and bibliographic notes in recent scholarship. The editors and contributors should be congratulated and emulated for the effort shown in writing and scrupulously acknowledging their sources, but even going beyond this, reading the notes alone is an education on the subject. Make no mistake, these essays are not easily read and comprehended; the scholar will profit from the research, but the student must study them with discipline and a thorough familiarity with Swift’s poetry and prose.

Paul J. deGategno
Penn State Brandywine

Edward H. Burt, Jr. and Wilson E. Davis, Jr. *Alexander Wilson: The Scot Who Founded American Ornithology*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2013. Pp. xi + 444; illustrations. ISBN 978-0-674-07255-8. Hardcover, \$35.

The publication in 2013 of Burt and Davis' handsome volume marks the bicentenary of the death of Alexander Wilson, self-taught ornithologist and "child of the Enlightenment" (1). When he died in Philadelphia on August 23, 1813, Wilson had nearly finished his ground-breaking *American Ornithology*, a work that the authors identify as "the first major scientific work published in the United States" (333). In Chapter 4, "Pioneer Ornithologist," the authors summarize some of Wilson's major accomplishments. His work "established American ornithology on the world stage. . . [and] gave science a taxonomic framework in North America. . . [He] was the first American ornithologist to adopt the Linnaean system of names" (285, 289). Although not trained as a scientist, Wilson "brought a level of rigor to field biology generally and ornithology specifically" (324). He based his work on direct observation of living birds. He traveled more than 10,000 miles over much of the existing United States, recording 268 species or about 77% of the birds in the new republic (287). He was among the first to understand the importance of birds as part of the cultural heritage of America and "introduced several concepts on which ecology is based" (330). *American Ornithology* is notable not only for its scientific innovation, it is also a fine work of visual and literary art. The major contribution Burt and Davis make in their study of Wilson is to reveal the process by which science and art combine to produce one of the most beautiful books ever printed in the United States.

The first two chapters, "Themes in Wilson's Life and Writings" and "A Varied Life," highlight aspects of Wilson's life in Scotland and America that prepared him for his great work. The authors do not attempt a comprehensive biography in these two brief chapters. Rather, they provide context for the chief focus of their book, the scientific and artistic synergy of creating *American Ornithology*. From earliest childhood in Scotland, Wilson felt a sympathetic connection with nature. After he immigrated to America in 1794, this connection with nature developed into scientific exploration in the vast wilderness of his adopted country. Wilson loved literature from an early age. As a young man in Scotland he enjoyed a modest success as a poet. Some of his satiric verses denouncing poor working conditions in the Paisley textile mills brought him into conflict with the local constabulary and the British authorities. In America, Wilson continued to write both poetry and prose to support the presidential campaign of his hero Thomas Jefferson, but he soon turned his pen from politics to nature. *The Foresters*, a 2,200 line narrative poem published in the *Port Folio*, records his 1804 journey on foot from Philadelphia to Niagara Falls. The passages describing nature foreshadow the scientific accuracy and lyrical quality found throughout *American Ornithology*. Wilson spent his first years in America teaching at various country schools in the Philadelphia area. In

1802 he accepted a position at the Union School in Kingsessing, where he soon met a neighbor, the naturalist John Bartram. This was one of the most fortuitous events in Wilson's life. Bartram became his friend, mentor and drawing coach. He made available to Wilson his substantial library which included the works of many European ornithologists. Above all, Bartram guided Wilson in his study of birds and encouraged him in his ambitious project to illustrate and describe all the birds in the new republic.

In Chapter 3, "Illustrating *American Ornithology*," Burt and Davis reproduce a rich trove of Wilson's working sketches and drawings, only a few of which have been previously published. (Most of this material is in the archives of the Ernst Mayr Library, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University.) Over 100 color illustrations, the authors' analysis and commentary on the drawings, and a generous sampling of Wilson's own descriptions from the ornithology combine to illuminate the process of creating this pioneering publication. No previous study of Wilson has so skillfully united artistic and scientific analysis to reveal the magnitude of his accomplishment. The chapter first details the production of the plates, including the creation of Wilson's sketches and drawings, the process of transferring the drawings to copper plates, the engraving and printing processes, and finally hand-coloring the plates. Wilson sold 450 subscriptions to this first edition. Each nine-volume set, published between 1808 and 1814, included 76 colored plates, for a total of over 34,000 plates. No printing project of this magnitude had been attempted before in America, and Wilson proudly announced to his subscribers that this was a totally American production: paper, typeface, engraving and "tints" for the coloring, were all made in the United States.

The images in chapter 3 follow the original sequence in which Wilson illustrated and described birds in the ornithology. This is not a predetermined, scientific sequence, but the order in which Wilson encountered the birds. The chronological sequence of images reveals Wilson's increasing accuracy and artistry over the approximately ten years that he worked on the project. Because nomenclature and taxonomy have shifted so much in 200 years, Burt and Davis explain that they have provided a sequential identification for each illustration: "Here we provide the current common and scientific names for each species pictured, the common and scientific names given in *American Ornithology* and the original name given to the species when it was first described" (83). This identification sequence for each image is followed by the authors' commentary on the image, such as its accuracy, artistic merit, and a comparison of the illustration with the work of earlier artists. For example, commentary on the pencil and ink drawing for plate 14, the orchard oriole, reads in part: "The individual scutes of the legs, feet and toes are individually rendered, a characteristic of Wilson's work and a great improvement over that of most previous illustrators" (89). Of the partially colored draft of the rough-legged hawk, the authors observe: "Drawing hawks was Wilson's greatest strength. This magnificent preliminary drawing is full-size with a superbly rendered head,

eye and bill. . . .As with the Red-tailed Hawk. . .the intensity of the hawk's gaze borders on frightening" (175).

Following their commentary on each image, the authors include an excerpt from Wilson's description of that bird as published in *American Ornithology*. Wilson's complete descriptions include, among other elements, nomenclature and taxonomy, a detailed physical description of the bird, its nest, eggs, diet, migratory patterns and vocalizations. He often also included his own field observations and anecdotes and bird lore related to him by "citizen scientists." The excerpts included here by Burt and Davis should entice readers to seek out Wilson's complete accounts, some of the finest nature writing of the 19th century. The authors include the lyrical first portion of Wilson's eight-page description of the barn swallow. The excerpt concludes: "We welcome their first appearance with delight, as the faithful harbingers and companions of flowery spring and ruddy summer; and when, after a long frost-bound and boisterous winter, we hear it announced, 'the Swallows are come,' what a train of charming ideas are associated with these simple tidings!" (142). The excerpt on the red winged starling (blackbird) illustrates two of Wilson's pioneering practices: species census and ecology. He computes that some six million blackbirds will destroy "a grand total of sixteen thousand two hundred millions of noxious insects. . .in the space of four months" (128). Wilson's wry sense of humor and his skill as a scientist raconteur are evident in the field reports, partially reproduced in this text, of his adventures with a captured ivory-billed woodpecker and a pet Carolina parakeet.

In Chapter 5 Burt and Davis trace the influence of Wilson's work on 19th century leaders in American ornithology, including John James Audubon, Charles Lucien Bonaparte, Thomas Nuttall, Spencer Fullerton Baird and Elliot Coues. The authors give a sensible ten-page summary of the complicated and contentious relationship between Wilson's supporters and Audubon. The chapter concludes by noting the influence of *American Ornithology* on modern field guides. "Wilson's use of two-dimensional space is very similar to that of Roger Tory Peterson, and more recently, David Allen Sibley. . . . [T]he purpose of the two-dimensional portraits in their field guides, like those in Wilson's *American Ornithology*, is to facilitate identification by the reader" (351).

Two appendices complete the book. Appendix A, "On the Shoulders of Giants: Wilson's Predecessors" includes two tables. "Table A.1" lists books on zoology and ornithology available to Wilson in three local libraries: The American Philosophical Society, The Library Company of Philadelphia and John Bartram's personal library. "Table A.2: Authors Cited by Alexander Wilson. . ." (there were 42), is followed by notes on their relevance to Wilson. Appendix B, "Wilson's Contemporaries and Correspondents," provides notes on seven European ornithologists who published while Wilson was working on his ornithology and a larger number of Wilson's correspondents.

William E. Davis, Jr. is Professor Emeritus of Natural Sciences and Mathematics at Boston University. Edward H. Burt, Jr. is the Cincinnati Conference Professor of Zoology at Ohio Wesleyan University. Both authors

have published extensively on ornithology. Their work on Wilson is accessible to general readers, yet informative for advanced birdwatchers and ornithologists.

Burt and Davis' beautiful, erudite book makes significant contributions to our knowledge of Wilson and early American ornithology. It deserves a place on the bookshelf next to Robert Cantwell's *Alexander Wilson: Naturalist and Pioneer* (1961) and Clark Hunter's *The Life and Letters of Alexander Wilson* (1983).

Peter F. Perreten, Professor Emeritus
Ursinus College

Howard D. Weinbrot. *Literature, Religion, and the Evolution of Culture 1660-1780*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. Pp. xii + 371; index. ISBN: 978-1-4214-0516-2. Hardcover: \$60.00.

Professor Weinbrot ranges wide and delves deep in this study, which could nostalgically be called intellectual history. Having no Great Chain of Being to tie things together, he employs a biological metaphor, evolution, and, fortunately, is too fine a scholar to let his model distort his many discoveries: we do not have here a restatement of the Whig Interpretation of History. Instead, we are told (and shown) that “gradual progress, regress, trial, error, and uncertainty define the human situation, which nonetheless has a crudely positive ark of melioration and advancement.” No cock-eyed optimist he!

The terminus a quo is the restoration of Charles II (1660), along with the regicide eleven years earlier that overshadowed subsequent British history for more than a century. The thirtieth of January sermons, mandated in 1662 and not officially taken off the books until 1859, were designed to provide “the nation . . . a perpetual reminder of its failed duty” in allowing the murder of its monarch, Charles I. Required to be delivered on the anniversary in “every Anglican cathedral, parish church, and collegiate chapel,” the sermons slowly changed, reflecting “the gradually changing nature of English and British political and religious cultures.” (Some of the material here appeared in a previously published essay, but the argument clearly benefits from the context provided by the book.) Just as convincing as evidence of the fluctuating melioration in the sermon rhetoric Weinbrot explicates is a discussion of the changing interpretation of an important biblical text, Luke 14:23 (“Compel them to come in”). In the latter part of the seventeenth century the high church Anglicans typically followed St. Augustine’s interpretation, which he had used against schismatic Donatists in the fifth century: Dissenters and lower church Anglicans were to be forced, by a civil magistrate if necessary, to return to the state religion. During the eighteenth century *magisterial* gave way to *ministerial* compulsion, then compulsion gave way to persuasion, Augustinianism (at least on this point) was rejected, and Dissenting minister Matthew Clarke could write regarding the text in question, “beating out his brains can never be the way to bring [a man] to his senses.” (Weinbrot has a talent for mining pithy or

entertaining phrases from his texts.)

After the regicide sermons and the scriptural interpretation, the third leg of the book's three-legged stool of religious issues is Methodism. Weinbrot describes the movement from its beginnings in Oxford in 1729, paying special attention to ways in which it was eventually treated much differently from divergent sects of the previous half century: "Anglican ongoing skirmishes with Methodists overwhelmingly were about doctrine, like the relevance of Calvinism and the conflict of faith and works. Methodist loyalty no longer was questioned and soon would be loudly proclaimed. One could still properly hate the Other, but increasingly and dramatically it was about whether Methodists endangered Christian souls, rather than whether they endangered the dynasty or the miter." This chapter concludes with a convincing reading of *Humphry Clinker* (1771) as "Smollett's novel of reconciliation." The novel reveals Humphry as a lay Methodist preacher as well as Matt Bramble's illegitimate son, and he is welcomed back to the familial fold by his natural, albeit Anglican, father.

The Gordon Riots (1780) mark the book's terminus ad quem, despite a glance at Dickens' *Barnaby Rudge* (1836), included for its reflection on the riots, of course, but still somewhat a distraction. Nowhere is Weinbrot's candor and critical honesty more apparent than in dealing with events that seem at first to undercut his evolutionary thesis. The Gordon Riots restaged the violent rhetoric of the previous century, rhetoric that should have been passé due to the increasing tolerance that he has chronicled. He quotes Gibbon, that the riots embodied "a dark and diabolical fanaticism, which I had supposed to be extinct."

I confess I knew very little about the Gordon Riots before reading this book. Yes, they were anti-Catholic and noteworthy, but how violent and how frightening to the people of London I was unaware. Weinbrot certainly has provided the right context for his analysis: "In 1780 as in 1641, Protestant zealots' loyalty to God trumped loyalty to a misguided and blasphemous Crown." Weinbrot may favor Lord George Gordon a slight bit in his narrative: Gordon's eccentricity can always be offered as his defense and the government certainly should have known better than to make the series of blunders it did, beginning with the passage of the Catholic relief bill in a high-handed fashion, albeit with somewhat good motives. Other blunders follow, including Gordon's arrest for treason. He was found not guilty, but incurred further legal jeopardy when he was subsequently excommunicated—"Anglican excommunication for Scottish Presbyterian is absurd"—and jailed. He died in prison at age 42 after an indisputably sincere conversion to orthodox Polish Judaism. I have not even scratched the surface of Weinbrot's fine, detailed analysis of the Gordon Riots, one of many reasons to recommend this book.

Weinbrot defines literature broadly ("sermons, poems, political or religious polemic, journalism, novels, or parliamentary and judicial reports"), and moves effortlessly among all these genres. All of us recognize an allusion to the last Jacobite rebellion as the Forty-Five, but I at least now know an earlier parallel, as high church Anglicans referred to the overthrowing of Charles I as the "Crimes and Calamities of Forty One." Moreover, Weinbrot provides accurate

and succinct historical summaries along the way. For example, “Dissenters believed that the higher the church, the higher the danger not merely to their version of Christianity but also to the very concept of Christ as loving, universal savior,” and “The divine right of government is indeed biblical; the divine right of succession is not.”

Finally, Weinbrot continually points out fascinating, unexpected comparisons. One example will suffice. In Addison’s *Spectator*, No. 3 (1711) Mr. Spectator imagines a visit to a very young Bank of England, which in his vision is threatened by allegorical figures representing foreign forces and saved by forces representing “Liberty and Monarchy, Moderation and Religion, and the future George I.” Sixty-nine years later a much more physically impressive Bank of England—its recent expansion having been in part at the expense of the deconsecrated and demolished Church of Saint Christopher-le-Stocks—was nearly destroyed by the aforementioned riots. Redcoats saved the bank and, as Weinbrot tells us, a military force would remain round the bank for almost the next two centuries. Indeed, the evolutionary road is a winding one.

Robert G. Walker
Washington and Jefferson College

Robert Burns. *Selected Poems & Songs. Edited with an introduction and notes by Robert P. Irvine.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xxxv + 451; appendices: “From the Letters” and “Contemporary Reviews of the Kilmarnock Poems”; bibliography; chronology; glossary; index of first lines; index of titles; map. ISBN: 978-0-19-960392. Hardcover: \$24.95; £14.99.

Robert Burns’s popularity since his death in 1796 has ensured that his works have never gone out of print; however, like the works of other well-known poets from the period such as Wordsworth and Keats, editions of Burns’s verse have varied widely in quality, reliability, and veracity. Perhaps even more so than his later Romantic compeers, Burns has suffered greatly at the hands of his posthumous editors, many of whom misrepresented the poet’s life and works for their own political ends. Into the present, this has been less overtly the case with critical editions, although the brouhaha surrounding the critical veracity of *The Canongate Burns* (edited by Andrew Noble and Patrick Scott Hogg in 2001) testifies to the culture wars still being fought over Burns’s legacy. Even more to the point, there has not been a reliable and widely available edition of Burns’s works since Carol McQuirk’s Penguin edition from 1993. Indeed, a new edition designed for teaching and scholarship has been greatly needed for some time by those working in eighteenth-century Scottish studies and beyond.

Into the political and cultural fray spurred on by the figure of Burns comes the welcome selection of poems and songs edited by Robert P. Irvine, Senior Lecturer at the University of Edinburgh. Irvine states that “the aim of this edition is to present the poems and songs of Burns in a form as close as is practicable to

that in which readers first encountered them in the public realm during Burns's lifetime and in the century after his death" (xxxiii). Accordingly, Irvine selects texts in order of publication rather than composition, beginning with Burns's Kilmarnock volume (1786) and concluding with selections from Robert Chambers's edition of the poet's works from 1852. This principle of selection differentiates Irvine's edition from many of its competitors, typically organized by date of composition rather than publication. Irvine includes the Kilmarnock volume in its entirety (including its invaluable Preface) as well as the additional verse added to the Edinburgh edition of 1787 (to which he adds its less-known but equally important Preface). There are also twenty-seven songs from *The Scots Musical Museum* (1787-1803) and *A Select Collection of Original Scottish Airs* (1798-1799), projects to which Burns devoted most of his creative energies in the last years of his life. Posthumous poems and songs are reprinted from the nineteenth-century editions of Currie, Cromek, Steward, Cunningham, and Chambers, as well as selections from *The Merry Muses* (1799), *The Scots Magazine* (1803), *Edinburgh Magazine* (1811 and 1818), and the Stewart and Meikle chapbooks from 1799. In addition, Irvine presents a selection of pertinent letters (including the indispensable autobiographical letter Burns wrote to John Moore in 1787), as well as two early reviews, two maps, and detailed, useful Notes for each selection in the edition.

In his introduction, Irvine attests that "this volume aims to return Burns to history; not as an object of merely antiquarian interest, but because for Burns . . . poetry and song provided a means of living in history, not a picture of it, or an escape from it" (xxix). By designing the edition in order of publication, Irvine has enabled readers to recapture the sense of Burns's distinctiveness as an eighteenth-century poet. With this edition (now available in an inexpensive paperback), Irvine has achieved his goals of resituating Burns in his own history and contextualizing the poet's own literary output for contemporary readers. By allowing us to read Burns anew in this fashion, Irvine has done a great service for the Scottish bard, and it is to be hoped that this edition will make him accessible and relevant to readers in the present, especially those who have not yet experienced Burns's works as they were read and celebrated in the past. For those lucky readers, this edition will be a real delight.

Corey E. Andrews
Youngstown State University

Suzanne Forbes Wins Elias Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship for 2014

The American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS) has awarded the A. C. Elias, Jr., Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship for 2014 to Suzanne Forbes, of the School of History and Archives, University College Dublin. Her winning proposal was entitled "The Pamphlet Debate

Surrounding William Penn's Visit to Dublin in 1698." The Fellowship provides Dr. Forbes with \$2500 to support primary-source research at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia.

Forbes will spend three to four weeks examining material related to William Penn's travels in England 1695-97 and in Dublin in 1698. In 1698, on his fourth and final visit to Ireland, Penn tended to his Cork estates and participated in a Quaker "missionary tour of . . . Wexford, Waterford, Clonmel, Youghal, Cork, Bandon, Charleville, Limerick," and other locations. Shortly after this visit, Penn published three Quaker tracts, which drew responses, some leading to correspondence between Penn and other authors. Forbes hopes to sort out these publications into a chronological sequence and provide events with a historical account and analysis. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has extensive manuscript papers by Penn and related to him from the period. Dr. Forbes' research is expected to throw "important light on Irish religious and political culture c. 1700, as well as on William Penn, a figure of undeniable religious and political importance in England and America as well as Ireland."

Dr. Forbes, besides being a part-time lecturer at University College Dublin's School of History and Archives, is the Assistant Coordinator of the National Print Museum's Cultural and Heritage Project. She took her B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees from University College Dublin, writing a dissertation entitled "Print, Politics and Public Opinion in Ireland, 1690-1715" (2012). Her publications include "'Publick and Solemn Acknowledgements': Occasional Days of State-Appointed Worship in Ireland, 1689-1702" in *Irish Historical Studies*, 38, no. 152 (2013).

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 eighteenth-century Ireland qualify for consideration, but recipients must be members of ASECS who have permanent residence in the United States or Canada or be members of its Irish sister organization, The Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society, residing in Ireland. Prize winners are chosen by an independent jury of three distinguished scholars from different disciplines, working in different countries, supported by a network of research specialists in Ireland, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Each application goes through the hands of several readers, from both inside and outside the applicant's field.

The Elias Irish-American Research Fellowship was established in 1993-1994 by the late A. C. Elias, Jr. (independent scholar, Philadelphia). The award was renamed in 2013 to honor and celebrate Elias's contributions to scholarship and the community of scholars. The fellowship's present trustees are Dr. Máire Kennedy, Divisional Librarian, Dublin and Irish Collections of the Dublin City Library & Archive (maire.kennedy@dublincity.ie; 138-144 Pearse Street / Dublin 2 / Ireland) and Dr. James May of Penn State University's DuBois

Campus (jem4@psu.edu; College Place / DuBois, PA 15801). The next Elias research travel fellowship will be awarded early in 2015, with applications due on 15 November 2014. The application materials are largely those required for other ASECS travel fellowships (cover sheet, 2- to 4-p. proposal, 3-p. C.V., budget, bibliography, and two recommendations). Applications should be sent electronically to the trustees (ideally as PDFs); if the two signed letters of reference on letter-head stationery cannot be supplied as PDFs, their actual hard copies should be sent to one of the two trustees. Further information is available at ASECS's website (google "ASECS research travel fellowships" or see <http://asecs.press.jhu.edu/general%20site.travelgr.html>).

Alice McGrath Wins 2013 Molin Prize

We are pleased to announce that Alice McGrath of the University of Pennsylvania has won the Molin Prize competition for the best paper by a graduate student at our 2013 meeting, held November 7-9 in Philadelphia. Alice's winning presentation was entitled "The Queer Art of Patchwork: Revisiting Jane Barker." The Molin Committee members--Anna Foy, Corey Andrews, Rivka Swenson, its chair--also chose to award an honorable mention prize to Mary Beth Harris of the English Department of Purdue University, for her presentation "Vignettes of Violence: Leonora Sansay's Secret History; or the Horrors of St. Domingo and the Recovery of Violence against Women."

The Molin Prize jury has submitted comments on both papers. Of Alice McGrath's paper, the committee remarks:

A number of critics have focused on the importance of female friendship/homosocial bonds in Jane Barker's "patchwork" fictions, but McGrath has actually theorized what Barker is doing, and McGrath has done it well (an added value inheres in how the paper thus opens the door for increased nuance in eighteenth-century queer criticism). McGrath uses very current theories (e.g., queer failure and queer time) in an interesting and even useful way; the theoretical framework doesn't obfuscate, McGrath does not use theory to take Barker outside of history, and the essay is strong in sensitive close readings and careful attention to Barker's unusual formal and structural choices. McGrath's interaction with her sources (Barker criticism as well as queer theory both inside and outside the eighteenth-century critical range) is very strong. Indeed, the mix of theoretical interventions (engagement with queer theory and engagement with the emergent critical tradition on Barker) and superb close readings is impressive. Here is a sophisticated handling of theory, with convincing close readings. More broadly, there's an effort to connect Halberstam's argument in *Queer Art of Failure* (explained well) to 1) Barker's failure-to-marry plot and 2) the "narrative mode of uncertainty" reflected in Barker's explicitly "patch-work" aesthetic and her ostentatious hesitations as

narrator, well-documented by McGrath. The initial summaries of existing scholarship help to set up McGrath's subsequent reading of the "patch-work" aesthetic as a "queer" aesthetic, a non-hetero-normative mode of being and performing. Intriguing and worth further developing is the gesture toward a historicized notion of queer/patch-work mode as a "failure to conform to neoclassical aesthetics" (p. 7). All in all, a wonderfully precise, evidence-rich analysis.

Of Mary Beth Harris's paper, the committee writes:

Simply put, Harris offers a fresh and radical re-reading of her primary text; this is a high-stakes analysis of *Sansay*. And Harris's intervention is admirably attuned to the matter of form and genre. Harris is crisp and bold, especially as she attempts not only to extend and refine, but to overturn, conventional wisdom. The compelling argument gains further traction in the attack on Mary's credibility as a witness and the connection made between Mary's "romantic" vision of violence and the "utopian" understanding of the ending as it is pursued by a majority of modern readers. Harris supports her guiding premise (a premise by no means a given, namely that generic instability is equivalent to psychological instability) by discussing Mary's role as obfuscating narrator, which lends potency to Harris's claim that the "utopian" readers have missed a central irony of the novel. Exciting moments abound; for instance, in endnote vii, Harris notes that Aaron Burr -- the formal addressee of Mary's letters -- was no beacon of security and refuge. In 1809, when the novel was first published, he had just had his famous duel with Hamilton, and had then been tried for treason. (Harris also follows up this point in endnote ix, where she suggests that "Mary is also positioning Clara as an object of desire for Aaron Burr" -- further evidence of Mary's bad judgment.) Harris has a real argument that promises to stretch its legs quite profitably and persuasively in a longer format with room for additional fine-toothed analysis.

We hope both these young scholars present their research again at future EC/ASECS meetings. And we hope many graduate students will participate in the competition at next year's meeting, when Anna Foy (Anna.Foy@uah.edu) will chair the Molin Committee, serving along with Scott Paul Gordon and Marie Wellington. Graduate students interested in submitting their papers for consideration in the 2014 Molin Prize competition should keep an eye on the EC/ASECS website for special instructions. They are advised to see the useful tips offered to candidates in the October 2011 *Intelligencer*.

The Prize honors Eric Sven Molin, one of the founders of EC/ASECS, who regularly enlivened our meetings. Eric was a beloved colleague and teacher, who provided great encouragement and assistance to graduate students, particularly those working in English with him at George Mason University.

After his death in 1987, many of our members wanted to honor him and so it was decided to create this award, which, with its small cash prize (\$150), encourages and recognizes good scholarship at our annual meetings. The prize is only given when the judges (drawn from our executive board) feel there is a graduate student paper (sometimes two) of high excellence, both in its content and presentation.

Minutes of the EC/ASECS Business Meeting, Saturday, November 9, 2014

We began our Business Meeting by giving Peter Briggs, Doreen Saar, Geoff Sill a hearty round of applause for their organizational genius. They organized a fantastic program, and the hotel provided an ideal setting. We also thanked John Richetti for his fascinating and enjoyable plenary address, and Brij Singh for the informative and reflective paper he presented to inaugurate our proceedings on Thursday evening. [His revised version leads this issue.]

On behalf of Matt Kinservik, who is serving as conference chair of our 2014, Ted Braun announced the theme of the meeting, "Leisure, Pleasure, and Entertainment in the Eighteenth Century." The conference will begin with a special reception at the famed Winterthur Museum, Garden, and Library founded by Henry Francis du Pont. We'll also have the opportunity to see a performance of an eighteenth-century play, followed by a cocktail party. The University of Delaware Conference Center hotel, which is a Marriott, will be our home. The dates for the conference are November 6-8, 2014.

We had a moment of silence in honor of Jim Moody, whom we miss so much. We were very happy Ellen was able to attend our meeting. Susan Beam is our new webmaster. You can now find the EC/ASECS website at <http://www.ec-asecs.org>.

Jim May, our indefatigable editor of the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, acknowledged the financial support of chaired professors Robert Hume and James L. West, III, at Penn State and encouraged members to submit copy for future issues. If you want to write book reviews or short articles for the newsletter, please contact Jim at jem4@psu.edu. We are grateful to Jim for the time he has devoted to EC/ASECS and to our newsletter, which is recognized throughout the world of eighteenth-century studies as the finest of any regional society.

Catherine Parisian, who is the ASECS delegate, joined us for the meeting. She's also been a longtime member of our Society. Cathy reminded conference attendees that ASECS has an extensive program of fellowships, and she encouraged members to attend the annual ASECS meeting, held every spring.

As chair of the Molin Prize Committee, Rivka Swenson reported that there were 11 submissions. She also announced that contestants should send a full copy of the paper to the committee by December 1. The committee will allow

entrants to make changes (at applicants' discretion) before submitting the paper. These include the optional insertion of parenthetical citations and/or endnotes/footnotes as well as any optional revisions prompted by the panel Q and A, but no paper submitted, all inclusive, may be longer than 12 pages (double-spaced, 12 point font, 1-inch margins).

As chair of our Nominations Committee, President James Woolley presented the following slate of nominees: Christine Clark-Evans for President; Sandro Jung for Vice President; Marie Wellington for Board Member; and, Linda Merians for the position of Executive Secretary. The membership approved these nominations with a round of applause. Linda has announced that she is honored to serve another term as the Executive Secretary, but this will be her last one. It is time for us to find a successor, so for those of you who are tenured at your institutions or otherwise relatively job secure, think about possible service to EC/ASECS. Please contact Linda or another member of the Executive Committee if you would like to explore serving as the Executive Secretary. The Executive Committee is in discussion about how the tasks handled by the Executive Secretary might be restructured. We will keep you informed.

Linda Merians promised a full financial report in the next edition of the newsletter (see below).

James Woolley asked the membership to accept a motion from the Executive Committee to raise the annual dues in January 2014. The EC/ASECS Executive Committee felt the need to build a cushion in our 'treasury', particularly because some of the expenses we now have are covered by institutional support that could well be in jeopardy in the future. The EC/ASECS Executive Committee has hesitated to raise dues, but we now feel it is prudent to do so. A good discussion followed [including objections by Jim May], and the motion was adopted by the membership. Therefore, beginning January 2014 dues for most individuals will be \$25 (up from \$15), but we will continue to offer a discounted rate to graduate students (\$15 up from \$10) and to couples (\$40 up from \$25). A lifetime membership continues to be \$250, and it can be paid over the course of two consecutive years.

Here is a list of members of our Executive Committee for 2014.

President: Christine Clark-Evans (2014)

Vice President: Sandro Jung (2014)

Elected Board Members: Anna Foy (2014); Scott Gordon (2015); Marie Wellington (2016)

Immediate Two Past Presidents: James Woolley, Kathy Temple

Newsletter Editor: Jim May [jem4@psu.edu]

Executive Secretary: Linda E. Merians (2016) [lemeria@aol.com]

Past and Future Chairs: Beverly Schneller (2012); Doreen Saar (2013); Peter Briggs (2013); Geoffrey

Still (2013); Matthew Kinservik (2014)

Web Master: Susan Beam (susancheriebeam@gmail.com)

Financial Report, January 1, 2014-December 31, 2014

We are good financial shape, thanks particularly to the fundraising efforts of Executive Board members and conference planners Peter Briggs, Geoff Sill, James Woolley, Lisa Rosner, and Doreen Saar who were able to raise a total of \$4,000 from their home and affiliated research institutions (Bryn Mawr College; Rutgers University, Camden; Lafayette College; Stockton College Honors Program; Drexel University; McNeil Center for Early American Studies). We also owe special thanks to Sandro Jung, who once again sponsored a reception for us.

As those of you who attend our annual meetings know, we do everything we can to keep the expenses as low as possible for the basic registration amount. We want to continue to be able to offer discounted rates for graduate students and day rates for those who choose to attend for only one day. Every year this is becoming more of a challenge because of the fees hotels charge, particularly for access to wifi and the charges for rental equipment for power point presentations. Depending on the location, of course, having the conference in a hotel costs somewhere in the range of \$22,000 to \$28,000. We work hard to make sure that our conferences pay for themselves as much as possible; the fundraising we did for the conference this year was extraordinary.

The Executive Committee encourages members to step forward to consider chairing our annual conference on their campuses. We recognize that chairing a conference is a responsibility, but we have guides and template schedules we can offer you---and lots and lots of moral support. Please contact Linda Merians if you would be willing to explore hosting an annual meeting on your campus.

We have approximately 450 members we carry on our membership list. Now is a good time to urge those of you who pay on a yearly basis to do so. You should have received the dues letter and the CFP 2014 recently. Thank you all for your continuing support of our Society.

Revenue in 2013:

Bank interest: \$3.96
 Conference registration: \$22,941.00
 Gifts received into EC/ASECS for conference: \$3,250.00
 Membership dues: \$3,025.00
 Miscellaneous revenue (bank adjustment, reimbursements): \$306.20
 Reception gift paid directly to hotel: \$1,000.00 (while this isn't revenue per se, it helps to defray the expenses of a reception at the annual meeting)

Expenses in 2013:

Bank charges: \$60.20
 Conference expenses paid centrally by EC/ASECS: \$22,373.16
 (plenary honorarium/expenses, food/beverage & other hotel fees)
 Molin Prize for 2012: \$150.00
 Newsletter printing: \$1,267.86

Office supplies (envelopes, labels, checks, copies): \$294.29
Postage for *ECI*, dues letter and other mailings: \$1,622.55
Website expenses: \$97.05

We had not closed the books on revenue and expenses for the 2013 annual meeting as of December 31, 2013. The post-2013 items relating to the annual meeting will be included in next year's financial statement.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda E. Merians
Executive Secretary

The 2014 EC/ASECS in Newark, Delaware

Matt Kinservik (chair), Ted Braun and others on the planning committee are organizing our next annual meeting for 6-8 November 2014 at the University of Delaware. Lodging and sessions will occur at the conference center on campus, run by the Marriott chain, and events include the performance of an eighteenth-century play and a trip to The Winterthur Museum, Gardens, and Library. The meeting's theme is "Leisure, Pleasure, and Entertainment in the Eighteenth Century," which the committee captures in the CFPs following.

We're gonna party like it's 1769! A culture of leisure, pleasure, and entertainment grew from infancy to maturity during the eighteenth century. The changing face of public places--theatres, pleasure gardens, taverns, coffeehouses and brothels--reflects the dynamic changes underway in arts and culture. These developments can be seen on both sides of the Atlantic. Pleasure was also a mentality, something that people sought in their day-to-day lives.

This conference seeks to address a range of questions relating to the eighteenth-century pleasure culture. What constituted the material culture of pleasure? How were leisure and pleasure commodified, produced, and consumed? How were emerging forms of pleasure represented in popular literature and the visual arts? What's the relationship between class and leisure? What were the more obscure or private forms of leisure? How did the pursuit of pleasure and entertainment affect religion and politics (or vice versa)?

We invite papers and panels from all academic fields in which leisure, pleasure, and entertainment are significant themes of continuing interest. Also, as always, we will do our best to find panels for papers addressed to entirely different themes and questions. Please join us at the University of Delaware for an intellectually stimulating--and pleasurable--conference.

Please send panel and paper proposals to ecasecs@udel.edu. Proposals for panels are due by 4 April. Please send paper proposals for announced sessions to the chairs--they are due by 15 June 2014. For more information, visit <http://sites.udel.edu/ecasecs2014/>.

Jim Moody, In Memoriam

In early October James Andrew Moody succumbed to cancer at age 65. Linda Merians sent out a notice: “For many years, the members of the East-Central/American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies were blessed to count Jim Moody in our membership roll. Jim was a friend to so many of us and a webmaster extraordinaire for our Society. We will miss him so much. I'm including here a link to Ellen's website and memorial service information [<http://austenreveries.wordpress.com/2013/10/10/he-is-gone>]. We will remember Jim always, and will find a time during our EC/ASECS meeting in Philadelphia to raise a glass in his honor.” And so we did, and there was also a solemn moment of silence to remember Jim.

The EC/ASECS is much indebted to Jim Moody for expanding the website, previously edited by T.E.D. Braun, and developing its archive for EC/ASECS. As the newsletter editor, I particularly benefited from his development of a newsletter archive there with back issues to 2007 and with the indexes for those and earlier volumes. This has led to hits in google searches that call attention to material in the *Intelligencers*. Moreover, Ellen's astonishing library of scholarship at JimandEllen.org is a staggering accomplishment that was dependent on Jim's computer and internet skills. After reading Ellen's superb tribute, I am struck by all I didn't suspect about Jim--he was extraordinarily accomplished, cultured, and educated--unusually well read.

Jim was born in Southampton, England, gaining in youth a love of boats and water. He read ceramics briefly at Leeds University. He and Ellen were married in October 1969 and then they emigrated to New York City, where he graduated from Hunter College and then went to Columbia for a Ph.D. in Math, leaving after four years. He taught briefly at Hunter College and then took a position as a computer scientist and software programmer for the Defence Department, which brought the family to Alexandria, where they've since lived. After retiring at age 57, Jim taught part time at George Mason University for five years. Then and thereafter he pursued his favorite avocations, cooking, working out in the gym, listening to opera and classical music, playing piano, etc.

Many colleagues shared recollections and impressions of Jim on the web last fall. Manny Schonhorn wrote me that he found Jim “a pleasant, unassuming, friendly man. Generous too. He could not help but make an impression of decency and openness the moment you met him and had a few words with him.” This struck me too. At meetings, I found Jim a kind and good listener.

To dip into some of the comments on the C18-L listserv, Ted Braun wrote to Ellen Moody: “You and Jim have always been two reasons we have truly enjoyed attending the EC/ASECS meetings. I remember Jim finding the best spot to use the free wi-fi in hotels. His smile, his affability, his good humor, and the seriousness with which he took the proceedings. You did so many things together. I--we--will miss him, but I'm sure only a tiny fraction of how much you will do so. He was always so helpful, so kind to everyone, and when he participated in discussions at sessions, I always knew he would say something

pertinent and useful. But he was even better at social gatherings, at a reception, a bar, a restaurant. You must have had a wonderful life together.”

Christine Clark-Evans wrote, “This is such sad news for us all. Jim Moody, as Ellen says on the website, was witty and wise. He helped me personally in a number of different ways--just spontaneously so. He has been so loyal and generous to EC/ASECS people for as long as I can remember. Though obviously literary and high tech in training, profession, and avocation, he spoke to us in English, and his conversation showed patience and understanding no matter how arcane his knowledge of the topic was.”

With a background in computer science, electrical engineering, and math, Jim wouldn't have found many of us at EC/ASECS meetings able to talk about his professional fields. But I thought, too, he held back out of a natural modesty and, especially, because he came to our meetings and took care of the website for Ellen, whom he always put first--if there was talk about the Moody family, he let her offer it. He was obviously a great husband, full of patience and courtesy. The same support for his beloved that is evident in the website was evident in his behavior at meetings, and only now we know better, his career and life choices. For all in EC/ASECS, I offer condolences, and for all at the last meeting, I thank Ellen for joining us.

William Pencak, In Memoriam

by George W. Boudreau

William Pencak, professor emeritus of history at Penn State University, distinguished historian of early American history, historian of Pennsylvania, and twice editor of *Pennsylvania History*, died Monday, December 9, 2013, in Atlanta, Georgia, of cardiac failure following heart surgery.

A native New Yorker, he received his B.A. from Columbia University in 1972, with an M.A. the following year and a Ph.D. in history in 1978. The years that followed included scholarly production on a phenomenal scale. His first books, *War, Politics, and Revolution in Provincial Massachusetts* (1981) and *America's Burke: The Mind of Thomas Hutchinson* (1982), focused on New England, while his third, *For God and Country: The American Legion, 1919-1941* (1989) explored a twentieth-century topic for a very special reason: he wrote the book that a friend had set out to do, prior to his untimely death.

The publications that followed would reveal the polymath mind that Bill Pencak possessed. His score of single-authored or edited volumes ranged from the intricacies of early American ethnicity, culture, and conflict to film studies, opera history, and semiotics. In the last decade, much of his intellectual passion focused on the history of early American religion. His *Jews and Gentiles in Early America, 1654-1800* (2005) took him into the reconstruction of an oft-overlooked segment of colonial society, as well as giving him the chance to focus on his own heritage. The ideas he wrote of in that book led to new avenues

to explore in the classroom. He taught classes in Jewish studies prior to his retirement from Penn State's University Park campus, and following his retirement he accepted a position as Bert and Fanny Meisler Visiting Professor of History and Jewish Studies in the Department of History at the University of South Alabama. At the same time he wrote the chronological successor volume to *Jews and Gentiles*, he was also working on a biography of Bishop William White, Pennsylvania's first Episcopal Bishop.

Bill Pencak's passion for Pennsylvania history was a central focus of his career. He co-edited the massive *Pennsylvania: A History of the Commonwealth* as much to engage in a history that fascinated him as to have the chance to work with his friend Randall Miller and numerous other friends. Service to community and commonwealth were always at the center of his life. A decades-long stalwart of the Philadelphia and McNeil Center for Early American History's Friday seminars and Zuckerman salons, he is remembered for his intense intellectual engagement of presenters as well as the sense of humor and love of good fellowship that he had there. Those characteristics combined ideally in the two periods in which he edited *Pennsylvania History*. He expanded its readership and scholarly focus during his first term as editor, including creating the annual *Explorations in Early American Culture* in partnership with the McNeil Center. In 1998, he honored me by inviting me to serve as his co-editor. Later, this work would lead to the creation of the new journal, *Early American Studies*, where he continued to serve as senior consulting editor until his death. While he took a few years off from journal editing to pursue other projects, he returned to helm *Pennsylvania History* a few years later. When news of Bill Pencak's sudden death spread throughout the academic community, stunned colleagues around the country responded with a similar statement: Bill Pencak was the first major scholar who noticed their – our – work, and he was the one who helped craft rough prose into numerous first published articles.

It is hard to sum up the warmth, the kindness, the sense of humor, and other personal attributes that were my dear friend Bill Pencak. Falstaffian in size and personality, he shared Dr. Samuel Johnson's passion for friendships, wit, and good conversation. His generosity in providing hospitality for emerging scholars was unsurpassed. He routinely drove to conferences so he could give free transportation to young members of the profession who could not afford airfare. On a personal level, we thought of him as a member of our family, and I will always remember Bill sitting on my couch, watching TLA Video VHS tapes for his *The Films of Derek Jarman*, assisted by our yellow Lab (he always joked she enjoyed film history, too); spreading out the illustrations for one book or another on our coffee tables and floors; sitting up to all hours discussing the history profession and its practitioners; and driving to professional meetings, listening to CDs of Julianne Baird and his other favorite opera performers. As I write this, a line Franklin used to remember one of his best friends comes to mind. He was a "Gentleman of some Fortune, generous, lively and witty, a Lover of Punning and of his Friends." Hundreds of grieving friends now mourn Bill's untimely passing.

Bill is survived by his mother, Harriet Pencak, and husband Vincent Parker. His father, only brother, and nephew preceded him in death.

George W. Boudreau
Department of History and Humanities
Penn State University--Harrisburg

[*Editor's note:* This fine tribute to our late colleague written by George Boudreau was posted on H-NET by John Saillant on 12 December 2013. We gratefully reprint it.]

Directory Changes and Additions

Carpenter, Andrew. New address: Ulverton Lodge / 35 Ulverton Road / Dalkey, Co. Dublin / Ireland
Clingham, Greg. Preferred email address: clingham@bucknell.edu
Howell, Jordan. 1309 W. 8th St., Apt. 1 / Wilmington, DE 19806-4675
McGrath, Alice Tweedy. amcgr@saws.upenn.edu; English / Univ. of Pennsylvania / 3340 Walnut St. / Philadelphia, PA 19104-6273
Parisian, Catherine. Preferred email address: Catherine.parisian@uncp.edu
Kane, Sonia. sonia.kane@rochester.edu; Editorial Director. University of Rochester Press / 668 Mount Hope Avenue / Rochester, NY 14620-2731
Rousseau, George. Osterley House / Harwell Didcot / Oxfordshire OX110HD [zero before "H"] / United Kingdom
Warren, Victoria. Binghamton University. bi90144@binghamton.edu [no "p"]

News of Members

Corey Andrews has had a book on Burns accepted for publication by Rodopi next summer: *The Genius of Scotland: The Cultural Production of Robert Burns, 1785-1834*. Congratulations, too, to Corey, for being awarded a Research Professorship at Youngstown State U. **Eve Tavor Bannet** is the plenary speaker at the annual meeting of the Johnson Society of the Central Region, chaired by David Brewer at Ohio State U., 4-5 April. **Temma Berg** has step forward with the offer to gather and to edit, with **Margaret Mary Stewart's** assistance, the eight presentations from the forum honoring Betty Rizzo at the 2013 EC/ASECS. This will take up half the October issue, increasing the number participating in the newsletter and redressing some of the *Intelligencer's* spotty and unbalanced treatment of the 18th century--I hope this forum rooted in a conference session provides a hint taken up by other members. Honoring the legacy of a scholar can focus attention on work being done or needing to be done. On 30 Nov. **Kevin Berland** posted another entry in his blog *Netwallah redivivus*, discussing early modern notions of weather, soil fertility, and strange occurrences of lightning, in the writing of William Byrd II of

Westover, Virginia: <http://netwallah.blogspot.com/2013/11/byrds-lightning.html>. Last fall the participants on Kevin's C18-L made a spirited effort to vote C18-L LISTSERV's (L-Soft's) "Maily Award" but, despite trying like the little train that could, they couldn't overcome some cheating fundraising and pro-gun groups's sites. **Andrew Carpenter** has been working on an anthology: *The Irish Poet and the Natural World: an anthology of verse in English from the Tudors to the Romantics*, which is due out from Cork University Press in the spring of 2014. He is editing it jointly with his wife, Dr Lucy Collins, and Andrew promises us a review, adding "It's a big book -- full of fascinating material gleaned from all over the place." **Hermann Real** alerted me to the publication by the Irish Manuscripts Commission of Andrew's edition of the "Purgatorium Hibernicum" (c. 1670). In the fall Andrew described it in a letter as "a wonderfully bawdy manuscript poem from Restoration Dublin--full of interesting things." the IMC's PR on the edition appears to entitle the volume *Verse Travesty in Restoration Ireland: "Purgatorium Hibernicum" (NLI, MS 470) with "The Fingallian Travesty" (BL, Sloane 900)*, 2013, indicating also that the these two MS works are joined with the printed *Irish Hudibras* (1689), and that all three are verse travesties of Book VI of the *Aeneid*, though "differing widely" (ISBN 9781906865153; pp. xvi + 240). Andrew reported that his on-going project "is a book on the literary culture of Restoration Dublin. I'm learning so much about the world into which Swift was born -- and it all has direct bearing on the kind of writer he turned out to be."

Lorna Clark in January was finishing up the index for her two volumes (vols. 3 and 4) in the ongoing series of *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney* (general editor, Peter Sabor), which should be out before ASECS. Her volumes cover 1788, when the Warren Hastings was on trial, George III went "mad," and the Regency crisis began--so it is a packed year and the volumes offer much for those who don't work specifically on Burney. **Logan Connors** (French, Bucknell U.) is a guest editor for a special issue of *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* entitled "Writing against the Stage: Anti-Theatrical Discourse in Early Modern Europe." Submissions to the issue (due 1 March) can involve work on European theatrical traditions. The issue will appear next winter. AMS Press this winter published the *ECCB* surveying 2009 scholarship (vol. 35), edited **Kevin Cope**, its sections on the fine arts ed. by **Gloria Eive**, on philosophy, science and religion by **David Ventura**, on British Literature by **Bärbel Czennia**, and on printing and bibliographical studies by **Jim May**. **Robert Leitz** of LSU-Shreveport was not Kevin's co-editor for this volume, and we must all thank that scholar, whose field was 20C America, for long helping bring out many *ECCB* volumes. **Paul J. deGategno**, who took on the difficult task of reviewing all the EC/ASECS members' essays in *Reading Swift* (above), has left his job as dean and returned to the classroom at Penn State Brandywine. **Emily Friedman**, after offering an account of the assignments in her course on novels c. 1800, chaired a pedagogical session run Quaker-style which included a tribute to her former teacher at Bryn Mawr, **Peter**

Briggs, who prepared her well for academic life and provided an exemplary introduction to teaching, showing her what a good class can be.

Ian Gadd edited *The History of Oxford University Press, vol. 1: Beginnings to 1780*, with 17 contributions, published in mid November by OUP (752 pp.; 117 illus., 8 in color, 100L). Then he returned to editorial work on the Cambridge Swift *English Political Writings, I*, and working up a short piece with new evidence for attributing to Swift *A Discourse on Hereditary Right* (1712), evidence involving a 1763 advertisement for an Oxford edition of Swift's political and historical works. Ian reports, "Paddy Bullard and I are planning to write up a fuller article on the background and fate of that ill-fated Oxford 1763 edition. Davis knew about the proposed edition via Nichols and Deane Swift's letters provide further background, but the advertisement offer a good deal of new detail. It's illustrated in my *History of OUP* volume, p.453." Ian also passes along some news on other vols. in the Cambridge Swift: "We have more volumes on the way: Adam Rounce and David Hayton's *Irish Writings after 1725* is nearing submission (Jim McLaverty and I saw a pretty full draft in the summer), and . . . Ian McBride . . . should be close to finishing his volume on the Drapier's Letters. And I'm hoping *English Political Writings 1701-11* should be done by the autumn, if not sooner." Last year Ian and the other general editors, **Ian Higgins**, **Claude Rawson**, and David Wolmersley, and textual advisor James McLaverty saw the publication of two weighty and handsome volumes in the series, *Journal to Stella: Letters to Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley, 1710-1713*, ed. by Abigail Williams (pp. lxxxix + 800); *Parodies, Hoaxes, Mock Treatises: Polite Conversatons, Directions to Servants and Other Works*, ed. by Valerie Rumbold (pp. xci + 821). These are vols. 9 and 2 of The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift, each with full textual apparatus, chronologies, illustrations, indices, and other resources, as a glossary of "little language" used in the *Journal*. (Wolmersley's edition of *Gulliver's Travels* appeared in 2012.)

Gabriella Hartvig presented "The Romantic Comic: Sternean Humour and Its Afterlife" at a Sterne Tercentenary celebration organized in Venice at the U. of Ca'Foscari by Flavio Gregori ("The Most Beautiful Spirit Ever Active': Laurence Sterne, a Modern and Ancient Writer"). **Jordan Howell** is writing his dissertation at the U. of Delaware. At least initially, in what he'd written by our November meeting, he'd looked "at how eighteenth-century abridgment is born out of 17th-century theories of translation." Jordan writes, "I've have come across some great texts by Alexander Ross and Roger L'Estrange (among others) that discuss abridgment, epitomes, and abstracts as a mode of translation related to imitation and paraphrase." His plan includes devoting "a chapter covering the rhetoric of the Royal Society and how abridgments realized a modern epistemology based on brevity and concision. Burnet's *History* looks interesting . . . as well as Wynne's abridgment of Locke's *Essay*. More importantly, I'm trying to walk a fine line between reading these texts within English intellectual history while also looking at how the materiality of the texts change between the originals and the abridgments." **Jacob Sider Jost** is "wrapping up a Junior

Fellowship at the Harvard Society of Fellows, and I'm completing my book, "Prose Immortality 1711-1819," which will be coming out in 2014 from Virginia UP. **Stephen Karian**, good colleague that he is, has taken over from **George Justice** the edition of the Newsletter of The Johnson Society of the Central Region, bringing out two issues now. George left Missouri to become the Dean of Humanities at Arizona State U., and lo and behold, Arizona State will be hosting the annual meeting of the JSCR, hosted by George and wife **Devoney Looser**, now Professor of English there. Steve's December issue includes abstracts from the 2013 meeting in Montreal, including his of "Clarifying the Canon of Jonathan Swift's Poetry," **Ashley Marshall's** "Swift and Regime Change, 1714-16," and (no not another on Swift) **Tara Ghoshal Wallace's** "Historical *Redgauntlet*" (a novel by Sir Walter Scott, treating a Jacobite conspiracy in 1765, a fiction, but drawing on "popular riots and political disaffections"). The February 2014 issue has registration details for the conference in April--and an announcement about the Universal STC, which I repeat in announcements below.

Walter (Hank) Keithley is one of several members with essays in *Editing Lives: Essays in Contemporary Textual and Biographical Studies in Honor of O M Brack, Jr.*, edited by Jesse G. Swan and published the end of last year by Bucknell U. Press and Rowman & Littlefield (Pp. xxi + 260; bibliography; illustrations; index; ISBN: 978-1-61148). Hank's essay is entitled "Learning from Don Bilioso's Adventures: Visualizing a Critical Edition of the Printed Works of John Arbuthnot" (33-44). The book opens with **Jerry Beasley's** "Skip Brack: A Tribute from a Colleague and Friend," which is followed with remarks by Skip's son Matthew Brack. The volume also contains **Loren Rothschild's** "Collecting Samuel Johnson and His Circle" (1-8); **James E. May's** "Some Notes on the Textual Fidelity of Eighteenth-Century Reprint Editions" (9-32); **Christopher D. Johnson's** "The Work of a Professional Biographer: Oliver Goldsmith's The Life of Richard Nash, ESQ" (177-94), and **Peter Sabor's** "Francis Burney on Hester Thrale Piozzi: *'une petite histoire,'*" an edition (197-218). Skip's frequent co-editor Leslie Chilton contributed "*Alceste*: Tobias Smollett's Early Career," and Jesse Swan closes out the volume with an coda on Skip and the bibliography he compiled of Skip's publications. Other essays are by Jennifer Santos, Robert DeMaria, Jr., Gordon Turnbull, Michael Bundock, Martine W. Brownley, and Thomas Kaminski.

Anthony Lee's note "Ramazzini, Johnson, and *Rambler* 85: A New Attribution" has just appeared in *Notes and Queries*. Bernardino Ramazzini (1633-1714," Tony writes, "is remembered today as the founder of the study of occupational diseases"; in the 17C he was a major scholar, and Tony has discovered an allusion to him in Johnson's *Rambler* 85, which begins with a discussion of "distempers to which men are exposed by particular states of life," and Tony contextualizes this discussion with others, as Johnson's naming Ramazzini in *Adventurer* 39. Tony's review of the Yale Johnson edition of *Lives of the Poets*, ed. by John Middendorf et al., appeared in *Modern Philology* in the fall. **Bill McCarthy** happily reports that *Anna Letitia Barbauld: New*

Perspectives, ed. by William McCarthy and Olivia Murphy (Bucknell UP, 2014) is now in print and will presumably appear on Bucknell's table at ASECS. **Ellen Moody** is going to teach a course (on Austen, I think) at the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute, and she has a review for our next issue.

Leah Orr's "The History, Uses, and Dangers of Halkett and Laing" (*Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature*) appears in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 107 (2013), 193-240. Leah has written a very informative history of the this multi-volume record of anonymous literature, indicating how it evolved and was shaped by not only its founder Samuel Halkett and his main successor John Laing, Laing's daughter Catherine, who took over on his death in 1880, up through James Kennedy, who led the second edition effort into the 1920s, the teams of contributors for that edition and the more rigorous aborted 3rd ed. edited by John Horden (1980). Apparently many have wrongly supposed more effort went into the attributions in the *Dictionary* than did (even 353 ESTC entries cite it as authority for an attribution), and Leah examines the sorts of bibliographical sources relied upon by the compilers, such as the *OED*, *Notes & Queries*, the *Term Catalogues*, and the catalogues of the Advocates Library, the British Museum and the Bodleian. In addition to criticism of the *Dictionary*, her article offers a good historical survey of 19C and early 20C cataloguing and bibliographical reference works.

Mel New and **W. B[lake]. Gerard** have co-edited the final volume of the Florida Sterne edition, *The Miscellanies*, which hopefully will be in print this spring. Blake, with co-editors **Roy Wolper**, **E. Derek Taylor**, and **David Ventura**, (et al., too), this January published the Autumn 2014 issue of *The Scriblerian*. **Frank Parks** encourages us all to attend the session he's chairing at the ASECS in Williamsburg: "Colonial Printing in the Wider World of the Eighteenth Century" He writes that one of the presenters will be Sean Moore, an assistant professor at New Hampshire, who'll discuss "Irish Books and Colonial Booksellers: the Influence of Irish Literature and Political Thought in America." Also on the program are two that we know well from our meetings: "**Cal Winton** will also be presenting and **Carla Mulford** responding."

Adam Potkay reports that he and "**Cedric Reverand**, **John Richetti** and other EC/ASECS members are in the brand new MLA *Approaches to Teaching the Works of John Dryden*, edited by Jayne Lewis and Lisa Zunshine--looks like a good volume." Adam's essay is entitled "Teaching Dryden's Latin Translations: Lucretius, Virgil, and the Honeybee" (158-63) I've also got an essay on "Joseph Andrews and the European Novel" that's forthcoming next year in a MLA *Approaches to Teaching the Works of Henry Fielding*. Adam's essay "The Virgilian Way from Milton to Wordsworth" (on the development of epic, georgic, and pastoral from the mid-1650s to Wordsworth--a good amount on Dryden here, too) appears in *The Blackwell Companion to British Literature*, in multiple vols., ed. Robert De Maria et al. Adam's "Rhetoric and Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century" is forthcoming soon in *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*, ed. by Michael MacDonald, perhaps already available on the web. Adam enjoyed presenting invited plenaries at the Wordsworth Summer

Conference in Grasmere in August (on “Wordsworth’s Ethical Thinking”) and at the “Queen Anne to Queen Victoria” conference at the U. of Warsaw in September (speaking on “Contested Emotions: Pity and Gratitude from Swift to Wordsworth”). This month, besides his duties chairing the English Dept. at William & Mary, Adam will be preparing to help host the ASECS meeting, for which he chairs the local coordinating committee.

Hermann Real went in early December to Nigeria to offer the commencement address at Godfrey Okoye University, on the invitation of its Vice Chancellor, the Very Revd Professor Christian Anieke, PhD, a former student and fellow Swiftian (Anieke translated *Gulliver’s Travels* into the native Nigerian tongue). The VISA required a trip to Berlin to fight through some bureaucratic chicanery, of which Hermann remarked, “I sometimes had the feeling they were trying to pay their former European masters back in their own coin.” In November Hermann spoke in Vechta, Lower Saxony (the horse-breeding county), at an interdisciplinary conference on horses: his paper was entitled “So that I wished myself to be a horse”: das Pferd als Repräsentant kulturellen Wandels in Denksystemen” (The Horse as a Representative of Cultural Change in Systems of Thought). This winter Hermann is working up two papers for later this year, one in June at the Paul Gabriel Boucé Memorial conference, on “Infinities and Beyond” and one later in Newcastle “at Allan Ingram’s ‘bash’ on Fashionable Diseases,” at which Hermann will speak on “issues related to *morbus Gallicus*.” The big news from Hermann, came in February: his and Dirk Passmann’s essential index to the four-volume edition of *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, edited by David Woolley (1999-2007), has been published by Peter Lang, in a matching DJ: Volume V: *The Index*, reasonably priced at 46 euros (ISBN: 978-3-631-40832-2). The editors and press have generously secured us a review copy, so there’ll be more details about the index in the fall *Intelligencer*. **Beverly Schneller** is thriving at her new job of Associate Provost for Academic Affairs at Belmont University in Tennessee and promises us a review of a new biography of Queen Anne. **Manny Schonhorn** wrote in late January that **Rivka Swenson** gave a stimulating talk on Francois Fénelon’s “*Adventures of Telemachus, Son of Ulysses* and the Mid-Century English Heroine” at the Columbia U. seminar on Eighteenth-Century European Culture. **Robert Walker** has become a contributing editor to *The Scriblerian*.

This summer appeared vol. 45, no. 2 of *The Scriblerian*, (the second number with pp. 177-320), edited by **Roy Wolper**, **W. B. Gerard**, **E. Derek Taylor**, and **David Ventura**. Team Scriblerian includes many contributing editors who are EC/ASECS members (**Anna Battigelli**, **Martha Bowden**, **Frank Boyle**, **Peter Briggs**, **Tony Lee**, **Ashley Marshall**, **Melvyn New**, **Mary Ann O’Donnell**, **Beverly Schneller**, **Geoffrey Sill**, and **Kathryn Temple**). This issue contains a grateful reply by Roy Wolper to the luncheon in his honor organized by the EC/ASECS and Roy’s fellow members, especially Mel New, Blake Gerard, and Derek Taylor (p. 293). There are good reviews by New, Sill, **Paula Backscheider**, **Rachel Carnell**, **Karen Gevirtz**, **Mary Ann O’Donnell**,

Cheryl Wanko and others, along with Part 1 of **Jim May's** "Scribleriana Transferred: Printed Matter, 2010-2012." The Autumn 2013 issue of *The Scriblerian* appeared (vol. 46.1) in January. It includes book reviews by **Martha Bowden, Vincent Carretta, Yu Liu, Stephen Scherwatzky, Geoffrey Sill, James Tierney, and Robert Walker**. Among reviewed works are books and articles by **Eve Tavor Bannet, Greg Clingham, J. A. Downie, Stephen Karian, Ashley Marshall, Melvyn New, Maximillian Novak, Peter Sabor, Catherine Skeen, and Brett Wilson**. Also included is an article by Neil Guthrie arguing that **O M Brack's** attribution to Tobias Smollett of "Memoirs of a Lady of Quality" (in *Peregrine Pickle*) isn't tight enough to close down the debate, showing that much the same stylistic arguments can be used to attribute the work to John Cleland. It also includes the second half of Jim May's account of MS and rare books sales in 2010-2012.

Forthcoming Meetings

ASECS meets 19-22 March 2014 in Williamsburg.

The **Johnson Society of the Central Region** meets at Ohio State U. in Columbus, chaired by David Brewer, with Eve Tavor Bannet as plenary speaker. Registration (\$40 + meals reservations, dinner \$44 and lunch \$25, checks made out to Ohio State University) should be sent to Prof. Brewer in English at OSU, 164 W. 17th Ave. / Columbus, OH 43210-1370.

The **Society of Early Americanists' Special Topics Conference *London and the Americas, 1492-1812*** will occur at the Kingston U. in SW London on 17-19 July 2014, chaired by Kristina Bross of Purdue U. and Laura Stevens (U. of Tulsa). Papers were due by 1 October (stevens@utulsa.edu). Queries can be sent to sea14london@gmail.com. Note that in even-numbered years the Society hosts a special topics conference of this sort, and in odd-numbered years it holds an open-topic "Biennial Conference." It also sponsors sessions at ASECS and the American Literature Asso. (See www.societyofearlyamericanists.org). Following the SEA meeting on the Kingston U. campus, the **Early Caribbean Society** will convene its third meeting.

The next **SHARP** conference, the 22nd, occurs in Antwerp (primarily at the University) on 17-21 September 2014, with the theme "Religions of the book" and with such sponsor as the Plantin-Moretus Museum. Then in July 2015 they will meet in Montreal. SHARP now boasts 1000 members in over 20 countries. Its first "Latin American regional conference" occurs in Rio de Janeiro on 5-8 November 2013. The dues for SHARP are \$55, which brings a subscription to the annual *Book History* (there's a good student rate of \$20, without that subscription). *SHARP News*, always packed with information, is now distributed electronically; sharpweb.org offers many useful links and tools.

The **Burney Society of North America** meets 9-10 October in Montreal.

The **Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies** & the **Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society** will jointly hold the conference *Revolutions in Eighteenth-Century Sociability* on 15-18 Oct. 2014, at the Hotel

Delta Montreal in Montreal. Proposals in French or English should be sent to conference organizer Pascal Bastien at csecs2014@uqam.ca by April 1, 2014 (include a summary for one paper of 20 minutes and a CV no longer than a page). The Society is co-sponsoring with the U. of Waterloo The Fourth International MARGOT conference on “Women and Community in the Ancien Régime: Traditional and New Media” (the MARGOT symposia bring an interdisciplinary focus to varying topics related to the medieval and early modern worlds); this fourth conference will be held 18-20 June 2014 at Barnard College in New York.

The **EC/ASECS** meets at the University of Delaware on 6-8 November 2014, chaired by Matthew Kinservik (see the article above).

ASECS meets 17-22 March 2015 in Los Angeles. The next Congress of the **International Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies** will occur in Rotterdam in 2015. The website www.isecs.org/ has information about the ISECS’s International Seminar for Early Career Scholars, held in Manchester 8-12 Sept. 2014, on “The Arts of Communication: In manuscript, in print, in the arts, and in person”). ISECS’s website also publicizes forthcoming conferences, including *L’Amérique du Sud et les Lumières*, hosted by the Argentine 18C Society, in association with other groups as the Canadian and German 18C societies (Buenos Aires, April 9-11, 2014, with deadline 30 Sept. 2013).

A conference “**Charles Dibdin and his World**,” celebrating the 200th anniversary of Dibdin’s death, will be held at the University of Notre Dame London Centre (1 Suffolk Street, London) on 28-29 November 2014. Ian Newman’s CFP introduces the man and then the conference, which is part of the ERC-funded project “Music in London, 1800-1851,” led by Roger Parker of King’s College): “2014 marks the 200th anniversary of the death of Charles Dibdin (1745-1814), perhaps the most versatile and talented actor, musician, playwright, and songwriter of the 18th and 19th centuries. Across his career Dibdin played the organ at St Bride’s in Fleet Street, collaborated with Isaac Bickerstaff on comic operas, acted at Drury Lane, Covent Garden and numerous other theatres throughout Britain, was director of music at Ranelagh Gardens, performed in blackface as Mungo in his opera *The Padlock*, translated French opera, opened his own theatre (twice), went to debtor’s prison, toured the country with a one man show, opened a publishing warehouse, wrote novels, memoirs, and a history of the English stage, published three music text books, and composed several thousand songs. . . . To this end we invite proposals for papers in any discipline on any aspect of the life and work of Charles Dibdin and his family, or that illuminate the world of this subversive, patriotic, irascible, and glorious anarchic writer and performer. The conference will be in a workshop format consisting of a series of roundtable discussions of pre-circulated papers. Dinner, accommodation, and a performance of Dibdin’s songs will be provided for all participants. Papers will be circulated by 14 November 2014. These will form the basis of a collection of essays placing Dibdin in his world, providing new ways to conceive of the relationships between legitimate and illegitimate theatre, elite and popular entertainment, and provincial and metropolitan

performance. Abstracts (max 500 words) for 3-5,000 word papers should be sent with a short biography to Dibdin200@gmail.com by 26 May 2014. For more information please contact the organisers, Drs Oskar Cox Jensen (King's College London), David Kennerley (Oxford) and Ian Newman (Notre Dame) at Dibdin200@gmail.com."

Announcements regarding Resources, Publications, etc.

Steve Karian in the February *Newsletter of the Johnson Society of the Central Region* calls attention to "the **Universal Short Title Catalogue** (USTC: <http://ustc.ac.uk>). The USTC is a database for books printed in Europe from the beginning of printing through the end of the sixteenth century. The records in this database direct you to where original copies of the books may be found, and in some instances, where open-access digital copies may be viewed and downloaded. . . . [With] only a little effort, I was able to download copies of a 1511 edition of Erasmus's *Moriae encomium* and a 1532 edition of Rabelais' *Gargantua*. The USTC intends to expand its coverage into the 17th century."

At the Philadelphia EC/ASECS I saw a flier for ***Eighteenth-Century Audio***, the blog or website set up by Marie McAllister and formerly described by her in the *Intelligencer*. Many of the additions of these audio recordings of poetry in English 1660-1800 have been added by her students at the University of Mary Washington. The site offers "poems of the day" and also "listeners' favorites." The audio-base holds poems by several dozen poets. Under Robert Burns I found 16 poems recorded, some read by Burns scholars. Look up the archive of oral poetry at <http://ecaudio.umw.edu>.

This fall **Goucher College** in Baltimore launches an 18-credit interdisciplinary minor for undergrads, called "academic program in book studies," chaired by April Oettinger (april.oettinger@goucher.edu).

The **Library Company of Philadelphia** has appointed as its director Dr. Richard S. Newman, who succeeds John C. Van Horne. Newman a historian who has edited or authored five books, has research specialties in early American, African-American, and environmental history, as well as Print Culture. He is Professor of History at Rochester Institute of Technology and begins his new role this June.

On 31 October, the **Shelley-Godwin Archive** held its public launch at the New York Public Library. Neil Fraistat and David Brookshire from the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities described "the creation of the Archive's first transcribed and encoded manuscript, the Bodleian Library's *Frankenstein* notebooks of Mary Shelley." Liz Denlinger, curator of the Carl H. Pforzheimer Collection of Shelley & His Circle gave an overview of the Archive's history. And Charles Robinson of the Univ. of Delaware offered a more extended talk on the composition of the novel, with illustrations from the Archive. Early editions of the novel and *Frankensteiniana* were displayed.

17 Oct. on C18-L, Susan Walker announced the **Lewis Walpole Library's** exhibition *Emma Hamilton Dancing*, up through 4 April, curated by John Clare-

Mellon, a Fellow in Art History at Yale. The exhibit focuses on renderings in 1794 of Hamilton's "Attitudes, or expressive postures" while performing. These James Gillray parodied in an enlarged set of engravings in 1803. The exhibition in Farmington is open from 2-4:30 and by appointment. (It's a reminder of the LWL's excellent print collection and efforts to attract visiting readers.)

The Folger Consort is performing "**Le Jardin Chinois: Music of 18C France**" on 21-23 March at the Folger Elizabethan Theatre (tickets \$37). The program explores the allure of China for the 18C French musical imagination in works by Rameau, Marais, and others, with soprano and instrument (there's a free pre-concert discussion of Robert Aubry Davis on 21 March at 7 p.m.). Through 15 June the Folger Library's exhibition hall is showing "**Shakespeare's The Thing**," a miscellany of Folger treasures sketching the poet's legacy.

On C18-L during the fall, Sharon Harrow, Jack Lynch, and others participated in another good discussion of how to make **ECCO** more available to American scholars, who envy the broader access that text-base has in Europe. In the end, it was hard to see how Cengage would profit from a deal with ASECS or another collective body or how ASECS could raise its dues for this database.

The **Eighteenth-Century European Culture** seminar held monthly at Columbia U. will this spring celebrate its 50th anniversary with a conference 4-5 April: The Study of 18th-Century European Culture: Past, Present, and Future. It will feature a keynote address by John Richetti, with remarks by Manuel Schonhorn and others on the occasion. Contact Al Coppola or Nicole Horejsi (njh2115@columbia.edu) or google up the website for more information.

The *Intelligencer* needs reviewers for the following: Michael Griffin's *Enlightenment in Ruins: The Geographies of Oliver Goldsmith* (Bucknell UP, 2013); Joseph Manca's *George Washington's Eye: Landscape, Architecture, and Design at Mount Vernon* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2012, very well illustrated); Kevin Pask's *The Fairy Way of Writing: Shakespeare to Tolkien* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2013); and a translation and edition of *England* by Johann Wilhelm von Archenholtz (1743-1812), edited by Louis Bueler, a "political and sociological description of Great Britain during the second half of the 18C" "based primarily on Archenholtz's firsthand observations from 1769 to 1779" (it has chapters on mindset, lifestyle, pastimes, the legal system, the military, etc.).

On 26 November 2013, Tom Hothem posted the news on C18-L that "**The William Blake Archive** is pleased to announce the publication of electronic editions of Blake's illustrations to works by William Hayley, including his *Essay on Sculpture*, the broadside ballad *Little Tom the Sailor*, *The Life and Posthumous Writings of William Cowper*, etc. "The works now published and republished include all of Blake's commercial engravings executed for Hayley during the three-year period Blake and his wife Catherine spent in Felpham." Access is free to the Blake Archive. The site is supported by the U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the U. of Rochester, and the Library of Congress; it is edited by Morris Eaves, Robert N. Essick, and Joseph Viscomi, with project Manager Ashley Reed.

Our woodcut tailpiece belonged to the London printer Hugh Meere.