
The East-Central ASECS will retire on November 7-9, 2013, not to a country bower but to a very public place—the DoubleTree Hilton, at 237 S. Broad Street in Philadelphia—to reappraise and renew its views of eighteenth-century thought and culture.

Retirement—temporary or permanent withdrawal by either a male or female subject from public life for the purpose of finding a new perspective on what one is about—is a celebrated practice in the literary, historical, dramatic, philosophical, and even scientific prose and poetry of the eighteenth century. Retirement is not the end of things, but a time of reconsideration, of re-centering and re-commitment. It is appropriate that this strategic retirement should take place in Philadelphia, the heart of the public transatlantic world at the time. Some 100 speakers will address these and related themes in the course of two days and an evening.

Registration, a reception, and cash bar will occur Thursday evening on the fifth floor of the DoubleTree. The program will begin with a special address by longtime member Brijraj Singh, who will open the conference with a retrospective/prospective view of the organization, “In Retirement: Contemplating what EC-AECS Is or Has Become.” Thursday evening will conclude, as it has for many years, with an “Aural/Oral” performance of eighteenth-century works by EC-AECS members under the direction of Peter Staffel. Besides the usual “volunteer” readings of eighteenth-century poetry, Peter is planning to put on a reduced version of Elizabeth Inchbald’s Lovers’ Vows, best known for its appearance in Jane Austen’s Mansfield Park.

The program will continue on Friday with three sessions of four panels each, leading to a plenary address in late afternoon by John Richetti, A. M. Rosenthal Professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania (emeritus), who will speak on “Retirement or Retreat: Varieties of Rustification and Renewal in Eighteenth-Century Literature.” A reception sponsored by Dr. Sandro Jung of the University of Ghent will launch the publication of British Literature and Print Culture, an edited collection from Boydell and Brewer that offers nine essays on the intersections of print, visual art, and culture. The reception will be followed by a banquet.

Saturday will begin with a Continental breakfast at 8 a.m. and proceed through two sessions with four panels in each. All registrants are invited to attend a business luncheon, which will feature a Presidential Address by the 2013 EC-AECS President, Dr. James Woolley, The Frank Lee and Edna M. Smith Professor of English at Lafayette College. His talk, relating to his work over decades on Swift and his current editing of Swift’s poetry for the Cambridge Swift edition, is entitled “Editing Swift: Problems and Possibilities.” Two more sessions, with four panels each, and a closing reception will bring the proceedings to an end, though registrants are encouraged to sign up for a Sunday morning tour of the new Barnes Foundation museum on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway, with works by Renoir, Cézanne, Matisse, Picasso and many other artists on display.
The Registration Form is available on the new EC-ASECS web site, www.ec-asecs.org, designed by Susan Beam. Registration (prior to September 21) is $140; late registration is $175 (please be sure your membership is up to date). Graduate students who are chairing a panel or presenting a paper qualify for a reduced registration fee of $100; graduate students reading a paper should make themselves known to a member of the Molin award committee (see web site) so they may be considered for the award. Graduate students not reading may attend on a day rate of $25 (no meals). Persons listed on the draft program may be dropped if their registration is not received by October 20. Reservations for rooms at the DoubleTree Hilton may also be arranged through the EC-ASECS.org web site. Go to “2013 Conference” and click on the web link to reserve at room at the conference rate. Reservations must be made by October 7 to get the group rate. The hotel is about 9 miles from Philadelphia International airport by taxi; the fare is about $24. Please allow 20 minutes.

The hotel has offered us its entire fifth-floor conference space, with six spacious meeting rooms, for the length of the conference. The hotel offers a complimentary fitness center and atrium pool, for those arriving early or staying late, and a first-floor restaurant and bar with an impressive four-story atrium. The hotel is located on the “Avenue of the Arts” in center-city Philadelphia. On November 7 and 9 at 8 p.m. at the Kimmel Center, about half a block south, the Philadelphia Orchestra will present famed pianist Yuja Wang playing works by Strauss and Prokofiev, with Yannick Nézet-Séguin conducting (see www.philorch.org). On November 8 and 10, the Philadelphia Chamber Music Society will present an all-Beethoven program at 8 p.m. at the Perelman Theatre, and a Beethoven-Sierra-Dvořák program at 3 p.m. at the Independence Seaport Museum (pcmsconcerts.org). For scholars needing to check a reference, the hotel is within walking distance of such repositories as the Library Company, the Chemical Society, the Philosophical Society, and the Rosenbach Museum.

The conference organizing committee, Peter Briggs, <pbriggs@brynmawr.edu>, Doreen Alvarez Saar, <saarda@drexel.edu>, and Geoffrey Sill, <Sill@camden.rutgers.edu>, express their gratitude to the members of EC-ASECS and, particularly, to the Executive Director, Linda Merians, for their assistance in planning the conference. We are grateful for the assistance of the sponsors of the conference, which include Bryn Mawr College; the College of Arts & Sciences, Rutgers University-Camden; the Department of English and Philosophy, Drexel University; Lafayette College; The Honors program at Stockton College; the McNeil Center for Early American Studies; and Dr. Sandro Jung, Director of the Centre for the Study of Text and Print Culture, Ghent University. Questions about the arrangements for the conference may be directed to any of the organizers.

Please keep an eye on the www.EC-ASECS.org website for updated information, and welcome to retirement in Philadelphia!
Blackstone Embarrassed: The Performance of the Commentaries

by Kathryn Temple

Author’s note: In November of 2013, I was honored to present a Presidential Address to our group. I thank the organizers of the conference and Linda Merians especially for their encouragement and support. Here I present a short digest of these remarks drawn from my soon-to-be-completed manuscript: “Loving Justice: William Blackstone, the Commentaries and the Affective Origins of Anglo-American Law.”

It almost seems that legal performance is a legal embarrassment. —Bernard J. Hibbitts

During the very period when theater dominated English culture and actors became cultural icons for the first time, William Blackstone took his place on the national cultural stage with the publication of the Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765-1769). As is well known and was brilliantly argued by Daniel Boorstin in 1941, Blackstone offered a comprehensive restatement of English law framed by Enlightenment philosophical and aesthetic values and famed for its commitment to reason and historical method. But reason and history alone do not explain his unique achievement. While assuming the voice of reason and claiming historical accuracy as the source of his authority, all in the service of presenting a clear and comprehensive, yet portable guide to English law, Blackstone was also deeply invested in affects related to law and justice. Reading for affect allows us to see how Blackstone placed what might seem to be a purely rational approach in an affective frame, thus allowing his readers to feel rather than reason their way towards justice. That feeling element in the Commentaries is the key to what might be called its “binding” power, its ability to create strong feelings of attachment and to attract both readers and non-readers to the Commentaries. By folding affect into the Commentaries, Blackstone created a compelling affect effect. And by reading for that affect effect, not only within the Commentaries but in other moments during which Blackstone effectively (and affectively) performed the Commentaries, we can better understand how the Commentaries became an immensely influential tool that bound its audience to the English system.

On the whole, my argument joins others in challenging the notion exemplified by John Rawls that justice can be satisfactorily or finally delineated through abstract analysis. Rawls’ disembodied “cloak of invisibility” ill fits contemporary understandings of the emotive-cognitive processes that lead to “reasoned” decisions. But while contemporary neuroscientists and cognitive theorists have moved towards recognizing emotion as central to ethical and moral decision making, our readings of Blackstone have continued to insist on reason as his dominant mode, even while at times noting the irrationality or at least inexplicability of some of his arguments. A closer reading reveals that Blackstone’s Commentaries engages an abstracted rational process only reluctantly. Consider, for instance, the opening chapter, where Blackstone lays out the relationship between justice, law, reason—and affect. As Blackstone sees
it, “the only true and natural foundations of society are the wants and the fears of individuals,” wants and fears that Blackstone expresses both directly and indirectly in the Commentaries. It is no accident or mere literary convention that Blackstone introduces the Commentaries by offering an affective commentary on its narrator as characterized by “great diffidence and apprehensions” (I 3-4). In introducing his monumental work in these terms, Blackstone marks, in Martha Nussbaum’s words, not only “the great importance…of things [people] do not fully control,” but also “their neediness before the world and its event” (22).

This framing device suggests that we look more carefully at other examples of Blackstone’s “diffidence,” at other moments when he seems to stumble, lose control or exhibit neediness in his efforts to communicate the thematics of the Commentaries to his audience. I pursue this by noting that Blackstone’s literary style stood in sharp contrast to his speaking style. The Commentaries was described as “pleasing” by Mansfield and “luminous” by James Sedgwick, and most interestingly as “correct, elegant, unembarrassed” by Bentham. But when Blackstone shifted from writing to speech, we find him incorrect, inelegant and quite embarrassed. He was notoriously ashamed of public performance. Anti-oratorical, said to fall silent when called upon to speak, to evince embarrassment while on the bench, and even to be a terrible lecturer, though he made his reputation by giving public lectures (that he read from a carefully prepared text), he seemed more than uncomfortable with public performance. Even Blackstone’s admirers admitted to his oratorical deficits. His own brother-in-law noted that Blackstone was “not … happy in a graceful Delivery or a flow of Elocution (both which he much wanted)” (Prest 6). Regarding his appearances in court and on the bench, Richard Graves, a friend and mentor, noted that he “lacked that plausible superfluity of words, which gives some pleadings a show of eloquence.” Graves seems to see the problem as one involving a lack of those filler phrases and expressions that allowed other more accomplished speakers to fill in any gaps: “[He] never used those supplementary phrases, of “I humbly apprehend”; and I “beg leave to insist on it; or I can take it upon me to prove; with all imaginable ease and facility, to the perfect satisfaction of your lordship and the court,” &c” (Qtd in Prest, Selden Lecture 15). Others were overtly unkind, suggesting that his deficits were so great that he should have avoided becoming a lawyer (Kadens, n. 50). Blackstone himself made no pretense of his abilities: as he put it, “there are certain Qualifications for being a public Speaker, in which I am very sensible of my own deficiency” (Letters 29). The most damning modern critique has been offered by Emily Kadens, author of an essay that examines a less-examined aspect of Blackstone’s life, his behavior on the bench after he wrote the Commentaries. Her examples of his oppositional, disfluent style lead her to the conclusion that Blackstone was a “fussy, by-the-book pedant” who was “bound to get frustrated with the compromise and subtlety of life at the bar” (1553). Her research supports a portrait of Blackstone as ill-spoken at best, ill-mannered at worst.

In the longer version of this essay, I discuss the context for accusations that Blackstone was stammering, diffident, frustrated, and a “fussy, by-the-book pedant.” Here I will focus on pointing out that these evaluative judgments clash with Blackstone’s judicial philosophy, with the desire evinced in his early poetry and in the Commentaries for a justice imagined neither as hesitant or uncertain,
nor as angry, vindictive or punishing, but instead as harmonic, balanced, and, in short, beautiful—in both content and expression. Various explanations for his inability to express these harmonies in speech have been offered, including an innate shyness that even may have resulted in a near breakdown after he gave his first lecture (Prest 153). Rather than focusing on Blackstone’s personal psychology though, I argue that these representations of Blackstone as a disfluent public speaker operate as a legible affective sign in what had become a highly theatricalized legal environment at Westminster Hall. Disfluencies had a performative value in themselves: stammering (or a halting style) forces its listeners into impatience, into desire for the unimpeded word; oppositional pedantry, the “by the book” approach, points observers away from courtroom theatrics and towards the pleasures of the book. Ironically, Blackstone’s “overexpression” of affective discomfort worked to highlight the comforts offered by the fluent and easily-digested Commentaries, comforts sorely needed at this moment in English jurisprudence, just when Blackstone’s idealized version of justice was colliding with the statutory “made” law of a legal culture attempting to adapt to rapid changes in commerce and trade. My analysis of Blackstone’s performative “anti-style” reveals that Blackstone’s “embarrassment” tended to shift his audience’s focus from the immediacy of courtroom performance to the more permanent pleasures of the book. Given the growth of international trade and the importance of Blackstone to colonial legal systems, recognizing this shift allows us to analyze the historical moment when easily transmissible representations of English law—such as Blackstone’s portable four-volume digest—became crucial to English law’s imperial authority.

Georgetown University
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Anyone for an Anti-Jacobin?

by William L. Mitchell

Editor’s note: The author of this article, now retired, is a former Associate Special Collections Librarian at the Kenneth Spencer Research Library of the University of Kansas with expertise in British periodicals and newspapers. He has been honored four times through The Bibliographical Society of America’s William L. Mitchell Prize for Bibliography or Documentary Work on Early British Periodicals or Newspapers, awarded every three years, most recently in January 2012 (to Carla Mulford). The next Mitchell Prize competition has the deadline of 30 September 2014 and will consider works (including theses, articles, books, and electronic resources) published after 31 December 2010. The competition is open to all without regard to membership, nationality, and academic degree or rank, requiring little more of applicants than the submission of a curriculum vitae and three copies of printed work (or one electronic copy) and access and instructions for internet publications. For information (and an account of former prize-winning essays), see the Society’s website (www.bibsocamer.org). Publishing Mr. Mitchell’s essay will hopefully be a way to publicize the Prize itself and encourage interest in the article’s specific and general subjects. When in early 2012 Bill Mitchell sent it to me with other bibliography materials boxed in his garage, he wrote the following of its composition:

The enclosed xerox of “Anyone for an Anti-Jacobin?” is a draft of a note I was preparing for Books & Libraries at the University of Kansas (a little publication begun in the 1950s, now defunct), in hopes of interesting someone in sorting out The Anti-Jacobin. (The MS notes on p. 1 [dated 30 September 1996, written by the late Alexandra—Sandy—Mason, then Spencer Librarian] brought back memories of the way Sandy and I worked: she was doing a class or something and showing The Anti-Jacobin, so I passed this to her for whatever use she could make of it. I don’t know if it did her any good, but, as she read it, she also proofread, as her note indicates. Stuff like that happened every day. What a place to work!) I send this along to you, in its draft state, for the same reason I wrote in the first place: in hopes of getting someone interested in sorting it out.”

To judge from the ESTC and secondary bibliographies, no one since Mitchell has sorted out the multiple settings and issues of The Anti-Jacobin; or, Weekly Examiner, although Emily Lorraine de Montluzin, the giant in periodical attribution studies, published an article in 2003 on “contributions to the Anti-Jacobin Review,” the A-J’s successor, “during the editorial regime of John Gifford, 1798-1806.” Mitchell’s account of variations in the weekly paper implicitly calls attention to the value of collecting multiple copies of hand-printed books and periodicals—and not impulsively selling off those duplicates owned by the same library, as has frequently happened.

Mitchell has written above his typescript a note to Sandy Mason that the KU volumes of The Anti-Jacobin with differing type-settings in some issues, the
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subject of his essay, have been pulled and put on a cart for her use. He has a typed note to other readers that “The term ‘issue’ is here used in the sense of a variant which has ‘originated in some action taken after the book was published’ (Carter); it is not used in the sense of a single issue of a periodical; for that, ‘number’ is used.” After looking myself at the three volumes in the Spencer Research Library, I have added a few editorial insertions in square brackets, as well as an endnote on the ECCO copy. Sandy Mason’s proofreading alterations have been silently inserted. I thank Elspeth Healey, Special Collections Librarian at the Spencer, for correcting errors in my typescript. The article follows.

The Anti-Jacobin is a late 18th-century journal--politically conservative, stylistically satirical--which ran for 36 numbers, appearing every Monday during the Parliamentary session of 1797-98 (with an occasional Thursday number to accommodate “communications . . . of peculiar importance at this time”). It was founded by George Canning, edited by William Gifford, and had contributions by, among others, William Pitt, the Prime Minister. Its fame nowadays rests chiefly on its poetry.

The recent appearance in a bookseller’s catalogue of a “complete set of the original numbers” started us off on the road to an interesting discovery. The initial check of our card catalogue revealed that the Spencer Library already had one complete set as well as another partial set, both of which were accompanied by prospectuses, as was the copy being offered for sale. That should have been the end of the story, for, if we already had one, we didn’t need another, and certainly not if we already had one and nine tenths! Our complete set had been first catalogued into the general library system in 1962 (a time when 18th-century materials were still intellectually somewhat undervalued; it was transferred to Special Collections in 1966, where it was given the call mark E808); the partial set was acquired as part of the Bond Collection and, since it was reckoned to be a duplicate, was left uncatalogued. The matter having been called to our attention by this new offer, we decided the time was right to make the first in a series of examinations that we always made before declaring a book “duplicate.” So, with the volumes off the shelves and, for the first time, side by side, they were visually scanned. Both sets certainly looked to be “originals” since each number bore a 7 halfpenny tax stamp—but wait! they were textually different.

It is not unheard of--it may not even be uncommon--for issues of a periodical to be reprinted for immediate sale. One example which comes to mind is that of the first issue of The Proceedings of the Army under the Command of Sir Thomas Fairfax, a weekly Parliamentary newsbook of 1645, which came out on July 9 and was quickly reissued on July 11, presumably in response to greater-than-anticipated sales (Spencer Library call marks Bond B443 July 9; Bond B444 July 11). It is very common for periodicals to be reissued in collected editions (sometimes textually altered) shortly after their demise or, even, in the case of successful and relatively long-lived ones, while new single numbers continued to be produced. Indeed, the former happened with The Anti-Jacobin and the Spencer Library has a copy of the collected “4th edition,” 1799. What seems most unusual about these two quite different sets of “original numbers” is that, although they were not immediately reissued (more anon), the printer used paper bearing a tax
stamp, naturally enough for the first issue but why not the second issue? The tax, as has been noted, was seven halfpence; the price of each number of the paper was only six pence; one would think that such an (up-front and out-of-pocket) expense would be a sufficient incentive not to use stamped paper unnecessarily.

As soon as the differences between our complete and partial sets were observed, we asked the bookseller to send his copy to us on approval. There was a slight hope that it would vary from both of our existing copies, but in that we were disappointed because it turned out to be the same as our partial set. Of course, a later, more thorough comparison may reveal differences as yet unnoticed. Since our partial set was missing two of the key numbers 1-12 (see below), we decided to buy the one offered; the Spencer now has a complete set of the first issues (Bond E56 [acquired c. 1996]), a partial set of the first issues (Bond E53, acquired as part of the Bond Collection [lacking nos. 10-11, 25, and 33]), and a complete set of the second issues (E808, acquired in 1962).

Although no attempt has been made to identify all the differences in these three sets, enough have been discovered to make easy the task of distinguishing the first from the second issues. (Our assumption at this point is that the two identifiably different issues of the same journal numbers have at least some distinct type-settings [those very largely reset might be called “identifiable editions”]. But, just as last week we thought them to be “duplicates,” so next week it might be discovered that there are other variants that we have not noticed.) In E808 the first 12 numbers have completely different type-settings from Bond E56/Bond E53, and nearly all have substantial differences in the arrangement of the text. [Nos. 11-12 have the same arrangement of articles, and involve straightforward resetting. Most pages of no. 12 are reprinted line for line, but pp. 89 and 91 end with different words.] The remaining numbers (nos. 13-36) are probably—on the basis of very cursory comparison—of the same settings.

We have examined nos. 1-6 somewhat more closely than the rest, and the observed differences have been charted. From no. 1 to no. 12 there seems to be a gradual diminution of the extent of the changes, to the point that, although no. 12 is clearly a resetting, the arrangement of the various cross-headed sections [those with titles] does not vary between E808 and Bond 56/Bond 53. [In the early numbers one is struck by the movement of articles wholesale, without much evident revision and certainly often with none but alterations in the articles’ titles, to different pages of the four-leaf numbers.]

Evidence points to Bond E56’s being composed of earlier issues than E808 and that its nos. 1-12 are, in fact, the first issue of the “original numbers.” Textually, the issues in E808 are much closer to those in the octavo reprint ‘4th edition” (also published by J. Wright, the publisher of the originals) than are those in Bond E56. The judgment on the primacy of Bond E56 is based in part on this similarity of E808 to the reprint edition and on some small textual differences, but chiefly on the fact that, in Bond E56, errors in previous numbers, announced in errata notes, have been corrected and the errata statements dropped in E808. For example, in no. 6 of Bond E56 the final text above the imprint is “Erratum in no. V. . . .” in no. 5 of Bond E56, the incorrect word appears, but in no. 5 of E808 the correct word appears, while no. 6 of E808 has no erratum note [i.e., at p. 40, column A, l. 7, E56 has “involuntary processes”; E808 has “revolutionary
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processes”]. This strongly argues that the “2nd issue” of no. 5 was distributed sometime after the “1st issue” of no. 5. In another example, the final paragraph in no. 4 of Bond E56 [p. 32] corrects a statement made in no. 2 on how long Lord Camden has been in office (Bond E56 and BL on ECCO, p. 32, column B, indicate that he was in his third, not fourth, year of office); in no. 2 of E808 the text has been altered to reflect that change and in no. 4 of E808 the correcting paragraph has disappeared [pp. 11 and 32 respectively]. Since issue no. 2 came out on 27 November and no. 4 on 4 December, at least a week must have intervened between the first and second issues of no. 2. [i.e. the corrected text in E808’s no. 2 must have been printed after 4 Dec.].

The final section in nos. 1-3 of Bond E56/Bond E53 is headed “Course of the Exchange”; that section, probably because of the necessity of such information being timely, is quietly dropped out of those numbers in E808. This is the only “newspaper-like” section in The Anti-Jacobin, the only one where currency matters; it disappears entirely after no. 3.

As mentioned earlier, each set also has a prospectus bound in ahead of no. 1; in E808 and Bond E56, they are of different settings of type. The implication is strong that “complete sets with prospectus” were prepared for sale as bound sets, possibly even after the final number was published on the 9th of July, 1798. One of these might account for the missing “2nd” and “3rd” reprint editions (neither of which are recorded in ESTC or pre-1956 NUC—only the 4th edition is recorded. [Although the ESTC records various selections of poetry later reissued, the only editions of The Anti-Jacobin now listed are the first numbers, P2134, and the collected reprint in 2 vols. 8vo, 1799, T135264.]

The complete extent of the differences between the first and second issues and whether they are of great or minor significance await the patient and perceptive eyes of someone keenly interested in The Anti-Jacobin or, possibly, someone interested in the nature of periodical publication. The librarian’s job of calling attention to the differences was accomplished when the volumes were catalogued and their differences mentioned in the records input to the international bibliographical database, OCLC. They seem to be such a considerable curiosity, however, that they are best advertised by this note, in hope that someone will take up the challenge and carry the discovery on to the “next level.”

William Mitchell
Lawrence, Kansas

Editor’s note: The copy at the British Library digitized on ECCO (unidentified by ECCO—it is one of three copies at the BL) has a different mixture of issues than occurs in the Kansas copies. It may, of course, involve some different type-settings than in the first and second issues at Kansas. But, to judge from Mitchell’s identified variants and others I noted at Kansas, the BL copy has the second issues of nos. 1-3 (that without exchange information at the end of the issues). In no. 1, whereas from column B of p. 2 to column B of p. 3, the first issue (Bond E56/Bond E53) has “On the Origin and Progress of the French Revolution,” the second issue (E808 and ECCO) has on p. 2B the article “Finance,” which finishes on p. 3A and is followed atop 3B by
“Misrepresentation” (the first issue treats “Finance” beginning in column B of p. 3). Similarly in issue no. 2, though both start with the same article, the first issue (Bond E56/Bond E53) proceeds at the bottom of p. 9A (its first page) to “Lies of the Week” and then to “Misrepresentations”; the second issue (E808 and ECCO) takes up “Finance” at the bottom of 9A, only later taking up “Lies.” Although the ECCO copy has what appears to be the same second settings as Nos. 1-3 of Kansas’s E808, on p. 40 at the end of issue no. 5, it has the uncorrected reading “involuntary processes” that characterizes the first setting. Apparently the ECCO copy has the first setting of no. 4, for it does have a correction on p. 32 regarding Camden’s tenure (“His Lordship was in fact appointed in March 1795; and this is consequently the third year . . .” ECCO copy, #3, p. 32.B up 7 and 6 lines). Similarly the ECCO copy has the first-setting reading “Erratum in no. V” on p. 48 in no. 6, and it has features distinguishing the earlier setting of No. 10 at KU: as in Bond E56, p. 77’s first column starts with “France”; whereas the later issue, E808, there begins the “Poetry” section. The Prospectus to The Anti-Jacobin, published prior to the first issue but bound regularly with the original numbers (as in the KU copies) is also available on ECCO, but it is from a different set, being owned by the Bodleian Library. This ECCO copy ends column B of p. 1 with “principle, or established practice,” which is the reading there in KU’s Bond E56 and Bond E53 (the column ends differently in the type-setting bound in E808). One final note about the ESTC entry for The Anti-Jacobin: ESTC P2134 says nothing of multiple settings for any issue, and it identifies the original numbers as being in quarto format. Bill Mitchell and the Kansas cataloguers describe their copies as folios, and, indeed, they seem so, measuring 31-32 cms. The first 14 numbers of Bond E56 and E808 are usually printed on sheets without watermarks and with vertical chain-lines (typically 28 mm. apart). One exception noticed is No. 11 of E808, which has horizontal chain-lines but has the same “1797” watermark also found in no. 10 with vertical chain-lines (as usual). ESTC indicates the original numbers are reproduced on the HathiTrust Digital Library in two volumes, but these are the Indiana University copies of the fourth-edition octavo reprint (1799), wrongly dated 1797-98.


Poetic Sisters is a wonderfully accurate and clear map of the terrain of women’s poetry in early eighteenth-century England. In separate chapters on Anne Finch, Countess of Winchilsea; Elizabeth Rowe; Frances Thynne Seymour, Countess of Hertford; Sarah Dixon; and Mary Jones. Deborah Kennedy discovers and charts rich areas of literary history. And, throughout, she colors in their various genres, such as, the pastoral, the epistle, the fable, the light satire, the occasional poem, the encomium, the country house poem, the progress poem, the landscape poem, the night piece, the graveyard poem, in which these five—until
now—largely inaccessible poets worked. Seldom did these women attempt poems on the affairs of state or on larger public concerns; nor do they write lampoons, travesties, formal satires, and mock epics. In such matters and modes Dryden, Swift, and Pope are the mountains. Nor are the Poetic Sisters edgy and stormy and sublime like their great male counterparts. But their poems, the meadows and gardens on the map, are mainly of quiet moments alone, or exchanges, often very humorous, among friends and relations that finally complete the landscape of Augustan literary history and foreshadow Romanticism’s private reflections and rural leanings so well that we should never again misname the earlier period “The Age of Satire.”

While these five poets did not constitute a salon in a drawing room or a club in a coffee house, for Winchilsea, Rowe, and Hertford, their verse-centric world was the country house. The estates of Eastwell, Richings, and Longleat with their surrounding fields and gardens prompted a rural poetry sharply distinct from the urban subjects of most contemporary poets. Their studies granted the context for private reflection and the exchanges of letters among themselves and many others. For Dixon the shire of Kent with its libraries and ruined abbeys nurtured a meditative sense of history and a tendency toward graveyard poetry, while its popular recreations led to poems critical and didactic. The most humorous of the five, the City of Oxford’s Mary Jones, with people all about, writes some poems about crowds and shopping. Yet by an inverse calculus, she is also a private poet, far from the madding crowd, who writes as a religious moralist.

Professor Kennedy’s book is classic literary criticism, one might almost say “Johnsonian” in that word’s very best senses. As in Dr. Johnson’s Lives of the Poets, every chapter is biographical, ethical, and critical. Every one reveals the life, religion, and political leanings of the poet. For example, allegiance to the Stuarts and subsequent shunning by William and Mary cast Winchilsea out of London; the dissenting religion of Rowe springs forth in her biblical verse; and Dixon’s High Church and royalist leanings leave their imprint on her poems. Like Johnson also, Kennedy sketches the poets’ ethos or character that derives from their loves, losses, and allegiances. And like Johnson at his comparative best, Kennedy lets the Sisters’ poems stand in relief to similar poems by others. In the background are, inter alia, Katherine Phillips, Jane Colman Turell, Lady Anne Irwin, Jane Brereton, Anne Steele, Thomas Parnell, and Pope. This referential practice grants sharper definition to the poems of the Poetic Sisters and argues a commonality of thematic interests. At times Kennedy brings other poets directly forward with their work for a contrast with one of the Sisters. For example, in the chapter on Sarah Dixon, Prior’s “Phyllis’s Age,” Parnell’s “An Elegy to Old Beauty,” Pope’s “The Rape of the Lock,” and Leapor’s “Dorinda at her Glass” stand against Dixon’s “The Looking-Glass.” All invite smiles about women’s vanity, a common subject of poets, peasants, and philosophers. But mostly, like Johnson, here and always, Kennedy’s analysis is a gem of criticism, clear, crisp, and cogent. Never must the reader move through fogs and thickets of theory to find value and beauty in the poems. For example, we get a close reading of Dixon’s poem that finds a formal balance between mild satire and sympathy for an aging beauty, which is absent in the other poems. One wishes only to have here and throughout the book a firmer assessment of metrics, especially the effect
of the frequent tetrameter lines whose rush speeds the reader to a comic effect, probably unintended in many instances. In “The Looking-Glass,” however, one might note that Dixon’s alternate quatrains convey the hesitation at the prospect of a dowager’s growing old while the speed of the iambic tetrameter verses parallels the sad rapidity of aging. It is sound echoing sense just as Pope would have it.

In their own time and later the Poetic Sisters were praised by major virile voices. Finch was admired by Wordsworth, Rowe by Watts and Thomson, Hertford by Watts, Walpole, Duck, and Thomas Percy, Dixon by Prior and Pope, and Mary Jones by Thomas Warton and Dr. Johnson. The larger reading public enjoyed the Sisters’ work as well. Sarah Dixon’s reputation, for example, attracted four hundred and eighty subscribers for her book, and the promise of Mary Jones’s collection won a remarkable two thousand subscribers, one of whom was Pope—no small accomplishments when the standard subscription list of the time numbered about two hundred. This praise and popularity in their own time starkly contrasts with the little attention these poets get now. Modern single editions of their work are ghosts. They might be admitted to a typical anthology of eighteenth-century literature only by the trade entrance of a short selection. Only Roger Lonsdale’s 1989 Eighteenth-Century Women Poets: An Oxford Anthology, organized by poets, and the magnificent collection of Paula Backscheider and Catherine Ingrassia, British Women Poets of the Long Eighteenth Century: An Anthology, organized by genres and subjects, redress the absence of women’s poetry. Kennedy’s book is a testament to uncommon research and scholarship in discovering letters and searching manuscripts. And the book is a gift of accessibility to readers in its reprinting the full text of many of her poets’ poems. Poetic Sisters is a major contribution to our understanding of early eighteenth-century English poetry, so it therefore should have a place in every university’s library to serve both scholar and student long and well.

H. George Hahn
Towson University


Among the pleasures of being a plenary speaker are the interstices: those vacant hours when one is not obligated to sit through every talk in every session. The plenary visitor attends sessions other than his own, but is forgiven for sauntering out for a cappuccino or sherry before slipping back in. I did just that at last October’s 2012 very welcoming EC/ASECS conference held at the downtown Hyatt Regency in Baltimore, made particularly commodious for the visitor by having the book displays on tables outside the conference rooms.

My hands caressed many book spines but only one caused me to pause. Its title appeared in large upper-case letters—HEY PRESTO!—its subtitle much smaller in lower cases—Swift and the Quacks—and the jacket’s colored
illustration of a quack selling medicines further arrested me by virtue of the three commedia dell’arte actors wearing masks, while the vendor and another person do not. I had puzzled over this luscious mid-eighteenth century oil painting in the Wellcome Collection in London, while searching for English equivalents when illustrating my biography of Sir John Hill (who is mentioned several times by Ormsby-Lennon), and wondered if its unknown painter would ever be identified. The Wellcome Catalogue suggests the School of Venetian Domenico Maggiotto or a follower of Pietro Longhi. The basket full of medicine bottles suspended around the vendor’s neck provides dramatic thrust to the image. Remembering my earlier quandaries about its provenance at the Wellcome I decided this would be the book to take to the nearest lobby arm-chair, coffee in hand, until my next session started.

I recalled that “Presto” sans the “Hey” was the name by which Swift passed in intimate correspondence with Stella, even if first assigned to him by the Italian-born Countess of Shrewsbury, who could not pronounce the English word “swift”. Stella liked the gesture and the name stuck in most posthumously published editions of Swift’s letters to her. Hey Presto! (with the exclamation) seemed a propitious title for a hefty monograph of more than four-hundred pages about “Swift and the quacks.”

It soon became clear this was a book about Swift’s Tub rather more than a social anthropology of charlatanry, or—in its shoddier representatives—“projectors” in the Enlightenment. I was well aware how neglected the broad tradition of charlatanry was, so much of it difficult to document. As I delved deeper, I recognized this book as an extended discussion of the rhetorical traditions, especially in religion and lay medicine, available to Swift’s milieu; diverse idioms, more oral than written, sweeping up into the massive transepts of Swift’s life and works. I wondered how the author would frame the m.

Attacks on Christianity (religion and learning) and exposés of charlatanry (not legitimated by state institutions rather than inherently fake or fraudulent) naturally shared common ground. Both attacks could converge along bromidic lines: that much Christianity circa 1700 was itself a version of charlatanry, the stance a fierce satirist like Swift might endorse. I would see for myself on the plane back home; so I secured a copy and disappeared into my session.

When I did, it grew plain that Ormsby-Lennon was not on a quest for proof that the biographical Swift developed the idea of the Tub from watching processions of mountebanks. Passages like this one therefore leapt out:

… bits and pieces of Swift’s later writing will not necessarily clinch authorial intention in the Tub because Swift outdoes Michel Foucault in his hocus-pocus with the author function. From the first, the Tubman was seen as an enigmatic quack or ecclesiastical Jack Pudding, and the Tub constitutes the finest tabarinade—blending mountebank’s harangue and Jack Pudding gabble—in literary history (p. 49)

Tabarinade is old Romance for gross farce and a word Swift was not likely to have known; in Spanish a synonym of bufonada, a carnival show of fools and clowns, tied-up grotesque animals and larger-than-life itinerants entertaining the
masses, often in *commedia-dell’arte* or during periods of religious observance. To present the *Tub* as “the finest *tabarinade* in literary history” not only gives a new spin to Swift but shows the angle from which the author is coming.

Diverse types of charlatans and their panaceas, more notorious than famous—Joseph Haines, having fled Drury Lane to moonlight in Hertfordshire, John Newman, William Read (the illiterate tailor from Aberdeen later knighted by Queen Anne), Joseph Sabbarton, John Salter, Salvator Winter, foreigners as well—appear but are not presented in any logical, historical or systematic way. The reader sifts, extrapolates, and makes connections, for this species of writing is, to its credit, itself a kind of *tabarinade* outstripping linear didactic analysis and straightforward presentation. Its prose form enhances verbal initiation into the charlatan’s world by generating hypnotic prose containing its own vocabulary, cadences, and syntax. The material embraces words we have lost, as pronouncedly as lost worlds—the foreign country of “circumforaneous charlataney”—and the reader works hard, often too hard, to disentangle the various strands, as in this chapter-opener: “Throughout the long eighteenth century, Europe reverberated to sounds of the medicine show, as circumforaneous entertainers pitched their stages wherever they could rustle up a mob” (p. 50).

These vendors wandered from market to market. The *c*-word almost dropped out of English by the time Dickens wrote but was commonly used in Swift’s era. Addison applied it to itinerant Wits in *Spectator* 47: “I mean those circumforaneous Wits, whom every Nation calls by the Name of that Dish of Meat which it loves best ... in Italy, Maccaronies; and in Great Britain, Jack Puddings.” Ormsby-Lennon routinely invokes it, and before one is halfway through *Hey Presto!* similarly obsolete words have also been excavated in acts of verbal bravura making plain that this scholar seeks to recreate the realms of mountebankery rhetorically. Nouns now lost to time describe quacks (the tribe of “cantabanks” who assisted mountebanks, as well as the “zanies” who imitated their masters); verbs adorn their quackish actions (as in the more puzzling act of “gurning”). All sorts of “vermiculants” (forerunners of “formiculant” pulses that creep slowly like ants) appear, as do “vermifuges” or “anthelmintics” (the class of medicines removing worms from the intestines). The book is primarily about the *Tub*, but quacks and their world also occupy center stage in this study of two parallel universes.

Rhetorical vivacity must not imply a lack of research: quite the contrary, survey the historiography of charlatanry in our generation and you discover no other monograph delving so deeply into two primary sources: first the risible Leipzig professor H. L. Mencken’s *De Charlataneria Eruditorum* (1715), a satire on charlatans published after the *Tub* and, secondly, Sir Hans Sloane’s collection of some five-hundred broadsides of quack advertisements. The two repositories are very different, Mencken’s amounting to satiric exposé composed in Latin, while Sloane’s is an archive assembled over many decades for reasons still unexplained. By combining these sources and teasing out their overlaps, Ormsby-Lennon provides a new context for his *ne plus ultra* “Tubbian” text.

*Hey Presto!* presents the type of “history” Swift himself preferred, the charged rhetorical version that regularly issued from his own gene of satire. It is less clear whether a primarily verbal analysis of charlataney can resuscitate a *Tub*
no longer widely read except in colleges, not even by devotees who not long ago worshipped in the writerly Swiftian Temple. Just as the decline of prose satire has been a fact of literary history, so too the demise of the rhetorical way of life, or at least the recognition of what that modus vivendi is. Contemporary society is chary of bombast that seems to admire itself over substance and thought, even if the rhetorical habit remains omnipresent in politics, religion, learning—all the realms whose follies Swift exposed.

Above all Hey Presto! identifies a new context for the Tub. New context is what Marjorie Hope Nicolson provided for Gulliver’s Travels in the 1920s by tapping into the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, what her student Miriam Starkman accomplished for the Tub in the 1940s by seeking out corruptions in learning, and what American literary critics achieved after World War II when reconstructing Swift’s various rhetorical heritages. Since then it has become more difficult to establish new contexts; instead the wheel continues to be reinvented. New contexts come in diverse forms and shapes, but a genuinely new context for a single work sheds light on its conception, execution, and reception. A new context for an entire society, or set of cultural practices, is a grander enterprise that transforms understanding of its sociopolitical arrangements and cultural institutions, as well as significantly exceeds that for a single work.

New contexts, especially for canonical works and epochs already mined to the breaking point (Renaissance, Restoration, Enlightenment, Romantics), have proved increasingly difficult to discover. A context grounded in early modern charlatanry presents immense hurdles because its traces are in small part verbal; much more lodges in its performative, sensuous, theatrical and visual heritages. Recent historians have written books about the circumforaneous charlatans who populated early modern Dublin, London, Paris and most other European cities (Roy Porter and David Gentilcore are two among several), but the relevance of mountebanks for Swift’s inimitable Tub eluded them. I am not surprised that a very broadly conceived medicine provided the clue. As long ago as 1981 I predicted medicine would reveal new contexts for literary history (“Literature and Medicine: the State of the Field,” Isis 72: 1981: 406-24). The last generation, and now Ormsby-Lennon too, have confirmed it.

Hey Presto! sweeps many currents pertaining to “Swift and the quacks” into its discursive streams, while also representing a life’s work immersed in a single male author’s (Swift’s) canonical text. Time will tell what caché Swiftians award the place of these charlatans—some of them projectors—in its making. The further fact that Swift’s text no longer speaks to our generation as it did to Swift’s, or even to educated readers two or three decades ago, counts neither for nor against Ormsby-Lennon’s approach. This is not a book to be read quickly or easily digested: you dip into its parallel universes of charlatans and Tub, you leave it on your shelf, periodically return, dip again, and form an opinion of its value years later.

This review embodies my first encounter with this admirable study. But do not hold me to these views a decade from now, nor will I you.

George Rousseau
Oxford University

The period from the Restoration to the death of Alexander Pope in 1744 has often been considered the “Great Age of Satire,” and with good reason. The period gave rise to such acclaimed and well-studied works as *Absalom and Achitophel*, *Gulliver’s Travels*, *The Beggar’s Opera*, and the several versions of the *Dunciad*. From these works, and from a few other masterpieces, modern scholars have created their conceptions of late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century satire. Ashley Marshall’s *The Practice of Satire in England, 1658–1770*, however, argues that we have not built our understanding of this period’s satire upon solid foundations. Instead of basing our accounts of satire on a few well-known works, we ought to look at the practice of satire more broadly, taking into account the thousands of satires written in this period that have not become as famous as the classics of Dryden or Swift—works with such unfamiliar names as *A Loyal Satyr against Whiggism* (1682) and *The Signal: or, a Satyr against Modesty* (1727).

This is a bold claim, and Marshall employs a bold method to make her case. For this study, Marshall has read over three thousand works that are deemed to be satires either by their own authors, their original audience, or modern critics. Readers looking for detailed interpretations of a few important works may be put off by the number of texts this book discusses; the emphasis on drawing from a wide range of primary texts necessarily means that only rarely does any single satire receive more than a couple paragraphs of commentary. What the broad scope allows Marshall to accomplish, however, is to observe trends in satiric practice that would be invisible to the scholar focusing only on a handful of privileged texts. The result is a detailed history of how the practice of satire changes throughout the 113 years covered that challenges many long-standing critical assumptions.

The objective Marshall seems most keen to accomplish in this study is to debunk the assumption that satire in this period is uniform. Taking issue with critics who refer to “Augustan satire” or “eighteenth-century satire” as monolithic enterprises, she argues that satire during the reign of Charles II is very different from that practiced after the Glorious Revolution, which in turn differs from satire in later sub-periods. Even at any given time, many diverse kinds of satire are being written. A related point is that the types of satire written in any period are determined to a significant degree by external factors such as the conditions of publication and the state of politics at that time. For instance, Marshall suggests that the 1680s produce a great deal of vehement satire because of the various political crises of the decade; satire in the 1750s is much milder due in part to greater political and social stability.

The theme of satire’s diversity is taken up in the first chapter, which discusses theoretical and methodological concerns. Of note is Marshall’s refusal to define satire, a point that no doubt will cause definitional sticklers to bristle. She argues that any definition will either be too narrow to encompass the wide variety of the period’s satire—not all satires can be described as literary attacks,
for instance—or so broad as to be of no use whatsoever. Here she also demonstrates that satires differ in purpose, motive, degree of judgment, and intensity. A work like Smollett’s *Adventures of an Atom* is a vehement attack and differs greatly in purpose and intensity from Pope’s *Rape of the Lock*. The point made here seems obvious but has significant implications for the study of satire generally. Satire scholars tend not to discuss different sub-varieties of satire; when they do, the categories are often fairly broad and few in number, as is the case with the Juvenalian/Horatian dichotomy. But Marshall takes a taxonomic approach to satire, asking us to consider a number of different types and sub-types as a way of more accurately understanding what satirists of the period thought they were doing.

The second chapter is devoted to what eighteenth-century writers thought about satire. Here Marshall responds primarily to P. K. Elkin’s *The Augustan Defense of Satire* (1973). Whereas Elkin found commentary on satire to be divisible into two general camps, pro- and anti-satire, Marshall contends that the reality was not so neat. She finds little agreement even on the basic issue of what satire is: for some writers the term signifies a severe attack on vice, while for others the term indicates light and witty jesting. Nor is there any single sense of what purpose satire fulfills, what methods are most effective, or what the proper targets of satire are. The wide range of opinions Marshall pulls from congeries of contemporary sources convincingly shows that no dominant conception of satire exists over the course of the period she covers.

Having discussed writings about satire, Marshall devotes the remaining chapters to surveying actual satiric practice. She breaks her 1658–1770 timeframe into five sub-groups: the Carolean period, the post-Carolean period (up to the end of the seventeenth century), 1700–1725, 1726–1745, and 1745–1770. Each of these periods produces different kinds of satire due to conditions specific to that time. In her investigation of each span, Marshall identifies the various kinds of satire prevalent at the time, giving copious examples. For instance, in the 1700–1725 period she identifies the rise of both monitory satire, which aims to warn its audience of some potential danger, and ideological argumentation satire, which employ reflection and inquiry instead of humor or abuse to make their points. The latter type of satire is exemplified by such works as *Leviathan, or, a Hymn to Poor Brother Ben* (1710), Dunton’s *King-Abigail: or, the Secret Reign of the She-Favourite* (1715), *Rome, or Geneva: or, the True Church of England Without Either* (1717), and Defoe’s *Jure Divino* (1706). The taxonomic discussion of different types of satire in each chapter allows Marshall to arrive at a broad characterization of each period. The Carolean period, for instance, is notable for the fierceness and humorlessness of its satire, whereas 1745–1770 is a time of much milder and more consciously artistic satire.

Aside from describing the general features of each sub-period, Marshall also addresses a number of specific critical issues and debates throughout the book. The range of Dryden’s satiric output, Marshall claims, has not been properly appreciated: most critics base their conceptions of him off of *Mac Flecknoe* and *Absalom and Achitophel*, but in fact his satire becomes less combative and more glum later in his career. Defoe, primarily known to eighteenth-century scholars as the progenitor of the English novel, would have been regarded in the first quarter
of the eighteenth century as one of the most important satirists of his time. Pope and Swift, satirists often considered to share similar methods and objectives, are actually quite different in both their interests and their methods. Pope tends to comment on general social problems with a degree of detachment and an attention to poetic technique; Swift deals in specific political issues and writes with more rage. *Gulliver’s Travels*, one of the few works to which Marshall devotes several pages, is a satire with no deducible primary point, despite the efforts of many scholars to pin down Swift’s meaning in this work. Marshall offers radical claims which depart significantly from conventional wisdom, and should have important impacts on our understandings of major authors.

In general, Marshall succeeds in demonstrating the diversity and complexity of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century satiric practice. Her willingness to discuss obscure satires is crucial for this enterprise, as the impressive number of examples she uses to back up her claims leaves the reader with the sense that they are empirically true, not just one possible take on a situation open to interpretation. This is a fundamentally different take on satire from any other that I am aware of.

The book has the additional virtue of being well-written. Marshall’s prose is bouncy and lively throughout, and the reader is never troubled by obscure jargon or tortuous syntax. She avoids the mystery-novel approach that some writers favor, in which the important conclusions are opaque until the last few pages. Instead, Marshall straightforwardly states what she hopes to demonstrate at the outset of each chapter, which is a great help in tackling this long and somewhat daunting book. Though most of the works discussed likely have few readers today, her engaging and enthusiastic descriptions make them seem interesting and worthwhile. The book never reads like a tedious taxonomic exercise. Throughout, one feels that Marshall enjoys making this argument and revels in the materials she has read for this project.

The formidable conclusions that Marshall arrives at and the methodical way in which they are proven make *The Practice of Satire in England* a book that should be grappled with by any student of the long eighteenth century interested in satire. The rigorous examination of what satirists were doing in each period gives us new contexts with which to study well-known works and also invites scholars to write about some of the lesser known satires Marshall mentions. Those theorizing about satire, too, will find this book challenging and provocative. The idea that satire can encompass more than just attack—that it may be written to defend a cause, to provoke inquiry, to display technical skill, to educate an audience, or for some other purpose—demands that we reassess our theories of how satire operates and what methods satirists use to achieve their goals.

In a book with so many virtues, the reader does occasionally stumble upon a drawback. At points I found myself wishing that Marshall had explained some of the ways she had come to determine the satiric purpose or intensity of a given work. She often asserts confidently that X is a relatively heated satire compared to Y, and that it differs in purpose from Z. Though I am inclined to accept her characterizations, and I understand that including lengthier interpretations would render the book cumbersome and unwieldy, a few more detailed analyses might increase the skeptical reader’s confidence that her assessments are trustworthy. Some readers might also take issue with the fact that Marshall’s conclusions are
largely negative—after all, the most important conclusion of the book is that eighteenth-century satire is not a unified genre or concept. Marshall is aware of this concern and offers some positives to take away from her study in the epilogue, namely that satiric practice in this period is both diverse and changeable. This may not be enough, however, to placate grumpy readers whose apple carts have been overturned by her contentions.

Whether one welcomes Marshall’s ideas or finds them too negative, *The Practice of Satire in England* is an ambitious and important book that writers on satire will need to reckon with for years to come. Marshall has challenged both our notions of what “eighteenth-century satire” is like and our theoretical conceptions of satire in general. Her empirical method, too, may be appealing to other critics interested in writing literary history, as the approach of reading a massive quantity of texts allows her to reach startling and interesting conclusions. More engaging, well-written, and revolutionary studies of this nature would certainly be welcome.

Julian Fung
The Pennsylvania State University


Winner of the 2012 Walker Cowen Memorial Prize in Eighteenth-Century Studies, *Backstage in the Novel* offers a fascinating exploration of the relationship between the eighteenth-century British novel and the theater during the reign of George III. Using a combination of semiotic analysis, cultural studies, and narrative theory, Saggini aims to “examin[e] how the novel renders the dramatic text into narrative through what we might call a transmodal adaptation of seventeenth- and eighteen-century plays” (Saggini 3). She focuses specifically on Frances Burney, a British author and playwright who best exemplifies a “transitive us[age]” of texts—or a “creative consumption that Burney stages in her double, overlapping roles of reader-author and author-reader” (6). Through a close reading of *Evelina, Cecilia, The Witlings,* and *The Wanderer,* Saggini successfully reveals the theatricality inherent in Burney’s novels, as well as the overlap between novelistic content and Burney’s plays. Ultimately, *Backstage in the Novel* complements previous Burney scholarship by deconstructing the boundaries between the theater and the novel, authors and readers, and public and private forms of discourse.

Aided by the clear prose of translator Laura Kopp (a former research associate at the Burney Centre at McGill University), Saggini begins her study with an overview of Restoration and eighteenth-century drama. In this first chapter she explains how the late-seventeenth century stage anticipated the
emergent form of the novel. Adding to claims made by Laura Brown and other theater historians, Saggini traces the shift from comedies of manners and she-tragedies in the Restoration to bourgeois drama in the early to mid-eighteenth century, arguing that by the turn of the century the theater offered a “rejection of aristocratic ideals and the affirmation of domesticity, of the pathetic, and of the interiority of the individual, together with a new focus on personal experience, often conveyed by means of a love story” (46). Thus the eighteenth-century stage’s increasing focus on middle-class morality, sentimentality, and domesticity paved the way for the novel’s formal realism (26, 30), as Ian Watt has famously suggested. In this first chapter Saggini covers ground familiar to readers of theater scholarship and the history of the novel, though her overview of eighteenth-century theater would be helpful to undergraduate students. For readers familiar with the field, Saggini’s argument could benefit from more specific references to Burney’s oeuvre (as well as a questioning of Watt’s thesis, as scholars like Michael McKeon, John Richetti, and J. Paul Hunter have done). However, in her next chapter Saggini tackles the creative process of Evelina, and her argument becomes especially compelling and focused when applied to a specific Burney text.

Since Evelina is Burney’s most heavily analyzed work, one would think there’s comparatively little that’s new to say about it. Yet in her chapter titled “Transmodal Adaptations and Transtextuality in Evelina,” Saggini brilliantly exposes the theatricality of Burney’s narrative by dividing the novel topologically and chronologically into a series of “acts and entr’actes,” highlighting four main dramatic components inherent within the text: comedy of manners, sentimental comedy, domestic drama, and farce (66-67). Beyond the different “acts” of the novel, the novel also includes familiar staples of eighteenth-century theater: cits, rakes, fops, and members of the female bon ton. The theatrical architecture of Evelina thus evidences Burney’s appeal to different class and social positions of potential readers. And beyond this formal relation, or dramatization of narrative, readers who were theatergoers would have recognized Evelina’s intertextual relations—or, explicit references to eighteenth-century plays. For instance, when Evelina attends a performance of Congreve’s Love for Love, readers familiar with the play would interpret Burney’s protagonist as the figure of Mrs. Prue. Saggini’s careful analysis of Evelina shows how the audiences for the theater and the novel overlapped, leading to shared content within these forms.

Given the theatricality of Evelina, it seems unsurprising that Burney next turned directly to writing plays. In her third chapter Saggini demonstrates how Burney, encouraged by playwrights like Richard Brinsley Sheridan, incorporated many of the dramatic elements found in Evelina into her second major work—the unstaged play The Witlings. Both texts feature elements of social satire as well as sentimental drama. However, Saggini uses this chapter to focus more on the gender and sexual politics of female authorship, explaining why The Witlings was never performed in the London theaters. Besides the well-known factors—the play’s impact on Charles Burney’s career and potential affront to the female Bluestockings,—Saggini reminds us that comedies usually featured overt sexual content, something unthinkable for a respectable female playwright to include. Burney’s public identity as an author thus worked to her disadvantage here. While
in *Evelina* Burney was able to refer indirectly to her heroine’s fear of rape by Sir Clement Willoughby, this mention of female sexuality would be more overt in a staged play like *The Witlings*—a dangerous position now that Burney was publicly known as the author of *Evelina* and the daughter of the famous music historian Charles Burney. To reveal her knowledge of women’s sexual exploitation might compromise Burney’s own virtue as a female author, a predicament also discussed by Burney scholars like Margaret Doody and Patricia Meyer Spacks.

By focusing largely on the creative process behind *The Witlings*, Saggini leaves unexplored the politics of female spectatorship, as well as how Burney fits into a larger “structures of feeling” (to use Raymond Williams’s term) about male fear of women’s sexual knowledge. For instance, in his famous *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* (1698), Jeremy Collier had condemned female theatergoers for understanding—and potentially enjoying—sexually charged dialogue in Restoration comedies. This predicament clearly still existed by the writing of *Evelina*, as seen when Burney’s heroine is literally silenced by a performance of William Congreve’s *Love for Love* because of the ribald material. In this chapter Saggini also discusses female education within the context of the female “witlings” of the play’s title, which could be a way to transition into the representation and consumption of female sexuality in the eighteenth-century theater. Where Saggini does largely succeed is in explaining why Samuel Crisp and Charles Burney suppressed *The Witlings* given a) Burney’s financial and emotional reliance on these male guardians, and b) her status as a young, unmarried, and upper-middle class author. Her analysis of Burney’s creative strategy provides a solid foundation for her analysis of Burney’s second novel, *Cecilia*, in her fourth chapter.

By analyzing how Burney’s father figures repressed her attempts at stage production, Saggini convincingly shows how Burney channeled dramatic content into her second novel. As with many of Burney’s texts, *Cecilia* explores the conflict between honor and love, or what Saggini sees as the basis of Restoration tragedy (167). Burney also reimagines the late-seventeenth century comedy of manners by complicating the gendered country-city binary. For instance, Cecilia Beverley does not embody the rural naiveté of Burney’s earlier heroine, Evelina Anville (139). Yet the most important theatrical function of Burney’s second novel is not necessarily its adaptation of dramatic content, but instead its focus on social spectacle. As Saggini writes, “theatrical events [in *Cecilia*] are not significant in themselves but only insofar as they provide a setting for the spectacularization of society … the lack of boundaries between stage and audience is closely linked to the novel’s focus on acting as deception, artifice, and disguise” (143-144). For instance, when Cecilia Beverley attends an opera and a masquerade ball, she is unwittingly transformed into a spectacle herself (at the latter, she is paradoxically objectified by refusing to wear a costume). Or, to take another example, upon Cecilia’s arrival at the Harrel residence in Portman-Square, she finds a crowd of spectators who critically appraise her dress and face—much like a playhouse audience might. Burney thus shows how the spectacularized social world of *Cecilia* is inherently theatrical, and how women are made especially vulnerable within these spectacularized urban spaces.
Saggini’s most notable example of this “spectacularization” within Burney’s text is in Cecilia’s descent into madness at the end of the novel. Using Plato’s notions of diagesis (narration) and mimesis (representation), Saggini argues that Cecilia’s “presence makes the transition from the diagesis of a novel to the mimesis of drama far more complex … Instead of giving their thoughts or feelings, the narrator can give only external descriptions and so must translate emotions into mimic signs and virtual stage directions” (155). Cecilia’s wild hair and frenetic movements through the London crowds parallels stagings of madness in Restoration “she-tragedies,” and references to plays by Otway and Southerne pervade the novel, suggesting that Burney’s staging of madness and appeal to Restoration tragedy was a way for her to increase the “cultural capital” of Cecilia and the novel as a genre—perhaps in a way that a staged production of The Witlings could not.

In her fifth and final chapter Saggini further develops her analysis of madness in Burney’s “macrotext” by exploring how Cecilia and The Wanderer frame madness as a spectacular event. For instance, The Wanderer’s Elinor Joddrel stages multiple “spectacularized” suicide attempts, echoing Mr. Harrel’s suicide in Cecilia at the playhouse. Saggini’s careful analysis of these texts supports her claim that madness functions more as a theatrical episode than a narrated action (192). Burney’s own observation of the “madness” of King George III (during her stint as Keeper of the Robes to Queen Charlotte from 1786 to 1791) likely informed her representation of madness and hysteria. However, it is unclear why Saggini does not incorporate Burney’s third novel, Camilla, into this argument—especially because madness in the novel is profoundly theatrical. For instance, when Camilla Tyrold and Mrs. Mittin go window-shopping in Southampton, a group of male spectators place bets on whether the two women are shoplifters or insane. At another point in the novel, Camilla and her father witness a young woman in a fit of madness near their country house in Hampshire; the young woman’s behavior unfolds almost as a staged scene, with Mr. Tyrold’s commentary serving as a form of social and moral commentary. Incorporating Camilla in her analysis would allow Saggini to argue that Burney’s deployment of passive, or contained madness serves as a departure from the active, vindictive madness of Restoration tragedies.

Ultimately, Backstage in the Novel has the potential to change how we think about cultural production and female authorship in the late-eighteenth century. By showing how Burney’s connection to the theater impacted her novels, Saggini encourages us to embrace Burney’s unique melding of genre with narrative content. Saggini’s text offers a provocative and largely convincing analysis of Burney’s cultural legacy that can open new avenues for future Burney scholarship.

Kate C. Hamilton
Carnegie Mellon University
After reading Jack E. DeRochi and Daniel J. Ennis’ collection on Richard Brinsley Sheridan, one clearly sees that, almost two hundred years after being interred in Poet’s Corner, the poet, playwright, and politician still has the ability to transform himself and those around him. The theme of transformation runs throughout the twelve essays and lengthy introduction, informing every aspect of the collection from its inception and methodologies to its theories and execution. Sheridan’s own metamorphoses are most likely the cause of—or more accurately the culprit for—the collection’s subtle fascination with transformation. As the authors suggest, Sheridan is a mysterious figure, seemingly constructed from contemporary rumors, speculation, scandal, and interpretation, then reshaped according to the whims of modern biographers and critics.

Transformative figures in their own right, the editors effectively update the enigmatic impresario for a current-day scholarly audience. The strength of DeRochi and Ennis’ collection resides in the treatment of its principal subject as a dynamic and complex participant in the social, political, and artistic discourses of the eighteenth century. The introduction establishes the collection’s principal purpose: to “seize with enthusiasm” (4) the various methodologies that have transformed eighteenth-century criticism in the past twenty years, including cultural studies, literary theory, performance theory, and celebrity studies, suggesting that our field, like Sheridan, is truly protean.

Beginning with a critical account of the many biographical “lives” of Sheridan and ending with the theatrical politics of Sheridan iconography, the inclusion and organization of the twelve essays reflects trends in recent critical discourse. The emphasis on updating Sheridan criticism is of particular concern, and DeRochi and Ennis take great pains to situation their collection in discussion with the excellent work by James Morewood and David Crane, editors of Sheridan Studies (1995). Sheridan Studies was the first, and until now the only, book-length collection devoted to Sheridan criticism. Since its publication, individual efforts have attempted to dust off the eighteenth-century poet, playwright, manager, and politician using the same and similar methodologies as this collection. DeRochi and Ennis bring together discrete critical voices, creating a holistic portrait of Sheridan as poet, playwright, critic, orator, and polemicist. In its desire to bring Sheridan into the twenty-first century, the collection imitates its principal subject, whose ability to transform himself with the changing times is dramatically and decisively detailed in these pages.

The collection fittingly opens with DeRochi’s “The Many Lives of Richard Brinsley Sheridan,” which traces the transformation of Sheridan from what DeRochi refers to as a “sentimental wit” to “arriviste” to “spectacular marvel” to “Irish romantic” and establishes the themes, questions, and conclusions of the entire collection. DeRochi begins—as do other essays in the collection—with Sheridan’s scandalous elopement with Elizabeth Linley, constituted as a specific
flashpoint in Sheridan’s popular reputation and shown to be a shared concern among Sheridan’s biographers. The essay then explores particular motives of individual Sheridan biographers and their treatments of the Linley elopement and other key benchmarks to suggest how “spectacular flashes of Sheridan’s life have no doubt encouraged the consistent biographical refashioning of his character” (37). DeRochi’s delivery is as lucid as it is interesting, and his ability to cover the breadth and depth of Sheridan biography and biographical criticism deserves applause.

In this same vein, Marianna D’Ezio’s “Sheridan and Women” offers a meta-textual reading of Sheridan’s complicated relationships with women and describes in fascinating detail the significance of contemporary theatrical culture and gender roles. The chapter takes on what D’Ezio calls Sheridan’s “often-misinterpreted connections with the professional women of his time, in order to assess his own personal and professional stance towards the female sex” (236). The chapter examines many relationships and considers powerful female figures such as Elizabeth Linley, Hannah Cowley, Elizabeth Inchbald, Elizabeth Griffin, Frances Burney, and of course, the coterie of the Devonshire House, including Georgiana. Using gender theory and biographical study to bolster her own close readings, D’Ezio provocatively counter-reads the critical narrative of Sheridan’s brutishness toward professional women, as put forth by theatre historians such as Ellen Donkin. That is not to say that D’Ezio provides an uncomplicated and unnecessarily positivist stance. She readily admits that while Sheridan goes through an evolutionary process in his conceptualizing of women, he never fully realizes it (237, 251).

The remaining essays advance and complicate the idea of transformation, using a variety of methodologies and texts. Many breathe new life into well-known Sheridan plays, especially David Haley’s laudable examination of the complexities of Sir Lucius O’Trigger, the “Stage Irishman,” in The Rivals; Mita Choudhury’s thorough investigation of success, spectatorship, and competition in The Duenna; Emily C. Friedman’s proactive reading of social education and School for Scandal’s influence and legacy; John Vance’s fascinating chapter on Victorian spectatorship and audiences for Sheridan revivals in the Age of Wilde and Shaw; Daniel J. Ennis’s careful analyses of satire, parody, and patriotism in Naumachia and The Critic; and Daniel O’Quinn’s stellar critique of Sheridan’s use of spectacle as political engine in Pizarro. Although Robert W. Jones’s chapter on Sheridan’s early poetry does not deal with the dramas per say, his reading of Sheridan’s poetry contributes to a larger argument concerning the interplay among these poems and Sheridan’s later dramatic pieces, especially The Rivals. Beyond the dramas, examinations of Sheridan’s transformative social roles, such as Steven Gores’s seminal study of Sheridan’s neglected relationship with the Lee theatrical family, Glynis Ridley’s thoughtful analysis of performance and theatricality in Sheridan’s political speeches, and David Francis Taylor’s riveting exploration of Sheridan’s complex relationship with contemporary caricaturists and the role of visual satire and politics, round out the collection.

Some essays, however, are transfixed, rather than transformed by, recent theoretical currents. At times, several authors choose theorization over explication. Readers otherwise interested in issues raised by the editors,
contributors, and the subject himself, might well experience frustration when faced with the task of deciphering, for example, how Sheridan “operates within the visual economy of caricature as a hieroglyph of the theatricality of politics in Georgian London” (260). However, I urge those readers to persevere, as all of the essays in this collection contribute to Sheridan criticism as well as to analogous discussions in performance theory, celebrity studies, eighteenth-century theatre and drama, and visual culture. To paraphrase the introduction’s playful ventriloquism of Sheridan’s Puff, I am in complete agreement that the collection is “astoundingly great.”

Melissa Wehler
Central Penn College


Jennifer Airey's study of plays that use rape as a trope for political and socio-political argument is an outstanding debut for this young scholar. Airey, a 2008 Ph.D from Boston University is an Assistant Professor of English at the University of Tulsa where she offers courses in Gothic Fiction, Early Modern Sexualities, Senior Seminar: Popular Culture, and special topics in her areas of specialization, early modern drama and theater history. *The Politics of Rape* as a work of scholarship is confidently written, closely argued, and tightly focused. Divided into five topical chapters, Airey blends political pamphlets, popular poetry, and performed stage plays to argue for the prevalence of female and male rapes as suggestive of multifaceted forms of political discourse. The stage provided performative realization and actualization of matters too volatile to be mentioned in court yet reflective of the ongoing rhetoric of political and social dissent that could be safely framed in and by the arts. The main themes of *The Politics of Rape*, cannibalism, debauchery, violence, and subversion, are largely depicted in plays referencing the Roman Catholic Church. The most sustained and longest dialogue within the material that Airey covers concerns anti-Catholic sentiments violently depicted on the pages of propaganda literature and on the stage in numerous plays from 1660 to 1699.

Airey chronologically analyzes a remarkable variety of plays, some by well known authors—Settle, Behn, Dryden, Shadwell—and others by lesser known figures, at least to a non-dramatic literature specialist, which makes the balancing of the five chapters fresh and interesting. Airey does not really unroll her thesis from the introduction. She presents it clearly as a framework and carefully returns to it with only slight expansions or modifications as the book progresses. This is a good strategy because these plays are not entirely familiar, certainly not overtly studied, and without a steady eye on the purpose of the literary analysis, it would be easy to become lost in the numerous characters and complexities of the many plots she surveys. She manages the depth of her reading by holding fast to the
focus of her study, enabled by her ability to leave each chapter with a short summary of what has just been presented. I would use this book in a Restoration drama survey course as a companion to the primary texts as each chapter, though linked, is complete in itself.

Chapter One examines three plays, Roger Boyle, the Earl of Orrery’s *The Generall*, Thomas Porter’s *The Villain*, and Edward Howard’s *The Usurper*. These plays introduce both the “debauched cavalier” and the “poisonous Catholic bride,” sources of equal anxiety in Restoration political propaganda, especially as concerned the influence of Queen Henrietta Maria, who was widely “feared by many and blamed by others for the destruction of the innocent martyr, Charles I” (56). The three plays from the 1640s employ rape and sexual violence to call up the reign of Cromwell, and force a separation of the Royalists from the monarchy (59). As is her want, Airey concentrates in subsequent chapters on two or three plays as focal points interspersed with shorter references to works with similar themes. Marvell plays a key role in the development of Chapter Two as preamble for an extended discussion of Dryden’s *Amboyna*, through which the playwright “traffic in atrocity to glorify the British monarchy” and substitutes the cavalier and the Catholic bride for the “demonic Dutchman,” who like the Catholic Church in Chapter Five has the power to rape the English nation, not a mere defenseless male or female. Airey provides an extended discussion of these nationalist rapists, before moving on to Elkanah Settle’s *Love and Revenge* and Thomas Shadwell’s *The Libertine*. These dramas illustrate what happens when those in authority, be they family or kings (metaphorical patriarchs) fail to control their families. Chapter Two ends with a penetrating discussion of Aphra Behn’s *The Rover* as the pivot point in politically themed drama as “the Cavaliers are simultaneously lionized and demonized . . . [as] a measured response to the figure of the libertine courtier” (100). Rightly, Airey notes Behn romanticizes the predator and thus takes the nature of such a character out of the political sphere, creating paradigms akin to attraction-repulsion or duty-disobedience. Chapter Three introduces the story of Lucretia first in the political tracts of Algernon Sidney and Sir Robert Filmer, through Shakespeare, and on to John Wilmot, the Earl of Rochester's *Tragedy of Valentinian* and Nathaniel Lee’s *Lucius Junius Brutus*, a play deemed so radical it was withdrawn from the stage in a matter of days (128). In these dramas, the image of the raped Lucretia involves tyranny, violence, and freedom. The rape of Lucretia focused attention on the family and forced the private acts of violence onto the public stage as analogs for the national family's conflicts. Chapter Four and Five shift the focus of pillage to cannibalism as the outcome of these self-inflicted and self-inflicted acts of disruptions and destruction. In what are the best two chapters of the book, Airey looks at how men were impacted as victims or how they victimized their own authority by willful self-destruction. The dramas that illustrate this are John Crowne’s *Thyestes. A Tragedy* and Edward Ravenscroft’s *Titus Andronicus*, which have open acts of cannibalism, not the Aristotelian spectacle approach, written into them. Similarly, Otway, in *Venice Preserv’d* uses rape as the pretext for wholesale rebellion and revisits the Lucretia trope in the assault by Renault on Belvidera, who was also symbolically raped by her corrupt father's behaviors towards her. These plays of the 1670s and 1680s demonstrate how engrained the corrupt family and particularly the corrupt father-
daughter relationship was in mirroring the ills of the nation. The plays of the
Glorious Revolution and its immediate aftermath are aligned with the topics and
styles of pre-1688 plays, but also have some departing characteristics as Airey
points out in the final chapter. If the fathers’ hands were forced into self-
destruction in the 1670s, in the 1680s and 1690s, they seem to have been bound
by forces beyond their control. In the propaganda literature the point of William's
coming to take the throne was to replace the Pope as the shadow king of England
as long as there were Catholic monarchs. To that end, Settle's plays of the 1690s,
especially his The Female Prelate were exorcisms through rape of the hold of
Catholicism on England. Throughout the five chapters, Airey quotes from primary
sources sufficiently to support her ideas, and she is very good about not weighing
the chapters down with summaries from secondary sources, even stating in the
discussion of The Rover, "I am not interested in re-covering such well-trod
ground here" regarding Behn's political views and their relationship to her
feminist themes (100).

Each chapter opens with a historical anecdote: an execution, the coming of
William and Mary, an abduction, to show that ravishing, violence, usurpation,
libertine noblemen, and, even cannibalism were very much preoccupations in the
later seventeenth century. These events would be thematized in various ways on
the stage, in ephemeral and belletristic verse, and in pamphlet literature. Part of
Airey's accomplishment here is to unpack the threads that created the dramatic
themes and to show us how they resonated with playwrights. That said, a couple
of small critiques. It would have been beneficial for her to expand on the specter
of Shakespeare and to address the argument that he was likely a Catholic. She also
fails to accommodate Dryden's tensions as he struggled with his faith, ultimately
becoming a Roman Catholic. This is known to figure in his dramas, and would
have been an important acknowledgment in Airey's robust notes. Further, it would
have been beneficial, if they exist in letters or diaries, to outline what the reaction
of playgoers or reviewers (often found in Introductions or Prefaces by competing
authors) were to the scenes of violence, and especially of cannibalism. The very
interesting chapter on cannibal fathers begged for allusion to King Lear's
metaphoric cannibalization of his daughters' hearts and their minds. Some drawing
out of the past and some pushing forward to show the extension of these images,
actions, and tropes would have lent more sustainability to Airey's argument. A
larger observation about the overall study is that it would have been enhanced by a
bit more contextualizing on the seventeenth-century Catholic Church in English
society. Largely, Airey takes the anti-Catholic propaganda of pamphlets and plays
uncritically and repeatedly uses quotations, such as those drawn from the Irish
Rebellion of the 1640s about female Catholics alleged atrocities, with insufficient
historical examination. Since we read in every chapter about rapes, babies
murdered in and out of the womb, and children being forced to kill their parents as
instances of Catholic cruelties inflicted on Protestants, a bit of historical or even
Catholic apologist perspectives would provide greater balance. However, we are
supposed to (and do) come away from this book with a greater appreciation and
understanding of "... the place of the subject in both the individual family and
the broader body politic, the negotiation of appropriate and inappropriate forms of
sexual expression, and the battle against any and all sources of perceived cultural
corruption, ranging from monarchical absolutism and court libertinism, to foreign mistresses and, of course, that perennial threat, the Catholic Church” (217). I hope Jennifer Airey will publish her talk at the 2012 EC/ASECS. As she noted, that presentation was an extension of what she did not have a chance to include on sexual tyranny and male victims within early eighteenth-century dramas.

Beverly Schneller
The University of Baltimore


In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, French authors shifted from focusing on patrons to trying to get readers to purchase their books. Many scholars, including Roger Chartier and Robert Darnton, have seen this move away from elite culture and towards a broader audience as crucial to the creation of the modern author. Geoffrey Turnovsky’s ambitious study, The Literary Market: Authorship and Modernity in the Old Regime, seeks to challenge this paradigm. Turnovsky argues that this shift was not as clear and abrupt as is often assumed, and that writers at the time did not see economic independence as key to their intellectual freedom. Instead, he suggests “that the integration and elevation of images of commercial literary activity within the self-presentational rhetoric of writers engaged in the decisive battles over legitimacy comprise an equally important development for the evolution of intellectual practices in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century France” (5). Modern authorship, in Turnovsky’s view, depends on how authors presented themselves and their literary endeavors, not on their actual economic circumstances or relations with the book trade. Thus, he sees the switch from patronage to commercialism as part of a search for legitimacy, not money. The strength of Turnovsky’s study is its skepticism of longstanding views of eighteenth-century authorship.

The Literary Market is divided in two parts: part one, on “Writing, Publishing, and Literary Identity in the Prehistory of Droit d’Auteur,” focuses on the seventeenth century; and part two on “The Literary Market: The Making of a Modern Cultural Field” looks at authorship and the book trade in the eighteenth century. The first chapter considers Pierre Corneille and the “Querelle du Cid,” a pamphlet controversy on the nature and purpose of drama sparked by criticism of Corneille’s 1637 Le Cid. As part of this, Corneille was accused of caring only about the money his play earned and not about crafting good drama. Turnovsky reexamines the evidence of the quarrel to show that the issue at stake in these accusations was not Corneille’s interest in earning money, but his lack of appropriate humility (38). Viewed this way, “print becomes a powerful symbol for Corneille’s inattentiveness to the feelings and well-being of others, and thus of the playwright’s lack of sociability” (41). Corneille’s arrogance in print is problematic to his antagonists because he is not considering his readers. In
chapter two, perhaps the strongest and widest-reaching chapter of the book, Turnovsky argues that, although modern critics want to see the philosophes as independent from patronage, they were in fact constantly courting favor in order to raise their social status: “the philosophes never imagined themselves outside of their interactions with social and political elites” (69). He examines the censorship of Claude Helvétius’ De L’Esprit (1758) to argue that Helvétius was far less rebellious than later historians have seen him, and that in fact he “plays the role of a writer dutifully submitting” to official intervention (75). The philosophes invested heavily in their own social success, and, even if they claimed to be outside le monde, they sought the approval of elite people.

The second part of The Literary Market is devoted to the argument that, while the literary market was not necessarily an alternative to patronage, in the later eighteenth-century writers came to see it that way. Turnovsky makes a helpful distinction between “the literary market” as an imaginative construct and “the book trade” as the actual buying and selling of books. In chapter three, “Living by the Pen,” Turnovsky cites a variety of writers including Diderot and Voltaire to argue that a writer’s need for money was seen as hampering rather than freeing. Patronage, on the contrary, was seen as allowing writers to be “driven only by noble ideals” (123). Low income from writing was a sign of dedication to higher ideals. Turnovsky argues in chapter four that in the late eighteenth century the turn to publication “was a function of a redefinition of what a valorized intellectual identity was,” and that success “was no longer defined through the social integration of writers into elite social networks based on their ability to please” (149). He makes the excellent point that a shift occurs in that “the provenance of compensation” becomes less important in establishing an author’s status than the amount of money earned from the sale of works (156). In the final chapter, Turnovsky analyzes Rousseau as an example of this new kind of authorship in which publishers help grant legitimacy to authors.

The argument of The Literary Market makes an important contribution to our understanding of the author in France. Turnovsky’s persistent rethinking of received wisdom is welcome and refreshing. Regrettably, many parts of the book are extremely difficult to follow on account of the density of the prose. Particularly in the introductions to the whole book and to the two separate parts, there is a proliferation of long parenthetical comments, compound adjective phrases, and unnecessarily complex phrasing. Many ideas are condensed this way and deserve more unpacking. A single sentence from part one’s introduction contains such wordy phrases such as “modern authorship consists in . . . one unified motive according to which the expression of desire to be liberated from subordination to protectors becomes at the same time a demand to be compensated for literary labors,” and “the demand for compensation from a libraire, however it may be formulated and regardless of its positive or negative end result, instantly conveys a repudiation in the name of the writer’s dedication and authenticity of all the personal compromises required by participation in an overindulged hierarchical leisure society” (19). Even some shorter phrases can be mystifying. Comments such as that one of the crucial indicators of honnête publication is “the construal of autonomy as a function of legitimacy rather than legitimacy as a function of a specific ideal of autonomy” do little to illumine key concepts in the
argument (11). The analyses of texts and historical evidence in the individual chapters are more readable, and Turnovsky provides clear translations of French quotations and terms. The argument is compelling and original, but the prose in the introductions and framework of the book obscures the clarity of the ideas.

A reader of The Literary Market would also be well advised to read the endnotes carefully, as a number of them contain important discussions that add significantly to the main text. These are not always apparent from the placement of the note. For example, note 7 from the introduction contains the source for a Diderot quotation from the main text, but then adds the important clarification that “We shall see, of course, that authors were in fact deeply involved in the commercialization of their writings from these first years. What is transformed is the relationship between this involvement and their sense of themselves as intellectuals or authors, and thus the degree to which this involvement was incorporated into their self-images” (211). Without this explanation, the comment in the main text that “Diderot described the Renaissance book trade as an authorless industry” would seem to mean precisely the opposite from what Turnovsky is arguing (6). Similarly, the discursive footnote 17 from the part one introduction contains virtually the only discussion of gender, in which Turnovsky explains why he “will tend more often to use the masculine pronoun when referring abstractly to the writer, especially when working off the eighteenth-century texts” (214). This explanation is not only buried in an endnote, but the placement of the note is puzzling since the sentence where the note is found does not have a masculine pronoun (22-23). Much of the argumentation against particular critics or scholars is also relegated to the endnotes. Some of these arguments are interesting and carefully reasoned, and one wishes that they had been elevated to the main text.

These criticisms aside, The Literary Market is a helpful contribution to our understanding of authorship in a transformative period in French literary history. Turnovsky offers both broad concepts for rethinking authorship generally, and individual analyses of major figures like Corneille, Helvétius, Diderot, Voltaire, and Rousseau. On the whole, The Literary Market provides a framework for disentangling the complex relations between authors, readers, and publishers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and can help us to make sense of the sometimes contradictory information available.

Leah Orr  
Dickinson College


In Reading 1759, Shaun Regan and his contributors take on the ambitious task of illustrating the breadth and depth of both English and French literary cultures within a single year. One goal, as explained in Regan’s introduction, is to produce “a kind of Geertzian ‘thick description’ of the literary culture of 1759” as
well as “a fuller sense of the writings and ideas that were variously drawn upon, appropriated, overwritten, rejected, and anticipated by works published in 1759” (6). The collection is also designed to test a model for the in-depth study of literary context within a single year. While such broad goals are impossible to achieve in limited space, Reading 1759 nevertheless provides interesting insights into a number of notable works and authors and makes a useful contribution to Bucknell University Press’s “Transits: Literature, Thought & Culture 1650-1850” transnational eighteenth-century studies series.

1759 saw the creation and publication of many works important both in their immediate contexts and in the years and centuries that have followed. The books most commonly cited and examined in Reading 1759 include Johnson’s The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia, Young’s Conjectures on Original Composition, Adam Smith’s Theory of Moral Sentiments, and Voltaire’s Candide. Additionally, Christopher Smart’s Jubilate Agno, Sterne’s Tristram Shandy, Sarah Fielding’s The History of the Countess of Dellwyn, and Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d’Alembert’s Encyclopédie each receive extended treatment in single essays. Those interested in David Hume will also find work of interest here: though the only title he published in 1759 (The History of England Under the House of Tudor) is mentioned in passing, his Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, Treatise of Human Nature and Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals are frequently used as philosophical background. The collection’s eleven essays (not including the introduction) are divided into six parts: “Writing Empire,” “Sentimental Ethics, Luxurious Sexualities,” “Authorship and Aesthetics,” “Enlightenment and its Discontents,” “Originality and Appropriation,” and “Conclusion: Reading 1759.” Roughly speaking, the essays take up two basic questions: 1.) How did authors conceive of themselves and their work in 1759? and 2.) Which philosophies guided 1759 literary culture?

Essays in Reading 1759 approach ideas of authorship and the meaning and purpose of literature from diverse perspectives. Adam Rounce addresses these concerns directly in his fresh comparison of the authorial roles presented in Young’s Conjectures and Oliver Goldsmith’s Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning in Europe, as well as in the character of poet Imlac in Rasselas. Rebecca Ford provides a useful close reading of the eighth volume of Diderot and d’Alembert’s Encyclopédie and the circumstances that delayed its publication, demonstrating that the pressures its authors faced from censors and each other manifested themselves in the work. Rosalind Powell’s examination of Smart’s manipulation of signs to mimic the divine sublime in fragment B of Jubilate Agno (part of which was drafted in 1759) gives a lively sense of the poet’s creative use of symbols, though her argument that Smart’s sublime is a useful counterpoint to Burke’s is less convincing. Contemporary uses of canonical texts and writers are examined in both Moyra Haslett’s convincing study of the employment of quotation and textual appropriation to create originality in Tristram Shandy and other early eccentric novels, as well as in Kate Rumbold’s overview of references to Shakespearean characters as moral benchmarks in The Countess of Dellwyn.

Other essays in Reading 1759 address the second critical question of the social and philosophical tenants that informed readers and writers. James Ward makes a persuasive case for the similarities between Hume’s discussion of
causation in the *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* and the representation of that concept in *Rasselas*. Two examinations of contemporary moral-sense philosophy find similar English social anxieties. Nigel Wood argues that the first edition of Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments* demonstrates the author’s “sense of the frailty of common feeling and the insistent need for it not to be neglected” (71), while Mary Peace concludes that both sensational accounts of prostitutes’ lives and the moral rhetoric encouraging support for their rehabilitation provide “more-or-less consoling narratives for a luxurious society in the midst of war” (89). And Simon Davies’ and James Watt’s close readings of *Candide* and *Rasselas* each find commentary on an increasingly interconnected world, with Davies arguing that Voltaire intended his novel as a call to action against ineffective leadership across the globe and Watt claiming that *Rasselas* reflects Johnson’s concern and uncertainty over “the long-term consequences of European expansionism” (34).

Although many of its individual essays shed new light on much-studied works, *Reading 1759*’s wide thematic and geographic basis yields inevitably scattered coverage. If they were not drawn from sources produced in 1759, the conclusions of most of the essays would not be unique to that year. Rounce’s conclusion that dwindling numbers of patrons and uncomfortable feelings about marketing one’s work as a commodity led to a “vexed vision” of authorship could probably be found throughout the century (110), as could the worries over global culture and the ramifications of economic expansion discussed in Watt’s, Davies’, and Peace’s essays. The attempted joint coverage of both Britain and France is also problematic: publishing practices and cultural tastes differed between those countries, and the lack of a comparative framework means that readers may erroneously assume claims made about one culture to be true of both.

But my largest objection to the fairly sensible work of *Reading 1759* is that it does not suggest the breadth and variety of literary activity implied by its title and promised in its introduction. Virtually no mention is made of drama, either English or French, and the only poetry examined at any length is Smart’s *Jubilate Agno*, which, though partially written in 1759, was not published until 1939. The small selection of primary works drawn upon cannot accurately illustrate the work of an entire year. Most of the essays address only a handful of literary texts and make little use of the materials most valuable to contextual readings (e.g. periodicals, personal writings, and publication records). The exception is Reagan’s own concluding essay, “Writers, Reviewers, and the Culture of Reading.” Drawing extensively on reviews and letters, Regan identifies the most-praised features of literary style in 1759 (“clear, precise, decorous, and bold (or ‘manly’) writing” [215]) and emends the view that review journals dominated reception and steered literary creation by illustrating the interconnections between and autonomy of individual reviewers, writers, and readers in 1759. Regan’s essay provides the kind of model for single-year studies he imagined in his introduction. And, in *Reading 1759* overall, scholars will find new perspectives on the texts and authors that distinguished 1759’s contributions to literary history.

Patricia Gael
Pennsylvania State University
The Goethe Yearbook is a publication of the Goethe Society of North America. It has been published since 1982. The latest volume, 19, came out in 2012. The Yearbook publishes regularly articles on Goethe and his contemporaries as well as reviews of books that might be of interest to scholars of eighteenth and nineteenth century literature and culture. The current volume contains twelve articles, seven written in English and five written in German. The topics in this yearbook range from Goethe to Schiller and Moritz, including a special section on the emergence of modern German literature studies from Goethe philology.

Beate Allert sheds new light on an often overlooked chapter of Goethe's research on color in her article "'Trübe' as the Source of New Color Formation in Goethe's Late Works Entoptische Farben (1817-20) and Chromatik (1822)." Allert counts herself among the scholars who divide Goethe's work on color "into several distinct phases"(29) rather than seeing it as a intrinsically consistent or coherent body of work. Goethe's ideas on color are usually identified with his Theory of Colors (1810) in which he opposed Newton's mathematical-based theory. In the following years, however, Goethe went even further to explore colors and color perception experientially. He did not see light as the primary cause of color but rather the hardly visible obstructions in the atmosphere. 'Trübe' (turbidity) is produced in air (and water) by imperceptible or hardly-perceptible particles and occurs with fog, smoke, rain drops and snow flakes. According to Allert, turbidity is something that exists "on the threshold between the physical and the spiritual realms" (30). In Goethe's late work on color it is turbidity which permits chroagenesis, and produces colors or color perception (which is the same for him). Chroagenesis and entoptic colors are very subjective and it is this aspect that links Goethe—somewhat against his will—to German Romantic painters like Runge and Friedrich, whom he had previously criticized for their multiple light sources and diffuse landscapes. Allert shows expertly how Goethe's scientific endeavors led him to redefine his classically trained eye as connoisseur of art.

Chenxi Tang's article explores the origin and theory of the novella with a highly innovative approach in his article "The Transformation of the Law of Nations and the Reinvention of the Novella: Legal History and Literary Innovation from Boccaccio's Decameron to Goethe's Unterhaltungen deutscher Ausgewanderten." Even though the article discusses only these two authors, anyone who is interested in this genre in general will find this article groundbreaking and insightful. Tang traces the origin of the literary genre back to its legal roots: After the compilation of Roman laws in the Codex Theodistanus and the Codex Justinianus the "Emperor Justinian issued new legal rulings on individual cases that could [not] be resolved" (67) by these previous publications. "These new rulings were . . . collected under the title Novellae." Tang establishes the connection between the legal publication form and the literary genre by showing that "the novella as a literary genre emerged at the height of the reception of Roman law in fourteenth century Italy" (69). Legal commentators of that time
provided legal counsel in cases where no specific law existed or where contradictory local statutory laws made a legal solution difficult if not impossible. They employed a "five-step schema casus-quaestio-pro-contra-solutio" (69), which can also be found as the underlying structure of the literary genre. Even though this angle has been overlooked it is not farfetched. As Tang points out, both Boccaccio and Goethe had been lawyers by profession and both wrote their collection of novellas during times of political and legal turmoil. This sheds certainly new light on Goethe's famous definition of the novella as being an "unerhörte Begebenheit" (unprecedented incident) by highlighting not so much the unusualness of the event but its challenge to judgment. So far I have only sketched out the foundation that Tang lays out for his discussion of Goethe's novellas. It would take too much space here to summarize the rest. Suffice it to say that Tang follows the development of the Jus gentium as the law of nations to its elimination through Hobbes's natural law and the transformation of the Jus gentium into international law. The lawlessness of Goethe's novellas is not the lawlessness of bellum omnium contra omnes but of wars between states.

Sean Franzel's article "'Hear him! hört ihn!' Scholarly Lecturing in Berlin and the Popular Style of Karl Philipp Moritz" describes and analyses a shift in the structure of public discourse in late Enlightenment. Lectures for the educated and mixed-gender lay public became increasingly more popular in the late eighteenth century. While encouraging the endeavors of one of his former students, Marcus Hertz, Kant himself looked with apprehension and anxiety at the new medium of education—one that established itself outside of universities, their scholarly methods and transmission of rational thought. Kant worried that rhetoric and oratory would just entertain the public but not engage them rationally. Franzel shows with the example of Karl Philipp Moritz how some of Kant's fears were born out and maybe exceeded by the Romantic Genius-style performance that Moritz adopted. In the end, Franzel concludes that the genius performance that restricts the audience to passive role runs counter to the Enlightenment project of thinking for oneself. However, Franzel acknowledges—even if he undervalues it—the affective aspects and rhetorical culture of a public discourse of citizens and shows the double nature of Moritz' lectures which are delivering content on public discourse in England and in classical Rome and are in addition through their rhetorical form an enactment of a type of public discourse that did not exist in Germany with its regimented absolutist states. Although this enactment was staged in an aesthetic setting, it had the potential to educate the public, through aesthetic play, to advance to a fully developed political public discourse.

Edward T. Potter's article "Hypochondria, Onanism, and Reading in Goethe's Werther" provides an excellent overview of eighteenth-century medical literature on the subject of onanism and contemporary reactions from puritanical corners to Goethe's novel even if one might object to how Potter applies them to "read between the lines." I am not sure how many readers would share his conclusion that "Werther's reading style [...] leads to the overstimulation of the imagination, then to sexual fantasizing, then to onanistic activities, which, in turn, bring on his hypochondria and then his death" (138). It might be worthwhile to reverse the perspective and explore the novel as an example of how during the period of
Sentimentalism, Storm and Stress, and Romanticism, experience and its facsimile, imagination, were so overcharged with emotion that they became eroticized.

In conclusion I would like to mention two book reviews included in the yearbook that are of interest to anyone reading or teaching Goethe's Faust. Eric Schaad's review of Susanne Kord's Murderesses in German Writing, 1720-1860: Heroines of Horror and Ehrhard Bahr's review of Volker Wahl's book "Das Kind in meinem Leib," which published legal documents of a neonaticide case in which Goethe gave legal counsel regarding the death penalty.

Norbert Puszkar
Austin Peay State University

Kate Chisholm. Wits & Wives: Dr. Johnson in the Company of Women.

Kate Chisholm is the radio critic for The Spectator, a two-time Royal Literary Fund Fellow and the author of a well-received biography of Frances Burney. She acknowledges being an admirer of Dr. Johnson since studying Rasselas for her A-levels. In Wits & Wives, she focuses on nine of the 85 or more women in Johnson’s family, friends and conversation circles. In this way, Chisholm aims to present an “alternative Johnson” as seen through his relationships with these wits and wives.

Chisholm devotes well-crafted chapters to each of the nine. She begins with Johnson’s mother, Sarah, and ends with the young Mary Wollstonecraft, walking from Newington Green to the City to visit him a few months before his death. Chisholm’s work is grounded in literary sources and current research, but her writing is aimed at the well-informed reading public rather than scholars or specialists. Yet her book has much to offer both. It is enjoyable and well written, offering an interesting array of apt quotes and some fresh insights about Johnson, the nine women, and the times they shared together.

The first chapters focus on two wives, Johnson’s mother and his own wife Elizabeth, familiarly known as Tetty. His relationships with them both are somewhat unsettling, as Chisholm recognizes. As a youth, he often challenged his mother; and, as an adult, he spent long years away, leaving her to run the family book business. Similarly, Johnson left Tetty alone for months at a time while working on his dictionary in London, a city she found unhealthy and undesirable.

Yet Chisholm determinedly sees the strengths in his relationships with these “wives,” while not ignoring his faults. She notes how Sarah shaped her son. For example, she ensured that as a young boy he memorized the collect every week, thereby disciplining his memory and enriching his language. Chisholm believes that Tetty provided the emotional stability he needed to make the transition to London. She points out Johnson did not seem to suffer from depression while Tetty was alive.
The heart of the book consists of seven profiles of Johnson’s interactions, while in London, with literary women, three wives (Charlotte Lennox, Hester Thrale Piozzi and Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin) and four single women (Elizabeth Carter, Hill Boothby, Frances Reynolds and Hannah Moore). All seven, however, can be considered wits in terms of being women with lively intellects who wrote privately and/or publicly and spoke brilliantly enough to earn the respect of Johnson. Here, Chisholm is best at presenting the women who are less well documented and frequently discussed.

Elizabeth Carter, for example, is gaining more recent scholarly attention, yet her life story is still not well known, mainly because her papers were destroyed. Chisholm brings to life this exceptionally talented thinker, writer and translator, who could and did challenge Johnson himself. Likewise, Frances Reynolds, sister of Sir Joshua, is even less well known today, but Chisholm portrays her as an interesting combination of artistic talent and social awkwardness. Chisholm has less to say that is new about Johnson’s well-studied and often written about women friends, especially Hester Thrale Piozzi.

Seen in the context of Johnson’s literary interactions with these seven wits, three additional “characters” emerge in Chisholm’s narrative: The Gentleman’s Magazine, the Bluestockings, and London itself. The magazine helped make the literary careers of Carter and Johnson and also informed much of the witty conversation of the day. Bluestockings, including Carter and Moore, personified women’s intellectual and literary abilities and redefined, albeit briefly, new realms of female accomplishments. London, growing rapidly with an undeniable magnetic force, is a ferocious character. As single women from the country, Elizabeth Carter, Hannah Moore and Frances Reynolds, all chose to leave the exciting but bruising city and return to rural life, with varying degrees of success.

Yet, as Chisholm makes clear from the beginning, her overarching purpose is to provide new insights into Johnson’s character by considering his interactions with these women, and in this, she succeeds admirably. Each of the relationships described here presents perspectives of an alternative Johnson than the man portrayed by Boswell and the long line of scholars and writers since. We see him romping with the Thrale children and gleefully taking part in children’s sports, even late in his life. On the more serious side, his relationship with Carter shows Johnson’s appreciation of the talents of this brilliant thinker and writer but also his fear and dislike of being outwitted by her or other strong women.

The reverse side of this fear and dislike is Johnson’s emotional vulnerability, often disguised by his thunderous pronouncements, but revealed in the deep connections with the women profiled here. We see again his great sympathy for “misfits” and those who could not fully succeed on their own. He writes tender and encouraging letters to Charlotte Lennox, as she struggled to support her family with her writing. He nurtured both the painting and writing of Frances Reynolds, who despite her artistic talent could not sustain her life in London.

Scholars will certainly find points to quibble about or contest in this book, such as unfair statements about Anna Seward, who is not profiled but cited, and even one about Hester Thrale Piozzi. But this is a book to enjoy for what it is and not condemn for what it is not. It is well worth reading for the pleasure of getting to know more about these nine women. It offers some refreshingly alternative
views of Johnson, without Boswell. This alternative Johnson longs for intimate female friendship with Hill Boothby and, in the last months of his life, makes time for a friendly and encouraging conversation with the young Mary Wollstonecraft.

Judi Jennings
Kentucky Foundation for Women


Last spring I taught a course on the Golden Age of Piracy, focusing primarily on the Atlantic world. Our various texts often referred to impressments, because many British naval seamen who had been impressed deserted and many of those joined pirate ships as a viable alternative, despite the harsh sentencing of captured pirates. Also, impressment at sea of able-bodied merchant sailors sometimes involved the exchange of poorly trained or troublesome sailors of previous impressments, some of whom were actual pirates or privateers who then mutinied and seized their new merchant vessel, returning to piracy.

What late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century piracy and Royal Navy impressment have in common is the enormous expansion of the British colonial empire and its necessarily huge merchant fleet as well as the “pressing need” (sorry, I couldn’t help myself) for a permanent (year-round) Royal Navy capable of protecting and expanding the new ocean empire during a roughly a century and a half of virtually permanent warfare. (Denver Brunsman has a chart of all the wars of the period and their duration—quite extraordinary: Tables 1 & 2, pp. 28 & 44.) Britain was a small nation in comparison with its main European rival, but its navies (merchant and military) made empire possible yet required an ever-increasing number of trained sailors to succeed, drawn from a comparatively small population. Plus, merchant ships, though requiring far fewer sailors than a naval vessel, paid a much higher wage, and market pressures continually applied upward pressure on those wages. In addition, merchantmen generally sailed only seasonally, avoiding the risks, for instance, of hurricane season. However, ships of the line served year-round, even in peace time. Given the choice, what sailor wouldn’t opt for the civilian fleet? The “solution” was the impressment of merchant sailors.

The “evil necessity” of Brunsman’s title refers to the paradox of a nation that prizes freedom above virtually all ideals that, nonetheless, “enslaves” a large class of free and highly skilled working men to ensure the expansion and protection of its colonial empire. A further paradox that Brunsman explores (what he calls “the impressment paradox”) is the defiance of sailors and Atlantic communities to impressment versus the somewhat surprising loyalty and work-ethic of the seamen once impressed and aboard a naval vessel. To Brunsman, this represents “the
most remarkable feature of the Royal Navy’s success” in the period (12), i.e., that sailors despised impressment—forced labor—not necessarily naval service.

The Evil Necessity—“the first comprehensive study of British naval impressment throughout the eighteenth-century Atlantic world”—is an extraordinarily comprehensive examination of a recruitment practice dating back to medieval Britain: 252 pages of well-written text, 52 pages of notes, and 44 pages of bibliography. Brunsman “draws from a wide range of archival sources and the insights of writers, statesmen, philosophers, and scholars from both sides of the Atlantic for more than three centuries” (3). While he certainly gives his sources their due, Brunsman also shows what he perceives as contemporary historians’ inadequacies, primarily of not recognizing the complexity of the issue and its difference in various colonial locations, not to mention in Britain itself. The present volume is the first of a projected two-volume set that “explores the imperial workings and social impact of impressment in the long eighteenth century” (14). The chronological narrative of this text extends through 1763, the end of the Seven Years’ War, while the next one will cover the American Revolution and the War of 1812. The Epilogue of this volume offers the preliminary findings of the subsequent one.

Brunsman divides his book into two sections, one covering the “macro” and the other the “micro” influences of impressment. Part One, “Empire,” in effect, parses the title, particularly the “necessary” aspect. Because naval records do not make a distinction between volunteers and impressed sailors—“they are all Voluntiers [sic] as soon as they find they can’t get away, says Admiral Philip Cavendish in 1741 (6)—scholars, even ones who disagree on other issues, estimate that half a million sailors served between 1688 and 1815 in Britain’s wars with the Spanish and French, with approximately 50% being impressed seamen (many impressed more than once), that is to say, a quarter million sailors! Yet the legal and philosophical bases of impressment were tenuous at best and regularly contested from any number of angles (virtually all explored in the text), very often by elements within the Navy itself, as well as the government, both of whom fully recognized the absolute necessity for empire of getting and keeping qualified sailors. I found this section the more important of the two because it demonstrated not only the complexity of the issue itself but the pervasiveness of its impact upon British domestic and colonial life. The range of people involved in the debate and cited here is extraordinary.

Part Two, “Sailors,” is rich with anecdotal information on life aboard a British man of war, methods and frequency of escape attempts by sailors from press gangs and by impressed sailors from men of war, and community riots in reaction to impressment practices, primarily in the American colonies. Part One is more thought provoking and challenging, while Part Two is, if not “light reading,” at least quicker and more engaging.

I would certainly call Brunsman’s book required reading for scholars interested in the economics, politics, and culture of the Atlantic world and, likewise, for naval historians. Its relative compactness (252 pages of text) and its fluid prose style make it accessible to virtually any educated reader. More than that, though, Brunsman’s closing paragraph alerts the reader that this seemingly
“historical” phenomenon remains relevant today, as it poses problems that have plagued western cultures for half a millennium:

Press gangs may be mostly forgotten, but they are not gone. Impressment left an extraordinary, if paradoxical legacy. A medieval invention, it flourished in the age of Enlightenment. An institution grounded in the principle of duty, it contributed to new discourses on liberty and rights. A practice likened to slavery, it offered slaves new opportunities for freedom. An obligation of British subjecthood, it helped give birth to a new form of American voluntary citizenship. The centrality of impressment to Britain’s self-fashioned empire of liberty raised difficult questions that are still relevant. What obligations do citizens owe their states? How should free governments balance a commitment to liberty with the need for security? What are the acceptable costs of empire? Answering these questions is no easier today than it was in the eighteenth century—evil necessities come in may forms. (252)

As Brunsman explains, closing the titular loop, when the evils exceed the necessity by mid-nineteenth century, the practice ceased. Yet as this first volume makes clear and volume two will reinforce, “In using impressment to sustain its empire, the British state nearly destroyed it” (3).

Peter Staffel
West Liberty University


For many contributions, the Intelligencer but especially its editor have for nearly two decades been indebted to Hermann J. Real, co-founder and long director of the Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies and editor of Swift Studies, the general editor of the Centre’s Online.Swift edition, and the convener of six important international symposium on Swift, held at the Centre and on the campus of Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität. I could not here exhaust the grounds of my admiration, but I would start with Professor Real’s accomplishments, service to colleagues, and go on to strengths, like superb memory and analytical powers, intellectual energy, industry, and integrity. Real has taught and mentored many fine students who have gone on to productive scholarly careers in part because of his assistance. It’s fitting that three of them combined to organize and edit this festschrift celebrating his 75th birthday, presented to Hermann in July at a dinner in his honor. Considerable distances separated the editors: Kirsten Juhas, at the Ehrenpreis Centre, Mascha Hansen of Ernst-Moritz-Arndt Universität, in Greifswald near the Baltic—long a member of EC/ASECS, thanks to Hermann,— and Patrick Müller of Friedrich-Alexander Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, who,
with Rudolf Freiburg, has been pushing forward The Shaftesbury Project, hosting a Shaftesbury conference in 2012. The editing was also complicated by Kirsten Juhas’s premature delivery of her and her husband Dr. Michael Bähr’s son Valentin, whom Uncle Hermann has doted on as would a grandfather—witness the baby’s photo in the preface to the 2013 Swift Studies. Juhas spent many weeks at the hospital before Prince Val, now thriving, could be brought home. And Hansen, with two young boys pulling on her pantlegs and ears, also had her share of motherly demands. Nonetheless, the trio, repaying their professor for his efforts, edited a thick festschrift of two dozen essays—including one by each of them. After consulting Hermann Real’s wife, Erika, they invited scholars to submit essays about two years ago and, following through wonderfully, presented their professor with several weeks of reading—he promptly worked through the volume, writing all the contributors insightful appreciations of their essays.

In their short preface, the editors begin with an anecdote suggesting Hermann’s love of literature and catching upon his personality (“dynamo” is one of their carefully chosen words). They then briefly review Hermann’s major accomplishments, such as the development of a fruitful research library, or laboratory, including the acquisition of 85% of Swift’s own book collection. (The six Swift symposia are celebrated best at the end of the volume by W. B. Carnochan, who singles out Real’s “role as tribal entrepreneur and headman,” affecting a healing solidarity in a postwar world.) They mention such tributes as the 1998 festschrift on his sixtieth birthday and the session in his honor organized at the 2012 ASECS by Christopher Fox. Next the editors introduce the volume. As they explain it, the essays reflect their professor’s own inclinations:

[Hermann J. Real] has been, throughout his academic career, a champion of historical criticism, defending, explaining, and expanding his principles with unflinching persistence. For this reason, the present collection by and large reflects his faith in a kind of philology “that not only preserves our literary heritage but also elucidates it for posterity.” Nevertheless, it also offers a cross section of the various approaches which pervade modern scholarship and of the thematic variety of Swift studies. Apart from biographical aspects, bibliographical and cultural studies, essays on Swift’s early prose, poetry and his perennial masterpiece Gulliver’s Travels, it presents sections on the reception of the Dean’s works and person as well as on eighteenth-century studies. The collection is completed by papers examining Hermann Real’s vital impact on Swift studies. (12)

The volume begins with “Yeats, Swift, and Ireland’s Contested Eighteenth Century,” written by the Irish Ambassador to Germany, Dr. Daniel Mulhall, a historian with diplomatic experience the world over, who has lectured in Münster and who helped subsidize the volume’s publication. The editors have a page of thanks for the many who contributed to the volume, with subsidies or by proofing and the like, including other former students of Professor Real, such as Sabine Baltes-Ellermann, Dirk Passmann, Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp, also those who once or presently work at the Ehrenpreis Centre, such as Sandra Simon, Helgard Stöver-Leidig, and Marlies Thöle, and Hermann’s old friends, including Rudolf
Freiburg and James Woolley. Peter Lang, too, is to be thanked for extraordinary pains to produce a handsome volume, well bound and on very good paper, with notes at the foot and essays beginning on rectos.

The twenty-five who contributed felt were pleased to—thrice that number would have gladly contributed to the volume, thus expressing their thanks while basking in the distinguishing association. Like the bridal couple trying to whittle down the guest list to a manageable number, the editors must have been under some pains, knowing they were inadvertently slighting many. Without further presumption, I will survey the volume’s contents, which, after Ambassador Mulhall’s keynote essay, are divided into eight sections.

In “Biographical Aspects” are James Woolley’s “Swift and Lord Berkeley, 1699-1701: Berkeley Castle Swiftiana” (31-69); and Ashley Marshall’s “Pope’s Dedication of the ‘1736’ Dunciad to Swift” (69-82). Woolley draws upon overlooked MS volumes that Sir Charles Berkeley, second Earl of Berkeley (1649-1710) brought back from Ireland to Berkeley Castle, Gloucestershire. These materials correct biographical accounts by Louis Landa and Irvin Ehrenpreis,” in particular illuminating Swift’s “comic strategy in ‘The Humble Petition of Frances Harris’ as well as his disappointment over missing the deanship of Derry,” which became vacant six months into Swift’s service to Berkeley. An immediate demonstration of the importance of the Berkeley archive comes when Woolley transcribes an unpublished letter from Swift to Humphrey May, dated “Kilkenny, 19 Augt 1699.” As background to his analysis, Woolley details the movements of Berkeley and Swift during Swift’s tenure with Berkeley, 1699-1701, and one of his appendices details Berkeley’s letterbook. Ashley Marshall’s essay focuses on Pope’s dedication of The Dunciad “To Dr. Jonathan Swift” (in red ink) on the title-page of the Gilliver 1736 edition (reproduced from a rare copy acquired by Marshall). She notes that, although The Dunciad, in Four Books of 1743 is also dedicated to Swift (inside the text), this dedication is ignored by the Twickenham Edition, even though the 1743 text is the declared copy-text (no reference is made to the 1736 dedication). Marshall’s essay supports Dustin Griffin’s recent critique (2010) of the falsities in conventional notions that Pope and Swift enjoyed the best of friendships. Marshall adds a new understanding of why Pope dedicated the book to Swift and how this paradoxically reflects the “strained relationship” between them: “The ‘1736’ inscription, almost certainly not meant as a tribute, appears to be part of an unpleasant tug of war between the two friends in the last half-decade of their active correspondence” (71). Pope is trying to tug free letters sent to Swift, and Swift is trying to get a poetical epistle or an equivalent tribute from Pope to himself. In that context, one possible reading for Marshall is that “Pope tried to fob Swift off with a somewhat shabby label on a minor reprint, hoping to provide at least enough of what the Dean was demanding to get what he wanted for himself” (82).

In “Bibliographical and Textual Studies” are James E. May’s “Re-Impressed Type in the First Four Octavo Editions of A Tale of a Tub, 1704-5” (85-108); John Irwin Fischer’s “Swift’s Authorship of ‘The Difficulty of Knowing One Self’: A Review of the Evidence” (109-116); and Andrew Carpenter’s “Reading Swift’s Works in Dublin in the 1750s” (117-31). James May identifies Benjamin Motte
Sr. as the printer of the first five authorized editions and finds that the first through fourth octavos share much type (including over half the pages of the second and third edition); in addition, alterations occurred in the stored type, some of which appear to be authorial. John Irwin Fischer convincingly demonstrates on multiple grounds Swift’s authorship of the sermon “The Difficulty of Knowing One’s Self,” whose canonicity was questioned by Thomas Sheridan the Younger. This and several other sermon in manuscript were inherited by Sheridan from his father, Swift’s friend, but Sheridan the younger failed to recognize the manuscript was in Esther Johnson’s hand. A review of stylistic features, which led Louis Landa to doubt Swift’s authorship, is also turned to make the case for attribution. Beginning with the fiction of two Dublin bibliophiles comparing their purchased sets, Andrew Carpenter’s essay offers a wonderfully engaging comparison of multi-volume 12mo works of Swift published by George Faulkner in 1737-51, and by George Ewing and his son Alexander in 1758 (less expensive but more inclusive, in part a reprint of the 1756 Scottish edition). Carpenter lucidly clarifies how these rival editions differ with regard to engravings, notes, and texts by Swift. He notes that Faulkner’s Vol. 1 is 95% by Swift and the Ewings’ Vol. 1, full of biographical and critical materials drawn from Delaney, Hawkesworth, Orrery, and Deane Swift, is “only about fifty per cent.” Carpenter also covers new Swift texts in the Ewing edition, such as A History of the Four Last Years of the Queen and a number of unpublished poems, with which the Ewings could justify their challenge to Faulkner’s unofficial copyright to Swift’s texts, though they claimed further that Faulkner had no exclusive right (the Ewings falsely claimed their text of A History derived from Andrew Millar’s London edition--Millar’s text was modernized and the Ewings’ set from an old-spelling text). Carpenter ponders the source of the Ewings’ new material, finds problems in the editorial selection and presentation, and surveys the consequent fight between the Ewings and Faulkner, noting various ideological differences that aggravated their quarrel (the Ewings supported popular rights more than did Faulkner [125]--though, ironically, “Few people supported the Ewings” [127]). Carpenter’s essay has too many thoughtful observations to do justice to them here: as Hermann Real wrote me, it requires close study and reflection.

In “Early Prose” we find Clement Hawes’ “Jonathan Swift and the Philosopher’s Stone” (135-48); Hugh Ormsby-Lennon’s “Of Late a Tabu: Newer Light on Darker Authors” (149-66); and Rudolf Freiburg (“‘But the Root is in the Earth’: Swift’s Satire on Enthusiasm in A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit (1704)” (167-89). Hugh Ormsby-Lennon takes the prize for style. His essay begins by recounting Hermann’s encouragement of the research that led to Ormsby-Lennon’s Hey Presto! Swift and the Quacks (reviewed above) and then tackles Swift’s method and meaning in A Tale of a Tub. He concludes, “In the imaginative Anglo-Irish tradition, Swift proves the fiercest philosophical intellect (Hobbesian in its savagery, penetration, and tenacity), more piercing than those of West British doodlers like Sterne, or Joyce, or Banville. Only Berkeley and Beckett can threaten Swift’s primacy” (165). In “Poetry,” Section IV, are Dirk F. Passmann’s “‘The Dullest thing I ever read’: Jonathan Swift and the Poetical Aspirations of a Country Squire,” quoting Swift’s comment in the Journal to Stella in regards to a poem the Duke of Beaufort asked
Swift to assess—Passmann identifies the poem as Charles Kirkham’s Philanglus and Astrea: or, The Loyal Poem, 1712, and proceeds to gloss its author, contents, and political implications (193-208); Sabine Baltes’s “Acclaimed by the Imperfect Muse: An Express from Parnassus to the Reverend Dr. Jonathan Swift” (209-22); Kirsten Juhas’s “‘Our mutual wit and poetry’: Prior’s and Swift’s Daphne,” which examines Matthew Prior’s “Daphne and Apollo” (covering well its composition and publication), several treatments of the Ovidian myth by Swift, and Swift’s appreciation of Prior as a poet and friend (223-38); and Arno Lößler’s “‘Her artificiall Face Appears’: Jonathan Swift and the Art of Cosmetics” (239-53).

The essays on Gulliver’s Travels include Allan Ingram’s “Gulliver’s Travails: Labour and Self-Loathing in Several Remote Nations of the World” (257-68); and Ann Cline Kelly’s “Biting the Hand that Feeds Them: The Abuse of Humankind in Houyhnhnmland and Other Animal Republics” (269-79). Ann Kelly, returning to material she’s worked on in the past, adds to the reasons why Swift chose horses as the rational governors in his fourth voyage. This leads her to “situate Houyhnhnmland in the context of other fantastic voyages to lands ruled by animals, who typically take to task the human visitor for the sins of his species” (269). Kelly’s examination involves texts like James Howell’s The Parly of Beasts (1660) and the work it is modelled on, Giovanni Battista Gelli’s Circe (1549, translated into English by Tom Brown in 1702).

The next section, on “Reception,” includes Mascha Hansen’s “‘A mere wild beast of a wit’: Swift among the Bluestockings” (283-95); Patrick Müller’s “Mapping a Tory’s ‘prostitute Pen and Tongue’: Satire, Criticism, and the Political Dimension of Shaftesbury’s Aversion to Swift,” which delineates different views of church and state as well as satire held by the two authors (297-314); Noriyuki Harada’s “Translation and Transformation of Jonathan Swift’s Works in Japan,” on Japanese reactions to Swift since the late nineteenth century, parallels between Gulliver’s Travels and Japanese literature, and Swift’s image of Japan within the work—Harada speaks with the familiarity gained from translating Gulliver’s Travels into Japanese (315-28); and Bernfried Nugel’s “The Young Aldous Huxley as a Modern Swift: His Imaginary Voyages to Thule” (329-39). Mascha Hanson re-examines Swift’s reception by women by looking closely at reactions to his character and writings by Elizabeth Montagu, Elizabeth Carter, Catherine Talbot, and Hester Mulso Chapone. She argues that a number found Swift’s character, particularly in his letters, sanctified his works, defending the enjoyment of them (286-88). Hansen also examines Swift’s A Letter to a Young Lady, on her Marriage (1723), glancing too at Swift’s notion of the good wife in his letter to Jane Waring; Swift’s remarks are defended as in part tongue-in-cheek, in part sensible, and compared, to his favor, with Mrs. Chapone’s challenging reply, A Letter to a New-Married Lady (1777).

George Gordon and the Fury of the Aggrieved” (363-75). Then in Section VIII, “Hermann J. Real and Swift Studies,” come Marcus Walsh’s “Candid Interpretations: Hermann Real and Our Understanding of the Swiftian Text,” a revision of remarks offered at the 2012 ASECS, on intentionalism in criticism and Hermann Real’s advocacy of contextual interpretation, in his editing of Swift and in critical pieces dating back to the 1970s (379-87); and W. B. Carnochan’s personal reflections on Herr-Mann Real in “The Tribe of Swift,” mentioned above (389-92). The volume concludes with Sandra Simon’s compilation “List of Publications by Hermann J. Real, 1998-2013” (393-403). Luckily for the Simon, the earlier festschrift (Swift, The Enigmatic Dean: Festschrift for Hermann Josef Real) contains pre-1998 publications. Still, she had to shoot at a moving target: Hermann Real has published much during and since the book was at press, as he will continue to work robustly for years to come. Her discovery and transcription of the publications of the past fifteen years will make it much easier for the bibliographer extending the Real corpus in 2018 or 2023. —JEM

Directory Changes and Additions

Alves, Kathleen. 16 Summit Circle / Somers, NY 10589
Beam, Susan Cherie. EC/ASECS Webmaster. susancheriebeam@gmail.com 746 Chanceford Ave. / York, PA 17404
Berkowitz, Carin. cberkowitz@chemheritage.org (Director, Beckman Center for History of Chemistry) Chemical Heritage Foundation / 315 Chestnut St. / Philadelphia, PA 19106
Broder, Janice. email and address correction: jbroder@bloomu.edu; English / Bloomsburg U. / 400 E. 2nd St. / Bloomsburg, PA 17815
Coppola, Al. acoppola@jjay.cuny.edu; English Dept. / John Jay College (CUNY) / 524 W. 59th St. / New York, NY 10019
Dillon, Clarissa F. (Independent Scholar, History) clarissafdillon@icloud.com; 768 Buck Lane / Haverford, PA 19041-1202
Distel, Kristen M. (grad. studies, English, Ashland University) 6091 Cole Road / Hillsdale, MI 49242
Eive, Gloria. geive@silcon.com; gloriaeive@gmail.com (music, theater) (retired from Dept. of Music, St. Mary’s College, Moraga, CA; now teaching Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at Cal State U. East Bay--Concord) 1814 Marineview Dr. / San Leandro, CA 94577
Genovese, Michael. Michael.genovese@uky.edu; English Dept. / Patterson Office Tower / University of Kentucky / Lexington, KY 40506.
Gerard, W. Blake. New preferred email: wgerard@aum.edu
Guile, Carolyn. cguile@colgate.edu; Department of Art and Art History Colgate University, 13 Oak Drive, Hamilton, NY 13346
Hartvig, Gabriella. hartvig.gabriella@pte.hu; Faculty of Humanities (BTK) / Janus Pannonius University of Pécs / H-7624 Pécs / Ifjúság útja 6 / Hungary
Horrocks, Sam. (grad. studies, English, West Virginia University) sahorrocks@mix.wvu.edu; 616 Hobson Street / Morgantown, WV 26501
Huitquist, Aleksandra. ahul@unimelb.edu.au (English)
News of Members

After serving superbly as webmaster, Jim Moody has had to step down due to illness. We owe him many thanks and deep gratitude. Our new webmaster is Susan Cherie Beam, a former student of Beverly Schneller, and now a teacher and editor; she’s kindly volunteered to maintain our website for us and has established it at www.ec-asecs.org.

Devoney Looser sent in the following report on the two sessions at ASECS honoring Paula Backscheider’s great contributions to ASECS and 18th-century studies: “At ASECS, two sessions were held in honor of Paula Backscheider. The first was a session on Elizabeth Singer Rowe, celebrating the publication of Paula’s new book, Elizabeth Singer Rowe and the Development of the English Novel. The session featured delightful commentary and enriching conversation by John Richetti, Dustin Stewart, Peter Walmsley, and Sarah Prescott, with Paula serving as respondent. The second session was in honor Paula’s entire body of work. Many came to honor her, with Catherine Ingrassia ably introducing remarks by Joseph Roach, Simon Dickie, Dan Ennis, and Judy Slagle. Simon elicited many appreciative laughs from the audience, as he read aloud from Paula’s decade-old emails to him, which gave advice on working in London archives. In the audience were many members of Paula’s NEH seminars in the mid-1990s, her current and former colleagues and students, and others honoring her for her fine scholarship and her many contributions to ASECS.” (Your editor well recalls how Paula, with thoughtful, decisive leadership pulled ASECS’s pan from the fire and put the organization on very sound financial footing.) Paula’s “Politics and Gender in a Tale of Two Plays” appears on pp. 52-69 of Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century, ed. by Tiffany Potter (2012). Jennifer Airey, whose first book is reviewed above, has organized the Aphra Behn Society’s meeting this October at the U. of Tulsa. Anna Battigelli produced three short videos for students using ECCO and posted them on her blog, Early Modern Bibliography Online (see p. 72 below). Barbara Benedict’s “Editing as Art: Authenticity and Authority in the Miscellaneies of Dryden and Behn” appears in Restoration, 35.1 (2011), 21-38, and her essay on Gulliver’s Travels in Reading Swift is noted below under Hermann Real). Barbara’s ‘‘Admiring Pope no more than is Proper’: Anthologizing Alexander Pope’s in Bookseller’s Beauties” is forthcoming in Living in the Eighteenth Century: A Festschrift in Honor of Betty Rizzo, ed. by Temma Berg and Sonia Kane (Lehigh UP). That volume will also contain Lisa Berglund’s “Hester Lynch Piozzi’s British Synonymy and ‘the Notion of a Sex in Words.’” This is Lisa’s third article concerning British Synonymy, the most recent perhaps being her “Hester Lynch Piozzi’s British Synonymy in Imperial France,” Dictionaries, 31 (2010), 69-86. Lisa’s “‘I am lost without my Boswell’: Samuel Johnson and Sherlock Holmes,” appears in The Age of Johnson 22 (2012), 131-43. Lisa’s six-year service as Executive Secretary of the Dictionary Society of North America is ending as she becomes chair of the English Department at Buffalo.
State (the editor’s alma mater). Lisa is also the first vice-president (chair elect) of NEASECS. On 1 November, the U. of North Carolina Press, for the Omohundro Institute, will publish Kevin Joel Berland’s edition The Dividing Line Histories of William Byrd II of Westover (592 pp.; bibliography; illustrations; index; ISBN: 1469606933; $50-60 depending on where one orders it), which is, so far as I understand it, two editions: the posthumously published The History of the Dividing Line betwixt Virginia and North Carolina Run in . . . 1728, and, from various MS sources, The Secret History of the Line. Kevin, as most know, continues to maintain the C18-L discussion listerv started a couple decades ago. I dropped out of it long ago when it took an excruciating amount of time to delete each piece of email and my mailbox had tons of spam. In its first decade, C18-L could be right out of the wild west, full of gun fights: people would flame in anger and also self-indulgently or accidentally, sometimes embarrassingly, bother the list with messages they should not have shared, etc. Well, this week I’ve been observing a different neighborhood. List members Mary Ann O’Donnell, David Brewer, Manny Schonhorn, Antonia Forster, Ellen Moody, et al., seem to be ever courteous and helpful—the list seems as a rule to live up to its original intention, with queries offered and answers, colleagues correcting others without a hint of vainglory, and others corrected offering their thanks (e.g., in a discussion of Catharine Trotter Cockburn: Brewer: “With apologies if I’m missing the point”; O’Donnell: “You did not . . . You made me face the point, and my error”).

During a sabbatical last fall, Martha Bowden finished her book entitled “Descendants of Waverley: Romancing History in Contemporary Historical Fiction,” another chapter in the ongoing history of the development of the novel. Martha presented “Reading Tristram Shandy Slowly” at the Sterne Tercentenary conference in Egham, near London, 8-10 July. The conference was organized by Judith Hawley, Melvyn New, and Peter de Voogd, with presentations by 60 scholars. Besides Thomas Keymer’s, keynote lectures were also given by David Brewer (“The Most Typical Author of the 18C”) and Mel New (“A Genius of that Cast: Celebrating Sterne”). Also, April London spoke on “Tristram Shandy and Anecdote”; Danielle Spratt, on “Hypertextual Travels”; and W. Blake Gerard, on “Cowper’s ‘Kate is craz’d’ as an Echo of Sterne’s ‘Poor Maria.’” Toni Bowers will be participating in the roundtable tribute to Betty Rizzo at the November meeting (the festschrift to Betty contains Toni’s “Clarissa’s Darkness”). Toni published Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance, 1660-1760 (Oxford UP, 2011) and that same year her and John Richetti’s abridged Clarissa was published by Broadview. More recently she co-edited with Tita Chico Atlantic Worlds in the Long Eighteenth Century: Seduction and Sentiment (Palgrave, 2012), and presently she is co-editing with Albert Rivero a Broadview edition of parts 1-2 of Richardson’s Pamela. Bucknell U. Press is now working on the production of the festschrift honoring the late O M Brack, Jr., edited by Jesse Swan of Northern Iowa U. (Editing Lives: Essays in Contemporary Textual and Biographical Studies in Honor of O M Brack, Jr.). It will contain a memorial tribute by Jerry Beasley, who, as general editor of the Smollett edition, worked closely with his old friend Skip. Jerry writes of Jesse’s volume, “it’s a wonderful book that would have made Skip very proud.” As planned, a memorial ceremony to Skip was held at the Huntington in March,
organized by Myron Yeager (Chapman U.), Secretary of the Samuel Johnson Society of the West. Skip’s wife Cynthia attended, and a lecture was offered by Thomas Kaminski, whom Skip worked with on the Yale edition of Johnson’s parliamentary debates. (Last issue in paying tribute to O M Brack’s career, I surveyed Skip’s work on the University of Georgia Press edition of Smollett, wrongly implying by omission that Skip prepared the text of *The Life and Adventures of Launcelot Greaves*—that text was prepared by Barbara Fitzpatrick.) Jill Bradbury, aided by a grant from Gallaudet, was in Dublin early this past summer to work on Irish economic literature from the first half of the 18C--there she met Anna Foy, also working in Dublin libraries. T.E.D. Braun presented the lecture “Jean-Jacques Le Franc, le Bienfaiteur de Pompignan” on 1 June while receiving his induction as Chevalier dans l’Ordre des Palmes Académiques Château de Caïx. Ted published “La Crise existentielle de Le Franc de Pomppignan au début des années 1750” in the Recueil de l’Académie de Montauban, n.s. 13 (2013), 79-87. During the spring Ted presented “Friends and/or Foes? Voltaire and Le Franc de Pompignan” at SEASECS, and a paper on “Sword Duels or Word Duels in French Fiction and Life” at ASECS.

Andrew Carpenter reviewed Joseph McMinn’s *Jonathan Swift and the Arts in Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 26 (2011), 220-21. For several years Andrew has been working on a study, presumably an anthology, too, of 18C poetry with ecological themes--his contribution to the last Münster symposium on Swift, was “The Birds and the Bees: Ecopoetry in Swift’s Irish Circle” (*Reading Swift*, ed. by H.J. Real, et al., 2013), 351-64). As noted above, Tita Chico co-edited the collection *Atlantic Worlds in the Long Eighteenth Century: Seduction and Sentiment* (Palgrave, 2012). Lorna Clarke, Mascha Hansen, and Peter Sabor participated this summer in the conference “Education in the Life and Works of Frances Burney and her Family,” held in July at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Greg Clingham had the good fortune to be awarded a J. D. Fleeman Fellowship at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland, where he spent “May and June this year working on a number of projects in cross-cultural engagements between Britain and China during the Qing dynasty up to the Opium Wars.” Greg wrote that, while in Scotland, he planned “to revisit the spectacular Isle of Mull, in particular the new Loch Buie House (built 1788) that stands alongside the old Lochbuy House (now a stables) and the old castle that was already in ruins when Boswell and Johnson visited in 1773. Unlike his ancestor, John Maclean, described by Johnson as ‘rough and haughty, and tenacious of his dignity,’ the present Laird, Jim Corbett, was urbane, relaxed and kind when I visited in 2011.”

Kevin L. Cope is editing with Robert Leitz the *ECCB* surveying 2009 scholarship and is chairing SCSECS’s 2014 conference on Galveston Island, 13-15 February. Kevin recently completed his third year as Faculty Senate President at LSU, waging a spirited fight for faculty governance. Some of what he learned working with the LSU administration is suggested in an editorial he contributed to the *LSU Faculty Senate Monthly Newsletter* for April. Kevin’s principal concern is to question “the assumption that privatization is the way of the future.” Kevin begins with the reflection that “universities replaced their chief assignment--that of questioning, that of the adept use of skepticism to abrade errors and to polish truths--with the new, lesser goal of productivity [“metric mania”] . . . . The [LSU]
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presidential search was a case-study in modern privatization, a private charity and a boutique search firm having been used as a shell in which to hide the appointment of a public official from public scrutiny. Development of a case against both privatization and against its inevitability is long overdue. Such a case can be built on many foundations in addition to the obvious example of the breach of public trust by LSU’s management board.” Kevin notes some strategies with which costs are concealed, such as “the dissipation of expenses across a range of phenomena wider than the item being priced.” For instance, “Those who linger outside the world of library science will never know whether the cost of maintaining thousands of computers, of subscribing year-in and year-out to databases, and of using services from units, such as IT, that hover outside of library budgets, is really cheaper than buying long-lasting paper copies of publications.” Then he turns to development office budgets and duplication of administrative positions, and the questionable improvement of now privatized institutions like the German National Railway System, and he concludes by asking whether the “drive toward privatization” doesn’t spring from a loss of confidence in the public. A clock at the LSU faculty senate’s website records the days since a no-confidence vote against the Board of Supervisors and an AAUP censure (over 200 and 800 days). That steadfastness warms my heart, for in July, we at Penn State, doing our research off campus, had a new wellness program with bio-metric screening thrust upon us with a $100 surcharge for non-participation. A rare uproar by faculty led to the suspension of that initiative this month, but other surcharges remain. The administration imposed its program without consulting experts on the faculty who had advised Washington for the Affordable Care Act!

Returning to Kevin Cope, this month AMS publishes his 20th volume of 1650-1850: Ideas, Ästhetics, and Inquiries in the Early Modern Era, which has a special-topics section on “Unorthodox Transportation and the Enlightenment” edited by Jessika Wichner and also over a dozen reviews edited by Scott Gordon. This fall or winter AMS is to publish The Sensational Centuries: Essays on the Enhancement of Sense Experience in Seventeenth, Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, which Kevin edited with the assistance of Robert Leitz. Among the essays are five by EC/ASECS members: David Hill Radcliffe’s “The Pleasures of Repetition: Novelty and Repetition in the Poems of the Pleasures” and David Venturo’s “Varieties of Sense Experience, from Milton and Hobbes to Keats”: Sayre Greenfield’s “The Cessation of Sensation: Or, Not To Be”; Linda V. Troost’s “An Entirely New and Splendid Spectacle, Founded on the Subject of the French Revolution: The Fall of the Bastille on the London Stage”; and Kevin Cope’s own “Loads of, no, not Shadwell, but Shells Paved the Way: The Deflective Power of ‘Junk’ in Long Eighteenth-Century Geological Speculation and in Dryden’s Religious Rhymes.” Other contributors include Kathryn King, Howard Weinbrot (on Defoe’s Shortest Way), Anne Barbeau Gardiner (“Richard Langhorne and the Popish Plot”), and Colby Kullman (on satire in Hogarth).

Al Coppola, a new member who’s been at John Jay College since finishing his doctorate at Fordham, published “The Secret History of Eliza Haywood’s Works? The Early Novel and the Book Trade” in 1650-1850, 19 (2012), 133-61. This is a good example of book history bearing on literary history. Coppola looks closely at how The Works of Mrs. Eliza Haywood, 1724, 4 vols. 8vo, was
reprinted with altered contents in 4 vols. 12mo as The Secret Histories, Novels and Poems . . . by Mrs. Eliza Haywood, 1725, called a “2nd” edition, though not a second edition of the whole earlier collection. Coppola makes the case that William Chetwood’s effort to sell Haywood as a prestigious author was “scaled back and reconfigured” by Dan Browne and Samuel Chapman to sell Haywood as a “writer specializing in amatory intrigue and thinly veiled scandal” (136-37). Al’s essay “‘Without the help of Glasses’: The Anthropocentric Visuality of Nehemiah Grew’s Biology” appeared this summer in a special section of The Eighteenth Century on “Subject Theory and the Sensational Subject,” edited by Rivka Swenson and Manushag Powell. Al’s dissertation on satires of science on the Restoration and 18C stage (2008) was directed by Stuart Sherman and read by Frank Boyle. Besides satire and the history of the book, Al is interested in natural history and spectacle. Vickie Cutting has for many years done a splendid job managing ASECS’s web presence, fellowships, membership correspondence, conferences, etc. While, along with Executive Director Byron Wells, she is thanked at the start of the program for the Cleveland ASECS, I cannot but wonder if many benefiting from ASECS recognize her central role in all that it does well. There’s never a delay in her correspondence. When I was curious how many attended the Cleveland ASECS, I wrote an email and learned almost immediate that 805 had (she added figures for the previous meetings, too: San Antonio 833, Vancouver 802, Albuquerque 802, Richmond 824, Portland [2008] 779). We welcome to EC/ASECS and the fall meeting Clarissa Dillon of Haverford, PA. With her doctorate in history from Bryn Mawr, Clarissa has long promoted the study of 18C American domestic life and culinary practices through primary materials, with such articles as the well-documented “Rhubarb in the World of William Penn” (Phactum, April 2012--free on the web) and workshops on 18C cooking and food processing. J. A. Downie may have snuck one by me: Alan published “Disappointed Swift” in Eighteenth-Century Ireland, 26 (2011), 11-23.

The late A. C. Elias, Jr., donated $20,000 from his estate to the endowment for the Irish-American research travel fellowship that he established under ASECS’s umbrella and coordinated for over a decade. This increased the award to $2500. In the spring, ASECS’s executive board agreed with the prize coordinators to change the fellowship title to “The A. C. Elias, Jr. Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship.” The fellowship is open to members of ASECS or the Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society wishing to conduct primary research across the ocean (the next deadline is 15 November and details for submission can be found in the last Intelligencer on pp. 54-55 or at the ASECS website). Questions can be sent to Jim May (jem4@psu.edu).

Gloria Eive has retired from the Music Department of Saint Mary’s College in Moraga, CA. She currently teaches at the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at Cal State U. East Bay--Concord, and also at the Diablo Valley College Emeritus Program. She remains the fine arts section editor of the ECCB and also the editor for the Centro Internazionale di Studi Sartiani (Giuseppe Sarti, 1729-1802). Currently she’s editing a collection of articles on 18C arts, literature and culture, entitled “Visions and Realities,” for Cambridge Scholars Press, and also editing “Collected Works for Strings by Florentine Composers” Pietro Nardini, Neri Bondi, and others. Laura Engel will give a plenary lecture at the Aphra Behn

In July Polly Stevens Fields died at the age of 79, in Reno, where she had moved after retiring from Lake Superior State U. in Sault Ste Marie, where she often taught five English courses a semester. Her obituary was posted 30 July 2013 on www.legacy.com, from The Tennessean of that day. She had been working on both medieval and 18C theatre in recent years, speaking on Hrothwissa’s convent dramas at The Gender and Medieval Studies Conference in Manchester, U.K., in January 2012, and writing up discoveries on Charlotte Charke. She published articles on Eliza Haywood and Mary Davys. Polly took her doctorate in 1992 from LSU after teaching Humanities at the University School in Nashville. The obituary states that from those she taught in high school are enough to humble and inspire any teacher; they are of a piece with “the single best teacher I ever had” from Mark Levine of Washington; “Ms. Fields was a force of nature” from Ellen Rubin of Westwood, MA; “She had a way of making history exciting and a little bit naughty” from Gwen Colley of Ottawa. Another tribute by Kim Collins glosses this: “the most amazing teacher I ever had . . . She shared just enough of herself to create a vivid Southern mystique. Descriptions she used, turns of phrase and coquettish looks she gave come to mind frequently even all these years later. She was the first teacher I ever had who used double entendre to get our attention. She treated us as the near-adults we were while letting us know that she believed we could do anything.” (These and other tributes reminded me of lines my Uncle Rich recited from Edwin Markham’s “A Creed”: “There is a destiny that makes us brothers. / None goes his way alone: / All that we send into the lives of others / Comes back into our own.”)

Anna Foy went to Dublin and Yorkshire early this summer, in part to see the MS at TCD of Grainger’s The Sugar Cane. Jack Fruchtman spent the first half of the summer working on a constitutional law text, treating civil liberties and civil rights. Michael Genovese will be coming from the U. of Kentucky to present a paper on Betsy Thoughtless at the Philadelphia EC/ASECS. Michael published “‘A Mixture of Bad in All’: The Character(s) of Self-Interest in Sarah Fielding’s David Simple” in The Age of Johnson, 22 (2012). He’s published several essays in The Eighteenth Century, including his “‘Profess as much as I’: Dignity as Authority in the Poetry of Sarah Fyge Egerton” (51 [2010], 45-66) and a review essay “Raising the Dead: Collecting Women Poets in the Eighteenth Century” (53 [2012], 492-97). Some of these articles and a forthcoming essay in ECS (“An Organic Commerce: Sociable Selfhood in 18th-Century Georgic”) are steps on the way to a forthcoming book: “Social Currency: The Expansive Self of 18th-Century British Literature,” which examines how the language of finance
was integrated with that of feeling to resist practices of possessive individualism.” Marilyn Francus published “Jane Austen, Pound for Pound,” which contains some charts related to finance, in Persuasions Online, Vol. 33 #1, Winter 2012 (http://www.jasna.org/persuasions/on-line/vol33no1/francus.html). Her essay “Where does discretion end, and avarice begin?: The Mercenary and the Prudent in Austen,” is forthcoming in Volume 34 of Persuasions: The Journal of the Jane Austen Society of North America. Julian Fung has published “Religion and the Anglican Narrator in Defoe’s Tour” in SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900, 53 ([Summer] 2013), 565-82. Julian convincingly argues, with good instances and quotations from the text, that Defoe uses a Church of England persona to make an ongoing case for religious toleration. The narrator over and over finds good dissenters and pious practices that might be emulated by his Church—the observations supporting tolerance extend to Catholicism as well. Julian concludes by noting that the rhetorical strategy holds true even if Defoe didn’t write the book and that it underscores the error of thinking of the narrator as Defoe himself. I thank, besides Julian, Patricia Gael and fellow Penn State graduate student and recent Penn State Ph.D. Leah Orr for each contributing a review to this issue, of three difficult books, too. Julian wrote a fine review of a major book on satire for the October 2012 issue, and, so, I turned around and asked him to tackle Ashley Marshall’s lengthy study of satire, which he promptly knocked off. Oh, the sons and daughters of Hume! Throw in others, like Nancy Mace, Cheryl Wanko, and David Spielman, all of whom have followed Rob in contributing to the Intelligencer, and add, too, Matt Kinservik, who’ll chair our 2014 meeting at Delaware, and one begins to measure how much that we have benefited from Rob’s contributions to our conferences and newsletter (which he continues to subsidize). Rob’s been a good citizen at Penn State, too, serving this past year on the time-consuming university-wide Research IT Strategic Planning Committee, recommending needed actions and investments, pitched to a surprising number of administrative power-brokers--there are more VPs, deans, chair-holders, and councils at a university than one might imagine

Jennifer Germann, Assistant Professor of Art History at Ithaca College, published "Tracing Marie-Éléonore Godefroid: Women’s Artistic Networks in Early Nineteenth-Century Paris" in Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture 41 (2012). She is currently working on a manuscript on the portraiture of Queen Marie Leszczinska, consort to Louis XV of France, and will be presenting a paper derived from this work at the Kings & Queens 2: Making Connections Conference at the U. of Winchester in July. Karen Gevirtz, currently Executive President of the Aphra Behn Society, published a review essay on Mona Scheuermann’s Reading Jane Austen and Rachel M. Brownstein’s Why Jane Austen? in Vol. 3.1 of ABO: Interactive Journal for Women in the Arts, 1640-1830 (April 2013). This new e-journal of the Aphra Behn Society is based at the Society’s website and edited by Laura Runge, Jennifer Golightly, and Alexksondra Huitquist. Vol. 3 also contains Cheryl Wanko’s “Interactive Aphra: Skyping Behn into your Classroom” and Katherine Kittredge and Qina Liu’s “Chasing the Ghost of Melesina Trench: A Film by Qina Liu in collaboration with Katharine Kittredge” (the short documentary on Kittredge’s research on Trench, an Irish diarist, is available on the WWW). Karen Gevirtz, Martha Bowden, and Jonathan Sadow
Carolyn C. Guile, a new member in Art and Art History at Colgate University, works on architectural history in particular and will be speaking at our meeting in Philadelphia come November. At the past six or more EC/ASECS meetings, often in Don Mell’s Swift roundtables, Eugene Hammond has been disclosing much new biographical information on Swift, dug up while researching a long and detailed new biography of Swift, called “Jonathan Swift: An Irish Blow-In.” What we’ve seen of the manuscript is an important updating of Ehrenpreis and other Swift biographies, but it’s also very engaging, no surprise given Gene’s authorship of the popular text Thoughtful Writing (3rd ed. from Kendall Hunt, 2009). Julie Hayes’s Presidential Address at ASECS was entitled “Philosophical about Marriage: Women Writers and the Moralist Tradition.” During her presidential term, Julie contributed interesting editorials to ASECS’s News Circular on 18C studies and the Humanities.

Mascha Hansen co-edited, with Kirsten Juhas and Patrick Müller, “The First Wit of the Age”: Essays on Swift and his Contemporaries in Honour of Hermann J. Real (published this summer by Peter Lang). I have provided an account of the book and members’ essays at the end of the review section, for it contains, not only Mascha’s efforts and a tribute to Hermann Real, but essays by Mascha and eight other EC/ASECS members: James Woolley, Ashley Marshall, Jim May, John Irwin Fischer, Andrew Carpenter, Hugh Ormsby-Lennon, Ann Cline Kelly, and W. B. Carnochan. Many of the essays contain important new arguments and discoveries. Mascha was twice to England this summer to read papers, at the Overton and the Burney conferences, traveling to the last with the whole family, including her sons Thies and Nick. George Hahn, besides chairing the English Department at Towson U, is working on an edition of neglected popular poems that will complement his book, The Ocean Bards: British Poetry and the War at Sea, 1793-1815. We welcome Gabriella Hartvig, an Associate Professor of English at the U. of Pecs, Hungary. Gabriella has written on the reception of English authors in Hungary, as repeatedly on Swift’s reception, but her principal focus has been Sterne, on whose reception she published a monograph in 2000. She spoke on “Hungarian Sterne” at the Sterne Tercentenary conference this past July in Egham, near London, organized by Judith Hawley, Melvyn New, and Peter de Voogd. Gabriella’s session “focused on the aesthetics of reception in the European Romantic and early modern periods”; others spoke on Sterne in Bulgaria, Germany, Italy, and Russia. Gabriella “especially enjoyed Yordan Kosturkov’s paper on the Bulgarian Sterne. He is the translator of Sterne’s works into Bulgarian (A Sentimental Journey in 1981, with a 2nd ed. in 2009), and he published a history of Sterne in Bulgaria within the 2012 volume of The Shandean.” Gabriella notes that “Emily Finer gave an interesting talk on Viktor Shklovskii, the Russian formalist critic, who wrote essays on Tristram Shandy in the 1920s (he could not read English but read Sterne in Russian).” She wishes he had heard “Helen Williams’s presentation on ‘The Good Humour Club,’ a recently identified minute book in Shandy Hall from 1743.” Gabriella continues that this international meeting comes “a very long time after the Bicentenary in 1968 (held in York, the conference proceedings being entitled The Winged Skull, 1971). There was a final round table discussion on
'The Winged Skull Revisited,' chaired by Pat Rogers, where we learned that the final volume of the Florida Sterne will come out soon (including miscellanies, *A Political Romance*, and a List of Subscribers). Also, a Norton edition on Sterne by Judith Hawley will come out next year . . . . There will be another birthday conference for Sterne, at the end of November, in Venice, organized by Flavio Gregori. Looking forward to it, I am now trying to dig up more information on the 1790s Viennese bookseller Rudolph Sammer, who published Sterne in English, his editions spreading throughout this part of Europe.”

**Alessandra Huitquist** deserves the longest travel award at our meeting in November--she’s flying in from the U. of Melbourne, where she’s a visiting fellow and lecturer. Dr. Huitquist’s 2008 dissertation, written at Illinois under **Robert Markley**, is entitled “ ‘Equal Ardour’: Female Desire, Amatory Fiction and the Recasting of the Novel, 1680-1760.” Aleksandra has elsewhere written on Behn and Haywood. **Rob Hume** and **Judy Milhous** are proofreading and editing their Panizzi Lectures on “The Publication of Plays in Eighteenth-Century London” (October 2011) for publication by the British Library in 2014. They also have a related on-going book project in “Theater Finances in London, 1660-1800,” and Rob has another in “The Economics of Culture in London, 1660-1820” (both books are under contract with Oxford UP). Recently Rob has written an essay on the “value of money” (the costs of and finances surrounding cultural productions long being a focus of his research), and, for a festschrift edited by Ashley Marshall, Rob’s produced an inclusive survey of Ronald Paulson’s scholarly corpus, 23 books and many articles and nearly 100 reviews. Judith Milhous remains the Distinguished Professor of Theater and Deputy Executive Officer of the Graduate Center Theater (at CUNY). **Andrea Immel** and Brian Alderson have edited *Tommy Thumb’s Pretty Song-Book: A Facsimile of the Earliest English Nursery-Rhyme Book*, accompanied by an illustrated essay, “Nurse Lovechild’s Legacy” (Los Angeles: Cotsen Occasional Press, 2013). Andrea reviewed P. M. Heath’s *The Works of Mrs. Trimmer (1741-1810)* in the *Journal of Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 35 (2012), 612-13. Also this month, she co-organized a conference at Princeton’s Cotsen Children’s Library entitled “Putting the Figure on the Map: Imagining Sameness and Difference for Children,” involving children’s sense of the national and of foreign countries.

Back in March, we learned that **Annibel Jenkins** had died, a founding member of SEASECS, honored by ASECS and SEASECS with prizes in her name. **Joe Johnson** shared the sad news with members on 20 March, noting that at 95 she remained delighted to receive SEASECS news, adding “when I saw her the week before last, she was full of questions about our meeting in Charleston and was touched to know about the recipient of this year’s very first Annibel Jenkins Prize.” We’re happy to welcome **Jacob Sider Jost** to the Society. Jacob, who took his M.A. from Oxford and his doctorate in English from Harvard and is an Assistant Professor of English at Dickenson, has written on such authors and topics as David Hume, the Grand tour, and Shakespeare. His first book *Prose Immortality, 1711-1819* is forthcoming from the U. of Virginia Press. **Sandro Jung** will once again fly over from Ghent to our annual meeting to host a reception and give what’s sure to be a first-rate presentation (after the last, **Eleanor Shevlin** said to me that Sandro was doing exciting, ground-breaking

Lehigh U. Press next month will publish the festschrift *Women, Gender, and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain: Essays in Memory of Betty Rizzo*, edited by Sonia Kane and Temma Berg (Amazon notes: 20 Sept., 352 pp.; $81; ISBN: 1611461413). On Friday at 1:30 at the EC/ASECS in Philadelphia, there will be a roundtable “Honoring Betty Rizzo,” serving as a launch for the volume. Chaired by Temma, the table or tables will accommodate nine additional speakers, mostly long-standing EC/ASECS members, such as Beth Lambert, Sylvia Kasey Marks, and Mary Margaret Stewart. The *Intelligencer* carried tributes to Betty by Beverly Schneller and Brijraj Singh back in fall 2008 (22.iii: 39-44, 66).

Crystal Lake, having taken her doctorate at Missouri and taught in the Atlanta area, is now an Assistant Professor of English at Wright State U. Her essay “The Life of Things at Tintern Abbey” appears in *RES*, 63 (2012), 444-65. This summer Stephen Karian, who has an essay in the *Reading Swift VI* (see Hermann Real below), was in Easton, PA, to work with James Woolley on their three-volume Cambridge edition of Swift’s poetry. Also, Steve spoke at the Rare Books School in Charlottesville on developments in electronic bibliography, tools like ESTC and ECCO, a topic that he also addressed at ASECS. In his preface to the 2013 *Swift Studies*, Hermann Real, surveying the state of the Ehrenpreis Center for Swift Studies, thanks “our loyal friend of long standing, Dr. Linde Katritzky” for helping “improve our financial situation by an ingenious knack.” This spring Deborah Kennedy’s *Poetic Sister: Early Eighteenth-Century Women Poets* was published by Bucknell U. Press and Rowman & Littlefield, in Bucknell’s series *Transits: Literature, Thought & Culture*, edited by Greg Clingham (this is at least the eighth title in the series). It is reviewed above by H. George Hahn. Chapters focus on Anne Finch, Elizabeth Rowe, “Countess of Hereford and the Poetry of the English Landscape,” concerning Frances (Thynne) Seymour, later Duchess of Somerset (1699-1754), Sarah Dixon of Kent (1671-1765), and the Oxford poet Mary Jones. In January, Catherine Keohane presented “Telling Stories: Narrative Concentration and the Family-State Analogy in Defoe and Swift” at the MLA in Boston, and in October 2012, she presented “Seeing Oneself in(stead of) the Poor: Charity and Imaginative Substitution” at the NEASECS in Middletown, CT, and “Creative Accounting: Charity, Consumption, and Debt in *Camilla*” at The Burney Society meeting in New York. Her 2009 EC/ASECS conference paper was revised as “Ann Yearsley’s ‘Clifton Hill’ and its Lessons in Reading” and published in *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, vol. 41 (2012), 233-53.

Paul E. Kerry with Matthew S. Holland has edited *Benjamin Franklin’s Intellectual World*, published last year by Fairleigh Dickinson UP and Rowman & Littlefield (xxii + 195 pp.)—it will be reviewed here in March by Jack Fruchtman. The volume includes Paul’s co-authored introduction and his “From
Weimar, with Love: Benjamin Franklin’s Influence on Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s Self-Fashioning” as well as Carla Mulford’s “Early Modern Imperialism, Traditions of Liberalism, and Franklin’s Ends of Empire.” Among the other six essays are Lorraine Smith Pangle’s “Ben Franklin and Socrates”; Douglas B. Thomas’s “Recasting Franklin as Printer: A Note on Recent Historiography,” and Simon P. Newman’s “Ben Franklin and the Leather-Apron Men: The Politics of Class in 18C Philadelphia.” James Kirschke is writing a second memoir—he earlier wrote a good one on his soldiering in Viet Nam, Not Going Home Alone: A Marine’s Story (2001, reprinted in 2008).

In March Anthony Lee gave a lecture at Bucknell U. entitled “‘We make the music which we imagine ourselves to hear’: Milton, Pope, and the Poetics of Intertextuality in Johnson’s Dictionary and Rambler.” Tony’s review of the Yale edition of Johnson’s Lives of the Poets, with thoughtful comparisons to the Lonsdale edition and a few good corrections, appeared in Modern Philology. As of summer 2013, having left the U. of Missouri, George Justice and Devoney Looser are working at Arizona State, where George is Dean of Humanities, and Devoney, Professor of English. Devoney taught there in 2000-01 as a visiting assistant professor, so “it feels a little bit like a homecoming” to her. In the past year, Devoney has published: “The Cult of Pride and Prejudice and Its Author,” Cambridge Companion to Pride and Prejudice, ed. Janet Todd (2013), 174–85; “Why I’m Still Writing Women’s Literary History” (reprint), The Critical Pulse: 36 Critics Give Their Credos, ed. by Jeffrey Williams and Heather Steffen (Columbia UP, 2012), 217–225; and a review essay for the Los Angeles Review of Books (in January), entitled “The State of the Union of Jane Austen, Fact and Fiction.” This month the fall 2013 issue of Eighteenth-Century Life appeared with Devoney’s “Her Later Works Happily Forgotten’: Rewriting Frances Burney and Old Age.” Devoney is presently editing the Cambridge Companion to Women's Writing in the Romantic Period (1780-1830), likely to be published in early 2014. Jessica Linker, a new member in History at the U. of Connecticut, is writing her dissertation on women’s scientific activities, broadly defined (from domestic chores to publication), between 1720 and 1860. She offers a critique of ahistorical modern stereotypes about women’s involvement in the sciences. Presently she holds the 2013-14 Dissertation Research Fellowship from the Philadelphia Area Center for the History of Science and has formerly received research fellowships from the McNeil Center, the Library Company, the American Philosophical Society, the NYPL, and the Filson Historical Society.

Ellen Malenas Ledoux’s “Defiant Damsels: Gothic Space and Female Agency in Emmeline, The Mysteries of Udolpho and Secrecy” appeared in Women’s Writing, 18 (2011) 331-47. Yu Liu’s essay “The Surprising Passion for Wild Nature: The True Innovation of Shaftesbury’s Aesthetics” appears in “New Ages, New Opinions”: Shaftesbury in his World and Today, ed. by Patrick Müller (P. Lang, 2013). Last year Cambridge published Samuel Johnson in Context, edited by Jack Lynch (472 pp.; bibliography; chronology; index; c. $90 on Amazon; ISBN: 978-0-521-19010-7). It strikes me as a well conceived tool, more like an encyclopedia than most “in context” books. There are too many articles to list them all, but I’ll list many, including those by EC/ASECS members (the

Ashley Marshall published a long discussion of “The Lives of Jonathan Swift” in the most recent Swift Studies (28 [2013], 10-57); it concludes with an appendix listing 67 biographies and biographical studies of Swift, from Pilkington and Orrery to David Oakleaf and Brean Hammond. She published “Swift and Temple,” a topic she addressed at the last EC/ASECS, in this year’s 1650-1850, 20 (2013). She has been editing “Representation, Heterodoxy, and Aesthetics from Swift and Hogarth to the Napoleonic Era: Essays in Honor of Ronald Paulson” (forthcoming from Delaware UP), and is currently researching and writing a book entitled “Swift and History: Politics and the English Past.”

William McCarthy in June reported that he is editing, with Olivia Murphy (Murdoch University, Perth, Australia), “a collection of essays on Anna Letitia Barbauld based on the bicentenary conference at Chawton House Library in 2012.” The collection consists of 13 essays and will be published by Bucknell U. Press, hopefully in time for the next ASECS. In May this year Bill spoke briefly at the unveiling of a plaque commemorating Barbauld’s birthplace in Kibworth, Leics. He writes that “Anyone who has occasion to visit Leicester should drive the 9 miles down the A6 to see the very handsome plaque on the wall of 33 Main St.” Bill also reports that he will be serving as “General Editor of a four-volume Collected Works of Barbauld for Oxford, copy to be delivered in September 2017. The edition will gather all of Barbauld’s identified prose writings for adults and young persons, and all her identified poems in newly-collated texts (a revision of the 1994 edition by me and Elizabeth Kraft, who will be one of my colleagues in this project). The “Collected Works” will represent the first effort to determine the Barbauld canon, and for that purpose I appeal to anyone who may have come across Barbauld attributions in print or MS archives to contact me by e-mail (wpmccarthy@bellsouth.net). Although the edition will not include letters, we wish very much to hear from the person who bought Barbauld’s letters to Lydia
Rickards at auction in May 2011, for the correspondence undoubtedly contains information important for identifying and editing Barbauld's works.”

In June Cambridge UP published Thomas McGeary’s *The Politics of Opera in Handel’s Britain* (418 pp; 3 illus; 4 tables; $99; ISBN: 9781107009882). The book, long researched, concerns the various relations (and uses) of Italian opera and British partisan politics during the first half of the century. Tom does not find that operas held allegorical commentary on politics or that the management was partisan; rather he focuses on how performers like Senesino and Faustina and how theatrical events were given new life in political satires (and gave new life to satire). (My sense from former articles that Tom has published is that he’s studied the British cultural context for and exploitation of opera.) In addition, Tom has much to say about institutions and organizations, with chapters and appendices on the Royal Academy of Music, Handel’s Second Academy, and the “Opera of the Nobility.” Also, Tom’s “Clarissa Harlowe’s ‘Ode to Wisdom,’ Composition, Publishing History, and the Semiotics of Printed Music” appears in *ECF*, 24.3 (2012), 431-58. Linda Merians is now working as the Chief of Staff at CUNY’s newest community college, the Stella and Charles Guttman Community College.


Ellen Moody has been blogging since May 2009 on a WordPress.com website she calls “Reveries under the Sign of Austen.” Many of these postings concern Jane Austen’s letters, such as “Austen’s Letters: Fragments 115-20, to Caroline and Anna, Dec. 1814-Sept. 1815,” posted 25 Sept. at reveriesunderthesignofausten/WordPress.com/2013/09. The amount of research and reflection Ellen has posted at “Ellen Moody’s Website” at www.jimandellen.org/ellen/ is truly staggering (and I am no more easily staggered than the next guy)—there is a link to a summary site dated 8 June 2012, providing an overview, which enumerates a huge range of chronologies, editions, bibliographies, critical essays and the like posted by Ellen over the preceding years, with links embedded in her summary. Besides Austen, Ellen has produced resources on writers like Richardson, Trollope, Frances Burney, Winston Graham, Anne Finch, Vittoria Colonna, and Veronica Gambara, and from poetry to gothic novels. There is a good deal of smart film criticism too, which all who have enjoyed film adaptations of Austen novels should particularly sample. Joanne E. Myers, who’ll be speaking on Defoe in Philadelphia, published “Defoe and the Project of ‘Neighbours Fare’” in *Restoration*, 35.1 (2011), 1-19, and “Infectious Fictions in *A Journal of the Plague Year*: Defoe and the Empirical Self” in *Individualism: The Cultural Logic of Modernity*, ed. by Zubin Meer (Rowman & Littlefield, 2011), 99-109. We’re very happy to welcome Elizabeth Neiman to the Society, whom I had the pleasure to meet at the ASECS panel on “EEBO, ECCO and Burney as Tools,” chaired by Eleanor Shevlin with Anna Battigelli’s interesting lament for EEBO Interactions’ demise. Elizabeth is an Assistant Professor of English, teaching in the Honors College at the U. of Maine in Orono and working on literature, gender, and the history of print culture and the book. She spoke at the last two ASECS meetings on late 18C print culture and generic conventions, esp. in the novel.

Among the 17 or so essays in *Theology and Literature in the Age of Johnson*, edited by Mel New and Gerard Reedy, S.J. (U. of Delaware Press;
Rowman & Littlefield, 2012; pp. xxi + 350), are a handful contributed by EC/ASECS members (no doubt the best the volume offers!): John Dussinger’s “The Oxford Methodists (1733; 1738): The Purloined Letter of John Wesley at Samuel Richardson’s Press” (27-48); Steven Scherwatzky’s “Johnson’s Fallen World” (131-46); E. Derek Taylor’s “Samuel Richardson’s Clarissa and the Problem of Heaven” (71-89), and Robert G. Walker’s “The Intellectual Background to Johnson’s Life of Browne: A Study of Johnsonian Construction” (91-111). This summer Mel wrote, following the Sterne Tercentenary conference in London (“a solid affair thanks to Peter de Voogd and Judith Hawley”), that a highlight of the conference was the “truly delightful one-man adaptation of Tristram Shandy by Stephen Oxley” of Los Angeles. Oxley began performing as Sterne 20 years ago, and, after a hiatus, revived the performance for the Sterne conference. He would like to find venues for his performance in the future, so those on program committees should keep him in mind (he shouldn’t be that expensive as he is a hedge fund manager and does this for the love of it). Contact him at seroxley@btopenworld.com. In remarks to us about the conference, quoted from above, Gabriella Hartvig notes that Oxley seemed to know Tristram Shandy by heart, and she adds, “What made his performance even more hilarious was that one had the feeling that the more significant sentences by Tristram were especially addressed to Professor New himself, who was sitting near the stage.” This fall should see the publication by AMS Press of Topographies of the Imagination: New Approaches to Daniel Defoe, ed. by Katherine Ellison, Kit Kincade, and Holly Faith Nelson, No. 69 in AMS Studies in the Eighteenth Century. The volume contains Maximilian Novak’s “Daniel Defoe in the Footsteps of the Goddess of Reason”; John Richetti’s “Second (and Third) Chances for Defoe’s Fictional Protagonists: Recovery and Realism”; and Geoffrey Sill’s “Daniel Defoe and the Sentimental Novel.” Among the other contributions is Kincade’s “Editing Defoe: A System of Magic as a Case Study” (Kincade’s edition of that work is forthcoming from AMS).

Bill Overton, a professor of English at Loughborough University in Leicestershire, died a little over a year ago. He had specialized in 18C poetry, publishing such articles as “Aphra Behn’s Versification” in Women’s Writing, 19 (2012), 145-64, and “Lord Hervey, Poetic Voice, and Gender,” RES, 62 (2011), 594-617. He was nearly finished with an edition of Hervey’s poetry, which James McLaverty will complete—as he did David Foxon’s Lyell Lectures on Pope and J. D. Fleeman’s Bibliography of Samuel Johnson. Well, Allan Ingram of the U. of Northumbria and Elaine Hobby, Bill’s wife, professor of 17C studies at Loughborough, in January issued a call for papers on 18C poetry for The Bill Overton Memorial Conference on Eighteenth-Century Poetry. The tribute was held this month, with dozens of presenters finding time on short notice to produce and present papers. Hermann Real described the event upon his return: “The Conference was extraordinarily successful, an impressive campus, good accommodation and catering, a genial, hospitable atmosphere, and, above all, some stunning papers, particularly by young, bright, and dedicated people, whom I was delighted to meet. One who impressed me deeply, a young man by the rather impossible name of Tom Jones, from Scotland, gave a wonderful paper on Pope’s Essay on Man . . . . Other good papers I heard were by Kerri Andrews,
Strathclyde, on an edition of Ann Yearsley’s poems; Leigh Wetherall-Dickson, Northumbria, on Burns (and his commonplace books); John Baker, Paris, on Henry Brooke’s *Universal Beauty*; Mascha Hansen, Greifswald (“This rhyming wit will die a maid”: Women, Poetry, and Futurity), delivered with confidence and poise, on the future plans, the dreams and fears, of women bold enough to venture into print; and Brean Hammond, always lovely and a good performer (‘The Poet as Professional’). Jim McLaverty, who will finish Bill’s almost complete edition of the poems of Lord Hervey for CUP, gave a good survey of what has been done and has still to be done. There was a tree-naming ceremony in the garden of the School of English—predictably the tree, a beautiful beech, was named Bill Overton, and it was planted before his office window. Several of his former doctoral students praised his humanity and learning, his patience and encouragement, as well as his care, meticulousness, and consideration. It became quite obvious that Bill was a deeply beloved and respected man.”

Kim O’Hara takes her M.A. in English this fall from Carleton University and continues on (her new address is noted above). Frank Parks is organizing a SHARP-sponsored session at the ASECS on “Colonial Printing in the Wider World of the Eighteenth Century.” Manushag Powell and Rivka Swenson introduced a group of essays on “Subject Theory and the Sensational Subject” in the Summer 2013 *Eighteenth Century* (54.2: 147-51). They begin by noting how the 18C supposed “human subjectivity was produced literally by the external world, that ideas themselves came from without the body,” making people “sensational subjects” (147). They end, by way of introduction, remarking that “as a collective body, these essays challenge common sense about the senses, emphasizing there is nothing immaterial to the 18C mind” (151). One of the six essays included articulates “the keystone relationship between the sensational subject and the novel,” Crystal Lake’s “Feeling Things: The Novel Objectives of Sentimental Objects.” Another essay, among three on the sense of touch, is David Brewer’s “The Tactility of Authorial Names.”

This month we received the fall 2013 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life*, edited by Cedric R. Reverand II, assisted by Book Review Editor Adam Potkay. It’s one of my favorite journals—I can count on over half the articles and most of the reviews holding my interest. *ECL* has a long interdisciplinary tradition that’s different from that of *Eighteenth-Century Studies*—I must suppose that the editors, beginning with Robert Maccubbin, have never lost track of their audience, mostly literary scholars. No doubt they’ve selected essays and encouraged some rewriting accordingly, and, over the decades, scholars have produced for submission to *ECL* articles that are more approachable and enlightening to non-specialists—part of that is staying free of jargon, but there’s more to it than that, such as the journal’s willingness begun long ago to illustrate articles. Even reviews often have the speaking voice of good conference papers. The journal does carry articles advancing the literary study of particular authors, as Devoney Looser’s on Frances Burney in this issue, but I turn to *ECL* hoping for something outside my specialization that gives me a better grasp of the developments the world over in the long eighteenth century (the late 17th century remains a focus in *ECL*—this issue carries an article by Anne Thell on Dampier’s *A New Voyage Round the World*, 1697). In this issue, most of the eight review
essays lead into research fields new to me, from Black missionaries, to servant-master relations, to finance and secularism, to late 18C French perceptions of Bohemians. For instance, in “Novissima Sinica,” Michael Keevak of the National Taiwan University, offers some exciting ideas about the influence of China on English culture, found in David Porter’s *The Chinese Taste in Eighteenth-Century England* (2010) and Chi-ming Yang’s *Performing China: Virtue, Commerce, and Orientalism in 18C England, 1660-1760* (2011). Keevak notes that Porter asks “us to think about how the encounter with China might actually have produced what we now think of as ‘Englishness.’ Tea drinking . . . quickly transformed from being a Chinese luxury import into being a paradigmatically English cultural trait.” Porter notes the popularization of porcelain and the decorative imagery on Chinese and Chinese-inspired objects. For Yang, who focuses on English conceptions of virtue, chinoiserie was also a force for the effeminacy. This especially fascinates me as I have lived through a similar feminization of my own culture (the university’s as well as America’s), not entirely unrelated to an engagement with Asia following on three American wars (marines brought back rice, incense, pot, Buddhism, Taoism, etc.). I recommend subscribing to *ECL*—it’s only $27 for individuals and $15 for students--watch for the three issues a year at your library and tell the administration you want that subscription to continue.

Elizabeth Powers gave a paper on 18C origins of utopian thinking while at a conference on the communitarian legacy held in British Columbia. In May she gave a related talk at the NYPL on “Modern Utopianism: The 18th-Century Background.” Her utopian studies led to her reading French *philosophes* and reduced her postings on her blog *Goethe Etc.* But as “Goethe Girl” in July she posted three articles on “Goethe, Commerce, and World Literature” and another on “Goethe and Saint-Simon.” Elizabeth’s article “Where Are the Mountains? Johann Jacob Bodmer and the Pre-Kantian Sublime” appears in *Goethe Yearbook*, 20 (2013), 199-222. Elizabeth’s focus is also on Bodmer’s “literary partner, Johann Jacob Breitinger,” both of whose notions of the sublime have recently received attention. Elizabeth works toward some precise observations about their views relative to others, such as to Addison’s and Kant’s, giving much attention to Bodmer’s notion that great, turbulent phenomena of nature are not sources of the sublime. Jonathan Pritchard’s essay “Pope at Chiswick” was published in *SEL*, 50 (2010), 625-44. Turning to the Pope’s neglected home, Jonathan asks why Pope was drawn to that resort in 1716 and why he was uncomfortable there--a discomfort reflected in his prose and suggesting some reasons why he was so fond of Twickenham. Jonathan also published two pieces in *Notes and Queries*: “Drink-Corn: Revising the Entry in the *OED*” (n.s. 58 [2011], 371-74), and “The Brewing Process in Dryden, Pope, and Hogarth” (58 ([2011], 410-17), the latter attesting to the period’s familiarity with brewing and its processes. More recently he published “Social Topography in The *Dunciad, Variorum*” in *Huntington Library Quarterly, 75* (2012), 527-60. Many thanks to Norbert Puszkar for reviewing above *The Goethe Yearbook*, 19 (2012)--there’s great difficulty in reviewing such a thick, varied volume. Incidentally, the 20th volume, the last to be edited by Daniel Purdy, came out this month.

Off and on at EC/ASECS meetings for a couple decades, John Radner has talked about Samuel Johnson and James Boswell and particularly their evolving
relationship, especially about how each tried to manage that relationship and what each gained from it—and, of course, how each understood the other. At the Cleveland ASECS, John gave a terrific capstone talk about how Boswell’s biographical project altered their relations around 1769, nine years or so after they’d met, which Boswell’s Paoli book gave him the confidence to pitch to Johnson (SJ would not have befriended Boswell to the degree he did and wouldn’t have disclosed much about his early life, his fears, etc.; the two would have exchanged fewer letters, the Hebrides trip wouldn’t have occurred, SJ might have completed an autobiography). Now we can read John’s many observations and arguments in the coherent development of the book that he’s been working on for a couple decades, for Yale University Press early this year published his *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship* (432 pp.; 5 illus.; $45; ISBN: 9780300178753). For the dust jacket, Yale secured three acclamations by senior scholars. Robert Folkenflik notes that none of the good biographies published “comes near” John’s book “in investigating a friendship . . . never . . . adequately examined,” and he stresses that it’s an important book for “understanding both” men. Howard Weinbrot calls the book “original, persuasive, elegantly written, and an important contribution to Johnsonian, biographical, and eighteenth-century studies.” Patricia Meyer Spack’s remarks that “Radner’s meticulous, exhaustive examination of the friendship between Samuel Johnson and his biographer, James Boswell, reveals sexual and literary competition between them and mutual impatience, fear, and neediness—as well as tenderness, supportiveness, and understanding on both sides. Boswell seems a more substantial figure and Johnson more volatile than their standard versions.” The March *Intelligencer* will carry a review for us by Beth Lambert.

The Cambridge Swift, with Claude Rawson, Ian Higgins, David Womersley, and now Ian Gadd, as general editors, this summer produced Valerie Rumbold’s edition of Swift’s *Parodies, Hoaxes, Mock Treatises* (vol. 2 of 17 projected; the 4th published), including many works, from *A Meditation upon a Broomstick* to *Polite Conversation* and *Directions to Servants* (pp. xci + 821).

**Hermann Real** in May presented “Swift on the Madness of Reason,” while in Berlin enjoying the hospitality of the Irish Ambassador. In June Hermann presented “An Un-Ruly Enquiry into the Vulgarly Received Notion of Pope’s ‘Nature’” at the conference “Echange(s) et changemont(s) au siècle des Lumières” hosted in Le Havre by Elizabeth Durot-Boucé and her colleagues there (they are organizing another for 2014), and in November he will present “Swift Horsing Around: or, The Madness of Reason” at a conference on “The Horse as Representative of Cultural Change in Systems of Thought” at the U. of Vechta in Oldenburg. In late winter the revised paperback edition of *The Reception of Jonathan Swift in Europe* appeared, with many experts providing broad geographical coverage. Early this summer Hermann sent his 28th volume of *Swift Studies* to the press, now published, which contains eight essays and two notes, including Hermann and Ulrick Elkmann’s “From Madness to Ménière’s to Alzheimer’s: A Bibliography of Studies on Swift’s Medical Case History.” As ever, the volume begins with a detailed account of developments at the Ehrenpreis Centre, such as important library acquisitions (supplemented by a bibliography at the back of the volume), lighter discoveries about Swift in popular culture (by
Elkmann), memorial tributes to deceased friends, including our late member O M Brack, Jr., and status reports for two important on-going projects. David Woolley’s four-volume edition of Swift’s correspondence was published without an index, due to Woolley’s death. It has become the standard edition for scholars, a definitive edition that won’t be attempted again (in view of Woolley’s mastery of Swift’s life and textual principles, but also the increasing costs of such projects and the rarity of someone’s dedicating his life to a monumental achievement). Now Dirk Passmann and Hermann Real will provide the index that makes Woolley’s labor much more valuable to all working on Swift and the period—the index should be published by Peter Lang in the next year, as they follow through on the edition they published in 1999-2007. The other big project, also supported by Team Ehrenpreis, involves the editing by Kirsten Juhas, Sandra Simon, and Hermann of the 36 essays from the sixth Münster Symposium (held June 2011), published in July by Wilhelm Fink. (Finally in late summer Hermann had time to write something new, on Swift’s donor books.)

Our next issue will carry a review of Reading Swift: Papers from the Sixth Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift (672 pp; illustrations, some in color; index). But we can at least note the presence of work there by members: John Irwin Fischer (on the book of vocabulary compiled by Swift for Esther Johnson and copied by her), W. B. Carnochan (on the relations of Swift and Charles Ford), Ian Gadd (on the publication history of The Examiner), Jim May (on the printing of piracies of and Curll’s key to A Tale of a Tub), J. A. Downie (on “The Topicality of A Tale of a Tub” for 1696-97), Ashley Marshall (“Aims and Motives” for The History of the Last Four Years), Ian Higgins (“A Preface to Swift’s Test Act Tracts”), Andrew Carpenter (on “Ecopoetry in Swift’s Irish Circle”), James Woolley (“Swift’s Most Popular Poems”), Hermann Real with Dirk Passman (on “The Humble Petition of Frances Harris”), Stephen Karian (“Who was Swift’s ‘Corinna’?”), Barbara Benedict (on “Things and Collections in Gulliver’s Travels”), Ann Cline Kelly (on “Swift’s Versions and Subversions of the Fable Genre: Context for Book Four of Gulliver’s Travels?”), Peter Sabor (on Fielding’s “Changing Views of Swift”), and Gabriella Hartvig (on “Hungarian Swift Scholarship in the Period of Censorship”). Kudos to the editors: it takes a long time to debug 672 fact-laden pages. July also saw the publication of a second festschrift in Hermann’s honor, this one on his 75th birthday (see the final book review above). Hermann had a golden year, so he mustn’t complain if his football team loses.

John Richetti, the distinguished emeritus professor from Penn who’ll give our plenary in Philadelphia, has written and edited many books over the past 45 years. Recently, with Toni Bowers, he edited an abridgement of Richardson’s Clarissa for Broadview Press (2011; 807 pp.). His Cambridge Companion to Daniel Defoe appeared in 2009, and his Life of Daniel Defoe in 2005. A number of his books, such as his edition of Robinson Crusoe, have been reissued for Kindle. One of John’s important critical works is The English Novel in History 1700-1780 (1998). Those attending 18C studies conferences might know John as an advocate of reading poetry aloud (he writes on the topic in Digital Defoe, 5). Albert Rivero and George Justice have brought out the ninth volume of The Eighteenth-Century Novel (books reviews edited by Kit Kincade). The volume

J. T. Scanlan of Providence College is joining us in Philadelphia. He served as President of NEASECS, his home regional, in 2009. John has long been the book review editor for The Age of Johnson, a considerable task—and he’s known to contribute a review himself, as he did last year, of Jan Golinski’s British Weather and the Climate of Enlightenment. He has a special interest in the law, contributing an essay on that subject to Samuel Johnson in Context (see the Lynch paragraph). Beverly Schneller, whom we thank for a review above, has recently become the Vice Provost at Belmont U. in Tennessee. We are happy to welcome to our ranks Steven Scherwatzky, chair of the English Dept. at Merrimack College in Massachusetts, whose essay “Johnson’s Fallen World” is among those in the volume noted above as co-edited by Mel New. We recollect his essay “Samuel Johnson’s Augustinianism Revisited” in The Age of Johnson, 2006, and last year his “Richetti’s Narratives” appeared in Eighteenth-Century Life, 36, no. 1 (Winter 2012). The spring issue of The Eighteenth Century has a “critical conversation” feature, introduced by Lisa Freeman, on “Why we argue about the way we read,” containing papers from her 2012 ASECS session responding to notions of “surface reading” in Representations, fall 2009. Two of the papers are Stuart Sherman’s “Pluralistic Reading as Not-Altogether-New Resource” and Kristina Straub’s “The Suspicious Reader Surprised, or What I Learned from Surface Reading.” Eleanor Shevlin put much of the summer into the successful SHARP conference and served on its Futures Committee and did program reviews for West Chester. She and her colleague Dr. Kuhi Walters have received an “NEA Big Read” grant for activities at the Center for the Book she founded at West Chester U. Geoffrey Sill is editing Defoe’s Colonel Jack for Broadview. Frances Singh published “More . . . Drumsheugh Scandal” in the August 2013 issue (#5) of The Signet Magazine of the Society of the Writers to Her Majesty’s Signet, pp. 26-28. It’s a cover story in this issue and easily googled up with “Issue 5 The Signet Magazine.” Frances examined transcripts and notes preserved in the Signet Library to discuss the difficulties in a legal case involving sexual and racial overtones. The case involved Dame Helen Cumming Gordon’s natural and half-Indian granddaughter Jane Cumming’s relations with the two women
founders of a school in Edinburgh, where Jane enrolled in December 1809. (This scandal was the inspiration for Lillian Hellman’s play *The Children’s Hour*, known to many for the film of that name with Audrey Hepburn and Shirley Maclaine.) Frances indicates that the lawyer John Clerk, defending the teachers, used Swift’s poem *Corinna A Ballad* (1711-12) to characterize Jane but that his private writings were more sympathetic than his remarks in court suggest. Poor Jane was married off to the Reverend William Tulloch, who turned out to be a womanizer and Jane was again in scandal as she “reported him to the Presbytery for sexual infidelity.”

We are happy to welcome to our membership **Chloe Wigston Smith** of the U. of Georgia, where she teaches 18C British and co-coordinates the Georgia Colloquium in 18C and 19C British Literature. Cambridge UP has this summer published her *Women, Work, and Clothes in the Eighteenth-Century Novel*. While working on that book, Chloe published essays on the figure of the female servant in popular culture and trade debates in *ECLife* and on representations of the body and clothes in trade cards and object narratives in *ECFiction* (a lengthy text: 23 [2010/11], 347-80). Chloe, who took her doctorate in 2007 from UVA, has enjoyed fellowships from the Folger, Huntington, Lewis Walpole libraries, the NEH, and the Yale Center for British Art. **Diana Solomon**’s book *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theatre: Gender and Comedy, Performance and Print* was published in April by the U. of Delaware Press (272 pp.; $75; ISBN: 978-1611494228)—it particularly attends to the performances of actresses. **Jan Stahl**’s “Women in Love,” on female friendship in Haywood’s *The British Recluse* and *The City Jilt*, appeared in *Gay and Lesbian Review Worldwide*, 19 (2012). **Laura Stevens**, having chaired at least one conference at her academic home in Tulsa, is co-organizing a special topics conference for the Society of Early Americanists to be held in London, England next July 17-19: *London and the Americas, 1492-1812*. Laura, who has for years been editing *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature*, is writing a book entitled “Daughters of Israel: Biblical Women and British Identities in Eighteenth-Century Transatlantic Literature.” *Imagining Selves: Essays in Honor of Patricia Myers Spacks*, ed. by Rivka Swenson and Elise Lauterbach, is reviewed by John Richetti in *The Eighteenth Century*, 53 (2012), 237-42. **Anthony Tedeschi** has left Otago and taken a position in Special Collections at the U. of Melbourne’s Baillieu Library. **Kathryn Temple**, who spoke on William Blackstone in Baltimore (see the start of this issue), reviewed Nicola Parsons’ *Reading Gossip in Early 18C England* in the Winter 2012 issue of *Eighteenth Century*. **Rosemary Wake**, a new member from Edinburgh will participate in the fall EC/A ECS, speaking on Frances Singh’s “Empty Nest” panel. Congratulations to **Philip Wilson** who this fall became chair of and Professor in the History Dept. of East Tennessee State U. in Johnson City. This summer appeared vol. 45, no. 1 of *The Scriblerian*, edited by Roy Wolper, W. B. Gerard, E. Derek Taylor, and David Venturo. The issue contains a grateful reply by Roy Wolper to the luncheon in his honor organized by the EC/A ECS and Roy’s fellow members, especially Mel New. Blake Gerard, and Derek Taylor (p. 293). **James Woolley** has a sabbatical this academic year to work on the 3-vol. Cambridge UP edition of Swift’s poems—and to write his Presidential Address for the Philadelphia EC/A ECS. James’s article on important discoveries about Swift
in the Berkeley Castle MSS is noted above in the review of The First Wit of the Age (at least one of the editors thought it the volume’s best essay). Susan Woolley (long in charge of publications at Moravian College in Bethlehem), with interests in English, particularly Jane Austen, and in social history, has taken a life membership in EC/ASECS, as has Nancy Mace of the U.S. Naval Academy. They join the ranks of a surprising number who have subsidized EC/ASECS and this newsletter through that generous contribution.

**Forthcoming Meetings and Organizational News**

The Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies meets 17-19 October at Western University in London, Ontario, with the theme “Enlightenment Constellations.” The meeting is chaired by Allison Conway and Mary Helen McMurran in English at Western U. See http://cseecs-secedhs2013.ca.

The Aphra Behn Society for Women in the Arts 1660-1830 holds its biennial meeting on 24-25 October 2013 at the U. of Tulsa, chaired by Jennifer Airey (jennifer-air@utulsa.edu). Laura Engel will give the plenary, and there will be a reading by Maureen Duffy, author of The Passionate Shepherdess: Aphra Behn 1640-89. The ABS’s 2015 meeting will be in Tampa, hosted by Judy Hayden. The Society’s website (www.aphrabehn.org) carries its newsletter, edited by Nichol Weizenbeck, and its new journal, ABO: Interactive Journal for Women in the Arts 1640-1830 (the fourth volume is due in March 2014). The site allows dues payments by credit card. The Society has a presence on Facebook, too.

We in the EC/ASECS meet at the Hilton DoubleTree in Philadelphia on 7-10 November 2013. See the lead article on the conference (sent by Geoffrey Sill).

The Midwestern ASECS, after meeting October 2012 in Madison, WI, was somewhere said to be meeting in Kansas City this fall, but I find no record of such on Google (their website www.mwasecs.net has not been updated in a year or more), and I am thus reminded of how lucky we in EC/ASECS are to have dedicated leadership from Linda Merians, Jim Moody and his successor, and the conference chairs like Peter Briggs, Doreen Saar, and Geoffrey Sill.

The British Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies holds its annual conference on 8-10 January 2014 at St. Hugh’s College, Oxford. All topics are welcome, though the plenary speakers will address the topic “Pleasures and Entertainments” (Helen Berry is the keynote speaker and the Haydn Mason Lecturer is Jerome Brillaud). The “venue organiser” is Dr. Debbie Welham in the Faculty of Arts at the U. of Winchester (conference.admin@bsecs.org.uk). Send inquiries regarding the program to Dr. Corinna Wagner, the “academic organiser” (academic@bsecs.org.uk) and submit by 20 October proposals at the BSECS website (www.bsecs.org.uk). Among the benefits of membership is access to the Society’s online review of books. But there is open-access to a more general category of “Online Reviews” edited by Emrys Jones, et al., 135 in all. These include exhibition reviews, as “Regency Colour and Beyond, 1785-1850” for the Royal Pavilion in Brighton, by Caroline Cannon-Brookes. Through 13 October, the Pavilion is itself an exhibition on what conservation has learned about colors chosen by George Prince of Wales for his home by or in 1822, information placed into the context of contemporary color preferences and color production. Another
review, by John Chu of The Courtauld Institute of Art, concerns “Houghton Revisited: Masterpieces from the Hermitage,” about the mounting of loaned works within the Palladian-Baroque mansion in Norfolk that Sir Robert Walpole built in part to house them (the review appeared 24 July; the exhibit ends 29 Sept.). Another exhibit review, written the past month by Kate Grandjouan, also of The Courtauld Institute, concerns the exhibition on Abbé Raynal at the Bibliothèque Mazarine in Paris. And, lastly, to give a sense of the variety, we also note here Ellen Moody’s “Mansfield Park at the Movies,” taken from Ellen’s blog on 23 September. Ellen offers comparative and evaluative observations about four film adaptations of Jane Austen’s Mansfield Park (1814): “all of them controversial, even the first, the 1983 BBC mini-series Mansfield Park, if you take into account persistent attacks on it.” The best adaptation to Ellen’s mind is Patricia Rozema’s Mansfield Park (1999), with Frances O’Connor as Fanny. Also discussed, with reference to interviews and the screenplay, are Whit Stillman’s Metropolitan [an adaptation] 1990), the “least known,” and Iain MacDonald’s 2007 Mansfield Park, written by Maggie Wadey, with Billie Piper as Fanny.

31 January 2014 is the deadline for submissions to a conference 23-25 July 2015 sponsored by The Shaftesbury Project and hosted by the Earl and Countess of Shaftesbury at their estate: “Shaping Enlightenment Politics: The Social and Political Impact of the First and Third Earls of Shaftesbury.” Proposals (up to 400 words) should be sent to conference chair Patrick Müller at Patrick.Mueller@angl.phil.uni-erlangen.de. Müller edited the papers from the 2012 conference and they were published by Peter Lang this year. Google up the project’s excellent website for more on the conference and the on-going research project.

The South-Central Society for 18C Studies (SCSECS) holds its 2014 conference at the Tremont House Hotel on Galveston Island, 13-15 February, with the theme “Energy,” chaired by Kevin Cope (encope@lsu.edu). The conference page at its website indicates the 2015 meeting will occur in Alabama or along the Gulf Coast hosted by John Burke and the 2016 at Disney World or New Orleans hosted by Kathryn Stasio (the Society’s newsletter editor).

The Western SECS meets on 14-16 Feb. 2014 at UC-Davis, with the theme “Love and Affect in the Long Eighteenth Century,” chaired by Alessa Johns (amjohns@ucdavis.edu) and Julia Simon (jsimon@ucdavis.edu). The submission deadline was 20 August (www.moosblues.net/wsecs2014.html).

The 40th SEASECS conference will be held February 27-March 1st 2014 in downtown Knoxville. The theme is “The Marketplace of Ideas,” and the co-chairs are Misty Anderson and Mary McAlpin. The deadline for proposals is 21 October (seasecs@utk.edu). Session topics are posted at http://seasecs.net/meeting_2014.html. The SEASECS has a number of prizes, among which is the “Undergraduate Teaching Prize: $1,200 for the best undergraduate panel proposed for the conference, with the monies to be used at least in part to help the participating undergraduate students with expenses related to attending the conference.”

There is a Society of Nineteenth-Century Americanists, which holds its third biennial conference on 13-16 March on the campus of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and at the Carolina Inn. Papers were invited on any aspect of 19C American literary culture (see http://as.vanderbilt.edu/c19).
The American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies (ASECS) holds its 2014 meeting on 19-22 March in Williamsburg. ASECS’s website has links for the program, registration, “things to do,” and lodging at the Williamsburg Lodge.

The 45th annual Northeast Modern Language Association will be held 3-6 April 2014 at Susquehanna U. in Selinsgrove, near Harrisburg, PA, without any overarching theme or topical title, though the organizers bill it as emphasizing drama and creative writing (the proposal deadline has past, but I mention NEMLA to remind folks of its meetings usually held close to the EC/ASECS region).

Penn’s English Dept continues to post “cfp.english.upenn.edu,” a lengthy list of calls for papers, with categories for sifting the huge number of postings, as “American” or “eighteenth century” (http://call-for-papers.sas.upenn.edu/). There is an excessive amount of overlap or duplication in the various categories, with some entries that seem a long stretch for the titular field. But the website is otherwise well run and set up to allow expanded display and convenient printing of CFPs of interest. Much more than calls for conference papers is posted here, including calls for projected books and new journals. For instance, Apollon eJournal of Undergraduate Research in the Humanities is looking for submissions (apollonejournal.org). The calls include other requests than submissions: e.g., the new journal The Journey of Heresy Studies is looking for editorial board members and peer reviewers. The conference postings include many from overseas.

The European Society for Periodical Research (ESRPit) and Radboud University Nijmegen will sponsor the conference “Backroom Business: The Production of Periodicals” on 10-11 April 2014. Proposals for 20 minute presentations on any “aspect related to the production of European periodicals, from the early 18th century to the present” are due 1 October to esprit@let.ru.nl. Topics treated include advertising, editing, financing, printing, sponsorship, etc.

The Nicholson Center for British Studies at the U of Chicago is holding “Poetic Genre and Social Imagination: Pope to Swinburne” on 9-10 May 2014. Send inquiries to popetoswinburne@gmail.com.

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 seal4london@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, also on the Kingston U. campus, the Early Caribbean Society will convene its third meeting (the previous two were in Barbados and Puerto Rico). Send proposals on early Caribbean culture or literature (with abstracts limited to 250 words) by 18 Oct. to Thomas Krise at krisetw@hotmail.com. Richard Frohock is the Society’s Secretary (richard.frohock@okstate.edu).

Gothic and Uncanny Explorations, an interdisciplinary conference at Karlstad U. in Sweden, 10-12 September 2014, seeks historical or theoretical papers on the gothic, the uncanny, or both, with proposals due by 20 January 2014 to maria.holmgren.troy@kau.se and sofiawijkmark@kau.se.
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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 cseecs2014@uqam.ca by April 1, 2014 (include a summary for one paper of 20 minutes and a CV no longer than a page). Remember that papers from the CSECS meetings are often selected for publication in its annual Lumen. 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 Society’s website (www.csecs.ca) has details on both meetings mentioned above and much else. The CSECS’s official representative to ASECS is the collegial Don Nichol, no doubt known to many in EC/AESECS.

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). Also, on 12-13 April 2014 in Bath will occur the conference Ballroom, State & Village Green: Contexts for Early Danced, with proposals due 1 Oct. to Barbara Segal (barbara.segal@thorn.demon.co.uk; see www.earlydancecircle.co.uk). And the Sorbonne Nouvelle is the site for a conference 24-25 April 2104 on Théâtre et charlatans aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, un art de la mise en scène? with proposals due 31 Oct. to colloque.charlatans@gmail.com. Then 1-4 May 2014 the biennial meeting of the American Bach Society will be held at Kenyon College in Ohio, which will include a celebration of the 300th anniversary of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s birth. Proposals were due 1 October to Markus Rathey (markus.rathey@yale.edu). Later that month, on 21-24 May, at the U. of Paris-X Nanterre et Bibliothèque du Sénat, an international colloquium entitled Voltaire philosophe is being organized by stephane.pujol@u-paris10.fr and Sebatien.Charles@USherbrooke.ca, with proposals due 15 Dec. On 5-7 June at the U. Paris-Diderot
will occur Quarrel Scenes–16th-18th Centuries: Conference-Festival (proposal deadline long passed). Then on 18-22 Sept. 2014 The Congress of Vienna and its Global Dimensions will commemorate in Vienna the bicentenary, with proposals due to Christian Cwik of the U. of Havana and U. of Cologne (ccwik@uni-koeln.de) by 31 Dec. 2013 and final papers by 19 August (see www.congesodeviena.at). L’Entente culturelle: L’Europe des correspondances littéraires, colloque international, will be held in Liège on 6-7 Oct. 2014, with proposals due by 15 Nov. to Ulla Kölving of the Centre international d’étude du XVIIIe siècle, Ferney-voltaire (ulla.kolving @c18.net) and Franoise Tilkin of the U. de Liège (F.Tilkin@ulg.ac.be). Finally, in Paris on 4-6 Dec. 2014, will be held Beccaria’s Cultures, organized by Pierre Musitelli (pierre.musitelli@ens.fr) and Xavier Tabet (xavier.tabet@wanadoo.fr)—send the proposals with CV’s by 15 Nov. (400 words, in English, French, or Italian).

Christopher Fauske has announced that the sixth conference of “Money, Power and Print: Interdisciplinary Studies of the Financial Revolution” in the British Isles, 1688-1776” will be held June 12-14 2014 in Leuven, Belgium. See the MPP homepage at https/sites.google.com/site/moneypowerprint/home.

The Rousseau Association having met in June 2013 will hold its next biennial meeting in 2015. No location is yet noted on the Society’s website, where we find a short tribute to the late Rousseau scholar Raymond Trousson.

The Defoe Society’s third biennial meeting was held this past August in Normal, IL, but I’ve not heard any account of it yet. The Defoe Society was founded in 2006, with Max Novak and John Richetti serving as President and Vice-President and Ashley Marshall, Geoffrey Sill, and Rivka Swenson quickly taking on responsibilities. The Society has been promoted in part by the website www.defoeseociety.org, which offers pages with bibliography, conferences, listserv, links, members books, pedagogy, and the e-journal Digital Defoe: Studies in Defoe & His Contemporaries. The journal is edited by Katherine Ellison in English at Illinois State U. (keellis@ilstu.edu) and Holly Faith Nelson at Trinity Western U. (hollyfaithnelson @ gmail.com). Early this year they sought copy for a fall 2013 issue of Digital Defoe, the fifth number, on “Public Intellectualism and Eighteenth-Century Studies.” There are several articles posted and freely accessible in their fourth issue of fall 2012, including Kyle Grimes’ lengthy “Daniel Defoe, William Hone, and The Right Divine of Kings to Govern Wrong! A New Electronic Edition” (http/english.illinoisstate.edu/digitaldefoe/features/grimes_pdf). Grimes notes that Hone, a “champion of the free press” and popular satirist, in 1821 published the short book Right of Divine Kings to Govern Wrong! that is “an updated, reorganized, and sometimes completely rewritten version” of Defoe’s Jure Divino (1706). The new edition is a web-based edition of Hone’s adaptation; Grimes, besides providing background to Hone, would show that “Defoe had a kind of ‘underground’--or at least unacknowledged--influence on the radical writers and publishers” of the 19C. As a dinosaur clinging to newsletters on papers, I am impressed and envious of this Defoe website and the related e-journal, and I hope that EC/ASECS can find a capable and diligent editor of this caliber to replace me in a few years. Let’s add here that Kit Kincaide writes that Irving Rothman’s edition of The Family Instructor (within The Stoke Newington

Announcements regarding Resources, Publications, etc.

The challenge for the Defoe Society’s and other websites may prove to be the never-ending duties required to keep up the publication. The websites of many societies and institutions have fallen behind. Editorial duties grow old. There has been flagging support for ASECS’s online book-review site, **EBRO**, established back in 1995 and long overseen by Clorinda Donato with student assistance at California State U.–Long Beach (www.csulb.edu/colleges/cla/ebro). Although thousands are in ASECS—enough to give **EBRO** an edge over other such sites, this week I found only three reviews posted in over two years. On 9 May 2012 Susan Carlile’s review of William McCarthy’s *Anna Laetitia Barbauld: Voice of the Enlightenment* (2008) was posted, and on 27 June 2011 Vineeth Mathor of Jawaharlal Nehru U. reviewed Jack Fruchtman, Jr.’s *The Political Philosophy of Thomas Paine* (2009), and John Christian Laursen reviewed *Correspondence of Pierre Bayle*, vol. 7 (2009). The site is nicely designed, containing a list of review copies in need of reviewers (the most recent are six books printed in 2011). The Editors of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* receive a long list of review copies noted at the back of *ECS*, many never sent to reviewers; one would think half of these copies would end up in EEBO’s list of books for review. But who am I to talk?

The *Intelligencer* needs reviewers for the following: Vol. 20 of *Goethe Yearbook* (2013); Michael Griffin’s *Enlightenment in Ruins: The Geographies of Oliver Goldsmith* (Bucknell UP, 2013); Kenneth R. Johnston’s *Unusual Suspects: Pitt’s Reign of Alarm & the Lost Generation of the 1790s* (Oxford UP, 2013); Scott R. MacKenzie: *Be it ever so Humble: Poverty, Fiction and the Invention of the Middle-Class Home* (U. of Virginia Press, 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 Tolkein* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2013); Howard D. Weinbrot’s *Literature, Religion, and the Evolution of Culture 1660-1780* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2013); Karen A. Weyler’s *Empowering Words: Outsiders & Authorship in Early America* (U. of Georgia Press, 2013). Help me out--I’d hate to return or steal these books. Promise to write 700 to 1800 words on one of these within a year, and I’ll send it to you (jem4@psu.edu). You can return it if it bores or confuses you.

In “Teaching with ECCO,” posted 17 August 2013 on *Early Modern Bibliography Online* (EMBO), Anna Battigelli announced that Gale Cengage was providing SUNY colleges with a free trial of ECCO and also sponsoring an essay contests for undergraduates using the tool (http:// earlymodernonlinebib..wordpress.com/ category/ ecco). Battigelli has integrated the use of ECCO into an undergraduate class on the Gothic Novel. To prepare students, she has created three short introductory videos (on what ECCO is and on basic and advanced searching), which are available in her posting, as are four others from Virginia Tech U. Library’s website (one offers specific advice about the search-history and infomarks functions). This posting was followed by a discussion of teaching with ECCO by Eleanor Shevlin, David Mazella, and others, archived at the site.
Justin Croft (Faversham) and Simon Beattie (Cheshire), English antiquarian booksellers, have issued *English Verse 1751-1800* in three parts (A-G, H-R, S-Z), available as PDFs at their websites. These contain rarities collected by James O. Edwards, whose superb holdings of English verse 1700-1750 were described by Stephen Weismann on their acquisition by Ximenes and Christopher Johnson several years ago. The three catalogues are important bibliographical tools.

The Metropolitan Museum has on exhibit through January 5, 2014, “Interwoven Globe: The *Worldwide Textile Trade, 1500-1800,*” which Brij Singh recommends and hopefully will review for us in March. The Morgan Library exhibits “two historic copyist scores of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony” and “Tiepolo, Guardi, and Their World: *18C Venetian Drawings* (until 1 Dec. and 5 Jan. respectively); from 17 Jan.-11 May the Morgan will display “Visions and Nightmares: Four Centuries of Spanish Drawings.” In Washington, the National Gallery of Art offers on the ground floor of the West Bldg. through 9 February: “The Transformation of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses.*” Demonstrating the work’s popularity through the 20C (“the most important single source for mythological lore”), the exhibit displays the gallery’s rare books, prints, drawings, medals and decorative arts objects. The Houghton Library is displaying recent additions (including MSS of Gilbert White’s sermons 1747-53). The Library Company of Philadelphia, at 1314 Locust St., an easy walk from our conference, offers through 13 Dec. “Remnants of Everyday Life: *Historical Ephemera* in the Workplace, Street, and Home,” with articles from the 18C to the early 20C, such as broadsides and playbills, postcards and tradecards, menus and ephemeral toys and games. The curators, Rachel D’Agostino and Erika Piola, co-Directors of the Visual Culture Program, look in detail at such themes as the evolution of graphic design, ephemera associated with women’s roles in the home, and the changing nature of leisure activities and consumerism. The exhibit follows the completion last year of a two-year NEH-funded project to catalogue and selectively digitize the library’s nearly 30,000 pieces of 18C and 19C ephemera. Note that a public talk on scrapbooking, related to the exhibition, will be given by Ellen Gruber Garvey on 13 Dec. The Library Company has accessible on the WWW a number of online exhibitions, such as “Benjamin Franklin: Writer and Printer”; “Black Founders: The Free Black Community in the Early Republic”;

As a part of its *Early Mozart Biographies Project*, the Mozart Society of America has posted 20 texts at its website (mozartsocietyofamerica.org).

The William Blake Archive in Sept. added electronic editions of *The Book of Thel* copy B (Yale Center’s Mellon Collection) and copy I (The Bodleian).

The *Children’s Books History Society Newsletter* in August notes several exhibitions this fall: *The ABC of It: Why Children’s Books Matter*, through 23 March in the Schwarzman Bldg. of the NYPL, curated by Leonard S. Marcus;
ABC: How We Learn to Read, through 26 Nov. at the British Schools Museum in Hitchin; and, beginning in December 2014 at the Grolier Club in NYC: One Hundred Books Famous in Children’s Literature, curated by Chris Loker (a catalogue with essays by distinguished experts is forthcoming, too).

In March 2012 the ESTC posted “The ESTC as a 21st-Century Research Tool,” partly as a response to UC-Riverside’s Center for Bibliographical Studies and Research’s receiving an award from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to “redesign the ESTC as a 21st century research tool.” The CBSR co-manages the half-million-record ESTC with the British Library (http://estc.bl.uk). A large planning committee, which included Benjamin Pauley, David Gants, David Vander Meulen, and Ann McDermott, met to rethink the ESTC, to make it “more usable to a broad spectrum of researchers and librarians and to harness the knowledge and input of those users to expand and refine ESTC data.” Brian Geiger (Director, CBSR) asked for comments on suggestions in the posted document by April 20, 2012. I have not seen a follow-up document incorporating public feedback, but the report itself is a series of short sections worth reading. It defines the ESTC’s future aims as 1) “To harness the expertise of its users in the ongoing curation and enrichment of its data”; 2) “To become the ‘electronic hub’ for relevant digitization projects and . . . make the universal corpus of digitized early modern English works accessible to scholars”; and 3) “To become a resource for new kinds of inquiry by making ESTC data more open to the wider web and more easily accessible for use in other digital projects.” For instance, the ESTC “should be extended beyond MARC specifications . . . collecting data not represented in MARC,” though mapped to applicable MARC fields. Also, “the new ESTC users will be able to edit or ‘curate’ existing data, add new data, and match contributed records to existing ESTC records,” with data not overwritten but “recorded in a versioning system not unlike a wiki.” Users will be assigned editorial levels or confidence ratings, in part reflecting the number of edits made, as from 1 to 5. Thus users will be able to insert new holding information or expanded imprint information. There would be a “contributed record” status that, on being verified or matched to an ESTC record by a “prescribed number of users” would lead the more tentative record to become an ESTC record. “A [contributed] record that a prescribed number of users suggest is new to the ESTC will be sent to a review board.” Note that presently there is a form to be sent to the Riverside office of the ESTC for adding new records. Obviously, someone who bought or discovered a new imprint or found a record faulty would be doing all a service by reporting it. Unfortunately, some formed the impression that corrections or correspondence sent to Riverside dropped down a well. Mr. Intelligencer has been relying heavily on the ESTC for a couple decades, but only recently has he, instead of publishing gaps and flaws in the records, begun hitting the error-report link atop the ESTC display of the faulty record and reporting problems, such as that X and Y records are for the same edition, or that the date doesn’t belong in square brackets as it’s printed out, or that the format should be 8vo and not 12mo. The real discovery was that at the BL office Ann McDermott and Greg Smith will field those reports very quickly, letting one know within the week (often the next day) whether or not one’s claims call for a revision and how the record has been revised. (Sometimes by checking copies at the BL or
contacting libraries, Ann and Greg have thus saved me from making mistaken claims.) Last year, if I had read the ESTC proposals for “future projects” like “Browser-based matching,” I’d have complained that what the ESTC first should do is edit the thousands of records with flawed (or incomplete) information, which book dealers and collectors or people using ECCO could and should do. Well, there are people in London who put reports to work promptly.

The **National Library of Ireland** has been creating a “Digital Library,” now with over 33,000 images. The catalogue of holdings is divided into four divisions: the printed, the manuscript, the visual (prints and drawings, photos, ephemera, etc.), and the digital. The WWW access to these digital holdings is excellent. If one clicks on “Cooper Drawings” one opens thumbnail images with headings for the 293 items contained in that collection; above is a chronological chart showing the frequency of materials across a temporal line; down the side are various analyses of the materials that can be used as filters, such as author, subject, genre, chronology. If one hits “author” for the full listing, then one has a list of artists creating the objects and the number of works by the artists in the collection (a good dozen are in this file). One can hit on, let’s say, “Austin Cooper (1759-1830),” “Gabriel Beranger (c. 1729-1817),” or “William Ousley (1738-1805),” and have just that artist’s images displayed. These images can be opened to a larger size for study or printing and can be emailed. This collection has many landscapes--one of the filters will give you just those images; others just the several hundred that are wash and ink drawings, the 30 portraits, or the 28 stipple engravings. Most of what’s digitized is from after the 18C. “LO folder” is an item with 56 letters, documents, and the like, involving the British army c. 1798.

The **Historical Society of Pennsylvania** continues to announce newly catalogued and available collections in *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*. Rachel Moloshok and the archive staff’s articles on “Newly Available and Processed Collections at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania” appear in the January 2012 issue to note the Abraham Cassel collection (47 vols., 1680-1893), and in the April 2013 issue to note the Conrad Weiser Papers (2 boxes and 2 vols., 1696-1760)–Weiser was an interpreter between the British and the Six Nations and also between the Iroquois and tribes to the south.

The **Shakespeare Theatre Company**, associated with the Folger Institute, this month worked out a settlement with its landlord, who had tried to evict the company until the company obtained a court-ordered stay in December 2012. Chris Jennings, the company manager, announced 20 September that it will be able to obtain, so long as it properly operating, a succession of 20-year leases for the Lansburgh Theatre building at 450 7th St., N.W., Washington.

The **Voltaire Foundation**’s September posting on new publications included an unusual puff for a modern **theatrical adaptation of Candide** at the Swan Theatre in Stratford through 26 Oct.: “Mark Ravenhill’s take on Candide is a deliberately startling one, but one that we very much enjoyed when we saw the play last week . . . have a look at the production photos on the RSC [Royal Shakespeare Company] website. There is even a trailer and a graphic novel.” The new books reported were *Representing Violence in Eighteenth-Century France 1760-1820*, ed. by Thomas Wynn (SVEC 2013:10) and Volume 51B of *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire: Writings 1760-1761 (II)*, ed. by David Williams, François
Moureau, and several others (pp. xxviii + 568; 5 illus.). Seven volumes of the *Œuvres complètes de Voltaire* have appeared this year (vols. 26A, 43, 51B, 79B, 71C, 76, 60C) and nine last year (vols. 25, 143, 61A, 42B, 79A, 61B, 140A-140B, 32C), and the project has been chugging, or zipping, along since 1968! I can think of no comparable editions in 18C British letters. Nicholas Cronk, the current general editor, remarked that “Our ambitious target is to complete the edition . . . in 2018. By then it will constitute about 200 volumes.” In 2008 the Arts and Humanities Research Council awarded the Foundation over £600,000 to assist in the “first scholarly edition” of Voltaire’s *Essai sur les mœurs et l’esprit des nations*, which led to the publication of vols. II-V of that world history (2009-2012), volumes now reviewed, such as on H-Net and in *Revue Voltaire*, 11 (2011). This project is now under the “umbrella of the Foundation’s Voltaire: Historian of the Modern World research project, which also includes scholarly editions of Voltaire’s *Siècle de Louis XIV* and the *Précis du siècle de Louis XV*.” There is a good introduction to the *Œuvres complètes* and indices to it at the VF website, including an 11-p. alphabetical index of Voltaire’s works by title, updated to Oct. 2013 and a full list of published volumes arranged chronologically (as is the edition). The edition extends from earliest works, Vols. 1A-B and 2 being *Œuvres de 1711-1722* (2001-02) and *Le Henriade* (1970), to the final works: *Œuvres de 1777-78*, II [2009]. Then the volumes’ count proceeds to the notebooks edited by founder Theodore Besterman (vos. 81-82, revised, 2nd ed., 1968), to the correspondence edited by Besterman (vos. 85-135, published 1969-1977) to volumes of marginalia edited by Natalia Elaquina (Vols. 136-43 thus far, 2008-2012, reaching to “Sommier”).

In the recent *Newsletter of the American Handel Society*, ed. by Kenneth Nott, besides the program for its conference in Feb. 2013 we find a CFP for *The Journal of Music Research Online*, a peer-reviewed, open-access e-journal published by the Music Council of Australia and edited by Jula Szuster (jula.szuster@adelaide.edu.au). See www.jmro.org.au.

Essay submissions are requested for a special issue of *The Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* on “New Approaches to Eliza Haywood: The Political Biogrpahy and Beyond,” to be edited by Patsy Fowler and Amanda Hiner (send proposals of 500 words or less by 1 Dec. to hinera@winthrop.edu).

Most know that *AMS Press of New York*, headed by Gabriel Hornstein, publishes *The Age of Johnson* edited by Jack Lynch (with book-review editor J.T. Scanlon), 1650-1850 edited by Kevin Cope (with book-review editor Scott Paul Gordon), *Eighteenth-Century Novel* edited by Albert Rivero and George Justice (with book-review editor Kit Kincaide), and *Eighteenth-Century Women*, edited by Linda Veronica Troost. AMS publishes several other annuals as well: Vol. 4 of *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment* should appear this fall, ed. by Brett C. McInelly (English, Brigham Young U., Provo, UT; brett_mcinelly @ byu.edu), with Kathryn Stasio as book-review editor (stasio@saintleo.edu). Vol. 5 of *Eighteenth-Century Thought*, ed. by Jeffrey D. Burson, is expected in 2014 (James Buickeroed endowed the journal and edited the first four volumes, the last in 2009; now send submissions to Burson at jburson@georgia.southern.edu).

Consider submitting revised conference papers to ASECS’s interdisciplinary, annual *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, published by Johns Hopkins UP
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and digitally available on Project MUSE. SECC publishes revised papers read at national and regional meetings of ASECS and its affiliated societies. For the 2014-15 vol. (45) the editor seeks especially essays illustrating “new directions for research” from “under-represented disciplines” in papers presented July 1 2012 to June 30, 2014. Follow the Chicago Manual of Style for annotation, and shoot for 20-25 typed pages. Submit for blind reviewing by 18 Aug. 2014 to the editor, Michelle Burnham, mburnham@scu.edu. Send illustrations or additions to the text as a separate file. Burnham also accepts submissions in three hard copies (English Dept. / 500 El Camino Real / Santa Clara U. / Santa Clara, CA 95053).

Beware of scholarly open access publishing on the web, many of which ventures are predatory publishers ripping off scholars and potentially black-marking good work. One list of questionable publishers appeared this summer at http://scholarlyoa.com/publishers, for news of which we thank Manny Schonhorn.

Pickering & Chatto’s Political Biography series, ed. by J. A. Downie, has now reached its 11th vol, with W. A. Speck’s A Political Biography of Thomas Paine (2013). The earlier vols. cover Defoe, Swift, Manley (by Rachel Carnell, reviewed in the Intelligencer), Fielding (by Downie), Steele, Pope, William King, Toland, Haywood, Johnson; future vols. will cover Joseph Addison (by Charles Knight, who wrote that on Steele), Maria Edgeworth, John Arbuthnot, Frances Burney (Lorna J. Clark), and Sarah Fielding (Christopher D. Johnson).

This June in Chicago the RBMS Exhibition Award Committee announced the winners of the Katharine Kyes Leab & Daniel J. Leab ABPC Exhibition Award entries for 2012. None of the winners mainly involve 18C materials, but there is a list of the submissions and some of those are noteworthy here. The five categories judged are expensive, moderately expensive, and inexpensive catalogues, brochures, and electronic exhibitions. Among the expensive (which include Grateful Dead posters at UC Santa Cruz!) is The Dr. Elliott & Eileen Hinkes Collection of Rare Books in the History of Scientific Discovery, ed. by Earle Havens for exhibition at Johns Hopkins’ Sheridan Libraries (122 pp.; 34 illus.; $42.50; ordered from Oak Knoll Books). Moderately expensive catalogues included the Benecke’s Remembering Shakespeare by David Scott Kaslan and Kathryn James (80 pp; 69 illus; $25; contact zoe.keller@yale.edu); and Penn’s Wonders of the Microscope! An Exhibition Selected from the Collections of Howard L. Schwartz, by Schwartz with a preface by Eugene S. Flamm (112 pp.; 102 illus; $20 + $5; www.pennlibrarystory.com). The inexpensive catalogues included SMU’s Bridwell Library’s Four Centuries of Religious Books for Children by Dan Slive (60 pp.; 27 illus; free, ordered from Daniel Slive, head of Special Collections at the Bridwell, dslive@esu.edu); and Illinois’s survey of Aesopica including La Fontaine and others in our period: Wise Animals: Aesop and His Followers by Willis Goth Regier (24 pp.; 18 illus; $5; dsears@illinois.edu). None of the brochures involve the 18C. The electronic exhibitions have an obvious advantage for access, and those on the 18C include:


Bridwell Library. *Four Centuries of Religious Books for Children*, curated by Daniel Slive; designed by Rebecca Howdeshell. www.smu.edu/Bridwell/Collections/SpecialCollectionsandArchives/Exhibitions/Children@20Books

Lilly Library, Indiana U. *The War of 1812 in the Lilly Library*, curated by Erika Dowell; designed by Laura Pence. collections.libraries.iub.edu/warof1812/


The cover illustration is the frontispiece to *Conversations with a Lady, on the Plurality of Worlds* “Written in French, By Mons. Fontenelle, Author of, The Dialogues of the Dead. Translated by Mr. Glanvill,” 5th ed. (Dublin: Printed by William Forrest, for G. Risk, G. Ewing, and W. Smith, 1728), 12mo, ESTC T119084. Though censored in some countries, Fontenelle’s *Entretiens sur le pluralité des mondes*, a popularization of the new cosmology, was well received in England and Ireland, where quickly translated under different titles, by William Domvile (Dublin 1687), Aphra Behn (London, 1688), and John Glanvill (London 1688). This edition is apparently, to judge from the title-page’s text, based on a 1719 London 4th (J. Darby for M. Wellington), and the frontispiece is based on that in London editions of the Glanvill translation, 1702-19 (entitled “The Plurality of Worlds” in 1702), but it has added the indexing of planets by number with text across the top, conflating two plates in the 1719 edition. The engraving was cut by Philip Simms, a skilled and hard-working Dublin engraver active 1725-1749. He produced for the Dublin book trade, such as the portrait of William Molyneux in *The Case of Ireland’s Being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England* (printed by P. Rider and Th. Harbin for P. Dugan, 1725), the frontispiece of David in *Les Pseaumes de David*, a work with much unsigned engraved music (S. Powell, for G. Risk et al., 1731), the engraved title-page of Pope’s *The Dunciad, Variorum* (n.p. [printed by Aaron Rhames], 1729), and the engraved title and numerous portraits in Gilbert Burnet’s *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 3 vols. (printed by A. Rhames for R. Gunne, et al., 1730-1733).