

Touring Flushing: Religion and Quakers in the (Very) Long Eighteenth Century

by Brijraj Singh

Many of my readers do not live in New York City but come here on visits, quite a few fairly frequently. They attend or give lectures, go to museums, concerts and plays, work in libraries, or visit friends, shop, and sightsee. Few, I suspect, take the No. 7 subway line from Times Square or Grand Central Station to its end on Main Street, Flushing. Today Flushing is largely Asian, crowded, colorful, noisy, dirty, smelly, full of Chinese restaurants, small shops, and massage spas. But New York is still a very eighteenth-century town, Flushing especially so; and readers of *The Intelligencer* will find a late Sunday morning and afternoon spent there to be rewarding.

On emerging from the subway at the corner of Main Street and Roosevelt Avenue, the visitor will find that the eighteenth century in the form of St. George's Church is just a block away. The church was established in 1702 by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Services were held in the old Guard House, a few blocks north at the corner of Main Street and Northern Boulevard, till 1746, when the first church building was constructed. It obtained a royal charter from George III in 1761. Francis Lewis, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, served as a vestryman at this church from 1765 to 1790, as did his son subsequently. The present building, dating to 1854, has two splendid Tiffany windows, some fine woodwork, especially around the altar, and a mosaic marble floor, making a visit worthwhile. Services are conducted in English, Chinese and Spanish. The surrounding graveyard has some stones going back to the late 18th century, including a few which use the long "s."

The 40-foot high wooden steeple of the church was knocked down on to Main Street in a freak tornado in September 2010; fortunately, no one was injured. It has now been replaced by a new one, and the church once again dominates the Flushing skyline.¹

The church is not, unfortunately, open all the time, but an English service is held on Sundays at 11 a.m., and before or after the service is a good time to visit.

Walking a few hundred yards to the north along Main Street brings you to Northern Boulevard. Turn right, and on your right hand side you will see the walled-in wooden building of the Quaker Meeting House. Thereby hangs a tale stretching back to the seventeenth century and beyond, to 1579, to be exact, when the six northern states of what today is Holland were united. The Union of Utrecht, the treaty which brought about the union and served as the Dutch Constitution, stated in Article XIII that "each person shall remain free in his religion and ... no one shall be investigated or persecuted because of his religion."² Of course, these words were not strictly adhered to. Roman Catholicism and churches other than the Dutch Reformed were proscribed, and anybody who denied the truth of the Trinity was persecuted. But, by and large, people were allowed to keep their faiths in the privacy of their homes.

When Flushing, or Vlissingen, as it was then known, was granted a patent in 1645 and made part of the new Netherland, the same religious freedom was extended to its citizens, mostly British settlers. However, Peter Stuyvesant, the Dutch governor, was adamant in seeing that no public worship in any form other than the Dutch Reformed took place. When several Quakers came over from Britain in the 1650s, he went one step further by ordering citizens, in 1657, not to harbor any of them or allow Quaker services in their homes. Today we might criticize him for religious intolerance in violation of the spirit of the Flushing Patent and the Union Treaty, but he had a point. Quakers were known to get drunk in public, be violent, loud, aggressive, and disturb public order. Stuyvesant's decree grew as much out of his interest in maintaining law and order as out of a desire to uphold the primacy of the Dutch Reformed Church, in keeping with practices current with those of Holland at the time. Therefore when Henry Townsend, a respected citizen, allowed a Quaker meeting to take place in his home, he was fined.

This fine upset many British citizens of Flushing. Not aware of the reality on the ground in Holland, they believed that the Dutch actually practiced religious freedom for all, Roman Catholics excepted, and that therefore their governor's actions were in violation of the Dutch constitution and their own charter of incorporation. Edward Hart, the town clerk, drew up a Remonstrance addressed to Stuyvesant on December 27, 1657, and it was signed, besides him, by two other government officials and twenty seven ordinary citizens, all of them British and none of them a Quaker.

This document, commonly called the Flushing Remonstrance,³ refers to the governor's order that the inhabitants of Vlessing (or Flushing) "should not receive or entertain any of those people called Quakers because they are ... seducers of the people," and declares that "we cannot condemn them ... neither can we stretch out our hands against them. ... We desire ... in this case not to be judged least we be judged, neither to condemn least we be condemned, but rather let every man stand or fall to his own Master."

The refusal of the remonstrants to condemn anyone for following his or her particular religion has been seen by many as the origin or foundation of the principle of religious freedom which was subsequently enshrined in the First Amendment. Other historians have disagreed, arguing that there is no evidence that the Founders were familiar with the Flushing Remonstrance, and that the American guarantee of religious freedom has its roots rather in John Locke's 1689 *A Letter Concerning Toleration*. While it is true that the Remonstrance can be read as a powerful and eloquent plea for religious tolerance, it is also true that its main purpose is not the upholding of this principle but rather, as I have already suggested, the maintenance of constitutional provisions. For, as the remonstrants declare, "The law of love, peace and liberty in the states [i.e. the States-General of Holland] extending to Jews, Turks and Egyptians, as they are considered sons of Adam, which is the glory of the outward state of Holland ... our desire is not to offend one of his little ones, in whatever form, name or title hee appear in, whether Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist or Quaker, but shall be glad to see anything of God in all of them, desiring to doe unto all men as we desire all men should doe unto us" ⁴ That is, religious liberty flows from the

laws of Holland, which are that country's outward glory, and the remonstrants' desire to grant this liberty to all (except the Roman Catholics) grows out of their wishes to conform to the law.

The remonstrants continue: "Therefore if any of these said persons come in love unto us, we cannot in conscience lay violent hands upon them but give them free egress and regress unto our Town, and houses ...for we are bound by the law of God and man [i.e. by divine law as well as the Dutch constitution and the Flushing Patent, which are just because they grow out of the law of God] to do good unto all men and evil to noe man." And they invoke the Flushing charter of incorporation in the New Netherland once again by insisting that their refusal to condemn the Quakers or deny them shelter in their homes "is according to the patent and charter of our Towne, given unto us in the name of the States General, which we are not willing to infringe, and violate."

The Remonstrance cut no ice with Stuyvesant, who knew that whatever the Dutch constitution said, religious tolerance of the sort being advocated was not practiced in Holland. He declared a day of prayer, sacked the town government, replacing it with another consisting only of the Dutch residents, and imprisoned Hart and three other signatories who were government officials. Two recanted immediately and were freed, but Hart and Tobias Feake held out. They were kept in jail on just bread and water for a month, when on the supplication of the elderly Hart's family he was let go but sent into banishment. Feake held out longer, but eventually recanted too and was released, but not before being fined and banned from public office.⁵

This was not the end of the story. In spite of Stuyvesant's opposition the number of Quakers continued to grow in Flushing. In 1661 John Bowne (1627-95), an Englishman who had migrated to Boston with his father in 1648, moved to Flushing with his wife Hannah Feake and built a house for himself. Hannah, a grand niece of John Winthrop, the governor of Massachusetts, had become a convert to Quakerism and begun to preach their doctrines. Under her influence Bowne became a Quaker too, and began to hold Quaker meetings in his house.⁶ When the matter was brought to Stuyvesant's attention, he arrested Bowne and ordered him fined. Bowne refused to pay, whereupon he was banished. Bowne disembarked in Ireland, traveled to Britain, and thence to Amsterdam where he appealed his case before the Directors of the Dutch West India Company in 1663. The Company first suggested that Bowne move to Holland with his family, and when he refused, that he return to Flushing and maintain his faith in private, not holding any more meetings in his house. When Bowne refused even this offer, the Directors relented and sent a letter to Stuyvesant saying that Bowne should be allowed to practice his Quaker faith in the open because "the consciences of men ... ought ever to remain free and unshackled."

By the time Bowne returned to Flushing in triumph in 1664, Dutch rule over New Amsterdam had been replaced by British, and the town re-named New York. The new rulers continued to fine Quakers and imposed various restraints on them, but they were allowed to conduct services, a practice that Bowne resumed.⁷ Quaker numbers grew; some of the signers of the Remonstrance converted too. The result was that by 1692 Bowne's house had become too small for the weekly meetings.

In 1674 Bowne had bought some land less than a mile away from his house to be used as a Quaker burial ground. He now acquired some more land adjacent to the cemetery on the north and started building a Meeting House, which was completed in 1694, when the first services were held. This is the house that the visitor will see today at the corner of Main Street and Northern Boulevard. The oldest religious house of worship in New York State, it has been described by the Landmarks Commission as “a prime example of medieval survival in its proportions and framing system. It is a plain rectangular building erected on a frame of forty-foot timbers, each hand-hewn from a single tree. The architectural interest of the building is derived mainly from its unusually steep hipped roof; the roof is almost as high as the two stories below it. This feature can be traced to the high steep roofs of medieval Holland.”⁸

Services continued to be held there regularly every Sunday morning till the Revolutionary War, when the British took it over first as a hospital and later used it as a stable and then a storage house. In return, the Quakers spoke out against those of their faith who accepted service with the British, and refused to man the city watch, though they may have done so not so much as an anti-British and patriotic American move as of their desire to remain neutral between the two sides. Meetings resumed after American independence, and have been held every Sunday ever since. Today they start at 11 a.m., and visitors can arrange for a tour from noon to 12. 20 p.m. with two weeks’ notice.

The Quakers of Flushing remained active throughout the 18th century. They established a school for their children in 1703. In 1717 the Meeting House was enlarged with a west wing being added. That was also the year when, at a Sunday meeting, John Farmer called for the abolition of slavery, one of the earliest such calls heard in the Colonies. William Burling, a member of the Meeting, published an address against slavery in 1718. In the 1760s and 70s slavery continued to be condemned, and calls were issued to members not to purchase slaves. In 1774 they were banned from owning slaves; though somewhat reluctantly, by 1776 all members had set their slaves free and some had even started bringing their African American servants to meetings with them. George Washington visited the Meeting House in 1789 and again in 1790.⁹

It is believed that John Bowne and his family are buried in the adjacent graveyard, though there are no markers to indicate the graves. Indeed, till about the 1820s the Quakers did not place any headstones on graves. When they started doing that, the stones were small and often had little more than the deceased’s name or indeed just the initials carved on them. The graveyard is no longer used now, but, ringed by old oak and elm trees, it remains a quiet, peaceful oasis in the midst of a frenetic Flushing and invites the visitor to a few minutes of relaxation and reflection.

Walking east two blocks on Northern Boulevard, along which s/he will pass the ante-bellum Flushing Town House to the left and, on the right, a fortress-looking armory which was used by the Unionists in the Civil War (and serves today as the home of the police precinct), the visitor will come to Bowne Street. On it, less than a mile away, is the original Bowne House, one of the oldest buildings in New York. A good example of the fusion of the British and

Dutch styles, it has been expanded several times. It is generally closed, though tours can be arranged, and tickets purchased, through the Queens Historical Society (QHS), which is located in the nearby Kingsland House. This latter building, begun around 1774 and completed in 1785, is one of the oldest surviving examples of a residential style common in Queens in the late 18th century. The house has divided entry doors and wide side parlors, typical of Dutch houses, while a central chimney is reminiscent of British homes of the period. The house was declared a City Landmark in 1965, the first structure in Queens to be so demarcated, and moved to its present site near the Weeping Birch park in 1968. QHS uses it for periodic exhibitions, and some of its rooms are open to the public by prior appointment.¹⁰

The Weeping Birch, or what remains of it, is worth a visit too, though it is not part of the eighteenth century. Planted in 1847 as a sapling which the botanist Samuel Parsons (1819-1907), himself a member of the Bowne family, obtained from Belgium, the tree grew to a height of 60 feet. Its branches touched the ground and took root, from where other branches sprang till eventually the tree and its branches created a circle 80 feet in diameter. The tree died in 1998, and now only some stumps remain.¹¹

Bowne Street remains true to its heritage of religious freedom. Along, or just off it, are churches of various Protestant denominations, Jewish synagogues, a Muslim mosque, and at least two Hindu temples, in one of which, devoted to the Swaminarayan sect, a copy of a picture of Swami Sahajanand gifting the manuscript of his *Shikshapatri* to Sir John Malcolm may be seen.¹²

By now, the visitor to Flushing must be truly hungry. If south Indian food suits her/his fancy, the Ganesh Hindu temple, a good example of the architectural style of south Indian temples transplanted to American shores, has a canteen downstairs where excellent *dosas* and other dishes may be had very cheaply. If Chinese cuisine is more to his/her taste, Main Street, just a few blocks away, offers a world of choices. For standard American fare I regret to say that a Burger King is all that is available. Flushing may have much to offer to one interested in the eighteenth century, but foodwise it remains resolutely modern and Asian.

Hostos Community College of CUNY (Emeritus)
bsingh1029@aol.com

Notes

1. Much of this information comes from Wikipedia and various websites of the church.
2. Translated from the Dutch and French by Herbert H. Rowen. See his *The Low Countries in Early Modern Times: A Documentary History*. NY:Harper and Row, 1972.
3. It is easily accessible online at www.nym.org/flushing/history.html. The original has been lost, but a contemporary copy is preserved in the New York State archives in Albany. It suffered damage in a fire in 1917.

4. It is easily accessible online at www.nnym.org/flushing/history.htm. The original has been lost, but a contemporary copy is preserved in the New York State archives in Albany. It suffered damage in a fire in 1917.

5. These details come from Wikipedia's essay on the Flushing Remonstrance.

6. See Wikipedia, "John Bowne."

7. See www.nnym.org/flushing/history.html.

8. Quoted in "Flushing Quaker Meeting House."

www.nnym.org/flushing/history.html.

9. www.nnym.org/flushing/history.html.

10. www.nycgovparks.org.

11. www.nycgovparks.org.

12. See the review of *Malcolm Soldier, Diplomat, Ideologue of British India: The Life of Sir John Malcolm (1769-1833)* in *East-Central Intelligencer*, n.s. 29, No. 1 (March 2015), 53 and note.

A QUANTITATIVE AND COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO RESTORATION COMEDY

by Robert D. Hume

Manuel J. Gómez-Lara, María José Mora, Paula de Pando Mena, Rafael Portillo, Juan A. Prieto-Pablos, and Rafael Vélez Núñez, eds. *Restoration Comedy, 1660-1670: A Catalogue*. Amherst, NY: Teneo Press, 2014. Pp. x + 581. ISBN: 1934844756. Paperback (only): \$49.00.

This very substantial book (the print block is 17 × 22.5 cm) is the first installment of a multi-volume series whose ambitious aim is to supply an essentially quantitative analytic description of the "comic" plays of the last four decades of the seventeenth century. The present volume covers the first eleven years. This is emphatically *not* a descriptive bibliography in the mode of W. W. Greg's *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration* (4 vols, 1939-1959). It is an attempt to represent the content and constituent parts of 92 comic plays of the 1660s, of which 74 survive in full-text form, either printed or in manuscript.

The bulk of the book is devoted to "Comedy Files" (occupying pages 115-492) and presenting descriptions and vital statistics of various sorts for each of the 92 comedies. The "Introduction" comprises thirteen numbered sections dealing with such subjects as what may be found on title pages; performance records (radically incomplete prior to 1705 when newspaper ads became *de rigueur*); publication and reprint records; prefatory matter (dedications, prefaces, epistles to the reader, prologue and epilogue); dramatic structure (English vs. French scene conventions, single vs. double or multiple plot lines); genres and subgenres; types of characters employed; proportions of male to female

characters; roles played by known performers; stage directions; music called for; and known sources.

Fourteen Appendixes (pages 495-581) comprising 37 separate lists supply the following kinds of information.

(1) Title and subtitle variants (e.g., *Taming of the Shrew/Sauny the Scot*); authorial name variants (e.g., Villiers/Buckingham).

(2) Alphabetical lists of the “Full Text Corpus” organized both by title and by author, specifying title, author, year of publication, company, and date of performance (date estimated where not known), plus a list of eighteen titles “Excluded from the Full-Text Corpus” because lost or known only from an incomplete or unavailable manuscript. Two of these are definitely ghosts, and probably a third is too—see below.

(3) Title-Pages. (a) Plays listed by author, noting source of attribution (e.g., title page, signed dedication, or “external evidence”), with year of publication; (b) a list of “Mottoes and Notices” garnered from title pages (mostly in Latin, with translation supplied); (c) mottoes “Listed by Source Author and Title”; (d) a list of the “Booksellers” (publishers, in present-day terminology), with the titles published by each of them, plus a list of identified printers (many known only by initials).

(4) Plays. (a) “Listed by Date of Performance” (many of them estimated, of course), plus (b) “Plays Listed by Company” (mostly Duke’s Company and King’s Company).

(5) Prints and Reprints. (a) A list of the “Dates of Publication and Reprint[s]” in alphabetical order by author, plus (b) “Plays Listed by Date of Publication” (a few were not published until the 1690s, and Betterton’s *The Amorous Widow* not until 1706).

(6) Prefatory Material. (a) A list of “Commendatory Verses, Dedications, and Prefaces”; (b) Dedications listed by patron; (c) list of surviving Prologues and Epilogues organized by author of play; (d) list of “Prologue and Epilogue Speakers”; (d) list of authors of Prologues and Epilogues “(if other than the playwright).” Listing plays that *lack* prologue and/or epilogue would have been welcome.

(7) “Dramatic Structure.” (a) A list reporting the “Dominant Scene Type,” i.e., the number of scenes in each play (which range from five acts unbroken into scenes, up to the 47 scenes in Cowley’s *Cutter of Coleman Street* and 48 in Margaret Cavendish’s unacted *Public Wooing*); (b) a “Time-Frame Reference” list, reporting how many days and hours the action occupies (if calculable); (c) the “Location” specified or deducible for each play, if determinable; (d) a list reporting the number of “Plotlines” (one, two, or as many as four) in each play.

(8) Genres. A list of the plays alphabetically by author, specifying the editors’ classification (Comedy of intrigue, Romantic comedy, Tragicomedy, Comedy a la mode, Foppish comedy, Satirical comedy, Philosophical comedy, Roguish comedy, Farce, or Composite).

(9) Character Types. (a) A table representing the sorts of people to be found in each play—e.g., “Gallants” (further subdivided into “Constant,” “Wild,” or “Rakish”), followed by (b) a series of lists identifying the names of *all* characters in 1660s comedies that the editors place in each classification.

Thus “Women of Honour” are subdivided into Honest Lady, Resourceful Lady, Wild Lady, Ingenue, and Witty Widow. In James Howard’s *English Mounseieur* we find Elsbeth (Ingenue) and Lady Wealthy (Witty Widow); in Sir Robert Howard’s *Committee* we find Arbella (Honest Lady) and Ruth (Resourceful Lady). Other “types” are “Helpers” (whether “Benevolent Parent, “Trusted Servant,” “Crafty Servant,” or “Companion”); “Blocking Characters” (Foolish Suitor, Severe Parent, Plotting Villain, Rival Gallant); “Comic butts” (Ridiculous Character, Clownish Fool, Clownish Servant, Cheat, Female Cheat).

(10) Actors’ Roles. An alphabetical list of all performers to whom particular roles can be assigned, with their roles enumerated (a surprisingly short list) from the original cast, if known.

(11) Stage Directions. (a) A table reporting the total number of “stage directions” and “stage references” (e.g., to properties) in each play—ranging from 294 and 597 in Digby’s *Elvira* down to 40 and 49 in Buckingham’s *Chances* among staged plays (closet and unstaged plays are included if we possess the full text); (b) a list of stage directions by “type” and frequency of occurrence (e.g., 864 “asides” are called for in 53 plays, which amount to 71.62% of the 74 full texts known from this decade); (c) numbers of “Prop References” (e.g., 93 references to “money and purses” are found in 33 plays, which is 44.59% of 74 surviving plays).

(12) A table summarizing use of music, play by play, (a) reporting the number of references to songs, dances, or instrumental music in each of the 74 plays; (b) an “Index of Songs by First Line” (specifying location by Act, Scene, and page in the first edition);

(13) Sources. (a) A list of 57 comedies with a known source or partial source, given in alphabetical order by playwright, with the source stated; (b) the sources listed by their author’s name, identifying the borrowing writer and title.

(14) A “Select Bibliography” of just two and a half pages.

Obviously a huge amount of labor has been invested in compiling these lists and comparative statistics. A great many significant questions can now be answered with great ease for the comic drama of the 1660s. How common are classical tags on title pages, and what sorts of quotations were considered appropriate? Easy now to answer that one. Are you looking for a comic butt comparable to Lady Cockwood in *She wou’d if she cou’d?* Appendix 9.6 supplies a list of possibilities, which can be extremely convenient. Of course such classifications are not absolute. In Sir Robert Howard’s *The Country Gentleman* why are Vapor, Slander, Sir Cautious Trouble-all, and Sir Gravity Empty all classified as “blocking characters”? I would call them comic butts, and the two fops are radically different sorts of characters than the two “men of business” (552). Under “comic butts” for this play the editors quite properly list Mistress Finical Fart, but also “Sir Peter Pride” and “Lady Pride,” who belong to Betterton’s *The Amorous Widow* (555)—a reminder that keeping things straight and verifying accuracy in such tables is damnably difficult, as I can testify from experience.

Without trying to be exhaustive, here are some things in this book that I have admired, approved, and often learned from. At 505 listing the source of attribution (e.g., title page, dedication, external evidence of some sort) shows at a glance how well attributed a huge majority of the comedies are, even in the

1660s. Listing plays by company (517-518) makes comparison of the new play repertory of the King's and Duke's troupes easy and vivid. Listing the presence of prologue and/or epilogue (525-527) is helpful, but also listing those plays *lacking* this apparatus would have been an improvement. The little table in Appendix 6.5 recording "Authors of Prologues and Epilogues (if other than the playwright)"—exactly five such cases—vividly demonstrates how rarely they were by anyone but the playwright at this date, a state of affairs that was to change. Systematic compilation of scene division (English, French, or none) and time elapsed in the story (where calculable) in Appendixes 7.1 and 7.2 is a wonderfully convenient and efficient way of getting a grip on the norms of the time. Appendix 7.3 shows us that "London" and foreign settings were almost equally popular (25 versus 21), which I suspect few people would guess, and we learn that five are in unspecified locations and half a dozen in other spots (e.g., Arcadia). One can get a very well documented sense of the descriptive norms of these comedies from this book, which will be a considerable boon to critics.

That *Restoration Comedy ... A Catalogue* will be a great convenience to many drama historians and critics is quite clear. But the subject matter is bulky and tricky, and quite a few issues of various sorts need to be raised. This cannot be more than a brief survey, not exhaustive, but I hope suggestive both for users and for the editorial team as they think about possible improvements and clarifications in the succeeding volumes now in preparation. I shall address these in five groupings: Inclusion Policies; Conceptual and Categorization Issues; Unclarity; Problems in Dates, Attribution, Identification, and Documentation; Missed Opportunities.

Inclusion Policies. Users need to be aware of several issues that fall under this heading. Most generally, where exactly does "Restoration Comedy" stop, generically speaking? Dryden's *Tyrannick Love* is a tragedy (so dubbed on its title page); his *Indian Emperour* is now almost universally classified as a "heroic play" (though David Erskine Baker called it a tragicomedy) and both are rightly excluded from consideration here. But what about Dryden's *Secret-Love*? Like *Indian Emperour*, it carries no generic label on its title page. It is included here without comment, though the *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700* categorizes it as a tragicomedy. James Howard's *All Mistaken, or The Mad Couple* is termed "A Comedy" on the title page and is included here, but the *Annals* classifies it as tragicomedy (correctly, in my view). Dryden's *Rival Ladies* calls itself "A Tragi-Comedy" on the title page and is omitted here. Some other plays (included or omitted) that fall in this fuzzy territory are Flecknoe's *Love's Kingdom*, Holden's *German Princess*, Edward Howard's *Change of Crownes* (think about the Asinello plot!), Shadwell's *Royal Shepherdess*, and Stapylton's *Step-Mother and Slighted Maid*. Since lost plays are generally included, why not include James Howard's happy-ending version of *Romeo and Juliet*, reported by Downes in *Roscius Anglicanus*? Because the dividing line is far from clear, I would have been glad to see tragicomedies included.

A major inclusion issue is posed by Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, whose seventeen closet comedies represent nearly a quarter (23%) of the extant comedies from the 1660s. To include them in this volume is surely right, but whether they ought to be counted in statistical descriptions of norms in

character types, stage directions, prop references, and music may be questioned. The principles of inclusion matter because in fact the editors are dealing with 92 titles (18 of them lost), of which 33 were not performed or were played only by amateurs (or so I have calculated from tables in this book). In fact, only 41 plays that were professionally performed survive in full-text form, and one could make an argument that some of the sets of statistics should have been calculated only from those texts. A couple of titles are spurious. *The Storm* (anonymous) is unquestionably Fletcher's *Sea Voyage*, mistitled by Pepys on 25 September 1667 (hence a ghost that should not have been resurrected at page 130). And "Dryden's" *Ladies à la Mode* is not an unpublished play by Dryden, but rather a confused reference by Pepys to Flecknoe's *Damoiselles à la Mode*, which he saw on 15 September 1668 and called "a translation out of French by Dryden" (another ghost). Consulting "Lost English Plays, 1660-1700," *Harvard Library Bulletin*, 25.1 (1977), 5-33, would have been helpful.

Looking at Appendix 2.2 ("Plays Listed by Author"), I note a number of problems. The "Perf." Column is supposed to record performance date, if known. In this column, unperformed plays are usually just given "----", but not always. The anonymous *Four Hours Adventure* is lost and was probably never completed, but is dated "1663" under "Perf." from a manuscript reference. *The Mistaken Beauty* is reported here as not published, but on page 125 is correctly said to have been published in 1685. In neither place do the editors note that it is an anonymous translation of Corneille's *Le Menteur* (a fact we have on Dryden's authority). However, In Appendixes 13.1 and 13.2 ("Sources") Corneille and *Le Menteur* are duly identified, but so is a second source, hitherto unknown to me—Juan Ruiz de Alarcon's *La verdad sospechosa* (ca. 1618-21). If this is someone's previously published discovery, then we need a citation. If this is new information, that should be clearly stated, preferably in the main entry for *The Mistaken Beauty* at page 125. Howard and Buckingham's *Country Gentleman* is said here to have been performed in 1669, though we are told (accurately) on page 363 that the play was suppressed before performance. James Howard's *All Mistaken* is dated to 1667 (when a particular performance date is recorded), but Montague Summers and James Sutherland long ago independently concluded that it was performed in spring 1665 and were eventually justified when additional evidence was discovered ("Dryden, James Howard, and the Date of *All Mistaken*," *Philological Quarterly*, 51 [1972], 422-29). Tatham's *Rump* is said to have been produced by the Duke's Company in June 1660 (503), but that company did not exist at that time. The performance was by a short-lived troupe at Dorset Court, probably in March. Buckingham's *Chances* is dated 1667 (pages 42 and 503), but ought to be dated 1664, prior to the murder of Walter Clun on 3 August. Clun's name appears in a manuscript cast annotation (see the 2007 Oxford edition of Buckingham). A play not included because its discovery was only recently reported is *Feniza*, an anonymous translation/adaptation of Lope de Vega's *La discreta enamorada* (1606), definitely performed, probably circa 1667, and later heavily plagiarized by Shadwell ("*Feniza or The Ingenious Mayde: A 'Lost' Carolean Comedy Found—and a Source for Shadwell's The Amorous Bigotte*," *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*, 18 [2013], 68-103).

Conceptual and Categorical Issues. A great deal of the editors' efforts has gone into categorization and characterization, often to quite good effect. In section 8 of the Introduction comedies are loosely sorted into a "Romantic group" (24 of 74, or 32.4%), a "Comic group" (27 of 74, or "34.6% [recte 36.5%]), a "Satirical Group" (5 of 74, or 6.8%), and "Philosophical Comedy" (17 of 74, or 23%—consisting solely of Margaret Cavendish's complete dramatic *oeuvre*). Categories within the romantic group comprise "Comedy of intrigue" (9 plays), "Romantic comedy" (8 plays), and "Tragicomedy" (7 plays). Making "Romantic comedy" a part of the "Romantic Group" seems a bit clumsy. Where the nine plays listed as "Comedies of intrigue" on page 42 fit in the larger scheme of comic categories is not clear to me, but from placement evidently they are being presented as part of the "Romantic Group." "Categories within the comic group" are defined as "Comedy à la mode," "Roguish comedy," "Comedy of humours," "Foppish comedy," and "Farce." These are reasonable groupings, though inevitably boundary problems arise. Only five plays are categorized as "Satirical comedy": Tatham's *The Rump*, Howard's *The Committee*, Carpenter's *Pragmatical Jesuit* (unperformed), Wilson's *The Projectors* (unperformed), and Medbourne's translation of *Tartuffe*. But what about James Howard's *The English Mounseieur*? Edward Howard's *The Change of Crownes*? Shadwell's *The Sullen Lovers* (with its wickedly effective personation of Sir Robert Howard, so relished by Pepys), or Howard and Buckingham's *The Country Gentleman*, where personation of Sir William Coventry led to a challenge to a duel and the imprisonment of the infuriated government minister? These are not satirical?

For better or worse, the editors try very hard to stick to fact, and so tend to shy away from even very straightforward analysis of content. For example, in the list of eight comedies designated "Romantic" on page 43, three remained unperformed, and only two enjoyed more than a bare minimum of success—Rhodes's *Flora's Vagaries* and the Dryden and Davenant revamping of *The Tempest* (1667). The latter became enormously popular in Shadwell's 1674 reworking of it as a semi-opera, but even before its reincarnation I do not really find it "romantic." What this list tells us (though the editors do not come straight out and say so) is that playwrights were not very interested in romantic comedy during the 1660s.

The analysis of the ordering and formatting of *Dramatis Personae* lists is decidedly helpful (50-52). The following taxonomical analysis of "Character types" inevitably suffers from borderline issues, but is generally useful in helping a reader see what sort of mix the playwright is serving up. The five "types" comprising eighteen "sub-types" (occupying pages 54-71 and exemplified play by play in Appendix IX) is a bit rigid. The enumeration of male versus female roles in each play (broken out by company) is an excellent snapshot (pages 72-75), and Table 10.3, which compares types of male and female "lead roles" in the two companies, beautifully demonstrates the enormous degree to which men rather than women were used in prominent comic roles. This is the sort of observation that can be made only with extensive comparison among a lot of plays. Section 10.2 on cast lists demonstrates that "Only eight plays provide the names of the players who acted in their

premieres,” and that “with the exception of Stapylton’s *The Slighted Maid*, all were printed after 1666” (75). I confess I had not realized just how few cast lists are printed in quartos. As the editors note, the norm changed rapidly in 1668 and 1669 (76). This is good to know. Because of Downes and Pepys, we tend to think we know who performed what in the 1660s, but what we can garner from printed quartos is in fact quite limited. I find the typological characterization of actors crude and unhelpful (Tables 10.4-7). There is some truth to “Lead,” “Supporting,” and “Minor,” but if Angel, Betterton, Hayns, and Underhill are all “Lead” actors, the epithet does not get us very far towards understanding their utility in the company. I have mixed responses in these realms.

The editors’ attempt to provide a vivid tabular representation of reprints (a significant indicator of popularity and longevity) is praiseworthy but flawed in some significant ways. Table 5.1 in Appendix 5 is said to list “Dates of Publication and Reprint[s].” It does not, however, specify *until when*. What is the cutoff date? There are a sprinkling of dates as late as 1714. But for Dryden’s *An Evening’s Love* (perf. 1668), for example, we are told there were editions in 1671, 1672, 1675, 1691, and 1695. ESTC and the California Dryden suggest that there were two editions in 1671, none in 1672, singleton reprints in 1675 and 1691. But the “1695” reprint is, I believe, part of a three-volume collection: if collections are being counted, a headnote should have told us that. Inclusion in an author collection tells us almost nothing about the popularity of the individual titles. And ESTC reports singletons of *An Evening’s Love* in 1735 and 1762, which is significant and worth knowing. In the case of Etherege’s *Comical Revenge* eight editions are reported between 1664 and 1697, but the ESTC adds 1715, 1723, 1735, and collections. Editions of Buckingham’s *Chances* are reported for 1682, 1692, and 1705—but ESTC adds 1710, [1720?] (Hague), and 1735. Editions from 1755 and later are of Garrick’s further adaptation (at least six), an afterlife I think should have been worth a footnote.

Some issues of unclarity. The figures given in section 4.1 of the Introduction (“Premiere dates” [and revivals] at page 15) are seriously misleading. “1st Run” appears actually to mean “recorded performances in the play’s first season” (*not* the number of consecutive performances given at the time of the premiere). And the nine plays for which “1st Run” is reported as “1” is again extremely misleading. Since remuneration to the playwright (all that would ever be received from performance) was at this time the profit of the third night, management tried extremely hard to give at least three performances. And “Revivals” is the wrong term for the next column. “Revival” is generally used to mean a production of an old play that has not previously been in a company’s repertory, or that has not been performed by a company for at least a couple of years, often necessitating some recasting. The figures given, however, are for the total number of nights on which a later performance is recorded (an entirely different matter), and the editors do not say what cutoff date they chose to impose, though clearly there was a cutoff. This needed to be specified. In fact, performance counts for individual plays have little significance in an era (1660-1700) in which we know title and date for only about 7% of the estimated total performances given. If Pepys or Charles II liked a play, we will have an exceptional number of recorded performances.

Table 5.1 at page 20, “Plays with more than one printed edition,” is interesting, whatever time period it is reporting: only thirty of these plays ever had more than one edition, and only sixteen enjoyed more than two. I question, however, the utility of Table 5.2, which adds totals for Prints, Reprints, “1st Run,” and “Revivals” to produce “*Total Refs.*” Surviving records are so radically spotty from decade to decade and season to season that overall totals signify relatively little. Was Dryden’s *Secret-Love* (perf. 1667) really the second most popular/successful comedy of the 1660s, as this count implies? Consider the figures reported by the editors: 1 “Print” in 1668; 6 “Reprints”; 9 nights in the “1st Run”; 16 “Revivals” (i.e., all recorded performances post-first-season); a “*Total Refs.*” count of 32. The totals made by my own count from the *London Stage* calendar, the ESTC, and the California Dryden are significantly different. The ESTC reports seven editions later than 1668 (1669, 1679, 1691, 1698, 1717, 1735, and 1762), not six. In the first season I count eight definitely documented performances (not nine). Between 1668 and the end of the seventeenth century I count nine more documented performances, with an additional eleven between 1700 and the end of performance history in 1706. My seventeenth-century total with reprints is 24, with eighteenth-century additions 38. Very possibly the editors know something I do not know, or I have failed to understand their logic, but I wish I could see how they came up with a total count of 32.

Edition counts are tricky, since the ESTC cannot be trusted. Etherege’s *Comical Revenge*, for example, had two “1664” quarto editions (not merely the one reported at pages 20 and 309), and the editors might have noted that the “1690” edition they list is merely reissued sheets from 1689 with a new title page. Inclusion policy needs to be more precisely defined, both in terms of multi-play volumes and place of origin. Etherege’s *She wou’d if she cou’d*, for example, had singleton editions in 1668, 1671, 1693, and 1710 (duly reported), but Thomas Johnson of the Hague published an edition *circa* 1711. This seems significant as evidence of continued interest and also because Johnson’s pirated Hague editions (obviously intended for the English market) had a demonstrable impact on later English reprint series such as Feales’s in the 1730s.

Date, attribution, identification, and documentation problems. Some examples. Lincoln’s Inn Fields is said to have been in service “until” January 1671 (17), but it was used by the Duke’s Company until Dorset Garden opened on 9 November 1671. *Love’s Quarrel*, seen by Pepys on 6 April 1661, is probably a pre-1642 play, not “lost” (124). An obvious possibility is Shirley’s *School of Compliments* (1632), which was a Duke’s Company play. *She’s Jealous of Herself*, known only from title in bills for plays seen by Charles II, is flatly said to be “lost” (129), but this is not necessarily true. The second and third editions of the *Annals* say “Alternative title of known play?” which seems likely. And its “Date of Premiere” is said to be 20 October 1670, but that date is merely the one on which the King attended. “Date of Premiere” and “Earliest Known Performance” (a formulation correctly used at 140) are entirely different matters. Edward Howard’s *The London Gentleman* is known only from a 7 August 1667 entry in the Stationers’ Register, but the “Source” cited at 338 is Sybil Rosenfeld’s “Dramatic Advertisements” article in *PMLA* (1936). I do not believe that she cited this play, or had any reason to do so, and it is not in her

“Index of Plays” at the end of that article. In this case we should be given the S.R. reference (II, 380) and “1667?” should not be stated as the “Date of Premiere.” We have no evidence of performance, and in any case the dates of S.R. entries often have little relation to either publication or performance. Edward Howard’s *Usurper* is part of the same entry, but it was performed in 1664 and published in 1668. William Lawrence’s *News From Geneva, or The Lewd Levite* (1662), unperformed and unpublished, survives in an manuscript (currently unlocated). The “Source” cited for this information is “Harbage 364” (387). The Bibliography reports “Harbage, Alfred 1989. *Annals of English Drama* ... Rev. by S. Schoenbaum. London. Routledge.” Neither Harbage’s 1940 version nor Schoenbaum’s superb 1964 revision mentions this play. What the editors are citing here is Sylvia Wagonheim’s third edition of 1989, at page 364 as specified. But Wagonheim’s name is never mentioned. At 421 the editors helpfully note Richard Perkin’s little-known 1975 edition of Shadwell’s *The Humorists*, but they might have pointed out that it is *not* from the 1671 quarto but rather from a surviving manuscript of the original, uncensored version. Unfortunately, Perkin merely prints the text, without introduction or annotation attempting to explain and identify the targets of Shadwell’s personation satire. And at 428, dealing with Shadwell’s *Sullen Lovers* (1668) the editors really ought to have quoted Pepys on the ridiculing of Sir Robert Howard as Sir Positive At-all. Personation is an important characteristic of a number of the plays, and one that goes unmentioned here. The reason for the non-publication of Newcastle and Dryden’s *Heiress* in 1669 was almost undoubtedly uproar caused by the personation of Sir Charles Sedley by Kynaston and the savage beating that resulted. Pointing out this episode at page 237 would have been very much in order.

An issue that should be mentioned is the unstated policy on titles. The editors have chosen to modernize, so *She wou’d if she cou’d* becomes *She Would if She Could*. I see no substantive objection to modernization, though neither do I see any point to it. There are some quirks. Southland’s *Love à la Mode* (as the title page has it) appears that way at page 434, but *sans* grave accent at 499—an inconsistency that haunts other accented titles. *S^r Martin Mar-all* (as the 1668 and later title pages call the play) is consistently rendered throughout this volume as *Sir Martin Marr-all* for no reason that I can see. Whatever policy is adopted should be made explicit, and any exceptions explained. Picky stuff, but makers of bibliographic catalogues should move heaven and earth to make them morbidly accurate and consistent.

Any book of this size and complexity is going to suffer some small mishaps, and most of those I have spotted are not substantively significant—e.g., in the Bibliography “Arthur C. Scouten,” and “1978-1993” as the publication date range of the Highfill-Burnim-Langhans *Biographical Dictionary*. At page 81 we are told that Elizabeth Davenport and Elizabeth Bowtell “may have been the same person (see Milhous, ‘Elizabeth Bowtell’),” but this is a documented *fact*, not a question of “may,” and the article cited does not appear in the Bibliography. A startling substantive error occurs on page 80 in a discussion of King’s Company personnel when the editors explain “the dearth of data” by saying that “Downes did not compile any casts for that

company in this period.” No, Downes did not “compile” such casts (what would he have compiled them from?), but as he explains on A2r-v “as to the Actors of *Drury-Lane* Company,” he had “the Account from Mr. *Charles Booth* sometimes Book-keeper there.” Downes then goes on to print 15 full casts for King’s Company productions, adding a list of 21 other plays in their repertory.

Missed opportunities. The editors have made excellent use of Part 1 of *The London Stage* and at least some use of Pierre Danchin’s monumental edition of *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration, 1660-1700* (7 vols, 1981-88). They include Montague Summers’ *The Playhouse of Pepys* (1935) in the bibliography, and rightly so: Summers is the one source I know where you can get learned, knowledgeable accounts of virtually every surviving play in this catalogue, those of Margaret Cavendish excepted. He is not, however, always invoked where he could be useful. At page 466 Thomson’s *The Life of Mother Shipton* (definitely acted, but date and auspices uncertain) is conjecturally dated “1668-71, following *The London Stage*, whose editors accepted the dating in James McManaway’s *ELH* article of 1934 on Massinger and Restoration drama. Summers offers potent arguments in favor of performance by George Jolly’s company in the spring of 1660, and these ought at least to have been pointed out. For reasons mysterious to me, the editors have preserved “1610” as the date in the imprint—an obvious misprint, since the booksellers involved (Peter Lillicrap and T. Passenger) had not yet been born.

For a book that devotes so much attention to issues of staging, stage directions, and props (etc.), two important modern studies should have been seriously combed, studied, cited, and at times argued with. The first is Montague Summers’ *The Restoration Theatre* (1934), a deeply erudite, well-documented, and still valuable source. The second is Edward A. Langhans’ doctoral dissertation, “Staging Practices in the Restoration Theatres 1660-1682” (Yale University, 1955), a 492-page, highly technical examination of a great deal of very particular evidence. It is a marvelous piece of scholarship that should have been published but never was, though some of the material on features of particular playhouses was used in articles. For a meticulous and detailed account, theatre by theatre, of such items as the stage, doors, balconies and windows, curtain and hangings, trap doors, machines, scenery, lighting, sound and special effects, costumes, and properties—Langhans remains the place to go. I point out also that his articles on Restoration theatre buildings and related subjects do not appear in the Bibliography and appear not to have been consulted. For example, in “New Restoration Manuscript Casts,” *Theatre Notebook*, 27 (1973), 149-157, Langhans reports additional cast information for Edward Howard’s *The Change of Crownes* and Flecknoe’s *Damoiselles a la Mode*, not noted here.

Another lost opportunity concerns the two “Music” appendixes, 12.1 listing the plays that call for song, dance, or instrumental music (other than the ubiquitous act music) with the number of instances in each, and 12.2, an “Index of Songs by First Line.” Both are very valuable indeed, but why did the editors not indicate the existence of the music where it is known to survive? Not much music was published from the 1660s plays, but towards the end of the century a great many songbooks contain music from the theatre. Given the existence of

Cyrus Lawrence Day and Eleanore Boswell Murrie's splendid *English Song-Books 1651-1702: A Bibliography with a First-Line Index of Songs* (1940), this would be extremely easy to do—and should definitely be done in the succeeding volumes of this *Catalogue*. One would like to be told, for example, that “Wake all the dead!” from Davenant's *The Law Against Lovers* is Day and Murrie no. 3561, music for which is to be found at page 60 in item 30, *Select Ayres and Dialogues To Sing to the Theorbo-Lute ... Composed By Mr. Henry Lawes ... And other Excellent Masters*, published by John Playford in 1669. The editors list in their Bibliography Curtis Price's *Music in the Restoration Theatre With a Catalogue of Instrumental Music in the Plays 1665-1713* (1979). Again, little survives from this decade, but quite a lot from the nineties—though why not note, for example, that music composed by Thomas Tollet for a 1680s or early 1690s revival of John Wilson's *The Cheats* survives in manuscript in the library of Christ Church, Oxford?

In sum, much has been well done in this book, and the results will unquestionably be useful. Having a compact basis from which to identify common features and areas of divergence among a very large number of disparate plays is a great convenience. As is often the case in ambitious multi-volume enterprises, much can be learned by the enterprisers as they contemplate their initial effort. Part 2 of *The London Stage* (1700-1729), the first published, was the least satisfactory of the five parts, and Highfill, Burnim, and Langhans told me that they wished they could redo volumes 1 and 2 of their *Biographical Dictionary*, the first installment published. I offer the *Catalogue* editors a number of friendly recommendations towards their future installments.

(1) Include tragicomedy. There is no clear dividing line between comedy and tragicomedy, and calculating some of the statistics separately could well prove interesting.

(2) Exclude closet drama from things like stage direction statistics. Or at least make separate calculations for closet drama. However, a play intended for performance by a produced playwright should not be excluded, even if no performance eventuated (e.g., *The Country Gentleman*).

(3) Make fuller use of previously published books and articles to try to eliminate ghosts and add recently discovered information. Part 1 of *The London Stage* is a marvelous piece of scholarship, but it was published exactly half a century ago, and we have learned quite a lot since 1965.

(4) Systematize the checking and verification process so that in a case like *The Country Gentleman* the play is not correctly said to have been suppressed in one place, but listed with a performance date in another. Uniform checking is particularly difficult with multiple authors.

(5) In the extensive “Comedy Files” that are the heart of this book, add information where available. For example, Richard Carpenter's *The Pragmatical Jesuit New Leavened* (quite an interesting piece) was published without date. It is entered here as “1660? / 1665? (DNB)” at page 156. The ODNB says “1665” without explanation or documentation. *The London Stage* places it “about” the season of 1660-61 (17). Summers says “No date, 1661? (The Bodleian copy has in an old hand: ‘I suppose printed near 1660, or 1663’)” (in Summers' *Bibliography of the Restoration Drama*, p. 33). Why not report these views for

the convenience of the reader? At page 328 the editors enter Alexander Greene's *The Politician Cheated: A New Comedy*, published in 1663. Why not mention that the Folger copy has a MS date of 18 June 1663 (which could indicate either publication or purchase), and that Pepys reports reading it on 29 July, arriving at a dismissive verdict? The play is mysteriously omitted from the index to the Latham-Matthews edition of the *Diary*.

(6) The sources of the figures reported in edition/reprint tables should be specified, the cut-off date should be stated, and the reader should be told whether the count includes non-London editions.

(7) "1st Run" must be distinguished from "total performances recorded during the first season a work was performed." We almost never have exact figures for the first run prior to the advent of daily playbills in the *Daily Courant* in the autumn of 1705. What we do sometimes have is claims in a preface or dedication, or a statement by Downes in *Roscius Anglicanus*. Of Cowley's *Cutter of Coleman-Street* he tells us that "it was perform'd a whole Week with a full Audience" (25). Such statements should be faithfully reported (but not fully trusted—though we are entitled to deduce that the play was a considerable success).

(8) In counting "performances after the first season" (not to be confused with "revivals"), the cutoff date must be specified.

(9) Extant music should be cited, at least with cross-references to Day and Murrie, Price, and *The British Union-Catalogue of Early Music* (1957). *BUCEM* records single-sheet songs as well as song-book collections.

(10) Other improvements. Indexes of persons, plays, and concepts are needed. A work of this size, complexity, and level of detail is a lot easier to navigate with good indexing. Another convenience to the user would be to omit or ignore "The" in alphabetical lists of plays. At page 495, placing *The Adventures of Five Hours* (and all other plays whose titles start with "The") after *Tarugo's Wiles* is disconcerting. A feature well worth adding to the relevant "Comedy Files" is inclusion of information about surviving manuscripts. For the 1660s these include Newcastle's *Humorous Lovers*, Digby's *Elvira*, Shadwell's *Sullen Lovers* and *Humorists*, Howard and Buckingham's *The Country Gentleman*, and Wilson's *The Cheats*. This is especially important where there is no seventeenth-century edition (*The Country Gentleman*), the manuscript is substantively different from the printed quarto (*The Humorists*), or the manuscript is a prompt copy with immensely valuable annotation not to be found in the published text (*The Cheats*).

We should be grateful to the Spanish team who have taken on this rather daunting project. What they have done is decidedly innovative, and the results are unquestionably useful. I have pointed out some defects and problems in this first installment, hoping to see improvements in future volumes. A Greg-style bibliography of published plays as physical artifacts would unquestionably be of great utility, but this sort of collective catalogue, one that attempts to establish common features and variances among *all* the plays, will be of even greater use to critics and historians attempting to analyze the plays. Some of the discriminators strike me as crude (for example, categorization by character

type), but if we are trying to get an overall grasp of “Restoration Comedy” in its totality, the approach taken by the editors of this volume is valuable.

Penn State University

Elizabeth Maddock Dillon. *New World Drama: The Performative Commons in the Atlantic World, 1649-1849*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014. Pp. xiii + 354 pp.; 17 illustrations; index. ISBNs: hardcover: 978-0-8223-5324-9, \$94.95; paperback: 978-0-8223-5341-6, \$26.95.

“New World Drama” is at least as much a metaphor as an historical artifact in Elizabeth Maddock Dillon’s book, the focus of which is race relations in the colonies as demonstrated in performances of various kinds, many but not all of them in theatres. The dates span the beheading of Charles I and the Astor Place Riot, and she sets these incidents up as “turning points in the history of popular sovereignty and theatrical performance in the Atlantic world” (2). (The question of just how “popular” sovereignty was in the eighteenth century is not discussed.) Dillon characterizes these two hundred years as “a revolution that dislodged power from above (in the king), in the name of locating it below (in the people),” though not all at once and not in a smooth progression. After 1649, “Parliament simultaneously declared the political power of the common people and fenced off the common land used by those very people to survive” (2-3). Dillon seeks to replace the “public sphere,” a print-dominated concept, with a “performative commons” (14), which includes illiterate as well as literate people and is not restricted by national boundaries around the Atlantic world, in view of how closely all these economies were linked.

She seeks out performances, often contested in one way or another, in London, Charleston, Kingston, and New York which demonstrate a chronological progression of attitudes toward race and toward sovereignty. She looks for instances in which some part of a specific theatre audience might arguably interpret a play in a way that endorses the power of the common people, as opposed to everyone’s automatically accepting a surface interpretation that favors the establishment. Whether such performances can influence or only reflect realities around them is an open question. Contrasting possible interpretations is particularly important for her in relation to the New World, and many of her best discussions emphasize how different a play might look there, as opposed to in London. Thus exile to an island, even an enchanted one, would seem very different in, say, Charleston, South Carolina in 1773-4, where *The Tempest* played three times in a five-month season, than it would in London. Much of the white audience would presumably share the longing of various characters for their literal or figurative home across the sea, whereas to Londoners that exile would have been essentially abstract, not provoking a visceral response. And, given that blacks outnumbered whites in Charleston more than three to one at the time, the threat represented by Caliban, “an enslaved colonial laborer,” would also have been real to them in a way it would

not to comfortably-distant Londoners (150, 107). Judging by the Philadelphia cast for the same company, Dillon deduces that the Davenant-Dryden version was staged in Charleston, although Shakespeare's had been standard in London since 1757. She seems unaware of the expanded stage directions in the 1674 "operatic" version of the latter, the one most often reprinted in the eighteenth century. Those descriptions would have better aided her first discussion of the play and would make the excitement over the production easier to understand. In Dillon's view, the surface message was one of white reproductive supremacy, as the pairs of innocent white teenagers are joined and the indigenous Caliban is first deprived of access, then left behind. But underneath, for Caliban, there was also a message that recovery of the island was possible, which might encourage blacks in attendance to subversive thoughts and actions. (Yet some version was also produced in Charleston in 1794, after the slave rebellion of 1791 in Haiti, a fact Dillon marshals for other purposes. Did the play mean the same thing in Charleston in 1794 as in 1774?)

Dillon wishes to "rejoin" two subjects she finds usually treated separately, "the materiality of the commons as land and the abstraction of the common people as a sovereign political force," which involves arguing that "the 'theatre' of the physical commons was, in some sense, replaced by the theatre itself in the eighteenth century—the location at which a new performative commons appeared" (4). This is a very large claim to make for theatre, and while I see its attractions, I remain skeptical, for reasons some of which will appear below. She follows Ranci re in thinking that "the struggle over what constitutes representation is the core of the political" (9), and she recognizes "any representation of the people" as "historically contingent" (11). For Dillon, the story must start in England to encompass the economic institutionalizing of colonial slavery in 1663 (36); she then treats intersections of slavery and theatre in Charleston and Kingston, and her project need not go further than mid-nineteenth-century New York City, with racial and economic tensions mounting and civil war imminent. While in the process of detaching themselves from European rulers, the colonies set up "new dispensations of political freedom insofar as they depend[ed] on a shadow economy of dispossession, specifically the dispossession of property (from Native Americans) and labor (from New World Africans)," which eventually "transforms the colonies of North America into the white-identified nation of the United States" (8).

The effectiveness of the book depends to a large extent on how closely Dillon can tie particular performances, or sometimes non-performances, to the local economy and to its racial tensions. To continue with the example of Charleston, a company playing there in 1795 announced Southerne's *Oroonoko*, but then the newspaper reported that it was "laid aside in consequence of an official . . . notification . . . that *that* play was improper for representation here" (43). The city having succored those who had enough resources to flee Haiti in 1791, the mayor apparently decided that the slave rebellion that occurs during the play, even though it fails, resonated too much with the nearby revolution. (He would have been horrified to learn that the uprisings would finally be settled in 1804 with "the creation of the first black republic in the Americas" [142]). One wonders what the company manager was thinking of, that he did not

recognize these circumstances before he advertised the play. The arc of Dillon's study emerges in the New York chapter when, some thirty-seven years later, a production of Southerne's play by Junius Brutus Booth met critical objections on account of the "quite *too* horrible" catastrophe, but more immediately on the grounds of the "unnatural" relationship between the black slave/king and the white Imoinda (220). Shakespeare's name could get *Othello* an exemption, but by 1832 *Oroonoko* was not acceptable even in cosmopolitan New York, perhaps because, following this arc, Imoinda is already pregnant, and miscegenation was becoming a sore subject in an increasingly white-identified city. After one more performance, Booth dropped the play.

I have two sets of reservations to make about this book. Some small ones I will deal with first; larger ones will come at the end of this review. The small ones can be gathered under the rubric that, despite a lot of careful research, Dillon is still prone to make mistakes about theatre, some trivial, others quite serious. She follows Stephen Orgel in saying that "The court masque is a spectacle that materializes the authority of the king: the public theatre, in contrast, materializes the sovereignty of the public" (62). But the London public is neither automatically against the ruling powers nor made up in large part of "commoners." Dillon does not mention the inescapable basic issue that the public theatre, both in London and around the Atlantic world, was always unsubsidized and was therefore dependent on pleasing people who were well enough off to attend it, while not ruffling the feathers of authority. By the most general definitions, across the period, how many of those people can we suppose had suffered from enclosures of common land? Given ticket prices, were they not more likely to be the enclosers than the excluded?

Dillon dates the interest of Sir William Davenant in "a New Way of Entertainment of the People" from a pamphlet issued anonymously in 1653 in which he "argues that the techniques of spectacle developed in the court masque [would] remain valuable" in producing a strongly propagandistic, pro-government public theatre (67). Davenant had in fact been interested in taking masque accoutrements to the public since at least 1639, when he secured a royal patent for a theatre in which to offer plays and "Musick, musical Presentments, Scenes, Dancing or other the like." (For the text, see G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, VI: 304-9.) Ticket prices for such spectacle could not possibly have stayed at Elizabethan/Jacobean levels. If Parliament had not closed the theatres, would Davenant have put on performances that "materialize[d] the sovereignty of the public" against that of the king? It seems unlikely. He obviously made some adaptations to the new ruling structure, but "the People" he meant to entertain were not composed largely of commoners, nor were the audiences for theatre with moveable scenery of the sort that, under the same economic constraints, he and Thomas Killigrew set up after the Restoration.

In my view, Dillon's penchant for metaphor can easily lead her astray. She is so determined to relate T. D. Rice's "Jim Crow" character to Oroonoko that she says "we might imagine" that the former as portrayed on the cover of sheet music in London in 1835 "has worn the clothes of Southerne's Oroonoko for seventy years until they have become shredded rags" (220). But speaking as a

costume historian, I have to say that the only garment they have in common is knee breeches: their vests and coats are completely different in cut and could never have worn away to look at all similar. Likewise, she uses striped pants to link the costume of Mungo from Bickerstaff's *The Padlock* to illustrations in Isaac Mendes Belisario's 1837 portfolio of Jamaican pictures. She refers to but unfortunately does not show a Jamaican Jonkonnu performer who "sports an elaborate replica of a plantation house on his head, as well as showy striped red-and-white pants" (213) (for which, see the cover of *Theatre History Studies*, vol. 27, 2007). Why she thinks Mungo's suit was made of silk is not clear (211). The word silk does not occur in the text. When he first appears, Mungo is returning from market, not playing; and repeatedly shifting a large market hamper onto and off his back would quickly abraid and soon tear the jacket of a silk costume. The London theatre marked class by fabric choices, and servants did not normally wear silk, whatever the location of the play. Dillon would like Mungo's suit to be a reference to the costumes of Jamaican slaves celebrating the mid-winter holiday, but acknowledges that "This textile genealogy is difficult to trace with precision," since *The Padlock* premiered in London nearly seventy years before Belisario's pictures. Need all striped pants be inter-related, or only those worn by blacks?

The most bizarre and illogical theatre-related error is the mistaken notion that the Licensing Act of 1737 "sought to curtail the gathering of large mixed-class crowds . . . at the theatre by banning popular forms of entertainment such as pantomimes from the patent theatres" (25), a repeated assertion that readers for the press should have challenged. Our field will be haunted by this misapprehension. If the Licensing Act banned pantomimes, why does the McMillan catalogue of the Larpent MSS list over 30 scripts labeled pantomime and licensed for performance after 1739 by the office set up by this act?

And, if the Licensing Act reduced or banned pantomimes, why is there one in 1781 called *Robinson Crusoe or Harlequin Friday* for Dillon to discuss in her fourth chapter? In 1794, a French company from Haiti, having taken refuge in Charleston, performed a two-act production derived from the *Crusoe* story and concluding with "a grand entertainment" (159) that consisted largely of dances, as the generic label implies. Dillon compares what was on offer in Charleston with the 1781 *Crusoe* pantomime, which, following *The London Stage*, she attributes to Richard Brinsley Sheridan. She declares that the originator (whose identity is open to question) is the first "to attach the signifier of Harlequin's blackness to the racial economy of the Atlantic world. . . to make Harlequin *racially* black," and thus a "condensed figure of coloniality" (156), so the attribution matters to the force of her observation. Did whoever made this choice have any inkling of what he or she was doing? Obviously the compiler did not think in Dillon's terms, but was this a conscious political decision or a mere convenience? The London pantomime was produced under Sheridan's auspices, so his name has been attached to it, although the published scenario consists chiefly of quotations from Defoe and was clearly constructed by or for the publisher, not by the author, who notoriously did not publish his work. Cecil Price, in the Oxford *Dramatic Works*, lists *Crusoe* under Sheridan's "Revisals" (II: 784-87), doubting that he originated the scenario. Near-contemporaneous

sources name Mrs Sheridan and friends; as Dillon recognizes in a note, one modern scholar suggests the Pierrot and pantomime contriver Carlo Antonio Delpini, who made other pantomimes at both patent theatres in the 1790s. Sheridan comes with a set of political positions attached to him, as well as a reputation as a writer, that give his name weight in this situation; Mrs Sheridan cannot readily be analysed as a source; Delpini is unlikely to have been thinking of anything more significant than how to make use of the standard characters derived from *commedia dell'arte* in this particular story. Is there any reason to think that Harlequin then stay racially black in other pantomimes, or was this a unique concatenation of story and stock character?

Dillon asserts but does not demonstrate a link between the 1781 English pantomime and the 1794 French grand entertainment (158), although why people whose repertory was entirely French-derived would look to an unauthorized English scenario is not clear, even assuming they had access to a copy in Charleston. (For their repertory, see *American Theatre Companies, 1749-1887*, ed. Durham, 229.) In fact, the novel *Crusoe* had been available in French since 1720, and an internationally popular children's version had been translated from German into French by 1779 and was available in Paris. What evidence says that the French Friday played in blackface, as opposed to the usual black mask for Harlequin, if indeed Harlequin played Friday in Charleston?

Many of the small mistakes in this book are of minor importance, and for some of her examples Dillon certainly presents thought-provoking context and possibilities for multiple interpretations by successive audiences. But my final reservations concern the limits of her chief concept. Must the performative commons be oppositional? Or does it occur any time audience opinion coalesces? How long does it last: that night only? Does it persist outside the theatre? Can viewers returning to the theatre bring a nucleus of it back with them? In an entirely commercial theatre, can theatre managers cultivate it? Can it occur today, or is it useful only for analysis of past conflicts? I wish Dillon had made the parameters of her concept clearer.

I end with a question about a particular example. Farquhar's *The Constant Couple* (1699) is not freighted with racial issues, and any proto-feminist issues are resolved in favor of the status quo. Enthusiastic London audiences ran the performance total for the play above fifty in its first season, at a time when ten nights was an accomplishment. Were they not implicitly agreeing with its politics? I find it difficult to imagine how that play could have generated much in the way of an oppositional reading, except perhaps among Roman Catholics, a standard target in England. Is this audience unanimity not a performative commons, and if not, why not? If an anti-establishment understanding is necessary to generate a performative commons, does that not sharply limit the number of plays in any of the relevant repertories for which the concept is useful? I wish Dillon had commented on how many of the fifty-three mainpieces and twenty-eight afterpieces in the 1773-74 Charleston repertory would lend themselves to the sort of analysis she explores in this book. The (operatic?) *Tempest* and *The Padlock* were on that list, but so was *The Constant Couple*. According to John J. McCusker in *Money and Exchange* (220), the

exchange rate between South Carolina (SC) and London (L) remained at 7:1 from the 1730s through the 1770s. Ticket prices for Charleston on 16 May 1774 as reported in William J. Burling and Odai Johnson's *Colonial American Stage* (470) are approximately equivalent to the scale in London. For what percentage of the Charleston public was this entertainment affordable? There was some local opposition to the theatre as an entity: this "amusement" was "presented" to the Grand Jury on 28 February as a public nuisance, but the petition was quashed (Burling and Johnson, 465). I suggest that the American Company performed so many plays not only to show off, but also because the percentage of the population that could possibly attend was small enough that they had to offer maximum variety to get repeat customers. To put the question another way, how much resistance to the status quo could the strictly commercial theatres of London and the Atlantic world afford knowingly to produce?

Judith Milhous
CUNY Graduate Center, Emerita

Cynthia Richards and Mary Ann O'Donnell (eds.). *Approaches to Teaching Behn's "Oroonoko."* New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2014. Pp. xv + 227 + [4, series bibliography]; bibliography of works cited; index; survey of teachers assisting. ISBN: 978-1-60329-128-6. Paperback, \$19.75.

Congratulations Aphra Behn! 326 years after the publication of *Oroonoko*, you have definitive, material proof that your signal piece of fiction has survived the ensuing years' vagaries of critical reception and "made it."

Joining other British writers in the long eighteenth century – Dryden, Swift, Pope, Johnson, Austen, and female dramatists – Behn's work is now represented in MLA's venerable "*Approaches to Teaching*" series. As the editors note in the volume's preface, "rarely has a text escalated in significance as dramatically as *Oroonoko*" (xii), and internet searches for syllabi that include it return thousands of hits. The MLA series has been around since at least 1986 (*Paradise Lost*, *King Lear*, Wordsworth's poetry). As critical concerns shift, one imagines that *Oroonoko* is now more frequently taught than Dryden (MLA volume published in 2013) or Johnson (1993) in our increasingly squeezed majors' classes. This volume proves its usefulness in classroom settings from introductory surveys to literary methods classes to graduate courses in transatlantic women's writing. (I myself have used it in a core majors' course in historical methodology and an upper-level special topics seminar on Behn.) All volumes in the series are developed from a questionnaire, and this one garnered responses from 49 teacher-scholars, 19 of whom are among the 28 contributors to this volume.

The collection of short essays is divided into five sections: formal and thematic contexts, cultural contexts, pedagogical contexts, comparative contexts, and authorial contexts. While the editors acknowledge that these categories are

“standard,” they also state that “most of [the volume’s] essays answer to more than one of these categories and could be positioned under a different rubric” (22). They identify race and gender, of course, as the issues that permeate all of the essays in the volume (23). Numerous contributors – among others, Thomas Krise (94), Laura Rosenthal (138) and Vincent Carretta (167) – point out the need to identify and interrogate students’ conceptions of race so that they are able to appreciate the term’s historical contingency; Behn’s text can both aid in and be the object of such work. Analysis of this core issue as well as that of gender (centering on Imoinda, the narrator, and Behn herself) is joined by many other ways instructors can open this text for their students. Genre claims lot of attention – what are *Oroonoko*’s romance, sentimentalist, or epic components? Is it a novel? How does it connect with other travel literature, other slave narratives, or drama? Thematic readings via economics, war, or constructs of heroism and the noble savage appear. The position of the narrator is discussed in multiple essays. Several chapters examine the novel’s transatlantic nature as well as considering it as a product of Anglocentrism. Like Behn’s text itself, this collection covers a lot of territory.

Almost all of the essays acknowledge the extraordinary complexity of this work and both the burdens and opportunities that that complexity presents to its teachers and students. Eric Bond’s piece does a particularly good job of addressing the possibility of reveling in this complexity with our students and showing how a 300-year-old text can confront us with our own modern limitations as readers and interpreters. Courses necessarily pressed for classroom time can find the lack of a clear overarching, key reading of *Oroonoko* frustrating. Yet, as Bond shows, if we pick up one critical thread, we necessarily drop others. To help with this, he describes “an approach that self-consciously reveals to [students] what each frame incorporates as well as what it ignores [and] takes them backstage ... , showing them the political ramifications of interpreting Restoration literature in particular and any text in general” (132). He identifies this as an important lesson for his particular group of students, aspiring teachers.

Bond’s attention to his student cohort is a strength of his and several other essays in the collection. For example, Karen Gevirtz begins by noting that her students as a group are diverse, yet all are concerned with money; thus, she chooses economics as her entrée to *Oroonoko*. Leslie Richardson’s chapter looks at how one might tackle the text in historically black institutions. Derek Hughes introduces an important focus on course design and describes how he used *Oroonoko* in several types of course at the University of Aberdeen. Students are mentioned in passing in all of the essays, but, as with these three, some center their discussions more on the types of students and precise methods of engaging them. Some essays’ lack of detail on their classes’ student composition causes me to worry about the assumption of a homogeneous student body, where racial issues reside primarily in the text instead of in the readers.

What classroom exercises, activities, and techniques do the contributors use to communicate the content their chapters discuss? James Grantham Turner mentions several writing assignments. Jane Milling and Cynthia Richards had

two groups of students – one in England and one in America – work through questions of national identity via email. Srinivas Aravamudan asks us to ask our students what *kind* of work Behn’s text is and then provides a list of potential genres that he suggests generating (29). Again, however, knowing the context of his class would be helpful, since I’m doubtful that many students would know the majority of these genres. Whatever the approach described, the chapters usually assume classroom success. Perhaps only to assuage my own self-doubt, I’d appreciate some war stories, some failures, some approaches attempted then abandoned. A fuller picture of these classes’ institutional positions, too, would also allow us to understand how these classes fit into the larger curriculum, how they contribute to assessment plans, and how they continue and then contribute to the knowledge transfer in their academic programs.

The Materials section at the opening of the volume gives basic information on editions and useful articles, as well as point us to relevant, helpful databases and websites. Contributors do not foreground media in their discussions, except for Gevirtz’s use of *Colonial House*, Milling and Richards’ email experiment, and Keith M. Bothelo’s mention of Early English Books Online. What other websites and databases are faculty are using, and are any employing hand-held devices in their classroom? Beyond traditional papers, are instructors exploring multimedia assignments? What many instructors would find useful is augmentation of the whole MLA series to take advantage of media, with online components such as syllabi for the classes described, sample PowerPoints, assignment sheets, tools to enable collaborative teaching, and some representative student work.

You can see my main concern: I desire more information about the *who* and *how* of the approaches to teaching. In issuing this call for more contextualization and more detail about class conduct and student work, I realize I am asking a lot of essays that aim at about 4000 words. But it seems to me that perhaps there is not enough distinction in the volume between “topic” and the series’ term, “approach.” The latter caused me to expect more emphasis on methods of delivering the topic/content. Both topic and approach are important to the project of teaching *Oroonoko*, but conflating the two may not help as many instructors as possible. In my view, the whole collection should address “pedagogical contexts.”

This is an enjoyable, content-rich volume that will help us all teach *Oroonoko* with a more comprehensive understanding of the work and with more ammunition for making the text “relatable” to our students. After having read these essays, I feel better prepared for the next time I teach the book. Yet I most appreciate what the volume means for *Oroonoko* itself. That all of this material has been marshalled for Behn’s text is a tribute to her and to the ways in which her text calls upon all of us to respond. So again: congratulations, Aphra Behn. You have arrived, and we marvel at what your book continues to offer us.

Cheryl Wanko
West Chester University

Carla J. Mulford. *Benjamin Franklin and the Ends of Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015. Pp. xv + 426; bibliography; illustrations; index. ISBN: 9780199384198. Hardcover: \$65.

Carla Mulford's fine study adds enormously to what has now become a veritable market in book publishing that has delved into Benjamin Franklin's life and times. In the past ten years, a virtual explosion in new work about him has appeared, especially as the world celebrated in 2006 the tercentennial of the anniversary his birth. I could even say that it began even well before that moment, as British and American historians, political theorists, English literary historians, journalists, and a vast array of commentators have all found new ways of studying a man who was perhaps the most well-known, well-respected figure produced in the Western Hemisphere. The numerous works published within the past 20 years alone would take up room on not only bookshelves, but on several bookcases.

Most of these studies are excellent, some not so, but clearly the authors show deep respect for, even love of, the man and his many contributions. How could they not, really? Born in 1706 and dying 84 years later, he spanned almost the entire (short) eighteenth century; he lived the heroic and iconic life of moving from the lower-middle class to becoming one of the wealthiest men in the colonies (he was able to retire at 45); as a brilliant autodidact with two years of formal education, he became the world's greatest scientist of his time; he experienced and reacted to the vast changes the American colonies endured in its difficulties with the British Empire; he was a highly regarded diplomat to both Britain and France; he participated in the debates over American separation from the Empire; and he helped set out the structure of the new United States, first in the Articles of Confederation and, then, more permanently, in the Constitution. He is the only person to have signed the four major founding documents of the late-18th century: the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the Articles in 1776, the Treaty of Paris in 1783, and the Constitution in 1787.

Numerous books have investigated and analyzed all of his achievements and exploits in great detail. Now comes Mulford's long-awaited study, which possesses many virtuous characteristics. Most of her observations are new, fresh, and even inspiring. A few, especially concerning when he advocated America's separation from the British Empire, are less persuasive (more on that point later). Still, in my judgment, it is the very best treatment of Franklin's thought, combining literary biography, political theory, economic thought, and the sociology of ideas.

This combination distinguishes it from other studies of Franklin and his time in two major ways. First, while hers is clearly a biography insofar as its fundamental structure is chronological, it is not the usual biography to which we have grown accustomed with the publication of recent work. The best among these, if we account for the past 20 years alone, are those by Francis Jennings (1996); H.W. Brands (2000); James Srodes (2002); Edmund Morgan (2002); Walter Isaacson (2003); Gordon Wood (2004); J.A. Leo Lemay (3 vols., 2005, 2005, 2008, although Lemay intended six total to equal the iconic Dumas Malone study of Thomas Jefferson, but his death cut this project short); and

Stacy Schiff (2005, mainly focusing on his years as a diplomat in France, 1776-1784). These names constitute a mouthful, so readers should get the gist of the length and breadth of Franklin biographical studies, which do not even take into consideration other kinds of studies. Fine specialized inquiries into Franklin's political and social thought, for example, include those by Douglas Anderson (1997 and 2012), Jerry Weinberger (2005), and Lorraine Smith Pangle (2007).

Muford's study fits into both of these categories, as she has self-consciously made her Franklin study a literary biography, focusing on Franklin's evolution as a writer, as influenced by not only his father and brother James (the latter for whom he worked at his Boston newspaper), but also his grandfather. There is little of his personal life here: his wife, Deborah, for example, does not even appear until page 210. Readers interested in such matters should consult the classic 1975 study by Claude Anne Lopez and Eugenia Herbert's *The Private Franklin*, which Mulford cites in her notes. Readers seeking detailed information about his scientific inquiries, his progress from apprentice to his brother to printer to wealth and diplomacy, and his inventions and discoveries will not find these matters covered here with great specificity. Some of these are briefly mentioned, but the focus lies elsewhere.

The second way in which Mulford's work markedly differs from previous efforts is rooted in the following. For the past sixty years, a new field of historical inquiry has grown through fits and starts. Known as Atlantic history, it has focused on the complex interactions of events in Europe (especially France), Britain, the Iberian Peninsula, and the colonies in the New World. Its origins center on the work of R. R. Palmer, the great historian of the French Revolution in the 1950s. His monumental *The Age of Democratic Revolution: A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800* (two vols., 1959 and 1964) inaugurated the field, which was quickly followed by the work of Bernard Bailyn at Harvard in the 1960s (see his *Atlantic History: Concepts and Contours*, 2005). Atlantic history received a major boost with the momentary unity of history and anthropology at Johns Hopkins University in the 1970s, when Jack P. Greene and Sidney Mintz created a center for study in this field. Meantime, numerous specialized studies appeared in the Johns Hopkins Studies in Atlantic History and Culture.

Within the past five years, after a lull, the field of Atlantic history revived to a great extent, although it has faced a good deal of criticism. The claim is that Atlantic studies are nothing more than imperial history, which in a way is true. In any event, my own modest entry into this arena occurred ten years ago with *Atlantic Cousins: Benjamin Franklin and His Visionary Friends*. Mulford also views Franklin's literary development through this Atlantic lens, specifically in the ways in which his ideas of empire evolved. Here, she wonderfully illuminates Franklin's evolving views of empire in both his most ambitious writings and projects. The latter include those ranging from his *Observations Concerning the Increase in Mankind* to his essays on imperial success. Clearly worried about the encroachments on Pennsylvania by Virginia from the South and New York from the North, he was also anxious about the French and their Indian allies in the West as well as the German immigration into the colony.

As for the latter, Mulford covers his activities that attempted to unite the colonies. These include his letters to Gov. William Shirley, published in 1754 and again widely in 1766, and his 1754 Albany Plan. Finally, she analyzes his diplomatic efforts in Britain from 1759 to 1774. For a strong, united empire, he believed in equal citizenship, which meant that the Pennsylvania proprietors, Richard and Thomas Penn, must pay their fair share in taxes on their lands. It also meant that the ministry, especially the Privy Council, should permit the Americans to raise militias and conduct their economy the way they best saw fit. Later, as the proprietors declined to accede to his request, he carried out his second mission to London to argue that the government should transform Pennsylvania into a royal colony to end the Penns' iron grip.

Of course, as we know, these efforts proved unsuccessful, and soon Franklin's enterprise focused on larger disputes that the colonies had with the British government over parliamentary representation and taxation, including opposition to the Stamp Act (though it took him a while) and the Townshend Duties. He began to advocate what might best be termed an "imperial federation" between Britain and the colonies, all governed by the King but having separate assemblies based on the ancient rights and liberties of Britons, including those in the colonies.

At this point, I must record my disagreement with Mulford's view of Franklin's growing hatred of the British Empire and his dwindling interest keeping the colonies within it. In opposition to most historians, she maintains that his realization that reconciliation with the British government was not possible occurred far earlier than his dramatic appearance in the Cockpit before the Privy Council in January of 1774. She is quite right to note that most historians do indeed claim that it was at that moment that he realized that the Americans could no longer remain within the Empire. There, as the Massachusetts colonial agent, he was to report the reasons why the colonial assembly had asked for the removal of the royal governor and lieutenant governor. Instead, he was subjected to an hour's worth of vicious condemnation by Sir Alexander Wedderburn, the Solicitor General, who accused him of opposing the Crown and becoming a danger to British rule. As is well known, after being forced to stand for the entire period while hearing Wedderburn refer to him, as Mulford puts it, "a lawless ruffian, a rank upstart, a petty criminal, one who deserved to be shunned from civil society," Franklin simply said nothing (267). There is a most interesting moment in her analysis of this incident and one that I found eye-opening. When Wedderburn likened Franklin to Zanga, the black slave in Edward Young's 1721 play, *Revenge*, she notes that Franklin was just then deeply engaged in rethinking his view of slavery and the slave trade (he himself had owned slaves in Philadelphia and took them to London with him on his first trip there as the Pennsylvania agent).

By my lights, Mulford's account of the Cockpit affair may well be the best representation of this event in any study. But the problem lies in her view that Franklin's growing determination to see America independent of the Empire began way before 1774: she claims it may be found in the late 1760s and early 1770s. She argues that in these earlier years "the colonies might at any moment decide to break with England" (243) or with the Stamp Act protests and

nonimportation policy (1765), “[Franklin] was ready to consider an alternative political model for the ‘distinct states’ of British North America” (244). Or as a result of his tour of Ireland in 1771, “to Franklin, the situation in Ireland was a perfect illustration why Pennsylvania needed to be rid of its Proprietary relationship with the Penns and *with Britain*” (252, emphasis added).

Surely, his second mission to London was to persuade the Crown and Parliament to end the proprietary rule of the colony and transform it to a royal colony, but his goal was not rebellion. It is, in short, a leap for her to include the phrase “with Britain” here. She persists, however: in learning more and more about British efforts to conquer India via the East India Company in the years 1772 and 1773, she states that Franklin “concluded that the Britons in North America might be better off on their own with no ties to such a rapacious government” (256). Or, “it was already too late to repair the damage caused by what he considered to be illegal administrative policies in North America” (257). These statements, and others like them, are, in my judgment, purely speculative, well beyond the writings of the man and his ideas about empire.

Curiously, Mulford repeats this view in her conclusion, but there, she does so with a twist, which I found confusing and even bewildering. Instead of focusing on the late sixties, early seventies, she now argues that Franklin held views of American go-it-aloneness from Britain “dating as far back as the middle 1750s” (347), referring presumably to his correspondence with Gov. Shirley and his advocacy of the united colonies in his 1754 Albany Plan. And yet, she is precisely closer to reality (and my view) when just a page earlier, she argued that Franklin’s goal was to devise “a collaborative colonial system . . . to work with leaders and members of the Parliament and also in Ireland to develop a cooperative system of trade that might develop into a collaborative political system within the British Empire” (346). Mulford is thus correct to argue that Franklin’s view of the relationship between the Americans and the British government had to change, that the colonial assemblies should have more authority to make laws (and taxes) on behalf of their own populations, and that a new kind of “federated empire” (noted above) was more along the lines of what he had in mind: a commonwealth of British nations, so to speak, but clearly British.

In my judgment, Franklin thought of himself as British until quite late, indeed later than many of his countrymen. He certainly was not as radical as his Massachusetts constituency, which was why he sought reconciliation, sometimes at all cost. This leads me to point out a very serious omission Mulford makes after she addressed the January 1774 Cockpit affair. She simply jumps to Franklin’s departure from London in March of 1775, a lapse of some 15 months. Why did he remain? What was he up to? What was on his mind? Why did Mulford skip this all-important 15-month period? Was it because it did not fit into her ideas about his desire in the late sixties, early seventies to leave the empire? I tried to answer these questions several years ago in an essay, “Unrespectable and Reluctant Radical: Benjamin Franklin as a Revolutionary,” in ed. Michael T. Davis and Paul Pickering, *Unrespectable Radicals? Popular Politics in the Age of Reform* (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2008). There, I argued that Franklin remained in London to continue his efforts at reconciliation, not

rebellion, to create that “federated empire.” He worked with Lord Chatham (the Elder) and the Howe brothers (William and Richard, who would later command the British military effort on land and sea, respectively against the Americans).

Franklin failed and failed miserably in these efforts and he was terribly upset by his inability to make any progress to reconcile the differences between the British and the Americans. In July 1775, he wrote an amazing confession to Richard Howe that underscored his belief in British America, not an independent America. He told Howe that he was deeply saddened that a break between the two sides was now inevitable: “Long did I endeavor with unfeigned and unwearied Zeal, to preserve from breaking, that fine and noble China Vase the British Empire: for I knew that being once broken, the separate Parts could not retain even their Share of the Strength or Value that existed in the Whole, and that a perfect Re-Union of those Parts could scarce even be hoped for.”

Mulford quotes this remarkable statement (284-285), but fails to see the pathos and sorrow in Franklin’s words. Instead, she argues, that “almost as soon as he landed in Philadelphia on May 5, 1775, Franklin worked *tirelessly* to secure the revolution” (274, emphasis added). I don’t think so. In fact, as he wrote them, he was still actively working with his congressional colleagues to make a last-ditch attempt to set out a mechanism that would lead to reconciliation to preserve the Empire. They crafted the Olive Branch Petition to the King, a document that Mulford mentions only in passing in a short phrase, but about which she is wholly dismissive (275). The petition received no response, and, as we know and as Mulford reminds us, the very next month, George III proclaimed that the colonies were in rebellion. Only by the fall of 1775 was Franklin finally convinced that independence was inevitable. He then worked, along with John Adams and David Rittenhouse, to comment on a draft of a pamphlet Thomas Paine was preparing. *Common Sense*, calling for American separation from Britain, appeared in print in January the following year, nearly six months before the dissemination of the Declaration of Independence.

Overall, Mulford’s is a noble and compelling attempt to convince us otherwise, but I, for one, am unpersuaded that Franklin sought separation in the late sixties and early seventies (or as early as 1754). But perhaps this is all but a quibble. Her treatment of Franklin’s late activities in France, the Constitutional Convention (though limited by infirmity, age, and pain), his efforts to promote the abolition of slavery, and his determination to fight for the equality and rights of all people, in her final chapter, are as marvelous as her assessment of his early ideas of empire in the first section of this study. *Benjamin Franklin and the Ends of Empire* is, in short, a superb addition to the Franklin library. Anyone interested in this great man’s evolving views will find it to be a mandatory read.

Jack Fruchtman, Jr.
Towson University

Julia Gasper. *The Marquis d'Argens: A Philosophical Life*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books [Division of Rowman & Littlefield], 2014. Pp. 297; bibliography [269-88]; frontispiece portrait; index. ISBN: 978-0-7391-8233-8. Hardcover, \$100; e-book, \$99.99.

Julia Gasper's recent biography, *The Marquis d'Argens: A Philosophical Life*, presents a valuable reappraisal of an author whose contributions to eighteenth-century thought deserve greater notice. Indeed, Gasper goes so far as to claim that "everything d'Argens wrote should be on more university reading-lists" (169). She decisively excludes *Thérèse Philosophe* from d'Argens's oeuvre, though, asserting that the novel so often associated with her subject resembles "a camel in a line-up of greyhounds" (5) when placed against his authentic works of fiction. Gasper maintains throughout her book that d'Argens was at heart too humane a man and too responsible an intellectual to be likened fairly to Casanova or de Sade or to be dismissed as a shallow-minded, sexually abusive libertine. She works spiritedly to prove Voltaire correct—"You have the mind of Bayle," he once told d'Argens, "and the style of Montaigne" (quoted in Gasper 102),—and her sincere alacrity for recovering d'Argens as a key Enlightenment figure accounts in no small part for the book's appeal. Soundly researched and full of colorful people and incidents, *The Marquis d'Argens: A Philosophical Life* successfully renders a clear and believable new image of d'Argens that should improve what we know of his work and his era.

Although quite talented, adventurous, and born to a position of social privilege, d'Argens faced myriad financial and romantic troubles throughout his youth (more than a few of his worries, admittedly, resulted from his own poor judgments). Perhaps not naturally suited for the life that his travels and studies in the law prepared him to undertake, he clashed repeatedly with his father; eventually, his family disinherited him (74-75). To make matters worse, he sought refuge in a military career that abruptly ended after he was wounded in an accident involving his own horse (83). Now incapable of soldiering, d'Argens devoted himself to writing and soon produced several provocative philosophical pieces, including *Lettres Juives* (1736) and *La Philosophie du Bon-Sens* (1737). He authored novels at this time as well, including *Les Enchainements de l'Amour et de la Fortune, ou, Mémoires du Marquis de Vaudreville* (1736); for Gasper, this book marks "a literary achievement that should be regarded as a classic, alongside *Tom Jones*" (97). Contrary to longstanding impressions, d'Argens did not compose sophisticated pornography; rather, he wrote incisively on morality and ideas in works guided by an unflinching commitment to honesty (Voltaire named him "The Enemy of Error, the Lover of Truth" when he wrote his friend's epitaph in 1771 [2, 264]). Because he saw Christianity as hypocritical and mendacious, d'Argens held philosophical inquiry to be the legitimate source of ethics and virtue. Among his admirers was Prince Frederick of Prussia, and, when Frederick became king, the Protestant sovereign invited the French philosopher to the court at Berlin (121-22). D'Argens stayed, first joining the Berlin Academy and then suffering through the precarious time of the Seven Years War, during which Frederick, often at a loss in the face of his military enemies, sought both advice and

reassurance through his extensive correspondence with d'Argens. For all that, d'Argens eventually returned to France after twenty-six years in Frederick's service (260). D'Argens died at Aix in January 1771 after taking extreme unction, a startling act of religious conventionality that Gasper calls "an astonishing compromise" intended to save his wife and family further grief rather than to make amends with God or the Catholic Church (263).

While sharpening the historical picture of d'Argens's life, Gasper also addresses her subject's checkered reputation for libertinism—the notoriety worsened, of course, by mistaken attributions of *Thérèse Philosophe* to d'Argens's pen. Gasper faithfully records d'Argens's sometimes questionable relationships with women, and she does so without sugarcoated excuses for his misdeeds. At the same time, she takes care throughout the book to cast d'Argens as a decent man whose sexual injudiciousness, especially in his younger days, should not be taken for a predisposition to heartlessness or deliberate cruelty. "D'Argens was guilty," she states, after narrating his regrettable treatment of Mlle de Besaudin, "but was he a libertine?" (56). Gasper makes a case for d'Argens as an uxorious, "naturally monogamous" man (76) and a trustworthy friend—scarcely what one might expect of a debauched eighteenth-century aristocrat. Given the degree to which his legacy has been damaged by exaggerations and falsehoods regarding his supposed libertinism, the rehabilitation of his reputation has a necessarily salient place in this book. Gasper merits praise as much for remaking the picture of d'Argens the man as for bettering our knowledge of d'Argens the scholar and artist.

That being said, *The Marquis d'Argens: A Philosophical Life* has a few distracting problems. The editing is not as meticulous as it should be: for example, in a passage on d'Argens's war comrades, we hear of "Colonel Terson, an Englishmen [*sic*] probably of Jacobite origin, who was a classical scholar" (80). Regrettably, such editorial missteps occur a bit too often, which is a shame given how nicely Gasper's prose otherwise reads. A second minor complaint involves a passage very early in the work. "The American President Thomas Jefferson," Gasper writes, "had several of d'Argens' works in his library and in 1815 he recommended his successor [*sic*] John Adams to read them" (3). Although this mistake seems negligible, I suspect that the book's American audience could scarcely help detecting it.

These concerns, though worth mentioning, should not be lingered over. All told, *The Marquis d'Argens: A Philosophical Life* is an enthusiastically argued and much-needed contribution to eighteenth-century studies. With this biography, Gasper in effect creates a fresh beginning for scholarship on d'Argens's thought and work. Beyond this important consideration, and because d'Argens's talents, interests, and experiences ranged broadly, the book casts light on several aspects of Enlightenment intellectualism and culture, including the European idea of the East, art criticism, the reception of philosophers from Descartes to the Pre-Socratics, and the world of theatre and opera. D'Argens's story also offers insight into figures such as Voltaire, the Berlin Academicians, and Frederick II, a practical joker, a scholar, and, in the bleakest moments of the Seven Years War, a man very close to committing suicide. And although he died before the moment of the American and French Revolutions, d'Argens may

indeed, as Gasper claims, be “a missing link between the Enlightenment and the Romantic generation” (236) in part because “while others talked of revolution, he practiced it” (9). For these reasons, and more, Gasper’s book belongs in the hands of readers interested in Continental philosophy and literature of the Long Eighteenth Century.

Timothy Ruppert
Slippery Rock University

Philip J. Stern and Carl Wennerlind (editors). *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and its Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Pp ix + 404; index. ISBN 978-0-19-998853-2. Hardcover: \$99.

What was mercantilism? In Part IV of the *Wealth of Nations* (1776), Adam Smith criticized the “mercantile system” of earlier economic thinkers for conflating wealth with money and for believing that the best way to accumulate money was to maintain a favorable balance of trade. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, economic historians developed a more sympathetic account, arguing that the states of early modern Europe devised a coherent set of mercantilist policies designed to harness economic activity—particularly trade—in order to increase state power. This historiography, most authoritatively formulated in the Swedish economic historian Eli Heckscher’s *Mercantilism* (1931), remains influential and valuable even as scholars in the field have repeatedly qualified or revised its claims.

For Stern and Wennerlind, the editors of *Mercantilism Reimagined*, the formula economics + state power = mercantilism is too simple because economic thought was more complex and heterogeneous, and because the early modern state was more inchoate and contested than our modern terms imply (4-5). Rather than substituting a single alternate equation, however, their volume invites a range of early modern historians and allied scholars to devise their own juxtapositions of economic, political, and other concepts, with rich and fascinating results. Stern and Wennerlind describe their guiding approach as “inductive rather than deductive,” but one could rather say that it is analytic rather than synthetic, breaking a complex concept into its constituent parts in order to do justice to their particularity (4). The sixteen chapters are given pithy but informative titles (“Population,” “Money,” “Corporations,” “Pirates and Smugglers”) that will guide readers to the sections most relevant to their own interests.

In some cases, the arguments that result are avowedly revisionist, correcting both Smithian and twentieth-century accounts of mercantilism. Thus Carl Wennerlind’s chapter on “Money” vindicates Samuel Hartlib and his circle from Smith’s charge that they had a confused understanding of money; there was a real and economically damaging shortage of specie in seventeenth-century England. Similarly, John Shovlin’s “War and Peace” shows that seventeenth-

and eighteenth-century states did not wage “commercial wars,” as Heckscher argued—though victors were not averse to imposing commercial conditions on the treaties that concluded wars begun for other reasons (305).

Other scholars take on key concepts from mercantilist writing and its subsequent historiography, and show how they changed over time: thus, Ted McCormick shows how “population” moves over the course of the seventeenth century from referring to particular groups (such as the agricultural poor) to a quantitative measure of all of the people within a state, while Henry Turner recovers the range of political and social as well as economic meanings comprised by the early modern “corporation.” Still other chapters propose novel and fruitful juxtapositions of different historical concepts or episodes, as when Abigail Swingen connects the history of Atlantic slavery to debates about population and labor back in Britain, Brent S. Sirota demonstrates the role of the Anglican church in eighteenth-century British naval aggrandizement, and Niklas Frykman brilliantly and wittily outlines the parallels between early-eighteenth-century Caribbean pirates and tea smugglers on the southern and eastern coasts of England. Andre Wakefield, Regina Grafe, and Victor Enthoven contribute valuable comparative perspectives, showing how the traditional historiography of mercantilism looks different in Germany, Spain, or the Dutch Republic respectively. Sophus Reinert’s pan-European chapter on “Rivalry” is even wider in range, and introduces the reader to much recent Italian historiography of early modernity that is not well known to Anglophone scholars.

There is much to praise in each of the individual chapters of *Mercantilism Reimagined*, not all of which I have had space to mention above, but in closing I wish to commend its authors, editors, and Oxford University Press for the book’s substantial scholarly virtues taken as a whole. Its essays are in both explicit and implicit communication with each other, deploying cross-references and shared historiographical touchstones to sustain a coherent conversation among contributors—the recent work of Steven Pincus on the partisan economic debates of the turn of the eighteenth century comes in for particularly frequent discussion. *Mercantilism Reimagined* is lucidly organized into five parts (“Circulation,” “Knowledge,” “Institutions,” “Regulation,” “Conflict”) and ends with a common index; both devices help the reader discover connections among its sixteen individual contributions. Its chapters are commendably short, yet densely annotated with relevant scholarship. Literary scholars (perhaps the single biggest group of *ECI* readers) may find particular food for thought in Thomas Leng’s “Epistemology,” Sirota’s “The Church,” and Martyn J. Powell’s “Consumption,” each of which takes up the interaction between the print sphere and other segments of European culture. Whatever mercantilism was—and this volume offers no single answer to that question,—this volume demonstrates that it remains relevant to us as scholars today.

Jacob Sider Jost
Dickinson College

***Tommy Thumb's Pretty Song Book: The First Collection of English Nursery Rhymes. A Facsimile Edition with a History and Annotations* by Andrea Immel and Brian Alderson.** Los Angeles: Cotsen Occasional Press, 2013 [2014]. pp. xv, [1], 121, [1]; 48 illustrations; 3 facsimile song books ca. 9 cm. (pp. [iv] + 59 + [5]; [ii] + 64; [ii] + 64). ISBN: 978-0-615-67876-4. Limited edition. Hardcover in presentation box.

Survival rates among children's books are poor, and even poorer when it comes to chapbooks and children's books. These cheaply produced little volumes were not designed to last; they were not generally bound with other volumes, an occurrence which often allows ephemeral pamphlets or broadsheets to survive the ages. They were usually unbound or stitched in paper wrappers and printed on poor paper; they were destined to be grasped in small hands, crushed into pockets, and read to pieces.

In this very attractive publication we find a series of three miniature song books hand stitched and beautifully bound in silk-covered boards accompanied by a lavishly illustrated companion volume offering a scholarly commentary. Thanks to the Cotsen Children's Library at Princeton and the Cotsen Occasional Press, these extraordinarily rare little volumes have been reproduced in facsimile editions for a wider audience. The preface draws attention to the chance survival of these volumes, noting that for one hundred and fifty years since its acquisition by the British Library in London, volume two of *Tommy Thumb's Pretty Song Book* was a unique survival, until a second example turned up at auction in 2001; an example of volume one of this set has still not been discovered.

Three facsimiles make up the set: *The Pretty Book: Being a New and Pleasant Method to Teach Children* (London, George Bickham, c.1746) from the Osborne Collection of Toronto Public Library; *Tommy Thumb's Song Book* by Nurse Lovechild (Worcester, Mass., Isaiah Thomas, 1788) from the Library of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, Massachusetts; and *Tommy Thumb's Pretty Song Book* Volume II (London, sold by M. Cooper, 1744) from the Cotsen Children's Library, with the missing page reproduced from the copy held in the British Library. The accompanying volume is titled *Nurse Lovechild's Legacy*. The set is produced in a limited edition of 500 copies.

Printed in London in 1744 and sold for sixpence by Mary Cooper, *Tommy Thumb's Pretty Song Book* was a commercial success, and a second edition of the two volume set was advertised in 1749. Its success benefited from the newly emerging marketing strategies of newspaper advertising and association with an important or influential personage, in this case the young Prince George (later George III of Great Britain), shown in the advertisement on the final page. The importance of this little book today lies in a number of areas. Firstly it is the earliest known edition of popular nursery rhymes in English, pushing evidence for some rhymes back forty years earlier than previously known. The editors see it as a hybrid text, straddling high and low culture, oral and print media. It is unashamedly aimed at a child audience, packed full of copper-plate illustrations and in a miniature format at a period when publishing for children was beginning to gain momentum. The titles of these little books remind us that the early nursery rhymes were meant to be sung. Subscribers' lists in some little

volumes point to actual child purchasers, and it is good to see the names of early owners inscribed in the volumes: testament to the value accorded to someone's prized possession.

The editors place these publications in their historical context, and using other similar publications attempt to recover something of the lost volume one. Careful detective work points to the engraver George Bickham Junior as printer of the work. In a detailed exploration of Bickham's output of engraved maps and prints, the attribution of the *Pretty Song Book* to Bickham is convincing. Examination of similar contemporary volumes, such as *Nancy Cock's Song Book*, point to the sometimes underhand marketing strategies employed by rival booksellers. Part of the commentary is given over to a reconstruction of volume one (pp 46-53), based on newspaper advertising and evidence from other publications, chiefly George Bickham's *The Pretty Book* published in London circa 1746, and Isaiah Thomas's *Tommy Thumb's Song Book* by Nurse Lovechild, published in Worcester in 1788, both reproduced here in facsimile. Space is given to an examination of the literary antecedents of the nurse, and an exploration of the character of Tom Thumb. Nurse Lovechild's literary descendant, Mother Goose, is explored, as is the subsequent gathering of nursery rhymes as suitable material for infants during the nineteenth century, and as a subject for antiquarian study by the mid century. Finally a page by page annotation of the rhymes is given (81-112), with reference to Iona and Peter Opie's second edition of *The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes* and with new information added on the background, history, and meaning of the texts.

Tommy Thumb's Pretty Song Book sold for sixpence, handsomely bound and gilt, and another little volume from Thomas and Mary Cooper, *The Child's New Play Thing* (1741), sold for one shilling. These prices were quite substantial and point to superior work, with good copper-plate engravings and attractive binding. Advertisements for *Nancy Cock's Song Book* give the cost as sixpence, bound and gilt. The editors point to the use of pretty embossed or gilt and colored paper covers for Thomas Boreman's 'Gigantick histories' (9). This range of cost puts these little pre-readers into a different category from popular chapbooks, which were usually stitched in paper wrappers, with crude woodcut illustrations, and which normally sold for about one penny. Here too we see a change in books offered to young children: production standards are higher and presentation is more appealing. John Newbery and his successors, through economies of scale and using different printing techniques, were able to sell their little books for one penny while keeping up the quality of production (40).

This publication, with its three facsimile volumes which have barely survived the ravages of time, is a very welcome addition to the study of early children's literature and the popular culture of nursery rhymes and verses. Its scholarship is assured and well founded, and its presentation very attractive. While the edition is limited to 500 copies, this still allows a much greater distribution of the original texts which only exist in ones and twos and in different repositories on both sides of the Atlantic.

Máire Kennedy

Dublin & Irish Collections, Dublin City Public Libraries

Scott R. Mackenzie. *Be it Ever So Humble: Poverty, Fiction, and the Invention of the Middle-Class Home.* (Winner of the University of Virginia Press's Walker Cowen Memorial Prize, 2013.) Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2013. Pp. x + 293; bibliography; index. ISBN: 978-0-8139-3341-2. Cloth, \$49.50 (same price for ebook version).

The associations, connotations, and implications of “home” have been, and remain, difficult to pin down with conviction. Attempts to define even the word “home” easily lend themselves to substituting similar terms instead of investigating “home” itself. Scott R. Mackenzie begins his project at this crux: that “domesticity,” “privacy,” and “family” are not completely synonymous with “home,” in spite of historical and scholarly tendencies to bind them together. Focusing on how “home” arises in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century texts, Mackenzie contends that a cultural shift from themes of liberation and inclusion to segregation and exclusion when the term “home” was deployed revolved around who was granted *home's* capital and how this affected those who already had access to it. In short, as the indigent came to acquire middle-class notions of “home,” the middle class began to turn away from what “home” meant to them. While this turn was evident in contemporary legislation (and is in scholarship written on it since), Mackenzie redirects our attention to those who contributed to “home’s invention” through their literary works. Through Mackenzie considering both literary and nonliterary works together, we gain a more holistic conception of “home” in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century than when the literature is disregarded. Mackenzie’s analysis includes such texts as Henry Fielding’s *Joseph Andrews*, Ann Radcliffe’s *The Romance of the Forest*, Wordsworth’s *Salisbury Plain* poems and *Home at Grasmere*, and Sir Walter Scott’s *Old Mortality*.

Mackenzie’s first two chapters outline the legal and economic trajectory of the poor over this period. In the first chapter he examines the eighteenth century through the lens of what he conceptualizes as Henry Fielding’s “parochial vision.” This vision was founded not so much on reforming the poor themselves but rather on reforming oversight of the poor (especially in regard to transitioning away from the fading parish system). This oversight was justified by and measured in sentimental terms, the deployment of which constitutes another major theme of the entire book. The risk of the poor being granted similar rights to home that the higher classes have is initially mitigated by their inability to wholly comprehend their superiors: “Poverty restrains affection, and therefore transgressive social emulation: the poor have no means of putting on the trappings of their betters and so cannot effectively develop any effective vanity” (61). It is only when the poor imprudently envy and then attempt to acquire the lives – and consequent comforts – of the wealthy that they become “vagrants or active criminals” (68). In chapter two Mackenzie explains that this anxiety was addressed by efforts to imbue a sense of national connection into the poor’s sense of home. This, Mackenzie explains, was accomplished by providing the poor with an opportunity to be self-sufficient. Over the time that the Poor Laws were amended and the rhetoric of sentiment sought to reason

away changes in the poor's living conditions, self-sufficiency became the bond between independent living and contributing to the welfare of the nation.

The book's fulcrum – and within it history's as well – pivots around the period during which these goals came into fruition. As Mackenzie announces in the third chapter, the progression of the poor's ties to home and nation necessitated progression of the middle class's ties to the same. As illustrated by an analysis of Jeremy Bentham's panoptic and workhouse tracts, by the early nineteenth century, "home" had shed its status as being acted upon by "major instruments of poverty management." These "instruments" were now subordinate to "home" (139). The fourth and final chapter provides a Scottish perspective, with the initial link being that both English and Scottish novelists in the early nineteenth century depicted "home" as being too "prison-like" (170). In Scotland we witness the entire evolution of home come full circle: from being a near-mystical locus over which the poor and early conceptions of surplus labor are debated (102, 105), home becomes a place from which one escapes. For Scottish authors "home" becomes a "scene of departure," for the Scottish subject is seeking to relocate him- or herself as a political subject elsewhere, as an exile, in England or in Scotland (176).

Mackenzie concludes by reiterating an assertion that the book maintained: "Home is where the state is not" (216). In closing he includes succinct analyses of certain key terms and ideas that arose in the book: "inhospitality," "iterative singularity," "comprehensive homogeneity," "sufficiency," "fictionality," "transformativity," and "relational figurations." These short accounts effectively synthesize many of the main points Mackenzie supplemented with his literary and nonliterary readings throughout his book. Ultimately we leave *Be it Ever So Humble* with a more thorough understanding of what went into literary eighteenth- and nineteenth-century conceptions of "home," and how these responded to and reflected "home" in the legal, economic, and sentimental spheres.

Matthew C. Jones
University of Connecticut

Kristine Johanson, Editor. *Shakespeare Adaptations from the Early Eighteenth Century: Five Plays*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2014. Pp. xiii + 459; bibliography; illustrations, index; explanatory notes. ISBN: 978-1611476477. Hardcover: \$110.

As we reinvent William Shakespeare in various television shows, movies, t-shirts, action figures, memes, and tweets, Restoration and eighteenth-century alterations of the Shakespearean canon invite interest, admiration, and at times, scorn. Some adaptations from the long eighteenth century, such as John Dryden's heralded *All for Love* or Nahum Tate's notorious *King Lear* (Fool-less and with a happy ending to boot), are well known, but there remains a largely untapped pool of Shakespearean adaptations available to readers, especially in

literature classes on college campuses. This being the case, there exists a need for authoritative, scholarly, and user-friendly editions of such texts. These resources will allow for facile classroom use, and they will increase student familiarity with the Bard's literary, theatrical, cultural, and political afterlife.

Kristine Johanson's *Shakespeare Adaptations from the Early Eighteenth Century: Five Plays* responds to the need for such scholarly editions. As Johanson states, "this book provides, for the first time, a scholarly edition of five adaptations from a much maligned period in literary and dramatic history" (xi). Concentrating on the years 1719-1724, the editor presents five adaptations of Shakespeare—plays that she believes reflect the socio-political climate that produced them, as well as different schools of Shakespearean adaptation—and her project is clearly important to her, both personally and professionally. Dedicated to the memory of the late Barbara Murray, a mentor and friend, Johanson continues Murray's work of providing Shakespearean adaptations from the long eighteenth century to readers. Indeed, the present volume looks to Murray's *Shakespeare Adaptations of the Restoration: Five Plays* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2005) as a model and guide. Like Murray before her, Johanson offers up a collection of generally obscure plays while providing the background necessary to place these texts within a larger context. As an editor, Johanson proves informative, clear, and—when turning to the plays themselves—laudably unobtrusive.

Johanson's ability as an editor is most apparent in her Introduction (1-57); here, too, she establishes her focus upon a general audience of readers. In these pages, she provides a far-reaching examination of the English stage and its relationship to the nation's political and cultural life during the early Hanoverian period, and she constructs an excellent resource for those unfamiliar with the dramatic history of the early eighteenth century. Johanson details the importance of the three unities of time, place, and action for neoclassical critics, as well as their absence in Shakespeare's oeuvre—an absence lamented by eighteenth-century scholars and dramatists and "corrected" in several adaptations (3-8). After focusing on dramatic criticism, Johanson proceeds to the dramatic environment: the playhouses and theaters of London. She offers an in-depth look at the London stage between 1714-1725, explaining practicalities such as authorial payment and structural innovations such as the shortened stage and the proscenium arch (8-11). This information helps readers better comprehend the settings that produced play texts often divorced from performance when read.

Additionally, the supplemental material highlights the close connection between eighteenth-century drama and eighteenth-century politics. Johanson stresses the theater's cultural potency as a means through which "Englishness," or national identity, was defined (16), and her examination of political and financial issues such as the South Sea Crisis, the Atterbury Plot, and other Jacobite uprisings keeps readers' attentions without sacrificing detail and nuance. The editor demonstrates how current events such as these were addressed on a stage she sees as upholding, for the most part, Whig principles (15-16). Finally, Johanson does not neglect the role of women in the theater, and she details the professional advances of actresses, even as misogynistic ideologies joined with nationalistic ones on the stage. Again and again, female

characters were sacrificed to the greater good, their example providing a model of submission for English citizens (23). The political and ideological power of the stage remains a central component of Johanson's analysis throughout.

After her Introduction, Johanson presents the plays themselves. She includes John Dennis's *Coriolanus* adaptation, *The Invader of his Country, or The Fatal Resentment* (1719); Lewis Theobald's *The Tragedy of King Richard II* (1719); Ambrose Philips's *The Tragedy of Humfrey, Duke of Gloucester* (1723); Theophilus Cibber's *King Henry VI* (1724)—both plays are adapted from Shakespeare's *Henry VI* plays—and finally, Aaron Hill's *King Henry the Fifth, or the Conquest of France, by the English* (1723). Supplemented with explanatory notes, these works demonstrate much of what Johanson discusses in the Introduction; they illustrate the political nature of the stage (especially Dennis, Philips, and Hall), they conform to neoclassical ideals, and they adapt Shakespeare to satiate audiences' tastes. The major complaint one may levy at these texts, or rather, Johanson's focus upon them, is that their obscurity does not align with the generalist perspective of the Introduction. In the Introduction, Johanson speaks to readers—probably undergraduates—unfamiliar with Shakespearean adaptation and eighteenth-century theater, and yet, one suspects these plays are rarely found in curricula. This being the case, perhaps Johanson's collection is an early step in revising classroom practices; it helps us broaden our view, better placing monumental figures like Garrick within a greater framework.

Matthew J. Rinkevich
University of Delaware

Andrew Carpenter and Lucy Collins (eds.). *The Irish Poet and the Natural World: An Anthology of Verse in English from the Tudors to the Romantics*. Cork: Cork University Press, 2014. Pp. xiv + 418; appendix on two versions of Joseph Atkinson's poem *Killarney*; introduction; notes; "Select Bibliography" [49-57]; list of textual sources for the anthology [407-14]; index of titles & first lines; index of authors. ISBN: 978-1-78205-064-3. Hardcover, €39; £35.

This anthology offers over a hundred poems or excerpts from poems written by Irish authors in English between 1581 and 1819. Focused on poetry treating the natural world and conceptions of nature, it contributes to burgeoning interest in ecological literature or literature related to ecology, which we all recognize is timely given the frightening changes to climates worldwide. Its contributions include the discovery and selection of the texts, the scholarly introduction to the historical contexts of the poetry and to the literary themes and traditions embodied in the poems (57 pp. with its bibliography), and the presentation of those texts (for some begun in the introduction) in headnotes and footnotes. The indices make all the effort, and resources, more serviceable.

Any editorial team for Irish poetry in English that involves Andrew Carpenter is unlikely to stumble. Carpenter's many edited volumes include two

fine collections of Irish verse: *Verse in English from Eighteenth-Century Ireland* (2003) and *Verse in English from Tudor and Stuart Ireland* (2003), the latter reviewed in the January 2004 *Intelligencer* (18.1:41-42). To judge from her other publications, Lucy Collins, Carpenter's colleague at University College Dublin (and wife), has been an equal partner in this effort. For instance, her "The Frosty Winters of Ireland: Poems of Climate Crisis, 1739-1742" in the *Journal of Ecocriticism*, 5, no. 2 (2013), offers an interesting discussion of some of the most remarkable poems in this volume.

Regarding the focus and scope of the volume, the editors write, "This anthology, then, seeks to present the reader with a reflection of the extraordinarily varied way in which Irish poets responded to their environment over a period of two hundred and fifty years, between the end of the middle ages and the generation before the Famine. The political events . . . remain, mostly, in the background . . . So do the interactions between the cultures and lives of the various communities inhabiting the island of Ireland. Yet the importance of defining the self in relation to its environment remains a crucial concern for these poets, and the specific Irishness of people and place . . . lies behind many of the poems" (48). All the selected poems and the extracts from long poems seem to fit these stated aims, and the editors' remarks help recreate the political, social, and natural forces that influenced them. Nor can social themes and values escape the reader when reading of pests and weather producing famine or of such metaphorical descriptions as John Leslie's in *Killarney* when describing mountains in "high dominion of the subject plains, / Smiling beneath: such smiles the people wear, / Happy in some paternal Monarch's care" (287). While the title stresses the natural environment as a subject, there are poems that treat urban environments, too, and the natural world is here defined to include climate and the ocean, which transcend any rural-urban divide. What's missing are verses in Irish and in Latin, though some eighteenth-century Latin verses were translated by the authors themselves and have been included. The introduction, besides citing collections of poetry in Irish, identifies genres and conventions in Irish-language poetry that exerted influence on the English-language poems.

The introduction provides both a historical survey of the materials (and to a lesser extent of Irish poetry in English), and the identification of common subjects, themes, genres, topoi, and motifs. The editors factor in, or sketch, the changing nature of the residents and their relation with the island, activities like hunting and gardening, the impact of agricultural and scientific societies and their scientific perspectives, the building of estates and plantations, the growth of tourism, the impact of the Union with Great Britain, the legacy of classical education, and generic traditions, such as the pastoral, the georgic, and the topographical. Along the way, much relevant recent scholarship is introduced in the footnotes.

The heart of the volume is, of course, the poetry, written between 1581 and 1819, between Edmund Spenser and his contemporaries' to William H. Drummond's and his. The poems are arranged chronologically, with the table of contents very helpfully providing the poet's birth and death dates, with an emboldened composition or publication date between. This means that some poets' poems are separated, but the index of authors will prevent one's losing

sight of those multiple contributions. The poems are divided into five parts or sections: 1580-1689 [year of the Battle of the Boyne], 1690-1739, 1740-1769, 1770-1799, and 1800-1819. The introduction and the list of sources for texts are similarly divided. The “Note on the Texts” indicates that the editors “retained the original capitalization, spelling and lineation,” but silently corrected misprints and altered and added punctuation (punctuation seems to have been usually respected to judge from the presence of commas prior to parentheses [e.g., 208]). Almost always the list of sources provides sufficient detail to identify the copy-text. Although there are some well known poems, like Goldsmith’s *Deserted Village* (the source of our cover illustration), the collection includes many poems never offered in modern editions, no doubt bringing some hidden gems to the attention of those studying Anglo-Irish poetry of the periods surveyed. The anthology reaches beyond ECCO. The selection pushes one out of one’s century or decades of expertise. And one is once again bowled over at the number of 17C and 18C English poets who were Irish!

Early in the period surveyed, the poems showcase not so much the natural world but attitudes toward it, often by devout English settlers: nature as a God-given resource for exploitation. (The landscape is also an occasion for poets to display their classical lore.) Although that focus on humankind remains for later poems, in which poets often witness reflections of God in nature and record sentiments engendered by natural environs, readers will also later find greater detailed description of the natural world. I pored over William Dunkin’s “The Frosty Winters of Ireland, in the Years 1739, 1740,” and related extracts from Thomas Hallie Delamayne’s instructions-to-the-painter poem “To Francis Bindon, Esq.,” both describing the severity of the 1739-40 and 1740-41 winters with stunning, realistic images offered in forceful poetic syntax and diction. Reading Dunkin, I reached a level of excitement that consciously reminded me that I liked poetry and that I should read it even when I’m not paid to teach survey courses! Of course, there’s much that’s commonplace, even trite, in the volume, but that’s only discovered in reading several dozen poems, and many readers will be reading to learn when and how poets made Nature into a mother, spoke of fields as showing their “pride” when they flower, and praised farmsteads as preserves of virtue and music. Mary Barber’s verse epistle “Written from Dublin to a Lady” (c. 1728) offers many such commonplaces within a depiction of the cycle of the day. Many poems invite comparison. There are interesting poems on the mistreatment of animals, as by Matthew Pilkington and Laetitia Pilkington, and poems by others, including Swift, on polluted urban environments.

Besides the historical commentary in the introduction and headnotes, the glosses for lines and phrases in footnotes should make the texts comprehensible to lay readers and undergraduate students. The headnotes are very helpful yet judiciously limited, regularly introducing bio-bibliographical information about poets unknown to professors working with Irish poetry. The volume is affordably priced, but one would hope that a paperback edition would make it possible to require the anthology as a text for university classes. As it had for Carpenter’s earlier anthologies, Cork University Press has printed *The Irish Poet*

and the Natural World on good paper, well bound, with plenty of space for readers' annotations.--JEMay

Third Edmund Burke Society Conference Held at Villanova U.

The Edmund Burke Society held its third conference at Villanova University on February 27-28, 2015. The overarching theme was "Edmund Burke and Patriotism." As the various papers demonstrated, it is a subject that lends itself to multiple interpretations of Burke's thought with respect to duty and to attachment to place as well as to the constitutional issues at stake in Ireland, France, and America. The conference began on Friday evening with a reception and dinner followed by Dr. Regina Janes' address: "Edmund Burke's Flying Leap from India to France." As you might imagine from the title, Dr. Janes' talk produced a stimulating discussion about the ways Burke was a man with "too many" countries, and it was an excellent forerunner to Saturday's two keynote addresses and the panel presentations.

Saturday morning's keynote address, titled "National Identity and Local Patriotism in Time of War," was given by Dr. David Bromwich (Sterling Professor of English at Yale). His most recent book, *The Intellectual Life of Edmund Burke: From the Sublime and Beautiful to American Independence*, covers Burke's life and thought to 1780. In his address, Dr. Bromwich fast forwarded to Burke's *Letters on a Regicide Peace* written during the last two years of his life and gave his listeners much to think about, and, in fact, much to talk about for the rest of the conference. Dr. Bromwich's talk was followed by Paper Panel Session I, with speakers Mr. Jonathan Green ("Ordered Liberty in Friedrich Gentz's Translation of Burke's *Reflections*"), Dr. Robert Heineman ("A Critical Examination of the Concept of an American Nation from a Burkean Perspective") and Dr. Timothy Madigan ("Was Burke an Irish Patriot?"). There was to be a fourth speaker but fate, in the person of the speaker's five-year old daughter, intervened by removing from her father's briefcase what she saw to be a lovely packet of paper most suitable for drawing. The theft was not discovered until our speaker opened his briefcase at the conference; a quick call home confirmed his worst suspicions.

The next foray into the new and different was the third keynote speaker's address that had to be Skyped from Scotland. Dr. Michael Brown, speaking on "The English Identity of Edmund Burke," had to cancel plans to be with us in person and resort to a technology Burke could not have envisioned. By the end of Dr. Brown's very informative and nuanced presentation, the audience lost sight of him but not of his voice so that we were able to carry on a stimulating discussion with a now-invisible Dr. Brown. A tea break was followed by Panel Session 2 with papers given by Dr. William Byrne ("The Universal & Particular and Burke's Patriotism"), Dr. John Kerwick ("The Patriotism of Edmund Burke versus the Patriotism of 'American Exceptionalism'"), and Mr. Mark Signorelli ("The Radical Dissent of Edmund Burke").

The success of this third meeting of the Edmund Burke Society reflected the hard work of Dr. Ian Crowe, Secretary of the Society, and Dr. Craig Bailey

of Villanova University. The conference was supported by Villanova University and the Irish Studies Program, the Research Institute of Irish and Scottish Studies at the University of Aberdeen, and the Russell Kirk Center for Cultural Renewal. Annette Kirk's presence at the conference was testimony to her continuing interest in the Edmund Burke Society, and her generosity in hosting an impromptu dinner Saturday evening for those attendees who stayed until Sunday morning was much appreciated. Two of our keynote speakers, David Bromwich and Regina Janes, were among those undaunted by the dire forecast of Sunday's winter weather, so dinner conversation that evening supplied "the feast of reason and the flow of soul"—words Boswell used to describe an evening's conversation with Burke. A fitting end to an excellent conference.

Elizabeth Lambert

In Memory of Martin C. Battestin (1930-2015)

With a text published in Charlottesville's *The Daily Progress* of 17 May 2015, we mark the passing on 15 May and celebrate the life and scholarly contributions of Martin C. Battestin. Martin was stolen from scholarship years ago by the onset of Alzheimer's disease; otherwise, his death would have brought forth greater lament. Martin and his wife Ruthe Battestin have been members of EC/ASECS for longer than I've edited the *Intelligencer*. He gave one of our best plenaries to my recollection and attended several additional meetings. He was a good colleague even to the mediocre among us--getting notes of encouragement and news from the editor of Fielding's novels and Smollett's *Don Quixote* translation was one of the treats of editing the *Intelligencer*. One of many indications of his being a good teammate was Martin's compiling the bibliography of Fredson Bowers for the volume in his colleague's honor, a task the editor of such challenging novels might have left to a graduate student. As a teacher, scholar, and friend, Martin, giant that he was, was duly celebrated during his life and will continue to be in prefaces, arguments, and notes by those indebted to his classroom teaching, mentoring, and publications. Just before his retirement, many of the foremost scholars of English literature paid tribute to Martin in the volume *Augustan Subjects: Essays in Honor of Martin C. Battestin*, edited by Albert J. Rivero (Delaware, 1997). The contributors, besides Al, included Jerry Beasley, Bertrand Goldgar, J. Paul Hunter, Maximillian Novak, Clive Probyn, John Richetti, Patricia Meyer Spacks, and Howard Weinbrot. The volume includes a list of his publications to 1997. That bibliography, Al's appreciative foreword, and all the well wrought essays are among the best memorials to his life and labor. As Dennis Todd wrote in reviewing the festschrift for *South Atlantic Review*, "The essays . . . written in honor of Martin C. Battestin by friends, colleagues, and former students, are inspired by the same intellectual and critical impulses that inspire him and written with the same attentiveness to the text that marks his work as a scholar, editor, and biographer" (62 [1997], 109). David Vander Meulen forwarded me the obituary I reprint below with slight change or two inspired by

the reposting in the next day's *UVA Today* (both versions are easily accessible on the internet).

Martin Carey Battestin, William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor of English Emeritus at the University of Virginia, died Friday, May 15, 2015, at age 85. Martin Battestin was born on March 25, 1930, in New York City, the son of Martin Augustus and Marion (Kirkland) Battestin. He attended the Peddie School and received both his BA (summa cum laude, 1952) and PhD (1958) from Princeton University, where as a member of the baseball team he expressed a love of sports that eventually would be manifested in his passionate backing of UVa teams.

After his first academic appointment at Wesleyan University, he moved to the University of Virginia in 1961, where he taught in the English Department until his retirement as William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor Emeritus in 1998. He was chair of the department from 1983 through 1986 and made vital hirings during that period. His years at UVa were punctuated by a faculty appointment at Rice University and by terms as visiting scholar at Princeton, Clare Hall, Cambridge, and Lincoln College, Oxford.

His literary interests were broad and included twentieth-century writings by T. S. Eliot and Tennessee Williams (a relative through the Sevier family of Tennessee) as well as any works that included cats. But his heart lay in the eighteenth century, whose elegant manners he inculcated, and his dissertation on Henry Fielding's novel *Joseph Andrews* set the direction of his scholarly career. His preeminent role as a Fielding scholar first of all involved the preparation of reliable editions. He was a founder of the now-standard Wesleyan Edition of Fielding's works and edited four volumes in the series: *Joseph Andrews* (1967), *Tom Jones* (1974), *Amelia* (1983), and "*Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon*" "*Shamela*," and *Occasional Writings* (2008). He also co-edited *The Correspondence of Henry and Sarah Fielding* (1993) and in later years edited the translation of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* (2003) by another eighteenth-century novelist, Tobias Smollett.

He analyzed these writings in landmark volumes of criticism on eighteenth-century literature, *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art* (1959) and *The Providence of Wit* (1974), and he prepared an important reference tool, *A Henry Fielding Companion* (2000). His understanding of literature and life came together in the biography he wrote with the help of indefatigable research by his wife Ruthe, *Henry Fielding: A Life* (1989). He naturally was pleased by the assessment of the English writer Antony Burgess that "This massive biography must stand, for many years to come or perhaps permanently, as the definitive Life of the man who is, conceivably, England's greatest novelist."

In 1997 colleagues and former students honored him with a collection of essays, and in 2012 the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia established Battestin Fellowships, in recognition of the Battestins' contribution to the scholarly life of UVa, to support bibliographical and textual research by UVa graduate students in UVa libraries.

He is survived by his partner in mutual devotion for 52 years, his wife and collaborator Ruthe. His son from his previous marriage, David, died in 1999,

and his daughter from the same marriage, Catherine, passed away in 2014. Martin was a member of the Church of England and, in the United States, a communicant of the Episcopal Church. In his final years he was under the wonderful care of Tom May and the compassionate staff of Gordon House in Gordonsville, Virginia. His funeral . . . [took place] May 20, 2015, at St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Ivy, . . . In lieu of flowers, gifts in Martin's honor may be made to the Battestin Fund, Special Collections, University of Virginia Library, Charlottesville, VA 22906, or to St. Paul's Ivy, P.O. Box 37, Ivy, VA 22945.

In Memory of John Irwin Fischer

On 15 May, John Irwin Fischer died from lung failure at his home with family beside him. John was a long-standing member of EC/ASECS, contributing to the *Intelligencer* back in 1990. After taking his doctorate at the University of Florida, John worked at LSU until his retirement in 2001. John served as both Chair and Director of Graduate Studies for the English Department in Baton Rouge. While John published on a number of authors, the main focus of his research, beginning with his dissertation, was the poetry of Jonathan Swift, the focus of many published articles as well as his *On Swift's Poetry* (1978) and his co-authored collections, *Contemporary Studies of Swift's Poetry* (1981) and *Swift and his Contexts* (1989). For several decades John compiled textual information and editions of Swift's poetry on the electronic archive *The Swift Poems Project*, working with James Woolley and, for a time, A. C. Elias, Jr. One of the threesome's collaborations was "The Full Text of Swift's *On Poetry: A Rhapsody* (1733)," in the 1994 *Swift Studies*. In recent years he was preparing for the press an unpublished manuscript vocabulary of hard words that Swift prepared for and with Esther Johnson, discussed in his essay "But Who Shall Arbitrate on Stella's Hand?" within *Reading Swift: Papers from the Fourth Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, ed. by H. J. Real et al. (2013).

Besides essays in the volumes noted above, John produced other searching essays on Swift's poems, such as the award-winning "The Government's Response to Swift's *An Epistle to a Lady*," *Philological Quarterly*, 65 (1986), 39-59; "Swift's Writing Poetry: The Example of 'The Grand Questions Debated'" in *Swift: The Enigmatic Dean: Festschrift for Hermann Josef Real*, ed. by Rudolf Freiburg, et al. (1998); "Swift's *Miscellanies*, in *Prose and Verse, Volume the Fifth: Some Facts and Puzzles*," *Swift Studies*, 15 (2000), 76-87; "'Love and Books': Some Early Texts of Swift's *Cadenus and Vanessa* and a Few Words about Love" in *Reading Swift: Papers from the Fourth Münster Symposium. . .*, ed. by H. J. Real et al. (2003); and "Swift's Authorship of 'The Difficulty of Knowing One's Self': A Review of the Evidence" in *"The First Wit of the Age": Essays on Swift and his Contemporaries in Honour of Hermann J. Real*, ed. by K. Juhas, et al. (2013).

The Scriblerian and other journals turned to John over the years to review particularly challenging volumes. Like his many articles, these reviews often show great diligence, an extraordinary skill at bibliographical analysis and

textual criticism, and careful attention to contemporary contexts. Long a member of ASECS and some of its regional societies, John served for years on the board of the Ehrenpreis Center for Swift Studies and participated in the Münster Swift symposia held every five or six years over the last three decades. Two generations of Swift scholars have appreciated his carefully prepared papers, his passionate yet respectful engagement in critical arguments, and his good-natured humor at conferences. John brought the forensic skills of an astute lawyer into his papers and the Q&A that followed. In his regard for precise facts and disdain for unsupported speculation, he was a scholar's scholar. For instance, he once wrote--and with self-effacing humor--to tell me my *Intelligencer* account overstated what he had been able to prove: "you are one of a very few persons to misrepresent *in my favor* something I saw or wrote. It seems churlish in me to point out the error, but you and I are in the business of trying to get things straight even when it would be to our advantage not to bother."

John's wife of 40 years, the scholar Panthea Reid (also formerly of LSU), wrote an obituary notice that appeared in *The Advocate* in Baton Rouge and was reposted at Legacy.com. She organized a fine memorial celebration for John in Princeton on 14 June, with first an ecumenical service in the University's Chapel and then a Memorial Service and reception at the Arts Council in downtown Princeton. The latter began with an unusually good slide show of John's life and family (some slides testifying to his being a good gardener) and was followed by speakers sharing heart-felt memories of John. The program was chaired by Herb Rothschild, a colleague at LSU from John's arrival in 1968, whom Panthea described as John's best friend. John's LSU colleagues spoke at length, some celebrating his activism during the civil rights struggles, others his service to the department. Other speakers were friends from his youth (back when he was an Eagle scout) and from recent years in Princeton. C. Earl Ramsey (emeritus, U. of Arkansas), a fellow grad student under Aubrey Williams at Florida, summed up many when, in remarking on how "you could trust John," said "he took care" of people. Panthea and her and John's daughter Hannah and her husband also spoke. Hannah recollected John's walking her to school daily during a year they lived in London and also how he got her up on her bike again after she'd fallen while learning to ride. Donald Mell, John's friend and fellow Swift scholar, spoke of John's most significant contributions to scholarship (see his text below). Like James and Susan Woolley, I drove home from the event impressed with how many others genuinely loved John and were loved by him.

Three Tributes to John Irwin Fischer

John Irwin Fischer was my professor and co-directed my dissertation. When I was considering graduate programs, he was the one whom I contacted about studying at Louisiana State University. He was encouraging and excited to have me attend the program to study with him. At the time, my interest was in Swift studies, and I wanted to learn about bibliography and textual studies (although I didn't know the name of the discipline). My first

class with him was Bibliography and Research Methods, a class that shaped my academic career and focused my trajectory on textual scholarship and editing. Unfortunately, after John became Chair of the English Department in my second year, he had less time to spend with me for several years as a student, but the foundation that he gave me in that first class was plenty to allow me to expand my initial entrée into this field. He was also instrumental in helping me navigate the bizarre and uncharted waters that are the politics of an academic department. By the time his term of Chair was over, I had moved on to studying Defoe and seized on an opportunity that has been fruitful for my academic career. He gracefully permitted me to add another Chair to my committee to facilitate my new project and proved an adept guide through the editorial work that I pursued for my dissertation. In my final year there, he permitted me to team-teach an extra large section of the undergraduate British Literature survey for majors, my first real attempt at teaching literature to majors. His guidance of my lectures and praise of my work were keys to building my confidence as I approached the oncoming job market. He was exacting and detail-oriented in his work, meaning that he was an excellent model for the kind of precision necessary for textual editing.--Kit Kincade, Indiana State University

Before I met John Irwin Fischer in the mid-1980s, he was known as a volcano who would read his papers at scholarly conferences with a passion. I suspected he would be a man after my own heart. I soon found out, however, that John's passion did not stop him from being a most kind and warm-hearted, tolerant and understanding, encouraging, charitable, and honest human being. Although he loved to argue, he would always do so with respect and politeness towards his opponents; he would never interrupt anybody enlarging on a point and would always hear him/her out, also thinking carefully before he replied. His passion merely meant that he cared about his scholarship, "his man," the Dean of St Patrick's, Dublin, THE Dean, the only Dean in the history of Ireland.

One of my favourite recollections of John is of a conversation in which I was foolish enough to try to tease him. At the time, I had taught my first seminar on Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, and the Lord Chancellor's doctrine of the idols, those fallacies beleaguering all human minds, had taught me that the discovery of Truth was not a matter of the moment but a matter of Time, *Veritas filia temporis*: if at all, Truth was only to be found in the infinity of time and space. When John, in our conversation, once again came up with his favourite question, "What is the evidence?" I reminded him, gently if stupidly, that that was the *unenlightened* version of the question. "Alright, Hermann," John replied in that lovely booming voice of his, "What do you think the *enlightened* form of the question is?" Proud of my new-found philosophical finesse and endeavouring to save my Bacon, I said: "What *do you think* the evidence is?" "Alright," came the reply, "What *do you think* the evidence is, Hermann?" John Irwin Fischer was one of the most unimpressionable scholars I have met in my life: he truly personified the motto of the Enlightenment, *Sapere aude*. I am grateful to the Lord for having led me to meet him.--Hermann J. Real, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

I knew John before I ever met or saw him. We had engaged in a number of minor interpretive disagreements through an exchange of footnotes during the late 1970s regarding several passages in Swift's best-known poem, *Verses on the Death of Dr. Swift*, the kinds of disputes or quibbles relatively young scholars often pursue to keep themselves busy, if nothing else.

A little later we were both involved in a series of scholarly panels and special sessions devoted to Swift, encouraged and organized largely by David Vieth, of Southern Illinois University, for various ASECS and MLA conventions. The emphasis was on Swift's writings, especially the poems. John had finished writing his book *On Swift's Poetry* (1978), and I had done some articles on various Swift poems. He asked me if I would be interested in co-editing a collection of essays on the poems. I was a bit surprised but delighted with the invitation.

He offered to drive from Baton Rouge to Newark, Delaware, the upcoming summer. Proximity seemed ideal for such a collaboration. He arrived with the family (and I think a dog was included) and stayed at the Chair of the English Department's house a convenient block from campus. It was vacated because the chair spent his summers vacationing at Bethany Beach, while the rest of us were publishing to avoid perishing.

We set up a rigorous schedule, had separate offices in Memorial Hall, but conferred a lot, and worked diligently and steadily from ten in the morning to four in the afternoon, Mondays through Fridays, for a little over a month. We divided up the editorial chores with John overseeing the whole project. John the perfectionist, especially whenever Swift was involved, wanted to make sure everything was right. We worked hard but had a lot of fun, too. On weekends we often explored some of Delaware's landmarks like the Winterthur Museum, Gardens, and Library; the Hagley Museum, where black gunpowder was manufactured during the Civil War; the prison on Pea Patch Island in the middle of the Delaware River mostly for Confederate soldiers captured at Gettysburg, among other sites.

I've been involved with many collaborative efforts over the years, but even though this was a first-time experience, it turned out to be one of the most rewarding and successful. I thoroughly enjoyed working with John, whose knowledge of Swift was even then amazingly prodigious and whose care, accuracy, determination, excitement, and enthusiasm as a Swift scholar were already legendary. The whole effort proceeded smoothly and productively, and the result was *Contemporary Studies of Swift's Poetry*, published by the University of Delaware Press in 1981. So far as I know, it was the first volume of essays devoted entirely to Swift's verse, and it made available much of the best criticism on the poems being written at that time.

Swift's poetry was then enjoying something of a renewed interest among readers of eighteenth-century poetry, despite skepticism among members of the anti-poetry school of Swift critics. True, these sporadic activities may have seemed, in hind sight, something of a cottage industry. Nevertheless, in the years following, publishing on Swift's poems has become a booming business, and John deserves much credit for this. The capstone of this increased attention and recent work on Swift as poet will be the forthcoming poetry volumes, edited by

James Woolley and Stephen Karian, in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift*.

Throughout his career, John has been directly and indirectly connected with a number of other different but important activities in Swift studies, namely as a coeditor of several collections, as a board member of the Ehrenpreis Center for Swift Studies, as participant in numerous national and international symposia devoted to Swift, as contributor to the Swift Poems Project, and as author of a long-term project focused on Swift's treatment of language and linguistic complexity in the *Journal to Stella*.

John's approach to the critical challenges of the Swift canon—the contradictions, equivocations, ironies, competing satirical perspectives, wit, humor, the whole range of rhetorical complexities that characterize the writings—puts on exhibit, in lively prose and clarity of argument, John's learning, intellectual integrity, and wide knowledge of Swift the man and his times. Equally important, what John never lost sight of in these insightful critiques is a complicated moral component continually informing Swift's literary brilliance, mind, and art. He has provided invaluable scholarly discoveries and critical understandings of Swift. Those of us working on The Dean owe John a huge debt.--Donald C. Mell, University of Delaware

In Memory of the Reverend Father Alvaro Ribeiro, S.J.

We apologize for not announcing till now the death, back in April 2013, of our dear member Father Alvaro S. Ribeiro, S.J. Following a series of strokes, he died while in retirement at Colombiere Jesuit Community Residence. Alvaro was long on the English faculty at Georgetown University and was one of our members helping Kathryn Temple organize our 1996 annual meeting at Georgetown. I had my most enjoyable engagement with him at that meeting--he was a delightful conversationalist at receptions and over dinners, full of sparkle.

Father Ribeiro had a fascinating history. He was born in 1947 in Hong Kong of Chinese-Portuguese descent, attending St. Joseph's College and graduating with first-class honors in 1969 from the U. of Hong Kong as a King Edward Scholar before taking his Ph.D. in 1980 from Balliol College, Oxford. Uncommonly brilliant, his publications began by 1970, soon including an article on Ben Jonson in *RES* 1973. With René Wellek he edited *Evidence in Literary Scholarship: Essays in Memory of James Marshall Osborn* (Clarendon, 1979). He began his research into the musicologist Charles Burney, which would lead to Vol. 1 of *The Letters of Dr. Charles Burney* (OUP, 1991). In the 1980s he joined the Society of Jesus and was ordained a priest in 1987. He returned to Hong Kong 1989-92 to be Assistant Warden and then Warden of Ricci Hall, the distinguished Jesuit residential college of the U. of Hong Kong founded in 1929 and since nurturing many of the University's most distinguished graduates, Alvaro among them. Thereafter he joined the faculty of Georgetown, while working on Burney in London and such research centers as McGill and Yale. Work at the Beinecke presumably led to his moderating the forum "The Tinker Legacy: The Yale 'School' of Eighteenth-Century Studies," a roundtable at the

1993 NEASECS with Maynard Mack, Cleanth Brooks, and Louis Martz, transcribed and published in *The Yale University Library Gazette*, 80.1-2 (2005), 23-43. Alvaro co-edited with James Basker the influential collection *Tradition in Transition: Women Writers, Marginal Texts, and the Eighteenth-Century Canon* (Clarendon, 1996)--his own essay in this collection involves the letters of Mrs. Thrale and Dr. Burney.

He took great pleasure at the podium and from his students. He told me with delight of repeatedly taking his best students in a class reading Man Booker Prize nominations to London for the Booker Prize ceremony. One of his former students, Victorino Matus, has a lively portrait of Alvaro, showcasing his love of food, cooking, and quick wit, in *The Weekly Standard* of 22 April 2013, available on the WWW. Another tribute on the web is an excerpt from the homily delivered by Father Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., President of Fairfield U. in Connecticut and Alvaro's friend of 40 years (it is reprinted in a newsletter for Ricci Hall). Father von Arx stresses Alvaro's exuberance, his gift for friendship, and his classroom performance, noting: "the joyful way he lived, . . . his deep appreciation for beauty, for friendship, for the life of the mind. . . . [he had] friends from Oxford and Montreal, New Haven and Dublin, Weston and Georgetown, a vast circle of friends and acquaintances who will be devastated by his untimely loss. . . . [He knew] modern English literature backwards and forward, from Shakespeare, whom he could declaim at length with appropriate theatrical gesture and intonation, to all the entries on the latest Booker Prize list. And Music! . . . And so much talent! Unlike many scholars, he was performative as well scholarly, and could act or sing a passage as well as explain it. And a superb teacher." The University of Hong Kong has a website devoted to a scholarship for undergraduate English majors in honor of Father Alvaro S. Ribeiro (www.scholarships.hku.hk/alvaro/).

News of Members

Brill (which last year bought Rodopi Press of Amsterdam) in March published **Corey Andrews's** book on Robert Burns's 18C and 19C reception and critical promotion: *The Genius of Scotland: The Cultural Productions of Robert Burns, 1785-1834* (ISBN: 9789004294363; \$93 or €72; pp. 290. It is the inaugural volume in Brill's new series Scottish Cultural Review of Language and Literature (see www.brill.com/products/book/genius-scotland). The PR indicates that the book "debunks both the hagiographic and vituperative representations of the poet from this period, revealing not only how (and why) he was culturally produced as a national 'genius' but also how the process continues to influence our understanding" of Burns. **Eve T. Bannet** has taken on the responsibilities and labor of editing *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*--it's lucky for 18C studies that a scholar so distinguished in both American and English literature and culture would take over the editorship. **Temma Berg's** illustrated essay "Thomas Rowlandson's *Vauxhall Gardens* [1785]: The Lives of a Print" appears in the September 2015 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life*, edited by **Cedric D. Reverend, II**. For this issue, Book-Review Editor **Adam**

Potkay gathered 14 reviews, including **Jacob Sider Jost's** of Howard D. Weinbrot's *Literature, Religion, and the Evolution of Culture, 1660-1780* (2013) and **Ashley Marshall's** of *The Unpublished Letters of Henry St. John, First Viscount Bolingbroke*, ed. by Adrian Lashmore-Davies, with Mark Goldie as "advisory editor," 5 vols. (2013). Another review to seek out is Linda Bree's of Thomas Lockwood's exemplary edition of Henry Fielding's *Plays* for the Wesleyan Edition, in 3 vols. covering the works by date and published in 2004, 2007, and 2011. **Wendy Laura Belcher** with Helen Deutsch has organized the conference "The Future World of 18C Studies" in "Honor of Felicity Nussbaum," sponsored by UCLA's English Department and The Center for 17C and 18C Studies; it'll be held 6-7 November in Royce Hall at UCLA.

Kevin Berland's *The Dividing Line Histories of William Byrd II of Westover* (2014) has drawn a number of glowing reviews, among which are Angela Calcaterra's in *JECS*, 37.4 (Dec. 2014), 569-70; **Thomas Hallock's** in *American Literary History*, 26.3 (Sept. 2014), 1-10; L. Scott Phillyaw's in *Journal of Southern History*, 81.1 (Dec. 2014), 163-64; and Brad J. Wood's in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 71.2 (April 2014), 304-06. **Jill Bradbury** wrote a proposal that gained Gallaudet College an exhibition of the first folio of Shakespeare (a book exhibit that will tour all 50 states plus the District and Puerto Rico next year). At the ASECS last spring, in the poster session on pedagogy, **Caroline Breashears** presented "You're an Austen Hero! Teaching about Masculinity in Austen's Novels"--a related essay was published in *Aphra Behn Online*: "You're an Austen Heroine! Engaging Students with Past and Present" (4.1 [2014] 1-9, plus attached game on web). Caroline's working on memoirs and fairy tales. **Andrew Benjamin Bricker's** "Libel and Satire: The Problem with Naming" appeared in *ELH*, 81, no. 3 (2014), 889-921. Andrew argues that elided, or "guttled," names (like "S____") served no legal function but rather a rhetorical and satirical end.

In the 2015 *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* we find **Samara Anne Cahill's** "Novel 'Modes' and 'Indian Goods': Textilic Nationalism in *A Patch-Work Screen for the Ladies* and *The Lining of the Patch Work Screen*" (44: 163-84). Here too appears **Julie Candler Hayes's** 2013 Presidential Address to ASECS: "Philosophical about Marriage: Women Writers and the Moral Tradition" (44 [2015]: 1-16). **Andrew Carpenter** has edited a five-volume scholarly survey produced by the Irish Royal Academy and published by Yale U. Press: *Art and Architecture of Ireland* (2014; 3000 pp; 3000 color illus.). Andrew, working from an unpublished manuscript, has just finished "an edition of the poems of Olivia Elder, the daughter of a Presbyterian minister living in rural Ulster in the 1760s and 1770s." He writes, "Olivia Elder's verse letters are fascinating and her poetry, as a whole, is not only well worth reading as poetry but also significant as a rare reflection of a female voice from the Ulster middle class in the 18C. I hope the edition will be taken on by the Irish Manuscripts Commission." Andrew, along with Aileen Douglas and Ian Campbell Ross, is organizing a Swift conference in Dublin, June 7-9, 2017 (see forthcoming conferences below). **Vincent Carretta** published the edition *Letters of the Late Ignatius Sancho, an African* (Broadview, 2015); "Representations of Race,

Status, and Slavery in Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko* and Olaudah Equiano's *Interesting Narrative*" in *Approaches to Teaching "Oroonoko,"* edited by **Mary Ann O'Donnell** and Cynthia Richards (MLA, 2014), 167-173; "Methodology in the Making and Reception of *Equiano, the African: Biography of a Self-Made Man*" in *The Black Atlantic and the Biographical Turn*, ed. by Lisa Lindsay and John Wood Sweet (U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 172-191; and "Literary Genres: Captivity Narratives," *Princeton Companion to Atlantic History*, ed. Joseph C. Miller (Princeton U. Press, 2014), 304-306. Vin has also given a number of invited lectures, including "Race, Religion, and Rights in the Age of Revolution: The Case of Phillis Wheatley" at the U. of Tübingen in June 2014; "Thank heaven one day of mis'ry was o'er': Olaudah Equiano's Literary Artistry in Chapter Five of his *Interesting Narrative*" at Mount St. Mary's U. in February 2014; and "Ignatius Sancho: Britain's First African Man of Letters" at the British Library, November 2013. Vin was on leave in spring 2015 to work on an authoritative edition for OUP of Phillis Wheatley's writings. In September **Lorna Clarke** brought out another issue of *The Burney Letter* in which we find Sophie Coulombe's account of the symposium "Scandal and Sociability: New Perspectives on the Burney Family," held at Cardiff U. The papers included Lorna's "The Scandalous Sister: The Literary Legacy of Sarah Harriet Burney"; **Mascha Hansen's** "'A Friend like dear Marianne': The Friendship between Marianne Francis and Hester Lynch Piozzi," treating Fanny Burney's niece Marianne, known as a musical prodigy but who also undertook some literary efforts; and **Peter Sabor's** keynote address, "The March of Intimacy: Dr. Burney and Dr. Johnson." Other articles involve "Mary Delany and the Court of George III," "Connections between Sir Joseph Banks, Dr. Nooth, and the Burneys," and ". . . a Possible Early Portrait of Fanny Burney."

Greg Clingham was awarded the Harold and Gladys Cook Travel Award at Bucknell and in spring 2015 travelled to the Cape of Good Hope to "walk" in the footsteps of Lady Anne Barnard, diarist and water-colorist who resided at the Cape (1797-1802) during her husband's tenure as Colonial Secretary under Sir George Macartney. Lady Anne was the first white woman to climb Table Mountain, and, in emulating her in that undertaking, Greg acquired a new appreciation of Lady Anne's strength of mind and strength of body. He recorded his trip in a blog (www.clingham.blogs.bucknell.edu). This summer Greg gave a paper on "Commerce and Cosmology in Sir George Macartney's Embassy to China, 1792-94" at the ISECS Conference in Rotterdam. Greg's "Cultural Difference in George Macartney's An Embassy to China, 1792-94" appeared in the April 2015 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life* (39.2: 1-29; illustrations). Also in the issue are three review essays of note: **Kevin L. Cope's** on George Rousseau's biography *The Notorious Sir John Hill*, the subject of our conference plenary in Baltimore (111-15); **David Hill Radcliffe's** "Creative Destruction" on **Ashley Marshall's** *The Practice of Satire in England, 1658-1770* (71-80); and **David Brewer's** "Uncorking Old Sherry for the Twenty-First Century," on the 2013 collection of essays on R. B. Sheridan edited Jack DeRochi and Daniel Ennis and on David Frances Taylor's *Theatres of Opposition: Empire, Revolution, and Richard Brinsley Sheridan* (81-86). This year Bucknell U. Press

publishes *Citizens of the World: Adapting in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by **Kevin Cope** (pp. xlviii + 174)--as it does a book by a former member of our regional, **Timothy Erwin**: *Textual Vision: Augustan Design and the Invention of Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (pp. viii + 281 + [10] plates). The *ECCB* n.s. 36, surveying 2010 scholarship has been published by AMS Press. A number of members were involved in compiling it: Kevin Cope, its general editor, and the field or section editors **Jim May**, **David Venturo**, and **Gloria Eive**. It also has some reviews by members, such as **Anthony Lee**'s of *The Age of Johnson*, ed. by **Jack Lynch**, and Dustin Griffin's *Swift and Pope as Satirists*.

JoEllen DeLucia, now promoted to Associate Professor at Central Michigan U., is working on the bookseller George Robinson and his network (and more generally her interests include book history, the Scottish Enlightenment, and women writers). Her book *A Feminine Enlightenment: British Women Writers and the Philosophy of Progress* (2015)--treating Elizabeth Montagu, Anne Radcliffe, Maria Edgeworth, Regina Maria Roche, and others--was published early this year by Edinburgh UP and is reviewed by Jane Rendall in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, 29 (2015), 32-33. She also published two essays last year: "A Delicate Debate: Nary Wollstonecraft, the Bluestockings, and the Progress of Women" in *Called to Civil Existence: Mary Wollstonecraft's "A Vindication of the Rights of Women,"* ed. by Enit K. Steiner, and "Transnational Aesthetics in Ann Radcliffe's 'A Journey Made in the Summer of 1794'" in *Ann Radcliffe, Romanticism, and the Gothic*, ed. by Angela Wright and Dale Townshend. This year's issue of *Swift Studies* contains presentations marking "The 300th Anniversary of the Death of Queen Anne," from a conference in London organized by **J. A. Downie**, who edited and introduces the volume. The essays include W. A. Speck, "The Golden Age Restored? The Reign of Queen Anne"; James A. Winn, "'Like her Britannia's Self': Mythologizing and Politics in the Life of Queen Anne"; Robert O Bucholz, "'Of more stomach than fancy'? Gender, Body Image and the Historical Reputation of Queen Anne"; D. W. Hayton, "The Image and Historical Reputation of Queen Anne in Ireland"; Allan I Macinnes, "Queen Anne and the Making of the United Kingdom"; and Daniel Szechi, "Scotland and the Union in the Summer of 1714." A very interesting harvest from Alan's conference, suggesting how conferences advance scholarship.

Robert Erickson, now retired half a dozen years from UC-Santa Barbara, is working on ecstasy and rapture in early modern literature. Bob has the article "Pope and Rapture" forthcoming in *Eighteenth-Century Life*. **Barbara Fitzpatrick** has been working on the book-trade business of S. H. Goetzel. She spoke last November at the 36th annual conference on Book Trade History: Bookshops in the History of the Trade, held in London, her title being "'Where I Hold My Headquarters': S. H. Goetzel and Bookselling in the Mid-Nineteenth-Century American South." **Jack Fruchtman Jr.** this year finished writing *American Constitutional History: A Brief Introduction*, a short book largely for undergrads and general readers. **Henry Fulton** drew on his experience writing *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802: A Life in Medicine, Travel, and Revolution* (Delaware, 2015), when he spoke last fall at the Montreal ECSSS on writing biographies of Scottish authors. His paper, "You're Writing What? The

Pleasures and Pitfall of Writing Scholarly Biography," dealt with the problems of an "old-fashioned scholarly discipline" and also "resources to be found in the Scottish National Archives (Edinburgh)." Henry's *Dr. John Moore* is reviewed by Pam Perkins in the 2015 *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (29: 29-30).

H. George Hahn, who's chairing the English Department at Towson U., has sent out a proposal for an edition of war poetry to complement his literary history *The Ocean Bards: British Poetry and the War with France, 1793-1815* (2008). **Mascha Hansen** has returned to Frances Burney after several years working on other authors and historical figures. This June at the conference in Le Havre honoring Paul-Gabriel Boucé, she gave the paper "The Joys of Wrongdoing in Women's Writings," and, at a conference on Burney in Cardiff in September, she delivered "'A Friend like dear Marianne': The Friendship between Marianne Francis and Hester Lynch Piozzi." Mascha and her husband bought a house this past year in Greifswald, allowing her to join an interest in ecocriticism with a joy in gardening. **Richard Hansen**, though retired from Mary Washington University, where he once hosted EC/ASECS, continues "to do local history in Fredericksburg, chairing the research arm of our preservation society (itself in a 1749 mercantile building) and researching the history and tales behind the town's numerous older homes. Even now, we continue to uncover the eighteenth-century origins or some of our buildings (a 1737 ferry keeper's toll house, opposite Washington's boyhood farm), and recently I had fun tracing a merchant's house back to 1787. Enjoyable stuff." In May 2014, **Jocelyn Harris**, after talking to the Philadelphia branch of JASNA about *The Watsons*, addressed the Minneapolis branch about "*Sanditon*, the Duke of Clarence and Sara Baartman, the 'Hottentot Venus.'" Her lecture to the Burney Society of North America, "Jane Austen and the Subscription List to *Camilla* (1796)," has since appeared in *Persuasions On-Line* 35:1 (Winter, 2014). In April, she contributed "Messy Copy for *Mansfield Park*?" to a Sydney symposium on the great novels of 1814. For the JASNA AGM in Montreal, she spoke on "Fanny Price meets Fanny Burney," then addressed the NY branch of JASNA on "'Censure in Common Use': Jane Austen's Satires on the Royal Family." Four of these papers will appear in a new monograph, "Satire, Celebrity and Politics in Jane Austen." In Sydney, she spoke at the 15th David Nichol Smith Seminar in 18C Studies, again about Fanny Price and Fanny Burney, and was delighted to witness the setting-up of a formal 18C society for the Australasian-Asian region (see below). The 16th Seminar will take place in Queensland. **John P. Heins** is getting into a long-term project on the 18th-C landscape garden at Wörlitz, Germany--he reported on one aspect of this at EC/ASECS in Philly in 2013 and hopes to speak on another at West Chester. In the Sept. 2015 issue of *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, **Jordan Howell** reviews *British Literature and Print Culture*, ed. by **Sandro Jung**, with essays in it by Jung, **J. A. Downie**, and others.

Robert D. Hume published "The Value of Money in Eighteenth-Century England: Incomes, Prices, Buying Power--and Some Problems in Cultural Economics" in *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 77, no. 4 (2014), 373-416. Rob has long been working toward this essay on the earnings of authors and the costs of cultural products like books and theatre tickets, tackling fundamental

questions underlying characterizations of authorship and audiences. In addition to the Panizzi Lectures (mentioned below under co-author **Judith Milhous**), Rob's other recent publications include "London in Comedy from *Michaelmas Term* to *The Beggar's Opera*" in *Modern Language Quarterly*, 74, no. 3 (Sept. 2013), 331-62; *Feniza or The Ingeniouse Mayde: A 'Lost' Carolean Comedy Found--and a Source for Shadwell's The Amorous Bigotte,* *English Manuscript Studies* (2013), 68-103; and "Ronald Paulson's Heterodox View of Eighteenth-Century Literature and Art" in *Representation, Heterodox, and Aesthetics: Essays in Honor of Ronald Paulson*, ed. by **Ashley Marshall** (2015)--to identify Paulson's often original methodologies and characterize his critical work in literature and art, Rob read Paulson's 20+ books and a greater number of articles and reviews. **Catherine Ingrassia** has edited *The Cambridge Companion to Women's Writing in Britain, 1660-1789* (2015; pp. xx + 263). **Catherine M. Jaffe**, with Elisa Martín-Valdepeñas Yagüe, published "Gender, Translation, and Eighteenth-Century Women Dramatists: Elizabeth Griffith's *The School for Rakes* (1769) and María Lorenza de los Ríos y Loyo's *El Eugenio* (1801)" in *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation*, 56, no. 1 (Spring 2015), 41-57. **Beverly Jerold Scheibert** has recently published half a dozen articles: "Diderot (Part I) — Authorship and Illusion," *Music Theory & Analysis* 1/1&2 (2014): 38-60; "Notes inégales: A Definitive New Parameter," *Early Music* 42/2 (2014): 273-89; "The Notable Significance of C and stroked-C in Bach's Era," *The Musical Times*, 155/1927 (Summer 2014): 85-96; "Johann Philipp Kirnberger and the Bach Chorale Settings," *BACH, Journal of the Riemenschneider Bach Institute*, 45/1 (2014): 34-43; "Kirnberger and Authorship," *NOTES: Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association*, 69.4 (June 2013): 688-705; and "The Varied Reprise in 18th-Century Instrumental Music," *The Musical Times* 153/1921 (Winter 2012): 45-61. And she has forthcoming, "Diderot (Part 2) — Temperament and Expressive Intonation," in *Music Theory & Analysis* as well as *The Complexities of Early Instrumentation: Winds and Brass*, vol. 3 (2015) in the series Musical Treatises from Brepols in Turnhout. In *Scottish Literary Review*, **Sandro Jung** published both "James Morison, Book Illustration and *The Poems of Robert Burns*" (6.2 (2014), 25-48) and "Illustrated Glasgow Editions of Robert Burns's Poems 1800-1802." (133-44). This year Lehigh U. Press publishes a book that ties together various essays and some paper presentations many of have heard, Sandro's *James Thomson's The Seasons, Print Culture, and Visual Interpretation, 1730-1842*. With **Kwinten Van De Walle** and Morteza Lak, he published "Humphry Repton's *The Bee* and Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery" in *ANQ*, 27 (2014), 73-83. Sandro was a visiting lecturer at the U. of Gothenburg for a time this past year.

Catherine Keohane is organizing the 2016 meeting in Washington of the North American Burney Society, at which the keynote speaker will be **Tara Ghoshal Wallace**. **Scott Krawczyk** has retired from the U.S. Military Academy and, relocating to Washington, has taken a job with the NEH and is teaching part-time at Georgetown University. We welcome to the Society **Jesse Tyler Lobbs**, who, at Kansas State U., is studying 18C American literature, working as a T.A., and writing his thesis on the letters of the Van Rensselaer family. **April London's** *The Cambridge Introduction to the Eighteenth-Century Novel*

and **Ashley Marshall's** *The Practice of Satire in England 1658-1770* are reviewed in the June 2015 issue of in *Notes and Queries*. **Devoney Looser** edited, with a short intro, the summer 2015 issue of *Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation*, 56, no. 1 (Spring 2015), focused on "Jane Austen and her Contemporaries." Among the essays is **Danielle Spratt's** Denaturalizing Lady Bountiful: Speaking the Silence of Poverty in Mary Brunton's *Discipline* and Jane Austen's *Emma*" (193-208). **Ashley Marshall** is "beginning to think about a book on the culture of politics in the reign of Queen Anne." She spoke on "Swift and Authority" at ASECS in March. This year Delaware published the festschrift she edited: *Representation, Heterodoxy, and Aesthetics: Essays in Honor of Ronald Paulson*, with contributions from **Claude Rawson**, Robert Folkenflik, William L. Pressly, John Barrell, Ann Bermingham, Mary Poovey, Michael McKeon, J. Hillis Miller, and **Rob Hume**. In March Cambridge published her *Swift and History: Politics and the English Past*. Her article "'*fuimus Torys*': Swift and Regime Change, 1714-1718" appeared this summer in *Studies in Philology*. Finally we congratulate her on her tenure and promotion earlier this year! **Jim May** updated and revised five of his bibliographies of recent scholarship at BibSite: those on censorship, children's literature, journalism, the book as a physical object, and 18C materials in present-day libraries. This fall he'll also update those on authorship, bibliophilia & reading, and engraving & illustration (with cartography), and add a bibliography on printers, publishers, & printing. These checklists with reflections on the state of 18C bibliography are the subject of his talk in one of **Eleanor Shevlin's** sessions at West Chester. Welcome to new member **Alice McGrath**, a doctoral candidate in English at Penn. **Carol McGuirk's** book *Reading Robert Burns: Texts, Contexts, Transformations* (Pickering & Chatto, 2014) is reviewed by **Corey Andrews** in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, 29 (2015), 33-35.

Congratulations go to **Judith Milhous** and **Robert D. Hume** for *The Publication of Plays in Eighteenth-Century England: Playwrights, Publishers, and the Market*, their Panizzi Lectures for 2011 at the British Library (BL, distributed in North America by University of Chicago Press, [June] 2015; pp. 416; 115 illus.). The lectures, also covering Restoration theater, provide much new information about the playwrights and producers, attending in great detail to costs and payments, and treating such diverse topics as the illustrations in publications. **Ellen Moody** reports that at the ASECS in Los Angeles she delivered a paper entitled "Shooting Scripts and Screenplays (not novels) into Films." It's about how we must use published scripts and screenplays and transcripts as central tools in understanding films, how they are sometimes valuable works of literature in their own right. Ellen taught "The Poldark Novels" at the OLLI at American University this spring. She writes that, from her panel, "The Anomaly: Single unmarried adult women living alone," she's "working on my paper 'The Depiction of Widowhood in Austen' for publication and perhaps a collection." At a Trollope conference at the U. of Leuven in Belgium, during September, Ellen read her paper: "On Living in a New Country: Trollope's North America and Australia and New Zealand." She's just published: "Epistolarity and Masculinity in Andrew Davies's Trollope Films," in

Upstairs and Downstairs: British Costume Drama from The Forsyte Saga to Downton Abbey, and a review for *Cercles* of *Better Left Unsaid: Victorian Novels, Hays Code Films, and the Benefits of Censorship*, online at www.cercles.com/review/r72/Gilbert.html (it's also on the Victorian Web with stills). Ellen is finding that the OLLIS classes "are different: that at Mason is different from the other at American U. They reflect their local areas and populations more than the senior colleges as they are more shaped by the 'students.'"

Carla J. Mulford's long anticipated study of Benjamin Franklin, begun over twenty years ago, was published in July by Oxford U. Press: *Benjamin Franklin and the Ends of Empire* (pp. xvii + 426; \$55.25 on Amazon; ISBN: 0199384193). It has a striking portrait of blue-eyed Franklin on the DJ that I doubt many have seen--Carla writes, "It is the first time that portrait, which was shown in Paris during Franklin's stay there to great admiration [at the Royal Academy's salon of 1779], is on the cover of any Franklin book. And the first portrait we know of by a woman. So I was thrilled when Oxford said they'd try to get it for my book!" Though **Jack Fruchtman's** review above sums the study up at greater length, I would note that the book examines what Franklin wrote/thought about society, economics, and politics. It's a fusion of biography and intellectual history, and is esp. attentive to Franklin's thoughts about empire (his evolving critique of the British empire) and about civic structures of other sizes, too. Carla now will enjoy a well deserved year's sabbatical to work on another book: "Benjamin Franklin's Electrical Diplomacy." Carla writes that she's "interested in examining how Franklin used his scientific reputation for political ends, scurrying into print his scientific papers at the same moments when he was engaging in political negotiations."

Mel New and **W. B. Gerard's** vol. 9 of the Florida Sterne (*Miscellaneous Writings and Sterne's Subscribers*) is reviewed by Marcus Walsh in *The Shandean*, 25 (2014), 161-63. This volume has several pieces of bibliographical research, including Gabriella Hartvig's "Rudolf Sammer's Editions of Sterne's Works" (133-46) and Nathalie Zimpfer's "The Stapfer Fragment: Variations on Attribution (II)" (99-118). **Leslie K. Overstreet's** "The Publication of Mark Catesby's *Natural History of Carolina, Florida, and the Bahama Islands*" has just appeared in *The Curious Mr. Catesby* (U. of GA Press, 2015). The essay is related to the paper she presented in November 2012 ("The Publications and Editions . . .") at the Catesby Tercentennial Conference. She presented "Reading the Evidence of Catesby's Book" at Henrietta McBurney Ryan's research seminar at the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art (London, 25 June 2014). **Peter Perreten** presented a paper at the 11th Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Literature and the Environment in June 2015 at the University of Idaho. His paper was titled: "The Subterranean Origins of Erasmus Darwin's Theories." He continues to be a contributing editor for *Native Notes: The Hawk Mountain Garden Journal*. **Adam Potkay** reports that his 2012 monograph with Johns Hopkins Press, *Wordsworth's Ethics*, is now out in paperback; and his related article on "Wordsworth's Ethical Thinking" will be out shortly on this side of the Atlantic in the new *Oxford Handbook to William Wordsworth*, ed. Richard Gravil and Daniel Robinson. Adam has articles in two *MLA Approaches to Teaching* volumes, one out in 2013--on Dryden (also

includes essays by **Cedric Reverand**, et al.)--and one, "Joseph Andrews and the European Novel," forthcoming in *Approaches to Teaching Henry Fielding*, ed. Jennifer Preston Wilson and Elizabeth Kraft. Finally, forthcoming in 2015 is an article in *PMLA*: "Contested Emotions: Pity and Gratitude from the Stoics to Swift and Wordsworth." **Manushag Powell**'s "Eliza Haywood, Periodicalist?" appears in *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, 14, no. 4 (Fall 2014), 163-86. **Irwin Primer** is working on his edition of the English translation of *Laus Ululae*--it's "The Praise of Owls," an "edition-in-progress" at Rutgers' digital online site. Back in March he was looking for related engravings by 17C Dutch artists.

For his *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship*, **John Radner** was awarded ASECS's biennial Annibel Jenkins Biography Prize--that will seem to many an indisputably good choice. The press release for the award called the book "a wholly original biography of a biography, Boswell's *Life of Johnson*," adding: "Radner, tracing a history of collaboration and resistance, shows in meticulous detail how the relationship between Boswell and Johnson was often over the years a struggle for dominance. . . . The committee found the book to be innovative and a 'remarkable exercise in biography' written in 'elegant and attractive' prose." During June **Hermann J. Real** read the papers "The Satirist as Physician" at the British-German association's annual meeting in Oldenburg and "By Force or Fraud: Or, The Two Principal Modes of Wrongdoing" at the conference "Wrongdoing: Realities, Representations, Reactions" at Le Havre. His essay "Swift Horsing Around: Or, The Madness of Reason" appears with fourteen other essays in English in "*That I wished myself a horse*": *The Horse as Representative of Cultural Change in Systems of Thought*, ed. by Sonja Fielitz (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 2015). His essay "Swift as Bookman: Reader, Collector, and Donor" appeared in *Material Moments in Book Cultures: Essays in Honour of Gabriele Müller-Oberhäuser*, ed. by Simon Rosenberg and Sandra Simon (P. Lang, 2014), 211-32. Professor Müller-Oberhäuser is Hermann's long-time colleague in Münster, and **Sandra Simon** has been a mainstay on the staff at the Ehrenpreis Centre, but now, taking her Ph.D., she's leaving for a position at the Leibniz Bibliothek at the U. of Hannover. In the spring Hermann was editing the 30th volume of *Swift Studies*, assisted by Ehrenpreis Centre colleagues Sandra and Kirsten Juhas--all of whom were also working on the *Online Swift* edition.

On 21 May 2015, aged 84 years, **Ian Simpson Ross** died in Vancouver, where he spent his academic career teaching English and Scottish literature at the U. of British Columbia, retiring in 1993. His U. of Texas dissertation became *Lord Kames and the Scotland of His Day* (OUP, 1972). With E. C. Mossner he edited the *Correspondence of Adam Smith* and went on to write *The Life of Adam Smith* (OUP 1995), highly praised--often called "definitive." He was a founder of the 18C Scotland Society and hosted its first AGM in 1987. Ian was the brother of our deceased member **Angus Ross** (Univ. of Sussex), who edited Swift and other 18C authors. Ian's life and work is celebrated by **Richard Sher** in a two-page memorial tribute inserted into the 2015 *Eighteenth-Century Scotland* (late May), where Sher characterizes him as "one of the kindest and

gentlest individuals I have ever known,” a sentiment shared in private correspondence by **Hermann J. Real**, another of Ian’s many loving friends.

Rebecca Shapiro in June sent off to AMS Press a 723-page MS for a book entitled “Fixing Babel: An Historical Anthology of Applied Lexicography.” **Jacob Sider Jost**’s book manuscript *Prose Immortality, 1711-1819* won the U. of Virginia Press’s Walker Cowen Memorial Prize for an outstanding work of eighteenth-century scholarship and has now been published by Virginia (2015; pp. x + 239; ISBN: 978-0-8139-3680-2; \$45). As I note below, we have received a review copy and need a reviewer. Jacob has a thorough and insightful review of *Editing Lives: Essays in Contemporary Textual and Biographical Studies in Honor of O M Brack, Jr.*, ed. by Jesse Swan (2014), in *Johnsonian News Letter*, 65, no. 2 (September 2014), 61-63. Here too we find Hilary Havens’ appreciative review of **Catherine Parisian**’s *Frances Burney’s Cecilia: A Publishing History* (43-45), Paul Tankard’s review of **John Radner**’s *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship* (46-49), and **Manushag Powell**’s review of Dustin Griffin’s *Authorship in the Long Eighteenth Century* (51-57). And this issue’s Johnsoniana includes a note by **Matthew Davis**: “Frederic Raphael on Johnson” (18-19)--the issue is also distinguished by editor Robert DeMaria’s inclusion of glossy colored photographs of two fore-edge paintings. The Spring-Summer 2015 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, has the special focus and title “Georgian Theatre in an Information Age: Media, Performance, Sociability,” with an introduction by editors Daniel O’Quinn and Gillian Russell. Here we find **Stuart Sherman**’s “‘The General Entertainment of My Life’: The *Tatler*, the *Spectator*, and the Quidnunc’s Cure” (27.3-4: 343-71), and **Kristina Straub**’s “The Newspaper ‘Trial’ of Charles Macklin’s *Macbeth* and the Theatre as Juridical Public Sphere” (395-418). **Diana Solomon** is writing a book on comic taste in the 18C and expanding into an article her plenary lecture “Hamlet with a Hornpipe” given at the last EC/ASECS. This past year she received the Simon Fraser U.’s “Excellence in Teaching Award” and a two-month Fletcher Jones Fellowship at the Huntington. She has an article forthcoming in *HLQ* on the play *Double Falshood*, a disputed Shakespeare attribution. Diana’s *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theatre* (U. of Delaware Press, 2013) has been released in paperback this year.

Robert Walker traveled in February from Florida to Washington and Jefferson College, to attend a Board of Trustees’ meeting, to which he’d had recently received election. Readers will recall how in February, temperatures in Pennsylvania were often below zero and never above freezing. He writes that “Mel New joked in an email today that it seems my alma mater is attempting to speed up collection of inheritance bequests by holding board of trustees meetings in February.” The *Sewanee Review* will publish later this year Bob’s essay, “The Rough-hewn Patterns of Evelyn Waugh’s *Sword of Honor*.” Also forthcoming in 2015 are two notes: “Boswell’s Reference to Erasmus on His Fear of Death” in *Notes & Queries* and “Scholia for Sterne’s Subscribers” in *Scriblerian*. Finally, the volume of *Religion in the Age of Enlightenment* dated 2014 will include Bob’s review of *Hugo Grotius: The Truth of the Christian Religion*. **Jane Wessel** published “Performing ‘A Ra-ree Show’: Political Spectacle and the Treason Trial of Stephen College” in *Restoration*, 38, no. 1

(Spring 2014), 3-17, on College's prosecution for sedition in 1691 for the ballad "A Ra-ree Show." **Roy Wolper, W. B. Gerard, Derek Taylor, David Ventura**, and their fellow editors brought out the Autumn 2014 **Scriblerian** six months ago. It begins with Roy's tribute to the journal's co-founder Arthur J. Weizman, who died in 2013. The issue contains reviews, some sharp-edged, of publications by **W. B. Gerard, Kate Hamilton, Joanne Myers, Hugh Ormsby-Lennon, Leah Orr, Laura Rosenfield, and David Spielman**, as well as reviews by **Anna Battigelli, Erik Bond, Al Coppola, Ian Higgins, Manuel Schonhorn, Sylvia Kasey Marks, Ashley Marshall, Mel New, Ian Higgins**, and others, and **Jim May's** "Scribleriana Transferred, 2014, MSS and Rare Printed Works, Mostly Irish." **Abigail Zitin's** "Thinking like an Artist: Hogarth, Diderot, and the Aesthetics of Technique" appeared in *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 46, no. 4 (2013), 555-70.

Forthcoming Meetings, Announcements, Recent Publications, &c.

The **NEASECS** meets 8-10 October 2015 in Hartford, hosted by Trinity College and chaired by Jean Marc Kehres (jeanmarc.kehres@trincoll.edu); the theme is "Texts and the City" (on representations and meanings of urban space).

The Bibliographical Society of America has organized a symposium at the Grolier Club in NYC for 6-7 November on **provenance research**, stressing ownership during the past century: "Mind the Gap: Recent Provenance of Antiquarian Materials" (\$75 but \$25 for students; contact bsa@bibsocamer.org).

EC/ASECS meets at West Chester University in southwest PA near Philadelphia on 12-14 November 2015, chaired by Eleanor Shevlin (EShevlin@wcupa.edu) and Cheryl Wanko (cwanko@wcupa.edu). Our theme, "Networks," is well discussed at the conference website: <https://ecasecs2015.wordpress.com>, which now includes the conference program. Rooms are reserved for us at the Days Hotel, 943 S. High St., West Chester.

The **Aphra Behn Society** for Women in the Arts, 1660-1830, holds its biennial meeting on 5-6 November 2015, with the theme "Women in the Global 18C," at Seton Hall U., South Orange, NJ, chaired by Kirsten Schultz and Karen Gevirtz (karen.gevirtz@shu.edu), with Lynn Festa a plenary speaker. Abstracts were due May 15. Write aphrabehn2015@gmail.com.

The Société d'Études Anglo-Américaines des XVIII^e Siècles invites papers for a conference in Paris 15-16 January 2016 on "**Modes of Silence in the 17th- and 18th-Century Anglo-American World**." Contact Laurent Currelly (laurent.currelly@uha.fr) or Guyonne Leduc (presidence@1718.fr).

The **Western Society for 18C Studies** meets on 12-13 February at U. of California at Riverside, with the theme "Encounters" (ranging from the political to the intimate). The proposal deadline was 1 October. Contact program chairs Aurora Wolfgang (aurora@csusb.edu) or L. Tomko (lindawsecs@yahoo.com).

The **South-Central SECS** meets 25-27 February in Oklahoma City, with the theme "East Meets West in the Eighteenth Century," chaired by Susan Spencer, English, Univ. of Central Oklahoma (sspencer@uco.edu). Sessions, events, and lodging are at the historic Skirvin Hilton Hotel downtown. On the 25th of Feb., the U. of Central Oklahoma hosts an Asian Studies Development

workshop, followed by panel discussions on the 26th. The luncheon will feature live performances of Jingju, “Beijing opera” (which arose in the 18C), along with a presentation by Elizabeth Wichmann-Walczak of the U. of Hawai’i. For more, see www.scsecs.net/scsecs/2016/cfp.html (abstracts are due 30 Oct 2016).

SEASECS’s annual meeting (its 42nd) takes place February 25-27 in Savannah, with the theme “East and West: The Broad Expanse of the Eighteenth Century.” Proposals for completed panels and individual papers are due November 1. The program chairman is Keith Pacholl (kpacholl@westga.edu); Chris Hendricks is handling local accommodations.

The 2016 **ASECS** will be held in Pittsburgh, 31 March-3 April, at the Omni William Penn Hotel downtown, remarkable for its fine lobbies. The EC/ASECS is hosting a session, as are most affiliate societies, and, given the location, a great many EC/ASECS members should be on the program. The **18C Scottish Studies Society** is hosting a reception and luncheon and also a plenary talk by Gordon Turnbull, General Editor of the Yale Edition of the Private Papers of James Boswell.

The fourth conference entitled “**Early Ibero/Anglo-Americanist Summit**” will be held in College Park, MD, and Washington, DC, on 19-26 May 2016, sponsored by The Society of Early Americanists, the Omohundro Institute, The Kislak Family Foundation, and the U. of Maryland. Its focus is “Translation and Transmission in the Early Americas” (not limited to English, Portuguese & Spanish). One of the organizers is Ralph Bauer (bauer@umd.edu).

The 7th biennial “**Money, Power and Print: An Interdisciplinary Colloquium on the Financial Revolution in the British Isles, 1688-1776**” will be held 23-25 June 2016, in Hay-on-Wye, Wales. See our last issue for details.

The **North American Burney Society** meets on 20-21 October 2016 in Washington, D.C. (on the eve of the AGM for the Jane Austen Society of North America). The theme is “Burney and Politics.” Send one-page proposals to Catherine Keohane (keohanec@mail.montclair.edu) by 30 May 2016. The **UK Burney Society** meets 4-6 July 2016 at St. Chad’s College, Durham U., with the theme “Burney and Popular Entertainments: The Business of Pleasure in Late-Georgian Britain.” The proposal deadline is 31 January 2016.

An international conference held in Dublin to mark the **350th anniversary of the birth of Jonathan Swift** is being organized for 7-9 June 2017. Patrons of the conference include Mary E. Daily, President of the Royal Irish Academy, Patrick Prendergast, the Provost of Trinity College, and Victor Stacey, Dean of St. Patrick’s Cathedral. The main location will be Trinity College Dublin, where there will be an exhibition of Swiftiana; events will also occur at Marsh’s Library, the Dublin City Library, and other locations. The conference is organized by Andrew Carpenter, emeritus, U. College Dublin, and by Aileen Douglas and Ian Campbell Ross, both in English at TCD. They expect to have three or four plenary lectures, sessions for papers and roundtables, and social events. Those who wish to propose papers or sessions should contact the organizers at Swift350@tcd.ie. The seventh international Swift Symposium at the Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies in Münster is being organized by Hermann J. Real and others for the week following the Dublin conference.

December 2014 saw the creation of the **Australian and New Zealand Society for 18C Studies** (ANZSECS), affiliated with the International Congress for 18C Studies. Its first President is Jennifer Milam and its first newsletter editor is Olivia Murphy, both of the University of Sydney. For further information, see <http://sydney.edu.au/intellectual-history/anzsecs/index.shtml>.

The **Library Company of Philadelphia** in July mounted the exhibition "Fashioning Philadelphia: The Style of the City, 1720-1940," running through 4 March 2016. Curated by Wendy Woloson (History, Rutgers U.), the exhibit examines Philadelphia's contribution to the early fashion industry.

The **Beinecke Library at Yale U.** is closed for a renovation overhauling "mechanical systems" and enhancing teaching and research facilities. Until it reopens in September 2016, readers consult paged material in the Franke Family Reading Room at the Sterling Library.

The **William Andrews Clark Memorial Library** closed in April 2015 for a "seismic retrofit" and will reopen in mid 2016. Construction projects also include a new entrance pavilion and expanded book storage.

Patrick Scott, the Curator of Special Collections at the U. of South Carolina, among his many contributions to literary studies, has kick-started the **Scottish Poetry Reprint Series**, which had been dormant after being edited by G. Ross Roy from 1970 to 1996. Numbers 8-10 have appeared this year with the imprint "Columbia: Scottish Poetry Reprints, U. of S. Carolina Libraries." In addition to John MacQueen's editing Archibald Pitcairne's *Tollerators and Con-Tollerators, A Comedy*, Scott has edited Robert Burns' *The Prayer of Holly Willie, A Canting, Hypocritical, Kirk Elder*, a 1789 Kilmarnock chapbook, and, by Gavin Turnbull, *A Bard Unkend: Selected Poems in the Scottish Dialect* (they are 32 and 46 pp. respectively, with introduction, notes, and bibliography, with the former offered in facsimile). Contact Patrick Scott at the Library (1322 Greene St., Columbia, SC 29208) or buy the publications on Amazon.

The **MLA International Bibliography** has moved its office to 85 Broad St., Suite 500, New York, NY 10004-2434. (This year, the staff quickly recorded *Intelligencer* articles that we noted were not listed in the *MLAIB*.)

ASECS's A. C. Elias Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship, with a \$2500 award, supports "documentary scholarship on Ireland in the period between the Treaty of Limerick (1691) and the Act of Union (1800), by enabling North American-based scholars to travel to Ireland and Irish-based scholars to travel to North America for furthering their research." Original research on any aspect of 18C Ireland qualifies for consideration, but recipients must be members of ASECS or The Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society. Prize winners are chosen by an independent jury of three distinguished scholars from different disciplines. Each application goes through the hands of several readers, from within and outside the applicant's field. The Irish-American Research Fellowship was established in 1993-1994 by the late Dr. A. C. Elias, Jr. (independent scholar, Philadelphia), and now bears his name. Applications consist of the coversheet downloaded at the ASECS travel-fellowship website, a short curriculum vitae (no more than 3 pp.), a short narrative description of the project (treating its contribution to the field and work done and to be done

during the proposed research period), a one-page bibliography of related books and articles, a short budget, and two signed letters of recommendation submitted directly by the two supporters. These materials are due by 15 November, with the candidate's application sent ideally as a single file attached in Word or PDF, to the fellowships two trustees: Dr. Máire Kennedy, Curator of the Dublin & Irish Collections of the Dublin City Public Library (maire.kennedy@dublincity.ie; 138-144 Pearse Street / Dublin 2 / Ireland) and Dr. James May of Penn State University (jem4@psu.edu; PSU--DuBois Campus / College Place / DuBois, PA 15801). Note: if the two letters of reference cannot be supplied as PDFs of signed letters, the original copies on paper should be mailed to one of the trustees. Last year the prize jury awarded the fellowship to two co-winners: Michael J. Griffin (U. of Limerick) for research at Yale's Beinecke Library and in Philadelphia towards the Cambridge Edition of the Collected Letters of Oliver Goldsmith; and David O'Shaughnessy (Trinity College Dublin) for research on Charles Macklin at the Folger Shakespeare Library.

This is the season to apply for **library research fellowships**. November first is the deadline at the Library Company of Philadelphia for its in-residence NEH post-doc fellowships with stipends of \$4200 per month (see its website). However, the deadline for the roughly two dozen short-term fellowships awarded by the Library Company in conjunction with the Historical Society of Pennsylvania is probably 1 March, last year's deadline. The American Antiquarian Society invites applications for 2016-17 visiting academic fellowships, including three NEH fellowships for 4-12 months and over 30 short-term for 1-2 months (with stipends of \$1850 per month), some of which are targeted at work on the history of the book and the 18C children's literature. Applications have been due 15 January in the past. See the society's website (www.americanantiquarian.org). The Newberry Library has the deadlines 15 Nov. and 15 Dec. respectively for its long- and short-term fellowships, with many of the latter for postdocs and PhD candidates (www.newberry.org).

An electronic blog equivalent to an interdisciplinary bulletin or newsletter for 18C studies is being published under the title *The Eighteenth-Century Common*, edited by Andrew Burkett (Union College) and Jessica Richard (Wake Forest). The colorfully illustrated website is supported by the NEH and the editor's universities; it has an advisory board including such scholars as Devoney Looser, Jack Lynch, and Linda Troost. Taking its title from the shared space in villages and towns, it solicits articles on particular topics, as, back in the winter, "New Directions in 18C Feminist Studies" and "Science and the Arts in the 18C." See www.18thcenturycommon.org/.

The Andrew Marvell Society offers on the web with open access its impressive *Andrew Marvel Society Newsletter*, now in its 7th annual volume, maintained admirably by Matthew Augustine of St. Andrews U., which hosts the site. The society's executive secretary is Emma Wilson. The back issues are all available, and the issues come up as a page with the initial texts and summary under the author and title and a link opens up the full article or review. During Tim Raynor's presidency, through 2013, the newsletter was admirably developed with good articles on auction sales, criticism, and many reviews.