

Samuel Johnson Revises a Debate

by O M Brack, Jr.

When the *Gentleman's Magazine* began publication in January 1731, the first number may have been printed in as few as 250 copies. As William B. Todd observes, demand for *Gentleman's Magazine* quickly grew: a reprint of the January 1731 number was announced as early as March, with reprints of the first two numbers in May and with reprints of the first five numbers in July. Some of the numbers from the early years were reprinted as many as nine times.¹ Those who began their subscriptions at any point after the first number, wishing to complete their sets because they recognized the *Gentleman's Magazine* would continue to serve as a valuable reference work on social, political, scientific, literary, and historical issues, created a demand for Cave's press to reprint back numbers, at least into the 1740s. Over the years Cave and his staff became more adept at estimating the number of copies of an individual number that needed to be printed to meet the demands of subscribers and occasional purchasers; therefore, there are fewer reprints of the later numbers. Sir John Hawkins remarks that Johnson's authorship of the debates increased the circulation from 10,000 to 15,000, and Johnson recalled late in life that Cave used to sell 10,000.²

Fortunately, by the time Johnson began contributing to the "Debates in the Senate of Magna Lilliputia" in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (published between late 1740 and early 1744), there was a relatively small demand for reprints, but a demand nonetheless. Not surprisingly, given that 10,000-15,000 copies were being printed in the initial press-run, the majority of the twenty-six debates in the traditional canon of the debates have only one printing, with others having stop-press corrections, re-impressions, and, in one case, re-setting. It is the re-setting that is of concern here.³

In the House of Lord's debate on the address to the king on December 4, 1741, published in the August 1742 number of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, a portion of it has twenty-nine revisions, nineteen of which are substantive (12:414-16). What is most curious about the revisions is that they appear in only twenty paragraphs in the middle of a long speech by the Nardac Agryl (Duke of Argyll). They occur from the paragraph beginning "Other Ministers" near the bottom of the first column on page 414, and cease in the paragraph beginning "At last the Queen . . . from other Purpose" at the top of the second column on 416. A few are corrections, such as "I which" to "which I" and "it that" to "that it"; these and changes from "happen" to "happened" and "shall" to "should" might be in the range of an alert compositor, but not a correction like "entred her territories" for "over-ran his territories." It is important to remember that compositors, paid according to the amount of type they set, in general were not interested in emendation and improvement in argument or style. Compositors normally followed their copy with some care since they knew they would be penalized for failing to do so. Only Johnson, therefore, would be interested in making even such relatively small changes as "deceive" to "delude," "promise" to "pomp," and "publicly" to "openly." Extensive revisions can only be attributed to Johnson, such as "and set themselves free from the necessity of supporting their measures" changed to "and

claim an exemption from the necessity of supporting their measures" or "for it was sufficiently plain, that our forces must be repulsed, to any man who has had opportunities of observing that knowledge in war is necessary to success, and experience is the foundation of knowledge" changed to "for to any man who has had opportunities of observing that knowledge in war is necessary to success, and experience is the foundation of knowledge, it was sufficiently plain, that our forces must be repulsed."

That Johnson is the source of most, if not all, of the changes is clear, but why introduce these changes into only these twenty paragraphs. A chance opportunity to edit a manuscript by Johnson in the Hyde Collection, Houghton Library, Harvard University, provided a solution. In April 1739 Joseph Trapp (1679-1747), a prolific miscellaneous writer and an aggressive clergyman of the High Church, preached a series of sermons denouncing the Methodists. The sermons were published shortly thereafter, and Edward Cave, always eager to promote the *Gentleman's Magazine*, joined in the ensuing controversy by publishing an extract or abridgement of the sermons in the number for June 1739 (9:288-94). A bookseller or booksellers must have threatened to prosecute Cave for breach of copyright. To defend himself, he turned to Johnson for an argument that abridgements were not a violation of copyright. The paper nearest at hand was galley sheets for the magazine, and Johnson filled ten of them with arguments, to which he gave the title "Considerations on Dr. T.----s Sermons abridg'd by Mr Cave."⁴

The galley sheets, now somewhat frayed and mounted, measure approximately 300 x 100 mm. The narrowness of these sheets suggest that the galley trays at the *Gentleman's Magazine* must have held one column of type from which proofs were taken. After proofs had been read, the type would have been divided into appropriate lengths to fill pages of two columns and placed within a skeleton of running heads, page numbers, and signatures. Each column of type on a page in the *Gentleman's Magazine* is 235 mm. in length, with this passage containing four full columns for a total of 940 mm. The partial column at the beginning is 80 mm., and the partial column at the end is 90 mm., for a total for the whole passage of 1110 mm. If the whole passage of 1110 mm. is divided by four, there is enough text to fill four galley sheets. If the sum is rounded off, the result would be 278 mm. of type per galley sheet. With allowance made for 11 mm. of blank space at the top and bottom of each galley sheet, the total is 300 mm. Since it would be unlikely that the text would run exactly to the top and bottom of each galley sheet for fear that a line or lines might fail to print when proofs were taken, and, since, if more space than 22 mm. was left, paper would be wasted, a galley sheet filled with 278 mm. of type is a reasonable guess as to what galley proofs of the *Gentleman's Magazine* may have resembled.⁵

What conclusions can be drawn from this? The manuscript for "Considerations" gives an accurate indication of the size of the galley sheets for the *Gentleman's Magazine*, providing an opportunity to calculate accurately that the revised portion of the House of Lord's debate on the address to the king on December 4, 1741 is just enough text to fill four galley sheets. From this knowledge it is possible to reconstruct a scenario for Johnson's revisions of a

passage in this debate. Johnson appears to have arrived at St. John's Gate at the time when signature Fff of the August 1742 number of the *Gentleman's Magazine* was being reprinted. As author of the debate and a member of Cave's editorial staff, Johnson certainly had responsibility for reading proofs. Whether this responsibility extended beyond the initial printing is difficult to say. What is certain is that he picked up four galleys of the House of Lord's debate and began to read. Not happy with what he saw, he decided not simply to correct the galleys, but to polish his prose. In spite of all the stories of the speed with which Johnson wrote, and without revision, the debates and other works, evidence suggests that he was a compulsive reviser.⁶ His revision of these four galley sheets of the debates add to the growing list of works Johnson is known to have revised.

Arizona State University

Notes

¹ William B. Todd, "A Bibliographical Account of *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1731-1754," *Studies in Bibliography*, 18 (1965), 81-109, esp. 83, 85f.

² Sir John Hawkins, *Life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D.*, 2nd ed. (1787), 57; James Boswell, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, rev. L. F. Powell, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934-1950; Vols. 5 and 6, 2nd ed. 1964), 3:322.

³ See *The Debates in Parliament*, ed. Thomas Kaminski and Benjamin Hoover, text ed. O M Brack, Jr.; Vols. 11-13 of the Yale University Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson, forthcoming.

⁴ See the reproduction of Samuel Johnson's 1739 manuscript of *Considerations on the Case of Dr. Trapp's Sermons*, ed. O M Brack, Jr, and Robert DeMaria, Jr. (Los Angeles: Samuel Johnson Society of Southern California, 2007).

⁵ These calculations assume that the first galley sheet has the entire first paragraph of the passage, although the first variant in the paragraph is five lines down (20 mm.); the last variant, however, is only two lines up. These possible variations do not alter the conclusion that the passage would fill four galley sheets.

⁶ See the review by O M Brack, Jr., of Samuel Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*, ed. Roger Lonsdale, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006) in *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, n.s. 21, no. 2 (May 2007), 28-29.

Gullible Lemuel Gulliver's *Banbury Relatives*

by Hermann J. Real

Although Mr. Lemuel Gulliver at the end of his travels chooses to retire to his native Nottinghamshire, the custodian of his *Travels*, Richard Sympson, assures his audience in "The Publisher to the Reader" that the origins of Gulliver's family history point in another direction: "His Family came from *Oxfordshire*; to confirm which, I have observed in the Church-Yard at *Banbury*, in that County, several

Tombs and Monuments of the *Gullivers*." At the same time, we are given to understand that Mr. Gulliver was so "distinguished for his Veracity, that it became a Sort of Proverb among his Neighbours . . . when any one affirmed a Thing, to say, it was as true as if Mr. *Gulliver* had spoke it."¹ More often than not, statements like this tend to send source-hunters off on a wild-goose chase, with the author silently laughing up his sleeve. As Sir Henry Craik remarked with delightful insouciance on the authenticity of the *Travels*: "The Geography of *Gulliver's Travels* is a subject which does not, *perhaps, seem to lend itself to very careful examination*."² Swift, we know, was only too often in the habit of proclaiming what he would not avow.

But then, Truth, or rather what one (mis)takes for it, is not something to be toyed with, and, as a result, annotators of the Dean's masterpiece have shown themselves determined to go and find out for themselves. "Several tombstones of people named Gulliver actually exist in Banbury, a town between Oxford and Stratford, then known for its Puritanism or extreme Protestantism," the most recent of them correctly summarizes what several generations of earlier critics had already posited. "Swift may have observed some Gulliver tombs there on one of his numerous journeys between Dublin and London," one of these predecessors had surmised, adding by way of explanation, "Banbury lies at the junction of two of the roads between London and the Irish Sea," and a respected authority on the authenticity of the *Travels*, the celebrated *realism* of its names and nautical argot, its geography and chronology, commented laconically: "'Gulliver' is a genuine English name."³ Indeed, it is, and, in the early eighteenth century, Banbury was a market town in North Oxfordshire, "a Market, a Borough Town of *Banbury Hundred* in the N. of *Oxfordshire*, seated in a Flat on the West Bank of the *Charwell*, counted for Wealth and Beauty next *Oxford*," Moréri's *Great Historical, Geographical and Poetical Dictionary* of 1694 puts it. It is also correct to say that in the churchyard of St Mary the Virgin various tombs and monuments of the *Gullivers* are still to be found.⁴

Even so, taken together, these explanatory statements about Banbury and Gulliver mix fact with fabrication. For one thing, the assumption that Banbury was a Protestant or Puritan pocket seems dubious at best.⁵ Not only is the documentary evidence of Puritanism's alleged predominance in the borough of a flimsy and untrustworthy character, not only is it limited to the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, it is also unclear what, if any, Swift knew of it.⁶ By the time the Dean was engaged in writing *Gulliver's Travels* almost a century later, the town's reputation for religious radicalism seems to have dwindled to a mere matter of the past. Remarkably, the bleak geography of Moréri's entry is supplemented by an equally factual enumeration of battles and sieges of Banbury from Saxon times to the end of the English Civil Wars (*s.v.*); there is no mention whatever of Banbury's Protestant or Puritan orientation, surely something to be expected if the town's religion had been, or still was, in any way outstanding. Moréri's account was endorsed, if briefly, in the various editions of Edward and John Chamberlayne's *Magnæ Britanniae Notitia: or, The Present State of Great-Britain*, very useful as "a sort of Whitaker's Almanack,"⁷ and in Guy Miège's rival publication, *The New State of England* (1691), the title of which later became *The Present State of Great-Britain and Ireland*, in which Banbury was praised as "a pleasant and rich Town, particularly noted for the Excellency of its Cheese: But far more memorable for the Battles fought in its Neighbourhood, and the Sieges it has sustain'd."⁸ Again, there was no recording of Banbury's Puritanism. On the contrary, if the evidence of Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* is to be trusted, Banbury was rather more of a Royalist stronghold in the 1640s than a centre of support for the Parliamentary forces: "Banbury's function was that of a stronghold and outpost of royalist power in an area of predominantly parliamentary sympathies."⁹

But then, scandal ever improves by opposition and rumour *did* associate Banbury with all sorts of "zeal," forming a somewhat uneasy triad with cheese and cakes (or ale) in the seventeenth century.¹⁰ More particularly, the dissemination of the rumour may have been helped on its way by the shambling Zeal-of-the Land Busy, "a Banbury man," from Jonson's popular comedy *Bartholomew Fayre* (first performed in 1614 but first printed in 1631).¹¹ Swift had an edition of Jonson's *Workes* (1640) in his library, and the available evidence suggests not only that he was familiar with *Bartholomew Fair*, but also that he was sympathetic towards Jonson's satirical attack on the Puritanism of the age.¹² At the same time, satires are unfair by definition, and it therefore comes as no surprise that there should have been voices since the middle of the seventeenth century protesting that the notion of Banbury *zeal* was rooted in an historical injustice, in fact, that it was a printer's error, "Zeal being put for *Veal* in that place." This error had originated in Philemon Holland's English translation of Camden's (Latin) *Britannia*, the church historian Thomas Fuller claimed, and had remained uncorrected in subsequent editions, "out of design to *nick* the *Town of Banbury*." This town, the Royalist Fuller concluded, "need not be *ashamed of*, nor *grieved at*, what *Scoffers* say or write thereof."¹³

However, no matter whether rooted in historical injustice or not, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, the myth of Banbury zeal was still alive, as may be seen not only from the figure of the "*Banbury Saint*" in Swift's *Discourse*

concerning the *Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* (1704), one of two companion pieces to *A Tale of a Tub*, but also from a sneering reference in Addison's *Tatler*, no. 220 (5 September 1710), according to which "the Town of *Banbury* near a Hundred Years ago . . . was a Place famous for Cakes and *Zeal*, which I find . . . is true to this Day as to the latter Part of this Description."¹⁴ While it seems safe to assume that, in his *Discourse*, Swift was harking back to the tradition of puritanical satire initiated by Jonson, Addison was at pains to capitalize on the myth against the more recent foil of Dr Sacheverell's "enthusiastic" reception by the mayor and dignitaries of Banbury, the "Banbury Apes," as a chapbook burlesque of 1710 once attributed to Daniel Defoe and reprinted several times in rapid succession had depicted them, during his progress through the west country after his trial.¹⁵ Yet even if Swift (mis)took Banbury for a hotbed of mad zeal, either Puritanical or High Church or both,¹⁶ it is difficult to see what interpretative significance should be attached to such a "fact" for any reading of *Gulliver*, a figure markedly devoid of religion throughout his travels. To be sure, *Gulliver* is undoubtedly mad at the end, but not "enthusiastically" so. Whatever else he may be, he is not a "Banbury Saint," the contexts of the *Tale* not being those of *Gulliver's Travels*.

For another, the harum-scarum geography of some of the explanatory glosses is in need of revision. It is a fact that Swift knew Banbury not from a visit he paid "his old friend William Rollinson, whose family home was a Chadlington, about 15 miles south-west of Banbury," in the summer of 1726¹⁷--at a time, that is, when *Gulliver's Travels* had gone to press and Swift was about to return from London to Dublin,¹⁸--but from numerous visits between 1689 and 1710. He would pass through the town either from Chester (when coming from Dublin) on his way to London (Moor Park) or from London (Oxford) on his way to Leicester to stay with his mother, who died on 24 April 1710 (see *Prose Works*, V, 196). Swift recorded these visits (and their costs) faithfully in his account books and his correspondence,¹⁹ and the briefest of glances at almost any contemporary map of England (or Oxfordshire) will show that the Oxford-Leicester road passes through Banbury in almost a straight line.²⁰

What is even more, this road used to pass directly by the church and churchyard of St Mary the Virgin--with its tombs and monuments of the Gulliver family. Whenever he chose to alight at Banbury, Swift had a chance to visit this centrally located parish church as well as the churchyard adjoining it.²¹

Finally, although some dozen or so tombs and monuments of the Gulliver family are still extant and although their inscriptions are still clearly visible,²² none of them antedates the publication of *Gulliver's Travels* (28 October 1726), and none of the stones and plaques records the name of "Lemuel"; in fact, the most frequent male name to occur seems to be that of "Samuel,"²³ phonologically close to "Lemuel," and its spelling variant "Lamuel," it is true, but hardly more than a rhyming jingle. In no way does it account for the *meaning* of Gulliver's first name (always provided of course there is any).

However, it is now possible to take the case further. Evidence that has recently (re)surfaced shows that the history of Gulliver's Banbury relatives is not confined to the nineteenth century, but that it may be traced back at least as far as the beginning of the seventeenth century. In the *Banbury Corporation Records: Tudor and Stuart*, half a dozen members of the Gulliver (Gullifer) family occur who all antedate the publication of *Gulliver's Travels*:

Edward, died 1635
John, died 1699
Richard, died 1620
William, died 1697
William, died 1723, and a
"Widow" Gulliver, who died 1644 yet cannot be allocated.

While nothing is known about Edward and the "Widow" Gulliver, we do know that John, in addition to being listed as a Quaker, was a locksmith, that William Sr. was a wheelwright and William Jr., a gilder. Richard's trade is unknown, but it is known that he married Alice Goodson (d. 1634; see *BHS*, 15 (1981), 36, 308).

The Banbury Gullivers are also on record to have apprenticed several sons to London livery company masters, particularly after the Restoration: "In 1697 Nathaniel Gulliver . . . together with his elder brother Samuel and his sister Sarah received 5s, the residue going to the wheelwright William's widow. In the fullness of time the former apprentice returned to Banbury, Mr Nathaniel Gulliver 'of London' being buried at Banbury in 1718."²⁴ In the following year, 1719, a William Gulliver, also "of London," presumably Nathaniel's son, married Mary Stokes, daughter of the recently deceased Charles Stokes, who in the 1680s had opened the *Three Tuns* in the Horsefair, Banbury's leading tavern, and which by the 1720s was run by her brother, Thomas Stokes.²⁵ Even though Swift certainly did not stay in Banbury while he was writing *Gulliver's Travels*, and even though it is unknown at what taverns and inns he stayed on his visits to Banbury, it does seem remarkable that several Banbury Gullivers are known to have been innkeepers or to have been related to them. In addition to Thomas Stokes's sister, who was married to a Gulliver, he could have encountered Samuel, publican of the *Dolphin* near the

Market Place. Another Samuel Gulliver (d. 1729), it seems, was licensee of the *Three Swans*.²⁶

The most important implication of this evidence is rather obvious. Swift's choice of Banbury is entirely accidental; the Dean opted for Banbury, and not, say, Stratford, because on his travels it was *there* that he had encountered real members of Gulliver's family, whom, with a charming pinch of realism, he (re)united with his hero's ancestral history. What matters is not so much Banbury, and its purported zeal, as the irony that Swift found in real Banbury the true name of the most famous of all travel liars. It is therefore a logical conclusion that, had Swift found the name of Gulliver anywhere else, the name of that place would have replaced that of Banbury in Gulliver's travels. The explanatory addendum that Banbury was "known for its Puritanism or extreme Protestantism" is a misleading, not to say useless, piece of information (even if it were true).

Of course, this does not rule out that the genuine Gulliver is also a telling name. Swift chose it for his hero, I suggest, because from the start he realized its *telling* potential. Since the name "Gulliver" is authentic, however, all accounts of its being a portmanteau word that Swift formed by blending portions of separate words together--Gulliver < *gull i(n) ver(o)*, "fool, or dupe, who deceives himself about the truth" or "gull" and "traveller"--fade in credibility.²⁷ Indeed, the natural implications inherent in the name *Gulliver* seem to advocate "gullible,"²⁸ a near homophonic pun corroborated by the "little language" of the *Journal to Stella*--"l-r" and "v-b" interchanges²⁹--and the first interpretative pointer, perhaps, of Swift's distancing himself from his narrator.

"Lemuel," Gulliver's "given" name, seems a less clear-cut case. More than anything else, Swift's annotators show themselves preoccupied here with its Biblical provenance, invariably referring to Proverbs 31,³⁰ in which a mysterious King Lemuel recollects the injunctions laid on him by his mother not to yield to the lure of women and the temptation of drink, in preparation for his future duties as ruler: "Give not thy strength unto women, nor thy ways to that which destroyeth kings. / *It is not for kings, O Lemuel, it is not for kings to drink wine*" (31: 3-4).³¹ While modern biblical scholars admit to knowing next to nothing about King Lemuel (Hebrew for "belonging to God," "towards God") except that his territory was Massa, whose location remains uncertain, too,³² seventeenth- and eighteenth-century annotators of Proverbs understood the name as a reference to Solomon. "It is generally taken for granted, both by Hebrew and Christian Writers," Oswald Dykes wrote in *The Royal Marriage: King Lemuel's Lesson . . . Practically Paraphrased, with Remarks, Moral and Religious, upon the Virtues and Vices of Wedlock* (1722), "that King *Lemuel*, whose Mother gave him the Precepts contained in this Chapter, was *Solomon*: Whom *Bathsheba* took Care early to instruct in his Duty."³³ This is an accurate précis of the more comprehensive and detailed commentary on Proverbs 31 which contemporary readers would have found in Matthew Poole's massive and immensely popular variorum commentary of the Bible, *Synopsis criticorum aliorumque sanctae scripturae interpretum*, and which the Dean had on his shelves (see Passmann and Vienken, II, 1488-90). Poole's entry is structured like a dialogue of instruction, which alternates between question (Qu.) and answer (Resp.) and

which is reminiscent of the Renaissance dialogues between Master and Student:

Qu. Quis *Lemuel*? [Who is this Lemuel?]

Resp. 2. Salomon . . . Nullus enim alius erat Rex apud Hebræos vel exteros qui dictus est *Lemuel*. Non dubium est quin hæc quæ sequuntur sint Salomonis, qui se appellavit *Lemuel*. [Solomon . . . For nobody else by the name of Lemuel was King of the Hebrews or that of another country. There cannot be any doubt that the words that follow are those of Solomon, who called himself Lemuel.]

Qu. Quæ causa mutandi nomen Salomonis? [What is the reason for the change of the name Solomon?]

Resp. Id à matre factum blandiente, ut videtur ex v. 4. quòd proprio id ipsius nomine affine erat, vel, proprium nomen paululùm inflexum; ut solent matres nominum liberorum quadam inflexione delectari, ac cumprimis ubi ominosa ac pia est nominis inflexi significatio . . . *Mater sua*, nempe Bathseba, quæ, post pœnitentiam commissi adulterii, prophetissa facta est, & prævidit periculum lapsus Salomonis, eúmque ideo præmonuit. [That was his fond mother's doing, as is shown by v. 4, either because this was related to his proper name or because the proper name was altered somewhat, mothers delighting in a little alteration of the names of their children; all the more so when the meaning of the altered name is foreboding as well as pious . . . His mother, Bathsheba of course, who after repenting of her adultery (2 Samuel 11) had become a prophetess and foreseeing the danger of Solomon's fall, admonished him beforehand.]³⁴

The Junius Bible of 1593, which also was in Swift's library, had already "refined" this view with a daring, if ultimately unconvincing, etymology. In a marginal gloss, the editor explained that the linguistic transformation of "Solomon," or "Schelomon" in Hebrew, into "Lemuel" was the effect of coaxing Bathsheba's "aphæresis," the taking away, of the first letter in "Schelomon" and the annexing of the word "El," "strong, powerful God," so that "Lemuel" came to signify somebody who "belongs to the powerful Lord": "Formatu[m] est autem nomen Lemuel siue Lemoel vers.4 a blanda matre per aphæresin primæ literæ de nomine Schelomonis, & adjectionem nominis El, quod est Deus fortis, significatq; Lemuel eum qui Dei fortis est."³⁵ While modern Old Testament scholars tend to accept this derivation of "Lemuel" as the diminutive form of "Solomon," which reads "Lemuel" as a maternal term of endearment, they reject its second part, the addition of "El," which turns "Lemuel" into a "theophoric" name.³⁶

This explanation is perhaps useful to know, yet it remains nonetheless difficult to decide what to make of it. If one assumes that "Lemuel" is an *unconscious* resonance of Proverbs 31, one need no longer worry, putting down the "parallel" as coincidental and taking comfort in the fact that Swift was not alone in his imperfection: like many an eighteenth-century writer, he freely "borrowed" from his predecessors, although he may not have been prepared to admit this.³⁷ But if one assumes that it is a *conscious*, and *more than personal*, reminiscence, an allusion

that Swift wanted his readers to *share*, one will have to decide at one point or another what particular significance to attach to it. Given the contemporary knowledge of the biblical Lemuel demonstrably available to Swift, no such significance seems to appear: neither is Lemuel Gulliver a king who needs to be prepared for his royal obligations, nor is he a paragon of uprightness and conscientiousness (see Case, p. vii), nor are his eyes alight with lust for women and wine at any point of the narrative. If, in short, there is a *tertium quid*, a connection, between King Lemuel and Lemuel Gulliver, it is so tenuous as to be invisible.

This conclusion seems to be corroborated by the fact that, like "Gulliver," "Lemuel" is also an authentic name, a name that sounds exotic, unusual and rare it is true, but nonetheless as authentic as other Old Testament names like, say, "Ezekiel" and "Samson" or "Caleb" and "Mordecai," and with no particular meaning beyond itself. In his "powerful and popular defence of the Revolution," *The State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government* of 1691, which was not in Swift's library but which he would have found impossible not to know,³⁸ Bishop King, like the zestful historian he was, printed numerous ancillary appendices which were all meant to testify to the truth and impartiality of his arguments (p. 239). Among these were political speeches and letters, parliamentary addresses and lists, declarations and affidavits *et alia* (pp. 241-408). Several lists contained the names of officers, both civil and military, employed in the Jacobite government institutions in the various counties of Ireland. Number 9 of these is the list of "*Privy Councillers appointed by Letters from King James, Dated the 28th of February, 1684; and such as are Sworn since by particular Letters.*" The majority of these are members of the aristocracy, but two are "Esquires; not sworn."³⁹ One of them is a man about whom little seems to be known, except that he was Paymaster General of the forces in the 1670s and Commissioner of the Revenue in Ireland by 1685. The man's name was Lemuel Kingdon (c. 1654-86) (p. 333), MP for Bedwyn in James II's first parliament and the dedicatee of *Love Letters from a Noble Man to his Sister: Mixt with the History of their Adventures, Part II*, attributed to Aphra Behn.⁴⁰ However, this does not mean that Swift intended Lemuel to connote insufficiency, loose principles, and want of moral honesty, which Bishop King had associated with *all* of James II's servants (pp. 24, 27). King's Appendix, no. 1 presented "An ACT for the Attainder of divers Rebels, and for preserving the Interest of Loyal Subjects" (pp. 241-98), which enumerated in tiresome detail the names of over 2,000 individuals "who [had] notoriously joined in the Rebellion and Invasion" of the King's enemy, William of Orange.⁴¹ Among those attainted to be "in the actual Service of the Prince of Orange" against his Catholic Majesty (p. 242) was the rascally Archdeacon of Down, Dr *Lemuel* Matthews (p. 261), a native of Wales who was known as a man of "considerable talents" but also of "a violent overbearing temper and a litigious disposition."⁴² His maladministration of the diocese, on account of which a royal commission deprived him of all his livings in 1694, is said to have resulted in "a great increase of dissenters."⁴³ It seems possible that Swift heard of this scandal, King being one of the commissioners, but again, even if he did, there does not seem to be a link between the abuses of absenteeism, malpractice, and simony this Lemuel stood for and the features of Lemuel Gulliver.

Another example will clinch the case. On 6 July 1714, Swift's printer, John Barber, wrote to one "Samuel Bridges, Esq;" (a pseudonym for Charles Ford, Swift's trusted friend), at St Dunstan's Coffee-House in Fleet Street, Ford's *poste-restante* address, to acknowledge the receipt of a packet containing the manuscript of *Some Free Thoughts upon the Present State of Affairs*, which Barber had sent on to Bolingbroke for alterations and approval. Ford subsequently forwarded Barber's acknowledgment to Swift *enclosed* in a letter of his own, dated 10 July and endorsed in Ford's hand: "I sent Lemuel." Lemuel was Ford's messenger, presumably "a boy of ten or eleven years old," by whom "no discovery" could be made. By endorsing Barber's letter in this way, Ford was telling Swift, who of course knew of Lemuel, that he had acted as Swift had instructed him to do in a letter of 1 July: "Here it [the MS printer's copy of *Some Free Thoughts*] is, read it, and send it to B[arber] *by an unknown hand*,"⁴⁴ the unknown hand being Lemuel. It is inconceivable that Swift should have overlooked what had expressly been intended for his eyes. Not only is "Gulliver" a real name, then, but so is "Lemuel" and, as a possible result, their combination, "Lemuel Gulliver"; a name admittedly somewhat out of the ordinary in either constituent, but for this very reason perhaps particularly fitting for a narrator who was in the habit of going on extra-ordinary voyages.

Postscript: I am deeply grateful to two most co-operative Banbury historians, Brian Little, Banbury, and Jeremy Gibson, Church Hanborough, Witney, Oxon, for providing invaluable source materials. I likewise extend heartfelt thanks to Professor Margaret Boerner, Philadelphia, for important electronic guidance; to Professor Hugh Ormsby-Lennon, Philadelphia, for his readiness to discuss "Banbury" with me over the years, even though I am afraid that some of my conclusions may differ from his own; to Dr Phil Beeley, Leibniz-Forschungsstelle, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität; who provided me with important photographic material at a critical stage, to my friend Dr. Dirk F. Passmann, Münster, for most welcome criticism and advice, and, finally, to my collaborators at the Ehrenpreis Center, Esther F. Sommer and Ulrich Elkmann, who have assisted me in all kinds of bibliographical chores with their customary courtesy and efficiency. Last but not least, I offer *basia mille*, together with profound affection and thanks, to my grandchildren Sarah and Florian, the dedicatees, who in a sense initiated this piece (see the Editorial of *Swift Studies*, 21 [2006], 1-2).

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

Notes

¹ *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, eds. Herbert Davis *et al.*, 16 vols. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939-68; various reimpressions, sometimes corrected), XI, 9 (2). Hereafter cited as "*Prose Works*."

² *Swift: Selections from his Works*, ed. Henry Craik, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893), II, 441 (my emphasis).

³ See *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Robert DeMaria, Jr (London: Penguin, 2001),

p. 274n.; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. A. B. Gough (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961 [1915]), p. 344; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Arthur E. Case (New York, 1938), p. viin.; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Robert B. Heilman, 2nd ed. (New York: Modern Library, 1969 [1950]), p. 340; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Albert J. Rivero (New York: Norton, 2002), p. 5. The most informative account is still that of Paul Turner, ed., *Gulliver's Travels* (1998 [1971]), p. 291, even though it is not free from errors, either. See also, for the more general context, Case's *Four Essays on "Gulliver's Travels"* (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1945), pp. 50-68. The literature on the authenticity of the *Travels* is conveniently summarized in Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken, *Jonathan Swift, "Gulliver's Travels"* (Munich, 1984), pp. 34-47, 148-153; and, in even greater and richer detail, in Dirk F. Passmann, *"Full of Improbable Lies": Gulliver's Travels und die Reiseliteratur vor 1726* (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1987), *passim*.

⁴ See the Editorial of *Swift Studies*, 21 (2006), 1-2. I am grateful to my son-in-law, Dr. Thomas Real, for taking the snapshots and making them available to me.

⁵ This assumption seems to be usually culled from *OED*, s.v. *Banbury*: "A town in Oxfordshire . . . formerly noted for the number and zeal of its Puritan inhabitants" (my italics). However, none of the seventeenth-and eighteenth-century sources adduced bears out this assertion. Shakespeare, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, for example, comments not on Puritan Banbury zeal but on the proverbial quality of Banbury cheese (I.i.118).

⁶ See *A History of the County of Oxford, X: Banbury Hundred*, ed. Alan Crossley (Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 1972), 8-9, 97-99.

⁷ I have checked the 24th edition (London: Timothy Goodwin *et al.* 1716), p. 16 (s.v. Oxfordshire), and the 27th ed. (London: D. Midwinter *et al.*, 1726), published in the same year as *Gulliver's Travels* (see p. 17).

⁸ I have checked the 3rd edition (London: J. Nicholson *et al.*, 1716), p. 71, and the 5th edition (London: A. Bettesworth *et al.*, 1723), p. 70. See also the *Bibliography of British History: Stuart Period, 1603-1714*, ed. Godfrey Davies and Mary Frear Keeler, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), p. 339 (no. 2353).

⁹ Crossley, ed., *A History of the County of Oxford*, X, 9. See also Edward Hyde, first Earl of Clarendon, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969 [1888]), VI, 80, 83, 98, 99, 101, 155, 278, 283; VII, 204; VIII, 26, 63, 152; IX, 132; Peter Heylyn, *Aërius Redivivus: or, The History of the Presbyterians*, 2nd ed. (London: by Robert Battersby for Christopher Wilkinson *et al.*, 1672), pp. 439-40; the essay by Kevin Lodge, "The Duke of Cumberland and the Mummings," and the accompanying note, "Aynho and Banbury in the Civil War," in the most recent issue of *Cake and Cockhorse*, the magazine of the Banbury Historical Society, 17, no 1 (2006), 2-20. The note features a facsimile reprint of *A Letter: Being a Full Relation of the Siege of Banbury Castle* (London: John Wright, 1644).

¹⁰ See *ODEP*, ed. F. P. Wilson, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1970), p. 29.

¹¹ See Ben Jonson, *Works*, eds. C. H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954 [1938]), VI, 12; see also I, ii, 64-70; I, iii, 106-48.

¹² See Dirk F. Passmann and Heinz J. Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift: A Bio-Bibliographical Handbook*, 4 vols. (Frankfurt: P. Lang,

2003), II, 980-84.

¹³ *The History of the Worthies of England, Endeavoured by Thomas Fuller, D.D., First Printed in 1662: A New Edition, with a Few Explanatory Notes*, ed. John Nichols, 2 vols. (London: F. C. and J. Rivington *et al.*, 1811), II, 220. See also Camden's gloss "in his MS Supplement to the Britannia in the Bodleian library," quoted in the commentary of Richard Gough, *Britannia: or, A Chorographical Description of the Flourishing Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, 2nd ed., 4 vols. (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1974 [1806]), II, 17n. In 1607, when the last (Latin) edition printed in his life time was published, Camden wrote of Banbury: "Nunc autem conficiendo caseo notissimum [Today, it is best-known for its making of cheese]" (*Britannia* [Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1970], p. 266).

¹⁴ *A Tale of a Tub, to which is added, The Battle of the Books, and the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, eds. A. C. Guthkelch and D. Nichol Smith, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968 [1958]), p. 280; see also the most recent edition of *A Tale of a Tub*, ed. Frank H. Ellis (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 2006), p. 223; and *The Tatler*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 151-52 and nn.

¹⁵ See F. F. Madan, *A Critical Bibliography of Dr Henry Sacheverell*, ed. W. A. Speck (Lawrence: U. of Kansas Libraries, 1978), pp. 163-64 (nos. 545-550). According to P. V. Furbank and W. R. Owens, *The Banbury Apes* should now be de-attributed; see their *Defoe De-Attributions* (London: Hambledon, 1994), no. 175.

¹⁶ For the time being, I refrain from commenting on Banbury as a byword for proselytizing Friends and "Banbury Tale" as a synonym for "bare-faced, albeit baroque, deceit" (p. 38) until I have seen the evidence promised by my friend Hugh Ormsby-Lennon (see his "Swift and the Quakers (I)," *Swift Studies*, 4 [1989], 34-62). If Braithwaite's history of the movement is anything to go by, Quakerism was strong in Midland counties in general, and, if Oxfordshire did have a strong Quaker centre in Banbury (see Crossley, ed., *A History of the County of Oxford*, X, 109-10), so it did in Charlbury and elsewhere; see William C. Braithwaite and Henry J. Cadbury, *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, 2nd ed. (York: W. Sessions, 1981 [1955]), pp. 199-200, 393-95.

¹⁷ Turner, ed., *Gulliver's Travels*, p. 291.

¹⁸ See David Woolley, "The Stemma of *Gulliver's Travels*: A Second Note," *Swift Studies*, 17 (2002), 75-87.

¹⁹ See *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. David Woolley, 4 vols. (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1999-2007), I, 103n., 136n. (Spring 1689; Autumn 1691), 106n., 120 (June 1694), 146 and n. (April 1702), 148n. (Nov. 1703), 156n. (Winter 1703; Spring 1704), 163 and n. (Dec. 1707), 237n., 246n., 250n., 253 and n., 255 and n. (7 May - 14 June 1709), 283n. See also Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, his Works, and the Age*, 3 vols. (1962-1983), I, 32. This evidence also disposes of the more fanciful nineteenth-century explanation that "the Dean, *being at Banbury while his work was composing*, but before he had fixed on a name for his hero, saw that of 'Gulliver' on a tombstone in the churchyard, and forthwith fixed upon it" (Alfred Beesley, *The History of Banbury* [London, 1841], p. 518, n. 39 [my emphasis]).

²⁰ From the original in my possession. See also Andrew Browning, ed., *English Historical Documents, 1660-1714* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, [1953]),

facing p. xxxii.

²¹ See the account of its history and illustrations in Crossley, ed., *A History of the County of Oxford*, X, 100-03.

²² For the monumental inscriptions surviving in St Mary's churchyard, as transcribed in the 1960s, from *Burial Register of Banbury*, pt. 3, 1723-1812, see *BHS*, 18 (1984), 140-41 (nos. 164, 169).

²³ Samuel is also the name of the only Gulliver on record who is contemporaneous with *Gulliver's Travels* (see Turner, ed., *Gulliver's Travels*, p. 291).

²⁴ See Jeremy S. W. Gibson, "Who Were the 'Younger Sons'? Banbury Families Who Apprenticed Sons to London Livery Company Masters," *Cake and Cockhorse*, 17, no. 1 (2006), p. 28. I am indebted here and in what follows to this essay by Gibson and the one cited in the next note.

²⁵ See Jeremy S. W. Gibson, "The Three Tuns in the Eighteenth Century," *Cake and Cockhorse*, 8, no. 1 (1979), p. 4.

²⁶ See Vera Wood, *The Licensees of the Inns, Taverns, and Beerhouses of Banbury* (Oxford: Oxfordshire Family History Society, 1998), pp. 104-5.

²⁷ The literature is completely listed in Real and Vienken, "Gulliver's Travels," pp. 46-47 and nn.

²⁸ See, in particular, Paul Odell Clark, "A Gulliver Dictionary," *Studies in Philology*, 50 (1953), p. 599; see also *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Heilman, p. 340; *Gulliver's Travels and Other Writings*, ed. Miriam Kosh Starkman (New York: Bantam Books, 1976 [1962]), p. 27n. In his "Some Significant Names in Gulliver's Travels," *Studies in Philology*, 48 (1951), 761-78, H. D. Kelling, while presenting an excellent summary of earlier research on the subject, does not discuss the names of "Lemuel" and "Gulliver."

²⁹ See Irvin Ehrenpreis, "Swift's 'Little Language' in the *Journal to Stella*," *Studies in Philology*, 45 (1948), 80-88; see also Harold Williams's Introduction to his edition of the *Journal to Stella*, 2 vols. (1948; rpt., Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1974), I, liii-lviii.

³⁰ See, for example, *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Gough, p. 344; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Case, p. vii; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Heilman, p. 340; *The Writings of Jonathan Swift: Authoritative Texts, Backgrounds, Criticism*, eds. Robert A. Greenberg and William Bowman Piper (New York: W. W. Norton, 1973), p. viii; *Gulliver's Travels*, ed. Rivero, p. 5.

³¹ Quoted from *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old Testament and the New: Newly Translated out of the Original Tongues* (London: Charles Bill *et al.*, 1701), p. 537, which was in Swift's library (see Passmann and Vienken, I, 214-25).

³² See, for example, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, ed. A. Bertholet, 4th ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), II, 321-22; *Sprüche/Prediger*, eds. and trans. Helmer Ringgren and Walther Zimmerli, 3rd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), pp. 116-17; *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, eds. David Noel Freedman *et al.* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), IV, 277; K. T. Aitken, "Proverbs," *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, ed. John Barton and John Muddiman (Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 2001), p. 422. See also Miriam K. Starkman, "Satirical Onomastics: Lemuel Gulliver and King Solomon," *Philological Quarterly*, 60

(1981), 41-52, who, while correctly summarizing the problems modern biblical scholars have encountered with the Lemuel-Solomon relationship, fails to identify Swift's historical and contemporary sources, easily available to him in his own library (see Passmann and Vienken, I, 201-16)--and as a result comes to some highly speculative conclusions. Unlike what Starkman assumes, it was not necessary for Swift to know Hebrew in order to understand the complications of "Lemuel" as contemporary biblical scholarship presented them.

³³ London, 1722, p. ix. As early as 1651, Hobbes had pointed out in the *Leviathan* that Proverbs, this "Collection of wise and godly Sayings," could not have been compiled by Solomon or "the Mother of *Lemuel*," but that it was "the work of some other godly man, that lived after them all" (*Leviathan*, ed. C. B. Macpherson [Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1986], p. 421).

³⁴ *Synopsis criticorum aliorumque sanctae scripturae interpretum*, 5 vols. (London: J. Flesher *et al.*, 1669-1676), II, col. 1799.

³⁵ *Testamenti Veteris Biblia Sacra*, ed. Franciscus Junius (London: excudebat G.B. *et al.*, 1593), fol. 64v (ad Proverbia 31:1); Passmann and Vienken, I, 204-05.

³⁶ I am grateful to my colleague, Professor Dieter Baltzer, Münster, for his illuminating instruction on the Hebrew ramifications.

³⁷ In this, and in what follows, I am indebted to Roger Lonsdale, "Gray and 'Allusion': The Poet as Debtor," *Studies in the Eighteenth Century, IV: Papers presented at the Fourth David Nichol Smith Memorial Seminar Canberra 1976*, eds. R. F. Brissenden and J. C. Eade (Canberra: Australian National U. Press, 1979), pp. 31-55. For Swift's vaunted and frequently quoted "originality," see *Prose Works*, I, 7-8; and *Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Harold Williams, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966 [1958]), II, 565, ll. 317-18.

³⁸ See Ehrenpreis, *Dr. Swift*, p. 215; and *Prose Works*, II, 282. See also J. C. Beckett, "The Government and the Church of Ireland under William III and Anne," *Irish Historical Studies*, 2 (1940), 281-82; Philip O'Regan, *Archbishop William King of Dublin (1650-1729) and the Constitution in Church and State* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000), pp. 40-53.

³⁹ I have used the London 1691 edition of *The State of the Protestants*, printed for Robert Clavell.

⁴⁰ See Mary Ann O'Donnell, *Aphra Behn: An Annotated Bibliography of Primary and Secondary Sources* (New York: Garland, 1986), p. 109 (A22.1a) and *passim*; *The Works of Aphra Behn, II: Love-Letters between a Nobleman and his Sister (1684-7)*, ed. Janet Todd (London: W. Pickering, 1993), 117-20 and n. Kingdon is not listed in *ODNB*. For his career as a Commissioner of the Revenue in Ireland, see *The Petty-Southwell Correspondence, 1676-1687*, ed. Marquis of Lansdowne (New York, 1967 [1928]), p. 100 (letter of Sir William Petty to Sir Robert Southwell, 5 September 1682). On Kingdon's parliamentary career, see *The History and Proceedings of the House of Commons*, 5 (1742), 31-37.

⁴¹ See J. G. Simms, *The Jacobite Parliament of 1689*, Irish History Series, no. 6 (Dundalk: Dundalgan, 1966), pp. 12-14; *Jacobite Ireland, 1685-91* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 74-94.

⁴² Henry Cotton, *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae: The Succession of the Prelates and Members of the Cathedral Bodies in Ireland, III: The Province of Ulster* (Dublin: Hodges & Smith, 1849), 231-32, 271. See also Richard Mant, *History of the Church of Ireland*, 2 vols. (London: Parker, 1840), II, 42-43.

⁴³ J. C. Beckett, *Protestant Dissent in Ireland, 1687-1780* (London: Faber & Faber, 1948), p. 37 and n.; see also the author's "The Government and the Church of Ireland under William III and Anne," pp. 289-90, and *ODNB*, 37 (2004), 306-7.

⁴⁴ See *Correspondence*, ed. Woolley, I, 645 and n; see also I, 627 and n.; II, 15 and n. (my emphasis).

Bruce Alexander Honored

by Liz Nelson

Students of the eighteenth century can celebrate the establishment of the Bruce Alexander Award for Historical Mystery fiction after his death in 2003. Alexander [pseudonym of Bruce Cook] merits the honor for his ability to create intriguing mysteries (from the famous "locked room" murder to murder by suggestion) placed in a microcosm of the geography and society of late eighteenth-century England. As a magistrate, his hero Sir John Fielding (1721-1780) was exposed to all criminal activity, both mundane and highly unusual; he is unique, however, in that he was a blind detective. Alexander provides a dramatic explanation of Fielding's blindness, recounted in several of the novels, as the result of an accident aboard ship while Fielding was a midshipman. His condition forced his other senses, particularly hearing, into rare alertness and acute attention to responses during an investigation. He is far from an armchair detective, however; he often leaves his Bow Street home and headquarters to travel about London and to major English cities. He is assisted by his ward, Jeremy Proctor, who narrates the eleven novels that comprise the series.

Although allowed some aid by an often ineffective army, his chief assistance comes from the Bow Street Runners, "permanent, paid constables," a group planned by his half-brother, novelist Henry Fielding, before he left his post as magistrate to John when the ailing Henry retired to the continent (1755). John formed and strengthened the group by his own support and efforts to win benefits for his loyal officers. From the inhabitants of his district he received recognition of his sense of fairness and justice; he was familiarly known as the "Blind Beak of Bow Street."

The honorary Runner, Jeremy, an orphan and runaway to London, provides the remarkable perspective of a childlike awe as he views London and other locations in England. He is only thirteen when Fielding rescues him from a criminal career to run errands and perform domestic chores; it is through his eyes that Covent Garden appears (*Blind Justice*, 1994) in sight and sound, full of noisy costermongers and shoppers. Later, he is captivated by entertainers--acrobats and tumblers--performing there for coins (*Person or Persons Unknown*, 1997) and still later repelled by the Seven Dials area, "supported by petty theft" (*The Price of Murder*, 2003). Not only

his sight but his sense of smell is assaulted in encountering the Fleet River, flowing into the Thames. But from his Bow Street base, he also races to the "best" London addresses, particularly the residence of William Murray, Earl of Mansfield, the Lord Chief Justice, in Bloomsbury Square (*Persons and others*): Westminster, Pall Mall, Great Jermyn Street, St. James Square and Street. Jeremy enjoys visiting Samuel Johnson's house and the nearby Cheshire Cheese (*Blind Justice* and *The Color of Death*, 2000). In *Murder in Grub Street* (1995), investigators visit a "shabby" but "respectable" neighborhood of residences and businesses related to publishing, because a printer's home has been the scene of the murders of an entire household.

It is obviously with some relief that Fielding and his family travel to Bath for an investigation into the identity of a claimant of property, requested by Lord Mansfield who provides his coach for a relatively comfortable trip (including an overnight stay). The younger members of the group are impressed with Bath, at least temporarily, as "grander, more beautiful and cleaner than London" (*Death of a Colonial*, 1999); a short stroll takes them past fascinating bookstores to the Pump Room for a taste of the waters. Not all of the tour is pleasant, however, and the party eventually returns to London by post coach, a thirty-eight hour trip. A further investigation of the claimant requires a visit to Oxford, a long, tiring afternoon coach ride that includes frequent stops (*Colonial*). Fielding and Jeremy visit Balliol and All Souls, trying to trace the background of the claimant and later endure an undergraduate party at an ale house. In contrast, the visit to Cambridge (*The Price of Murder*) is brief; Jeremy describes it as enchanting, with "the appearance of some fairy-tale city of a past that never was." Another long coach trip takes Jeremy to Deal, on the Channel coast, regarded as "prosperous" as Bath (*Smuggler's Moon*, 2001). It is not the pleasant beaches and strolls through town that make Deal so appealing and prosperous; it is the success of "owling" (cant term for smuggling). A trip to Portsmouth for an investigation involving the Navy nearly results in Jeremy's being "enlisted" in a press gang (*Watery Grave*, 1996). Jeremy again visits Portsmouth to witness a Benjamin Franklin-inspired experiment of "taming" waves by pouring oil over the waters (*An Experiment in Treason*, 2002).

But not all of his trips were to fairyland. He also made numerous trips to some of the worst localities in London. A visit to Newgate to interview a witness (*Blind Justice*) is harrowing but not as "forbidding" as the trip to Bedlam to interview the "mad poet," John Clayton. Jeremy sees a gray, grim structure, a "centuries old stone building" that "had the look of an ancient fortress" (*Grub Street*). A visit to St. Bartholomew's Hospital to interview a dying witness seems antiseptic in contrast (*Color of Death*).

In a lighter mood, Alexander re-creates the London theater. Jeremy is totally engrossed in David Garrick's *Macbeth* at the Drury Lane Theatre (*Blind Justice*) and is present at the Covent Garden Theatre for the triumph of Goldsmith's comedy, *She Stoops to Conquer* (*Experiment*). He pronounces the Garden site larger than Garrick's Drury Lane though not so well designed, when the "walls shook with laughter" during the performance. Music is not neglected; the Fielding family attend a Handel concert, featuring the "Ode for St. Cecilia's Day" at the Crown and Anchor (*Jack, Knave and Fool*, 1998) but unfortunately witness an extraordinary

death on stage. Coffee is enjoyed (frequently) by Jeremy at Lloyds, with the excuse of meeting important "sources of information," and he enters the fascinating world of racing at Newmarket, especially since his friendship with jockey Deuteronomy Plummer earns him a backstage view of stables and track, as well as a good tip on a winner (*Price*).

While locations, or their traces, may sometimes linger for contemporary inspection (and correction by experts), characters do not. Alexander may have researched geography and historical characters, but personal relationships and actual conversations must be imagined. Written records—correspondence, publications, diaries, eye-witness accounts, even Boswell's—may provide clues, but informal conversation must be left to the author. Alexander succeeds in presenting reasonable approximations of the voices of his historical characters and creates appropriate dialogue for his creations.

First among the "real" is obviously Fielding. His public biography provides Alexander with an easily developed skeleton. He brought distinction to his role as magistrate, not only with his insistence on justice, but by his common sense and good humor. As magistrate, "he had power to try lesser crimes, adjudicate lesser suits, and bind over for trial at Old Bailey capital crimes" (*Watery Grave*). Compassion supports justice in his decisions; Alexander capitalizes on that compassion with his portrayal of Fielding's relationship with the Runners, his own household (such as securing a naval post for the second Lady Fielding's son, Tom Durham, when he appeared in Fielding's court in *Watery Grave*) and his concern for some of the worthy indigents whom he encountered, especially Jeremy and the daughter of a criminal-murder victim. He advocated a "pre-emptive" control of crime; it was through his suggestion that a law was passed allowing young male criminals to choose a career in the navy over a prison sentence. He also supported the formation of the Magdalen Society for Penitent Prostitutes. His actions and writings helped to earn him his knighthood. At the same time, Alexander demonstrated Fielding's detective skills; Jeremy continues his description of Fielding's skill as a detective: "I had seen him, on a number of occasions, turn a witness quite inside out, forcing him to admit that he had not actually seen what he claimed to have seen--only heard it, heard about it, or supposed from other factors that it had taken place" (*Watery Grave*). Furthermore, Fielding predates Holmes's warnings about ignoring details and concentrating on what is real, if seemingly improbable, in solving several puzzles.

Fielding is aided by his ability to cajole friends into assistance, most prominently Samuel Johnson, who is not just a complaisant friend but often an ally. Johnson defends a "mad poet" in *Murder in Grubstreet* and succeeds in witnessing the good reception of at least one volume of John Clayton's poems. He offers advice on Jeremy's apprenticeship in a printing shop, encourages Fielding's ward Clarissa in her writing ambition and recommends some female writers as models. He assists Fielding in arranging a dinner party to investigate Benjamin Franklin tactfully about his involvement with "colonial intrigues" by suggesting that Franklin would be drawn to Bow Street by his own presence and his hint of an introduction to the Thrales (*Experiment*). While Fielding and Johnson disagree in their literary

discussions (Fielding thought Johnson had "the audacity to write ill of Henry Fielding"), Johnson agrees with Fielding's associates in finding Boswell annoying (largely because of his constant questions) in *Color of Death* and humorously dismisses Boswell's championing his own work by reminding Fielding that he did not have to read about Corsica, since he didn't intend to visit there. Fielding's friend, Dr. Donnelly, is disgusted with Boswell's trying to gain a free medical opinion while they encountered him in the Cheshire Cheese and dismisses him as "that terrible man" (*Blind Justice*).

Benjamin Franklin himself appears "lascivious, pompous, and petty by turn" at a private moment but defends himself ably in his discussions with Fielding who recognizes Franklin's importance as a representative of the colonies. He tries to ensure Franklin's safety when he is called to testify before a committee of the House of Parliament (*Experiment*). The scene for the testimony is the "Cockpit," a puzzling term which is defined by the engaging Goldsmith. He is always a welcome dinner guest and on one occasion defends a journalist's right of free speech, even in writing an inflammatory pamphlet. He proves his point that the way to neutralize such material is to write an accurate broadsheet of his own to exonerate the maligned suspect Josef Davidovich in *Person or Persons Unknown* (1997). He appreciates the company of fellow Irishman Dr. Donnelly, and the real and the imagined unite as good friends

Making a cameo appearance in *The Price of Murder*, Sir Joshua Reynolds is enlisted as a painter for the portrait of Lord Lamford (for two hundred guineas), but the Lord came to an unfortunate end, however, before its completion. Alexander does not resist including David Garrick, who entertained Fielding and friends often; Fielding regrets Garrick's "audacity" in playing Romeo when he was too old for the role (*Experiment*) but is awed by his success in playing Macbeth: "He has the music of the poet's words" (*Blind Justice*).

Perhaps the most captivating fictional character Alexander created was "Black Jack" Bilbo, rumored to have been a pirate, but certainly a privateer. He describes his success as the owner of a gambling house, commenting on the gullibility of wealthy customers (*Blind Justice*). In the London house he has appropriated as payment for gambling debts, he provides shelter for Jeremy's friend, orphan Jimmie Bunkins, and even for Fielding when he was shot near Bilbo's home (*Color of Death*). He lends his coach for necessary transportation and, most importantly, his ship to help capture the smugglers at Deal (*Smuggler's Moon*). He retreats to the colonies, partly to protect his lover who was involved in that smuggling operation. His creation is an indication of Alexander's concern with prevailing attitudes in British society, particularly prejudice against Jews, Roman Catholics and blacks, along with the burgeoning disaffection with the American colonists.

Bilbo appears before Fielding for a breach of the peace – a small riot that is occasioned by an attack on Bilbo by members of the Brethren of the Spirit—for his being a Jew. He had been irritated before by the assumption that he was a Jew but reacted violently when one of the group pulled his beard. Centuries-old anti-Jewish attacks had been stirred at this time by the Grub Streeter writer's pamphlet attacking

a Jew as a murderer. Even Goldsmith's counterattack could not calm the anti-Jewish rage which climaxed in the burning of the synagogue in Maiden Lane (*Grub Street*).

On the positive side, Fielding finds new friends when he is instructed on the Jewish predicament by Rabbi Gershon and Moses Martinez (who also supplies information on the Brethren and returns later to give advice on the disposal of stolen jewelry, particularly in *Color*). But the shadow of this hatred lingered, as did the old feelings toward Roman Catholics, who were not exempt from slurring remarks and continued disabilities. In *Rules of Engagement* (2005), Bishop Talley describes a Tory plan for a bill "reaching back to the Elizabethan practice of priest hunting, public executions of the more spectacular sort, etc." by which Whig attempts to revise the Act of Tolerance would be thwarted, and Roman Catholics would still be held in contempt; he is disappointed with the failure of the plan.

Anti-Semitism was matched by prejudice against blacks, Africans or immigrants from the islands of the Caribbean. Bilbo again is involved because of his hiring Robert Burnham ("a cream and coffee colored mulatto," *Jack, Knave and Fool*) as tutor for his ward. When robbers disguised as blacks invade London's best district, and a murder is involved, public sentiment subjects any black man to unwarranted attack. Burnham is a suspect in the murder case, but Bilbo defends him without reserve and is satisfied to have Burnham's name cleared. He claimed his freedom based on his residence in England (probably inspired by the Somerset case of 1772), but Burnham's father granted him manumission and a small income. (Bilbo eventually found him a teaching post outside London in the same school attended by Francis Barber). Racism again surfaces when Burnham's friend, and Johnson's servant, Francis Barber, is pursued by an angry mob on St. James Street, but Jeremy manages to save him by hiding him behind a fence and defending him with a drawn pistol until a Runner rescues them both. Alexander stretches the description of prejudice to a denunciation of slavery when he concludes with the statement that slavery is "a cancer upon the body politic and its victims" (*Color of Death*).

Although not as obvious as these prejudices, a negative attitude towards the American colonists became apparent. As a representative of the colonies, Franklin was treated respectfully, but a resentful surge greeted news of the Boston Tea Party and suggestions to deny "British liberties" to the ungrateful Americans were murmured. During these tense times, Fielding receives a letter of farewell from Jack Bilbo who may have begun another career as a privateer--against the British Navy? (*Experiment in Treason*).

Fielding's sympathies were to be found in the middle ground; his guiding principle was fairness, "to find the way for common justice" (*Rules of Engagement*).

He rejected the concept of one set of laws for the upper classes (the rich and/or aristocracy) and another for common citizens. It is in this context that Alexander scrutinizes the Navy carefully in *Watery Grave* when Fielding was disappointed to find that fairness did not prevail. In *The Adventure*, he rejects the court martial verdicts in a case involving a captain's murder on the high seas because wealth and influence swayed the votes: "I have seen naval justice . . . and I was not favorably impressed."

He might have found some consolation from the success of the Runners,

even though it was nearly fifty years past his death before a London police force was established. Some of his procedures, and, as Alexander illustrates, several of his methods of detection still survive. Alexander himself has been well rewarded for combining this magistrate and detective into a successful series that so vividly recreates the eighteenth century.

St. Peter's College

Contentions about Contentious Times: Recent Works on Eighteenth-Century Indian History

By Brijraj Singh

P.J. Marshall, editor. *The Eighteenth Century in Indian History Evolution or Revolution?*. (Oxford in India Readings, Themes in Indian History Series.) New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003. Pp. vi + 456 (no index).

Seema Alavi, editor. *The Eighteenth Century in India*. (Oxford in India Readings, Debates in Indian Society Series.) New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. 262; index.

Amiya Kumar Bagchi, Dipankar Sinha, and Barnita Bagchi, editors. *Webs of History Information, Communication and Technology from Early to Post-Colonial India*. (History Congress Institute of Development Studies, Kolkata.) Delhi: Manohar, 2005. Pp. 298 (no index).

Peter Robb. *A History of India*. Houndsmills, Basingstoke, U.K., and New York: Palgrave. 2002. Pp. xiv + 344, including maps, tables and index.

P. J. Marshall. *"A Free though Conquering People" Eighteenth-Century Britain and its Empire*. (Variorum Collected Series.) Aldershot, U.K., and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. Pp. xiv + 302, including plate and index.

These are boom times for Indian history, but when were they not boom times? In the pre-Independence era, apart from leaders who studied India's past as a way of forging a sense of the nation for whose independence they were fighting—Jawaharlal Nehru's *The Discovery of India* comes to mind—there were such outstanding scholars as Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar whose works on Aurangzeb and the decline of the Mughals are still classics. Straddling Independence was D.D. Kosambi who brought a new methodology, rigorous scholarship, and keen insights to a study of ancient India. After 1947 there have been apologists of the Raj, Indian nationalists, the Cambridge school of Indian historians, the Aligarh school, the Marxists, and, more recently, the Subalterns. The multiplicity of their approaches and the diversity of their conclusions prove, if proof were needed, that Indian

history is a highly contentious subject about which no opinion can be received as infallibly true.

What applies to Indian history in general applies also to the history of eighteenth-century India. Once upon a time a consensus held about it. Historians of an imperialist bent maintained that with the death of Aurangzeb in 1707 India went into an all-round decline, political, economic and cultural, till the British, who were more "advanced," more powerful and better organized, had to step in to stem the rot. Willy-nilly they were drawn into Indian affairs till, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, they found themselves in possession of an empire which they proceeded to rule justly and impartially. Nationalist historians disputed the claim that British rule was beneficent and argued instead that its greatest beneficiary was not India but Britain, which destroyed Indian industry and agriculture and impoverished the people. But they agreed that the early eighteenth century was a period of decline in India. They were also at one with the imperialists in seeing the establishment of the British Raj as representing a total break from the old Mughal notions of sovereignty, justice, administration, and conceptions of the State.

The view that British rule marks a clean break from the past is still heard. But increasingly historians have come to see the eighteenth century as a period of evolution rather than of revolution, a period when in spite of dramatic changes an essential continuity was maintained, a period when, instead of decline on all sides, we see signs of growth and progress. This shift in perspective, or, as it has been called, "revisionist" history, has brought the boom in Indian history to the field of the eighteenth century as well. So long as the period was regarded as one of decline, historians of the modern era tended to bypass it, concentrating either on the greatness of the Mughals or on the nineteenth century when the Raj was fully established and challenges to it first began. But, as we learn more about the eighteenth century as a period of continuity and growth as well as of change and decline, more historians are being attracted to it, and the contentions that characterize the rest of Indian history have begun to characterize that of the eighteenth century as well. Exactly which parts of India progressed, and which declined? Why, and to what extent? To what extent and in what forms did Mughal practices continue in eighteenth-century India, and to what extent, by whom, and for what reasons were these practices modified or jettisoned? And where do the British and other European powers, especially the French, fit into this kaleidoscope? If the Mughals regarded the British as legitimate "successor states," did the British see themselves this way? If not, to what extent did they see themselves as continuing old traditions and to what extent did they inject a new element altogether into Indian polity? These and allied questions have begun to form the staple of eighteenth-century Indian history, and they also provide the focus of the works reviewed here. All of them were either published or presented as papers during 2002-03.

One of the proponents of the view that the eighteenth century is a period of evolutionary growth is P.J. Marshall, who was, until his retirement, the Rhodes Professor of Imperial History at King's College, London. Another is the younger scholar Seema Alavi who obtained a Ph.D. at Cambridge in the 1990s and is currently Associate Professor of History at Jamia Milia University in New Delhi. Marshall has argued his position in various works with wide scholarship and

Careful nuances, and in 2003 edited *The Eighteenth Century in Indian History* for the Oxford in India Readings series entitled "Themes in Indian History." This work brings together fourteen previously-published essays, book chapters and excerpts by Indian, British and American historians together with Marshall's own thoughtful and convincing introductory essay, complete with a long bibliography which includes many works of note that have been published on eighteenth-century India in recent years. Not all contributors insist on seeing the period as evolutionary. At least two, M. Athar Ali and Irfan Habib, both of the Aligarh school, view it as one of decline with little continuity between the Mughal Empire and the British Raj. Habib's essay, which is more detailed than Athar Ali's, sees an educational as well as an economic decline (p. 109) and points out that the Tribute, by which large sums of money were expatriated to Britain, not only contributed to this decline but is also a major cause of the unbridgeable differences between Mughal and British dispensations (pp. 111-13). However, most other contributors find signs of growth, notice the way in which Mughal practices were carried over into the eighteenth century first by the "successor states" that were established in India following the collapse of the Mughals and then by the British, and argue, with a wealth of scholarship, that all kinds of elaborate local, regional and pan-Indian networks and connections flourished, thus tying regions and communities together. To them, such breakdowns as occurred are of less significance than the economic, mercantile, cultural, religious and other ties that thrived.

Coincidentally, the previous year, 2002, saw the publication of *The Eighteenth Century in India*, a collection of eight essays, including the introduction, edited by Seema Alavi for the Oxford in India Readings series called "Debates in Indian Society." Though half the size of Marshall's, Alavi's book is of a piece with it. Several contributors (C.A. Bayly, Burton Stein, Irfan Habib, Muzaffar Alam and Marshall himself) are common to both; indeed, in the case of Habib, the essay Alavi reproduces is only a very slightly revised version of the one in Marshall. Alavi's introduction is slightly more "Indocentric" than Marshall's in that it pays more attention to Indian historiography, and it seems to take the rightness of the "revisionists" rather more for granted, thus freeing itself to consider more than Marshall does the finer distinctions regarding the extent to which the British carried over existing Indian practices in the early years of their rule. Other than that, either essay could have served as an introduction to the other's book. These similarities make one wonder why Oxford University Press brought both books out so close together. Is Alavi's an "overspill" of Marshall's though it precedes Marshall by a year, providing accommodation to essays that could not fit into an already bulky book? But if so, how to explain the duplications and overlaps?

Since all the essays in Marshall and Alavi, whether "revisionist" or otherwise, are the work of leading historians of India and as such are characterized by depth and original scholarship, it is invidious to single out a particular one for praise. However, because, generally speaking, historians of eighteenth-century India tend to concentrate largely on what is sometimes called "mainstream" India, Ajay Skaria's essay in Marshall on "Being *Jangli*: The Politics of Wildness" draws attention to itself, dealing as it does with a group of tribal or indigenous people in western India who are often left out of consideration. With originality, insight and

zest, it argues for "the centrality of apparent chaos in the growth and sustenance of settled agriculture," for the view that "practices . . . regarded as disruptive, such as raids, [are] often part of the construction of large centralized states," and that "regions regarded as peripheral, such as the forested tracts," are tied into the complex network of trade and agriculture (p. 294). It is Skaria's contention that the Bhil tribals, instead of being in opposition to the Maratha State, existed in an antinomian relationship: they were connected to the State by subterranean networks though they were often at loggerheads on the surface. For what was in operation here was a theory of "shared sovereignties" by which the sovereignty of the Marathas was upheld, paradoxically, through the very act of being challenged by the Bhils even as this act served to provide legitimacy to actions that could be regarded as illegal.

If Marshall's and Alavi's books share common themes and common contributors, and exhibit equally high standards of historical writing, they also share common weaknesses. One is that, although many big names in eighteenth-century Indian history are represented, one notable omission from both books is that of Nicholas Dirks. Not that this would matter at all; but Dirks has written very cogently about the changes and transformations of the Indian caste system in the eighteenth century, and Marshall's and Alavi's books lack all discussion of this important aspect of Indian society. It used to be argued once upon a time that Indian society was timeless and unchanging. Those perceptions have now been abandoned, and Dirks's work has had something to do with this abandonment. In *The Hollow Crown: Ethnohistory of an Indian Kingdom* (1987) and other essays he has argued convincingly that caste hierarchies, far from being rigid, underwent (and are undergoing) constant changes, and it was the British who froze these changes by valorizing the Brahmins for various political and other reasons. Surely this insight has a legitimate place in books such as Marshall and Alavi have edited.

While economic historians are richly represented in their pages, there is little of cultural history in them. Yet eighteenth-century cultural history is crucial to the establishment or rejection of their thesis. Did Indian culture suffer a decline after Aurangzeb's death and a disruption after the establishment of British control, or did the rich traditions of music, art, architecture, language scholarship and astronomy continue to thrive? And did a new hybrid, born of European influence but rooted in the Indian soil, emerge? These are vital questions for whose answer one looks to the two books in vain, though David Ludden's extract in Marshall does contribute to our knowledge of south Indian socio-cultural anthropology, agricultural practices and caste relations.

Marshall's book would also have benefited from greater editorial attention. A number of extracts which are taken from books refer to earlier or later pages or chapters of those books. Such references make perfect sense in the books themselves but none in the stand-alone extracts that Marshall gives.

The theme of the existence of networks and affiliations, so prominent in Marshall and Alavi, is prominent also, as its title indicates, in *Webs of History Information, Communication and Technology from Early to Post-Colonial India* edited by Amiya Kumar Bagchi et al. (2005), which consists of essays that were first presented in a panel on "History of Information and Communication Technology in India" at the 2003 annual meeting of the Indian History Congress.

The contributors' interests range from ancient to contemporary India, and only three essays are of relevance to the student of the eighteenth century. Though Ruquia Hussain entitles hers "Communication and Commerce: The Armenian World Trade in the Seventeenth Century," what she says about the seventeenth century applies to the eighteenth as well. She points out that mercantile information traveled speedily and accurately between India, Iran, the Levant, and Europe thanks to an elaborate network of the Armenian community existing all over these areas (pp. 106-07). Because the Armenians were fine linguists, they were often able to profit at the expense of the other European nations that were engaged in the East India trade, and through their networks they established bonds between the Indian hinterland of producers and the consumers of Europe and the Middle East.

Iqbal Husain's "Primitive Newspapers: The Eighteenth Century *Akhbarat*" is more successful in examining communication links in eighteenth-century India between Delhi and other areas than in arguing that these links foreshadow newspapers of the following century. Akbar started the practice in the seventeenth century of stationing reporters and spies in various parts of the country from where they sent him regular bulletins. This practice was adopted by various "successor states" as well as the British. Often the men who reported to the British also sent the same reports to other Indian principalities. The demand for news led to the setting up, in the 1730s or 40s, of a news agency in Delhi by the banking firm of Khemkaran Mansaram, which G. T. Kulkarni calls "the world's first ever news selling agency during the eighteenth century." This agency collected raw news from all over the country from its paid correspondents, arranged it under various heads, and then sent it to Poona to the Peshwa court at regular intervals in exchange for payment. Dissemination of news was rapid, though how trustworthy it was is a matter of conjecture. There was much bribery leading to slanted reporting; however, some scribes remained scrupulously honest. Several news reports, almost invariably in Persian, and sometimes bound together in volumes, exist in archives. They are of historical significance and provide further demonstration of the intricate links which bound the nation together after the Mughal collapse. But they can hardly be called the forerunners of newspapers, not least because they were not meant for public consumption.

Given the complexities and details that characterize Indian history, not to mention all the controversies that swirl around it, how does one write a history of India from the earliest times to the present? One would have to be either extremely selective (in which case the history might not be of much use to anyone) or else extremely polemical and ideological (in which case again the work would suffer irretrievably). Peter Robb's *A History of India* tries to eschew ideology, and though selective is not overly so. It goes over well trodden ground and generally presents information that is already available, but does so in its own way. The originality of the work lies not in what is presented but in the way it is assembled. Robb divides his subject into four periods, the ancient, the medieval, the early modern, and the modern, and considers each under three headings, rule and protest, customs and beliefs, and material culture, production, and trade. His treatment is usually characterized by incisive good sense as well as scholarship.

Though published in 2002, the book deals essentially with India till the 1970s. In the 70s and 80s conditions in India looked bleak. Fissiparous tendencies

were beginning to appear, and the State was under considerable economic as well as political strain. Robb's book is colored perhaps too much by this mood of uncertainty. Not that he highlights it; on the contrary, he asserts over and over again the essential unity of India, as though thereby to disperse any threat. But today the mood of the country is buoyant; the pulls against the integrity of the State have been overtaken by a dizzying growth rate and a newfound confidence. This makes for a strange sense of timewarp in reading him, though there is no denying that the problems he has thrown into relief are real and persistent.

This is another way of saying that the book's major preoccupations are with "modern" India, which Robb dates from the 1830s, in certain cases even after 1857. From this two consequences follow. First, since he sees contemporary India as also being "modern," he treats Independence not as a break in history but as a mere date beyond which the same tendencies and issues are to be found as were present in British India. Second, in a similar fashion, the eighteenth century is seen as being of a piece with the early modern, which includes the Mughal period and successor states as well. This makes him a "revisionist" like Marshall and Alavi, except that he is more willing to sketch out developments in art, the growth of syncretism in religion, progress in handicrafts, and India's place in the international mercantile world than they. He is also more interested in wealth disparities in 18th-century India, in the utter indigence of many of the poor, and in differences between India and the West (both patriarchal societies) in the treatment of women. This makes his view of the period broader if considerably less detailed than theirs.

If Robb's view of history is as a long-term and continuous process which does not admit the existence of sharp ruptures or quick changes, how is Britain's gaining mastery over India to be explained? He sees the causes as going back hundreds of years into the histories of the two nations which created the "ecological and institutional environment" that led to this annexure. These causes have to do with mercantile and trading practices, capital formation and its consequences, better British infrastructure in the form of transport and shipping, and the fact that a bigger percentage of Indian population depended on agriculture. He is very likely right, but the scope of his book does not allow him to argue these positions fully, so that they remain essentially assertions. He is unambiguous in discounting cultural and racial differences to explain British dominance, and is more willing than some to suggest that Britain's possession of American colonies provided the resources without which this dominance would have been impossible.

Britain *vis-à-vis* America as well as India is the theme of the sixteen essays which Marshall published between 1981 and 2001 and were collected in "*A Free though Conquering People*" in 2003. Unlike historians who see the existence of two British empires, the first in the West, succeeded by the one in the East only after the first collapsed, Marshall maintains that because British interests in India had become significant even before the loss of America, there was only one empire. The British believed that having possessions in America and India would give them the financial and military ability to stand up to France. Whether in the Colonies or in India, they ruled according to the same principles. By the mid-eighteenth century they had got over the warning implicit in the fate of the Roman empire that those who seek conquest abroad are doomed to pay a heavy price at home and no longer saw themselves as a mercantile nation engaged in free trade with free peoples all

over the world, backed by a strong navy. Instead, they began to seek foreign possessions, and began to believe that these possessions needed to be overseen by Parliament, held despotically with the help of a strong standing army and not just the navy, and ruled benevolently. In the event, the British lost control of the Colonies and gained that of India; but win or lose, the same principles that motivated their control of America or the Caribbean are found in their attitude towards India.

So the aim of Marshall's book is to underline the similarities as well as the obvious differences between Britain's empires in America, Caribbean and India. This international scope helps the reader appreciate the global nature of Britain's reach in the latter half of the eighteenth century. However, a good deal of the book is concerned with India. Here Marshall takes the "revisionist" position we have become familiar with. His essay on Britain and India, while clear and trenchant, adds little to the argument that in the initial years after they came into possession of the *diwani* of Bengal in 1765 the British continued to be seen by Indians as yet another successor state, and they did not altogether dispute this view. They may have believed in exercising sovereignty rather more unambiguously than did the other successor states; but though Hastings never attended the Mughal emperor's court at Delhi, he did go to Lucknow when summoned there by the Mughal prince. He rode into town behind the prince's elephant, and Marshall reproduces a little-known but important painting by Zoffany (who was present on the occasion) showing the prince sitting on raised cushions with Hastings sitting on the floor in front of him, bareheaded, his hat lying behind him, while a number of Englishmen in full uniform are ranged, one knee raised in each case and looking quite uncomfortable, on the side. There is no question here as to who is the ruler, who the subordinate, and which cultural mores dominate.

Marshall's publishers decided to reproduce his sixteen essays in exactly the form in which they appeared originally in various journals, with the result that the typeface varies, as does the location of the notes, some being at the bottom of the page and others grouped together at the end. More annoying is the fact that the original pagination is retained, with the result that page 262, say, can be followed by page 460.

Flushing, New York

Peter S. Onuf. *The Mind of Thomas Jefferson.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007. Pp. x + 281; index. Cloth, \$49.50; ISBN: 978-0-8139-2578-3; paperback: \$19.50; ISBN: 978-0-8139-2611-7.

Francis D. Cogliano. *Thomas Jefferson: Reputation and Legacy.* (The Jeffersonian America Series.) Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006. Pp. vi + 276; index. Hardcover, \$45. ISBN: 978-0-8139-2619-0.

For the past twenty years or so, academic and non-academic historians, journalists, political commentators, novelists, and seemingly anyone with a word processor have crafted millions of words about the leading lights of America's

founding era from Washington and Adams to Hamilton and Franklin, Madison and Paine. Even some rather dimmer luminaries of the era have also received impressive attention. Between 2003 and 2005, for example, no less than four serious studies of Gouverneur Morris appeared (one reviewed in the May 2007 *Intelligencer*).

The enduring attention given to Thomas Jefferson is no exception. No year goes by without three, four, or more new Jefferson studies appearing in print. The two works under consideration here contribute to the continuing re-evaluation of our third president, especially in light of the 1998 revelation, via DNA testing, that Jefferson may well have fathered at least one and perhaps all of Sally Heming's children. Almost immediately, Jefferson's defenders and critics moved into action to burnish his image as a man of his time or to attack him as a hypocrite who eloquently argued for human rights, but not for the hundreds of slaves he owned or the woman he secretly loved.

The fascinating infatuation that contemporary Americans have with so many of the nation's founders has stimulated one wag to name the entire phenomenon "Founders Chic," a label first used in 2001 in *Newsweek*, but one that became fashionable in 2003 after H. W. Brands, biographer of Benjamin Franklin, used it in the title of an *Atlantic Monthly* article. Then just two years later, University of Edinburgh historian Francis D. Cogliano used the phrase as the title for a long *History* review article of no less than seven books, most of which were solely or partly about Jefferson. Every one was published in 2003. And now, Cogliano has produced his own study of Jefferson to add to "founders chic."

Meantime, the Thomas Jefferson Foundation Professor at the University of Virginia, Peter S. Onuf, perhaps the most prolific of contemporary Jefferson scholars, has added to the canon with a series of essays, all published or written between 1993 and 2005, that seek to reveal Jefferson's thinking on an array of subjects. Together, as his title suggests (*The Mind of Thomas Jefferson*), they are designed to offer a new comprehensive interpretation of Jefferson's mind as revealed in his ideas about politics, international relations, religion, education, and, perhaps most controversial of all, slavery. Onuf's goal is not to justify Jefferson against his critics, but rather to examine and explain him from the perspective of a thoughtful historian.

Onuf's work is stimulating and will no doubt lead to additional controversy about America's third president. In our age, when the Federalist faction, that of George Washington, John Adams, and Alexander Hamilton, seems momentarily ascendant for us, leading some to suggest that it is more accurate to talk about Federalist, not Founders, Chic, Jefferson's opponents accuse him endlessly of hypocrisy when he argued the cause of liberty for white Americans while he refused to liberate his own slaves. They call him disingenuous when he argued a strict constructionist approach to constitutional interpretation against the broad construction of, say, Hamilton, but then watch how he almost blithely took upon himself with no explicit constitutional authority to make the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. They dub him dishonest when he attacked standing, professional armies as dangerous to the republic, but then he agreed wholeheartedly to the creation of the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1802.

What could a commentator say about Jefferson when faced with such

criticism? Onuf's analysis, as it turns out, is not merely to inquire into Jefferson's mind, but rather to seek ways to understand and appreciate Jefferson's *minds* insofar as he seemingly lived with so many contradictions and paradoxes. If anything, this book goes a long way to demonstrate the complexities of Jefferson's thought and just how they distance him from so many of his contemporaries, including Adams, Hamilton, and his protégé James Madison. Would that we have presidents in our own time who could match Jefferson's profound intellect, learning, and wisdom.

First, Onuf accepts the premise that slavery was Jefferson's primary agonizing struggle--within his own thinking and his practical needs for his plantation at Monticello. He also surprisingly and wholeheartedly accepts the 1998 DNA finding concerning Jefferson's paternity of Sally Hemings's children, but not merely one, but all four of them. But Jefferson must be seen, he argues, not only in the context of late-eighteenth, early-nineteenth century Virginia, but as a moral sense philosopher well versed in the writings of Lord Kames, Dugald Stewart, Frances Hutchinson, and David Hume. Onuf does not accept, however, Garry Wills's attempt to make Jefferson wholly into a recipient Scottish philosophy, but rather focuses on his use of the pragmatic aspects of that moral theory. Thus, Jefferson argued that slaves were unable to develop a moral sense as long as they were enslaved. His prescription for emancipation was complex: it involved practical considerations, such as the separation of children from their mothers and then their expatriation to their original African homeland. Blacks and whites, Onuf explains, could never co-exist because the result of keeping blacks in America would only result in genocidal race war, something Jefferson was familiar with in light of the Haitian Revolution.

Onuf also has a new interpretation concerning the Louisiana Purchase. Here he pits the Federalist leadership, which was moving toward strict constitutional construction, just as Jefferson abandoned it. As president, Jefferson used his first inaugural address to make the startling statement that "we are all republicans, we are all federalists" in an attempt to overcome partisanship and to forge new alignments to protect the infant republic against far stronger nations, especially the British Empire, his old nemesis that he had so vigorously attacked in his original draft of the Declaration of Independence. Moving simultaneously on an east-west and north-south axis to ensue the expansion of the nation, he sought to encourage settlements that would bring in new states and republican self-rule. This, he thought, would immeasurably strengthen the new United States and forestall European or British encroachments by ensuring that the nation had, in Jefferson's words, "the strongest government on earth."

Finally, the new military academy, Onuf argues, was well within the framework of Jefferson's worldview when we consider his intense fear of a standing army under a militarist (Jefferson preferred the term "monocrat") like General Alexander Hamilton who wished to pursue war during the Adams administration, the so-called Quasi-War with France that lasted from 1796 until 1800. Hamilton had convinced Washington to come out of retirement to lead an army with Hamilton second in command, but which effectively was under Hamilton's control, given Washington's frailty. Such a spectacle, according to Jefferson, would soon undermine the foundations of the American republic, and

create a military dictatorship that would make the United States no different from any other despotic government in Europe. Only at the last minute was all this averted when President Adams concluded an agreement with France and disbanded Hamilton's army. The lesson, said Jefferson, was that America had to wait until the Revolution of 1800, *his* revolution, when the republicans were in ascendancy before it was safe to establish a standing professional armed force with a highly educated and republican officer corps trained in the new military academy.

Onuf's book is highly suggestive, and it ought to give pause to those in the Federalist Chic camp that there is far more to Jefferson than they know or appreciate. There is much to learn from Onuf, and his fertile mind is a tribute to his careful study of Jefferson's. The main problem is one that often appears when a book consists of essays drawn from several sources, namely repetitiveness. The two chapters on the Louisiana Purchase and the several on slavery frequently duplicate ideas already articulated, and the quotations used over and over again are often tiresome: as one example for the latter, the statement cited above concerning America's becoming "the most powerful government on earth" is used for similar purposes on pages 34, 113, 178, 188-89, and 194--and I may have missed a few. In any event, even if Onuf has as one purpose taken up the challenge to rescue Jefferson from his critics, he has come as close as anyone can in this noble effort.

If Onuf's goal is to reveal a new interpretation of Jefferson's mind, Cogliano's is far more limited and restrained. His book serves as a counterpart to Stephen Knott's highly regarded 2002 inquiry into how Alexander Hamilton has fared throughout the past two hundred years at the hands of historians and political theorists (*Alexander Hamilton and the Persistence of Myth*). Above all, Cogliano's is a study in historiography, designed to determine how Jefferson's "reputation and legacy," as his subtitle suggests, has made it through the last two centuries among historians, not only as he himself intended and desired, but in the real concrete ways in which his changing historical fortunes became embattled in a mix of political bias, cultural correctness, and sociological struggles, in claims and tensions between those who wish to "own" Jefferson as their hero and those who wish to renounce him as a villain.

Thus, Cogliano embarks on a voyage to determine how history has treated Jefferson in light of how he himself wanted to be remembered. Jefferson worried about his legacy, which was why, for example, he crafted his own epitaph for the tombstone that would mark his grave. As is well known, he wished to be remembered above all else for his bill for religious liberty in Virginia, his draft of the Declaration of (American) Independence, and his founding of the University of Virginia. Cogliano devotes an entire chapter to an analysis of the epitaph, which in itself offers us insights to Cogliano's method and purpose: so obsessed was Jefferson with his legacy that as early as 1782 he prepared his first draft of the epitaph along with a sketch of the monument that was to accompany it. Just months before his death in 1826, so concerned was he with how he would be remembered, he pleaded with his old colleague and friend, James Madison, to "take care of me when dead."

Cogliano argues, as Knott had for Hamilton, that Jefferson's reputation went through a series of four stages after his death: the first lasted until the end of the Civil War; the next until the 1920s; the third until World War II; and the final

one has lasted into our own time. In fact, Cogliano's most measured focus is on the changing nature of Jefferson's fortune over the last fifty years, of how for a while he has moved from the quintessential "apostle of freedom," as FDR called him at the dedication of the Jefferson Memorial in 1943, to the *bête noire* of his hostile critics who view him as overrated as a writer, self-interestedly egomaniacal, wholly and selfishly political, and a hypocrite. This is somewhat akin to Onuf's task as well.

As a foundation for his claims, Cogliano devotes the first half of the study to an inquiry to Jefferson's perspective of history: that he saw the study of history as embodying moral and political lessons and how he himself sought to shape historical events in his own writing that would impart these lessons. Included in Cogliano's assessment of Jefferson's historical thought is an evaluation of how Jefferson himself sought to frame how future historians would judge him by arranging for the future publication of his own papers, or at least those papers that he wanted published. Above all, he wished to include his original draft of the Declaration, which he thought Congress had distorted by removing and editing his strongest words. The past is, he thought, merely a history lesson concerning human beings' passage toward republican values and republican government.

In addition, Jefferson was careful to include his own assessment of the American Revolution by crafting his own history in a partial memoir or autobiography and his later reminiscences that extend the memoir, titled "Anas," a name given to these works by commentators who followed Jefferson after his death. Here, Jefferson particularly wanted to define his genuine revolutionary credentials, especially in the years before the Revolution, thus hoping to supplant the leaders of Massachusetts, and then to demarcate his central role vis-à-vis his two most considerable enemies, Hamilton and Adams. Along with these two major documents Jefferson intended his public papers and letters to be published, thus giving his side of the story of the founding era, the first Federal government, his presidency, and retirement. As Cogliano demonstrates, this was unfortunately not to be, as his papers were scattered far and wide after his death. Only with the Princeton collection of his complete writings, beginning in 1950, has his desire been achieved. Current speculation suggests that the collection, now up to some 32 volumes, will be completed, along with the retirement series, no sooner than two decades from now.

Finally, Jefferson's lasting imprint on architecture--his famous home at Monticello--offers insights into how he was perceived by the generations of people who owned the homestead after him, going from a magnificent estate to one in near total disarray and neglect to what it is today: one of the most successful tourist attractions in the United States. For Cogliano, the house is a representation of Jefferson's reputation through history: thus, the current debate between Jefferson's supporters and opponents has even affected Monticello in that the Jefferson he himself had sought so carefully to construct is all but absent there. It is a nice place to visit, but there is no hint that Jefferson the political man ever lived there.

After a careful and fascinating review of these matters, the study turns to focus on the variety of ways in which historians have judged Jefferson. Here Cogliano like Onuf has chosen three of the most controversial areas: his relationship to Sally Hemings, his ambivalent views of slavery and emancipation, and his approach to foreign affairs during his presidency. These topics frame the

most contentious issues of the current debate over Jefferson and his legacy and reputation. How did Jefferson truly feel about Sally Hemings? And why her? What are we to say about his clearly racist views, especially in the famous Query 14 in the *Notes on the State of Virginia*, and his ideas about slavery as an institution and emancipation with inevitable expulsion of the newly freed blacks? In foreign policy, as Onuf does, he asks how did a man who started as a strict constructionist ignore the Constitution's most central provisions to purchase Louisiana from Napoleon? And why did he engage in a damnably injurious embargo for two years beginning in 1807? Unlike Onuf's objective, Cogliano's purpose is not to debate the debaters, but to elucidate the major issues in the contemporary quarrel over Jefferson's legacy. Hence, perhaps inevitably, his conclusion is somewhat simple, even uncomplicated: his last chapter title perhaps says it all, "Jefferson survives."

Well, indeed he does, as both of these books fully demonstrate. As useful and eloquent additions to Jefferson studies, they forge new ground insofar as our understanding of the ups and downs of the man and the myth continue to teach and fascinate us.

Jack Fruchtman, Jr.
Towson University

Temma Berg. *The Lives and Letters of an Eighteenth-Century Circle of Acquaintance*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. Pp. 306; appendices; bibliography; 20 illustrations; index. Hardback, \$99.95; ISBN: 0-7546-5599-7.

In the summer of 1993, at the Society of Antiquaries in London, Temma Berg found a small collection of thirty-one letters, which included two previously undiscovered letters by Charlotte Lennox. The letters were written by nine different men and women during the latter half of the eighteenth century, and were all addressed to the same person--Lady Lydia Clerke. Like Lennox, some of the nine correspondents had been remembered by history: there was a letter from Thomas Winstanley, the minister whom Dr. Johnson turned to for comfort when he was dying; and there were two letters from Susannah Dobson, writer, translator and learned lady, who warranted an entry in the *DNB*, and who appears to have modeled her somewhat breathless and "philosophical" epistolary style on that of Elizabeth Montagu, whom she admired. Other correspondents were people long forgotten: some Clerkes, a farming family in Essex into which Lydia had married; and some Braithwaites, who mixed (fairly unsuccessfully) with dukes, duchesses and princes in London. All these people had written letters to Lady Lydia; but there was no letter from Lady Lydia herself. She figured only as an absent and mysterious center, and as a cypher. For though all these letters addressed to Lydia obviously speak to crises or turning points, they do so in that obscurely allusive manner of letter writers who are not willing to be understood by any public which, as Derrida has pointed out, makes a letter "illegible."

Thanks to Berg, the letters are no longer illegible. Berg has added to each reprinted letter, not only an analysis and explanation of the letter itself, but a great deal of information about each letter writer, which she unearthed in obscure official

documents, diaries, newspaper clipping and in the letters of contemporaries. This information sheds further light on the letter/s. Because she sought above all the "ghosts" of the people behind the letters, Berg allows each cluster of letter analysis, context, and ghost to stand alone. The letters and letter writers are related each to each, principally in Berg's introduction. Here she explains that, other than Lennox and Dobson, the letter writers were loosely connected through marriage as well as through friendships of sorts, and thus formed what she calls in her title, a circle of acquaintance. Berg also argues that, arranged in the series in which she has placed them, the letters tell two novel-like stories: one about Lady Lydia's unhappy marriage, and one about her god-daughter, Sylvia Brathwaite's, courtship and equally unhappy marriage. I think there is a third story in the letters-- about female friendships, and the complex, sometimes uneasy, relations among women who can (as Berg points out) also be seen as literary types: the ingenue, the unhappy wife, the learned-lady whose ambiguous sexuality makes Lydia uncomfortable, the lonely spinster, the impoverished writer.

Glimpses of such stories make this book a thoroughly good read. But I think the interest of Berg's book goes far beyond this. First, Berg has given us our first real sight of Charlotte Lennox in a nuanced social circle, and allowed us to get to know her friends and acquaintance, and see how she related to them. Before Berg, we knew Lennox as the woman who was crowned with a laurel wreath by Samuel Johnson in a tavern when he was particularly merry and as the woman whom the Bluestockings dismissed as vulgar and as having dirty finger nails. But here we see Lennox's generosity, her concern and willingness to help other women, her admirable lack of envy, her love for her children--and the delicacy shown by a woman who has known too many slights. Another major point of interest emerges as soon as this book is read alongside Sarah Prescott's *Women, Authorship and Literary Culture* (2003), which showed, among other things, that women writers depended on patrons and their circles to establish themselves in the literary culture and make their mark. Though Lennox got patronage in the form of a subscription from Lady Lydia when the latter was back in the money, the circle of acquaintance that Berg has retrieved from oblivion here is a far more open circle than those that we have learned about from Prescott and depends far less on maintaining the proper moral pose. Perhaps because of its absent center, or perhaps because this circle is on the margins if we think of Lennox as part of Dr. Johnson's literary circle, what comes to the fore in Berg's juxtaposition of discontinuous letters contextualized by their ghostly writers is how many other circles each of these letter writers inhabited, and how circles of acquaintances overlapped. The ghosts of people invoke other ghosts. Susannah Dobson, for instance, was acquainted with Hester Thrale, Fanny Burney and Elizabeth Inchbald, and they with her. The fact that each of the latter bothered to record their dislike of Dobson suggests that they were obliged to see her rather more than they wished. Sylvia Brathwaite was courted by Banastre Tarleton, who then became Mary "Perdita" Robinson's long time lover (to Sylvia's annoyance; she wanted him herself), while Winstanley was acquainted with Dr. Johnson, as Lennox was. And so on.

Equally striking in this volume is the sheer epistolary reach of a woman living in the depths of the country or in a provincial town, as Ann Clerke and Lady Lydia did. This too was a matter of acquaintance, albeit of a different sort. Through

a Dobson or a Lennox, these women were acquainted with the London literary world; through a Sylvia Brathwaite, with intrigues at court, as well as with men like Tarleton who had just returned from the war in America. Through a brother or brother in law, like Charles Clerke who sailed the world with Captain Cook, they were acquainted with the maritime world of discovery complete with tales of cannibals and of India or Maori, as well as with creaking and unseaworthy ships. Through a brother and husband, they were acquainted with the world of smugglers in which these family members at times participated, and with the efforts and intrigues of men seeking desperately to make or mend their fortune at sea or in the colonies. It is all really very Mansfield Park.

This is a fascinating, meticulously researched, and positively post-modern book--a Barthian series of discontinuous letters and letters writers, which can be read, organized and used in different ways and which is the more valuable for that.

Eve Bannet
University of Oklahoma

Martha Tomhave Blauvelt. *The Work of the Heart: Young Women and Emotion, 1780-1830*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2007. Pp. xi + 240; bibliography; 10 b/w illustrations; index. ISBN 978-0-8139-2597-4. Cloth, \$39.50.

The Work of the Heart is a well-researched and intelligent interdisciplinary study of the emotion work women performed in post-revolutionary American society. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of Erving Goffman and Arlie Hochschild, as well as other historians and sociologists, Blauvelt presents a complex and insightful examination of the dynamics of emotion work. She considers the ways in which expressing emotion at the end of the eighteenth century / beginning of the nineteenth became both a form of performance and a form of labor, requiring a complex negotiation of the demands of the emerging self and the emerging nation. Placing women's individual stories at the center of her analysis, Blauvelt peruses early journals and diaries for what they have to tell us about "doing gender" as well as class. Blauvelt urges us to look upon the work of emotion as real work; if we do so, she argues and I would agree, we can better understand the eighteenth-century world, where the private sphere included not only the family but also work and property, and where the domestic space could become a site of public performance.

Blauvelt studied diaries that 50 young women kept between 1780 and 1830, selecting eight for close analysis. In addition, she examined 18 diaries produced by young women in female academies. Believing that, as women aged, the emotion work they performed changed, Blauvelt divided her book into five chapters, each illuminating one aspect of women's life cycle. Chapter 1 is devoted to youthful indulgences of the imagination. Chapter 2 focuses on the academically-inclined students of the Litchfield, Connecticut Female Academy, exploring how young women managed the intersections of gentility and learnedness. Chapter 3 scrutinizes courtship; Chapter 4 the particular emotion of anger; and Chapter 5

religion, marriage, and motherhood.

Carefully considering the consequences of emotion work, Blauvelt insists on its limited transgressiveness: while emotion work fostered a sense of self, that self was subject to considerable cultural and social demands. Sensibility might offer women a mirror in which to watch themselves performing emotions but it could limit them to the prescriptions of novels and theatrical performance. Throughout her study, Blauvelt explores the ways in which sentimental novels taught late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century women how to narrate their lives. Emulating the values of such sentimental literature as *The Vicar of Wakefield*, sentimental diarists narrated the growing delicacy, sensibility, and taste of their narrators. Also, the desire to establish a republican identity conflicted with the desire for European and English luxuries, and there was a disparity between the republican desire to be spontaneous and the sentimental expressions required by the novels of the day.

In her chapter on Litchfield Female Academy, Blauvelt stresses the ways in which Sarah Pierce's institution was dedicated to the enhancement of "what historian Linda Kerber calls 'republican motherhood.'" However, like life at home, life at school had its contradictions. Although women were expected to excel academically, they were also expected to act as if academic distinction did not matter. Emphasis was on contentment and restraint. Blauvelt discerns two different emotional languages in the Academy diaries she studied: a language of official restraint and a language of inner yearnings (which was most openly revealed in friendship albums). The cost of gaining an education, Blauvelt concludes, was the contradictory work of doing femininity while simultaneously pursuing academic excellence.

In the chapter on courtship, Blauvelt continues the argument that novels tell us how to live and how to write letters, diaries, and journals, demonstrating how novels of seduction and betrayal enabled women to describe and negotiate the difficult terrain of courtship. Noting that both republican ideology and sentimental novels urged alliances based on love, Blauvelt concludes that republican ideology proved more helpful than sentiment, for it provided women with the language they needed to define and deflect "tyranny and deceit." I would argue that many eighteenth-century novels by women (and men) provided much specific advice, language, and analysis to help readers make comparisons between tyrannical men and tyrannical monarchs, gauge deceit, and avoid the lures of unworthy suitors, and might have proved more helpful to young women than the abstract arguments of distant politicians.

Blauvelt found many expressions of anger in young women's diaries. "In vivid, forthright prose, Mary Guion, Abigail May, Rachel Van Dyke, and Susan Heath demonstrate women's willingness to voice their anger during the early republic." Most often women were angered when their self-representation was at stake. Thus, those diarists with a strong sense of self were more likely to get angry. The greatest amount of anger was expressed by a young woman who knew she was dying. Blauvelt suggests that perhaps her illness liberated her from the conventions that constrained other diarists. However, as Blauvelt concludes, "anger, like sensibility, provided few solutions to real-life problems." Furthermore, anger was more often directed at other women who lacked any real power to

change themselves or society rather than at the men (husbands, fathers, sons) who were more directly the causes of their rage.

Religion, marriage, and motherhood are, according to Blauvelt, the triumvirate that disciplined sentimental young women and transformed them into sedate matrons. Domestic duties displaced reading and writing, as the Bible displaced novels. "Concepts of republican motherhood had expected women to play a key role in the religious education of their children, but Victorian ideology heightened the association of femininity and piety and made women fully responsible for the spiritual state of their families." When we read the more restrained life writings of older women, it is as if we are witnessing that transformation we always suspected but had until now not so clearly seen--the work of the vibrant young woman as she slowly turned herself into a staid matron, or, as some would have it, dwindled into a wife.

In her concluding chapter, Blauvelt speculates about the value of journal writing for women in the early republican period, the emotion work of women beyond 1830, and the ironies of prizing women's emotion work. Suggesting that while journals provided a site where emotion work could be performed and where the self could emerge (a "heightened sense of a distinctive self became the loose canon of emotion work"), she cautions us not to place too much emphasis on this possibility. Emotion work and a heightened sense of self are no substitutes for equality. Because "public transcripts resisted change," Blauvelt asserts (argues?) that we cannot place too much confidence in the emotion work of journal writing. Women were still constrained. Glancing briefly at the emotion work of Harriet Beecher Stowe and Oprah Winfrey, Blauvelt balances the achievements of Stowe against the more limited success of Winfrey. While Stowe and other antebellum women shifted emotion work from self to the larger society, and played "a significant role in constructing national feeling about . . . moral and political issues," Winfrey's emotion work is less transformative. Although Winfrey encourages her mainly female audiences, she emphasizes individual solutions rather than more encompassing social changes. As she draws to an end, Blauvelt perceptively emphasizes the ways in which emotion work (whether in the past or in the present) becomes just another example of "women's work" and bears all the usual markers: the work is invisible, natural, and inherent rather than learned and acquired; and the work is performed for others rather than to express the self. In other words, like all women's work, emotion work is "simultaneously expected, unappreciated, and underpaid."

Temma Berg
Gettysburg College

Louise Barnett, *Jonathan Swift in the Company of Women*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. Pp. 225; bibliography; frontispiece; index. ISBN: 0-19-518866-7. Cloth, c. \$65 [on Amazon].

Louise Barnett's *Jonathan Swift in the Company of Women* should effectively put to rest future speculation about Swift and his women friends as it clarifies a

multitude of errors and expectations regarding the Dean's love life. Barnett's chief contributions to Swift studies in *Jonathan Swift in the Company of Women* are the clarity with which she assesses past attempts at understanding Swift and his women friends; her ease in debunking the over-emphasis modern critics place on Swift the misogynist; and the new sharpness she brings through her own analyses of Swift's poetry and prose. Barnett's study is an interesting companion to Robert Mahony's *Jonathan Swift: The Irish Identity* (Yale 1995), as Barnett is equally attuned to Swift's overarching interest in cultivating a wide circle of friends required to fashion his desired public persona.

Much of the book's seven chapters marshal past scholarship into new contexts. There are no new women for Barnett to discover, but there is much to say about the forms and meanings of friendship between the sexes. Barnett's insight that Swift intended to "promulgate a different standard" in male-female relationships, surfaces throughout the book as she underscores Swift's struggle to protect his innermost self while maintaining deep commitments to his female friends.

Barnett's study sheds new light on Swift's bachelorhood. Labeled a misogynist, Swift in fact did not hate women, but he seems to have feared their power over him.

He was aware that too much emotionality skewed reason, and, as a result, a "self-protective impulse" led him "to retreat from love to friendship." Barnett believes the early death of Swift's father and his own failure to marry early led him to avoid anything more than scripted interactions with women. Swift's letters, such as those shared with Mary Pendarves, Mrs. Delany, exemplify how he could flirt with a woman when he had the comfort of knowing that he probably would not see her often, if at all. For him, corresponding with women who respected him was more playful and a relief, no doubt, from the pressures of increasing ill health and his clerical duties. In addition, his circle of women provided a venue to further his public reputation as a social commentator, satirist, and Irish patriot.

Swift approached his women friends as Crusoe did Friday, if his letters are indicative of his true feelings. As Barnett observes, he was older than all his female friends, a clergyman, and a political spokesman as "renown as the prime minister of England." He was thereby safely shielded from any improprieties, and he used his position to teach those young women who lacked proper taste and education as a father or a colonizer would educate his family or subjects. Barnett wryly notes: "It hardly seems accidental that he was drawn to the company of women much younger than himself, who would most certainly be impressed by his formidable intellect and wit, not to mention his renown."

Though she addresses Swift's misogyny, real and implied, Barnett's chapter on "Maternity" is noteworthy in that she traces how mothers are "strikingly absent" in his belletristic works and his letters, and Barnett shows how he dealt with those women who had only domestic news to share. Swift was no sentimentalist, and he clearly lost patience with Abigail Masham, who shared her anxieties over her son's lengthy illness with Swift. He cautioned other mothers not to spoil children with too much attention or affection. He often replied to their stories of concern with variations on his remarks to his cousin, Mrs. Whiteway, "I pity you and your family, and I heartily pray for both," followed by "I pity myself" as he is forced to hear the sad news that her son is dying. Reading the excerpts from his letters to mothers, it is clear that Barnett is right in concluding that his own early life, during

which he was sent by his mother to live with a relative, shaped him as one who'd avoid overt displays of maternal love, even when presented second-hand in letters.

Swift was also impatient with women's interests in fashion and their narrow topics of conversation, resulting from their lack of education. One of the strong assessments Barnett makes in her discussion of Swift and misogyny is that he strove to remake women into creatures suitable to be in the company of men, but not to masculinize them to the point where their femininity would be lost.

In the final chapter of the book, Barnett addresses "Swift and Women Critics." While she has shown some of the shortcomings in earlier readings of Swift in each chapter, the focus here is to review the role of women critics in shaping Swift's reputation. Barnett covers 19th- to 21st-century female critics, honing in on the influential scholarship of Ruth Salvaggio and Laura Brown. (She also touches on Helen Vendler, Felicity Nussbaum and Carol Barash, and Nora Crowe Jaffe). Barnett critiques feminist and post-colonial readings of Swift's friendships with women and his descriptions of women's bodies to show how these critics are forced to adopt untenable positions because of the approaches to texts that they pursue.

Barnett's "Conclusion" presents a summary of Swift's attitudes towards the women in his life. He liked women and had many female friends with whom he visited and corresponded. Early in his life, he had a passionate love for one woman, and, when that relationship with Jane Waring failed, he began to consider women flawed by their own faults and by those imposed upon them. He appeared to possess a clear vision of the differences between the sexes, both physically and intellectually. Barnett states he would not have seen himself as a misogynist in pointing up that women were "inferior," yet, why he departed from stereotypes to obsess about women's "mental confusion, frightening sexuality, disgusting physicality, and disease" is "a matter of conjecture" given that he had lifelong friendships *and* perplexing abhorrence (at least in print) of the women whose indispensable company he gladly kept.

Beverly Schneller
Millersville University

H. J. Jackson. *Romantic Readers: The Evidence of Marginalia*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005. Pp. xvii + 366; bibliographies [325-52]; 30 illustrations; index. ISBN: 0-300-10785-4. Hardcover, \$37.

Reading H. J. Jackson's *Romantic Readers*, it is nearly impossible not to feel self-conscious about one's own habits of making marginal notes. At some points, I found myself marking passages and then thinking about what my marginal gestures might signal to another reader, while at other moments I would pause before making a note, wondering whether or not my markings were consistent. I never confused myself with William Blake, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, or Hester Lynch Thrale Piozzi. Jackson does a compelling job of casting these writers as idiosyncratic annotators, whose marginalia engage the material and intellectual apparatuses of the books they are reading in ways that range from arresting to passive, and in moods that might be vehement, angry, and polemical or social,

friendly, and acquiescent—and everything in between. Still, I have never thought so much about my material interactions with a book while reading it. What is the relationship between a marginal note and the amount of whitespace available? Do marginal notations change with the subject matter of a particular book, with the reader's perceived relationship with the author, or with the reader's perceptions of sociability and posterity? Which gestures are constant for an annotator, and which gestures change in relation to textual and extra-textual variables?

Jackson asks variations on these questions in her introduction, and she returns to them in her conclusion by asking: "What does the evidence of marginalia have to contribute to the history of reading in Britain?" and "What does the evidence reveal about the history of marginalia? About actual readers? About the history of reading in general?" (299). Here Jackson neatly folds together two very different things: the history of reading and the history of specific readers. This dual-natured version of history is the subject of Jackson's book, and she recognizes how precarious a subject it is. She never seems to forget how highly individualized reading practices are, and she remains attuned to individual differences as she searches for larger structural and theoretical patterns in reading and writing marginalia. Her discussions of individual readers are drawn from a wide range of disciplines, as well as from a vast continuum of political, gendered, social, and ideological positions. This breadth reminds us that there are many interpenetrating layers that constitute literary skills, social practices, and the history of reading.

In some ways, Jackson extends the concerns about habits of reading, writing, and literacy that Heidi Brayman Hackel, Adam Fox, Jacqueline Pearson, and Margaret Spufford, among others, have brought to the fore in studies of early modern England. Obviously the historical period that Jackson takes on differs materially from the early modern period. In her fascinating and informative introduction, Jackson gives clear material evidence about why marginalia produced from 1790 to 1830 can and should be read as a fundamental part of the history of reading and the history of the book. She reconstructs the reading environment of the times, deftly mixing notes on large-scale issues of education and literacy, copyright laws, material availability of paper and printed books, and processes related to bookbinding and stereotyping with descriptions of individual readers' relationships with their books—a methodology that she retains (always effectively) throughout *Romantic Readers*.

Like several other recent contributions to the field of book history—most notably Margaret J. M. Ezell's *Social Authorship and the Advent of Print* (1999), George L. Justice and Nathan Tinker's *Women's Writing and the Circulation of Ideas* (2002), and Brayman Hackel's *Reading Material in Early Modern England* (2005)—*Romantic Readers* includes a variety of analogies between eighteenth-century reading habits and contemporary ones. She remarks that people read together "in the absence of radio, television, CDs, movies, and the Internet" (9), that printers were as common "as dry cleaners today" (20), that incorrect references added to law books would have been "as useless as an inaccurate URL on the Internet today" (102), and that we still "do this [make copies of texts] with photocopies" (119). These examples effectively nudge readers to think about their approaches to reading and writing in books while simultaneously helping to defamiliarize a process that is intimate to us all by pointing up how reading and

writing have changed over the last two hundred years.

But Jackson's comparisons often seem more problematic than helpful. One slight flaw in Jackson's approach is that she makes what seem like some large overgeneralizations about our contemporary writing practices. This would not be a major problem if she only made one or two offhand references to our own habits of writing in books, but she expends a large amount of energy comparing and contrasting eighteenth-century practices with twenty-first-century ones. Jackson wonders if Coleridge wrote his marginalia "like a person carrying on a cellphone in a public space, did he not much care what was overheard or not?" (268). However, throughout *Romantic Readers* she presents the mindset of an annotator as far too complex and historically, materially, and culturally contingent to be understood through easy analogies like this one.

Several times Jackson mentions that readers today have internalized the prohibition against writing in books, making our marginalia a "private aberration" (116), and she concludes by suggesting that "we treat our own notes in books as secret if not shameful" (305). Her assessment, while perhaps true of most private reading acts (and certainly of reading library books), discounts the modern use of marginalia as a pedagogical tool. Many modern teachers grade students on their underlining and marginalia; markings in the book are, in such a context, a way of making private reading publicly quantifiable and assessable. Jackson made a similar point in the final chapter of her first book on this topic, *Marginalia: Readers Writing in Books* (2001). She ends that book by questioning how, why, and whether it is transgressive to write in books—a point that is interesting but that, in both books, somewhat oversimplifies the many ways that individuals approach marginalia. Writing in the margins is never simply right or wrong. Jackson proves this with her examples, but in some of her assessments she seems to rely on organizing principles that minimize variance.

Romantic Readers is not, however, a study of modern marginalia or an analysis of the ethics of writing in the margins of printed texts. Where Jackson presents documentary evidence about Romantic marginalia she is at her best. Jackson has a tremendous command of the marginalia of the period, and her depth of knowledge allows her to talk about the marginalia of a huge number of authors (some famous, others anonymous, and some in between) with confidence, grace, and humor. Throughout her expansive yet clear and carefully documented study, Jackson uses a series of case studies, introduced by a larger history of reading and punctuated with many broader comments on the psychology and sociology of reading during the period from 1790-1830. She divides the book into four major chapters—"Mundane Marginalia," "Socializing with Books," "Custodians to Posterity," and "The Reading Mind"—that expand on theoretical points by drawing together many specific examples of similar strategies of annotation, and she ends with two bibliographies. The first of these, a "Bibliography of Books with Manuscript Notes," provides evidence of how exhaustive Jackson's work is. She has mined archives for these marginalia. In her descriptions of annotators and the marginalia that they have left behind, Jackson adds richness to books and shows that they are far more than objects. For annotators, books were often friends and companions; many of the readers who Jackson describes debated with friends, enemies, and authors they never met.

Among literary figures, Jackson draws distinctions between social annotators like Horace Walpole and Piozzi, whose books "convey an impression of the age through gossip and anecdote" (180), and Blake, who is "confident, dogmatic, defiant" in marginal notes that follow a "self-imposed discipline with a fixed method and clear goals" (155). She analyzes marginalia that gives us further insight into major debates (for example, Blake versus Joshua Reynolds & Edmund Burke, and Percy Bysshe Shelley versus William Godwin), but she never privileges informative marginalia and consistently returns to the idea that notations in books suggest liminal zones of contact: men and women talk to their books in ways that embody various aspects of their personalities, some of which they could or would not publicly express but others that they carefully crafted for potential readers of their books and the marginalia in them.

The margins did not belong exclusively to published authors, though, and Jackson does a remarkable job of highlighting what we can learn from the margins of texts about botany, law, and medicine that were owned by anonymous, unknown, "common readers." Painstaking illustrations and interpretations of the marginalia left behind by the Classicist Charles Burney, the "annotating physician" Philip MacDermott (70), and the naturalist James Edward Smith lead Jackson to draw the following conclusion early in *Romantic Readers*: "In their everyday lives, readers of the Romantic period were accustomed to work with the books they had as schoolbooks and then in their jobs and avocations. 'With' is the operative word; annotators tended to behave as contributors" (119). Jackson thus showcases how marginalia helped readers break down boundaries and become active participants in their texts; readers' contributions added illustrative examples, visual features, and other details that problematized, challenged, or supported and expanded the material on the printed page.

Readers will leave Jackson's book with a new appreciation for the individual experience of reading, a wider understanding of patterns of reading (and writing in) books, and a tremendous sense of how multidimensional any attempt to construct "The Reader" must be. Jackson has produced a remarkable study that encourages us to think about how habits of reading—idiolectic, individual, and inconsistent as they may be—should be thought of as a key component of our understanding of the history of reading and the history of the book.

Emily Smith
Lawrence University

Angela Vietto. *Women and Authorship in Revolutionary America*. Aldershot, Hampshire, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005. Pp.ix + 147; bibliography; index. ISBN 07546-5338-2. Cloth, \$89.95

Most of the readers of the *Intelligencer* are keenly aware of effects of the critical revolution in scholarship, particularly that of feminist criticism, on English eighteenth-century studies; fewer may be aware of the parallel changes in American eighteenth-century studies. Over the last two decades, that period of American literature has been revived by the work of a variety of scholars. Among the most

significant is Cathy Davidson's *Revolution and the Word: The Rise of the Novel in America* (1986), a ground-breaking revisiting of early American novel. Although intended to treat all pre-nineteenth-century novelists, Davidson's book has had the greatest impact on the study of American women novelists. Two important texts, Grantland Rice's *The Transformation of Authorship in America* (1993) and Michael Warner's *The Letters of the Republic* (1990), set the limits of the debate about the role of public discourse and commercial authorship during the American revolution. Expanding the context of literary production, David Shield's *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America* (1997) demonstrated the existence of a vibrant culture of manuscript circulation.

Examining the premises established by these pillars of contemporary scholarship, Angela Vietto's *Women and Authorship in Revolutionary America* has an ambitious project: "to complicate and challenge a number of critical commonplaces that arise from these studies" about women and their literary activity. In particular, this 123-page volume challenges the scholarship that follows the "narrative of American literary history that presents the novel as women's entrée into authorship" as well as the scholarship that follows "dichotomized views of civic and commercial authorship" and "manuscript and print cultures." Further, she wishes to remove the "persistent sense" left by some feminist scholarship "that women of letters constantly struggled against a literary world that begrudged them entrance based on their gender" (1). Vietto hopes to help her reader to see American women's literary society in its own cultural terms.

Vietto begins by establishing that American women writers of the Revolutionary period found a way to become writers within the constraints of their gendered existence. According to Vietto, while constrained by the strictures of their place and time, women writers had developed a strategy for authorship based on the community model illustrated in Eliza Haywood's *Female Spectator*, one of the most widely read and distributed pieces of the century. Vietto denominates this strategy of women's networks "literary sorority" and records a variety of American examples. Her first chapter explores literary correspondence such as Mercy Otis Warren's correspondence with English historian Catherine Macaulay, and mentoring such as the manuscript circulation among the Delaware Valley women's circle (documented by Carla Mulford and Susan Stabile) as forms of female networks. In particular, manuscript circulation provided audience and criticism as well as possible ways to get into the public sphere of print. Sometimes, as in the case of Mercy Otis Warren's letter to her son, another sister in the literary sorority (in Otis's case Abigail Adams) could endorse a work in a manner that would result in notice being paid to the work by important men and in eventual publication. Thus, Vietto suggests, there was a methodology of authorship practiced within the bounds of women's spheres.

One precept of the American Revolution was that, if all citizens were part of the government, then all citizens should strive to practice civic virtue: this Revolutionary concept was transmuted into a role for women in the new society--known as Republican motherhood. As mothers of the republic, women were granted some right to public status. As Benjamin Rush, physician, friend of the Revolution, and author of *Thoughts on Female Education*, would remark: "The equal share that every citizen has in the liberty and the possible share he may have

in the government of our country, make it necessary that our ladies should be qualified to a certain degree by a peculiar and suitable education, to concur in instructing their sons in the principles of liberty and government" (78).

Not only did republican motherhood allow women a public voice, Vietto claims, but also "offered women the unexpected opportunity to engage in the definition of masculinity" (37). Although some scholars treat republican motherhood as a conservative restraint on women's political power, Vietto argues that, by performing their roles as mothers, authors such as Warren and Martha Ramsay found a platform that allowed their writings to find their way into print.

One of the important delimiters of women's sphere was the perceived mandate of biology based on women's physical inadequacy, a paradigm most often expressed by the image of the warrior. Yet the American Revolution provided another unusual occasion for women to confound the notion of female subordination. Since the American Revolution required the participation of all ranks and classes of Americans to ensure their success in the war, this national imperative led both to actual demonstrations of women's warlike prowess and audience acceptance of examples of such prowess. Chief among these, according to Vietto, are the narrative and performances of Deborah Sampson, who served a soldier during the American Revolution, and the celebrations in print of Charlotte Corday's assassination of Jean-Paul Marat, architect of the French Revolution. Vietto demonstrates that the reception of these acts marked the point at which the readership was acclimated to accept a disruption in gender expectations.

Despite the generally dim view of historians about the attention paid to the question of women's rights during the Revolutionary era, Vietto uncovers a contemporary debate about the extension of democracy to include women: discussions of women's civic status can be found in the writings of men, such as James Otis, brother of Mercy Otis Warren, and Charles Brockden Brown. In addition, women themselves took part in the debate: Warren's works offer striking examples of women who are models of disinterested public virtue. However, as Vietto concludes, paradox defined women's activity: "Seeking to display their civic interests in print and for a wide audience, women minimized their political independent thought and invoked conservative ideals to justify moving beyond those ideals" (88)

The ultimate demonstration of the book's thesis is Vietto's study of the careers of three women writers of the period: Judith Sargent Murray; Mercy Otis Warren; and Sarah Wentworth Morton. Vietto argues that scholars need new ways of thinking about the nature of career, particularly eschewing modern concepts of commercial success, and of considering the "microhistorical" factors that influence authorship. The career of each of the writers challenges conventional descriptions of American women's writing: Murray published widely and demonstrated an ability to manipulate gender conventions; best known because of the political nature of her poetry, prose and plays, Warren succeeded in part due to the American need for propaganda; and Morton had a sustained career during which she carefully shifted her authorial stance to adapt to the changing conventions of each period. Their careers suggest that there were many avenues to authorship and that women were writing and sometimes flourishing despite the conventions of women's sphere.

With Catherine Belsey's strictures against closure as her epilogue, Vietto reaffirms her goal to create discussion, to engender interest, and to spark debate. She has certainly succeeded at balancing the *sine qua non* of literary propositions--that texts may be read through the centuries--with educating readers about how texts operate in a peculiar culture environment that affects the way they are read. While theories that find reflections of modern social formulations in older texts can bring new understandings of the past, often the modern interpretation can create a penumbra of misunderstandings. This work attempts to shed light on those dark areas created by recent scholarship on authorship and women's roles. The book is particularly useful in its consideration of a variety of genres such as popular religious tracts, histories, and compendia, and of little known authors such as Hannah Adams, Sarah Pogson Smith and Eunice Smith. It will, as the author hoped, create interest and debate among American eighteenth-century scholars.

Doreen Alvarez Saar
Drexel University

Notes from Newark

So there we were, Anne and I, sitting in the Philadelphia airport, waiting for our 3:30 US Airways flight due to take off in two hours. We were going to Boston where we would change to Aer Lingus for a flight to Limerick in Ireland to visit my cousin, who's been diagnosed with a dreadful disease, ALS. Our ultimate destination was Montpellier, via Air France from Dublin. In Boston we were scheduled to have somewhere near a 2 or 2 ½ hour wait. After about an hour and a half, a woman seated near us returned from the departure board where she discovered that US Airways had surreptitiously changed the departure time of the flight to 3:50. After that time had gone by we heard on the loudspeaker that we had to go to a different gate, where our plane had been waiting for hours. Once there, another message told us that we couldn't begin boarding because the plane had gotten too hot and had to be cooled off. Then it was announced that boarding would begin when they could find the crew! The crew finally showed up, and it was nearly 5 p.m. when we began to taxi. What a history of deceptions, without a single word of apology or even explanation: apparently that's business as usual for US Airways. We were able to rush to our plane and get on board on time, but our luggage didn't make it. The Aer Lingus flight, on the other hand, left and arrived on time, offered us little packages to carry us over for a day, and delivered the luggage to our cousin's house the next morning. A Tale of Two Airlines, or rather three: Air France was just as prompt as Aer Lingus, on both the Dublin-Montpellier and Montpellier-Philadelphia legs (with change of plane in Charles de Gaulle). The last flight, to Philadelphia, left Paris about a half hour late, a delay that was both explained (weekend following 14 July, airport swamped with travelers) and apologized for. And the meal was terrific.

So was our stay in Montpellier, located in the south of France just a few kilometers from the Mediterranean. Warm days, cool evenings. A contrast from Ireland, which like Britain at that time was suffering through a cold and very rainy four or five week period, with high temperatures about 50 degrees. Bonnie Robb

stayed in the same hotel as we did, along with Beatrice Fink, Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink and Roger Fechner, among others. Breakfast was always a lively time.

Before registration began on opening day we went to the Musée Fabre to take in the exhibit "L'Impressionisme de France et d'Etats-Unis," a glorious event. After lunch we returned to see the museum's own collections, which were extraordinary in their own right. On my entry stub was a brilliant early 18th-century painting by Jean Ranc, "Vertumne et Pomone," which as it turned out was also featured on the cover of the 178-page program, including 16 pages of beautiful illustrations. At registration, what should I see but bright orange cloth attaché cases! Orange was the official color of the meeting! I thanked an organizer, Claude Lauriol, for having chosen the color in my honor. He seemed a bit bemused by this, but said something polite in return. For a week, in any case, anywhere we went in town we could see people with orange on them, a beautiful sight.

Those who followed the evolution of the congress on the pages of C18-L will recall the many frustrations and the anger of people who were simply trying to navigate the program. I was among these people, but I did eventually realize that once the organizing committee got their act together they had produced a complex document that should provide the basis for the next (2011 Graz, Austria) congress's organizing committee. I think the problem was that they knew where they wanted to go with the program but announced their intentions too early. For example, I had submitted my proposal, electronically as apparently required, by e-mail; however, what the organizers meant but did not say in English or in French was that submissions were to be made on a yet-to-be-released form on the web site. They explained this to me when in frustration I wrote to them, with copies of my proposal and their acceptance. They then asked me to resubmit the proposal online, using the form provided. When I did that, everything went according to plan. They also encouraged people to sign up for various tours and activities before letting anyone know when they would be speaking. In the absence of a directory of speakers, I discovered the day and time of my own session only because I was inexplicably listed as its organizer, since they had named me chair. A directory of this sort would be very useful in the future. And, incidentally, I'm not sure that most organizing groups would have undertaken this monumental electronic task. The French should be proud of having done it and of having carried it off so well once everything began to work properly.

We found the staff at the Corum, a huge convention center that housed all the meetings, to be helpful and courteous whenever we had to interact with them. The book exhibits were full and exciting (my most recent book was there, which was the cause of excitement to me!) and peruse. Between the two rows of stands was a poster session display: instead of reading papers, some participants created a series of posters that constituted their presentations. While poster presentations are common in scientific meetings, I've never seen one in meetings like ours.

There were live concerts on several days. Once, we came a trifle late and were ushered into an adjacent and identical room, with superb acoustics and a huge screen on which the quartet was projected as they were playing. The performers and the audience were not disturbed, and we enjoyed the music almost as if we were next door. One concert was held outdoors in connection with an "Apéritif dînatoire" (a reception with heavy hors d'oeuvres) on an evening that became rather

chilly because of the sea breeze. It was cold enough to chase Max Novak and his wife back to the hotel. We saw Brycchan Carey pull a sweater out of his backpack. "I live in a place [England] with a maritime climate, so I'm always prepared," he said. We took one day off to travel to Sète, where both Georges Brassens and Paul Valéry are buried in different cemeteries, to visit some of the descendants of my poet, Le Franc de Pompignan. On Saturday, we went to La Grande Motte to visit our friends Jean and Claude Tort, whom I had met in 1955 when I was an assistant d'anglais in Valence. Both are beachside communities. And on several occasions we wandered about in the company of Bonnie Robb and Beverly Jerold-Seiffert when dinner time came. We had a memorable meal, also quite at random, one evening when we went out with the Ibero-Americans, Peggy Bonds, Rebecca Haidt, Elizabeth Lewis, Enid Valle, Ana Rueda and many others, 15 to 20 in all.

I heard Bonnie Robb speaking about Religion and Antiphilosophy in one of Mme de Genlis's works, my colleague from my Milwaukee days Sylvie Romanowski speaking on Alexander von Humboldt's "Tableau physique des Andes et pays voisins," and my co-author of an article on Voltaire's *Micromégas* Edwin Van Meerkerk speaking on changing editorial strategies in 18th-century periodicals. This took some dashing about from one room to another, and some fortuitous scheduling. I was also able to hear Dale Scott and Rebecca Haidt speak on different aspects of Feijoo's work (if you don't know Feijoo, you're missing something important!). At a plenary session Michel Blay gave a wonderful talk about a neglected French scientist of the time, Fontenelle. I was unable to attend a panel of the Ibero-Americans because my own session, "Musique: Théories et Pratiques" took place at the same time.

As the chair of a session with four speakers, I asked my panel to limit their talk to 15 minutes, and set the example (as I was listed as the first speaker) by coming in at 13 minutes. My topic was the moral opera, a genre created by Le Franc de Pompignan, who wrote five operas in this genre, only one of which was performed. Béatrice Ferrier's paper dealt with two unperformed operas by Voltaire. Claude Knepper spoke on the astronomer Jérôme de Lalande's interest in musical theory, and Solveig Serre finished the papers with discussion of the Académie royale de musique (that is, the Opéra) in the 18th century. A good session, held together by a succession of themes on a common topic. Discussion was lively here as elsewhere throughout the congress.

One other highlight was a session on music. Beverly Scheibert spoke on Diderot as the pseudonymous author of several pieces on music, quite an interesting topic to me. But when Pedro Gomes Januário spoke on the incredible reconstruction he's been doing (in scale model size) of the opera house that was destroyed in the Lisbon earthquake, and the research leading up to his vast book sure to come out one hopes soon, and Aline Gallasch-Hall's work on Carlo Reina, a castrato who sang in that ill-fated opera house, I was truly amazed. They were delighted to meet the co-editor, with John Radner, of the Lisbon Earthquake book, and each had a copy of the book from which they quoted. With this session taking place at the same time as Sharon Harrow's, I could not hear her paper, alas.

The closing plenary was a brilliant analysis of "Le Diable dans le bénitier: L'art de la diffamation 1770-1793 / The Devil in the holy water: The art of diffamation 1770-1793" given in both English and French by Robert Darnton, a

real tour de force. Another interesting feature of the congress was that the ECSSS had a session or two every single day, and their sessions were in the book as though they were special, with a different background color (a very visible dark brown) than the regular sessions, and the heading "Congrès des études écossaises." The Scots have always appreciated the help the French gave them against the English, even back in Robert Bruce's time. Even today, there are bumper stickers with the cross of St. Andrew and the word "Écosse" written, rather than "Scotland." It's nice to see that the French have not forgotten their old friends.

A great experience, this was my 11th straight Enlightenment Congress (I've missed only the first one, which took place in Geneva in 1963 when I was an impecunious graduate student). There were countless other people I met and ran into, lots of things learned, a wonderful time in the south of France.

I anticipate a similarly exhilarating experience in Atlantic City in November. My session will be one of the openers, 8:30 in the a.m. on the first day of the conference, which happens to be St. Theodore's day (not me, the real St. Theodore). I hope many of you will be alert at that hour, because Kevin Cope and Baerbel Czennia will be the other participants. You can be sure their papers will be fun and instructive; I'm not so sure about mine.

Theodore E. E. Braun

Memorial Tribute to John H. Middendorf

John Harlan Middendorf died at age 85 on 14 August after surgery for pancreatic cancer. John long taught at Columbia, before his retirement a decade or two ago, years spent finishing his edition of Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* for the Yale edition of Samuel Johnson. John's WW2 service involved translation and intelligence in the Pacific theater. Perhaps having written an M.A. thesis on Arthur Young (1947), co-authored *Manual of English Prose Composition* (Rinehart, 1956), and edited *Selections* from Goldsmith's *History of the Earth* (1977), John can't be said to have been born devoted to Samuel Johnson, but he took up the faith early. He was a protégé of James Clifford (a founder of EC/ASECS and the *Johnsonian News Letter*); John became Clifford's co-editor of the *JNL* and then succeeded him. When I took over the EC/ASECS newsletter, I modeled my *Intelligencers* on the *JNL*'s format, a half-sheet crowded with short articles and news, with little margin and relying on bold font for organizational design. John published many essays, including "Stevens and Johnson" in *Johnson and His Age*, edited by James Engell (1984); and "Ideas vs. Words: Johnson, Locke, and the Edition of Shakespeare," in *English Writers of the Eighteenth Century*, a volume Middendorf edited for Columbia in 1971, with expert essays on major figures. But most of John's scholarship over fifty years went into editing the *Lives of the Poets*. Back in 1970, within *Eighteenth-Century Studies in Honor of Donald F. Hyde*, he published "Johnson as Editor: Some Proofs of the 'Prefaces.'" John wrote in January 2005 that "since November the *Lives*--all 6000-plus pages--have been resting safely on the desk of our editor at YUP. You can imagine my relief. After all these years, I've still not adjusted to days without a daily schedule of work." He

had worked on the edition for about fifty years! John wanted to have the "index essentially complete by the time proof reaches us," but neither proofs nor index had been produced by his death 30 months later (the delay surely being related to his having finished the 3-volume MS, as he'd begun it, without a computer). One of several to whom a "Life" had been delegated, I edited the "Life of Young" (Henry Pettit had submitted an edition back in the 1970s, but it had to be redone, rules having changed, excluding Herbert Croft's authorial changes after Johnson's death, etc.). Over half a dozen years, I enjoyed John's regularly typed pep-talks and profited from his considerable guidance and hawk-eyed scrutiny of my text, introduction and apparatus. John took good care of his students and younger colleagues, too, and recently many have testified to their debt to him in the *NYT* guestbook. Dr. Ernest Gilman characterized John as a "kind and generous man, patient, unassuming," qualities Gilman found rare among NNC's grad faculty in the 1960s. John reminded Julie Peters of 18C values: "true manners, gracious good humor, judgment and gentleness," and Jenny Davidson noted how John "took great interest in the work of younger scholars." The common theme is that John Middendorf was always a gentleman scholar, faultlessly polite and precise. Also, from his letters and conversation, I was struck by his great affection for his wife, Maureen MacGrogan, and his two daughters (and grandchildren) from his first wife (d. 1983). The Yale Johnson's editorial board meets this month to select a new general editor to get the edition through the press and produce its index, etc.--JEM

News of Members

We have gained over 40 new members as a result of the conference in Atlantic City organized by **Lisa Rosner** and colleagues like **Michelle McDonald** from the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. What a jackpot! Given the focus on the Atlantic, it's no surprise that many of the new members are in diverse fields of history. **Yvonne Fabella** won a 2006-07 dissertation fellowship from the McNeil Center for Early American Studies at Penn and is this academic year an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation fellow at the Library Company of Philadelphia (her project is "Jealous Creoles and Priestesses of Venus: Gender, Race, and the Negotiation of Identity in Colonial Saint Dominque, 1763-1789." Many of our speakers have recently completed or are completing dissertations involving the Caribbean. For instance, **JoEllen DeLucia** is now an asst. prof. of English at John Jay College of CUNY, having finished her dissertation at Indiana ("Tales of Other Times': Scotland's Past and Women's Future in 18C British Writing"). **Christian Koot**, formerly in Delaware's Ph.D. program in history and a visiting professor at Colgate, is working on 17C and 18C trade between the Caribbean and New York City. Dr. **Robert D. Hicks** of Loxodrome Consultants is currently organizing for the Chemical Heritage Foundation a 2008 exhibition in Philadelphia on the history of chemical and molecular sciences. A number of the graduate students have already accomplished a good deal, as **Anna Foy**, one of the coordinators of the "18C and Romantics Reading Group" at Penn; **Rebecca Lush**, the winner of a "Distinguished Teaching" award for TAs at Maryland; **Anne Pushkal**, who is finishing or has finished at dissertation in colonial Latin American history at Penn

is working at Stockton; and **Lisa Sibbett** presented a paper on poetic authority in Lady Mary Wortley Montagu (her *Turkish Correspondence*) and Alexander Pope at the June 2007 British Women Writers Conference. Our thanks to **April Langley**, Asso. Professor of English at Missouri, who's bringing several graduate students with her to a session she organized. Many of the graduate students are doubly engaged, as **Gabriel Cervantes**, who teaches at Penn while pursuing his Ph.D. at Princeton, and **Laura Yoo**, who teaches at Howard Community College while pursuing hers at Maryland. In 2005-06, while working on his dissertation., **Kyle Roberts** had a Reese Fellowship at the American Antiquarian Society to work on religious periodicals and biographies in New York, and this year enjoys AAS's Hency post-dissertation fellowship for converting his dissertation to a book ("Evangelical Gotham: Popular Religious Beliefs in NYC, 1783-1845"). **Heather Kopelson**, who completed her dissertation this year at Iowa, presented "'Transgressing the Law of God and Man': Regulating Sexual Intimacy in 17C Bermuda" at the annual Omohundro Institute's conference this June and she will speak next June on related research on sexuality and Bermuda at the conference on Gender and Slavery in Early America at the Univ. of Minnesota. Quite a few of the new members have recently taken professorships at new schools, as **Marisa Huerta**, who went from Brown to the University of Texas in San Antonio. **Arne Bialuschewski** has a book recently published on piracy. **Michael Dorn**, a cultural geographer, teaches in Urban Education at Temple while working, too, in its Institute on Disabilities. **Jeroen van den Hurk**, born in the Netherlands and granted his M.A. from Utrecht, took his Ph.D. in art history last year from Delaware and is now working in Historic Preservation at the Univ. of Kentucky. Jeroen's dissertation ("Imagining New Netherland: Origins and Survival of Netherlandic Architecture in Old New York") was awarded the New Netherland Institute's Hendricks MS Award for the best new study of the Dutch colonial experience in North America. **Frieda Koeninger** coordinates Sam Houston State U.'s field school in Puebla. **Michelle McDonald**, a co-chair of our conference, took his Ph.D. in history at Michigan and then had a post-doc at the Harvard Business School in 2005-06. Since joining Stockton last fall, she's been working on a book "using the history of the coffee industry to understand the place of Caribbean in early American economic development." She has received awards from the Fulbright Foundation, McNeil Center, and Winterthur, and has published in *WMQ* and *PMHB*, and has an essay forthcoming in "Food and Globalization: Consumption, Markets and Politics in the Modern World" (Palgrave, 2008). The distinguished historian of Scotland, **Ned Landsman** of Stony Brook, has also joined our ranks, and **Robert Markley** of Illinois, who gave our plenary a few years back and has long co-edited *The Eighteen Century*, returns to us.

Special thanks go to our President, **Kevin Berland**, for setting up the e-discussion list **ECASECS-L@lists.psu.edu**--this is the sort of list where any message is directed to all on the list. If you don't want to get messages, don't tell the whole list but send the message "SIGNOFF ECASECS-L" to **LISTSERV@LISTS.PSU.EDU** or sign off at the "subscriber's corner" at <http://lists.psu.edu/>. Perhaps some of what has been in the *Intelligencer*, like the directory, will be distributed cheaply and kept up-to-date via the listserve. We also thank **Leland Peterson**, founder of the EC/ASECS newsletter, for setting up a

complete run of the newsletter (1978-2007) at Old Dominion University Library.

Marcia Epstein Allentuck will give a plenary lecture on Rita Levi-Montalcini, the Nobel Prize winner in physiology, to the History of Science Society at its November meeting in Baltimore. **Eve Bannett's** "Quixotes, Imitations, and Transatlantic Genres" appears in this past summer's *ECS*. We wish decades of happiness to **Jerry Beasley** and his wife Fleda upon their move this month to Traverse City, Michigan--that's "retiring from Delaware," though Jerry will miss colleagues at Delaware, as will Fleda, who resigns her position as the state's Poet Laureate. In noting **Nandini Bhattacharya's** *Slavery, Colonialism, and Connoisseurship: Gender and 18C Literary Transnationalism* (Ashgate, 2006), I placed her at Texas Tech, but she's at Texas A & M. Her look at changes in taste and attitudes treats James Cobb, Charles Colman, Jr., Richard Brinsley Sheridan, and Phillis Wheatley. **Erik Bond** spoke on "Fielding's *Tom Thumb* and the Tragedy of Literary Criticism" at ASECS. This year Ohio State UP publishes Erik's *Reading London: Urban Speculation and Imaginative Government in 18C Literature*. Assisted by a Huntington fellowship, **O M Brack** spent the summer working at that library on his edition of John Hawkins' biography of Samuel Johnson for Georgia Univ. Press, collaborating with Tom Kaminski on the three-volume Yale Johnson edition of the Parliamentary Debates (see his note above), and working towards the Huntington's exhibition on SJ, planned for May-Sept. 2009. **Ted Braun** is the co-editor of *Lumières Voilées*, a selection of diverse works by Le Franc de Pompignan (1709-1784), published this year and reviewed for our January issue by **Robert Frail**. Ted writes that the editors provide a general intro, bibliography, and introductory remarks to each section of the book (*Poésies sacrées*, the tragedy *Didon*, legal & fiscal writings, Anti-philosophical writings, and religious and secular verse). **Brycchan Carey's** "John Wesley's *Thoughts upon Slavery* and the Language of the Heart" appears in a strong issue of *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* devoted to a 2003 tercentenary conference on Wesley (85, nos. 2-3 ["2003" but c. 2005], 269-84). Brycchan is chairing the program for the BSECS conference in January.

AMS Press this month published Volume 29 of the *ECCB* (for 2003), which is dedicated to former editor Jim Springer Borck: **Kevin Cope** and Bob Leitz were its general editors; **Bärbel Czennia** compiled Pacific Cultures material and indexed the volume; **Henry Fulton** contributed to the coverage of religion, and three members compiled and edited sections: **Gloria Eive** (Fine Arts), **Jim May** (print culture and bibliography), and **David Ventura** (Philosophy, science & religion). **Andrew Curran** last year published "Imagines l'Afrique au siècle des Lumières" in *Le problème de l'Alterité dans la culture européenne* (Naples: Bibliopolis) and "Diderot and the *Encyclopédie's* Construction of the Black African" in *SVEC* 2006: 9. **Bärbel Czennia** and **Peter Sabor** presented papers at the "Fourth James Smith Noel Symposium" (sponsored by LSU Shreveport's Noel Collection, organized by Curator Robert Leitz and devoted this year to "Celebrity: The Idiom of the Modern Era"). Bärbel has moved from Göttingen to Louisiana, taking a professorship at McNeese State U. She spoke at the David Nichol Smith Conference in Dunedin on "The Many Deaths of a British Mariner: From Anna Seward's 'Elegy on Captain Cook' to Robert Sullivan's 'Captain Cook in the Underworld.'" Besides the *ECCB*, **Gloria Eive** has contributed to *Selected*

Music for Stringed Instruments by Pietro Nardini and Giovanni Francesco Giuliani (she researches 17C-19C Italian instrumental music, as the violin school of Paolo Alberghi [1716-1785] and the musical activities in the Romagna). This spring Gloria spoke on "Goldoni, Galuppi, and 'Dramma Giocoso'" at SCSECS and "Coffee and Chocolate Ceremonies in Court and Chapel" at ASECS, and last year in Faenza, Italy, she gave the keynote lecture ("Sarti and Mozart") at the Giornata Internazionale di Studi: "Mozart e i suoi contemporanei." **Jan Fergus's** long-researched study *Provincial Readers in 18C England* was published early this summer by OUP ("2006"; ISBN 0199297827). A promised review will tell us about its detailed survey employing the records of the Clays, booksellers in Daventry, Rugby, Lutterworth, and Warwick, and also of Timothy Stevens of Cirencester--Jan has much new information on juvenile readers, too. There are 40 pp. of appendices with primary data on book circulation and magazine subscriptions. **Mascha Gemmeke** is working on Burney this month at the Burney Center of McGill U., Montreal, the first to enjoy a new visiting scholar fellowship. **Clem Hawes** spent the winter and spring working at the Ehrenpreis Center for Swift Studies and this summer spent a month with his wife in India, esp. in Kashmir. At the Midwest ASECS in Kansas city in October, **Devoney Looser** presents the plenary "The Ghost of Mary Wollstonecraft" and **Haskell Hinnant**, another, "The Erotics of the Gift: Gender and Exchange in the 18C Novel." **Thomas E. Kinsella** and Willman Spawn published *American Signed Bindings through 1876* (Oak Knoll, 2007), the first study in this field, describing and illustrating 315 bookbinders' tickets from 233 binders in 19 states, 1750s-1876 (ISBN: 9781584562085). Congratulations to **Matt Kinservik** for his promotion to full professor at Delaware and for his publication of *Sex, Scandal, and Celebrity in the Late 18C England* (Palgrave), treating the Duchess of Kingston's trial for bigamy and Samuel Foote's related trial for attempted sodomy. **Catherine Lafarge** published "Les Frontispices de *La Paysanne perversie*" in *Symposium*, 60, no. 3 (Fall 2006), an issue devoted to "New Perspectives on Rétif de la Bretonne," guest edited by **Amy Wyngaard**. **J. A. Leo Lemay** reviewed **James Green** and Peter Stallybrass's *Benjamin Franklin: Writer and Printer* in *The Book* (newsletter of the AAS), no. 69 (2006), 7-9. **Ashley Marshall's** "Gulliver, Gulliveriana, and the Problem of Swiftian Satire" appears in the spring 2005 *Philological Quarterly*, just published (84:211-37)--those who love the tangle over Book IV should look at Ashley's examination of critical assumptions about *GT* as satire. **Kate Marsters**, still working on Mungo Park and other Scots, has retired from Gannon U. and moved to Savannah, the better to help raise a granddaughter, and my delightful colleague, **Bill McCarthy** is moving this fall from DuBois to Maine. **William McCarthy**, after a couple decades of research, will see the publication next year of his biography *Voice of the Enlightenment: Anna Letitia Barbauld*, in which JHUP will include appendices and around 50 illustrations! **Carla Mulford** reviewed Eric Stockdale's *'Tis Treason, My Good Man! Four Revolutionary Presidents and a Piccadilly Bookshop* (2005) in *PBSA*, 101 (2007), 255-57. We're delighted to welcome to our Society **Melvyn New**, the distinguished editor of Laurence Sterne--indeed, the dean of Sterne studies--the book-review editor of *The Scriblerian*, and the author of many fine books and important articles (see his thought-provoking reflections on literary judgment and reviewing in "Swimming Down the Gutter of

Time with Sterne and *The Scriblerian*," *Scriblerian*, 39.1 [fall 2006], 48-52). With Penn's publication this year of **Steve Newman's** *Ballad Collection, Lyric, and the Canon* (to be reviewed here soon), Steve is now writing a book "clarifying and defending core values of the humanities by considering how two key terms intertwine--ideas of time (esp. as they are embodied in narrative) and ideas of value," with the focus commencing during the Scottish Enlightenment (with special attention to Adam Smith). **Hugh Ormsby-Lennon** is enjoying a sabbatical in his and Margaret's London home this summer and fall. Hugh and Margaret have one or two flats there, near the British Museum, which they let out to scholars (hugh.ormsby-lennon@villanova.edu). **Adam Potkay's** *The Story of Joy from the Bible to Late Romanticism* is being published this fall by Cambridge, and his edition of Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* appeared this summer from Longman. **Betsy Powers** has again organized the Columbia 18C seminar, the dates and lectures for which are listed below. Prior to his fall trip to Oxfordshire, **Hermann J. Real** sent to press *Reading Swift V*, with 32 essays arising from presentations at the fifth Münster Swift symposium. **Laura J. Rosenthal** is editing a special issue of *The Eighteenth Century* on "The Future of Feminist Theory in 18C Studies," appearing by the 2010 ASECS, when the ASECS Women's Caucus celebrates its 35th anniversary (her proposal deadline was early in Sept. for essays due in January, but perhaps it's not too late: lrosentl@umd.edu). **Eleanor Shevlin**, who can provide you with the dates and titles for the Washington Area Print History Group's meetings, participated at the SHARP conference this summer (she's the ASECS-SHARP liaison); she reported that **Lisa Berglund**, **Nancy Mace**, and **Paula McDowell** also gave papers--I know that Nancy's examined Chancery suits related to the *Edinburgh Review*. Dennis Moore has organized a session at ASECS for the discussion of **Laura Stevens'** book *The Poor Indian: British Missionaries, Native Americans, and Colonial Sensibility*, at which Laura will respond (this format was used at the 2007 ASECS for **Vin Carretta's** *Equiano, the African*). **Linda Troost** and **Sayre Greenfield** in August began a nine-month sabbatical in London--in July both spoke at the sixth bi-annual International Robin Hood Conference in Wales. Together they last published an article on Jane Austen in *Sensibilities*, 33 (Dec. 2006), 35-47. Linda edited her 4th volume of *E-C Women*, IV, which includes work by **Bärbel Czennia**, **Jenny Davidson**, **Scott Paul Gordon** and **Betty Rizzo**. The last *PBSA* contains **Shel Rogers'** review of *Samuel Johnson's Unpublished Revisions to the Dictionary of the English Language: A Facsimile Edition*, edited by Allen Reddick, Catherine Dille, et al. (101: 247-48), and also Jocelyn Harris's review of **Peter Sabor** and Tom Keymer's *Pamela in the Marketplace: Literary Controversy and Print Culture in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland* (237-38). **Mark Vareschi**, a TA at Rutgers, is writing his dissertation about anonymous publication. West Chester U. appointed **Cheryl Wanko** to be Interim Liberal Studies Director--to which position she brings her experience chairing English and directing the University's Program Review.

Forthcoming Meetings, Exhibitions, New Publications, etc.

As noted in our last issue, the **SEASECS** meets at Auburn Univ. on 14-17 February, with the theme "Contexts and Legacies," organized by Paula

Backscheider and her team (pkrb@auburn.edu; see www.auburn.edu/sesecs); the **SCSECS** meets at the Hotel Monteleone in the French Quarter of New Orleans on 21-23 February, with the theme "Birth and Rebirth," chaired by Kathryn Duncan (kathryn.duncan@saintleo.edu; proposal were due 1 October 2007 (<http://www.scsecs.net/sesecs>); **ASECS** meets in Portland, Oregon, 27-30 March (grad. students can apply until 1 Nov. for \$300 "traveling jam-pot" awards--write asecs@wfu.edu); the **Omohundro Institute of Early American History & Culture** meets 6-8 June at Suffolk Univ. in Boston; the **18C Scottish Studies Society** meets 26-29 June 2008 at Dalhousie University (write fiona.black@dal.ca or see the website www.ecsss.org); the **NE/ASECS** meets 30 Oct.-1 Nov. 2008 at Hobart and William Smith College in Geneva, NY.

The **British SECS** meets 3-5 January 2008 at St. Hugh's College in Oxford (the submission deadline was 28 Sept.). For a registration form, contact venue organizer Chris Mounsey (cmouns@aol.com) or see www.bsecs.org.uk.

The conference "**Evidence of Reading, Reading the Evidence**" is being organized for 21-23 July 2008 at the Institute of English Studies, U. of London, by the Institute and the Open University--both are home to the related Reading Experience Database 1450-1945. Abstracts for 20-minute papers on the history of reading (with short C.V.) should be sent electronically by 31 January 2008 to the organizers: S[haf].S.Towheed@open.ac.uk, r[osalind].h.crone@open.ac.uk, and Katie.Halsey@sas.ac.uk.

The **Midwest ASECS** holds its 2008 meeting in Oklahoma City on 9-12 Oct. at the Skirvin Hilton, organized by Susan Spencer (English, U. of Central Oklahoma).

Our 2008 **East-Central ASECS** meeting is in Georgetown during late October or early November 2008, chaired by Kathryn Temple (templek@georgetown.edu).

The McNeil Center for Early American Studies, the Library Company of Philadelphia, the College of New Jersey, and the U. of Maryland--College Park will host a conference in Philadelphia 3-4 April 2009 on "the experience of the incarcerated in **jails and prisons in early America**." Send a 250-word abstract and brief C.V. to the Center (mceas@ccat.sas.upenn.edu) by 18 January; direct questions to conference organizers Michele Lise Tarter (tarter@tcnj.edu) and Richard Bell (rjbell@umd.edu).

The **18C Seminar at Columbia** will devote its meetings this year to the **historical origins of free speech**, with speakers designed to cover a wide cultural range. The forthcoming talks (all at 6 p.m.) are: 15 Nov.: Douglas Smith (U. of Washington), "The Novikov Affair and the Limits of Free Speech in the Reign of Catherine the Great"; 13 Dec.: Jonathan Israel (Princeton), "Radical Enlightenment 'Free Press' versus Moderate Enlightenment 'Free Press': The Clash of Two Antagonistic Conceptions"; 31 Jan'y: John A. McCarthy (Vanderbilt Univ.), "Morality and Politics: Free Thinkers, Free Speech, the Public Sphere, and the Foundations of a Deliberative Democracy in the German Enlightenment"; 21 Feb.: Javier Fernández Sebastián (Univ. del País Vasco, Bilbao), "Free Speech within the Hispanic Enlightenment on Both Sides of the Atlantic"; 27 March: Joris van Eijnatten (Univ. of Amsterdam), "Beyond Liberalism? A Typology of Arguments in Favor of the Freedom of the Press:

England and the Netherlands, 1650-1800"; 17 April: Helena Rosenblatt (Hunter College), "Rousseau on Speech and Corruption: The Hazards of *doux-commerce* from the *First Discourse* to the *Social Contract*." (Elizabeth Powers, chairing the Seminar, can provide locations on campus: elizabethmpowers@verizon.net).

Americanists should know of the **Early American Digital Archive**, an extensive collection of electronic texts and links to texts about the Americas, 1492-1820, published by the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities and edited by Ralph Bauer (the resources are extensive and the website's design is friendly: <http://www.mith2.umd.edu/eada/intro/php>).

Several **exhibitions** are of note. The Cooper-Hewitt National Design Museum at 2 East 91st St., NYC, through 20 January offers "**Piranesi as Designer**." (N. Ouroussoff's *NYT* review notes, "By introducing us to the full sweep of this Venetian artist's career, from the early etchings of antiquities to his eccentric furniture designs . . . the ["lovely"] show liberates him from clichés.") The Folger Shakespeare Library has on exhibit through January "**Marketing Shakespeare: The Boydell Gallery (1789-1805) and Beyond**," curated by Ann Hawkins and Georgianna Ziegler. Hawkins, who wrote most of the exhibition cards (the Folger's art curator, Erin Blake, wrote on etching and engraving), has prepared one of the best virtual exhibitions I've seen, displaying a third of items and offering essays on publisher John Boydell's "national edition" of an illustrated Shakespeare, his painting gallery in Pall-Mall; the etched and engraved plates produced from paintings for the edition; competing galleries; Gillray's revenge on being rejected as one of the many engravers; etc. Boydell (1719-1804) paid Reynolds, Kauffman, Romney, West, Fuseli and others to paint scenes: he opened in 1789 with 34 paintings from 21 plays and would hang 72 by 1791 and eventually well over a hundred. Annually he printed a catalogue to the gallery. Besides paintings, prints and books, the exhibition covers artifacts related to Shakespearean performances. McMaster U.'s archives and research collections (downstairs in the Mills library) has mounted through the year's end an exhibition on "**Grub Street: Journals and Newspapers in the 18C**," also touching on other sorts of fleeting publications (see the virtual exhibit <http://library.mcmaster.ca/archives/exhibitions/grub/index.htm>). Yale's Beinecke Library has mounted through 9 January 2008 "**Celebrating Italian Festivals**," documenting religious and civic festivals in Italian towns and provinces, 16-19Cs, for which lavishly illustrated books were produced as records and personal promotions. (Its previous exhibit was on "Visions of Pirates since 1650.")

The University of Virginia Press invites submissions by 1 November for the **2007 Walker Cowen MS Prize Competition**, providing \$5000 and publication of the MS for a scholarly book-MS on 18C studies (history, literature, philosophy & the arts specifically included). Note that European books can be submitted for translated publication. Request an application from Mary MacNeil at UVP, PO Box 400318, Charlottesville, VA 22904-4318; mmm5w@virginia.edu. MSS will not be returned.

[A 20-page unpaginated directory of membership, August 2007, follows. Then:]
Cover illustration: One of the tombstones for a Gulliver in the churchyard of St. Mary the Virgin in Banbury, Oxfordshire (see Hermann Real's article above, p. 4).