Eighteenth-Century Modernities: Present Contributions and Potential Future Projects from EC/ASECS (The 2014 EC/ASECS Presidential Address)

by Christine Clark-Evans

It never occurred to me in my research, writing, and musings that there would be two hit, cable television programs centered in space, time, and mythic cultural metanarrative about 18th-century America, focusing on the 1760s through the 1770s, before the U.S. became the U.S. One program, *Sleepy Hollow* on the FOX channel (not the 1999 Johnny Depp film) represents a pre-Revolutionary supernatural war drama in which the characters have 21st-century social, moral, and family crises. Added for good measure to several threads very similar to Washington Irving's "Legend of Sleepy Hollow" story are a ferocious headless horseman, representing all that is evil in the form of a grotesque decapitated man-demon, who is determined to destroy the tall, handsome, newly reawakened Rip-Van-Winkle-like Ichabod Crane and the lethal, FBI-trained, diminutive beauty Lt. Abigail Mills. These last two are soldiers for the politically and spiritually righteous in both worlds, who themselves are fatefully inseparable as the only witnesses/defenders against apocalyptic doom.

While the main characters in *Sleepy Hollow* on television act out their protracted, violent conflict against natural and supernatural forces, they also have their own high production-level, R & B-laced, online music video entitled "Ghost." The throaty feminine voice rocks back and forth to accompany the deft montage of dramatic and frightening scenes of these talented, beautiful men and these talented, beautiful women, who use as their weapons American patriotism, religious faith, science, and wizardry.

The second television program that plunges viewers into its interpretation of the eighteenth century and legends of the American founding fathers is *TURN: Washington's Spies*. An AMC television series, *TURN* is a political and war drama about the propertied farmers and trades people who were radicalized by the harsh rule of the occupying Redcoats. The "New" Americans are driven to "turn" into enemy spies under the nose of British troops. With things not being at all what they seem in the televised "New" York, this small group of childhood friends and relatives was recruited and eventually trained into an organized espionage network that is skilled enough to pass precious, detailed intelligence for Washington, who is revered by rebellious colonials as a leader of men and an expert military strategist fighting for a righteous cause.

From Televideography to Research and Theoretical Concerns, Or What the Present Has Brought, What the Future Might Bring*

Based on Alexander Rose's *Washington's Spies: The Story of America's First Spy Ring* (2007), *TURN* follows the group who became historically known as the Culper or Culpepper Ring, which in 1776 and 1777 helped General George Washington after his recently defeated army had lost Long Island, Staten Island, and Setauket, New York. Setauket was the location of a battle that had divided neighbor against neighbor and was the setting in the concluding episode of the first television season—insurgents versus loyalists. Abraham Woodhull

historically a leading member of Washington's Culper Spy Ring and the main character in the television series, is a farmer turned insurgent and spy, under the leadership of Continental Army Major Benjamin Tallmadge, though Woodhull's father is portrayed as remaining a prominent Loyalist.

Sleepy Hollow, premiering in 2013, received good reviews and high enough ratings to have been renewed for a second season, so a demographically mixed, mostly young, audience will see it again. The magic and mystical special effects and the supernatural, walking-dead-like demons are entertaining, even humorous, and remove any reason for the viewers to look for historical consistency. It is best to go with the comic tone of some of the more violent scenes as the main characters travel between time periods and find themselves menaced by otherworldly creatures. Though at first understandably culture-shocked, the Ichabod Crane character readily adapts to "modernity," as he himself calls it, especially when it comes to weapons and electronic technology. Lieutenant, called "Leftenant," Abby Mills and Ichabod show friendly affection for one another and the loyalty of comrades-in-arms with just a hint of sexual tension between the handsome white Brit and the lovely African-American woman police officer.

TURN, however, is consistently a suspenseful war drama; and, the dramatic tone as well as the understated period décor, costumes, and sets make it very much a realistic political thriller. It shows New York in the 1770s to be a very dangerous place to live, though there are obviously still no small numbers of anachronisms that can jar a dix-huitièmiste's attention. While dedicated to his cause, the Woodhull character leads a very lonely life hiding his radical views and other feelings from all those around him: his wife, his father, his neighbors and friends, and the infant son who needs a father's protection and guidance.

Eighteenth-Century Modernities: Ironies, Tensions, and Controversies in the Plural

These two examples should give us all a brief pause about how popular the representation of the 18th century has become in today's media. However, these two television series should also make us think more seriously about what we ECASECSers are doing presently and how gratifying it is to pursue our scholarship with focus and energy as we have here in Newark, Delaware. But could looking at the work presented in this year's meeting, collectively and individually, suggest future directions of 18th-century modernities?

While we have many new members and conferees, whom we are delighted to have join us and hope will return to participate in other ECASECS meetings, the papers and the programmed activities remind us of the authoritative and imaginative scholarly work we have come to respect so highly. First, reflection on this conference reminds us of our role as the political, cultural, literary, and philosophical historians, critics, researchers, writers, and scholars we have become. And second, the impact of ECASECS members' scholarship presented at meetings contributes fundamentally to creating our community of scholars, scholars who become friends based on our mutual respect, affection, and honor.

ECASECS can lay claim to the formidable juggernaut of a dix-huitièmiste publication that is *The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, which serves to inform us so well—from regional, national, and international conferences held by

colleagues in related disciplines, to funding sources, to available collections, archives, and seminars, and to reviews, analyses, and informative articles. Also the prominent place of women and gender studies has been seen in ECASECS officers and Executive Board, panel topics, papers presented, plenary speakers, and conference organizing committees. The *C18-L*, the Eighteenth-Century Interdisciplinary Discussion Bulletin Board, is our electronic site to debate with colleagues and raise crucial issues in our fields. Since 1990, this international forum has provided the means for discussing all aspects of 18th-century studies and the opportunity to learn from diverse perspectives and contexts. Participation of international colleagues as panel organizers and officers also distinguishes our regional society. And launched in 1998, our very newly enhanced website has given us a rather heightened and attractive digital profile. One of ECASECS's best and yet least known accomplishments is the integration of our member graduate students as colleagues whom we mentor and accept in our ranks as intellectuals and professionals: we take pleasure in receiving graduate student members on conference panels, the S. Eric Molin Award we present for the best paper delivered by a student at the annual conference, and more recently the leading role of graduate students on conference organizing committees in 2011 at Penn State and here in 2014 at Delaware.

But as dix-huitièmistes we accept that to best apply current theoretical approaches, albeit in diverse interdisciplinary projects, most of us look at our research with a view toward the "long eighteenth century," the period from 1660 to 1830, beyond the Judeo-Christian hundred year cycles, to discover what was happening at the time not only politically and economically, but socially and intellectually, ethically and aesthetically, for a Foucauldian take on the archeology and genealogy of knowledge. This expanded paradigmatic perspective on history and culture has moved beyond scholars and into the wider society over the last forty-five years and could continue to be influential for possibly another decade or more according to how our world changes—and it *will* change. Taking an example from an even earlier early-modern view of change and scholarly perspective, "That By Various Means We Arrive at the Same End" is the title of Chapter 1, Volume I, of the *Essays* by Montaigne.

Our fields have weighed for some time what modernity means, including debates on the "early modern," the "high modern," the "late modern," and the "post-modern" contexts. So the focus on modernity in recent years has attempted to develop a more problematized viewpoint and to consider more than what people in advanced industrial, European or Northern Hemispheric countries have viewed or how they have experienced modernity. As a result, much of what had been called "modern" since the 1970s has often centered on modernity as a single, though complex, phenomenon, whereas now more historians, cultural critics, philosophers, feminists, literary scholars, and other writers in various disciplines, particularly in the last ten to fifteen years, conceptualize modernity in terms of multiples.

As "modernity" in the singular becomes "modernities" in the plural, whether early, high, late or post, the question is being reconsidered for the multiple features and processes that can be observed outside and beyond presently modern industrial countries and into the far reaches of global capital. Societies that unevenly experience modernity include peoples in places too often referred to as "underdeveloped." Because they had been colonized for centuries

and would hardly overcome the disastrous effects of previous political regimes in a few decades, these societies could never reasonably be expected to catch up to their already more democratic, autonomous, and economically richer neighbors. After which, the failure of governance in countries which have not had the advantages of industrialization, democratization, or a durable yet sustainable infrastructure has been arguably accepted as sufficient explanation for why certain peoples and nations are and should remain at the lower levels in the world economy or politics.

"Modernities" in the plural, however, conceptualizes multiple points of contact among a given set of nations and among the peoples in those nations. Viewed in a more dynamic relational manner and necessarily without reducing peoples and nations to static essentialist categories, we can see how a so-called modern society in one aspect may be less modern in another, depending on where and when communities or individuals come in contact. Just as in physics, music, and culture, since the 1940s jazz musicians have conceptualized modernity and expanded on their own meaning in the phrase, "It's all relative."

ECASECS has been dealing with long and multiple forms of modernity as can be seen in the papers presented in our meetings and publications. In this sense, the concept of 18th-century modernities includes recognizing the impact and limitations of historians writing history. So modernities in the plural point to the need for analyzing the effect of the cultural ethos and history in different societies and social groups. Using the term "modernities" acknowledges the transformative processes and interaction between our human (and consequently shared) biology and our learned behavior but also takes measureable account of significant differences among us. Research into early modernities that reveal marked material changes continues to be a promising intellectual engagement and attempts to factor in sociological, racial, ethnic, gender, class, psychological, economic, political, ideological, and religious differences.

The Leisure to Pleasure, the Pleasure of Entertainment in the 18th Century

At this meeting of ECASECS, we can see what has been accomplished and speculate on what future opportunities might lie ahead for us as a regional society of scholars. The theme of this 45th meeting, "Leisure, Pleasure, and Entertainment in the Eighteenth Century," relates to important economic, social, and political changes. "Leisure" in that era was a new creation of wealth and value that transforms the time that had long been structured very differently since medieval cathedral bells communicated through ringing the hours of morning prayers during the vigil before the dawn the next day, particularly before a Christian feast or holy day. This new wealth in early modern times was paid for with the labor of women of all classes, enslaved Africans, American Indians, Asian Americans, indentured and bonded persons, and principally the physical but also the intellectual work of other groups. The creation of leisure designated a period of time reserved for what could be perceived as salutary, beneficial, or transformative in the direction of good health and happiness—not for all, but for more than previously had had the opportunity before the rapidly accumulated "wealth of nations" made leisure even possible.

In the epistemology of Western societies from classical antiquity, Roman imperial rule, and medieval Christian beliefs, "pleasure" had varyingly been

associated with aesthetics and ethical theory and with corruption and loss of virtue. Differing views of pleasure can be traced to ancient philosophical traditions in Stoic asceticism but also in that rarely recognized and much maligned Epicurean academy, known as the only school to dare to admit women in their circles. Christian asceticism conceptualized pleasure as an "occasion of sin" or a precursor to unrighteousness. The philosophical bad or the sin of indulging in pleasure retained its cross-cultural sources over centuries.

In the long eighteenth century a justification emerged for one's pleasure on metaphysical grounds and then later pleasure was explained according to an eclectic mixture of natural philosophies. Metaphysics yielded to medicine on the sources and consequences of pleasure and happiness for philosophers, medical doctors, and literati who were acquainted with debates about how sensibility and sensations functioned and were involved in discussions of how the senses operated as organ-related mechanisms. But like commodities that find their market niche, pleasure did find its own normatively accepting social and intellectual milieu and became a reason in itself for experiencing happiness, even the utility of pleasure in physical terms. For example, works like Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* (1776) and articles in Diderot and D'Alembert's *Encyclopédie* (1751-1772) took religious, philosophical, or openly misogynistic ethical approaches to show pleasure as useful and good.

The meaning of "entertainment" expanded with economic, social, and moral justifications for individual and social forms of distraction. An appreciation for entertainment became infused into all forms of spectacle and performance with ideas about how the pleasurable satisfaction of the arts was valuable for diverting one's attention from the bad, the sad, and the sustained suffering of melancholy. In classical medical perspective, entertainment could be said to disrupt and even transform the circulation of humors and the spirits flowing within them that determine human temperaments. As medicine developed at mid century, philosophers and doctors debated human sensibility versus irritability, sensations, climate theory, temperaments, and the causes and consequences of pleasure and pain. Methodologically, medico-philosophical debates showed the decline of classical traditions in textual medicine, whether Galenic or Hippocratic models, and signaled the rise of observational, demonstrated, and more evidence-based medicine with certain theoretical implications for entertainment and diversion. Philosophical discussions ranged from what comprises the moral value of the theater, to what makes poetic or dramatic discourse evoke a strong response, and what theories explain intellectual and emotional experiences with music and the visual arts.

Thinking Back and Looking Forward: EC/ASECS on History and Early Modernities to Come

ECASECS conferees at this meeting have thoughtfully considered leisure, pleasure, and entertainment. They have shown us how pleasure was known to have resulted from sports, games, the good and, ironically, also the bad time one can have at the theater, even when it is Shakespeare. Conference papers have presented us with what were at the time new objects to make and play with, the benefits that were then judged to come from simple entertainments, and what could have come just from spending time enjoying one's leisure. Some pleasures

were deemed suitable for taking in public. Others were very controversial, sometimes good and sometimes so evil and sinful that they could only be indulged in private or in secret—witness the two panels on "Hidden Pleasures, Hidden Sex." Studies on the pleasures of creativity and the mental and intellectual good of *poiesis* could go even further.

Papers at this conference have also argued moral and ethical questions of pleasure and entertainment, the pleasure that is derived from entering a new space or location, taking ownership of property, the luxuries of colonial life and empire, and the edification and much needed distraction that come from travel itself. Other panels broached how violence and pain in a performance relate to entertainment, and similarly how a high risk-taking individual can become excited at the imminent prospect of winning or losing, like the avid gambler who lives on the edge of pain or pleasure not knowing which feeling to expect.

More investigation could raise very disparate views. Just as theater has been judged both entertaining and at one and the same time valuable, future study into the moral psychology of theater in this era could investigate the reasons for the performer's own pleasure when engaged in public speaking, acting, and oral interpretation. Not only could opera and theater have been regarded by some as detrimental to society leading to pernicious habits, but in early modern theories of the mind a person who uses this new leisure time for entertainments toward their own pleasure could also be perceived as being mentally weak, lacking in good moral fiber, or even dangerously irreligious. Future research on theories and judgments in the long eighteenth century could extend more generally into the aesthetics and ethics and the beauty and value of leisure, pleasure, and entertainment.

The ECASECS 2014 program introduces new topics and problems that will surely be explored in depth and on a larger scale. In the future some papers from this conference will take a new approach or method to study another, very different corpus. Still other topics will undergo significant changes in the next iteration of a scholar's research and writing. I thank my colleagues for coming together and bringing such fine results to this meeting for all of us to share.

Pennsylvania State University

**Author's Note*: My acknowledgment and thanks to Brijraj Singh, Hostos Community College, CUNY (emeritus), who, in his opening address to our 2013 meeting in Philadelphia, "In Retirement: Contemplating What EC/ASECS Is or Has Become," inspired me to look at recent, and speculate on future, scholarship

Two Talks/Lectures on Scholarly Publishing Delivered at Emory

by Greg Clingham, Director, Bucknell University Press

The Serendipity of Scholarly Publishing

I would like to thank Professor Martine Brownley for inviting me to talk about publishing at the Bill and Carol Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry [Emory University on 18 September 2014], and for this opportunity to

reminisce a little about the work of the Bucknell University Press. These remarks will, to some extent, look backwards and be more personal in nature. Later this afternoon I will give another talk in which my remarks will look forward, and consider the enterprise of scholarly publishing as it looks to the digital future that is already upon us.

It is easy to think of a book as a natural object, always already existing in the world of words, ideas, and communication, and to think of the circumstances under which a book – this one, for example – comes into existence as being highly tenuous. The scholarly experience of reading, researching, writing, revising, correcting, and proofing, of course, teaches us otherwise, and as scholars we know that a book can take a very long time to write and to be made. In 1978 the Cambridge professor and eighteenth-century scholar Ian Jack ruefully opined to me that "a man can grow old waiting for a book to be published." I had no idea then how intimate I would become with a proposition that at the time seemed to be the view of, well, an old man! But there is something about the finished nature of a book – of the book as a phenomenal object – that uncouples it from the circumstances of its creation, and that informs its identity as a reliable and powerful form of technology for delivering knowledge, a form that has remained constant despite the cultural and social changes over the last 500 years of print and the 500 before that in other forms of the codex. While recognizing the noumenal nature of the printed book and finding its history to be fascinating, as someone who for the last 18 years has been involved in the *making* of books, and not just in creating scholarly content, I am struck by its quotidian nature. Books may contain art, and as objects of skill and beauty may even achieve the status *of* art, but the *process* by which they come into being is many faceted, distinctly artisanal – and serendipitous.

I would not be here today, and the Bucknell Press would not have acquired its considerable reputation in eighteenth-century studies, among other fields, were it not for a series of serendipitous events, some historical, some personal. Just as the mid-twentieth century saw a proliferation of important scholarly work in eighteenth-century studies – the editorial recovery or critical *dis*covery of so many of canonical writers, including Defoe, Richardson, Swift, Pope, Fielding, Johnson, and Boswell – the last twenty years has been a comparable high point of critical exploration of a wider, more intertextual, more comparative, more interdisciplinary, and elongated eighteenth century. I would not wish to diminish or underplay the contribution of other presses in this endeavor – not only Oxford and Cambridge, but also Yale, Georgia, Kentucky, Johns Hopkins, and Delaware, – but I think it is true to say that Bucknell University Press spotted the opportunity offered by the explosion of new energies and the redefinition of boundaries, but also the mature and reasonable scholarly developments that characterized the field after the claims of the first feminist, deconstructive, and new-historicist phases of the 1960s and '70s had been absorbed. In 1987 Felicity Nussbaum edited a landmark collection of essays entitled *The New Eighteenth Century*, published by Methuen, and since the mid-1990s Bucknell has produced more than 100 titles that gave substance to the eighteenth century, both old and new. Indeed, Bucknell Press has benefitted enormously from extraordinary work – mainly from younger scholars, but not exclusively so – that has been done over the

last twenty years on women writers, on what used to known as minor writers, on gender and class, on non-canonical genres (such as biography and the familiar letter), on interdisciplinary topics and cosmopolitan, transatlantic, and global issues. . . .

I hope this does not sound pretentious, but I sometimes think *of* the collaborative nature of our undertaking as being a little like the sixteenth-century scholarly-publishing ventures of the Paris and Geneva-based Stephani – Henri Estienne or Henricus Stephanus (d. 1520), his son Robert Estienne (1503-59) and *his* three sons, Henri, Robert, and François; or like the late fifteenth–early sixteenth-century publishing and printing undertaking of Aldus Manutius and his Aldine Press in Venice; or like the work of the Dutch family of Elzevir between the late sixteenth and the early eighteenth centuries.[1] Unlike the great eighteenth-century publishing houses of Tonson, John Nichols, Longman, and John Murray – all of whom (especially the last two) became powerful and wealthy international commercial enterprises – the Renaissance publishers I mentioned were all textual scholars first and foremost, then printers and publishers. They were all small, close-knit, and fraternal. They published what they themselves researched, animated by the humanist enterprise of intellectual discovery and historical *re*covery. This, of course, is not to diminish the remarkable contribution to literary culture and publishing history of the great eighteenth-century houses, without whom we would not be where we are today, but to draw attention to the way in which, in recent years, scholarly publishing, especially among small presses, has begun to resemble the conditions and the structures that obtained at the outset of the publishing enterprise in the sixteenth century, when the printing press was a brand new technology. As the financial circumstances and technological opportunities continue to change in the future, and college and university libraries begin to play a larger role in safeguarding and producing scholarly work, so digital publishing may begin to look more and like our Renaissance originals. In part, that will be my topic later this afternoon.

The Monograph, Open Access, and the Future of Scholarship in the Humanities

For the last fifteen years university presses have accepted, and now begun to embrace, the idea that the future of scholarly publishing will be digital. The crisis that threatened the survival of the scholarly monograph in the 1990s and the first years of this millennium, seemed millennial in its gravity. To some the end of the university press as we knew it seemed nigh; some presses did cease to exist, and many were forced to undertake deep restructuring and re-prioritizing. We have seemed to weather that particular storm, just as the economy as a whole seems to have survived the recessions of 2008 and 2001-03. Indeed, in the culture at large more print books are being sold than ever before, even while the sale of electronic books of one kind and another is also growing exponentially. But the scholarly market is a different matter. The increasing costs and the labor-intensiveness of producing a print monograph, together with the small markets and reluctance on the part of many universities to subsidize the work of their presses – at least to the same extent, and now with more prescriptive oversight – not to mention the rapidly

changing attitudes towards the study of the humanities, all mean that the writing is on the wall, even if we can't quite bring ourselves to read it.

All university presses and independent publishers now produce books both in print and digital forms – our books, for example, are available via Rowman & Littlefield for download in many forms: for example to 3M Cloud Library, Kindle, Ipad, Baker & Taylor Blio, the Nook, Books24x7, CafeScribe, Ebook Library, ebrary, Google Books, Ingram Digital, Kobo, Mobipocket, MyiLibrary, NetLibrary, OverDrive, Questia, Sony Reader, and other platforms. We are not unusual in this. Publishers are trying to remain flexible and responsive, to position themselves to supply the demands of libraries and individuals, in whatever form they might come, while also recognizing that print continues to be primary in academia. At present most university presses account for about 10% of sales from digital downloads, but the numbers are growing, and the supposition is that the balance between print and digital sales will continue to shift in favor of ebooks. Most people in the industry expect a tipping point beyond which "born digital" texts will become the norm for scholarly books. We just don't know when that will happen and what it will mean.

I used to think that there was no question that the monograph would survive no matter what happened, because it was the *lingua franca* of the academy, at least in the humanities. My rather circular reasoning was that we would continue to need and to produce monographs because the academy would continue to exist in the same way it had for a hundred years. But, as we now know, the rapid corporatization of the university in recent years, the political pressures that have been brought to bear on the curriculum, the costs, and the very concept of the university both in the US and in the UK – so well critiqued by such works as Martha Nussbaum's *Not For Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities* (2010) and Stefan Collini's *What are Universities for?* (2012) – together with the cultural impact of social media and the proliferation of cheap, advanced technologies able to retrieve and store information, all of these factors have placed in question the kind of knowledge we expect to acquire and to promote in the university.

In 1999 in an article called "E-Books and Old Books" Robert Darnton articulated the threat to the scholarly monograph that remains essentially the same today.[2] What, briefly, were – and are – the main factors?

1. For decades library budgets have been cut and monographs in the humanities have been sacrificed to journals in the STEM subjects;

2. The budgets of university presses have been cut and stricter fiscal conditions have been imposed upon them at a time when fewer and fewer libraries have been buying books and the cost of books has been increasing exponentially;

3. Because presses are publishing fewer books than before, fewer younger scholars have been able to publish books, thus jeopardizing their careers.

Given these intersecting problems it was thought even in the 1990s that digital publishing could provide a solution. Everyone knew of course that digital would be no panacea, partly because of costs – digitalization entails its own expensive expertise – and partly because of culture – we were not then (nor are we now) quite ready to *value* digital as equal to print. In addition, the

Amazonian fantasy that electronic downloads should be free or almost free, was never feasible for university presses who had to cover their costs in the brave new world of fiscal accountability. Still, several projects were started, including one by Robert Darnton himself. What came to be known as Gutenberg-e was a six year initiative (1998-2004), backed by the Mellon Foundation, in association with the American Historical Association and Columbia University Press, to publish good dissertations in history in digital form. The project of course ran into many problems and was only a qualified success, but Darnton nonetheless saw not only the continuing need for digital but also the potential: "In the first years," he says, "I stressed the innovative potential of e-books as a new form of scholarly communication," and by 2002 he came to believe that "it is best to concentrate on producing excellent e-books, the sort that will set a standard and that will legitimize the medium at the same time."[3]

We have moved on since 2002. The MLA now has protocols and "Guidelines for Evaluating Work in Digital Humanities and Digital Media," a document in which the word "new" appears 15 times in two paragraphs (http://www.mla.org/guidelines_evaluation_digital). Furthermore, the technology has evolved, the field of Digital Humanities has grown and attracted significant funding, and the economics of print has become even more intractable. But it is still not clear how we will bridge the gap that exists between new technologies and new modes of reading, and the institutional cultures that still see *print* as the touchstone, the *point* of publication.

It seems to me that a shift to digital publishing as a *primary* mode of scholarly publication will depend on our addressing four main issues.

The first is the concern about quality. Digital monographs will have to distinguish themselves from all other digital downloads and web-based information and learning – however useful and innovative they may be – by maintaining and highlighting peer review, and by articulating what might be called a historiography, a narrative of continuity with traditional scholarly practices. New technologies may in due course perforce produce new kinds of scholarly work, but to secure and maintain the integral value of the monograph, ebooks will, at least at first, have to offer a clear continuity with existing technology, that is with print in the form of a codex.

A second concern is about reading habits and the experience of reading. Naomi S. Baron's forthcoming book *Words Onscreen: The Fate of Reading in a Digital World* (Oxford University Press) is only the latest to argue the "shift from reading in print to reading on digital devices is further reducing students' pursuit of work in the humanities" because, she says, digital devices with online connections encourage multi-tasking and discourage "deep reading."[4] Though the question of how we read today is a complex and important one, Baron's argument seems soft and circular, for there is no *necessary* connection between words onscreen and the inability to concentrate that she associates with digital devices, though there clearly is a cultural and psychological one. The problem would seem to be one of purpose and not just of experience. Tackling the problem of fitful reading might start at the point at which we can make a difference, with education, rather than with the technological medium. Still, I fully recognize that, if we are to embrace digital monographs – as distinct from the many other reasons we might go online, – we will need *more*

advanced software and the technology to enable the production of high quality, sophisticated, visual and paratextual products that will enable scholars to have not only a fuller, but a *simpler and more concentrated* reading experience. Greater comfort with three-dimensional, more nuanced digital texts will then make for different reading habits, which will in time express themselves in a greater demand in the market for digital books.

A third concern is about academic value and cultural capital. Accepting digital monographs as our primary mode of publication will require universities and colleges to be readier to accord an equivalent academic value, material significance, and cultural capital to the publication of an ebook as they do now to a print book, and to tenure and promote people on the basis of ebooks. This large cultural issue touches, as John Thompson notes, on the presses two main functions, dissemination and certification. "The function of dissemination," he says, "involves more than simply making the results of research available: it also involves making them available in ways and in contexts that will be noticed and taken into account by others." Likewise, "the function of certification … is equally important: the organization that makes the results available also bestows a degree of legitimacy or symbolic value on the output, and thereby gives the output a standing which it would not have if it were simply made available by the researcher as an unpublished paper."[5] Responding to such tropes of social signification, our authors often say that they need their Bucknell publication to be a *print* book because an ebook by itself would not *count* with their Deans. These views are of course already changing as organizations like the MLA normalize digital publication, as more Digital Humanities initiatives and centers spring up, as the quality of ebooks improves, and as the culture absorbs, transforms and *uses* the new – and not just cosmetic – kinds of knowledge that digitalization enables.

And a fourth concern has to do with the changing nature of the university library, which, as Jeffrey Schnapp and Matthew Battles, write in a fascinating new book, finds itself on a threshold "made up of interlocking components: changes in the nature and status of the document and the book; changes in the practices of reading, research, note-taking, and information sharing; changes in the architectural and institutional containers in which such practices are carried out and by means of which they are supported."[6] Not only do librarians already determine how they spend their budgets and apportion their space, but they are also strongly committed to the principle of open access as central to a newly energized educational vision. In some form all university libraries already provide some degree of open access to a wide range of materials in the humanities, whether to journal articles via databases such as Project Muse or JSTOR, or reports, papers, and out-of-copyright publications on their digital commons. Federal and private institutions already support and mandate open-access scholarship in the sciences and social sciences, especially in the form of the article or report. But so far no university press that I know of has adopted open-access monograph publishing, although some, like Harvard and MIT, make some of their books freely accessible after a few months of sales, and one of the subsidiaries of the University of Michigan Library is the excellent Open Humanities Press (http://www. openhumanitiespress.org/) that publishes open access monographs. Most presses simply have to charge (and continue to charge) for access to their ebooks, and usually the price of an ebook will

remain about the same as the hardcover print book, and then drop down to the paperback price if and when a paperback is produced.

It is worth reminding ourselves very briefly what open access is and why it might be attractive to those publishing collaborative research, reports, and articles in the sciences and social sciences. As Peter Suber explains in his openly accessible book *Open Access* (MIT Press, 2012) – and I paraphrase freely – open-access literature is digital, online, free of charge, and free of most copyright and licensing restrictions. What make it possible are the internet and the consent of the author or copyright-holder. It provides free access to reading, searching, redistributing, translating, mining, migrating to new media, long-term archiving, and innumerable new forms of research, analysis, and processing we haven't yet imagined. In most fields, scholarly journals do not pay authors, who can (unlike musicians and movie-makers) therefore consent to Open Access without losing revenue. Open Access is entirely compatible with peer review, and all the major Open Access initiatives for scientific and scholarly literature insist on its importance. Just as authors of journal articles donate their labor, so do most journal editors and referees participating in peer review. Open Access literature is not free to produce, even if it is less expensive to produce than print publication. The question is not whether academic material can be made costless, but whether there are better ways to pay the bills than by charging readers and creating access barriers that make the dissemination of knowledge difficult. The 2002 Budapest Open Access Initiative sums it up as follows: "An old tradition and a new technology have converged to make possible an unprecedented public good. The old tradition is the willingness of scientists and scholars to publish the fruits of their research in scholarly journals without payment. . . . The new technology is the internet" (http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/).

While we might subscribe to the vision of open access for the publication of articles, in either the sciences or the humanities, the business model for publishing monographs in the humanities is very different. Publishing companies, such as our business partner Rowman & Littlefield or Macmillan or Ashgate, are commercial, for profit organizations that necessarily have to look to their bottom line. University presses, likewise, have to at least break even and have to work within very strict financial limits that prevent their giving away the fruits of the labor. The matter of royalties is also of importance to authors, even though only a few earn even moderate sums from their publications. Oddly, the very notion of making one's work freely available is felt by many to diminish its intellectual value. For just as university presses act as gate keepers to the profession and to the academy itself – determining which works are good enough to receive their imprint – the *print* – on the spine – so, paradoxically, many feel that the value of their work is not unrelated to the cost of the book – *some* monetary cost, however modest. So to replace print with pixels on a screen is thought to diminish the intrinsic value of the work. There seems, in fact, to be a direct correlation between intellectual content and social worth revolving around the term "capital" that any effort to openly distribute digital monographs will have to come to terms with.

One new initiative exploring ways of publishing open access monographs, with which Bucknell may eventually be associated through its

library, is the Lever initiative, sponsored by the Oberlin Group, a consortium of 85 Liberal Arts colleges from across the country.[7] It aims to sustain high scholarly *and* technological standards of production and accessibility. This initiative has been spearheaded by the library directors of the various colleges. It is still in its early stages, but its goals and objectives are already clear, and echo many of the points I have made. Among other things, the initiative is responding to what the Oberlin Group sees as the need for new ways of generating and publishing original scholarship in the humanities that responds to interdisciplinary curricular needs within a global consciousness, that would draw on collaborative energies to promote research in the fields taught at liberal arts colleges, building on the close relationships between faculty and students common in their institutions, and that would inspire alumni, thus strengthening broader support for the institutions themselves.

What remains to be worked out is the form this new publishing entity will take, whether a new Open Access Press will be created that will, I quote, "align the mission of this venture with the mission of our institutions, thus gaining support from deans, provosts, and presidents;" or whether it will collaborate with some existing open-access initiative either in the US or in Europe, among the many in existence, such as the OAPEN Foundation, based in Holland and working with 55 publishers producing 3000 plus titles per year with 95% of these in the humanities. Or whether the Lever initiative will seek to partner with an existing press, such as the newly created Amherst College Open Access Press (https://acpress.amherst.edu/), with its impressive list of editorial advisors and consultants, but which has yet to publish a book, or possibly with Bucknell University Press, using the existing infrastructure but providing input and investment to include the open access business model and technological developments alongside Bucknell's present arrangement with Rowman & Littlefield.

Nor is it clear yet how the new open access monograph publishing program will be funded, whether it would seek a grant from the Mellon Foundation and / or other foundations; whether it would seek private donations; whether participating institutions will contribute to the operating budget of the press in equal amounts or whether they can "buy in" to varying degrees, as the constituent parts of the University Presses of New England operate; whether authors will contribute in any way to the cost of publishing their work; or whether it will be some combination of the above.

Given the increasingly intractable situation of monograph publishing, however, digital publishing would seem to be one way in which we could encourage new and diverse work that responds to both intellectual and technological challenges, and that can add vitality to our scholarly institutions in the humanities. There is no question that digital will change not only *how* we do things but also *what* we do. Perhaps it is a truism in both science and literature that new forms come into existence in order to meet emerging needs, and, perhaps, when old forms die, their content either dies too or it morphs into something new, better able to thrive within the evolving conditions. For it looks as though new digital technologies are enabling scholarship to take different forms and produce different kinds of knowledge, especially as associated with user-generated content and applied scholarship. The paratext has been part of the vocabulary of media and cultural studies since Gérard

Genette's *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* published in French in 1987 and in English in 1997,[8] but the "accompanying productions" to the text that were part of the *theoretical* language of 1987 have now been actualized and have become an integral part of the digital text. The outside of the text has now literally become inside, and its interstitial aspects have become central, making possible creative teaching and curricular innovation that some working in Digital Humanities are already undertaking.[9]

Like many in the profession, I too appreciate both the moral and economic arguments in favor open access. How do we justify the expenditure of resources and human energy required to produce print books that retail at $100 plus, that sell to 50 individuals and 250 libraries, and whose intellectual content remains the property of the publisher? It is easier to ask such questions than it is to provide economically workable and formally adequate solutions to the problems they imply. One instinctively approves of the vision of Schnapp and Battles of the opening up of the humanities as an integral component of what they call the "library beyond the book." "The democratization of this once-enclosed world," they write, "is one of the great conquests of the modern era, one that has unleashed social forces, spread expertise, given rise to a vastly enriched universe of knowledge forms, and defined new set of civic and public functions for temples of learning" (*The Library Beyond the Book*, 29). To speak of open-access publishing of monographs – its ability to tap creative potential among writers, to reach a potentially global audience, including people in emerging economies and third world countries, while engaging students on our campuses – is to speak of the emancipatory potential of the humanities, newly energized in a world mostly dominated by STEM subjects.

But open access monographs are still far from becoming common practice, and the wholesale commitment of energy and resources towards a digital future for the humanities that many universities are now embarked on may pose as many dangers to the mission of university presses as they offer opportunities. How will the work of an open access scholarly press, in cultivating and disseminating knowledge in the humanities in forms that are *valued* by the academy, be funded without traditional commercial structures? Will university administrations acknowledge responsibility for this aspect of their educational mission? While the Bucknell Press, now in its forty-seventh year and with a strong reputation in eighteenth-century studies (among other fields), though with minimal support from its administration, explores ways of collaborating with Bucknell's Bertrand Library and the newly endowed Digital Humanities Center to produce open access monographs, we are fortunate to be in a productive relationship with the independent publishers Rowman & Littlefield. This relationship enables us to produce beautiful books of high scholarly value in hardcover, paperback, and, as indicated above, ebooks for download from many different platforms.

Certainly, collaboration between the press and the library – increasingly common in recent years as university presses have come under pressure from their administrations, and at present nineteen university presses in the USA report to the heads of their libraries – permits one to fantasize about the imminence of Borges' universal library. It also uncannily recalls the origins of humanistic scholarship in the nexus created by printers, publishers, and libraries in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe. As Anthony Grafton

eloquently discusses, as early as the third millennium BC Mesopotamian scribes were annotating the tablets they were collecting and storing, a process that later flourished in the library at Alexandria, where the poet and scholar Callimachus systematically collected, copied and commented on scrolls, a process of collecting, ordering and publishing that came to fruition in the work of Giovanni Andrea Bussi (1417-75), librarian of the collection of Pope Sixtus IV, who published with two German printers in Rome, Conrad Sweynheym and Arnold Pannartz.[10] One would like to think, to dream, that the relationship between the library and the press exemplified by Bussi's editions of the Classics and the Church Fathers could be on its way back.

But this dream presupposes an enlightened and humanistic vision and commitment on the part of librarians, appreciation for what the printed book has accomplished over the last 500 years and continues to deliver, and respect for existing academic institutions, rather than political opportunism and a mania for technological implementation at any cost. How many librarians really understand the work of the editor, the copyeditor, the designer, the typesetter, and the publisher? It remains to be seen whether libraries can honor their historical obligation to books and learning under the sign of the new digital reality, and are able to nurture rather than negate the humanistic enterprise of which they themselves are the historical product.

Notes

1. See, for example, Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1979), especially chapter 4; and Vincent Giroud, "The History of the Book in France" and Paul Hoftijzer, "The History of the Book in the Low Countries," both in *The Book: A Global History*, ed. Michael F. Suarez, S.J. & H.R. Woudhuysen (Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 2013), 330-34 and 352-57.

2. Robert Darnton, "E-Books and Old Books," in *The Case for Books* (New York: Public Affairs, 2009), 67-77. See also two other documents that survey the situation of scholarly publishing in relation to professional accreditation and achievement over the last decade: MLA Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of Scholarly Publishing, "The Future of Scholarly Publishing," *Profession 2002* (New York: MLA, 2002), 172-86, and Philip Lewis, "The Publishing Crisis and Tenure Criteria: An Issue for Research Universities?" *Profession 2012* (New York: MLA, 2012), 244-55.

3. Robert Darnton, "Gutenberg-e," in *The Case for Books*, 99, 100.

4. Naomi S. Baron, "How E-Reading Threatens Learning in the Humanities," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 18, 2014, A52.

5. John B. Thompson, *Books in the Digital Age* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005), 82-83.

6. Jeffrey T. Schnapp and Matthew Battles, *The Library Beyond the Book* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 2014), 14-15.

7. The initial report on the Lever Initiative can be accessed at the following link: http://leverinitiative.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/lever_initiative_phaseone_report_apr141.pdf.

8. *Seuils* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1987); *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, trans. Jane E. Lewen (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1997).

9. For example, Katherine Faull's fall 2014 course "The Humanities Now" (HUMN 100-1) at Bucknell University: http://thehumanitiesnow.blogs.bucknell.edu/. See also Thomas Doherty, "The Paratext's the Thing," *The Chronicle Review*, January 10, 2014, B13-15.

10. Anthony Grafton., "Codex in Crisis: the Book Dematerializes," in *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 2009), 293-95.

Editor's note: We thank Greg Clingham for allowing us to cut much from the first of his two lectures at Emory University on 18 September 2014–the material omitted includes appreciative remarks on the press and Bucknell University.

"The Falsity of that Definition animal rationale": Philosophical Foundations of Swift's "Misanthropy"

by Kirsten Juhas and Hermann Josef Real

None judge so wrong as those who think amiss.
Pope, *Translations from Chaucer*

How finely we argue upon mistaken facts!
Sterne, *Tristram Shandy*

I

On 29 September 1725, in what has been described as the "most celebrated passage in Swift's correspondence," and presumably the most frequently cited one, too, the Dean of St Patrick's let his good friend Alexander Pope into the secret of his "Misanthropy":

> when you think of the World give it one lash the more at my Request. I have ever hated all Nations professions and Communityes and all my love is towards individualls; for instance, I hate the tribe of Lawyers, but I love Councellor such a one, Judge such a one, for so with Physicians (I will not Speak of my own Trade) Soldiers, English, Scotch, French; and the rest but principally I hate and detest that animal called man, although I hartily love John, Peter, Thomas and so forth. This is the system upon which I have governed my self many years … and so I shall go on till I have done with them. I have got Materials Towards a Treatis proving the falsity of that Definition animal rationale, and to show it should be only *rationis capax*. Upon this great foundation of Misanthropy (though not Timons manner) the whole building of my Travells is erected: And I never will have peace of mind till all honest men are of my Opinion: by Consequence you are to embrace it immediatly and procure that all who deserve my Esteem may do so too.[1]

The Dean obviously cared about his "Definition": he not only reiterated but also confirmed it two months later, on 26 November 1725, in another celebrated letter to Pope, insisting at the same time both on the longevity and the originality of his views: "I *have always rejected* that Definition and made *another of my own*."[2] Of course, Swift subsequently had a price to pay for what he privately confessed to be his "[Dis]affection to the World" that was not to "be imputed to [his] Age." When this finally became public knowledge in Faulkner's 1741 edition of *Letters to and from Dr. J. Swift*, it almost immediately redirected the "very good diversion to all the town" that had marked the early reception history of *Gulliver's Travels*[3] and unleashed the cascade of opprobrious epithets showered on it since the mid-eighteenth century as a position of negativity "sapping the very foundations of MORALITY and RELIGION."[4] What the Dean's detractors never seem to have realized was that he would have had a story to tell: neither was Swift's position as straightforward and self-evident nor as new and original as he claimed it to be.[5]

II

The rejection of "that Definition animal rationale" is usually associated with the young Jonathan's rebellion against the scholastic curriculum of Trinity College. Biographers and critics have never tired of pointing out that his academic education began with the inculcation of "the dull, crabbed, system of *Aristotle*'s Logic,"[6] at a time, that is, when young people were least "capable of applying that to any valuable purpose."[7] Moreover, Aristotle was mediated through the "Provost's Logic," Provost Narcissus Marsh's manual of *Institutiones Logicæ in usum juventutis Academicæ Dubliniensis* (first published in 1679 and revised and reprinted in 1681),[8] which, as Trinity's Laudian statutes stipulated in Latin, had to be "read through at least thrice" during the first year,[9] and it was written by a man, too, whom Swift detested and whose head, as he acerbically noted in "A Character of Primate Marsh," was packed with "other mens thoughts."[10] Last but not least, Young Jonathan, as he would later remember in his autobiographical fragment, "Family of Swift," had "*no great relish by Nature"* for the subject, with the upshot that "he too much neglected his Academical Studyes."[11] Indeed, it is no surprise that Jonathan's mark in philosophy was *male* in his final year.[12]

However, if we may take Swift's confessional statements in the letters of September and November 1725 to Pope seriously, what seems to have exasperated the young student most about the "Provost's Logic" was not so much the fact that the humdrum whole with all its parade of convoluted cant and seemingly interminable series of impenetrable syllogistic opacity was required reading for all junior freshmen as the circumstance that in it he would have been repeatedly reminded of its hubristic understanding of human nature, the loathed maxim in which the boastful belief in the essential rationality of Humankind most pithily articulated itself: *Homo est animal rationale,*[13] a proposition, incidentally, to which near contemporaries of Swift like the Bishop of Dromore, Dr George Rust, awarded the status of a logical and moral universal, that is, a "necessary and eternal truth."[14] This 'truth' was represented in a tree diagram, the *Arbor Porphyriana*, an ontological as well as hierarchical model of the Creation named after the Neoplatonist philosopher Porphyry (ad 233-c.305),

whose *Isagoge*, or Introduction to the Categories of Aristotle, had provided the basis for "the Provost's Logic":[15]

It is important to realize that the Provost showed himself primarily preoccupied with this age-old ontological model of the physical world, that continuum of realized forms of existence otherwise known as the Chain of Being, and Mankind's middle position on the *scala naturae*. The very fact that this middle position endowed Man with an element of Divine Reason, somehow allowing him to "participate" in it, perhaps best accounts for Marsh's (exasperatingly uninventive) obsession with syllogistic ratiocination, the ancient if trusted method of arriving at "reasoned" results, which dominates virtually the whole of the "Provost's Logic." In his view, the Reason of Nature and the reasoning of syllogistic logic are correlative. It is true that Marsh at times *does* invoke the formula *animal rationale*, the gist of the hubristic understanding of human nature underlying the teaching of the schools. But he never propagates or preaches it, invariably utilizing it only as an *example*, among a plethora of others, to demonstrate the workings of syllogisms.[16] In other words, the formula never "becomes" an argument, and it is never central to an argument, either; rather, it is always incidental to a thesis, as auxiliary as a welcome point, but never more than apposite to a subordinate purpose. By the early 1720s when *Gulliver's Travels* was being written,[17] Marsh (1638-1713) had been dead for several years,[18] and, if the Dean still had personal reasons for a protracted vendetta against his old Provost at that time,[19] these are unknown.

Rather, and more probably, Swift was at pains to explode the philosophy Marsh stood for, or, perhaps better, *not* stood for, and with a particular orientation and intent, too. While it may still be safe to assume that the *Institutiones Logicæ* was *among* Swift's targets,[20] new evidence suggests that the Dean was aiming not at *individual*, identifiable sources but at a whole school of "orthodox" thought of which Marsh was but *one* representative.[21] Remarkably, Swift's massive two-volume edition of Aristotle's *Opera omnia* of 1629 also contained the *Institvtiones Porphyrii*, in which the tree diagram, or ontological hierarchy, was described in these words:

> Substantia est & ipsa genus.
> sub ea est corpus, &
> sub corpore, animatum corpus:
> sub quo animal.
> sub animali autem, rationale animal:
> sub quo homo.
> sub homine autem Socrates, & Plato, & particulares homines.[22]

In other words, if Swift wished to kick against the pricks of conventional, accepted knowledge, he was up against a really formidable challenge.

But then, the question also is whether we can safely accept the Dean's claim that his alternative, *Homo animal rationis capax*, may be regarded as his own. Admittedly**,** the syntagma *rationis capax* was important to Swift. In the holograph of his letter to Pope of 29 September 1725, "now presumed lost," whose transcription, before publication in 1741, Lord Oxford "personally double-checked for errors or omissions" supplying "in his own handwriting any word or words considered by the transcriber to be illegible," *rationis capax* "received an underline."[23] This emphasis notwithstanding, a modicum of doubt remains given the fact that Swift loved 'originality' topoi throughout his career, that, more often than not, he was speaking tongue-in-cheek when invoking them,

and that, as a result, he teased, *and* confused, his readers with them.[24] A few examples will have to suffice.

Paradoxically, the Latin lines quoted as an epigraph on the title page of *A Tale of a Tub* (1704) - "*Juvatque novos decerpere flores, / Insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam, / Unde prius nulli velarunt [velarint] tempora Musæ* ['Tis my joy to pluck new flowers and gather glorious coronal for my head from spots whence before the muses have never wreathed the forehead of any man]" - proclaim a promise already made in the *De rerum natura* of Lucretius, one of Swift's favourite authors;[25] similarly, his announcement, in the Apology to the *Tale'*s fifth edition, dated 1709, "*He resolved to proceed in a manner, that should be altogether new, the World having been already too long nauseated with endless Repetitions upon every Subject*,"[26] was a commonplace as old as Horace - "Dicam insigne recens, adhuc / Indictum ore alio [I will sing of a noble exploit, recent, as yet untold by other lips]"[27]- and as late as 1731, the Dean made the speaker of the *Rose*-tavern monologue say what he probably liked to have heard about himself: "'To steal a Hint was never known, / But what he writ was all his own,'"[28] a couplet that constitutes a lie enacted being pilfered as it was from Sir John Denham's "On Mr. Abraham Cowley: His Death and Burial amongst the Ancient Poets": "To him no Author was unknown, / Yet what he wrote was all his own."[29] Outrageously, Swift is "original" here in asserting plagiarism to be original. Finally, in Faulkner's Advertisement to the *Works* of 1735, the Prince of Dublin publishers endorsed the claim: "*The Author never was known either in Verse or Prose to borrow any Thought, Simile, Epithet, or particular Manner of Style; but whatever he writ, whether good, bad, or indifferent, is an Original in itself*,"[30] a sentence which reads as if it had been dictated by the Dean himself.

III

The boastful belief in the essential rationality of Humankind is not only a linchpin of the Aristotelian, and Porphyrian, scholasticism to which Swift and his fellow students were subjected at Trinity College at the end of the seventeenth century (and beyond); it was also the hallmark of competing rival movements, such as the Stoic and (neo-)Pythagorean schools of philosophy.[31] Two important sources in the history of transmission are Diogenes Laertius (*fl.* first half of the third century AD), the Greek compiler of *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers*, of whom Swift owned the important two-volume edition by Marcus Meibomius, *De vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus clarorum philosophorum libri X*,[32] and Diogenes' English popularizer Thomas Stanley (1625-1678), whose *History of Philosophy* the Dean may or may not have known. Another is the *Aurea carmina*, 71 hexameters, on which a commentary exists by Hierocles, of Alexandria, a fifth century AD Neoplatonist. The 1654 London edition of *Golden Words* was in Swift's library, together with a Latin verse translation by the commentator, a certain Joannes Curterius (*fl.* 1580).[33] Surprisingly, Hierocles' lengthy annotations on the individual hexameter lines of *Golden Words* are suffused not so much with Platonist ideas as with Stoic notions, familiar from Cicero's philosophical writings. Thus, Nature is controlled by Reason, and Reason in turn is identical with God - "est enim bonus Deus natura ipsa" - Reason, likewise, is the distinguishing faculty of Man - "[ratio] quæ in nobis est" - and the passions have to subject themselves to

Reason - "Decet ergo adversus ista omnia recta ratione bene munitum animum;" conversely, to the wise man, "who is capable of reason," all kinds of vice will appear to be marks of imprudence - "Exsistunt autem vitiorum genera permulta, *in eo quidem quod rationis est capax*, imprudentia." Finally, Hierocles' gloss on line 29 of *Aurea carmina* presents the conclusion:

> Quia enim *natura nostra rationis est particeps, atque ideo deliberationis capax*, cum propria voluntate ad consilia vel prava vel recta ducitur, tum quidem quæ secundum naturam vita est, vim servat ipsius; corrumpit autem, quantum potest, quæ id eligit quod non decet [Because *our nature partakes of reason and because it is therefore capable of deliberation*, whenever it is led by a person's own will either to wrong or right decisions, a life which is according to Nature will preserve its power, but a life which opts for what is not fitting, will destroy it to the extent to which that is possible].[34]

All this evidence notwithstanding, Hierocles and the contexts for which his "creed outworn" stands may be considered an unlikely "source" for the Dean of the St Patrick's. Yet even so, it has to be noted that the components of Swift's celebrated and, at the same time, provocative definition of Man occur previously in intellectual history, however dark and remote its corners may have been. But there are more pieces to be picked up before the end of the story.

IV

In November 1719, shortly before he embarked on *Gulliver's Travels*,[35] the Dean finished reading the *Attic Nights* by Aulus Gellius (c.130-180 ad), "a random collection of short essays, based on the Greek and Latin books [the author] had read and the conversations and lectures he had heard," both in Athens and Rome, and dealing "with a great variety of topics." As Swift jotted down in a note, in Latin, on the recto of the first flyleaf of his own copy, which is in the Forster Collection of the Victoria and Albert Museum today (4^{o} 1706.3362), this was the second time he had studied Gellius, and after a long interval, too - "Post longum temporis intervallum secundâ vice perlegi hunc librum" - and the care with which the Dean did so is borne out by the many pencil marks and saltire crosses, ostensibly in his own hand, which permeate the volume.[36]

At the beginning of Book Four, Gellius records a dialogue, in somewhat bantering Socratic fashion, between a philosopher, Favorinus, and a nameless braggart grammarian, or literary critic in modern parlance. During their altercation, which relates to the philosophical difference between *genus* and *species*, Favorinus forces the naive grammarian into admitting that, if challenged to define the genus *homo*, he would (have to) fall back on the familiar, "standard" definition:

> Si, inquit, ego nunc te rogem uti mihi dicas & quasi circumscribas verbis, quid *homo* sit; non, opinor, respondeas hominem esse te atque me. Hoc enim, quis homo sit, ostendere est; non, quid homo sit, dicere. Sed si, inquam, peterem ut ipsum illud, quod homo est definires, tum profecto mihi diceres, *hominem esse* mortale *animal rationis & scientiæ capiens*; vel quo modo alio modo diceres, ut eum à cæteris animalibus omnibus separares.

> [If I should now ask you to tell me, and as it were to define in words, what a man is, you would not, I am confident, reply that you and I are men. For that is to show who is a man, not to tell what a man is. But if, I say, I should ask you to define exactly what a man is, you would undoubtedly tell me that a man is a mortal living being, endowed with reason and knowledge, or you would define him in some other manner which would differentiate him from all other animals].[37]

In the learned glosses of their commentary, in which the editors Gronovius chiefly focus on problems of the complex and controversial transmission of Gellius' text, they drily, and correctly, point out the tautological element in "*Et scientiæ capiens*] Superfluum hoc in definitione esse videtur, cum sufficiat dixisse hominem esse animal rationale. *Capiens*, autem dixit, pro *capax*" (p. 258). Indeed, any animal *capable* of reason(ing) by definition is rational; conversely, no animal void of reason is capable of rational thought. In other words, it does not make a difference whether one defines Man as *animal rationale* or as *animal rationis capax; rationis capax* implies, or presupposes, *animal rationale*. However, while the Dean is likely to have spotted the editors' reservation in their gloss on that line due to his exceptional familiarity with the *Attic Nights*, he was not concerned with either logic or tautology when creating what he told Pope was 'his' definition, *homo animal rationis capax*.

V

Among Swift's most important working quarries from which 'his' definition, and by implication the 'philosophy' of *Gulliver's Travels*, was eventually hewn were the philosophical dialogues of Cicero, more particularly *De natura deorum*, *Tusculanae disputationes*, and *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, as well as *De legibus* and *Academica*, or *Academici libri*, all composed during Cicero's political retirement towards the end of his life and all easily available in several editions in Swift's library.[38] These dialogues were designed to disseminate knowledge of the various schools of Greek philosophy in Rome; thematically as well as structurally, this is achieved by allowing a (real rather than imaginary) interlocutor to expound his views at some length, with other less dominant characters joining in the conversation, more or less perfunctorily, as occasion requires. In several of these dialogues, Cicero assigns to Stoic speakers the role of setting out the chief doctrines of their school. These explain that Nature, which is identical with the universe, is controlled by Reason - "since it would be sacrilege to say that anything stands above universal Nature, we must admit that reason is inherent in Nature [nefasque sit dicere ullam rem praestare naturae omnium rerum, rationem inesse in ea contendendum est]" - from which "it follows of necessity that the world is an intelligent being [necesse est intellegentem esse mundum]."[39] Reason in turn is identical with God - "Deum verò esse animal … rationale" - who not only created the world - "in seipsum omnem substantiam consumens, ac eam rursus ex seipso gignens [who absorbs into himself the whole of substance and again creates it from himself]"[40] - but who also makes Himself felt in the world process as Fate (alternatively called "Providence"): "Such being the nature of the world-mind, it can therefore correctly be designated as prudence or providence [Talis igitur

mens mundi cum sit ob eamque causam vel prudentia vel providentia appellari recte possit]."[41]

Reason is also the distinctively human faculty, in fact, "the most divine element in Man [qua nihil est in homine divinius]," in so far as "any whole takes its name from its predominant and preponderant part [semper enim ex eo quod maximas partes continet latissimeque funditur tota res appellatur]."[42] Therefore, the wise man, "the perfect and consummate type of humanity,[43] who is aware of this truth, is always at pains to live in harmony with Nature (that is, Divine, or Right, Reason), and to avoid any "agitation of the soul," which Zeno defined as a disorder "alien from right reason and contrary to nature [aversa a recta ratione contra naturam animi commotio]."[44] Indeed, "virtue itself can best be summed up as right reason [ipsa virtus brevissime recta ratio dici potest]."[45] In *Academicis libris*, his epistemology, Cicero summarized the gist of this Stoic thinking on Nature and the nature of Humankind in a formula which is more than vaguely reminiscent of Swift's: "Si *homo* est, *animal* est mortale, *rationis particeps.*"[46] Cicero obviously thought sufficiently well of this definition as to make his fictional spokesman, Marcus, reiterate it in *De legibus*, at the same time taking care to embed it in the whole of the Stoic system and to elucidate its rational component, ratio(cination), by a sequence of explanatory synonyms:

> *anima*l hoc providum, sagax, multiplex, acutum, memor, *plenum* rationis et consilii, quem vocamus hominem, praeclara quadam condicione generatum esse a supremo deo; solum est enim ex tot animantium generibus atque naturis *particeps rationis et cogitationis*, cum cetera sint omnia expertia. Quid est autem non dicam in homine, sed in omni caelo atque terra ratione divinius? quae cum adolevit atque perfecta est, nominatur rite sapientia. est igitur, quoniam *nihil est ratione melius* eaque est in homine et in deo, prima homini cum deo rationis societas; inter quos autem ratio, inter eosdem etiam recta ratio communis est. [That animal which we call man, endowed with foresight and quick intelligence, complex, keen, possessing memory, full of reason and prudence, has been given a certain distinguished status by the supreme God who created him; for he is the only one among so many different kinds and varieties of living beings who has a share in reason and thought, while all the rest are deprived of it. But what is more divine, I will not say in man only, but in all heaven and earth, than reason? And reason, when it is full grown and perfected, is rightly called wisdom. Therefore, since there is nothing better than reason, and since it exists both in man and God, the first common possession of man and God is reason. But those who have reason in common must also have right reason in common].[47]

The briefest of glimpses at the two Latin dictionaries available to Swift on his library shelves, the French *Officina Latinitatis* of 1681, and Adam Littleton's *Linguae Latinae liber dictionarius quadripartitus* of 1684 will clarify what is meant by the phrase *rationis particeps* in the contexts of Ciceronian philosophy.[48] While Littleton defines "particeps" as *partaker & sharer*, as well as *privy to one's design* in the collocation "particeps consilii," *Officina Latinitatis* describes it, perhaps more precisely, as *participant, qui participe à quelque chose, qui y a part* (s.v.). "Rationis particeps," in Cicero, then, denotes the man who, although not identical with God, *partakes* of Divine Reason, his

God-given *donnée* distinguishing him from all other animals of the Creation, the divine spark enabling him to act rationally as well as morally. In this view, the only truly rational "animal" is God.

Rationis particeps comes close to both Swift's formula *rationis capax* and also to the definition of "capax" in the sense of "capable to receive or hold."[49] In this sense, which is that propounded by the *Arbor Porphyriana* in the "Provost's Logic," nobody on the human scale of the ontological pyramid is entirely *void* of reason; everybody is *potentially* rational, "capable of reason," a conclusion which, however, eventually re-establishes the already disputed tautology. But, at the risk of being our own chorus, Swift was not interested in the (tauto-)logical aspect of the formula; on the contrary, he was interested in ethics.

VI

Almost a year *before* the *editio princeps* of *Gulliver's Travels*, Swift's philosopher-friend Henry St John, Viscount Bolingbroke, who like Pope had been let into the secret of the Dean's "misanthropy," confronted him with a reservation about the truth claim of this supposedly new anthropology. In a postscript added to a letter from Pope to Swift, dated 14 December 1725, his Lordship reminded the Dean bluntly as well as brusquely: "Your Definition of Animal capax Rationis instead of the Common one Animal Rationale, will not bear examination. Define but Reason, and you will see why your distinction is not better than that of the Pontiffe Cotta between mala Ratio and bona Ratio."[50] Bolingbroke's critique leads on to what may have been Swift's most important source of inspiration: the third part of Cicero's *De natura deorum*, in which one of the interlocutors, the distinguished orator Gaius Aurelius Cotta, Roman consul and *pontifex maximus* before 74 BC,[51] voices his belief that "god bestows upon us (if indeed he does) merely reason - it is *we* who make it good or the reverse."[52] Although Cotta never once summons the phrase *rationis capax* during his exposition, his understanding of Man as a reasonable creature stipulates a shift from the general *status of being* to the *capacity*, or *ability*, of individuals. It is this shift that Swift was having in mind when he targeted "the *falsity* of that Definition animal rationale" in his most famous letter of September 1725 to Pope.

To the best of our knowledge, Swift was the first to have understood *animal rationale* and *animal rationis capax* not as a tautology but as an antithesis. And to the best of our knowledge, he was the first to have realized, *and* to have exploited, the ambivalence of Latin of *capax* by opting for its second (active) meaning, "capable," in the sense of "in a condition or qualified to do a thing: able, apt, fit."[53] In (t)his view, everyone is *potentionally able* to use their share of reason "reasonably" as well as *potentionally able not* to do so: the possibility of choice implies the freedom to act *either way*. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, which also was mandatory reading in Trinity College's scholastic curriculum,[54] Aristotle explains what freedom of choice entails with all the clarity one could wish for:

> For where we are free to act, we are also free to refrain from acting, and where we are able to say No, we are also able to say Yes; if therefore we are responsible for doing a thing when to do it is right, we are also responsible

> for not doing it when not to do it is wrong, and if we are responsible for rightly not doing a thing, we are also responsible for wrongly doing it.[55]

(Rational) virtue is as *voluntary*, then, as the propensity to (irrational) vice.

There are two arguments which persuade us that this reading of Swift's 'anthropology' is more plausible than traditional readings. Led astray perhaps by the Dean's own asseveration in his November 1725 letter to Pope that his "[Dis]affection to the World [should] not be imputed to [his] Age,"[56] these tend to locate the origins of Swift's philosophy of Man in his education at Trinity College and its scholastic curriculum, but this is not necessarily the case. For one thing, our reading tallies with what the Dean had to say on Reason elsewhere, on its range as well as its relationship with the passions. *"Reason* itself is true and just," he announced in his sermon *On the Trinity*, "but the *Reason* of every particular Man is weak and wavering, perpetually swayed and turned by his Interests, his Passions, and his Vices."[57] For another, and more importantly, the traces Swift has left in the Fourth Book of his masterpiece confirm his knowledge of Cicero.

At the end of his long conversations with the Houyhnhnm Master, ostensibly the embodiment of reason pure and unalloyed, Gulliver comes to a devastating verdict on the use his own species makes of its God-given potential: "WHEN I thought of my Family, my Friends, my Countrymen, or human Race in general, I considered them as they really were, *Yahoos* in Shape and Disposition, perhaps a little more civilized, and qualified with the Gift of Speech; but making no other Use of Reason, than to improve and multiply those Vices, whereof their Brethren in this Country had only the Share that Nature allotted them."[58] This position, according to which Man's inability to make proper use of reason when confronted with moral choices only leads to an increase in his corruptions sounds like an echo of Pontiff Aurelius Cotta's judgement that "it would perhaps have been better if that nimbleness and penetration and cleverness of thought which we term 'reason', being as it is disastrous to many and wholesome to but few, had never been given to the human race at all, than that it should have been given in such bounteous abundance."[59] The available evidence suggests that Swift concurred with Cotta's critique even though he continued to refer to the definition as his own.

VII

The upshot is clear: the Dean is not as original as he pretended to think of himself, having revivified "another" definition of Man that already existed in a variety of (classical and post-classical) sources, verbal, syntactic, and intellectual, among which the "Provost's Logic" is but one among many. In the light of the examples from Swift's library and reading, in which the formula *homo est animal rationale* and its variant *rationis particeps* occur again and again, he is bound to have felt provoked by their self-evident, unquestioned omnipresence. However, the conclusions he drew from this pre-existing material, especially from Cicero's *De natura deorum*, stressing Man's (in)capability to reason(ing), as well as the way the Dean treated this topic in *Gulliver's Travels* are distinctively Swiftian.[60]

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

Notes

1. *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. David Woolley, 5 vols. (Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 1999-2014), II, 606-7 and n. 7. We have cautiously modernized the punctuation in two or three places. Hereafter cited as "*Correspondence*" (referring to Woolley's edition).

2. *Correspondence*, II, 623; emphasis added. Paradoxically, in this same letter, Swift denied that his stance could justly be labeled "misanthropic": "I tell you after all that I do not hate Mankind, it is vous autr[e]s who hate them because you would have them reasonable Animals, and are Angry for being disappointed" (II, 623). Some critics have tried to resolve this paradox by means of another paradox, the concept of 'benevolent misanthropy" (see, for this notion, Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken, "'Not in Timon's Manner': La Bruyère and Swift," *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 32 [1985], 203-4).

3. See, in addition to *Correspondence*, III, 13, n. 4, 47-48 and n. 1, 52 and n. 2, and *passim*, Dr John Arbuthnot to Edward Harley, 16 November 1726, *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath*, I (London: HMC, 1904), 252; *The Correspondence of Dr John Arbuthnot*, ed. Angus Ross (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2006), pp. 269, 272; *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu*, ed. Robert Halsband, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965-67), II, 71-72 and n. 3.

4. *Correspondence*, II, 623, 609, n. 7; I, 65-67. For some select titles from the critical history of *Gulliver's Travels*, see Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken, *Jonathan Swift, "Gulliver's Travels"* (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1984), pp. 7-14 (9); see also Donald M. Berwick, *The Reputation of Jonathan Swift, 1781-1882* (Philadelphia, 1941), pp. 38-44, and *passim*; Merrel D. Clubb, "The Criticism of Gulliver's 'Voyage to the Houyhnhnms,' 1726-1914," *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*, ed. Hardin Craig (1941), pp. 202-32; and, more recently, Melanie Maria Just, "The Reception of *Gulliver's Travels* in Britain and Ireland, France and Germany," *Les Voyages de Gulliver: Mondes lointains ou mondes proches*, eds Daniel Carey and François Boulaire (Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen, 2002), pp. 81-100.

5. We agree with Peter K. Elkin's warning that "this is not the simple admission that it is usually taken to be" (see *The Augustan Defence of Satire* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973], p. 95).

6. See E. J. Furlong, "The Study of Logic in Trinity College, Dublin," *Hermathena*, 60 (1942), 38-53; Constantia Maxwell, *A History of Trinity College, Dublin, 1591-1892* (Dublin: University Press, 1946), pp. 49-53.

7. William King, *An Essay on the Origin of Evil: Translated from the Latin, with Notes, by Edmund [Law], Lord Bishop of Carlisle*, 5th (London and Cambridge: R. Faulder and T. and J. Merril, 1781), p. xviii. King's criticism was endorsed by Matthew Prior (*The Literary Works of Matthew Prior*, eds H. Bunker Wright and Monroe K. Spears, 2nd ed., 2 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971], II, 1007).

8. See, in addition to M. Pollard, "The Provost's Logic: An Unrecorded First Issue," *Long Room*, n.s. 1 (1970), 38-40; James A. W. Rembert, *Swift and the Dialectical Tradition* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), pp. 63-72, and Muriel McCarthy, *Marsh's Library, Dublin: All Graduates & Gentlemen* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), pp. 15-16 and n. 6.

9. Robert Bolton, *A Translation of the Charter and Statutes of Trinity-College, Dublin, 1760* (Dublin: Samuel Watson, 1760), pp. 70-71.

10. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, eds Herbert Davis, *et al*., 16 vols. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939-68), V, 211-12 (212). For the reasons for Swift's contempt for Marsh, see also Kenneth Craven, "*A Tale of a Tub* and the 1697 Dublin Controversy," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 1 (1986), 97-110 (pp. 106-8).

11. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, V, 192 (emphasis added).

12. Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, his Works, and the Age*, 3 vols. (London: Methuen; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1983 [1962-83]), *I: Mr Swift and his Contemporaries*, p. 279.

13. For more details, see the seminal essay by R. S. Crane, "The Houyhnhnms, the Yahoos, and the History of Ideas," *Reason and the Imagination: Studies in the History of Ideas, 1600-1800*, ed. J. A. Mazzeo (New York: Columbia U. Press, 1962), pp. 231-53.

14. George Rust, *A Discourse of Truth* (New York: Garland, 1978 [London: J. Collins & S. Louns, 1682]), pp. 165-66. See also Uwe Pauschert, "It Should Be Only *Rationis Capax*," *Swift Studies*, 1 (1986), 67.

15. The following illustration is from the second edition of *Institutiones logicæ* (Dublin: S. Helsham, 1681), p. 15.

16. See, e.g., *Institutiones logicæ*, sigs A3r, A4r, pp. 129, 131-33, 182-83.

17. See Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, his Works, and the Age*, 3 vols. (London: Methuen; Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press, 1983), III, 442-47.

18. For a brief survey of the Archbishop's biography, see Muriel McCarthy, "Swift and the Foundation of the First Public Library in Ireland," *Swift Studies*, 4 (1989), 29-33.

19. See, among others, *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, V, xxvi.

20. For more reasons, see Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken, "Vistas of Porphyry's Tree," *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 8 (1983), 92-94.

21. From what follows, it will become clear that we do not agree with J. A. Downie, who has recently argued that Swift was targeting "a specific writer's treatment of the subject in Gulliver's fourth voyage, and that that writer [was] Locke" ("Gulliver's Fourth Voyage and Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding*," *Reading Swift: Papers from The Fifth Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift*, ed. Hermann J. Real [Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2008], pp. 453-64 [459]).

22. *Opera omnia quae extant, Graece et Latine*, ed. Guilelmus Du Val, 2 vols. (Paris, 1629), I, 1-14 (sigs. A1v-B1v) (p. 3 [A2r]). We have typographically re-arranged this quotation, so as to make its character of the *scala naturae* more evident. See also Chapter XII: "semper enim Socrates *est* rationalis, & semper Socrates *est* homo" (p. 11 [A6r] [Dirk F. Passmann and Heinz J. Vienken, *The Library and Reading of Jonathan Swift: A Bio-Bibliographical Handbook*, 4 vols. {Frankfurt on Main: Peter Lang, 2003}, I, 85-86]; hereafter cited as "Passmann & Vienken").

23. *Correspondence*, II, 609, n. 7.

24. See also Michael G. Devine, "Disputing the 'Original' in Swift's *Tale of a Tub*," *Swift Studies*, 18 (2003), 26-33 (p. 27, n. 6).

25. *De rerum natura libri sex*, ed. Tannegui Le Fevre (Cambridge: by John Hayes for W. Morden, 1675), p. 26 (I, 928-30); quoted from an edition known to have been in Swift's library (Passmann & Vienken, II, 1122).

26. References are to *A Tale of a Tub and Other Works*, ed. Marcus Walsh (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 2010), pp. 5, 14, 320.

27. *Carmina*, in *Qvintvs Horativs Flaccvs*, ed. Daniel Heinsius (Leiden: Elzevir, 1628), p. 75 (III, xxv, 7-8); again, quoted from an edition known to have been in Swift's library (Passmann & Vienken, II, 905).

28. *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Harold Williams, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), II, 565, ll. 317-18.

29. *Poems and Translations*, 5th ed. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1709), p. 86, ll. 29-30.

30. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, XIII, 184.

31. Not dealt with by Robert Voitle in his learned survey, "The Reason of the English Enlightenment," *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 27 (1963), 1735-74.

32. Passmann & Vienken, I, 525-26. For the life and writings of Zeno of Citium (*c*. 333-262 BC), the founder of the Stoic school, see I, 366-470.

33. Passmann & Vienken, II, 857-58. See also Friedrich Wilhelm Köhler, "Textgeschichte von Hierokles' Kommentar zum Carmen aureum der Pythagoreer," Ph.D. dissertation, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (Münster, 1965), pp. 145-50.

34. *Hieroclis Philosophi commentarius in aurea Pythagoreorem carmina: Joan. Curterio interprete* (London: R. Daniel, 1654), pp. 20, 76, 123, 151, 83-84, 163, and *passim*. The translation is by Hermann J. Real.

35. Ehrenpreis, *Dean Swift*, pp. 442-47.

36. See, for most of these details, Passmann & Vienken, I, 688-90. As Swift also recorded on the recto of the second flyleaf, the edition was a present from his friend Erasmus Lewis ("Donum amici de me optime meriti Erasm. Lewis"), dated 10 April 1712. If Swift read the *Attic Nights* in this same edition for the first time, April 1712 would provide the *terminus post quem*, an interval of seven-and-a-half years.

37. *Auli Gellii Noctium Atticarum libri XX prout supersunt*, eds Johannes Fredericus and Jacobus Gronovii (Leiden: Cornelius Bouteskeyn and Johannes du Vivié, 1706), pp. 255-62 (p. 258 [IV, i]); emphases added. The English translation is again taken from the Loeb Classical Library edition, *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, ed. and trans. John C. Rolfe (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1961 [1937]), p. 313 (IV, i, 12). In our view, the phrase "endowed with reason and knowledge" is not an adequate translation of the Latin "animal rationis & scientiæ capiens." We prefer "capable of," alternatively, "susceptible to," reason and knowledge. Interestingly, Gellius' near contemporary Galen, the Greek physician and philosopher (129-199 AD), defines Man in almost identical terms "as the only animal capable of knowledge [solus autem homo scientiæ capax]" (*Epitome Galeni opervm, in qvatvor partes digesta* [Lyon: J. Caffin and F. Plaignard, 1643], pp. 1, 92 [Passmann & Vienken, I, 662-63]), possibly because they had a common source.

38. Passmann and Vienken, I, 406-14.

39. Cicero, *De re publica; De legibus*, ed. and trans. Clinton Walker Keyes (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1970 [1928]), pp.

389, 381-82 (II, vii, 16; iv, 10); *De natura deorum, Academica*, ed. and trans. H. Rackham (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1961 [1933]), p. 157 (II, xiii, 36).

40. Diogenes Laertius, *De vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus clarorum philosophorum libri X*, ed. Meibomius, I, 451, 458 (137, 147). The English translation is from Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, ed. and trans. R. D. Hicks, 2 vols. (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1970-72 [1925]), II, 241

41. Cicero, *De natura deorum, Academica*, ed. and trans. Rackham, pp. 179, 197 (II, xxii, 58; II, xxx, 76).

42. Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, ed. and trans. H. Rackham, 2nd ed. (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1967 [1921]), pp. 435, 497 (V, xiii, 38; V, xxx, 92). See also pp. 133, 207, 429-31 (II, xiv, 45; II, xxxiv, 114; V, xii, 34).

43. Cicero, *De finibus bonorum et malorum*, trans. Rackham, p. 341 (IV, xiv, 37); see also Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, ed. and trans. J. E. King (London: William Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1960 [1927]), p. 205 (II, xxii, 51).

44. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, ed. and trans. King, pp. 339, 379 (IV, vi, 11; IV, xxi, 47). See also p. 243 (III, vii, 15). In addition, see Diogenes Laertius, *De vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus clarorum philosophorum libri X*, ed. Meibomius, I, 417-18 (87-88).

45. Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, ed. and trans. King, p. 363 (IV, xv, 34).

46. *De natura deorum, Academica*, trans. Rackham, p. 495 (II, vii, 21).

47. Cicero, *De re publica; De legibus*, ed. and trans. Keyes, pp. 320-23 (I, vii, 22-23); see also *Epitome Galeni opervm, in qvatvor partes digesta*, pp. 499-500 [Passmann & Vienken, I, 662-63]).

48. Passmann & Vienken, II, 1088-89, 1339.

49. Nathan Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum: or, A More Compleat Universal Etymological English Dictionary* (1730) (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1969), s.v. "capacious." See also *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on the Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*, eds Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), s.v. "capax."

50. *Correspondence*, II, 627 and n. 11. The reference is to Cicero, *De natura deorum*, II, xxviii, 71.

51. Cicero, *Brutus*, ed. and trans. G. L. Hendrickson (Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1962), pp. 155-57, 275-277 (xlviii, 183; xcii, 317-18).

52. Cicero, *De natura deorum, Academica*, ed. and trans. Rackham, pp. 355-57 (III, xxviii, 70-71); emphasis added.

53. Bailey, *Dictionarium Britannicum*, s.v. "capable." See also *A Latin Dictionary*, eds Lewis and Short, s.v. "capax"; OED *Online*, s.v. "capable" (5a), (http:/www.oed.com/view/Entry/27354?redirectedFrom=capable, accessed 1 October 2014).

54. Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, his Works, and the Age*, I, 57-65.

55. Aristotle, *The Nicomachean Ethics*, ed. & trans. H. Rackham (London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge: Harvard U. Press, 1968), pp. 143-45 (III, v, 2).

56. *Correspondence*, II, 623.

57. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, IX, 166. See Charles Peake, "Swift and the Passions," *Modern Language Review*, 55 (1960), 169-80.

58. *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, XI, 278 (IV, x, 4).

59. Cicero, *De natura deorum, Academica*, ed. and trans. Rackham, pp. 353-55. Shortly after, Cotta corroborates this view: "Is there a single act of lust, of avarice or of crime, which is not entered on deliberately or which is not carried out with active exercise of thought, that is, by aid of the reason?" (p. 355 [III, xxviii, 71]).

60. We are grateful to Markus Twittmann, Ennepetal, for discussing some aspects of this essay with us, to Professor Alfons Weische, Münster, for invaluable philological advice, and to Ulrich Elkmann, Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies, Münster, for his unfailing bibliographical support

Teaching Eighteenth-Century French Literature: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly

by Marie A. Wellington

When Ted invited me to take part on this panel, my first reaction was that I was very flattered. Then the reality set in, and I began immediately thinking about how to approach such a topic as teaching eighteenth-century French literature. I wrote back and asked for his guidance to which he responded—and I paraphrase slightly—that I should be informative and humorous. As my anxiety escalated, I decided nonetheless to embrace the daunting challenge of confronting my insecurities and overcoming the terror of the blank page, and thus, you find me here today addressing you.

I am fortunate enough to be at an institution where we never lost the two-year foreign- language requirement. Nor have we had to phase out any foreign-language major. So the university's commitment remains intact in that regard. It is also my good fortune to be able to teach upper-level literature courses on a rotating basis, and the best that I can do is to talk to you about these courses, their content and the assignments in the hope that you may draw some ideas for yourself or, at least, that you will have sympathy for me, for, as you will see, I am woefully technology averse and have reached that point in my career where, it pains me to say, I have become what my own contemporaries in their youth used to refer to as a "dinosaur." The three courses about which I will speak are the survey course, which combines seventeenth- and eighteenth-century literature, my specialty course entitled simply "Eighteenth-Century Literature" and our newest course, a topics course.

The survey course is, in principle, the first tier of literature that our students reach. In reality, it is often taken toward the middle and sometimes the end of the completion of the major due to the intricacies of scheduling in a small program and in a small school where the administration is always monitoring enrollments. The fact is that I have found very little difference between the students who have already been exposed to literature and those who have not. For better or worse, this has made my job in this course somewhat easier because of the homogeneity of my audience.

For more than 20 years, my program has chosen and stayed with Robert Leggewie's *Anthologie de la literature française*. By and large, the students read

excerpts rather than entire texts. This means that works such as Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des lois* and Rousseau's *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité* and Beaumarchais' *Le Mariage de Figaro* are met with a passing glance, but what we sacrifice in depth we compensate for in breadth, and, frankly, excerpts are more manageable readings for our students at this level.

My approach in this class, as in all my classes, is, first of all, to engage the students, and in this regard, I am speaking primarily of class discussion and participation. I currently assign 15% of the final grade to their participation. While in the past, I used a higher percentage, the growing propensity of students to challenge their grade and the admittedly subjective nature of the class participation grade, forced me, for practical if not potentially legal reasons, to amend the final grade distribution to soothe the ire of parents, the ego of the students, and the ease of my own existence. My behavior in class, on the other hand, has not undergone a transformation. I am extremely pro-active in class, and, while I do give biographical and historical background that complements the information offered in our textbook, I do not lecture at all. Broadly speaking, I use a socratic method because I want the students to speak, but I want them to speak of their own ideas. Some professors compose and distribute specific discussion questions beforehand, but I really think that a more spontaneous discussion that is personalized in each class is more valuable. And, so, I proceed to go through our texts and pepper the students with questions designed to elicit the meaning of the reading versus merely what it says. One could say, and has said, that my students become volunteers and, if not, victims, for in the end they have no choice but to participate. I am guided by my own imaginary image of what I call "praying to Buddha"—that moment when a question is posed and almost by mutual pre-arrangement, all upper torsos bend forward with all eyes suddenly focused on the book as if searching for a lost contact lens. This moment of mesmerism is generally broken and discussion is begun the moment a student voice breaks the ominous silence of timidity.

In this survey class, which is usually the first exposure to the dreaded eighteenth century and all the connotations of its predominant association with philosophy, I find it most helpful to steer and anchor the discussion of meaning in ways that touch the students in a personal way, be it in a psychological or historical context. There are three authors that are particularly useful in lifting the veil of fear which surrounds eighteenth-century literature. First is Marivaux, whose play, *L'Epreuve*, we read in its entirety. Beyond the trapping of the concerns of a time and a society with which the students cannot identify, there are universal themes with which they can. Who hasn't loved but been hesitant to be the first to say so? Who hasn't feared not having the love returned, or having it reciprocated for the wrong reason? Who, in an effort to protect their fragile ego, hasn't sandbagged themselves with the result that the very end they feared is the one of which they themselves are the architects?

A similar approach has proven extremely useful in the case of Voltaire's *Candide*. Here, I assign individual chapters to students who present their own ideas on Voltaire's points/criticisms/observations in each chapter in order to catalyze the discussion. Candide is useful to dispel the mystery surrounding the existence of evil in the world and the nature, foolish or wise, of hope—optimism, as it were, but not in the vein of Leibnitz. In the end, Candide's story is life's story, our story. It is a chain of fortunate and unfortunate events linked

together in a "which came first, the chicken or the egg" way. Does today's happiness prepare tomorrow's misery, or does today's misery prepare tomorrow's happiness? Both are true and intrinsic to the continuum of life. Further, except for the storms at sea and the earthquake in Lisbon, the sources of evil that we witness are all manmade, which is another way of saying, a product of choice. Evil can be chosen or rejected. It is up to us.

And then there is Diderot and the delicious *Neveu de Rameau*. Who can resist being amused, surprised and inspired by the declaration, "Mes pensées sont mes catins" and being seduced by the implications of a metaphor that says so much in so few words? Aside from pointing out the grey area of life where judgments of people that seem to be black and white in theory are anything but clear-cut in practice, this work allows me to introduce to the students Diderot's philosophy of materialism, and, in so doing, to guide them to see the potentially dangerous ramifications of this belief system when applied to conduct and its relationship to morality and personal responsibility. By the semester's end, if the students grasp those truths and, in them, find a personal connection and, through that, relevance, I can ask for no more to rehabilitate the 18th century in their minds.

In this course, as in any literature course, critical thinking is paramount. I return here to the goal already mentioned in the context of class discussion—separating what a work says from what it means and coming to realize the way in which the former serves the latter. I had an idea a long time ago of having the students keep a journal that addressed five works selected by me. They were to do two compositions for each—one a summary and one a thematic study. I soon realized that I had erred in two ways. Firstly, I ended up reading, in effect, two summaries, and, secondly, the whole semester was over by the time I realized that this assignment, which counted for the bulk of their grade, missed the mark. So, I revamped the written assignments by staggering them throughout the semester, and by eliminating the summary, which, in truth, we covered in class anyway. Instead, they needed only to do a thematic study, but in that, too, I inserted my own iron hand in order to impose a structure that they seemed ill-prepared to impose on themselves. We have all had those papers that start off, "The theme of this work is love." As Niles Crane would say (and as I often do in class), "And your point would be?" I find myself being part English teacher, part French teacher as I resolved that organizational challenge by thinking back to my sophomore high school English teacher, a certain Sister Alexandra, with an alabaster face who, beyond her teaching acumen, possessed the uncanny ability of being able to throw, with no forewarning, a piece of chalk (yes, this was in the day of blackboards) into the open crevasse of a student's yawning mouth. But I digress. Her lasting impression on me was to teach me to formulate a "controlling purpose" and link it logically with a specific of the paper to which it was attached. Thus, I decided to demand that the students put, word for word, at the top of their papers, "It is the purpose of this study to show …." From there they could complete the sentence, but this resolved the problem of papers that had no focus and meandered on, going nowhere until they reached the requisite number of pages, as if, somehow, if they typed on the computer long enough, their thematic study would magically emerge on the screen from cyberspace.

The more advanced eighteenth-century French literature course that I teach allows me to go more in depth. Generally speaking, the students are comprised

of majors and minors. For me, that means that they are more serious, more committed, and, given the course prerequisites, more proficient in French. My approach to the class and to class discussion is substantially the same as in my survey class, but here, I have many more volunteers than victims. The intimidation relative to the mere thought of eighteenth-century literature remains in force, however, and my goal is to transport them from hate to love, or, at the least, from avoidance to appreciation.

In this class, I focus on three genres, as it were—philosophy, theater and, of course, the novel. Voltaire's *Lettres philosophiques* are particularly desirable for two reasons: they are divided into relatively short chapters which, I believe, ease their digestion, and they represent a microcosm not only of Voltaire's interests but also the interests of the eighteenth century: religion, tolerance, science and discovery, health, politics, letters. And behind all of that, all the issues important to mankind, "l'homme de tous les temps." This is my opening act in shamelessly inculcating in my students the belief—the truth—that the modern world, the world they know, begins in the eighteenth century, and that most of the beliefs we hold about earth and our existence are the extravagant ideas of the past, put to the test to emerge as the victors over superstitions. It is also the century that put us on the path to curiosity and discovery that are the catalysts and underpinning of our world.

From there I move to the theater—*Zaïre* and *Turcaret*. Passion in one, money in the other. Religion in one and society in the other. Can anything be more timely? Take away the trapping of the eighteenth-century world, and, sadly, once again, we see our own with Christians against Muslims and the intolerance it can breed on both sides; individual categorization versus individual behavior and the all too frequent contradiction between the two; money and love, money and sex, or, to quote the movie *Cabaret*, "money makes the world go around." We end the semester in the romanesque world of *La Religieuse, Manon Lescaut* and *Les Liaisons dangereuses*, a work so deep, so insightful and so magnetic and true that I think every student should reread it at least every ten years of their life. From a story of "love the one you're with" in *La Religieuse* to the battle of mind and body, human reason and animal passion in *Manon Lescaut*, to sex as a means, not an end, to a pleasure far darker than sin in *Les Liaisons dangereuses*, the students are introduced to three arenas in the psychology of the individual that is so dependent and malleable when faced with circumstances of isolation, repression and marginalization respectively. If it is true what Prevost says in his preface to *Manon Lescaut* (and I believe it is), then all these works double the students' lives and erase the line between reality and fiction. After this course, none can argue successfully or in good faith that eighteenth-century literature is either impossible to understand or divorced from life as we know it.

While the assignments in class, as in the survey, are geared to develop the students' critical sense, they still need to be structured for, even at this level, the creation of a statement of theme often ends in failure leading to an amorphous composition. So, those works that are not the subject of a paper are the subject of an exam question, but in both cases, my approach is the same. I give them a statement with which they must agree or disagree, which forces them to have an argument to make and to use the text rather than summarize it. Here are some examples: "Zaïre would be a Christian if she didn't love Orosmane"; or

"*Turcaret* is only the study of the destructive power of money"; or "What does Diderot teach us about the effects of the cloistered life on the psychology of the individual?" The corollary to all of this, particularly at this level, is language, and here, I become a grammar tutor as well. Students often ask if they are graded on their ideas rather than their grammar. My answer is, of course, that it is impossible to separate the two. Even the most beautiful painting, if dipped in mud, would be impossible to discern. Therefore, while I don't force students to come for individual appointments, I do encourage them to do so and go over each paper line by line so that, in the end, they never again have to answer "I don't know" to the question "What did you mean to say here?"

In the effort to attract more students and make the course more "sexy", as everyone loves to say now, I revised my specialty course to appeal to a slightly less prepared student and gave it as a topics course entitled "Love and Lies in Eighteenth-Century French Literature." I don't know how sexy the course was, but it was definitely "literature light." This was done by necessity since this class carries not only a lesser prerequisite, but for the bulk of the students in this class, it is usually their first and only French literature class. While I kept *Turcaret* and all of the novels from my specialty course, I revamped fully half of the class by treating it in terms of a theme anchored in the eighteenth century: Madame LePrince de Beaumont's *La Belle et la bête*. We began by reading and discussing the text, but from then on I relied on film: Cocteau's classic film of the same name, Rostand's *Cyrano de Bergerac* as done by Gerard Depardieu, and *The Phantom of the Opera*. While I confess that I did list the original Gaston Leroux novel as one of the readings, in reality my phantom was represented by the DVD of Andrew Lloyd Webber's musical whose libretto, I hasten to add, remains true to the spirit of the novel and has the virtue of inserting verbatim the terms of "beauty" and "beast" in one of the highlighted songs. This approach allowed me to trace this same theme through three centuries of literature, to study the various ways it has evolved, and also to compare and contrast two different media. The advantage has been certainly to see what the films have retained or omitted, and by virtue of that filtering how, in fact, the film complements/enhances the understanding and appreciation of the original text.

So there you have what has been my experience to date in teaching eighteenth-century French literature. The "good", as it were, is that I am still able to do so because I teach at a school with a program that has integrated eighteenth-century literature into its major and minor, and, therefore, offers my courses on a regular basis to students who are still, generally speaking, able and open to study that period. However, the "bad" is, sadly, that the student demographic has been changing in ways that are beyond our control but that present us with students of declining basic skills and interest in a foreign-language literature, especially with the concerns both of students and parents regarding vocational relevance even in pursuit of a "liberal arts" degree. The "ugly"—and I will qualify this: I speak not so much of my colleagues but of the students—is technology, or, more specifically, the internet. As with most things, it has its advantages and its disadvantages, its uses and abuses. What I have seen that is detrimental to teaching eighteenth-century literature specifically and to education in general is an increase in plagiarism. For some reason, many students knowingly take this road, aided and abetted by the internet, but there are also those who, for some peculiar reason, don't equate copying from the

computer to copying from a traditional book. In terms of learning, I have noted that the internet has allowed the students to go from point a to point b and eliminate the mental journey altogether. And, as I so often preach to my students, the journey is more important than the destination. Lastly, often when students remark in class that they didn't expect a particular question on an exam, I quip dramatically, "No one expects the Spanish inquisition!" Never mind that I am the only one laughing heartily at my own joke because I am the only one who is familiar with Monty Python. But this brings up a more important and germane point, and that is that even with the world at their fingertips via the internet, they are mired in staggering cultural illiteracy. In my humble opinion, the internet has been a force in creating this phenomenon that, coupled with today's hedonistic and relative approach to life, morality and the value of an individual impedes if not thwarts any attempt to have students understand a time with different values, to appreciate that there are things more important than selfish desires and their satisfaction, and that there are, in fact, things bigger than oneself and more important than life, things which actually enable rather than decimate an individual. In fact, thus is summed up the value of great literature, but particularly the value of the literature of the eighteenth century: to show us our potential, what we can be. It is self-affirming in the sense of elevation of self rather than nonchalant complacency.

In closing, I want to thank you for your attention. If you have gleaned any thought-provoking ideas from this teaching retrospective, I am happy, and, if not, I hope that at least you had a laugh.

University of Mary Washington

"The Glory and the Nothing of a Name": Sources of Charles Churchill's Scottophobia

by Corey Andrews

In his biography of John Wilkes, Arthur Cash depicts an eventful encounter that Wilkes had in 1762, one that would greatly influence his burgeoning career in politics: "Wilkes met the Rev. Charles Churchill, the most heteroclite parson and most celebrated poet of the time . . . . This unlikely literary lion was really a bear. He weighed something like three hundred pounds and was nicknamed the Bruiser" (66). The following year, William Hogarth also took notice of the "heteroclite parson," whose angry defense of Wilkes in his *Epistle to William Hogarth* (1763) the artist answered with an engraving entitled "The Bruiser, C. Churchill (once the Rev:d!) in the Character of a Russian Hercules, Regaling himself after having Kill'd the Monster Caricatura that so sorely gall'd his Virtuous friend, the Heaven born Wilkes."

In this memorable print, illustrated on the **outside cover**, "the Bruiser" is represented as a bibulous bear with a tankard in one paw and a club carved with "lyes" cradled in the other; in the foreground, a stoic Pug is "pissing on Churchill's epistle, and a poor box stands on *The North Briton*" (Uglow 1193). The linking of Wilkes and Churchill is visually reinforced by Hogarth's engraving, although it is worth noting that Churchill's theriomorphic

representation is quite unlike Hogarth's satirical portrait of the devilish yet decidedly human Wilkes from the same year. In such manner as Hogarth's, Churchill's bearish reputation was established in the literary culture of his day in print and image that dramatized the poet's fierce persona as a political satirist.

It is primarily for such notices that Churchill is still recalled; in particular, his work editing *The North Briton* (1761-1762) has been of more historical and literary note than his many volumes of poetry. This is a particularly intriguing development in the history of his reputation, for the Bruiser was extremely (perhaps excessively) prolific. As James Sambrook notes, "Churchill produced 14,000 lines of published verse in three and a half years" ("Charles Churchill"). Despite this massive body of work, "[Churchill's] association with Wilkes came to be considered his best claim to memory. Many critics portrayed him as Wilkes's instrument" (Twombly 91-92). Certainly this was the case for such critics as Hogarth, who tended to minimize Churchill's contributions to contemporary literary culture in lieu of his partisan politics.

In tandem with Wilkes, Churchill is also remembered for the virulence of his "Scottophobia." This term, which vividly echoes scotophobia (fear of the dark), has special resonance in British political culture of the 1760s. In her seminal *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*, Linda Colley describes the phenomenon of Scottophobia as the national prejudice faced by Scots as they sought to share in the promises offered all Britons by the Union. Colley observes that "many regarded the Scots as poor and pushy relations, unwilling to pay their full share of taxation, yet constantly demanding access to English resources in terms of trade and jobs" (13). By the 1760s, Scottophobia was at a fever pitch in London due to the appointment of the Scottish Earl of Bute as the Prime Minister. Meanwhile Scots were still feeling the lingering aftershocks of not only the 'Forty-Five but also the Act of Proscription (1746) and the Tenures Abolition Act (1760).

Colley has asserted that Scottophobia "was deeply felt but also profoundly ironic. So often interpreted . . . as evidence of the deep divisions between south and north Britain, in reality [it was] savage proof that the Scots were acquiring power and influence within Great Britain to a degree previously unknown" (121). Colley and others have presented compelling arguments for the emergence of Scottophobia in British culture at this time, but finding more specific sources for its manifestation in the lives and works of Wilkes and Churchill is more challenging. Wilkes for one had many Scottish friends prior to the 1760s. The Scottish poet and doctor John Armstrong numbered among them, having expressed his friendship in a poetic epistle dedicated to Wilkes in early 1760; Armstrong also served as physician to Wilkes's young daughter Polly. Wilkes even received direct assistance in finding a suitable school for Polly from a Scottish neighbor in Westminster in 1756; that neighbor was none other Wilkes's later arch-enemy Tobias Smollett (Cash 44). Indeed, as Colley observes, "it was Wilkes, not Smollett, who began the barrage of insults that Mr. Briton and Mr. North Briton would soon be firing at each other" (69).

In addition, Wilkes traveled to Scotland in 1758, claiming in personal letters that "I was never happier than when in Scotland . . . . I love the people for their hospitality and friendship . . . as much as I admire them for their strong manly sense, erudition, and excellent taste" (qtd. in Cash 53). He maintained a friendship with David Hume throughout his life, even during their mutual

residence in France in the early 1760s when Wilkes was considered "a nonperson at the embassy and a questionable asset as a friend" (Cash 166). Wilkes's change of heart is hard to fathom in light of his earlier attestations of friendship and hospitality among the Scots, especially his animus in 1763 when he averred that "'the principal part of the Scottish nobility are tyrants and the whole of the common people are slaves'" (qtd. in Colley 116).

Churchill's Scottophobia seems equally inexplicable prior to the 1760s; in fact, the poet's mother Anne was Scottish (Sambrook, "Charles Churchill"). His first poem of note, *The Rosciad* (1761), contains no satirical commentary on the Scots, nor does its follow-up *The Apology Addressed to the Critical Reviewers* (1761). While both express Churchill's characteristic topical satire, neither offers political commentary in the manner and style of his later works. In fact, the appearance of virulent Scottophobia is quite unexpected in Churchill's oeuvre, given that his early work focuses almost exclusively on the poet's attempts to gain recognition in the literary marketplace. Sambrook notes that it is only "after the *North Briton* [that] Churchill's poetry is more sharply political than it had been earlier" ("Charles Churchill"). The politicization of his verse coincided with the emergence of his deeply-felt Scottophobia, a preoccupation that extended into his family life as well; Churchill even "dressed his young son in a plaid, like a Highlander, in order (as the child was coached to declare) to plague the Scots" (Sambrook, "Charles Churchill").

Unlike Wilkes, Churchill had no direct experience or knowledge of Scotland gained through friendship or traveling, nor did he have any prior praise for the nation to recant as did his fellow Scottophobe. Relying entirely on an imagination fueled by caustic prejudice and propaganda, Churchill's representation of Scotland and its people was uniformly bleak and bitter. Scots emerge in his poetry as parasitical aliens, poor, starving, and seeking to suck the life from Mother England. Adam Rounce observes that "Wilkes and Churchill present a bigoted form of Englishness that ultimately calls itself to question, so anxious and self-conscious are its attempts at defending and defining itself" (21). Their expression of xenophobia certainly reveals larger anxieties within English culture about the influential roles Scots were increasingly playing in British politics and culture.

However, it is important to recognize the intensely personal nature of Churchill's Scottophobia, and it takes some digging to find its most probable sources. It is clear that his animosity toward the Scots was not entirely derived from national politics but also (and perhaps more so) from his personal grievances as a professional writer in a literary marketplace increasingly monitored by powerful Scots. In particular, he focused his energies against powerful Scottish critics of the day like Tobias Smollett, mounting an argument against their influence even before he met Wilkes (and before Smollett headed *The Briton* [1762-1763] as well). This element of Churchill's Scottophobia has yet to be properly understood or appreciated when considering his role as a political agitator at this time.

The reason that Churchill's verse was so popular in its day—primarily for its excessively topical nature—is also a key factor in the decline of his literary reputation. Sambrook states that "Churchill's satires engage in transient controversies" ("Charles Churchill"), while Twombly observes that "the charge of triviality dogged Churchill in his own day" (86). However, the poems' very

topicality underscores Churchill's abiding concerns with his own recognition as a serious poet in the literary field. His first real forays into the literary marketplace were marred by Churchill's lingering ire over the misattribution of his first published poem *The Rosciad* (1761) to his friends. His follow-up to that poem, *The Apology Addressed to the Critical Reviewers* (1761), was in fact occasioned by a hostile review of *The Rosciad* by a critic in the March 1761 issue of *The Critical Review*, edited by Tobias Smollett (Sambrook, "Charles Churchill"). In this review, the critic suggested that *The Rosciad* was authored by one (or all) of the following authors: Robert Lloyd, George Colman the Elder, and Bonnell Thornton; all three of these writers were close friends of Churchill. In later issues of *The Critical Review*, Smollett redressed this misattribution situation with a charitable review of Colman's *The Jealous Wife* (1761) and a different review of the third edition of *The Rosciad* (Basker 154). As James Basker observes, "not only did the reviewer mistakenly attribute [*The Apology*] to George Colman and disparage Colman's character, he also treated the poem so severely that he angered the real author Charles Churchill" (154).

A closer look at this review reveals the stakes involved in gaining recognition in the literary marketplace. The reviewer begins his assessment of *The Rosciad* with a wry catalogue of the poem's key traits, claiming that it "is a well-written, ill-natured, ingenious, abusive poem, levelled principally against a set of men whom ... it was rather ungenerous to attack" (Lowe 55). He continues by noting that the martial attacks waged by *The Rosciad* were beneath the efforts of "an able general" who would find such weak targets (viz., "the whole group of second, third, fourth, and fifth rate actors") hardly "worth powder and shot" (Lowe 55). After noting the praises bestowed upon *The Jealous Wife* in *The Rosciad*, the reviewer presents a clever argument about the poem's authorship which subtly attributes the work to Colman and his friends Lloyd and Thornton:

> It is natural for young authors to conceive themselves the cleverest fellows in the world, and withal, that there is not the least degree of merit subsisting but in their own works: it is natural likewise for them to imagine, that they may conceal themselves by appearing in different shapes, and that they are not to be found out by their stile; but little do these *connoisseurs* in writing conceive, how easily they are discovered by a veteran in the service. (Lowe 57)

By this time, Colman and Thornton had already gained recognition in the field for their periodical *The Connoisseur* (1754-6), while Lloyd had also received considerable praise for his poem *The Actor* (1760). The review ends by suggesting that "we will not pretend ... absolutely to assert that Mr. L___ wrote the poem; but we may venture to affirm, that it is the production, jointly or separately, of the new triumvirate of wits, who never let an opportunity pass of singing their own praises" (Lowe 58). That Churchill was excluded from this "triumvirate" may have been occasion enough for his future "apology," as might have the reviewer's final admonition to the author to "put less gall into his ink, and make use of a softer pen for the future" (Lowe 58).

Churchill would not heed this advice. *The Apology* seeks to establish Churchill's authorship of *The Rosciad* as well as to voice bitter complaints about the destructive power of reviewers who "with partial rage rush forth,—Oh!

shame to tell!— / To crush a bard just bursting from the shell" (2, 13-14). The predatory nature of such reviewers is further highlighted when Churchill's speaker states that "Authors, alone, with more than savage rage, / Unnat'ral war with brother authors wage" (2, 27-28). The reference to "unnatur'l war" explicitly characterizes the literary field into which the young bard has been born; in such harsh and violent landscape, "brother authors" engage in pitched battles over reputations and reviews, demonstrating the fundamentally competitive and ruthless nature of literary pursuit. The endgame of such competition is "consecration" in the field as an established author; as Pierre Bourdieu observes, within the literary field there is "an endless struggle for a power of consecration which can no longer be acquired or consecrated except in and through the struggle itself" (230).

In this light, Churchill's anger in *The Apology* is tightly focused on the misattribution of *The Rosciad* to the reigning triumvirate of Colman, Thornton, and Lloyd. Unlike Pope's *Dunciad* (1728-1743), which takes issue with the venality of the literary field itself, Churchill's *Apology* does not seek to criticize the nature of consecration in the marketplace; instead, for a fledgling author like the Bruiser, the misattribution of *The Rosciad* (another popular, topical poem about contemporary actors) was profoundly unjust because it consecrated the wrong author. Along with the erroneous attribution, the reviewer who attacked *The Rosciad* was also unduly harsh in his estimation of the poem; as Churchill's speaker remarks, "A Critic's fury knows no bound; / Drawcansir like, he deals destruction round" (4, 67-68). This alludes not only to Buckingham's character in *The Rehearsal* (another nice nod to the stage) but also to the hostile review itself, in which the reviewer observes that "like another Drawcansir, he deals about most furiously on friends and foes" (Lowe 56). In like manner, Churchill depicts the fury of critics who destroy the works of friends and foes in the same breath. In the face of such critical ferocity, the speaker feels there is little recourse for reprisal: "Our great Dictators take a shorter way— / Who shall dispute what the Reviewers say?" (5, 93-94). This question is asked with equal measures of irony and acceptance, for reviews and reviewers did matter in establishing (or destroying) an author's reputation.

As if to add further insult, the speaker complains about such critics' refusal to sign their punitive reviews: "All men and things they know, themselves unknown, / And publish ev'ry name—except his own" (7, 125-126). However, Churchill believed he knew the identity of the reviewer responsible for this offense against his art and his integrity—novelist, critic, and editor Tobias Smollett. Although Smollett denied authorship of the review of *The Rosciad*, "it was common practice . . . blatantly to deny any accusation of heavy-handed deprecation of another's literary efforts" (Wainwright, 89). Smollett certainly was capable of delivering harsh critical judgment, and the reviewer's self-identification as a "veteran in the service" would certainly apply to the editor of *The Critical Review*. While it is difficult (and perhaps impossible) to definitively identify Smollett's authorship, Churchill's later Scottophobia suggests that he held Smollett personally responsible for the offending review. Indeed, Smollett's critical authority at this time was considerable; as Kenneth Simpson notes, "by the summer of 1756 [Smollett] was the driving force behind the *Critical Review*, which he edited until 1763 and which he regarded as 'a small branch of an extensive plan which . . . projected for a sort of Academy of the

Belles Lettres'" ("Tobias Smollett"). Smollett was well-positioned to implement such a plan, given his talents and publications in a wide variety of endeavors in the literary marketplace.

The Critical Review operated not only as a tastemaker in the literary field but also as a vehicle for Smollett's political criticism, seen most notably in the libel case he lost for his attack on Admiral Sir Charles Knowles in *The Critical Review*, for which he was imprisoned for three months in 1760-61 (Simpson). Smollett was also famously irascible, a personality trait he acknowledged in a letter to John Moore: "My difficulties have arisen from my own indiscretion; from a warm temper easily provoked to rashness; from a want of courage to refuse what I could not grant without doing injustice to my family" (quoted in Simpson). Despite the recognition and financial rewards Churchill achieved with both *The Rosciad* and *The Apology*—said to be from £750 or £1000 (Sambrook, "Charles Churchill")—the critical snub administered by Smollett deeply offended the Bruiser and most likely contributed to the poet's growing antagonism against Smollett and other Scots. In addition, it also allowed him to fuel his growing ambition to be considered a "fourth" to the triumvirate of wits who were his friends and competitors.

If Churchill's *Apology* suggests there is a personal animus behind his Scottophobia, his next major poem, *Night: An Epistle to Robert Lloyd* (1761), confirms the poet's tendency to conflate private grievances with public displays of bitterness and bad feeling. *Night* was written as a retort to John Armstrong's *Day* (1760), a poetic epistle that the doctor had inscribed to Wilkes. The connection between Wilkes and Armstrong was fairly close at this time; Sambrook remarks that "on 18 April 1760 Armstrong sailed from Harwich as physician to the English army in Germany, a post he perhaps owed to Wilkes's patronage; it seems that Wilkes also lent or gave him money at this time" ("John Armstrong"). Described on its advertisement page as a "Work of Taste and Genius," Armstrong's poetic epistle to Wilkes describes his experiences traveling through Germany, noting the local customs (particularly their food and drink), delivered in a deliberately casual tone indicating their genial friendship.

Armstrong sent the poem to Wilkes in August 1760, and Wilkes revised the poem (with the doctor's consent) prior to publication. The friendship between Armstrong and Wilkes was to be short-lived. Upon his return to London in 1763, Armstrong discovered that Wilkes had canceled large passages of *Day* and mutilated its overall design in the process; he was also extremely enraged by Wilkes's charges against Scotland in *The North Briton* (Sambrook, "John Armstrong"). Sambrook explains that "Armstrong was always sensitive to slights upon his nation." Like Smollett, he was a touchy and irritable character: upon meeting him in 1769, James Boswell claimed that "'he is a violent Scotsman' and 'as splenetick as ever" (qtd in Sambrook, "John Armstrong"). Though he was not personally attacked (or even referred to) within Armstrong's poem, Churchill felt as antagonized by it as he had been by the critical reviews of *The Rosciad*; indeed, the Bruiser wrote his poetic retort *Nigh*t (1761) even before he befriended Wilkes.

This begs the question of why Churchill felt compelled to respond to Armstrong's poem in such an aggressive and antagonistic fashion. In *Night*, Churchill clearly announces a reason for writing: "When foes insult, and prudent friends dispense, / In pity's strains, the worst of insolence, / Oft with thee,

LLOYD, I steal an hour from grief, / And in thy social converse find relief" (*Poems*, 77, 1-4). Establishing his friendship with the noted poet Robert Lloyd (indicated most prominently by the poem's subtitle) is the poem's fundamental objective, as is countering Armstrong's friendship with Wilkes in *Day* with his more pleasurable association with Lloyd. Throughout the poem, the manifold, forbidden pleasures of night are countered to the sobriety and dullness of the day, particularly the day as endorsed by the good Dr. Armstrong. The self-assertiveness of the *Apology* is found throughout *Night* as well, as is Churchill's characteristic satirical voice, described by Katharine Turner as "aggressively masculine [… and] stridently self-confident" (xi). Indeed, the Bruiser's opinion of Armstrong is stated plainly enough: "We our friends, our foes, ourselves, survey, / And see by NIGHT what fools we are by DAY" (82, 121-122).

The source of Churchill's animus in this poem is equally obvious; in 1756, Armstrong had aided Smollett in launching *The Critical Review* (Sambrook, "John Armstrong"). The personal nature of Churchill's Scottophobia is once again evident in his verse, particularly in instances when he believed that Scots were conspiring against him in the literary field. In addition, the closeness between Wilkes and Armstrong may have riled Churchill, whose friendship with the political agitator beginning in 1762 was all-consuming; their efforts in producing *The North Briton* would lead to Wilkes's arrest for "seditious libel" in 1763 (Thomas). Certainly the enterprise that was *The North Briton* did not presume to deliver judgments in the literary field, but was instead a political tool with one key goal. As Cash records, "Wilkes's primary purpose was to bring down Bute and restore Pitt to the ministry" (78). While this may have also been an aspiration for Churchill, clearly the opportunity of lambasting the editor of *The Briton* (1762-1763)—once again Smollett—was a major enticement for his involvement and yet another source of his Scottophobia.

The Prophecy of Famine (1763), written seven months after Churchill and Wilkes had launched *The North Briton* (1762-1763) was his most thoroughgoing poetic attack on the Scots. Churchill's poem employs a speaker whose sarcasm accentuates the contempt with which Scots are viewed throughout the poem. He employs the rhetoric of the *North Briton*, with its blunt anger over preferential treatment granted to the Scots, asserting that "Oft have I heard thee mourn the wretched lot / Of the poor, mean, despis'd, insulted Scot" (9, 175-176). To which Churchill's speaker sarcastically retorts, "The Scots are poor, cries surly English pride; / True is the charge, nor by themselves denied. / Are they not in strictest reason clear, / Who wisely come to mend their fortunes here?" (10, 191-194). An obvious parody of Allan Ramsay's pastoral drama *The Gentle Shepherd* (1725), the poem aspires to be a "Scots pastoral" in which two starving Scottish shepherds, Jockey and Sawney, converse about the lamentable state of their country as they watch over a flock of equally famished sheep.

Into the mix enters Famine herself, personified by Churchill's speaker as a peculiarly Scottish goddess: "FAMINE, by her children always known, / As proud as poor, here fix'd her native throne" (16, 329-330). Her "prophecy" to Jockey and Sawney confirms the prejudices held by Englishmen like Wilkes and Churchill and expressed in *The North Briton*. She praises Scottish independence by stating that Scots were "Long free, because the race of Roman braves / Thought it not worth their while to make us slaves" (22, 425-426). She plans to further disrupt English politics by stating her intentions to "spread the flames of

civil discontent" (25, 504). Lastly, she offers a hopeful vision of the future for the famished Scots, a time of feasting to come when the starving prey might become the vicious predator: "Think not, my sons, that this so bless'd estate / Stands at a distance on the roll of fate; / Already big with hopes of future sway, / E'en from this cave I scent my destin'd prey" (24, 483-486). In this vision of famished Scots vying for revenge, Churchill departs from even the semblance of political realities into the realm of allegory; therein his personal animus against powerful Scots is transformed through poetic fantasy into a particularly blunt, satirical weapon to use against helpless adversaries.

In sum, the Scottophobia revealed in Churchill's poetry stems largely from a personal sense of injury, perceived to have been inflicted by powerful Scottish critics, poets, or rivals; this prejudice found a ready fund of inspiration once Churchill met Wilkes and embarked on *The North Briton*. One of Colley's conclusions in *Britons* affirms the actual basis for such Wilkite Scottophobia: "Scots had been going south in search of greater opportunities for centuries, but not in such numbers, and rarely with the advantage . . . of having fellow countrymen sufficiently highly placed in politics to act as influential patrons. To this extent, Wilkite laments that the Scots were getting above [the English] were fundamentally correct" (124). In Churchill's case, this was profoundly true; as Robert Southey observed of the Bruiser, "No English poet ever enjoyed so excessive and short-lived a popularity" (qtd. in Turner xi). Dying in Wilkes's arms in November 1764, Churchill's fame seemed to expire with him. At his graveside in 1816, another powerful Scot, Lord Byron, had this to say for the man "who blazed / The comet of a season": from now on, Churchill would be known only as the epitome of "the glory and the nothing of a name" (Byron, qtd. in Sambrook, "Charles Churchill").

Youngstown State University

Works Cited

Basker, James G. *Tobias Smollett: Critic and Journalist*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1988.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, trans. Susan Emanuel. Stanford: Stanford U. Press, 1996.

Cash, Arthur. *John Wilkes: The Scandalous Father of Liberty*. New Haven: Yale U. Press, 2006.

Churchill, Charles. *The Apology Addressed to the Critical Reviewers*. London, 1761.

_____. *Poems by Charles Churchill*. London, 1763.

_____. *The Prophecy of Famine: A Scots Pastoral.* London, 1763.

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837.* New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1992.

Lowe, Robert W., ed. *The Rosciad and The Apology by Charles Churchill*. London: Lawrence & Bullen, 1891. *Google Book Search*. 6 Feb. 2015.

Rounce, Adam. "'Stuarts Without End': Wilkes, Churchill, and Anti-Scottishness," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 29.3 (2005): 20-43.

Sambrook, James. "Armstrong, John (1708/9–1779)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Online ed. Ed. Lawrence Goldman. Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 4 Feb. 2015<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/660>.
Sambrook, James. "Churchill, Charles (1732–1764)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 2004. Online ed. Ed. Lawrence Goldman. Oct. 2006. 4 Feb. 2015 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/5397>.
Simpson, Kenneth. "Smollett, Tobias George (1721–1771)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford U. Press, 2004. Online ed. Ed. Lawrence Goldman. Jan. 2008. 4 Feb. 2015 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/25947>.
Thomas, Peter D. G. "Wilkes, John (1725–1797)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford U. Pess, 2004. Online ed. Ed. Lawrence Goldman. May 2008. 4 Feb. 2015 <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/29410>.
Twombly. David J., "The Revenant Charles Churchill: A Haunting of Literary History," *Studies in Philology* 102.1 (2005): 83-109.
Turner, Katharine, ed. *Selected Poems of Thomas Gray, Charles Churchill, and William Cowper*. London: Penguin, 1997.
Uglow, Jenny. *William Hogarth: A Life and a World*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, & Giroux, 1997.
Wainwright, Valerie. "Tobias Smollett and *The Critical*'s Reviews of Charles Churchill's Poems, *The Rosciad* and *The Ghost*," *Notes and Queries*, n.s. 60.1 (2013): 89-91.

Editing, Editions, Essays, and Lives: Johnson, Boswell, and Other Usual / Unusual Suspects, 2014

Howard D. Weinbrot, editor. ***Samuel Johnson: New Contexts for a New Century***. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Press, 2014. Pp. 386; index. ISBN-10: 08732822590. Hardcover, $55.

Jesse G. Swan, editor. ***Editing Lives: Essays in Contemporary Textual and Biographical Studies in Honor of O M Brack, Jr*.** Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2013. Pp. xxix + 260; bibliography of Brack's publications [220-25]; 2 portraits of Brack [one on DJ]; 2 illustrations ; index. ISBN: 978-1-61148-540-0. Hardcover, $85.00.

Paul Tankard, editor, with the assistance of Lisa Marr. ***Facts and Inventions: Selections from the Journalism of James Boswell*.** New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014. Pp. lii + 442; bibliography [405-18]; 19 illustrations; index. IBSN: 978-0-300-14126-9. Cloth: $115.

In 2011, the indefatigable Howard Weinbrot organized a conference at the Huntingdon Library in San Marino entitled "Samuel Johnson: New Contexts for a New Century." These proceedings, enlarged by a handful of essays from scholars not present, have now been published. Another scholar attending the sessions but who did not speak, O M Brack Jr., has since been honored with a

festschrift, *Editing Lives*, which appeared in December 2013. And a third volume, Paul Tankard's *Facts and Inventions* augments this repast of recent publications that should be not only tasted but thoroughly digested by committed students of mid to late eighteenth-century British literature.

The fruits of the Huntington gathering and the later supplements have been drawn together in a large, lovely volume—a rare nod to the aesthetics practiced by printers of earlier ages, but rarely aspired toward in these financially strapped days. The front cover boasts an image not hitherto used in any book devoted to Johnson criticism: Henry Wallis's 1854 oil painting, *Dr. Johnson at Cave's, the Publisher; Johnson, Too Ragged to Appear at Cave's Table, Has a Plate of Victuals Sent to Him Behind the Screen, vide Boswell*. It serves as a colorful portal to a carefully designed and gorgeously printed ensemble of seventeen essays, arranged under six sections: 1. "Johnson and the Arts of Thought," 2. "Johnson the Writer," 3. "Johnson and the Dull Duties," 4. "Johnson and Politics," 5. "Johnson, Religion, and Philosophy," and 6. "Johnson after Johnson," all encapsulated by three prefatory pieces and a concluding index. Space limitations prohibit careful examination of these extensive essays; here I will exercise brevity and examine but a handful of particularly striking and representative specimens.

Weinbrot's Introduction, "Notes toward New Johnsonian Contexts" (an elaboration of his opening remarks), provides a helpful frame for readers coming to these pieces for the first time. Weinbrot observes that our views of Johnson will continue to shift as new information about him and his contexts accumulate. Among the examples he marshals to enforce the point is that of the Learned Astronomer's injunction in *Rasselas* to "never rob other countries of rain to pour it on thine own." This, in all probability, Weinbrot observes, is an allusion to a passage in Amos (4: 7-8) from the Hebrew Bible. Linking his discovery with such eighteenth-century Biblical scholars such as the Williams Lowth and Warburton allows "our … understanding of the texts … [to] expand … one of the volume's prime goals" (8). Weinbrot thus early on sets the tone and bar high—a thoughtful and learned circulation between attention to minute textual detail and larger historical contexts constitutes volume's goal. Happily, most essays here meet this goal.

In a piece not delivered at the conference, "The Agile Johnson," David Fairer pens the counterpart to an essay he published in an earlier commemorative collection, "The Awkward Johnson." A specialist in the Warton brothers, Fairer has written illuminatingly on many other British authors, from Spenser to Coleridge. However, he has reserved until late in his career to register his observations on Samuel Johnson. As this pair of essays make clear, it was well worth the wait. The seasoned fruitfulness of the brace display a critical intelligence itself capable of great agility and insight; for example, in the present piece Fairer moves from accounts of Johnson's physical dexterity to the nimbleness of a mind stored with weighty knowledge but light and rapid in its "art of thinking, the art of using his mind, a certain continual power of seizing the useful substance of all that he knew, and exhibiting it in a clear and forcible manner ; so that knowledge, which we often see to be no better than lumber in men of dull understanding, was, in him, true, evident, and actual wisdom," as Boswell once elegantly put it. Fairer explores Johnsonian gracefulness in *Dictionary* quotations, combative conversation from the *Life*, the

Rambler, the poetry, and other points in the Johnsonian canon. At the end, he neatly synthesizes his two interventions, quoting a passage from the *Life* where Boswell describes Johnson as an elephant dancing on a rope: "Consciously performing for his friends, and for us, he [Johnson] leaves us all with a final delightful image of Johnsonian agility, unabashedly embracing the potentially clumsy but turning it into a dance of triumph" (46).

In an essay presented in 2011, William Gibson's "Reflections on Johnson's Churchmanship," reviews the 20th and 21st centuries' historiography on Johnson's religious life, finding it "somewhat checkered" (219). Emerging from this contextualization by concluding the apparent insolubility of firmly identifying Johnson's religious views, Gibson observes a recent shift within this critical discourse to a more politicized understanding of Johnson's religious thought. Instead of seeking a stable and normative religious identity, he suggests, Johnson might be more fruitfully apprehended by comparison with contemporary figures whose lives embody similar religious ambiguities—figures as seemingly different as Benjamin Hoadly and David Hume. Freya Johnston's "Byron's Johnson," also presented in 2011, superbly unfolds how Byron's contribution to his "land's language" (296) is based upon a deep emotional investment in Johnson, an investment serving as a mediation between Byron and Pope. In this, of course, Byron was a fish out of water among his Romantic contemporaries—according to anecdote, he was willing to go fisticuffs with anyone with the temerity to attack his beloved Pope. Johnston extends her reception study to a triangulation embracing other Romantic figures, concluding that, "if Hazlitt and Ruskin sought to escape Johnson, Byron construed him as a liberating precedent" (311). This is at once an original and compelling observation, one born of an evidently deep conversance with both authors.

For a number of decades, Johnsonians have profited from a rich repository of critical collections by various hands. Some of these are serviceable; some are superb. The present volume promises to become a classic. If, as Weinbrot notes in his introduction, *New Contexts for a New Century* "cannot possibly map all of the Johnsonian territories that remain unexplored" (5), it surely serves as a guide to many of the proper directions. In sum, this book will be an essential component of any library aspiring toward sufficient coverage of Johnsonian studies over the coming decades.

Students of literary studies typically tend to view bibliographical and textual criticism as the most austere and objective areas of our cognitive domain, those methodologies aspiring most convincingly toward the status of the hard sciences. Many of the essays in Jesse Swan's fine *Editing Lives* support this reputation. However, by belonging to the genre of *festschrift*, the present volume also embraces a moving and subjective humanity, as it celebrates the life and career of the eminent Johnsonian whom friends and colleagues fondly called "Skip." All who knew him will surely acknowledge Skip to be a rarely fine human being as well as a top drawer scholar. The apparatus of *Editing Lives*, that bookend these essays, offer eloquent testimony to these claims. At the front, Jerry Beasley's "Skip Brack: A Tribute from a Colleague and Friend" offers a warm glimpse into a friendship sustained over decades that succinctly captures the essence of Brack: a down-to-earth, generous-to-a-fault man, as well as a meticulous, serious, and unflinching scholar. His son Matthew Brack's

following essay, "Print Borne and Born Digital: Considering Careers, My Father's and My Own," offers a deftly insightful précis of the revolution in the history of the book occasioned by the development of the internet and the digital humanities. This revolution, as momentous as any since the Gutenberg one, was, according to Matthew Brack, celebrated by his father, who pinpointed with possibly prophetic urgency that the last quarter of 2010, when Kindle e-books sold though Amazon.com first exceeded the sale of print books, symbolizes the moment "when the book [in its traditional hard-copy format] ended" (xvi). We hear much about the "death of the book," but rarely do we find such empirically demonstrable precision. In his Introduction, editor Jesse Swan includes two personal memorials from Paul T. Ruxin and James Gray. Swan concludes the book (excepting the last two apparatus, the index and list of contributors) with another personal piece, a summary of Brack's career, attended by a subsequent twenty-two page list of his numerous publications.

Given this warm flush of remembrances and recollections, it strikes me fitting that the title, *Editing Lives*, possesses an alert and subtle ambiguity. The word "lives," considered as a substantive, emerges clearly as the primary signification, echoed as it is by the subtitle's "Biographical Studies": "lives" mean "The Life of …." However, "lives" may also serve as a predicate; recognition of this invites a different and livelier apprehension of the title. That is to say, *Editing Lives* at once recognizes that textual, bibliographical, and biographical studies "live" on, as exhibited in many of the book's essays. But to press the point further, these practices "live" on by exhibiting the exemplary figure of Brack himself and his immense influence upon students and colleagues. Fittingly, Skip himself "lives" on here, just as he does throughout his many books, editions, and essays. The beautifully designed front cover, that of a smiling Skip Brack in the foreground, framed (literally) by the famous Sir Joshua Reynolds "Blinking Sam" portrait, brings into fine symbolic propinquity Brack the man and one of his major foci of scholarly inquiry, Sam: Johnson. Both are present, living, and enduring.

The editor has divided the book into three sections: 1. "Textual Studies," 2. "Biographical Studies," and 3. "Edition." Within these heads are arranged eleven scholarly essays and a translation. Loren Rothschild's "Collecting Samuel Johnson and His Circle" commences the first section with a charmingly modest yet quite informative piece that gives the reader access to the mind and world of a serious and "competitive" collector of Johnson and other eighteenth-century writers (1). Rothschild includes his own responses to "the five questions … asked of every serious collector" (5): 1. Why do you collect?, 2. How did you get interested collecting Johnson?, 3. Do you read all the books in your collections, 4. Are rare books a good investment?, and 5. What are you going to do with your collection when you die? Curious readers of this review will consult the book for the answers.

James E. May's "Some Notes on the Textual Fidelity of Eighteenth-Century Reprint Editions" cautions scholars handling primary 18th-century texts (an archive greatly augmented by the recent development of textual digitalization in the humanities) against uncritically accepting the accuracy of these digital "mono-versions." Details of variations in substantives and accidentals, and indeed even the claims of which edition is purportedly set forth, as on the title page, according to May, should not be accepted *prima facie*; there

are potentially many misleading deceptions. The problem is further compounded, he explains, because even the presumably definitive critical editions are not always reliable. For example, he shows that in the Twickenham edition of Pope, the *Essay on Man's* editorial treatment is inadequate, failing to account for all of the editions or impressions available in the first year of publication alone. May's welcome call for textual skepticism revolves to a great extent around his specialty, Edward Young. However, these superbly accomplished "Notes" travel far afield, documenting facts and problems in many authors and texts. Indeed, note five alone should be photocopied and inserted into the reader's copies of King and Ryskamp's edition of *The Letters and Prose Writings of William Cowper*, Knapp's *The Letters of Tobias Smollett*, and Henry Pettit's *The Correspondence of Edward Young*. May practices what he preaches, and his work here serve as an eye-opening primer for novices and a timely reminder for seasoned experts.

Walter H. Keithley's astute "Learning from Don Bilioso's Adventures: Visualizing a Critical Edition of the Printed Works of John Arbuthnot" uses the 1719 abbreviated satiric parody of a Quixotic romance to explore the challenges and possibilities of compiling a new critical edition of Pope and Swift's fellow satirist, Arbuthnot. Keithley takes this problematic intervention in the "great small-pox war" as representative of the "sub-canonical" ("works not considered to be canonical, but legitimate candidates for canonical inclusion," 35) body of writings that any editor of Arbuthnot would have to account for. His solution is to envision a hybrid edition, where the securely canonical works occupy a print edition, while the sub-canonical works would be archived in a digital repository akin to the Swift Archive associated with *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jonathan Swift* <http:// jonathanswiftarchive.org.uk/index.html>.

The "Biographical Studies" section commences with Robert DeMaria, Jr.'s "Samuel Parr's Epitaph for Johnson, His Library, and His Unwritten Biography." Using MSS letters of Parr (Johnson's Whig friend and author of the official epitaph for the Johnson's monument at St Paul's Cathedral) to supplement (and challenge) the scholarly printed accounts, DeMaria retells the story of the bickering among Johnson's friends over the wording of the Latin epitaph, using the archival details he has recovered as a platform from which to speculate what sort of biography Parr would have written, had he executed what he contemplated: "Parr's biography … clearly would have been less adulatory than Boswell's and even less so than Hawkins's, though he would have expressed much admiration for Johnson" (76). Using a list of books assembled for this unwritten life located in the catalogue of Parr's library (which is presented in a superbly useful annotated bibliography appended to the essay), DeMaria suggests that the projected work would have situated Johnson in the European neo-Latin humanists of the early modern period—something neglected by most Johnson biographers until DeMaria's own revisionary biography of 1995. In "Samuel Johnson's Shakespearean Exit: Emendation and Amendment," Gordon Turnbull meditates upon Johnson's lifelong preoccupation with death by imaginatively collating depictions of death scenes in his own writings (as in*Life of Savage*), in his editorial comments such scenes in the 1765 Shakespeare (such as those found in *Lear* and *Macbeth*), and in Hoole's narrative of Johnson's last days (using the 1972 edition edited by Brack). Michael Bundock sets out to accomplish two goals in his "Searching for

the Invisible Man: The Images of Francis Barber." First, examining various fictional attempts to construct a "doughnut life" (one "with a whacking hole in the middle where the central character should be," 107) of Johnson's black manservant Frank Barber by David Nokes, John Wain, Maureen Lawrence, and others, Bundock concludes that fiction—and particularly drama—is an important way to account for the elusive Barber. Second, he argues persuasively that the Reynolds portrait traditionally held to represent Barber is more likely that of Reynolds's servant, a claim that would constitute a significant finding for art historians as well as students of Johnson.

Four essays complete this middle section. Leslie Chilton's "*Alceste*: Tobias Smollett's Early Career" investigates the relationship between Smollett and the unproduced masque by G. F. Handel. Martine W. Brownley's "Gender, State Power, and the Rhetoric of the Funeral Sermons for Queen Mary II" examines how the sermons commemorating Queen Mary's unexpected death at age thirty-two worked to subvert her political and religious agency by demeaning her to a more passive, "womanly" status. Thomas Kaminski's "Swift's Politics Reconsidered" offers a revisionary rehabilitation of Jonathan Swift as not a deeply entrenched Tory, but rather as a centrist Whig. And Christopher D. Johnson's "The Work of a Professional Biographer: Oliver Goldsmith's *The Life of Richard Nash, ESQ*" seeks to re-situate Goldsmith's best biography—a book some commentators have levelled to mere Grub Street hackwork—into a higher estimation, one that "reveals Goldsmith to be a conscientious, capable writer" (177).

The final "Edition" section holds a single item, "Frances Burney on Hester Thrale: '*une petite histoire*,'" Peter Sabor's translation of the 1814 notebook that Burney (as Madame d'Arblay) used to practice her French. In it, she gives a frank account of her former friend Hester Piozzi—an account, as Sabor notes, that has been neglected by many Burney and Piozzi scholars alike. While the document has been transcribed previously in French, Sabor's is the first English translation. Formally dedicated "to the memory of O M Brack Jr.: Johnsonian, biographer, textual scholar, editor, and bibliophile extraordinaire," this useful and interesting contribution serves as a fitting conclusion to a sound and rewarding excellent volume.

Paul Tankard is to be lauded for producing *Facts and Inventions*. He has selected specimens of Boswell's largely neglected journalistic pieces, enlarging our view of Boswell's writings, his world, his relationship with Johnson and other members of their circle, and his involvement in the world of print culture. We have within this book's ambit a convenient and well-annotated archive that will be useful to social historians, to students of Boswell and Johnson, and perhaps, as Tankard speculatively hopes, to the common reader. First, an account of the book's presentational apparatus. Tankard's introductions, headnotes, and footnotes reveal an impressive command of the Boswellian canon, from the earliest jottings and heedlessly youthful publications, to the *Account of Corsica*, through the journals, essays, correspondence, and miscellaneous poetry, culminating finally in the late masterworks, the *Life of Johnson* and the *Tour of the Hebrides*. The annotation itself is full in coverage yet restrained in presentation, something important, given the complex farrago of facts that these often contextually saturated texts demand. The annotator has faced dense and frequently obscure knots and thickets of biographical, political,

social, economic, military, diplomatic, and literary information; he succeeds in reducing this wild exuberance to a meticulous and pruned order. Tankard's archival research illuminates with clarity and precision the practical details and the processes of publication behind the scene of the daily newspapers (as well as those published twice or thrice a week), the monthly journals, and other British serial publications from the mid-to-late 18th century. Especially valuable is the intricate cross-referencing of the information to the pertinent places in the Yale Boswell publications, as well as in the trade edition. And Tankard's prose style is immediate and accessible throughout and, on occasion, drily acerbic.

As constructed, *Facts and Inventions*—a title drawn from Boswell's MS index to his bound periodical productions, where he marks many items as either "Fact" or "Invention" (see xxvi)—possesses what Tankard describes as a "narrative" organizational principle (xlv). Rather than arranging the materials in temporal sequence, he chooses to sort Boswell's pieces under umbrella themes (such as "Execution Intelligence," "The Rampager," "The Lives of Johnson," etc.) and generic categories (such as, "Reports and Interviews" and "Essays and Letters."). Within these large regimes subsist various smaller subtopics. See, for example, the prose devoted to the Stratford Jubilee under "Reports and Interviews" and "The Case of John Reid" under "Execution Intelligence." The lucidity of this arrangement is usefully complemented by an appendix, "Chronology of Articles" that lists all the items included, working year to year from 1758 to 1794, and with the multiple entries located beneath each annual head sequenced in temporal progression, by month and date.

In addition, Tankard provides another appendix, "Attributes and Textual Notes," which details "every item in this collection, giving . . . authority for the attribution to Boswell, textual variants, and other matters of specialist interest" (378). Rounding out the volume are a list of short titles and abbreviations, a bibliography, a full if not exhaustive index—some modern scholars such as Pat Rogers are included, while others, such as Lance Bertelsen, are not—and 19 black-and-white illustrations. Inside, the pages are attractively set in Adobe Caslon type; outside, a graphically pressed, sleeveless cover is ornamented by a reproduction of Sir Thomas Laurence's 1791 pencil sketch of Boswell.

Second, an account of the book's contents. I suggested in a 2007 *Age of Johnson* review of the James Boswell's *An Account of Corsica* (Oxford University Press, 2006) that this early work in many respects anticipates Boswell's procedural method in the later *Tour* and *Life*, particularly by centering his text around a strong, charismatic figure, by performing detailed research to support the presentation, and by fostering his narrative voice as a personable, intimate inhabitant of the great man's world—a foil. And so, the first item in *Facts and Inventions* I turned to was "An Authentick Account of General Paoli's Tour to Scotland, Autumn 1771," published in the *London Magazine* two years before Johnson and Boswell's immortal trek into the peat. In noting a report where Boswell escorted Paoli around Edinburgh, Glasgow, Auchinleck, and their environs, I had entertained some hopes of finding a miniature trial run of the 1785 *Tour of the Hebrides*. However, these slender dreams were doomed to be dashed when I read through the actual selection. It lacks both the fluent dialogue and the adroit character sketches that we admire in the more familiar Boswell. While well-written, it is plain and matter of fact—in fact, its style is perfectly suited to the newspaper account that it is. And thus the "Account,"

like many of pieces included here, shows us a Boswell we aren't accustomed to, one relatively restrained, tonally neutral, stylistically lean. Even so, some edgy traces of the Boswell we do know appear in the report: his implicit, neurotically-fueled glory in being associated with the great Paoli, his native pride in the descriptions of the noteworthy things to be seen in Scotland, such as the Forth-Clyde Canal, calling it "one of the greatest works in modern times" (37), and his Scottish nationalistic fervor as he records the enthusiastic response of the Scots to Paoli. This doesn't amount to high literature. But the piece is informative about local culture and history, and it shows Boswell, ever the master mimic, able to adopt yet another role, that of the diurnal historian. This latter role Tankard's edition superbly illustrates in various Boswellian voices and formats.

In summary, *Facts and Inventions* constitutes a major contribution to Boswellian studies. It divulges and expertly presents a side of Boswell that has been largely ignored or unread after the late eighteenth century—a side of Boswell neglected despite the wide and intense scholarly scrutiny that Boswell has enjoyed since the revelation of the archives housed in Malahide Castle and Fettercairne House that came to light in the early decades of the twentieth century. Tankard's edition makes accessible a jostling buffet of cultural observations, self-promoting puffs, *jeu d'esprit* of the imagination, legal reports, cultural celebrations, précis of such admired contemporary celebrities as Edmund Burke, John Wilkes, and Lord Shelburne, as well public jousting with literary foes such as Sir John Hawkins, Hester Piozzi, and Anna Seward (perhaps the most vivid section of the book is "The Lives of Johnson," scurrilously entertaining warfare masked as gossip that often shows Boswell in a most unpleasant light). The rich menu of materials ultimately coalesce into a rich ragout that should satisfy the tastes of any and all students of the period.

Anthony W. Lee
University of Maryland University College

John Malcolm, *Malcolm Soldier, Diplomat, Ideologue of British India: The Life of Sir John Malcolm (1769-1833).* Edinburgh: John Donald, an imprint of Birlinn, 2014. Pp. xxii + 641; bibliography; family tree; glossary; frontispiece portrait and many illustrations (some in color) and 12 maps; index of people and general index. ISBN: 978-1-906566-739; hardcover: £30.

It is not easy, in our anti-imperialistic, post-colonial age, to write sympathetic biographies of the founders of the British Empire in India. Many of its heroes have had chinks in their armor exposed: ours is not the age of adulation. But three arch imperialists, all Scottish, remain impervious to this trend, Sir Thomas Munro (1761-1827), governor of Madras, Montstuart Elphinstone (1779-1859), governor of Bombay, and Sir John Malcolm (1769-1833), who conquered central India for the British and succeeded his friend Elphinstone as governor. Munro and Elphinstone have not been badly served by historians and biographers.[1] But, with the notable exception of Jack Harrington's *Sir John Malcolm and the Creation of British India* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), the only full-length book on Malcolm, William Kaye's two-volume biography, was published in 1856.

The lacuna has now been masterfully and monumentally filled by John Malcolm. Perhaps no one is more qualified for the task. A collateral descendant of Sir John, Malcolm brings not only a Scottish[2] but an international perspective to bear on his subject, similar to Sir John's on the British Empire, having lived several years in Iran, to which Sir John led three embassies, and having a summer home in Mahabaleshwar, India, where Sir John loved to spend time. He has spent over twenty years examining archives in London, Edinburgh, Australia, Canada, India and the United States, besides at least fifteen other cities in Britain, and has read just about all that was written by Sir John or has been on him. In India, he has traveled to nearly all the places that are associated with Sir John; like him, he has a keen sense of geography and military history, and his book is full of very helpful color plates, photographs (mostly taken by his wife Bini), maps, diagrams, battle sketches, etc. Not the least striking feature of the book is the portrait on the cover, reproduced from a painting now in possession of Sardar Dilip Kibe of Pune, showing Sir John's right hand resting on a chair and, in the other, the hand of Tantia Jogh, the founder of the Kibe dynasty and the chief minister of Holkar who signed the Treaty of Mandsaur with Sir John in 1818 which ceded central India to the British, and subsequently became his associate in the administration of that region. The portrait sums up perfectly the easy relations and interdependence of British ruler and Indian subject that could exist—not that they always did—in the early years of the Empire, well brought out in Malcolm's book but often ignored by post-colonialist critics, as well as the regard in which Sir John personally held the wily and able Tantia Jogh.[3]

Malcolm narrates Sir John's life chronologically in 32 chapters plus a postscript. The seventh of seventeen children of a poor tenant farmer, Sir John arrived in Madras as an ensign at the age of 13. By the time he returned to Britain for good 47 years later, the East India Company, which on his arrival had been essentially a trading company controlling only parts of eastern, western and southern India, had come into possession of all of India except Punjab and Kashmir. Malcolm served as the ideologue of the Company's expansionist policies and was one of the chief architects of empire. Having acquired a knowledge of Persian, the court language of India, he was involved in negotiations that led to the expulsion of French forces in favor of British from the court of the Nizam; later he served on the staff of General Harris when the latter conquered Srirangapatnam where Tipu was killed. In 1800 he was appointed to lead an embassy to Persia, the first of three such missions. Persia was pretty unknown to the British at the time. Malcolm's job was to persuade the Shah of Iran to reject any overtures from the French under Napoleon, who, it was believed, was planning, now that he had reached Egypt, to march to India through Persia. When he reached Tehran in November, the threat from France had receded, so he returned after signing a trade and peace treaty. Though events overtook Malcolm's mission, rendering it unnecessary in hindsight, the experience served him well. He got to know the country and, thanks to two further missions, was able to write the two-volume *History of Persia.*

Richard Wellesley, the governor general, whose policies were frankly expansionist, having subdued Hyderabad and Mysore, now turned his attention to the Marathas, a loose confederacy of powerful chiefs, notably Scindhia and Holkar, who owed nominal fealty to the Peshwa in Poona, but in fact ruled quite

independently and always viewed one another with distrust. Had they been able to unite against the British, the latter might well have been routed from India and history would have been very different. But though Yashwant Rao Holkar tried to affect this union towards the end of his life, it remained a vain hope. The military strength of the Marathas lay in their cavalry. Excellent horsemen, they could travel enormous distances, carried little except lances and dried chick peas, and knew how to live off the land. British armies were largely infantry and moved with heavy baggage, and therefore easily harried by Maratha cavalry.

In 1803 Arthur Wellesley, though hopelessly outnumbered, defeated Scindhia decisively at Assaye in 1803. The battle marks the effectual end of Maratha power in India. Only Holkar remained unsubdued; the rest of India except Punjab and Kashmir had now come under British control. To his great chagrin Malcolm had fallen severely ill just before Assaye and could not participate in the fighting. But he was deeply involved in the negotiations with Scindhia that followed, leading to the signing of peace treaties by both sides.

In 1807 Malcolm married Charlotte Campbell, an eighteen-year-old girl twenty years younger than he. They were to have five children. But just before the first was born, he set off on his second embassy to Persia, this time to attempt to disrupt the close relations that had developed between the Shah and the French on account of the latter's promise to help the Iranians recover territory from the Russians. It proved infructuous, in large part because he and the agent of the Crown there, Sir Harford Jones, just couldn't pull together as a team. The third embassy, undertaken in 1810 with a view to signing an agreement whereby the East India Company would supply advisors and arms to Iran, was also unsuccessful, essentially because the government in London and the governor general in Calcutta were unable to coordinate their aims or efforts.

Malcolm spent 1812-17 in Britain. When he returned to India, having left his family behind, he was gratified to find that the new governor general Lord Hastings, though lacking the imperial vision of Richard Wellesley, agreed with Malcolm's policies that called for an extension of British influence on the subcontinent. Together they drew up a plan against the Pindaris, freebooters who owed no loyalty, raided and plundered vast areas of central India, and relied on the Peshwa and the Maratha powers of Scindhia and Holkar for support. Malcolm marched as the commander of the Deccan army to the banks of the Narmada in pursuit of the notorious Pindari Cheetoo, while the Holkar army itself, having seemingly overcome various internal dissensions, marched towards the Narmada with a view to teaming up with the Peshwa's forces. The two clashed at Mahidpur on December 21, 1817. Though he had always been an army man, this was Malcolm's first and only major engagement in battle. Outnumbered and outgunned, he prevailed through sheer discipline and derring do, thus securing central India for the British.

He served as the undisputed ruler of central India till 1821, and later wrote about his work and the history, society and culture of the region in the two-volume *Memoirs of Central India* (1823). These years mark the apogee of his power and show him as a benevolent ruler who traveled everywhere in the region, met with every class of Indian, brought peace to the area by putting an end to constant depredations and raids, founded the town of Mhow, collected the records, history and legends of this land and wrote its first and most authoritative history, which remains an important sourcebook still. His policy

that any Indian, however lowly, who wanted to see him should be admitted into his presence immediately, even if he was eating or resting, endeared him to Indians in every rank of society by showing that he was truly accessible and had the Indians' interests at heart. While here he also propounded his theory of indirect rule, according to which the British would exercise suzerainty but day-to-day affairs would be carried out by the local rulers and high-level positions would be opened to talented Indians. This model was not followed: the Utilitarians and Evangelists who gained control of the East India Company believed in direct rule, looked at Indians unfavorably as "heathen," and tried to bring civilization and education to them through Christianity. It has been speculated that had Malcolm's policies been followed rather than the Evangelicals', the 1857 Mutiny might have been averted.

In1827 Malcolm was appointed governor of Bombay. What should have been the capstone to his career proved to be a rather troublesome three years, since a good deal of his energy was directed towards dealing with the judges. Appointed directly from London, they were responsible to the Crown, not the Company. Malcolm wanted their jurisdiction to be confined to the original Presidency alone, but they thought that they should exercise control over all the territories that had been added as a result of British conquests. This led to an impasse till finally London ruled in favor of Malcolm, but not before much bad blood had been created.

He also traveled through Gujarat, parts of which practiced *sati* and female infanticide. In 1830 he rather reluctantly rescinded a law that had allowed *sati*. Female infanticide he could not curb, feeling that it would end only when its practitioners decided to give it up. But he did call upon Swami Sahajanand, a Hindu saint and founder of the Swaminarayan sect, who preached women's rights, in order to enlist him as an ally. The Swami gifted Malcolm a manuscript of his book *Shikshapatri* which eventually found its way to the Bodleian, where it used to be visited by so many devotees, thanks to the spread of Swaminarayan Hindus in Britain, that they could not be easily accommodated, leading the library to digitize the text.[4] Stylized paintings of the meeting between Malcolm and the Swami adorn Swaminarayan temples all round the world.

Malcolm returned to Britain for good in 1830. The last three years of his life were not very distinguished. He got into Parliament from a rotten borough but did not make a mark. He opposed the Reform Bill. In India his conservative policies, stressing indirect rule, non-interference with local customs, laws and traditions, and using Indian intermediaries to run the country on Britain's behalf, might have been visionary, but in the British context his views seemed outmoded. He lost a parliamentary election following the Reform Bill, and died of a stroke before he could move into a large house he had been building.

I have summarized Sir John Malcolm's life at some length to show the complex and diverse affairs in which he was engaged for the nearly fifty years he was in India. Getting them all down in order, so that the outlines of the story are never occluded even as every small detail is developed with care, is not an easy task, but the biographer John Malcolm manages it admirably. An excellent narrator, and a great raconteur like his distinguished forebear, he can be relied upon to explain vividly and clearly the tangled webs of plotting, diplomacy, lies, intrigue and cupidity, whether he is describing the James Kirkpatrick affair (chapter 4), or the way in which the British were finally able to curb the Nizam

of Hyderabad's power, or the negotiations between Scindhia and Sir John. To a historian his account of British-Maratha relations may seem too much like a summary of what occurred. But his focus is not to provide a detailed history but just enough background to explain the role Sir John played, and in this he succeeds completely.

He brings another strength to his task, his knowledge of Iran, which makes the chapters describing Sir John's three embassies there among the strongest in the book. He has a good sense of the topography of the area over which Sir John traveled and is familiar with local traditions of hospitality and methods of negotiation which have remained unbroken since the 19th century and before, and this knowledge helps him explain the actions and motivations of various personages. Indeed, he is able to go behind and beyond what happened to an explanation of why it happened, speculating at times but adding depth to our understanding of Sir John's perception of these events.

By the time we get to the end of the book he has laid bare Sir John's character, his boyish high spirits, his optimism, his gregariousness, his open and generous nature, as also his self-congratulatory manner, his desire to thrust himself into the attention of the powerful, his dirty finger nails and inappropriate table manners. He has also provided excellent character sketches of a large number of other people like William and James Kirkpatrick, Marquess Wellesley and his younger brother Arthur, Elphinstone, and others. Indeed, so rich is the book in its clear depictions of the people, places, events, campaigns, battles and treaties that determined the course of Indian history in the momentous fifty years from 1780 to 1830 that it may be regarded as the single best one-volume history of this period, though admittedly told from the viewpoint of Sir John Malcolm, one of the leading participants in the formation of this history.

After such praise it would be churlish to pick holes in the work, but it is necessary to do so. Though it is extensively footnoted, a few more would not have hurt. Thus on page 22 he says that the children of British men and Indian women who had formed stable relationships were not disadvantaged in seeking a career or marriage, and cites as an example Sir John's maternal uncle Dr. Gilbert Pasley, Surgeon General of the Madras Presidency, whose daughter by an Indian *bibi* married Robert Campbell, a merchant who ended up as Chairman of the East India Company. The matter is more complex. While it is certainly true that the children of several of these relationships had fruitful lives in Britain, in India, or in both, others were not so fortunate. They were left behind when their fathers returned to Britain and had to fend for themselves, not always successfully. Sir John's elder brother Robert, who had several such children, made provision for them only at his younger brother's insistence and never spared them a thought after returning to Scotland. Individual talents, predilections, even the color and gender of children, played a role in who was successful and who not. A footnote to what seems a blanket statement would have lent the author's statement more credibility. Similarly, the story of Malcolm breaking off negotiations with the Sikhs in order to dash off to shoot a tiger reported in the vicinity (p. 225) would have benefited from references.

I have another issue with the book. The author notes that Sir John praised Jaswant Rao Holkar's predecessor, Ahilya Bai, "to the skies," but leaves it at that, unlike his practice in the Persian account of going behind the facts to

discover their true significance. Why did Sir John praise her so effusively? Partly, of course, because she deserved it. But no reader of this section in *Memoirs of Central India* can fail to be struck by how carefully he builds up contrasts between Ahilya Bai and a later regent Tulsa Bai, beautiful and charming but corrupt, vicious and unreliable, who was his immediate Holkar adversary and was executed by her rebellious generals the night before the battle of Mahidpur. Sir John clearly wants the reader to understand not only that it was in order to replace Tulsa Bai's ruinous control of central India with the moderation and justice of British rule that the battle was fought, but also that this British rule would bring back the golden age of Ahilya Bai. What he is doing is to carefully position himself as the latter's moral heir, thereby gaining some legitimacy for what otherwise would be regarded as the replacement of a legitimate ruler by force of arms.

Similarly, Malcolm the biographer does not comment on the fact that one reason why Holkar lost at Mahidpur was because a leading general, Gaffoor Khan, fled the battlefield. Sir John knew that Charles Metcalfe had struck a deal with Amir Khan, Gaffoor's relative and his superior, not to support Holkar, for which he was rewarded by the British. Sir John says that after Holkar's defeat Gaffoor, too, was awarded the kingdom of Jaora carved out of Holkar territories. Surely this was a reward for his treachery to his employer. That Malcolm was party to this settlement, however regretfully, makes him an accomplice after the fact in this double dealing; indeed, the suspicion is aroused that he may have been privy to the negotiations that must have taken place between Gaffoor and the British *before* the battle of Mahidpur, which would imply that the flight was pre-planned, the British had knowledge that it would take place, and the outcome of the battle had, in a sense, been settled even before it was fought.

In fact, John Malcolm takes Sir John's account of his dealings with Holkar at face value, not trying to look, as he had done with the Persian narrative, behind the facts to hidden motives and causes. He has tried to make his biography balanced and objective, representing the Indian point of view as fully as the British. But, as the examples above show, he is not entirely successful. The book remains, in the end, an account of the life of Sir John Malcolm as told from the British point of view.

Finally, I have long been puzzled by one aspect of Sir John's life on which John Malcolm throws no light. So strong had Arthur Wellesley's ties been with a number of Indians that, even after he had left India for good, in his letters he asked to be remembered to Purnea, the chief minister of Mysore, and others. Sir John's ties with Indians were even stronger. But once in Britain, he never seems to have remembered them. There is no record of any correspondence with close associates. How was he so easily able to put his Indian friends out of his mind once he had left Indian shores? I hope John Malcolm will address this enigma should he write about Sir John again.

Flawlessly printed on rich, thick paper and handsomely and sturdily bound, at the Gutenberg Press in Malta, this book is essential reading for all who are interested in the early years of the British Empire in India, and at $45.55 from Amazon.com (and only $15.88 for an online edition) is a veritable steal.

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

Notes

1. See, for instance, T.H. Beaglehole, *Thomas Munro and the Development of Administrative Policy in Madras 1792-1818* (Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1966); Burton Stein, *Thomas Munro: The Origins of the Colonial State and His Vision of Empire* (Delhi: Oxford U. Press, 1989); Cyril John Radcliffe, *Montstuart Elphinstone* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962); R.D. Choksey, *Montstuart Elphinstone The Indian Years* (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1971).

2. The best study of the influence of Scottish Enlightenment philosophy on Sir John's thinking and administrative practice remains Martha McLaren, *British India and British Scotland 1780-1820: Career Building, Empire Building, and a Scottish School of Indian Governance* (Akron, OH: Akron U. Press, 2001)

3. As John Malcolm points out, the portrait is more problematic. It originally showed only Sir John, his left hand resting casually on a table, and hung in the Rajwada, the Holkar palace, in Indore, where it was destroyed by a fire. The table was removed and the figure of Tantia Jogh superimposed in its place at a later date by an unknown Indian artist. Sir John was well over 6 feet tall, while Tantia was probably not more than 5' 5", but in the portrait the two are shown as being equally tall. Nevertheless it depicts Sir John's relations with Indians accurately.

4. Kristina Koford, "The Digitization of the Shikshapatri," ils.unc.edu/wilden/Oxford_seminar2009/ Koford.pdf. See also www.shikshapatri.org/uk-imageb/content.php.transcr.

Real, Hermann J., and Dirk F. Passmann (compilers). *The Index*. Volume 5 of *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D*. Edited by David Woolley. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014. Pp. [*v*] + 307. ISBN: 978-3-631-40832-2. Hardcover: $66.95.

David Woolley's very welcome edition of Swift's *Correspondence* was published in four volumes between 1999 and 2007, the last volume in press at the time of its editor's death. Swift's epistolary canon is massive: Woolley's edition includes 1,516 letters occupying almost 2,750 pages. The letters are rich in references and reflections, full of allusions to and information about the many major figures in Swift's various circles and illuminating of his own outlook and ideology. Anyone working in Swift studies—or in the literature and history of England and Ireland in his lifetime—will benefit from from mining this problematic but enlightening corpus of correspondence. That the new standard edition had no index to aid navigation has represented a major problem; users have had to use the index to the old Harold Williams edition (1963-1965) to obtain a date, and then turn to Woolley. But that, at last, has changed, thanks to the devotion and diligence of Woolley's friends and fellow Prestophiles, Hermann J. Real and Dirk F. Passmann.

The index that they have compiled will unquestionably be an invaluable aid to scholars wishing to use Swift's correspondence. It is admirably thorough, running just over 300 pages. Numerous cross-references are extremely helpful, though there are a few surprising inconsistences. John Boyle, the fifth Earl of Orrery, is cross-referenced under Orrery, for example, and Henry St John, first

Viscount Bolingbroke, is cross-referenced under Bolingbroke, but Robert Harley, the first Earl of Oxford, appears only under Harley. But the extensiveness of the index makes it a godsend, opening up the correspondence to a wide range of scholars interested in any number of topics.

Even the most minor places (e.g., Kilbride, County Meath, mentioned in one note in Woolley's edition) are indexed, as are relatively insignificant figures from the anonymous Mr. Abdy to the English soprano Cecilia Young. Important people are given the detailed entries they need and deserve: the Reverend Thomas Sheridan gets four-and-a-half pages' worth, and Bolingbroke five-and-a-half; almost nine are devoted to Swift's most famous (if not his closest) friend, Alexander Pope. Swift's entry accounts for the better part of fifty pages, including what must be every reference—even the most cursory—he makes to anyone or any work. The Swift section is, sensibly, copiously subdivided. In addition to his works (under which they give prose; poems; transcripts; library; reading; and presentation copies and gifts), entries are organized into "*Life (including Afterlife), Education, and Career*"; "*Movements and Journeys*"; "*Correspondences*"; "*Friendships*"; "*Household*"; "*Stella and Vanessa*"; "*Personality and Character*"; "*his love of food and drink*"; "*Autographs (Holographs) and Manuscripts*"; "*Comments and Views*"; and "*References*." The index points readers at the major issues in Swift's career (e.g., his opposition to William Wood's patent and his contempt for English tyranny), as well as a whole host of lesser concerns (his love of mutton, his cambric handkerchiefs and beaver hats, his tea caddy and his riding gown). Everything from his handwriting to his hatreds is catalogued here. In what seems an incongruous bit of economy, only surnames are given for the sub-entries, with a few exceptions, and occasionally the entries seem vague ("A Pamphlet"). Such inevitable quibbles aside, what one must conclude is that Real and Passmann have done a noble job of mapping Swift's remarkably wide-ranging epistolary canon.

The index is as accurate as it is comprehensive, both in itself and as a guide to the contents of the *Correspondence*. Indexing is a subjective business, and not all readers agree about what constitutes an index-worthy reference. Their assiduous, very precise subdividing leads to what some might consider a surplus of individual entries where a broader category might suffice. As my own preference is strongly in favor of indexes that err on the side of too many entries rather than too few, I applaud and appreciate Real and Passman's careful exclusivity. This is an index that invites not only casual use but active skimming, insofar as it points us at parts of Swift's life, career, and outlook that we might not even know to look for in his correspondence. The Real-Passmann index serves as a valuable—indeed, an utterly necessary—guide to the now standard edition of Swift's correspondence. The care with which it was executed is testimony to the compilers' admiration for David Woolley, and this final installment of the *Correspondence* represents a worthy tribute to epistolary Swift's late editor.

Ashley Marshall
University of Nevada, Reno

Leo Damrosch. ***Jonathan Swift: His Life and His World***. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013. Pp. xi + 573; chronology; 94 b/w illustrations; index; notes prefaced by list of titles and their abbreviations. ISBN: 9-780300-164992. Hardcover, $35 [Now in paperback for $16.74 from Amazon].

Damrosch's biography embraces the whole of Swift's life, offering non-specialists historical contexts as required along the way, and illustrating and indexing the text well. For under $20 on Amazon, it's worth the purchase for anyone teaching 18C British literature. Despite limitations, it may well be the best full-life treatment of man and author since Irvin Ehrenpreis's *Swift* (1962-1983), which it critiques, though dependent on it. Damrosch, in bringing Swift "to life as a complex, compelling human being" (7), presents his biography as taking "seriously some daring speculations about his family and his relationships that differ radically from the official story"--thus he aligns himself with Sybil Le Brocquy, Denis Johnston, Victoria Glendinning, and Bruce Arnold, and examines the hypotheses that Swift was fathered by Sir John Temple, that Hester (Stella) Johnson was fathered by Sir William Temple, and that Swift was sexually involved with Hester Vanhomrigh (see 53-61, etc., on the Temples' possible paternities; 230-40, 320-37 on Vanessa). Damrosch usually recounts the consensus view, what he calls "the official story," thus quoting "a recent biographer" (J. A. Downie) that "There is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that Swift was the son of anyone other than Jonathan Swift senior," but then he stresses the improbabilities and gaps in the official accounts of Swift's birth and early childhood (57). To many Swift specialists, Damrosch will seem to be slanting for scandal to sell books; but for some reviewers, his entertaining hypotheses not developed by Ehrenpreis show "a tolerance for mystery" and "scrupulous intellectual integrity" (Marcela Valdes qtd. on Amazon). It is ironic that Damrosch criticizes Ehrenpreis for wild Freudian conjectures about Swift and for indulging "constantly in invention without saying so" (5; e.g., 312).

Whether or not Damrosch has gone too far in arguing diverse paternities and sexual relations, there is still much to recommend in his account of Swift's life. His portrait of Swift has an evolving unity, with traits like pride and vanity, loyalty, and resentment strongly etched, traits shown to lead to mistakes as well as achievements, and Swift's deep emotional life is convincing and moving--the account can provoke tears. Inconsistencies in the portrait reflect inconsistencies in the man. Damrosch's treatment of problematical areas like Swift's religious beliefs are full and balanced and usually don't overstate conclusions. He also offers a good introduction to Swift's close relationships, clerical positions, his health problems, and his major works (as well as the Journal to Stella). And the 94 illustrations, one for every five page of text, greatly augment the book, most are facsimiles, many maps are included, and nearly all are very crisply reproduced (Damrosch acknowledges that a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation helped acquire them). I am no expert, but some knowledgeable Swiftians have praised the book. Andrew Carpenter in the *Irish Times* called this a "wonderful and absorbing biography . . . the most balanced, nuanced and persuasive biography of Swift so far . . . It should remind the reader what a wonderful writer Swift is and send us enthusiastically back to the texts" (quoted on Amazon). And Pat Rogers, who decades ago edited a fine edition of Swift's *Poems*, also thinks the biography "superior to anything that has gone before"

(*New Criterion*). There is a long list of excerpts from favorable reviews on Amazon, which also indicates the Damrosch won the 2013 National Book Critics Circle Award for Biography.

I read the biography with pen in hand over four or five days with great interest, both in Swift and in how Damrosch was organizing and presenting his material for a broad audience. Damrosch's sense of his audience is evident in his explaining to readers that Gulliver encounters little people in Lilliput (357). In the text he rarely names the scholars whom he relies and comments upon (such as, pp. 98ff., Richard Haworth's 2009 *Swift Studies* article), referencing most of them as he did Downie only in the notes. This makes for a better mass-market biography, one that can be called "fast-paced," though it minimizes engagement with what's been written about Swift and his works. Some of the greatest contributors to Swift scholarship are not found in the index. The scholars Damrosch puts to most explicit use are those, like A. C. Elias, Jr., who have questioned some account of Swift's respectful or respectable behavior (in Elias's case, towards Sir William Temple). Finally, Damrosch seems not to have discovered anything new from documentary sources. His biography isn't an indispensable source for any future biography, there being nothing that must be cited from it. Accordingly, it surprised me to find among the eulogies on Amazon Professor Robert Mahoney's claim that the book was "Thoroughly researched." To my mind it is a well written biography in a lively voice with an engaging and plausible portrait of Swift, integrating his strengths and weakness well, bringing him to life, but calling it "thoroughly researched" cheapens an important distinction. That it is not the product of "thorough" research into all Swift wrote and all written about him can be inferred from Damrosch's publishing *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Restless Genius* in 2005, *Tocqueville's Discovery of America* in 2010, and (co-edited) *The Essential Writings of Rousseau* in 2013, the year of his Swift biography--nor was Damrosch's specializing in Swift earlier in his academic career.

Damrosch has read many important books and articles on Swift and on major Swift's works (and more selectively on Irish history), but there's a great deal of material he has missed, and he was not in thorough command of the scholarship, nor employed the best texts. Let me give instances of factual errors that I caught (perhaps someone with expertise in political history might catch others). I will avoid errors such as that involving the remains of Richard III (34) which might have been missed by a thoroughly researched book published in 2013. Damrosch repeatedly calls Swift's *Ode to the Athenian Society* his "first publication" (83, 90, 245), but James Woolley republished Swift's earlier *Ode to the King* (1691) in facsimile in *Reading Swift* IV (i.e. vol. 4, 2008), after reporting the discovery in 2006 at Munster, and his account was converted to a record so attributing it in the ESTC (R181173). Damrosch remarks that *A Tale of a Tub* "was more or less finished at Moor Park in 1696" (131), but this is only true for the fable of the three brothers, with the dedications, preface, introductions, and digressions written or largely written later (see Marcus Walsh's Cambridge edition, 2010, xxxvi-xxxix). In discussing the character Jack's reliance on Providence in *A Tale of a Tub*, Damrosch quotes from the text where Jack twice speaks of being (mis)guided by "Providence," which Damrosch calls a "risky" word choice; then Damrosch notes "Swift had second thoughts, and when he brought out a new edition both mentions of 'Providence'

had disappeared," replaced by "Nature" and "Fortune" (138-39, with fn. 19 citing the wrong section number of the *Tale*), but it should be acknowledged that "Providence" appeared again in the second through fourth editions (1704b-1705, see variants in Walsh's Cambridge edition, 303), in one or more of which appear authorial corrections. In another reference to the *Tale*, again relying on Herbert Davis's edition *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift* (1939-1968), Damrosch claims, "In Swift's Latin quotation the critical word, *cunnus*, is discreetly omitted" from the first edition's quotation of Horace (140), but it is the reading in the first four editions, only omitted in 1710 (see Walsh, 302)--Damrosch had time to have put to use Walsh's edition, as he did the 2008 Cambridge edition of *English Political Writings 1711-1714*. Damrosch remarks of early editions of Swift's *Conduct of the Allies* that "compositors . . . had to start from scratch for each new editon, since it was impossibly expensive to keep whole pages of type intact." But Herman Teerink made clear long ago that "the first four editions are from the same setting" and reimpressions occur for some later settings, too (*A Bibliography of the Writings of Jonathan Swift*, 2nd ed., 1963, p. 282)--and this is fine-tuned in the textual notes by Ian Gadd in the 2008 Cambridge edition (344ff.), and Damrosch's notion that it was prohibitive to leave type standing reflects an ignorance about printing in Swift's day. Teerink is never mentioned by Damrosch! David Woolley but once--we are directed to Ehrenpreis's biography, not Woolley's three important articles in *Swift Studies (*nor Michael Treadwell's), for "a full account of the publication of *Gulliver's Travels*" (523, n. 8). Damrosch wrongly identifies Edward Young's and the young Philip Duke of Wharton's roles in Ireland when Swift, walking with Young, said he would "die at the top": Damrosch introduces Young as "secretary to the lord lieutenant at the time" (460, n. 19)--Wharton was there to sell off his estates, not as Lord Lieutenant (see Woolley, *Correspondence,* II: 335-36 and then Harold Forster's biography of Young). Damrosch's remarks that "for a century it never occurred to anyone to abridge it or clean it [*Gulliver's Travels*] up," suggesting that clean up began in the 1820s (369). He should have known of *Travels into several Remote Nations of the World . . . Faithfully Abridged* (J. Stone and R. King, 1727; ESTC T108362), recorded by William Sale in 1950 as printed by Samuel Richardson (p. 208)--who, Peter Sabor conjectured, may have abridged it (*Reading Swift* IV [2003], 388). What else in the important *Reading Swift* volumes did Damrosch overlook? The lax manner of citing sources suggests more reading than has occurred. Damrosch's habit of citing multiple sources for a paragraph often leads to some citations being uncertain (354, n. 48). The importance placed on the scholarly record is suggested by Damrosch's listing in his bibliography the first five *Reading Swift* volumes as "1985-2008" edited by "Hermann J. Real and Heinz J. Vienken" (479), which over-represents Vienken and omits Real's co-editors Richard Rodino and Helgard Stöver-Leidig.

I don't believe that Damrosch read enough of the secondary literature. Quotations from Sir Walter Scott's biography of Swift are drawn from *Swift: The Critical Heritage*, not Scott directly (p. 106, n. 26). There are a number of important quotations that I would have taken from the originals, as Bishop Evan's aspersions of Swift's marriage to Stella, reproduced from Le Brocquy, who reproduces it with elisions (518, n. 35). On p. 380 in addressing Gulliver's name, Damrosch writes, "It may be that Swift picked up the name on his way from Chester, since he passed through a town whose innkeeper was Samuel

Gulliver" (p. 380, citing in n. 4 Woolley, *Corr*. III.11n., who identifies the inn as in Banbury, where others were named "Gulliver"). Damrosch would have done better had he read Hermann J. Real's "Gullible Lemuel Gulliver's Banbury Relatives" in *The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, n.s. 21.3 (Sept. 2007), 3-16, reviewed in the fall 2008 *Scriblerian*. Real covers Swift's familiarity with Banbury and the Gullivers living there prior to publication of *GT*, and he offers various associations Swift possibly intended for "Lemuel" and "Gulliver." Similarly, the discussion of the significance of "coffee" (234-36, 327-28) might have been improved after reading Real's "Confessions of a Coffee Drinker: or How Coffee Became Sex(y)" in the *Intelligencer*, n.s. 24.3 (Sept. 2010), 6-13. There he would also have read of a conversation over Swift's sex life decades ago between David Woolley and Real, scholars he might have thought upheld the Ehrenpreis tradition and the official version.

Damrosch is too eager to slight earlier biographies and criticism offering the official story, which can result in some imprecision or exaggeration. Speaking of Vanessa's (Vanhomrigh's) poem "To Love," Damrosch writes, "amazingly--unmentioned by all of Swift's biographers--the copy in her [Vanessa's] desk *was in Swift's handwriting*" (337), but the footnote to this sentence indicates, "[Harold] Williams quotes Sheridan as confirming that the handwriting was Swift's"--this seems like self-promotion by Damrosch, for Thomas Sheridan was a biographer of Swift, his edition an extension of his biography in vol. 1. There are some important characterizations of Swift's relations, as with Pope ("Swift's most valued friend" 386), that should be more precisely phrased. For instance, he exaggerates in saying that when Stella died in 1728 "for the past twenty-year [years], apart from his stays in England, he [Swift] had seen her [Stella] almost every day" (410)--this neglects such facts as that Swift following Hester Vanhomrigh's death traveled "on a four-month journey into the west of Ireland" (334). Damrosch is careless in describing Swift's and Sheridan's periodical, *The Intelligencer*: "it lasted barely a year, never made any money, and was discontinued after nineteen numbers" (417); but there was a twentieth number, by Swift himself, and James Woolley reveals in his edition that there were multiple settings of some issues (especially early ones), attesting to some success with the public (see *The Intelligencer* [Clarendon, 1992], 4 and 26-33). And I suppose likely typos might be mentioned in this paragraph: for instance, Damrosch misdates Vanessa's "gossip-causing appearance at Wantage in 1712" at p. 331.2 (it was in 1714; Woolley, *Correspondence*., II: 72, n. 2).

So, I wouldn't give the biography high marks for research. It's essentially a good life story based on others' research. Although Damrosch's account is 450+ pp. long, there's far less detail in it than in Ehrenpreis's three volumes with four times the pages, which Damrosch himself praises for being "encyclopedic" and offering "week-by-week [coverage] . . . with complete assurance" (5). There are plenty of gaps in the biography (e.g., little is said about Swift's editing of Temple or about literary projects of the 1730s, such as the *Don Quixote* and Faulkner editions). Eugene Hammond, having done primary research for his forthcoming biography of Swift (U. of Delaware Press) will correct Damrosch's conjectures about Swift's family and his own childhood, as that "Sir John might have provided for the education of his son [Swift]" (60). Many at EC/ASECSes of the past decade have heard Hammond speak of his

research for the biography, offering, for instance, information about Swift's grandmother's support for her family, of which there is no hint in Damrosch. Future biographers will be aided by the ongoing Cambridge and Münster editions and the index to Woolley's edition of the *Correspondence*, but then Damrosch has not put to use a number of tools that were available, like the first Cambridge Swift volumes, Teerink, and the ESTC.--JEMay

Michael Griffin. ***Enlightenment in Ruins: The Geographies of Oliver Goldsmith***. (Transits: Literature, Thought, and Culture.) Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2013. Pp. xv + 209; bibliography; chronology; 3 illustrations; index. ISBN: 978-1-61148-505-9; hardcover: $85.00.

Enlightenment in Ruins offers a critical revaluation of Oliver Goldsmith's contributions to enlightenment thought, focusing particularly on elements that align with Irish strains produced by contemporaries such as Edmund Burke. Griffin asserts that Goldsmith has been too easily dismissed as a mawkish purveyor of simplistic nostalgia, when his imaginative works question cultural relations, parody fascination with the exotic, and critique the British imperial project. In the introduction, Griffin proposes that Goldsmith's geographies are not just spatial and climatological, but also cultural and political. He suggests a significant parallel between the desolate landscape of Goldsmith's*The Deserted Village* and Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's idea that the prospect of ruin invites a self-reflexivity normally lacking in enlightenment discourse. Goldsmith was particularly concerned with the espousal of political liberty as beneficial to all ranks of man. His various works represent the greater political liberty associated with the decline of monarchical rule as simply a commercial liberty that enriched a privileged few while destroying traditional social structures. Imaginative geographies in *The Deserted Village*, *The Traveller*, *The Citizen of the World*, and other works thus question elements of English enlightenment thought. At the same time, Griffin examines the derogatory and superioristic discourses on race and national character that appear in Goldsmith's natural histories. Goldsmith's two geographical discourses - one expressed in his more creative works, the other in his more professional writing - reflect the variety of perspectives on imperialism in enlightenment thought. For Griffin, these conflicting discourses also mark a tension between poetic and professional imperatives, and between cultural and scientific spheres. At various points in his study, Griffin acknowledges that Goldsmith's anti-imperialism is concerned not with the effect of colonial expansion on non-Europeans, but on the Europeans themselves; with a 'colonial decline' brought about by commercial modernity. Nonetheless, Griffin finds in Goldsmith imaginative geographies that subvert the discourses of imperialism by demonstrating that these "contain within them the possibility of their own parody and critique" (6).

Griffin carefully sets up a nuanced scholarly and theoretical context in which to consider Goldsmith as contributing to a pluralistic enlightenment tradition. Griffin traces the various intersections of national character, geographical determinism, and critique of commercial modernity in Goldsmith's varied works. But given the stereotypical and prejudicial descriptions in the

natural histories of African, Asian, and American Indian people and cultures, I find it difficult to accept Goldsmith's works overall as evincing a "considered appreciation of cultural difference" (150). The argument that the creative works espouse an anti-imperialism that is more "Goldsmithian" than the ethnic chauvinism that pervades the natural histories also contains some local problems. First, the cultural relativity in *The Traveller* is entirely Eurocentric, and this needs more consideration than the one sentence dismissal Griffin gives it. Second, Griffin finds evidence of Goldsmith's appreciation of cultural difference in the Chinese perspective and critique of exoticism in *The Citizen of the World*. While there are compelling aspects of this argument, Griffin himself acknowledges that Goldsmith's orientalism is a vehicle for satirizing the commercial/consumer excesses of the English, rather than valuing China's otherness in and of itself. Third, Griffin's argument that orientalist and Irish narratives merge into a political critique of absenteeism in Ireland via the mediation of the aisling form by 'the English tradition' and 'the Chinese fashion' in landscape design seems weak. There is little discussion of the aisling itself, other than one etymological connection. Griffin convincingly explores Goldsmith's perspectives on the opposing theories of landscape design, but only gives one example of how these are merged in a commentary on the socio-economic decay wrought in Ireland by commercial liberalism. Not enough textual evidence is provided to convince me that Goldsmith's use of "Chinese ideas and allegorical modes to think through his position as an Irish outsider" is as self-reflexive as Griffin portrays it (111).

Geographies of Ruin proposes that we view Goldsmith in the tradition of Swift and Burke, as "a sometimes compromised, but often insightful commentator on Irish and imperial affairs" (15). I find Griffin convincing in the first respect. The second, however, seems to me to require an extrapolation of Goldsmith's Euro-centric cultural relativism to non-European cultures that is not fully supported by Griffin's analyses.

Jill Bradbury
Gallaudet University

Kevin Pask. *The Fairy Way of Writing: Shakespeare to Tolkien*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2013. Pp. xi + 178; bibliography of works cited; c. 12 illustrations; index. ISBN: 978-1-4214-0982-5. Hardcover: $39.95.

Kevin Pask's latest book has an intriguing objective: "to restore the centrality that Addison assigned to the fairy way of writing in the English construction of a national literary canon. This entails the interrogation of the strict distinction between mainstream literature and fantasy that has defined the literary field since the early twentieth century" (2). This project is ambitious in goals and scope, covering centuries of writing from Shakespeare to J. R. R. Tolkien. It is also worthwhile, since Pask lays the foundation for further studies that complicate the division between "literature" and "fantasy."

Readers who approach the book from that perspective will find valuable insights despite Pask's eclectic and occasionally diffuse argument. After introducing his subject, Pask devotes two chapters to plays by Shakespeare

before turning to eighteenth-century literature in chapter three, "The Fairy Way of Writing." He then analyzes eighteenth-century paintings of Shakespeare's plays, devoting special attention to the erotic nature of the depictions of fairies. In chapter five he turns to the Romantics, focusing on Keats and alluding briefly to the Victorians, before ending in chapter six with a discussion of Tolkien (there is no formal conclusion). Pask therefore does not offer a complete history of "the fairy way of writing" but an examination of the development of that concept and related themes in fascinating examples.

Eighteenth-century specialists will appreciate Pask's attention in Chapter 3 to the key phrase of his title—"the fairy way of writing"—adapted from John Dryden's allusion to "that Fairy kind of writing" and popularized by Joseph Addision in his essays on "The Pleasures of the Imagination." This conception of writing linked fantasy with the creative imagination, which Pask notes emerged as central to the modern view of literature. He develops this argument in eight brief sections. For instance, he devotes four pages to "The French Fairy Tales: The Ancients and the Moderns," then breezes through two pages on *The Rape of the Lock.* Readers expecting sustained analyses of texts or genres will therefore be disappointed and even surprised by Pask's omissions, such as his inattention to English fairy tales (where are Horace Walpole, Jane Johnson, and Sarah Fielding, for instance?). Pask's larger claim, however, is provocative.

Likewise, chapter four—"Painting Shakespearean Fantasy"—will appeal to readers interested in 18th-century art. Here Pask examines how the creative aspect of "the fairy way of writing" facilitated works that were less "rational" or socially restrictive and more openly erotic. This point is especially true in the 18th-century responses to Shakespearean fairies, which were more prominent in paintings than on the stage. He focuses on depictions of Shakespeare and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* by Henry Fuseli, Joshua Reynolds, George Romney, and William Blake. His analyses of Fuseli's paintings are particularly engaging and subtle, though his occasional connections with Gothic novels by Walpole and Ann Radcliffe are too brief to be useful.

Overall, then, this is an engaging book that raises excellent questions about the origins and significance of modern fantasy fiction. It reflects Pask's background as a Renaissance scholar and his skill in sketching a larger argument about the development of fantasy fiction. Readers interested in eighteenth-century literature will find it most useful in raising questions that lay the foundation for a more thorough study of this period's "fairy way of writing."

Caroline Breashears
St. Lawrence University

Kate Parker and Courtney Weiss Smith (editors). *Eighteenth-Century Poetry and the Rise of the Novel Reconsidered*. (Transits: Literature, Thought & Culture.) Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), pp. xxiv + 255; bibliography; 6 illustrations; index. ISBN: 978-1-61148-483-0. Hardcover: $80. (Also available as an ebook for $79.99.)

In his excellent contribution to Kate Parker and Courtney Weiss Smith's *Eighteenth-Century Poetry and the Rise of the Novel Reconsidered*, Wolfram

Schmidgen contends that the "increasing boundlessness" (91) of contemporary life—a state of things hastened along by myriad social, economic, technological, and medical changes—has readied our world for "the positive transformations that can be triggered when political, geographic, aesthetic, ethnic, or species boundaries are crossed" (91). For scholars generally, and for readers of 18th-century British literature particularly, the corollary to Schmidgen's thesis suggests that we would do well to remake certain of our intellective tenets and procedures to better suit the present time (and, naturally, that to come). We have drawn much nearer to a moment when once-generative ordering principles such as periodization and strict divisions between genres may prove counter-productive and unviable, if not wholly archaic.

I open by commenting on Schmidgen's essay because the piece nicely captures the reformative spirit behind the nine essays comprising Parker and Smith's new volume. *Eighteenth-Century Poetry and the Rise of the Novel Reconsidered* is a provocative and timely collection well worth the attention of the reader who wishes, as Smith states in her introductory remarks, to "grapple with unexpected collisions and collusions between poetry and novels" (xiv-xv). Borrowing from John Gay's *Trivia* (1716), Smith evokes a picture of the hectic and diverse Augustan book trade to frame what her reader, ideally, will find: during the 1700s, a visitor to a London bookstall might see "William Congreve's prose fiction or plays jammed in between mock heroic-poems, literary criticism, and volumes of Plutarch or Francis Bacon" (xv). The bookstall image, as Smith uses it, successfully represents both the vitality of her project and the variety of her authors' interests.

Sophie Gee's impressive and cogent essay "Heroic Couplets and Eighteenth-Century Heroism: Pope's Complicated Characters" provides the book with a superb beginning. In the piece, Gee rejects the all-too-common notion that *The Rape of the Lock* (1714) "is merely a light comic poem in which we don't need to care about the characters" (20) because the work—a blend of generic conventions—is in fact remarkably complex in both its narrative and its characterizations (3-4). By bringing together two competing modes of literary expression (poems on one hand and novels on the other), Pope reflects his times but anticipates the future as well—perhaps as far forward as the Romantic age and Jane Austen, or beyond, to the early Victorian era and Emily Brontë (4; 18-9). The volume's second essay, Kate Parker's "'The Battle Without Killing': Eliza Haywood and the Politics of Attempted Rape" carries forward some of the conversation initiated by Gee's chapter. Parker focuses on the "mock-heroic logic" (28) of *The History of Miss Betsy Thoughtless* (1751) and addresses the ways in which Haywood's novel engages both Pope and Henry Fielding (29), neither of whom viewed Haywood favorably. Thematically, this essay strikes me as a courageous and meaningful elucidation not simply of *Betsy Thoughtless* but of women's troubled position in eighteenth-century England.

In "The Novel's Poem Envy: Mid-Century Fiction and the 'Thing Poem,'" Christina Lupton and Aran Ruth look at how poems and novels circulated during the 1700s and assert that the celerity and ease with which the former traveled among the reading community helped to facilitate the development of the latter. Henry Mackenzie and Austen receive special recognition here. Although Lupton and Ruth write engagingly of Austen's 1815 novel *Emma* (61-62), the real treat for Romanticists is Shelley King's "'To delineate the human mind in its endless

varieties': Integral Lyric and Characterization in the Tales of Amelia Opie." In this finely written and critically sophisticated piece, King claims that Opie sees "poetry as an index of emotional response—a means of revealing and developing the subjectivity of her characters" (66), that is to say, as a way to achieve "psychological realism" (65) in keeping with notions of novel writing prominent at the time when Opie published *The Father and Daughter* in 1801. In a book of outstanding individual efforts, King distinguishes herself by virtue of both her expertise and her prose: Opie studies will duly profit.

Like King's chapter, Wolfram Schmidgen's "Undividing the Subject of Literary History: From James Thomson's Poetry to Daniel Defoe's Novels" and Heather Keenleyside's "The Rise of the Novel and the Fall of Personification" present new and perhaps inestimable opportunities for teaching and researching eighteenth-century British literature. These centerpiece chapters offer clearly articulated and expressly original arguments that merit and repay rereading. As a way to renovate the field of eighteenth-century literary studies, Schmidgen calls for "a unified narrative about literary innovation that manages to recover the positive program nestled inside the anti-essentialist impulse" (102). For her part, Keenleyside too encourages us to reevaluate by inviting us to think in new ways about personification: what may seem a démodé poetic technique rather is "a figure attuned to ties that extend beyond human being" (108). Through anthropomorphism, authors suggested ideas similar to those today explored in "posthumanism, animal studies, and thing theory" (108). Her readings of Hugh Blair and Lord Kames prove fascinating as well.

By spotlighting King, Schmidgen, and Keenleyside, I don't wish to suggest that the book's final three essays fail to satisfy. Quite the contrary. David Fairer writes a complex and incisive discussion of Sterne's literary daredevilry vis-à-vis the "empirical excitement" (154) inspired by scientific experimentation and inquiry. Not surprisingly, Newton, Descartes, and Franklin figure saliently in Fairer's study of how Sterne's fiction undoes the "old binary" between realism and romance. Joshua Swidzinski reads Richardson's *Clarissa*—"a skein of letters unspooled through a vast labyrinth of domestic violence" (163)—with Young's *Night Thoughts*—"a theodicy in blank verse, a monument of epigrams and orthodoxy" (163)—in a well-rendered analysis of how these authors seek to come to terms with the phenomenon of human interiority. Natalie Phillips contributes an admirable treatment of the habits of readers who sought to concentrate on printed words in "a landscape of distraction" (189). Phillips includes poets such as Gay, Pope, Akenside, Thelwall, and Erasmus Darwin in her gracefully written discussion of "the intricate cognitive dynamics that arise when we engage with a unique set of literary patterns [like] rhythm and rhyme.

Margaret Doody closes *Eighteenth-Century Poetry and the Rise of the Novel Reconsidered* with her "Coda: Time, Space, and the Poetic Mind of the Novel," an erudite and spirited commentary on the volume's overarching themes and ideas. Although it is more a virtuoso performance than a precisely developed argument, and thus slightly disappoints, the piece successfully lowers the curtain on an accomplished and intriguing volume that, in my estimation, counts among the year's best books in eighteenth-century studies.

Timothy Ruppert
Slippery Rock University

Sandro Jung (editor). ***British Literature and Print Culture***. (Essays & Studies 2013 [English Association's series, Volume 66].) Rochester, NY: D. S. Brewer [Boydell & Brewer], 2013. Pp. xiv + 221 + [*4*] colored plates; c. 43 illustrations; index. ISBN: 978-1-84384-343-6. Hardcover: $50.

The eight essays in this collection address "the role that print played in the fashioning of literature" (1). Foremost among the topics addressed is the role of engraving and book illustration in increasing book sales, which is discussed in several paragraphs of Sandro Jung's short introduction. Three of the six essays treating the long 18th century (Bunyan to Scott) involve book illustration (1-2). The many plates and figures illustrating those three essays add much to the volume. Jung provides two pages with accurate thumbnail sketches for the eight essays. The volume has good range, and most of the essays are valuable, which should not be obscured by my sometimes playing a bibliographical curmudgeon.

The first essay is Laura L. Runge's "Tracing a Genealogy of *Oroonoko* Editions" (5-32), which ends with a bibliography of editions and reissues 1688-2010. Runge provides an enlightening account of the textual editing of Behn's *Oroonoko*, showing how study has been plagued by corrupt texts reaching into the 1990s (noting how editions as the 1973 Norton and studies as Laura Brown's "The Romance of Empire: *Oroonoko* and the Trade in Slaves" [1987] have been undermined by the reproduction of corrupt readings [4-10]). Runge offers a "line of descent for *Oroonoko* texts in English" from the 1688 first edition, a task aided by Gerald Duchovnay's 1971 dissertation edition, which collated the first four editions to 1700 or the first five editions through 1705 (after the first edition the novel was reset in editions of Behn's *Histories and Novels* 1696-1705, most of which appeared in two issues sometimes with varying dates). Runge's descent is based on a collation of variants in only the first four pages and on the treatment of four variant sentences, or cruxes, later in the book (10-11)--a scheme that would be flawed if an edition employed multiple printers' copies.

Runge provides an interesting account of 17th- and 18th-century editions (12-18), drawing on Duchovnay and Mary Anne O'Donnell's bibliography of Behn (O'Donnell's reference numbers are usefully included in the appended bibliography), though she could be clearer regarding the confused issues of *The Histories and Novels* 1696, and *All the Histories* 1698 (3rd ed.), 1699/1700 (4th ed.), and 1705 (5th ed.). Clearer detailing of what's an "edition" and what an "issue" would help on pp. 13-14. Regarding the 1696 2nd printing, Runge confusingly remarks that Duchovnay found "evidence that the copy-text for the 1696 volume was the 1688 edition [the only text formerly published and Behn died in 1689]. O'Donnell disagrees (A40.1a) and argues that the 1696 text is a reprint of 1688" (13). Runge hasn't collated enough to find more than one variant in the 1696 edition and so can't say for certain what role it played in the textual descent. Runge identifies several substantive variants in the 1698 edition, accepts without evidence that 1699/1700 took 1698 as printer's copy as Duchovnay noted, and adds that all but two changes found in the 1699/1700 are taken up by 1705. Then she concludes that, since the 1705 "reproduces verbatim the emendation to the textual cruxes introduced in the third edition of 1698 and passed on to the 1699/1700 volume.[,] Consequently, we can conclude that the 1705 edition is based on the 1699/1700" and is "a lineal descendant of 1688" (15). Perhaps, but the asserted consequence relationship exists only

between 1698 and 1705, and the 1696's role in that lineal descent isn't established. More bibliographical rigor was needed throughout, with Runge relying on the reproductions of single unidentified copies for her collations of roughly 6 pp. per edition and failing to resolve difficulties in the bibliographical record, such as whether the edition she dates 1770 was published in 1759 as O'Donnell claimed (17, n. 30). Runge should have referred to what references and digitized texts are available to most scholars--her bibliography should provide ESTC and/or Wing numbers, and the copies digitized on EEBO and ECCO should be referenced. I turned to these sources to make sense of what was published 1688-1705. Runge's bibliography does not refer to the issue without title-page in a nonce collection with other works dated 1697 (ESTC R175528-Wing B1711bA, BL copy on EEBO); I found it to have the same signature positions as the 1698 3rd ed. copy at the Bodleian digitized on EEBO (Wing B1712). Nor does she indicate that the two issues of 1696 for Briscoe (ESTC R231656 and R12677; Wing B1711 and B1711aA) differ only on their title-pages (apparently they do--though the ESTC doesn't give the same pagination for the final item in the nonce). Finally, while Runge does identify a Dublin 1791 edition not listed by O'Donnell, presumably from ESTC T212435, she doesn't trace its descent.

The second essay is "*The Pilgrim's Progress*, Print Culture and the Dissenting Tradition" by Nathalie Collé-Bak, whose 2002 dissertation at the U. Nancy treated iconography in early editions of *Pilgrim's Progress*, I found nothing original in this essay's "outlining the early stages in the iconographic tradition inspired by Bunyan's allegory" (35). Collé-Bak doesn't go far in revealing "the role of the early *Pilgrim's Progress* illustrations in promoting the text" nor in showing that they increased its "popularity" (35-37)--reading at the close that the illustrations are "worth examining" (56), I scribbled, "Well, do it then!" She brings no new information about the illustrations to what's found in scholarly editions and her main critical comments on the meaning and impact never improve on frequent quotations from Sharon Achinstein, G.E. Bentley, Jr., et al. Without evidence, she must speculate about Bunyan's possible contribution to his publisher's selection of images for the frontispiece (frt) and the first illustrated edition (13 cuts advertised as produced for Ponder's fifth edition of 1680 [50]). The essay is immediately flawed by insufficient bibliographical analysis. The first figures are of the "Sleeping Portrait" design used in early frts for Nathaniel Ponder's editions and "copied, imitated and re-interpreted" in later editions (a sleeping man with the walking pilgrim reading the bible above and below a lion in a partially barred cave). Figure 1 reproduces the frt from a 1678 first-edition copy; figure 3a offers apparently the identical plate from a 1679 third-edition copy. Collé-Bak indicates that only one copy of the first edition has the frt which "did not figure in any copy of the second edition . . . and then reappeared in some copies of the third" (also suggested by the ESTC's holdings file). This to Collé-Bak "suggests that it was temporarily withdrawn or lost," due to "editorial interventions" or readers' removing "it from the volumes." I think the more obvious explanation is that the plate wasn't cut until publication of the third edition and that someone inserted it *after* the third's publication into that unique copy of the first edition. Illustrations from later publications are often tipped into earlier ones. That possibility is suggested by the more worn and less detailed impression of the plate in figure 1 as

compared to that crisper reproduction of the third edition in figure 3a. This is another instance of book history without bibliography: we should be given a record of all extant copies of the plate and notes on their paper-stock(s) or any evidence for reimpression. Like Runge, Collé-Bak never refers to the ESTC.

In the third essay, "Printing for the Author in the Long Eighteenth Century," J. A. Downie corrects several fuzzy and misleading notions about the relations of publishers and authors. He first notes that the end of the licensing system in 1695 and the Copyright Act of 1709 didn't increase the value of author's copy. Downie then attacks the notion that books were *normally* printed by publishers who paid authors for copyrights, instanced by Habermas's "the publisher replaced the patron"; here Downie expands with interesting examples what has been written on "printing for the author" by Keith Maslen (1972). This reality has been noted for many major poets and some prose authors, yet it seems not to be understood by many who write about "print culture." Downie has good evidence of the frequent need for authors to invest in the printing of their works, from Defoe's remarks to Robert Harley in 1713 to Jane Austen's preference for giving a publisher a commission for copy she retained (true of all her novels but *Pride and Prejudice*, whose copy was sold in a family crisis, as Downie relates). Downie thinks James Raven's account underestimates the frequency with which publishers took a commission and insisted authors bear the loss (66). He also covers authors' efforts to publish by subscription, noting in the case of the blind poet Thomas Blacklock's subscription *Poems* how friends took multiple copies, helping wholesale the subscription (one of several ways David Hume helped Blacklock). There follows a good examination of Boswell's deliberations about whether or not to sell his copyrights to the *Life*.

Finally Downie turns to the evidence from imprints recorded in the ESTC. He found 11,163 records in the ESTC with the phrase "printed for the author" in the imprint, growing from 895 in 1701-1720 to 4506 in 1781-1800. I checked this again in April 2014 and found 872 in 1701-20 and 4543 in 1781-1800. I would have advised Downie to use the more generous total involving the number of imprints with the word "author" in them, for often imprints don't read "printed for the author" but such variants as "printed by the author," "printed by X for the author" or "for brother/widow to the author." Instead of 11,163 instances, if only "author" were sought in the imprint, the total would be 12,044. (We need bear in mind that a small percentage of the 345,000 ESTC entries are for the first editions of books with imprints.) This figure could be very greatly expanded by using sources like the Lancaster-Maslen *Bowyer Ledgers*, the ESTC (searching "published by the author" in the title field, etc.), and author bibliographies, and by considering the imprints--many times a printer who was strictly a printer, never publishing, is the only person named in an imprint and we might well suppose many of those productions were for authors, and then there are imprints listing the author as publisher. The need to enlarge the figure is evident when we consider that, judging from the ESTC, nothing Addison, Manley, Pope, Swift, or Young published and only one item that Defoe, Curll, and Gay published has "for the author" in the imprint. Downie briefly considers the genres where printing for the author is more or less common and also how provincial presses increasingly printed for the author as the century progressed (with a long list of cities where such occurred). Surely he's right (in Dublin

during the first four decades, "author" as publisher occurs at least 23, 21, 23, and 30 times, in nearly 2% of records and a higher percentage of actual books).

The fourth essay is "Robert Burns's Interleaved *Scots Musical Museum*: A Case-Study in the Vagaries of Editors and Owners" by Gerard Carruthers, the general editor of an Oxford U. Press edition of Burns due out this year. Burns had leaves bound into the first four volumes of James Johnson's *Scots Musical Museum* (*SMM*), 1787-92, which contains "around 150 of his own compositions" and would grow to 6 vols. in 1803. Burns had the interleaves bound into the volumes after they appeared with the intention to gather materials for a future edition, including songs and also notes on his own songs. Burns also made use of interleaves in a copy of his poetry that he borrowed from the Catholic Bishop John Geddes. Carruthers recounts the provenance of the interleaved *SMM* (including leaves removed from it), which Burns gave to his friend Captain Robert Riddell (1755-94), and which was later used by Robert Hartley Cromek (1770-1812), an important early editor of Burns (*Reliques of Robert Burns*, 17808). Carruthers analyzes Cromek's texts and the MSS left by Burns and exonerates Cromek from charges by J. C. Dick, made early in the 20C century, that Cromek misrepresented the *SMM* interleaves. Carruthers covers Cromek's use also of the Laing manuscripts of Burns, and he hypothesizes the likelihood of an untraced "third Burns holograph manuscript" to account for transcriptions by Cromek that aren't faithful to either the Laing or the *SMM* manuscripts (86). He tracks a leaf important to Burns's account of his life (with notes on the "Highland Lassie") to the Burns Birthplace Museum, probably acquired in 1907, prior to the Museum's acquisition in 1961 of the *SMM* volumes, stating the case for its being one of the leaves missing early on from the Riddell set of *SMM*. Carruthers' magisterial reconstruction of MS sheets demonstrates the sort of editorial and bibliographical difficulties confronting editors of Burns (and others), showing how "manuscript (and print) materials can quite quickly become almost impossibly confusing and in need of a reconstruction that can often never be easily or fully completed" (94). From the long unnoticed presence of this important material in the library, Carruthers notes the need for archives to keep a full descriptive catalogue of their holdings.

Another strong essay follows, Jung's "Packaging, Design and Colour: From Fine-Printed to Small-Format Editions of Thomson's *The Seasons*, 1793-1802" (97-124, plus 4 colored plates between 114/115). Some of this material will be familiar to those attending EC/ASECS meetings: Jung spoke on Thomas Stothard's illustration at the Pittsburgh meeting in 2010 and on Scottish editions at Penn State in 2011; and his 2010 article in *Eighteenth-Century Life* ("Visual illustrations, Print, and Illustrations of Thomson's *The Seasons*, 1730-1797) also addresses evolving subject focus of illustrations and the impact of new technologies on editions of the poems (34.2: 23-64). The present article shows how "booksellers in the 1790s published expensive, high-end editions . . . with exquisite, sophisticatedly engraved plates" (122), with several editions in succession outperforming what had seemed as fine an edition as the market required. The greatest attention is given to P. W. Tomkins's 1797-98 folio edition, with superb stipple engravings by Francesco Bartolozzi, some copies issued with the prints in color. Also covered in depth is the subscription quarto by Robert Morison, Jr., of Perth, 1793 (with 8-p. specimen in 1792), whose full-page plates engraved by Charles Catton are one of the first British uses of color

printed plates *à la poupée*, finished with colored washes; Jung calls the edition a "milestone in the Scottish publishing of belles-lettres and no later edition published in Scotland would rival it" (114). A third treated at length is Thomas Hurst's in 1802, with plates printed by James Cundee, who re-issued the plates in his Albion Press edition of 1805. Hurst introduced colored printing into smaller format editions. Jung is briefly attentive to other improvements and additions raising the quality and price of editions at this time, such as woven paper, new typefaces, and more and better woodcut vignettes, all of which demonstrates that there was an audience for better collectible editions. I cannot cover the many subjects treated by the essay, such as the nexus of painters (e.g. William Hamilton and Henry Fuseli) and publishers, nor the evolution of preferred pictorial treatments, some stressing seasonal landscape and some the human stories. Many other finely illustrated editions, not only of Thomson, are discussed, such as Joseph Johnson's 2nd ed. of Cowper's *Poems* (1803), with ten full-page plates designed by Stothard, some printed in color and "finished with a series of bright water-colour washes" (122). Jung's conclusion suggests that the decades flanking 1800 were a pinnacle of fine book production, that the Napoleonic wars led to economic challenges and a falling off in high-end productions. This essay has much value for students of Thomson, book history, and the history of printing. With regard to the latter, Jung corrects the account offered by Joan Friedman in her *Color-Printing in England, 1486-1870* (1978--which I assume is the incomplete title referenced in fn. 36 but misdated "1970"--and while noting possible errors, I'd add that figure 3a on p. 110 indicates "engraved by Richard Corbould" but the plate is signed "Caldwell Sculp.").

Of the three remaining essays, all involving the 19th century, the most relevant is Peter Garside's "Print Illustrations and Cultural Materialism of Scott's Waverly Novels" (125-57; 9 illus.), with a useful account of *Illustrating Scott: A Database of Printed Illustrations to the Waverly Novels, 1814-1901*, compiled by Garside and Ruth McAdams: http://illustrating-scott.lib.ed.ac.uk/; As part of an established series, the book should be in research libraries.--JEMay

Eric Parisot. ***Graveyard Poetry: Religion, Aesthetics and the Mid-Eighteenth-Century Poetic Condition.*** (British Literature in Context in the Long 18th Century.) Farnham: Ashgate, 2013. Pp. x + 184; bibliography; illustrations; index. ISBN: 9781409434733. Hardcover, £54 [presently; initially £60].

In *The Citizen of the World* of 1762 Oliver Goldsmith classified four variations of graveyard poetry: that of the solitary youth glooming among tombs; of learned rustics weeping in the fields; of Parnassus bathing in tears; and of "Britannia [who] sits upon her own shore and gives a loose to maternal tenderness." Writing in his time and place, Goldsmith gently mocks the popular poetry of death.

And, although Eric Parisot's *Graveyard Poetry* overlooks Goldsmith's contemporaneous classification, the book extends it to recognize the religious quotient in the type. Doing so, it gives us the most direct and important study of the genre since John Draper's signal work of 1929, *The Funeral Elegy and the Rise of English Romanticism*. And thus it joins other major studies that explain the loneliness, melancholy, and gloom indigenous in graveyard poetry:

Raymond Dexter Havens's "Literature and Melancholy," *MLN* 24 (1909), Amy Reed's *Background of Gray's Elegy: A Study in the Taste for Melancholy Poetry, 1700-1751* (1924), Eleanor Sickels's *The Gloomy Egoist: Moods and Themes of Melancholy from Gray to Keats* (1932), and John Sitter's *Literary Loneliness in Mid-Eighteenth-Century England* (1982).

But eclipsing Hoxie Fairchild's first two volumes of *Religious Trends in English Poetry* (1939 and 1942), Parisot's is the only study of how changing religious practices from public sermons to private reading, reflection, and sensibility produced a new aesthetic and poetics. And thus the book lays an important plank in the bridge from religion to poetry. That plank is a careful reading of sermons on death. These sermons conform to the textures and colors of individual sects, but collectively they show a singular concern with life's last stop. And all of the parson-poets, as I call them—Thomas Parnell, Robert Blair, and Edward Young—agree that poetry is, as Parisot claims, "a legitimate language of religion." Indeed, Young says, "There is something in Poetry beyond Prose-reason; there are Mysteries in it not to be explained, but admired; which render mere Prose-men Infidels to their Divinity." Many of the graveyard poems stop at dying; others speculate on death, on what lies beyond the grave. And doctrinal brands are clear in their emphasis on, say, predestination, faith, and good works. But their premise is "God as the spontaneous and divine fountainhead of poetic inspiration." And their template is the sermon's delivering moral instruction through passion.

My reservation about *Graveyard Poetry* is its scanting of contexts other than homiletics. The vital and pathological contexts, for example, reveal much. About the early eighteenth century's population of some 6 million, Roy Porter in *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (1982) notes that average life expectancy was about thirty-five and that in the 1740s some three in four children died before the age of six. A passing sigh at many a tombstone in some 14,000 village churchyards confirms still the daily ride of the Fourth Horseman on his Pale Horse of Death and Pestilence. And most often that pestilence was smallpox, abated a bit by inoculation in the 1740s but not widely routed until Edward Jenner and vaccination in 1798. In his *Letters on England*, no. 11, in 1726, Voltaire estimated that 60 percent contract smallpox, and 20 percent die of it. And David Shuttleton in *Smallpox and the Literary Imagination, 1660-1820* (2007) cites mortality rates from the disease at 15 to 90 percent. A simple walk past the tombstones in the churchyard to his sermon in the pulpit must certainly have weighed heavily on a vicar's thoughts about his text.

Another missing context is war, for the Second Horseman took his red toll. Here the churchyard is no index, for with the exception of the Scottish rebellions of the 'Fifteen and the 'Forty-five, no battles in the eighteenth century were fought on British home soil. Rather the concurrent wars of early empire—Queen Anne's War, the wars of the Spanish and the Austrian succession, the Seven Years' War, the wars in India—left many an Augustan Rupert Brooke under some corner of a foreign field. And the loss of so many Jack Tars at sea makes Felicia Hemans's later verses on watery graves poignant: "The sea, the blue lone sea hath one, / He lies where pearls lie deep; / He was the lov'd of all, yet none / O'er his low bed may weep." Deeply buried in the memories of their families and inscribed in parish registers and tablets, thousands of those English soldiers and sailors must have been part of every vicar's consciousness as well.

Only their names came home, and, without doubt, like the home dead in the churchyard, they could not but cast a pall on his sermons.

Still, Parisot's reading of the poems is as compelling as his argument for the sermons is definitive. Central focus is on the standard Graveyardists, Parnell, Blair, Young, and Gray with glances at Thomas Warton, William Broome, and James Hervey. A curious omission is William Collins's elegant "Ode, Written in the Beginning of the Year 1746" ("How sleep the brave"). An ode only in its register of high praise, it is rather an elegiac sonnet set in a graveyard and cut off at twelve lines, a formalistic memorial of English soldiers, their lives cut off before their time in the Jacobite invasion of 1745.

Regardless, Parisot's sensitive analysis of the work of the parson-poets leads neatly to the classic of the genre, Thomas Gray's *Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard* of 1751. For example, Parnell's "Night Piece on Death" (1722), with its graveyard tour after dark, its contrast of the humble tombs of the poor and the marble tombs of the mighty, and its tolling clock, introduces the basic conventions. Blair's *The Grave* (1743) intensifies the form by affects of melancholy and horror. And Young's *The Complaint; or Night Thoughts* (1742-45) wrestles with the personal loss of family members. The three see death finally as positively Christian: Parnell as the portal to happiness in heaven, Blair as a benevolent end, and Young as the gift of a providential God. Not so Gray.

While incorporating the conventions, Gray's poem, however, makes leaps of the transcendent imagination not present in the earlier poems. Standing in the churchyard, Gray makes three transcendent leaps: he imagines morning and evening moments of the humble folk buried there, then he makes an imaginative leap into the church to inveigh against the pomp of the cenotaphs and statues of the wealthy, and, in a remarkable third leap, he imagines himself dead and imagines the reaction of a typical villager. God is absent as the Romantic self takes precedence, dead and alive.

Parisot's book reminds us well that the graveyard poems of the 18th century's first fifty years bid fair to claim fatherhood of English romanticism with its rural setting, its contemplative tone, its pervading melancholy, its isolation and loneliness, its consummate sensibility, its preoccupation with death, and its imaginative leaps. But the book's singular—and definitive—contribution is the discovery of the sermonic influence on graveyard poetry.

H. George Hahn
Towson University

Minutes of the EC/ASECS Business Meeting, November 8, 2014

We began the business meeting by applauding Matt Kinservik and the great Delaware team who planned such a tremendous gathering for us. Throughout the conference, we found ourselves commenting on the perfection of the setting, the high quality of the papers, and the excellent entertainment. We announced that the 2015 meeting will be co-chaired by Eleanor Shevlin and Cheryl Wanko. We will meet at West Chester University, November 12-14, with the theme "Networks." We distributed a CFP that included the following:

> In selecting this theme, the committee seeks to cast a wide call for papers across disciplines, languages, geographies, methodologies, and institutions. In our ever-expanding digital culture, the term "network" has assumed widespread currency, but the concept also has pervasive relevance for the long eighteenth century. We invite papers and panels that consider "networks" from any one or more of a variety of perspectives: social, cultural, intellectual, economic, artistic, ecological, philosophical, political, religious, commercial, scientific, criminal, gendered, provincial, literary, legal, transnational, transatlantic, or global—to a name a few possibilities.

Panel proposals are due March 15, 2015, and proposals for individual papers and completed panels are due June 15, 2015. Questions? Email the conference organizers at ECASECS2015@gmail.com and you can find the conference website at http://ecasecs2015.wordpress.com. Those of you who attended the meeting received a CFP already, and for those who haven't please go directly to the website. We'll also link the conference website to our EC/ASECS website at http://www.ec-asecs.org. Please see all the announcement there (we won't mail a separate CFP out to the membership).

As chair of our Nominations Committee, Christine Clark-Evans presented the following slate of nominees: Sandro Jung for President; Eleanor Shevlin for Vice President; and, Joanne Myers for Board Member. As is our custom, those assembled voted in favor of these nominations with a round of applause.

Anna Foy presented a report from the Molin Prize Committee. There were 12 submissions, although one of the presentations was not made. See the separate article in this issue about the winner.

Jim May, editor of our newsletter, *The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, noted the diversity he found in early issues of the *Intelligencer* while producing tables of contents for issues back into the 1980s. He encouraged members to browse the table of contents for former issues at the Society's website and to contribute something recently lacking from the *Intelligencer*. Those wishing to write book or theater review or an article for the newsletter or wishing it to announce a CFP or event, can contact Jim at jem4@psu.edu.

Linda Merians reminded those in attendance that, when her term is up in 2016, she will step down as Executive Secretary. To that end, the Executive Committee has formed a Search Committee that will include the following: Eleanor F. Shevlin (EShevlin@wcupa.edu), Christine Clark-Evans (cxc22@psu.edu), Geoffrey Sill (sill@camden.rutgers.edu), Scott Gordon (spg4@Lehigh.edu), Jordan Howell (jmhowell@udel.edu), and Jim May. Geoff Sill has agreed to chair the Search Committee, so please reach out to him if you are interested in applying for the position. Also, reach out to Linda if you want additional information before you apply. You will find a job description below and on our website. The Search Committee hopes to bring a nominee for election by the membership at the West Chester meeting. Then Linda and her successor can work together the last year of Linda's term, aiding the transition.

To conclude our Business meeting, Linda Merians promised a full financial report in the newsletter (see below). Thanks to you---our membership---our Society continues to attract and maintain smart, spirited, and generous scholars. There is no need for any rise in dues at this point in time. We currently have close to 450 members; the Delaware meeting brought us about 40

new members. We particularly want to praise Melissa Downes and Rodney Madner for bringing some of their students to the meeting.

Here is a list of members of our Executive Committee for 2015.
President: Sandro Jung (2015)
Vice President: Eleanor Shevlin (2015)
Elected Board Members: Scott Gordon (2015); Marie Wellington (2016); Joanne Myers (2017)
Immediate Two Past Presidents: Christine Clark-Evans, James Woolley
Newsletter Editor: Jim May [jem4@psu.edu]
Executive Secretary: Linda E. Merians (2016) [lemeria@aol.com]
Past and Future Chairs: Peter Briggs (2013); Doreen Saar (2013); Geoffrey Sill (2013); Matt Kinservik (2014); Don Mell (2014); Eleanor Shevlin (2015); Cheryl Wanko (2015)
Web Master: Susan Beam
Molin Winners: Jeremy Chow and Rachel Zimmerman

Financial Report, January 1, 2012-December 31, 2014

We have approximately 450 members. Thank you for your continuing membership. For calendar year 2014, you will see that, as in previous years, the majority of our expenses were related to the annual meeting, postage, and the printing of the newsletter. We are deeply grateful to Sandro Jung, Winterthur, and the University of Delaware for sponsoring and underwriting certain sessions and receptions. Thanks to them and also to the planners of the 2013 meeting, this year we were happy to be able to offer graduate students a significantly discounted registration rate to attend the conference ($50.00). What follows is a detailed account of our revenue and expenses for the year. I am happy to report that we have a healthy and adequate bank balance to begin 2015.

Revenue received in 2014: Total, $18,837.92
- Bank interest, $4.99
- Conference registration, $15,387.05 (this includes some membership dues)
- Membership dues, $2,695.88
- Conference Subvention: $750.00 (MacNeil Center for 2013 meeting)

Expenses paid in 2014: Total, $22,335.93
- Bank charges, $91.04
- Conference expenses paid centrally by EC/ASECS, $18,009.00
- Membership expenses for dues letter, $113.25
- Molin Prize (for 2013), $250.00
- Newsletter printing, $1,872.40
- Office supplies (envelopes, labels, checks, copies), $29.05
- Postage for *ECI*, dues letter and other mailings, $1,756.52
- Website expenses, $214.67

Bank Balance: $4,742.70 (as of January 22, 2015)

Respectfully submitted,

Linda E. Merians
Executive Secretary

Search on for EC/ASECS Executive Secretary

EC/ASECS is seeking a new executive secretary. Linda Merians' term is up in December 2016, and the Executive Committee hopes that the Nominations Committee will be able to place the name(s) of nominee(s) before the membership for election at the 2015 Business Lunch. This will allow the prospective Exec. Sec'y and the incumbent to work together throughout 2016.

If you are interested in the position, please contact Geoff Sill, chair of the Search Committee (sill@ camden.rutgers.edu) by June 1, 2015. Inform him of your interest and include a statement that you have read the job description below and feel you have the time and resources to carry out the duties of the position for the three-year term. You might also describe your history with EC/ASECS and your vision of the role you will play as Executive Secretary.

Although she will not serve on the Search Committee, Linda is happy to answer questions anyone might have (lemeria@aol.com) before he or she decides whether or not he/she has an interest in the position. In addition to Geoff, the members of the Search Committee are Christine Clark-Evans, Scott Gordon, Jordan Howell, Jim May, and Eleanor Shevlin. The members of the Search Committee will interview candidates by phone or skype after the June 1 deadline, which will allow them to make their recommendation to the Nominating Committee in good time before we gather at West Chester for the annual meeting. At the Business Lunch, the Nominations Committee will present the candidate(s) for election by the membership.

The job of Executive Secretary requires a willingness to serve as the organization's point of contact for members and the institutions that host our annual meeting. The Executive Secretary should have good organizational skills and knowledge of the membership and the Society's history; she/he should also be committed to attending the annual meeting. S/he must work with the Executive Committee and the annual meeting chairs to foster successful meetings of the Society. While some months are more work intensive than others, the position does <u>not</u> require significant time throughout the year.

<u>Continuous responsibilities</u>:
*Open and maintain an EC/ASECS checking account to pay bills and/or issue reimbursements.
*Keep the dues, e-mail, and mailing label lists as current as possible.
*Keep the newsletter editor informed of changes of addresses or other contacts.
*Send the newsletter editor the current mailing labels in February & September.
*Check in with the Executive Committee about once a quarter or as needed.
*Send out the annual dues letter in early February.
*Answer e-mails as necessary.

<u>Responsibilities and schedule of tasks for the annual meeting</u>:
*Advise conference chair(s) of tasks and deadlines in planning annual meetings.
*If necessary, assist the local chair(s) in evaluating the proposed space for the conference and in the negotiation of contracts with hotels or conference centers.
*Issue checks to site and vendors for annual meeting and to the plenary speaker.
*Remind the members of the Nominations Committee to complete their task.
*Prepare an agenda for the Executive Committee meeting (October).

*After the Executive Committee meeting, work with the president on notes for the Business meeting and help run the meeting.
*After the meeting and the Molin deliberations, issue check(s) to the winner(s).
*Also, work with chair of the Molin Committee to write letters to the winner's department chair and/or dissertation advisor (January, usually).
*Write a yearly financial report and business meeting's notes for the newsletter.

Jeremy Chow and Rachel Zimmerman Receive Molin Prize Honors

The Molin Committee is delighted to honor Jeremy Chow (English, University of California, Santa Barbara) and Rachel Zimmerman (Art History, University of Delaware) as co-recipients of the 2014 S. Eric Molin Prize for Best Conference Paper by a Student. In his paper, "Mellifluent Sexuality: Female P/Leisure in Radcliffe's *Romance of the Forest*," Chow argued compellingly that, through persistent representations of lute playing, Radcliffe's novel explores issues of female pleasure and female intimacy. The committee commented particularly on Chow's lively and professional delivery of his strong reading of the text, which he contextualized with a cultural history of the lute in a beautifully organized, well-paced, synthetically skillful essay. Zimmerman, in "A Brazilian Idiosyncrasy: Hammocks and Social Status in Colonial Brazil," deftly traced a cultural and material history of the Brazilian hammock as an object that defied facile binaries between colonizer and colonized, metropole and periphery, old money and new money, American and Brazilian. The committee was particularly impressed with Zimmerman's poise as a presenter and with the confidence and depth of her research, which relied on a rich variety of visual and written sources in multiple languages to sketch a regional history of colonial Brazil, where, while some elites "aspired to European notions of nobility," others "affirmed their own variety of status based on the products of the Brazilian land, including hammocks." Scott Gordon, Marie Wellington and I, as the 2014 prize committee members, congratulate the winners and thank all who entered into the competition.

The Molin Prize is so named as a tribute to Eric Sven Molin, one of the founders of EC/ASECS, who regularly enlivened our meetings. Eric was a much beloved colleague and teacher, providing great encouragement and assistance to graduate students, particularly those working in English with him at George Mason University. After his death in 1987, the Molin Prize was created to reward and to encourage excellence scholarship by graduate students at our annual meetings. The Prize, which carries a small cash prize ($150), is only given when the judges (drawn from our executive board) feel there is a graduate student paper (sometimes two) of high excellence, both in content and presentation. In order to be eligible for this competition, contestants must be physically present to read the paper at the conference. An entrant cannot have someone else give the paper since a part of the committee's evaluation will be on the actual presentation and the way in which the contestant fields questions after the talk. The paper must be unique; that is, a contestant cannot recycle a paper previously presented elsewhere. After the conference, contestants must send each committee member a copy of the paper in full (and with endnotes), typically by December 1. (A summary of the talk on a roundtable or panel

discussion is unacceptable.) Graduate students interested in submitting their papers for consideration in the 2015 Molin Prize competition should watch the conference website and the next *Intelligencer*'s conference coverage for special instructions, or contact Scott Gordon of Lehigh and Marie Wellington of Mary Washington (see too the advice offered in the October 2011 *Intelligencer* [27]).

Anna Foy (Molin Committee Chair)
University of Alabama in Huntsville

In Memory of A. Franklin Parks, II

On 22 November A. Franklin Parks, II, died unexpectedly at his home. Frank attended most of our EC/ASECS meetings over the past decade. He was on sabbatical last fall and thus still professor of English at Frostburg State. Born in Salisbury, MD, in 1948, Frank took his undergraduate degree from Salisbury State College and then his Ph.D. in English from Stony Brook University. He had taught at Frostburg State University since 1978, winning there three Faculty Achievement Awards for Academic Achievement, Teaching, and University Community Service. Frank's publications include *Maryland: Unity in Diversity: Essays on Maryland, Life, and Culture*, co-edited with John B. Wiseman (Kendall-Hunt, 1989). He co-authored several writing textbooks, including, with Ida Masters Hollowell and James Levernier, a very successful text for freshman comp: *Structuring Paragraphs: A Guide to Effective Writing* (St. Martin's, 1991). Passing through five editions, it was expanded to *Structuring Paragraphs and Essays* (2000). More recently, Frank published his biography *William Parks: The Colonial Printer in the Transatlantic World of the Eighteenth Century* (Penn State UP, 2012), an important source for the study of the 18C American printers and print culture (it was reviewed in the *Intelligencer* of March 2012: 26.i.27-31). Frank contributed to the May 2007 *Intelligencer* a review of *Teaching Bibliography, Textual Criticism, and Book History*, edited by Ann Hawkins. Just before that, Frank began attending our meetings. In the 2000's, he gave many papers on the printer William Parks at our conferences (particularly on Eleanor Shevlin's sessions on the history of the book). At the Georgetown meeting in 2008, he delivered "Travel Narratives and the Press in Both Sides of the Atlantic," and, in 2013, he spoke on "Morality, Politics, and the Poetry of Retirement in Early American Newspapers."

Eleanor Shevlin writes that Frank was also an active participant in the Society for the History of Authorship, Reading & Publishing (SHARP). At the 2006 SHARP conference he delivered "*Worcester Post-man* and Developing Perceptions of Local Readership among Provincial Newspaper Publishers in Eighteenth-Century Britain." Other papers at SHARP meetings include "Science and the Readership of Early English Newspapers" in 2011 and another on William Parks's colonial reprinting of three of Jonathan Swift's sermons in 2012. Eleanor adds that Frank "also appeared on SHARP-sponsored panels at ASECS and organized one of the two SHARP panels for the 2014 ASECS. Mostly recently, he had established an affiliate relationship between SHARP and the Society for Early Americanists (SEA). In this role he organized a SHARP-sponsored panel, 'The Atlantic Exchange: The Two-Way Street of

Reading and Publishing during the Eighteenth Century,' for the 2015 SEA. That panel will now take place at the 2016 ASECS in Pittsburgh. Carla Mulford (Penn State) has graciously agreed to chair the session in his stead, and a brief tribute to Frank is planned for the panel." His sabbatical last fall was dedicated to researching science and pseudo-science in early English newspapers.

Frank was a good colleague and dedicated teacher. That is the theme of the tribute by his student Austin Swanson, in *The Bottom Line*, the Frostburg State student newspaper. Swanson quotes faculty and students at Frostburg, who stress, to quote Dr. Amy Branam Armiento, that Frank "walked the walk." (The article, as well as tributes by Mulford and Shevlin, is available at www. societyofearlyamericanists. org/parks.html). Only this fall Frank helped me out by serving on a prize jury, and Cal Winton mentioned Frank as someone who'd read your manuscript with care. At Frostburg State he served as chair and Associate Provost and Acting Provost. A good listener, he was utterly free of pretense: one would never have known from him many of the accomplishments noted in the obituary run by his local newspaper, *Cumberland Times News*, and posted on the web. I quote from the obituary's account of his personal life:

"He enjoyed traveling, biking, and cross-country skiing with his wife. He played the saxophone and ukulele in college and later for his children and grandchildren. Home improvement became one of his favorite pastimes. Frank's smile and his wonderful sense of humor will be missed greatly by his loving family, friends, and students." Frank is survived by his wife, Karen Parks; two daughters, a son, three grandchildren, and his brother D. Gregory Parks.

News of Members, with First a Query on the Directory

A revised directory of EC/ASECS members will appear in the September 2015 issue of the *Intelligencer*. If you do NOT wish your email or even your land address listed, please contact the editor (jem4@psu.edu) and tell him not to publish such. To save space, I skip over the usual additions and corrections.

Note too **Linda Merians** has a new address, printed in the masthead.

We welcome many new members, including Andrew Bricker, a post-doc at McGill working on satire, law & literature and book history, fields addressed in his paper at Newark; **Benjamin Colman** of the Florence Griswold Museum, specialized in art history and material culture; **Lauren Duval**, a PhD student in cultural history at American U. and intern at the National Portrait Gallery, interested in early American and transatlantic gender & culture; **Sierra Eckert** (Columbia), working on the history of science, book history, and information culture; **Andrea Fabrizio** of Hostos Community College, whose colleagues Francis and Brij Singh tell me is a "talented teacher and a nice person to boot"--she organized a panel for the Newark meeting; **Ruth Garcia**, an Asst. Prof. of English at NYC College of Technology, working on women writers, esp. novelists, and also in cultural studies on servants and service; **Dashielle Horn,** a PhD student at Lehigh working on the late 18C and Romantic period novel and women writers (her M.A. thesis was on Austen's *Persuasion*); **Kevin Knott** of Frostburg State, who studies and teaches theatre and cultural studies; **Drew Lopenzina,** working on early American and Native American at Old Dominion; **Juliann Reineke,** working on her Ph.D. at Carnegie Mellon, studying mobility, post-colonial theory, and performance theory, especially with novels; **Jennifer**

Schnabel, working on leisure and literature at the U. of Memphis**; Kathleen G. Stall,** working on the novel and female authorship**; Rebecca Roma Stoll,** working on aesthetics and moral philosophy at Iowa; **Suzanne Taylor**, focused on the history & theory of the novel, as well as ethics, in the Enlightenment and Romantic periods (Britain and France); **Kevin Wisniewski**, working on satire & comedy, periodical writing, the history of the book, print culture; and **Rachel Zimmerman,** an art historian working on colonial Brazil. New members are encouraged to contribute to this newsletter--it needs help, from the young especially--the *Intelligencer* has no Facebook page (nobody can like it), and it battles a hoard of handsome internet sites catering in color to sexy new interests. To publicize what we have carried, I've produced tables of contents back to Dec. 1968, placed by **Susan Beam** in the Newsletter Archive at www.ec-asecs.org. Back issues since May 2007 are open-access PDFs in the Archive. And I'm happy to announce that, thro' **James Woolley**'s intervention, earlier issues will this summer be digitized by Lafayette College Library's digital dept.

Brill this spring will publish **Corey Andrews**'s *The Genius of Scotland: The Cultural Productions of Robert Burns, 1785-1834*. **Paula Backscheider** co-published "The Empty Decade? English Fiction in the 1730s" in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 26.3 (Spring 2014), 375-426. In the fall 2014 *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*, devoted to "New Approaches to Eliza Haywood," ed. by Amanda Hiner & Patsy Fowler, **Rachell Carnell** published "Eliza Haywood and the Narratological Tropes of Secret History." The issue also has **Eve Tavor Bannet**'s "The Narrator as Invisible Spy: Eliza Haywood, Secret History, and the Novel" (143-62); **Manushag Powell**'s "Eliza Haywood, Periodicalist(?)" (163-86), & **Catherine Ingrassia**'s "'Queering' Eliza Haywood" (9-24). In this Winter's *The Eighteenth Century: T&I*, **Barbara M. Benedict** published "Print into Fiction, Readings into Authors" (55.4: 455-59), a review essay of Christopher Flint's *The Appearance of Print in 18C Fiction* (CUP, 2011). I read another review of this book that jabs at all trendy "print culture" studies covering multiple fields: in *RES* Christopher Fanning notes that Flint "attempts to jump on all the bandwagons that left the gate in the 1990s: in addition to print culture--including book manufacture, graphic design, authorship and readership and the commodification of literature--questions of national identify and the public sphere, 'it-narratives,' and women writers also play their parts. Riding several vehicles in all directions" (64: 158-60). **Andrew Carpenter** reviewed *Jonathan Swift and the Eighteenth-Century Book*, ed. by Paddy Bullard and James McLaverty, in the Spring 2014 issue of *SHARP News*. **Greg Clingham**'s "Cultural Difference in George Macartney's *An Embassy to China, 1792-94"* will appear in *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 39:2 (Spring 2015), 1-29. **Kevin Cope** and his wife **Bärbel Czennia** spent two pleasant days at Bucknell U., where Kevin gave a talk entitled "The Miter, The Sombrero, and the Helmet: Headings for the Humanities in a Post-Humanistic World," which his host Greg Clingham described as "full of his usual energy and wit." Greg added that Kevin and Bärbel also "participated in a round table discussion about digital humanities with leaders from the library, the dean's office, and the new digital humanities center, and then they attended my 'Law and Literature' seminar and helped make it more lively than usual." **Laura Engel**, with Elaine M. McGirr, edited *Stage Mothers: Women, Work and Theater, 1660-1830*, published by Bucknell last year (pp. 284; $90; ISBN: 978-1-61148-603-2; available as an ebook).

Emily Friedman published in *Women's Writing* "Austen among the Fragments: Understanding the Fate of *Sandition* (1817)" (20:115-29). **Ian Gadd**, now ably serving as President of SHARP, has been regularly reporting organizational developments in his columns in issues of *SHARP News*. **Michael Genovese** published "Middlemen and Marriage in Mary Davys's *The Reform'd Coquet*" in *SEL*'s Summer 2014 issue on the 18C (54:555-84), and in 2013 he reviewed Claudia Thomas Kairoff's *Anna Seward and the End of the Eighteenth Century* in *XVIII: New Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century* (10: 103-05). In that same issue, **Beatrice Fink** reviewed Sean Tokats' *The Expert Cook in Enlightenment France*. In the first 2015 issue of *Women's Writing*, focused on Aphra Behn, we find **Karen Bloom Gewirtz**'s "From Epistle to Epistemology: *Love-Letters* and the Royal Society." Last year Palgrave published Karen's *Women, the Novel, and Natural Philosophy, 1660-1727*, and Ashgate published *Gender and Space in British Literature, 1660-1820*, a collection edited by Karen and Mona Narain. Karen also is co-organizer of the 2015 Aphra Behn Society meeting at Seton Hall. **Tonya Howe**'s paper at Delaware entitled "Corpse Humor On and Off the 18th-Century Stage" was a spirited, illustrated talk--suited to Halloween season--on how around 1800 "the meaning of the material practices of death . . . [were] being resignified." She focused on Centlivre's *A Bickerstaff's Burying; or, Work for the Upholders* (1724) and Ravenscroft's *The Anatomist* (1696), asking "How do these plays help us assess the relationship between the changing trade in death and its treatment on the popular stage?"

All of us at the EC/ASECS meeting owe a great debt to the organizers of our 2014 meeting at the Univ. of Delaware: Profs. **Matthew Kinservik, Donald Mell**, & **Theodore Braun**, and graduate students **Evan Cheney, Nora Fulmer**, **Jordan Howell, Matthew Rinkevich**, & **Jane Wessel** served on the conference committee. Jane and Jordan handled correspondence for the program admirably and worked the desk at the conference center, along with students **Christina Kelly, Joel Palmer, Jimmy Miranda,** and **Erin Rafferty**. Matt Kinservik, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the comt. chair, as well as **Linda Merians,** gave the graduate students a sincere and loud acknowledgement from the podium at the business luncheon, but those not present should hear that the students ran a crackerjack conference. We also thank the University itself for its support (Matt says our shout-out should include Sandy Ernst and Sandy Robbins of the REP and esp'ly thank Cheri Jones' in the Dean's office, for a "ton of work"). We thank those behind our visit to the Winterthur on Thursday and to the production of *Shakespeare Restored* on Friday night--and also to **Don Mell** for the book exhibit showcasing new scholarship from not only Delaware but other presses, as Bucknell UP. These exhibits tie Don up for much of our meetings and come with various logistical anxieties. (I thought the conference at $125 plus $25 for business lunch was modestly priced, and the conference center was ideal.)

Jordan Howell's essay "Eighteenth-Century Abridgements of *Robinson Crusoe*," published in the Sept. issue of *The Library* (7th ser.: 15, no. 3: 292-342), is an important addition to scholarship on not only the novel's 18C fortunes but also on various publishers, on readers, and on abridgements. The essay is remarkably well researched and very thoroughly presented, with charts mapping the publications of the unabridged three vols. of Defoe's novel, the abridgement written by printer-author Thomas Gent (mentioned as his work in his autobiography) and first sold by Edw. Midwinter, Gent's employer, and the

shorter epitome, presumably a further reduction by Gent or of Gent's text. Jordan offers a list of editions and also appended passages in the abridgement and epitome for comparison. Jordan notes, "These two abridgements are the base text for nearly one hundred further abridgements published prior to 1801" (73 published in Britain in 1775-1800), 46 based on Gent's abridgement and 45 based on the epitome--these textual streams accounting for over half the 18C abridgements and over a third of the editions of *Robinson Crusoe* (297). The principal abridgement was entitled *The Life and Most Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe . . . Abridg'd* (Midwinter et al., 1722); and the epitome, *The Wonderful Life, and Most Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe Epitomized* (Midwinter alone, n.d.)--the former has a title very similar to Defoe's first volume's (*The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of . . .*). Besides covering the ample illustrations for the abridgement and epitome (those for the latter continued longer), Jordan analyzes the editorial reductions and finds the abridgement and epitome devoted similar percentages of their pages to the parts of Defoe's three-vol. work (both focus on the Caribbean travels in vol. 2 and cut vol. 3 very close to the bone). The epitome is less religiously didactic. Jordan also covers well the grounds for the sale of the abridgement, how Charles Gildon's critique of Defoe's novels (in *The Life and Strange Surprizing Adventures of Mr. D___ De F__* [1719]) helped Thomas Cox to justify the abridgement against Wm. Taylor's decrying it as a theft of his copyright of Vol. 1. He tracks the early 18C case that abridgements were superior to the originals, and he surveys, too, later abridgments in Scotland and North America.

Those interested in authorship, especially the careers of poets, will find much of value in Dustin Griffin's ***Authorship in the Long Eighteenth Century*** (Delaware, 2014), which attacks misunderstandings, myths, and simplifications about authors' lives and careers, focusing on their relations with booksellers, patrons, and collaborators. In the summer 2014 *SHARP News,* **Robert D. Hume,** though he finds scant attention to playwrights and few specifics about individuals' profits, concludes his review with, "Griffin has performed a real service in reconstructing 18C authors' untidy, often contradictory, and slowly evolving sense of what it meant to be an author." **Steve Karian**, ever a good citizen, has taken over the Johnson Society of the Central Region's *Newsletter*, and **George Justice** & **Devoney Looser** are hosting the Society in Tempe, AZ, on 6-7 March. Steve's November issue informs us that the Yale Digital Edition of the Yale Works of Samuel Johnson is available at **www.yalejohnson.com**; its "Additional Resources" include back issues of *Johnsonian News Letter* to 1940. Here too we find abstracts from the 2014 meeting (at Ohio SU chaired by **David Brewer**) of **Laura Engel**'s paper on how theater influenced Austen; **Emily Friedman**'s on Johnson's concept of the "nose of the mind" and attention to olfaction; and **Manushag Powell**'s on Haywood's legacy in the periodical.

Walter (Hank) Keithley is working with Leslie Chilton on a volume of miscellaneous Smollett works excluded from the Georgia Smollett, a project for Pickering & Chatto they were set to undertake with Skip Brack before he died. **Deborah Kennedy** reviewed Orianne Smith's *Romantic Women Writers: Revolution, and Prophecy in Women's Writing*, 21, no. 1--"romantic" could be misleading here, and it suggests the word's range is expanding: the authors receiving analysis by Smith include Piozzi and Barbauld. **Devoney Looser**'s essay "The Blues Gone Grey: Portraits of Bluestocking Women in Old Age"

appears in *Bluestockings Displayed: Portraiture, Performance, and Patronage, 1730-1830*, edited by Elizabeth Eger (2013). **Jack Lynch** contributed "'A Disposition to Write': Johnson as Correspondent" to *Samuel Johnson: New Contexts for a New Century*, edited by Howard Weinbrot (reviewed above). **Sylvia Kasey Marks** published the review essay "*Delectando Monemus*: An Examination of the Books that Delighted and Instructed Young Readers 1700-1840," focused on M. O. Grenby's *The Child Reader, 1700-1840*, in *The Eighteenth Century*, 55.2-3 (Summer/Fall 2014), 313-17. **Ashley Marshall** reviewed Jim Kelly's *Charles Maturin: Authorship, Authenticity, and the Nation* in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 27.2 (Winter 2014-15), 331-33. Last fall out in Reno, Ashley was teaching courses new to her and serving on the faculty senate, while preparing for Delaware UP the festschrift honoring Ronald Paulson and for CUP her book on *Swift and History: Politics and the English Past*. I heard from her just after she'd attended a conference in Spain, "well worth whatever scrambling it caused." **Ellen Moody** has been teaching at the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at George Mason, with classes at multiple locations--**Beth Lambert** has been working with Osher since 2009 and in 2012 joined the Board of Directors (I find lots of good faculty profiles at the OLLI website). Of her first experience teaching there, Ellen reports: "OLLI has really just started for me, but thus far it's going well. Students really do the reading enthusiastically. You get very different kinds of comments that (me at least) pull you up. You are among your peers in age and there is no grade to control people's comments. So I was asked, 'Why do you like the gothic?' They make very real comments about their reading." Congratulations to **Henry Fulton** on the publication by Delaware of his long biography *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802*, a career project (details below in list of books needing a reviewer). **Maureen E. Mulvihill** reports that she recently published three illustrated essays: (1) An immersive piece on the legacy of Veronese among Stuart art connoisseurs (*Seventeenth-Century News*, lead article, 2014, pp. 1-26)--its dedicatees are John Shawcross, Peter Tasch, and Robert J. Barry. Several specialty sites have linked to it (*ILAB, Fine Book & Collections*, ASECS); (2) A lavish portfolio of 17C frontispieces (annual Cavendish conference, Sundance, UT), digital copy hosted by *ASECS Weekly Announcements*; (3) An essay on the intriguing "painted closet" of Lady Drury, an unusual instance of 17C art installation and female space (*Early Modern Studies Journal*, 2014). Several of her essays, some with music, are now listed by book collector Jerry Morris (*Sentimental Library* blog, guest page). The Mulvihill Collection of Rare & Special books includes three additions: (1 Rimmel's *Le Livre Parfums*, a 19C classic (1st English ed., gold-tooled cover & spine, gilt-edged, illus.); (2 *The Healy Collection* catalogue, mostly of WB Yeats, illustrated by Jack Yeats (Dublin: Cuala Press), a holiday gift from Philip Bishop (Mosher Books, Ephrata, Pa.); and (3 *The Memoirs and Letters of Richard and Elizabeth Shackleton* (1st ed.; see Mulvihill's Flickr site). Her donation to the recent Grolier Club show, *Women in Science & Medicine*, is acknowledged in the printed catalogue (p. 14). As a guest speaker (host, Florida Bibliophile Society), she spoke on frontispieces, with table display from her collection, Univ. of Tampa Library (see Society's site, Archives, 4th listing). She was awarded a plaque by the Society for her recent service as Vice President. (Her primary affiliation continues to be with the Princeton Research Forum, NJ.)

Leah Orr reviewed *Reading 1759: Literary Culture in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Britain and France*, ed. by Shaun Regan (2013) in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 26.3 (Spring 2014), 489-91. **Elizabeth Powers** organized two sessions for the Goethe Society of North America's annual meeting held in Pittsburgh this fall, and we'd ask her for an account of the conference (and society). **Greg Clingham** writes that **Kate Parker**, now at the U. of Wisconsin--La Crosse, but formerly a senior editor at Bucknell UP, has joined Greg as co-editor of Bucknell's 18C series "Transits: Literature, Thought, & Culture, 1650-1850." **Michael Parker**, a participant at the last EC/ASECS, is co-editing the poems of Edmund Waller and will also be completing a biographical volume on the second half of Waller's remarkable, rather charmed life (he tells me that the 1729 edition of Waller edited by Elijah Fenton is the best early 18C edition to own). **John Price** returned from the UK to display books at the Pasadena and the American Antiquarian Booksellers (Oakland) exhibitions this winter and put out numerous catalogues the past year, including "By and About Women" in November. In *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, 27 (2013), edited by **Richard Sher**, appear a number of reviews involving members: **David Hill Radcliffe** reviews **Thomas Bonnell**'s *The Most Disreputable Trade: Publishing the Classics of English Poetry, 1765-1810*; **Jack Lynch**, in a review essay "And We Ashamed of Him," covers both **John Radner**'s *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship* and Bonnell's third volume of his *James Boswell's "Life of Johnson": An Edition of the Original Manuscript in Four Volumes* (2012). Also **Henry Fulton** reviews Richard Jones's *Tobias Smollett in the Enlightenment: Travels through France, Italy, and Scotland* (2011). **Christopher Johnson** reviewed Jones in *XVIII: New Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century*. *Cercles* 34 (2014) contains 12 essays from a 2013 conference organized by Élizabeth Durot-Boucé (and here introduced by her). Among these is **Hermann J. Real**'s "An Un-Ruly Enquiry into the Vulgarly Received Notion of Pope's 'Nature,'" which examines Pope's response to challenges by science of his view of a universe defined by coherence, hierarchy, and plenitude. Hermann notes that Pope's chain of being isn't the Renaissance's as many suppose, and he finds contradictory (or impossible) Pope's notion of "linearity in infinity" that runs from nothingness to God, ultimately leading Hermann to wonder if Pope understood the model he offered in *Essay on Man* (read the essay at www.cercles.com/n.34/real.pdf). ***Cercles,*** a "revue pluridisciplinaire du monde anglophone" (Rouen) is an admirable, open-access e-journal. **Cedric D. Reverand, II**, published *Queen Anne and the Arts* last year in Bucknell's Transit series (322 pp.; 978-1-61148-631-5). **Peter Sabor** gave a plenary at the SEASECS meeting in Gainesville in February. Congratulations and best wishes to **John Savarese,** who has taken an asst professorship at the U. of Waterloo. **Mona Scheuermann**, whose book on Austen was reviewed in the last issue, has retired from teaching and enjoyed a 2014 Fulbright Fellowship in Vienna.

Alex Selzer has forthcoming in *1650-1850* an article related to his fine talk at our 2012 meeting on how birds in Catesby's representations often employ poses deriving from oriental vases. **Frances Singh** spoke in October at the joint meeting in Montreal of the Canadian SECS and the 18C Scottish Studies Society (**Brij Singh, Kevin Berland, Rebecca Shapiro** also participated). Frances has co-authored or revised the entry on Jane Pirie for the *ODNB*, which will be available online in 2015. Her essay "Dispose or Destroy: The Textual History of

Woods and Pirie against Dame Helen Cumming Gordon" has been accepted for the journal of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society. Frances and husband Brij gave the two most interesting papers I head at Newark--they will participate in the ISECS in Rotterdam this year. **Rodney Mader**, besides his teaching and work on the gen-ed. requirements at West Chester Univ., is working with undergraduate **Kacey Stewart** of West Chester on the transcription of letters in Elizabeth Graeme Fergusson's correspondence with Benjamin Rush. Fergusson had a very irregular hand, but in Newark, aided with illustrations, Kacey gave a good demonstration of how it can be deciphered. **Lisa Rosner** reviewed *The Chevalier d'Eon and his Worlds: Gender, Espionage and Politics in the 18th Century*, ed. by Simon Burrows et al., in *French History*, 27 (2013), 465-67. **Geoffrey Sill** reviewed *Seeing Satire in the Eighteenth Century*, co-edited by **Kelly Malone**, along with **Ashley Marshall**'s *The Practice of Satire in England 1658-1770* in *ECF*, 27.1 (Fall 2014), 160-63. Ashley's book was also reviewed by Adam Rounce in *RES*, 65 [no. 271] (2014), 748-49. **Chloe Wigston Smith**'s *Women, Work, and Clothes in the EC Novel* and **Paula Backscheider**'s *Elizabeth Singer Rowe and the Development of the English Nove*l are among the books reviewed by Carole Sargeant in the Spring 2014 *ECS*. Both are also reviewed in last year's *XVIII: New Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century*, Chloe's by Marta Kvande and Paula's by **Christopher Johnson** (11:84-86). **Laura Engel** reviewed Chloe's book in *Women's Writing*, 21 (2014), 617-20.

Kathy Temple last year wished to share news of a project she's working on, **altstudentsuccess.com**, aimed at non-traditional students and using social engineering software to encourage students to set up online micro-communities that give them support with study skills and writing habits. In April she had about 30 students using it at Georgetown and thought it could "be very useful for institutions that have a large population of non-trad students." The program "uses a variation of social engineering software called 'finishagent' (see finishagent.com) to create online micro-communities of students who engage around (1) study skills and (2) thesis and dissertation writing. By logging in each day, recording their goals and progress, and commenting on each other's progress, students develop supportive communities under the supervision of a mentor. Regular mentoring includes comments on their progress logs as well as group phone call-in sessions and posts that emphasize positive learning strategies and positive writing strategies. The magic though derives not so much in the mentor's comments as in the group dynamics that evolve over time."

In the 2013 *XVIII: New Perspectives on the Eighteenth Century*, **Ruth P. Thomas** reviewed *Citogennes: Women and the Ideal of Citizenship in 18C France* by Annie K. Smart. **Matthew Vickless** is finishing up his dissertation at Duquesne while teaching at Central Penn College. In Delaware he gave an interesting talk entitled "An Embarrassment of Riches or a Golden Age of Scholarship? What George Dyer's Verse Can Teach Us About Digital Research of Radical Eighteenth-Century Poetry" George Dyer completed a number of daunting scholarly projects, from history to the editing of over a 100 volumes of Greek and Latin literature, but he was also a poet and the author of reformist literature. Matthew, speaking of one of Dyer's odes ("XI. On Genius. On Taking Leave of Dr. Priestley . . . ," focused on some of the conveniences and hazards of the "(seemingly) limitless access to digitized primary texts, considering especially whether availability has rendered questions of poetical

quality irrelevant." **Robert Walker** published "Sterne's Locked Up Boots," *Notes & Queries* 60 (2013), 582-83. **Melissa Wehler**, now serving as an assistant dean at Central Penn College, is working on the Irish actor and playwright Charles Macklin and attending to the complex intersection between Irishness and Britishness as it was literally performed on the stages of London and Dublin. **Marie Elizabeth (Liz) Winton**, **Cal's wife**, died 26 December at home in Sewanee after long suffering from Alzheimer's. Old members will remember Liz as a lot of fun whenever she attended our meetings--nobody could forget her beauty and wit. She once hosted participants of EC/ASECS at her and Cal's home near the U. of Maryland campus. Liz graduated from Vanderbilt in 1947 and wed Calhoun the following year. For a time she was Fredson Bowers' secretary, and later was a very successful real estate agent--close friends of mine enlisted her after being told, "If Liz Winton can't sell your house, nobody can." Our condolences go to Cal and his and Liz's sons, Jefferys and Will.

Forthcoming Meetings, Announcements, Recent Publications, &c.

The 14th **ISECS Congress** occurs 26-31 July at Erasmus U., Rotterdam.

EC/ASECS meets at West Chester Univ. in SW PA near Philadelphia on 12-14 Nov. 2015, chaired by Eleanor Shevlin (EShevlin@wcupa.edu) & Cheryl Wanko (cwanko@wcupa.edu). They have chosen the theme of "Networks," explaining its reach and deep relevance to the 18C at their smart website: https://ecasecs2015.wordpress.com. (What networks, from clubs to roads, with what impact on production of knowledge and goods, etc.) Panel proposals are due 15 March and paper proposals on 15 June to ECASECS2015@gmail.com. Rooms are reserved for us at the Days Hotel, 943 S. High St., West Chester.

The Société d'Études Anglo-Américaines des XVIIIe Siècles invites papers for a conference in Paris 15-16 January 2016 on "**Modes of Silence in the 17th- and 18th-Century Anglo-American World**." Google it up for details. Send proposals along with bibliography and short C.V. by 24 April to L. Currelly (laurent.curelly@uha.fr) or Guyonne Leduc (presidence@1718.fr).

On 22-23 July the **Defoe Society** holds its 4th biennial conference in Bath, England, with the theme "Nature in the Age of Defoe." That weekend in St. Giles's House occurs "Shaping Enlightenment Politics: The Social & Political Impact of the First & Third Earls of **Shaftsbury**," organized by Patrick Müller.

The 7th biennial **"Money, Power and Print: An Interdisciplinary Colloquium on the Financial Revolution in the British Isles, 1688-1776**" will be held 23-25 June 2016, in Hay-on-Wye, Wales. These conferences address the "intersections between public finance, politics, and print during Britain's 'financial revolution.'" The CFP indicates "Papers for the colloquium should be grounded in one four general areas . . . [1] the mechanics of the 'financial revolution' itself — the operations, theoretical and practical, of institutions such as banks, joint-stock companies, public debt , and paper money; [2] the effect of . . . emerging financial instruments and theories upon contemporary political debate as demonstrated in the literature and legislative debates of the period; [3] the influence . . . of specific legislative and/or financial proposals on the development of political and economic programs throughout this period; and [4] the impact of literature and legislative debates on people's perceptions of the financial revolution and/or its political consequences." Papers should focus on

how material discussed shaped the implementation of financial policies and influenced political discourse." Five sessions are planned: one on Joseph Harris (1702-64), and four on "geographic themes: Scotland, Ireland, North America (and other colonial entities), and France. Participants sum up in five minutes papers distributed in advance and then discussed. Send 250-word proposals no later than 20 June to Christopher Fauske: cfauske@salemstate.edu.

The **Library Company of Philadelphia** has a new director: Richard S. Newman from Rochester Inst. of Technology (Jim Green remains the Librarian). In December the Library Co. announced that three metal blocks on deposit there have been identified as "instruments used to print colonial currency in Delaware," etc., produced by Benjamin Franklin--they contain "**images of leaves used as a counterfeit deterrent** on paper money printed by Franklin and his successors from 1737 to 1785." (Experts believe Franklin used real leaves in plaster during the molding, a genuinely innovative method).

From 19 March to 23 Aug. The **Folger Shakespeare Library** exhibits "Lost, No Way Home: Ships, Clocks, and Stars: The Quest for Longitude," produced by the National Maritime Museum of London to celebrate the 300 anniversary of the **Longitude Act** of 1714 (admission free).

The British Society for 18C Studies has created an "annual prize for the **best digital resource** supporting 18C studies, with a £200 award from Adam Matthew Digital and a mid-December deadline. The nominated site might aid teaching or research. See www.bsecs.org.uk/Society/prizes.aspx#digital.

Print Networks in the UK has the deadline of 27 March for its **biennial Peter Isaac Prize** for the best essay by a grad student or new Ph.D. (under 3 years out) on the history of the Anglophone book trade (the essay must be in English, unpublished, 6000-8000 words). Submit on Word to Catherine Armstrong (C.M.Armstrong@lboro.ac.uk). The winner gets £150 and free entry to the Print Networks workshop held at Chetham's Library, Manchester, in July.

On 16 October 2014, Paul J. Erickson, Director of Academic Programs at the **American Antiquarian Society** announced that AAS was launching a new initiative with a **conference and workshop** to explore critical, historical, and practical challenges of **archival research and access**, offering project-based development & discussion focused on its unparalleled pre-1876 holdings . . . . The 2-day conference will open up questions related to digitization, cataloguing, and research design, exploring applications of digital tools & methods to diverse materials, identifying opportunities in the development of critical bibliography appropriate to 21C tools. Leaders in book history, curators and librarians from research libraries, and innovators in the digital humanities will convene in Worcester to exchange ideas about the past, present, and future of historical information literacy and the archive. The conference has been organized by Thomas Augst and Molly O'Hagan Hardy. Kenneth Carpenter, Carl Stahmer, and Michael Winship will give keynote talks. Papers will be presented by Kyle Roberts, Todd Thompson, and 13 others. Following the conference, concepts and methods will be more deeply explored in a five-day workshop dedicated to practice-based learning in digital humanities in the AAS's major archival areas. Topics and exercises will focus on how metadata for archival collections are created, organized and remediated in digital environments, using AAS digital projects as a case study; how special collections collection catalogs are organized based on the specificities of the collection, standardized through

authority work, and related to and different from union catalogs; and finally, how decisions about digitalization are made, To register for the conference and/or to apply for the workshop, visit: www.americanantiquarian.org/digitalantiquarian. For information, contact Molly Hardy at mhardy@mwa.org.

Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America, now edited by David Gants, will now be produced and distributed by the U. of Chicago Press. UCP will digitize a complete run of *PBSA*, making it available on JSTOR.

The Middle Temple's library (London), reestablished in 1641 and in new quarters since 1958, "suffered two significant thefts" c. 1964 and 2000. The story is told by Renae Satterley in "**Missing Books at Middle Temple**" in *Book Collector*, 61 (2012), 85-89. Satterley, as the first rare-books librarian to take charge of the collection, initiated an inventory and identified 169 missing titles and some 24 missing plates or maps; then she contacted booksellers, posting the missing volumes, and ultimately retrieved some valuable volumes together worth over $40,000--booksellers were on the whole cooperative--eBay was not.

The ***Intelligencer*** **needs reviewers for the following**: Henry L. Fulton's *Dr. John Moore, 1729-1802: A Life in Medicine, Travel, and Revolution* (U. of Delaware Press, 2015; pp. xxi + 788; illus; index); Jason H. Pearl's *Utopian Geographies & the Early English Novel* ((U. of Virginia, 2014; c. 200 pp.), treating Cavendish, Behn, Defoe and Swift; Julia Gasper's biography *The Marquis d'Argens: A Philosophical Life* (Lexington Books, 2014); pp. v + 297; Vol. 21 of *Goethe Yearbook* (2014, c. 300 pp., 11 essays + reviews [we want an overview with comments on a few articles]); Paula Radisich's *Pastiche Fashion and Galanterie in Chardin's Genre Subjects: Looking Smart* (U. of Delaware Press, 2014), pp. xi + 193; illus.; and *The Miscellaneous Writings and Sterne's Subscribers, an Identification List*, Vol. 9 of The Florida Edition of Laurence Sterne, ed. by Melvyn New and W. B. Gerard (2014; pp. xxix + 592; index).

Miriam C. Meijer sent us a two-page article from the January-February 2015 issue of *AAA World* magazine, entitled "George Washington Ate Here: Chief Walter Staib, Host of *A Taste of History* on PBS, Serves up 18th-century Fare at Philadelphia's Historic **City Tavern**." We thank Miriam for this tip, and Theresa Gawlas Medoff for her smartly written feature story. The City Tavern, at 138 South 2nd St., is a reconstruction opened in 1976 of a tavern built in 1773 long a favorite of the Founding Fathers. Three blocks from Constitution Hall, it's owned by the National Park Service, who require it be operated as an 18C tavern. Staib bought it in the 1990s and happily runs it within the restrictions demanded. He was raised in Germany and trained to produce meals from fresh food (he boasts that seafood was delivered 52 times the previous month and that turkey is roasted daily and mashed potatoes made from spuds eight times a day). Many of the menu's 18C dishes come from Hannah Glasses's classic *The Art of Cookery* (first published 1747) and others from Mary Randolph's *The Virginia House-Wife*. His chocolate mousse cake derives from Martha Washington's recipe. The article includes a lengthy recipe for Corn and Crab Chowder from Staib's *The City Tavern Cookbook*. I'd mention here two venues described on C18-L last year by Sean Moore and Robert Folkenflik: The **Swift Hibernian Lounge** with Swift's portrait on murals and Stella's on the menu (34 E 4th St., New York), and The **Juan Fernandez Bar of the Crusoe Hotel**, Fife, "home of Alexander Selkirk," sometimes called the model of Robinson Crusoe, which features timber clad walls and Man Friday's footprint highlighted in the floor."

On 23 January 2015 Kevin Whelan (History, Notre Dame U.) gave the **2015 Sir John T. Gilbert Commemorative Lecture in Dublin**, on the theme "Dublin as a Global City: Through Time and Space," reaching from the Vikings to the 21st century. It'll be published on the occasion of the 2016 lecture next January. These annual lectures are supported by the city and often bring the mayor, but the principal organizer is the Dublin City Public Libraries and particularly Dr. Máire Kennedy, the curator of special collections at the Pearse Street Library (138-144 Pearse St., Dublin 2), whose Dublin & Irish Collections is still often called the "Gilbert Collection." The Library publishes the lectures in a well-illustrated booklet typically 20-32 pp. in length. Some are important sources for the long 18C, such as Raymond Gillespie's *Seventeenth-Century Dubliners and their Books*, the 2005 lecture (Dublin City Public Libraries, 2006; 28 pp.), Andrew Carpenter's *Mrs Harris, her Pocket, and Her Petition: Some Thoughts on Swift's Dublin Castle Poems of 1699-1701*, the 2006 lecture (2007; 16 pp.), and Colm Lennon's *Dublin's Civic Buildings in the Early Modern Period*, the 2009 lecture (2010; 24 pp.; profusely illustrated). Brendan Twomey's 2012 lecture provides good background for those who don't know Gilbert: *Sir John T. Gilbert: Life, Works, and Contexts*. (2013; pp. 32; 22 illus., many in color). Gilbert's important library of 9000 or so books and other rare materials, as early 18C newspapers, were catalogued by Douglas Hyde and D. J. O'Donoghue, *Catalogue of the Books and Manuscripts Comprising the Library of the Late Sir John T. Gilbert, LL.D.* (1918). Gilbert is famous as the great historian of Dublin, producing the 3-vol. *History of the City of Dublin* and compiling the *Calendar of the Ancient Records of Dublin*, abbreviated CARD, 19 vols., continued after his death in 1898 by his wife Rosa Mulholland, a novelist, who also wrote a biography of him. The Gilbert Lecture booklets for 1998-2006 were priced €7, but have since risen to €10 and then €12.

Dr. Triona O'Hanlon in 2013 announced the publication on the WWW of ***Mercer's Hospital Music Collection***, the "first major project to be published in the RISM Ireland database." The project was a collaboration of the Irish and UK branches of RISM (Répertoire International des Sources Musicales). O'Hanlon reported on the project in "The Mercer's Hospital Music Collection: An Overview." *Brio*, 49, no. 2 (Autumn/Winter, 2012), 6-21, an issue with half a dozen articles related to 18C Irish music, and in an article written with Catherine Ferris for *Research News: Dublin Institute of Technology*, 7 (2013), ed. by Jean Cahil. Mercer's Hospital's collection holds 50 manuscripts and seven printed volumes with evidence on the repertoire of benefit performances begun two years after the Hospital's founding in 1734 (it cared for the poor and destitute). Another resource on Irish music is Catherine Ferris and Barra Boydel's website ***Dublin Music Trade***, a database accessible at http://www.dublinmusictrade.ie, posted Oct. 2013. This resource assists cataloguers in establishing publication dates of scores by cross-referencing dates and addresses of publishers. The Irish branch of RISM has posted bibliographies of annual publications on resources for Irish music at its website (www.rism-ie.org/pages/publications/). Also, on cataloguing projects at the Bodleian and Christ Church College related to 18C music holdings, see the well illustrated ***Christ Church Library Newsletter,*** 8.1-3, (2011-12): www.chch.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/lib-newsletter-2011-12.pdf.

Many have presumably used, or would use if their library owned such, the **Nineteenth Century Collections Online (NCCO)** from Gale Cengage

Learning, which began publication in 2012. The searchable digitized text-base includes materials from outside the nineteenth century. The texts are being brought out over time, grouped into categories to allow the purchase of smaller units. In spring 2012 four sections appeared: "British Politics and Society"; "European Literature, 1790-1840: The Corvey Collection"; "Asia and the West"; and "British Theatre, Music, and Literature." Gale's Artemis interface allows searching NCCO with ECCO (Eighteenth Century Collections Online). Other sections now available include "Children's Life and Childhood"; "Mapping the World: Maps and Travel Literature"; "Religion, Spirituality, Reform, and Society"; and "Science Technology and Medicine, 1780-1925." The resource was reviewed, along with ECCO, very favorably by Jorden Smith in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada*, 52, no. 1 (2014), 340-43. Smith has some useful details about the Artemis interface for NCCO and ECCO and about the capacity of term-frequency and term-clustering tools. But Smith praises ECCO and NCCO for "high-quality digitization and excellent optical character recognition" in full-text searches, without qualification, apparently ignorant of how much searches routinely miss. I have sensed no increase in the accuracy of ECCO searches, which I covered here in detail in January 2009: "Some Problems in ECCO (and ESTC)" (23.1:20-30). I hope by now all users understand the degree to which searches overlook texts. For instance, there are 14 editions of Swift's *A Tale of a Tub* published between 1704 and 1727 on ECCO. If one searches for "Tom Thumb whose author" or "Lord Peter's Projects" one finds these phrases in only 3 of the 14 editions; if one searches for "productions of the Grub-Street Brotherhood," one finds it in only 2.

The French society for 18C studies' annual ***Dix-huitième siècle*** had a groups of essays focused on Africa and Fontenelle in the contexts of history and science in vol. 44 (2012); and the 2013 volume another on "La Nature" (the 2010 had concerned the related or overlapping topic of animals).

Those in French studies might be interested in Timothy Allen, Robert Morressey, and Glenn Roe's "Re-Imagining French Lexicography: ***The Dictionnaire Vivant de la langue française***" in *Dictionaries*, 32 (2011), 129-43. It concerns this electronic edition, the DVLF, developed by the ARTFL Project at the U. of Chicago. The DVLF takes an "experimental, interactive, community approach." This article covers the history of the project, compares it to similar e-dictionaries, and presents the DVLF's features and compilation procedures.

Gelehrte Journale und Zeitungen der Aufklärung [abbreviated "*GJZ 18*"]. Edited by Stefan Dietzel, Angela Kuhk, and webmaster Marcus Hellman in Göttingen and others at three different libraries. Göttingen: Academy of Sciences and Humanities, University of Göttingen, 2011-. On-going open-access, online database with bibliographies and digitized texts: gelehrte-journale.adw-de/. The home page of the project's website has text translated into English and French. The English page's title at gelehte-journale.adw-goe.de/en/home is "Research Database: Scholarly Journals as Networks of Knowledge in the Age of Enlightenment." This study and publication project is focused on scholarly journals and newspapers published in Germany beginning about 1680, often called "Ephemerides," which produced a great flowering of scholarship by the end of the 18C. Aided by a systematic indexing project in the libraries (2007), the *GJZ 18* project aims to digitize and index the most important and representative of these periodicals, also making the case for their importance to

the Enlightenment. The project plans to digitize some of 128 journals (ca. 1274 volumes), making them accessible in interactive online database. Besides the scholars noted at Göttingen (and these include productive, publishing students such as Wiebke Hemmerling), the team includes Katrin Loffler and Flemming Schoch at the U. of Leipzig and scholars at the State Library of Lower Saxony in Göttingen and also at the Bavarian State Library, Munich. They have published much in the past five years on German scholarly serials of the long 18th century.

The **Instituto Feijoo de Estudios del Siglo XVIII** in Grijón, Spain, publishes annually for members *Bibliografía Dieciochista* and *Cuadernos de Estudios del Siglo XVIII*. Its 36-page *Catálogo de Publicaciones del Instituto Feijoo de Estudios del Siglo XVIII* is published as a PDF on the web at http://www.ifesxviii.uniovi.es/publicaciones. Here appears an account of the *Cuarenta años de* Bibliografía Dieciochista *(1973-2013)*, ed. by Inmaculada Urzainqui and Juan Díaz Álvarez--a compilation with 30,441 references divided in three parts, published digitally. The Institute's bibliography first was published from 1973 to 1983, within *Boletín del Centro de Estudios del Siglo XVIII*. It has three sections: 1) bibiografía general, 2) bibiografía especifica de personas, and 3) Visiones y revisiones del siglo XVIII (these are further divided into 26 chapters).

Visible Prices is an ongoing digital humanities project developed by Paige Morgan, for the collection of prices drawn from literary and historical sources in 18th and 19th century England. The database has a home page at www.paigemorgan.net/visibleprices/, with an update posting on 30 July 2014. Morgan writes, "Users will be able to search for information relating to a specific good or service, or a specific amount of money. For example, a query for 3 shillings in 1789 reveals that, in London, that amount would purchase a bushel of wheat, a quarto of translations from Diderot, or a day's services of a crippled or deformed child as a companion to an adult beggar. My intent is for the database to make use of the influx of printed texts onto the web in facsimile format, in databases like Google Books, the Hathi Trust Digital Library, ECCO, the British Newspapers Collection, and the London Times Online Archive, to name only a few. Though entry privileges are currently restricted, the goal is to eventually make it possible for registered users to enter data in the process of individual research or classroom activities; and thus to make it possible for researchers specializing in other time periods and regions to extend the scope of the database." The site has a currency inflation calculator.

Literature Compass is a refereed, on-line open-access journal published by Wiley (http://literature-compass.com/), whose general ed. is David Amigoni; it appears monthly (12 issue a year), continuously paginated, with some periods represented therein, but never are all found in each issue. "The 18th-Century" section, ably edited by Kathryn King, appears in about four issues of the year--it is one of the periods occurring most frequently (and three 2015 essays are now posted). Articles for the long 18C are found also in the sections "17th Century," ed. by Nicholas McDowell, and "Romanticism," ed. by Sue Chaplin and Joel Faflack--all these editors have held positions for several years or more. Although no publications in "17th Century" appeared in 2012-13, five did in 2014, and 2015 has an essay by Nigel Smith on Marvell studies of the past ten years. The placement of an essay within a field is not always optimal, reflecting presumably the editor obtaining the submission; for instance, much included within "Romanticism" might be placed in "18th Century." Or again, the special

issue "Scholarly Editing in the 21st Century," which appears in the 17C section in 2010, has an essay on editing Robert Southey. Recent articles of note include:
Bannet, Eve Tavor. "History of Reading: The Long 18th C." 10 (2013), 122-33.
Batt, Jennifer. "Eighteenth-Century Verse Miscellanies." 9 (2012), 394-405.
Bullard, Paddy. "Digital Humanities and Electronic Resources in the Long Eighteenth Century." 10 (2013), 748-60.
Drew, Erin. "Teaching and Learning Guide for Ecocriticism and Eighteenth-Century English Studies." 10 (2013), 301-10.
Fordham, Douglas, and Adrienne Albright. "The Eighteenth-Century Print: Tracing the Contours of a Field." 9 (2012), 509-20.
Gevirtz, Karen. "Recent Developments in 17 & 18C English Catholic Studies."
Monod, Paul Kleber. "A Restoration? 25 Years of Jacobite Studies." 10: 311-30.

The Summer/Fall 2014 issue of *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* is devoted to "**The Dispossessed Eighteenth Century**," ed. by Jordana Rosenberg and Chi-Ming Yang. The fall 2014 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* focuses on "**The Maritime Eighteenth Century**, with essays that include Prasannan Parthasarathi and Giorgio Riello's "The Indian Ocean in the Long 18C" and Geoff Quilley's "Art History and Double Consciousess: Visual Culture and 18C Maritime Britain"--several review essays fit the topic, including Jeremy Black's "Atlantic Worlds." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* has been publishing "**Primary Sources in Context**"; some are short documents, but at least one is accompanied by an attribution study: Barry Sales's "*The Landlord's Tale* (1708): An Introduction and Contextualization," with an edition of an adaptation from Ariosto, and an argument attributing it to George Farquhar, on 47.3 [Spring 2014], 313-42).

Library & Information History, formerly *Library History* (published by Maney for The Library and Information History Group), has lately offered much on the 18C. Issue 29.3 (2013) is devoted to 18C libraries. Articles include: David Allan's "Politeness and the Politics of Culture: An Intellectual History of the 18C Subscription Library" (159-69); Rebecca Bowd's "Useful Knowledge or Polite Learning? A Reappraisal of Approaches to Subscription Library History" (182-95); K. A. Manley's "Jeremy Bentham Has Been Banned: Contention and Censorship in Private Subscription Libraries before 1825" (170-81); James Raven's "Debating Bibliomania and the Collection of Books in the 18C" (196-209); and Mark Towsey's "'I can't resist sending you the book': Private Libraries, Elite Women, and Shared Reading Practices in Georgian Britain" (210-22). Vol. 30 (2014) has articles by John Crawford on "Libraries, Reading, and Society in Paisley, 1760-1830"; by Vivienne Dunstand on "Professionals, their Private Libraries, and the Wider Reading Habits in Late 18th- and Early 19C Scotland"; and by Emma Jay on English lit in Queen Caroline's Library.

The Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester (est. 1905) is now published by the Manchester U. Press, as a biannual, with the shorter title ***Bulletin of the John Rylands Library***. This began with v. 90, no. 1 (spring 2014), ed. by Peter Nockles and Vivienne Westbrook. Fall 2014's issue will have the theme "Writ from the heart? Women's Life Writing in the Long 18C." The new website gives the editor as Paul Fouracre. The journal appeared to 2006 and then came a hiatus until 2012 ("Architecture and Environment" in Manchester); then a varied issue on JRL's resources in 2013 (e.g., T. Whelan's "Baptist Autographs in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, 1741-1907").

Half a dozen essays on the ***Oxford English Dictionary*** (OED) appear in the 2013 *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* (vol. 34)L Julie Coleman's "Forum: Using OED Evidence"; Lynda Mugglestone's "Acts of Representation: Writing the Woman Question in the Oxford English Dictionary"; Julie Coleman's "Using Dictionary Evidence to Evaluate Authors' Lexis: John Bunyan and the Oxford English Dictionary"; Charlotte Brewer's "OED Online Re-Launced: Distinguishing Old Scholarship from New." Also several essays in the section "Reference Works in Progress" concern it: John Simpson's "The Spirit of Place: Five Rooms and the OED" (156-74), Peter Gilliver's "Thoughts on Writing a History of the *Oxford English Dictionary*," and Beverley McCulloch's "The Living Archive: Preserving the Papers of the OED." The previous issue had a related article: Roderick McConchie's "'Her words had no weight': Jane Austen as a Textual Test Case for the OED."

The annual survey of "**Recent Studies in the Restoration and 18C**," in that issue of ***SEL: Studies in English Literature 1500-1900*** covering mostly 2013 publications, was written by **Frances Ferguson** (emerita, U. of Chicago). Ferguson, the author of *Pornography, The Theory* and two books mainly on the Romantic period, one on Wordsworth, covers well several books on the Restoration, particularly the late historian Kevin Sharpe's *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714*. Ferguson observes that the 2013 publications surveyed are "extensive" in scope, rarely treating single authors, and that the greatest concentration of scholarly attention . . . is Gothic fiction" (746). Ferguson, disposed to theory, characterizes the inclinations of the thousands of scholars working on English literature 1660-1820 (see 755-57), a tricky undertaking. I was struck by the survey's extensive attention to cultural history, e.g., books on sex, sports, and household politics--far and away the lengthiest treatment concerns *The Architecture of Concepts: The Historical Formation of Human Rights*, by Peter de Bolla, a professor of history. One might think one was reading the interdisciplinary *ECS* as one reads through accounts of the reprinting of William Buchan's *Domestic Medicine*, Samuel Pufendorf's *Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdom and States of Europe*, and Lord Kames's *Principles of Equity* (753). Although important works in English literature are covered, such as Deborah Kennedy's *Poetic Sisters*, Ashley Marshall's *The Practice of Satire in England 1658-1770*, the Georgia edition of Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*, and John Radner's *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography*, these don't receive the attention they might have were the survey more focused on literary study. Superficial examination is sometimes suggested, as when the coverage of *Peregrine Pickle* fails to reflect the editors' relative shares in the effort and when paperback reprints of earlier publications are covered as if they are new scholarship. The value of the survey as a review of scholarship is undermined by the absence of important journal articles, which take up the bulk of both *Year's Work* surveys--what we get in *SEL* is "books received." Of course, to judge from conference programs, Ferguson's survey mirrors the interests of most working in "literary" studies.

Cover illustration: William Hogarth's "*The Bruiser*" (1763), a caricature of Charles Churchill (c. 36 x 26 cm; one of multiple states). See p. 35 for Corey Andrews's discussion of the context of this etching and engraving. Also thanks go to Michael Sellers of Action Graphics in Clearfield for the new cover design.