First of all, profound thanks to Emily Kugler for coordinating this year’s EC/ASECS conference. Managing a conference requires the full gamut of skills, from managing a diminutive budget constantly in flux, to negotiating as a novice with hotels who negotiate for a living, to persuading one’s university to make a few concessions in their usual access policies, to keeping faculty busy elsewhere with their teaching on time with their conference tasks, to mastering technology and emergency technology repair, to guessing when and how important coffee is to participants, to keeping cool under pressure, to giving up much of your leisure for a year. I’ve only scratched the surface. I have coordinated only two conferences in my career, and they were the most taxing professional experiences I’ve had. Doing this work is satisfying at the end when you see your conference take intellectual shape, but until that climax many, many times you doubt your common sense for having agreed to do this job.

Second, it is moving to be back here at Howard where we held a funeral service for Maurice Bennett, my officemate at the University of Maryland in the early 80s, and who died of AIDS in the early 90s.

Third, I’d like to express my deep gratitude to this organization, EC/ASECS, that saved me during the 14 years that I left university teaching to teach high school; EC/ASECS has consistently been a collection of people and of scholars, not of ranks. I’d especially like to thank Linda Merians, Jim May, Cal Winton, Mary Margaret Stewart, Beth Lambert, Don Mell, Ashley Marshall, Nancy Shevlin, John Radner, and Robert Hume who encouraged me and my work on Jonathan Swift during the years that I had no other obvious academic tether. I know many other EC/ASECS participants who have felt the same openness to all that is particularly characteristic of this society.

I’d like use my presidential remarks this afternoon to reflect for a few minutes on where we are (physically and historically), and on why we’re here. Just a year ago (Fall 2016), we were moving fairly comfortably along a continuum that included our first African-American president and that seemed to promise our first female president. Terrorism was a serious, unsolved problem, but our society and particularly our universities and colleges were becoming gradually more open, more diverse, and more international in their faculties, their students, and their curriculum. Now (Fall 2017) that political climate has changed utterly. Our “Whig” sense of inevitable progress has been shaken, exposing at the same time significant weaknesses, blindnesses, and even smugness in our college and university micro-climate. When last year I finished several years of seemingly total immersion in my biography of Jonathan Swift, I suddenly realized that I was distressingly out of touch with the political and social present. Such a feeling or approach is no longer a luxury that we can afford. Since our last election, as our activity in the present becomes more urgent, I think a lot more about extra-professional things, starting with grass roots involvement in our chosen communities, that I believe
we should be doing. It's encouraging to see how many others, particularly young people, are coming to the same conclusion.

Our professional role in our country is, I think, among the grass roots activities that we should be re-examining. In all our colleges and universities, not just 18th-century enrollments but humanities enrollments across the spectrum are plummeting. At Stony Brook where I teach a rumor has been circulating among students this semester that the humanities are going to be eliminated. In fact a technology course (a good idea in itself) has replaced one of the humanities courses in our general education requirements, general education credit for AP courses allows many of our students never to even set foot in our buildings, and American parents are becoming reluctant to allow their students to major in liberal education subjects. When I started as an Assistant Professor at Maryland in 1977, or shortly after, we had Shirley Kenny, Cal Winton, Vin Carretta, Sue Lanser, Leo Damrosch, Paula McDowell, and myself teaching the 18th century. We taught The Age of Pope, The Age of Swift, 18th-Century Drama, The 18th-Century Novel, English Literature 1700 to the Present, and 18th-Century Special Topics courses. Now it is rare to be assigned a course that has more than one 18th-century work in it. EC/ASECS still has plenty of members, but societal forces are pushing us in a shrinking direction.

At the same time that we are shrinking professionally, the average American has become less inclined to listen to us, or to our laments. Just at the time when our voices are more crucial than ever to our larger society, we are resented for our tenure, for our summer freedom, for our advocacy of diversity and international perspectives, and even if we have none of the above, for our health insurance.

To begin to rebuild a bridge over the widening gap between ourselves and the general public, I find myself thinking back to my reasons for deciding during the 1960s to study and to teach, first literature, and then more specifically 18th-century literature. My principal motive was to help students get beyond their narrow time and place, a time and place that they are not even able to see the narrowness of unless they are challenged to read outside their country and outside their century. I was torn in 1969 when I began graduate study between specializing in Shakespeare, in 18th-century English literature, or in African literature. I finally chose the 18th century for its wit, its political engagement, its intellectual standards, its journalism, its rapid expansion of a reading public, the rise of the novel and its frequent celebration of undervalued views, and its enlightenment (for better and for worse). Soon I joined EC/ASECS, which broadened my interests with the opportunity it provided to learn more about music, art, history, Diderot, Goethe, The French Revolution, the settling of Pennsylvania and the other colonies, and what we now call the Black Atlantic. Now, even when our opportunities to teach the 18th century are diminished, we can still fulfill our original motives, and teach a wide variety of works that were ignored in that early curriculum: the Japanese Burmese Harp, the Indonesian This Earth of Mankind, the Nigerian The Joys of Motherhood, the Vietnamese When Heaven and Earth Changed Places. Fortunately, book popularity hasn’t taken as much of a hit as we feared it
might. Human nature hasn’t changed. Most of our students still have a hunger for good writing and reading courses.

I know from talking with you that the people in this room teach these and even more creative options. In fact, we keep the 18th-century alive by showing our colleagues and our students that the openness we have been inspired by in the 18th century has led us to exercise that openness in many and creative ways — administration, women’s studies, African-American studies, and various colonial and post-colonial studies.

Still, 18th-century studies themselves have infinite resonances in modern life. Even as determined a curmudgeon as Swift offers us thought-provoking views on a number of issues still very much relevant, such as 1) reining in a popular general; 2) co-existing with religious fundamentalism; 3) thinking globally while acting locally; 4) helping people enter into the economy through micro-loans; 5) standing up for women; 6) standing up against colonialism; and 7) expecting the best from ourselves and others.

Since Jonathan Swift has been the principal focus of my 18th-century study, I’d like to conclude with three excerpts from my recent biography of Swift, all of which I hope illustrate ways in which we can use the texts we teach from the 18th century to intrigue our students into pursuing intellectual and emotional pleasures beyond their usual ones. My first excerpt is from my preface, which shares with readers the pleasures of research; the second is from Swift’s youth and illustrates the serendipitous pleasures of scholarship and the frequent near-invisibility of women in the public record; and the third is from Swift’s prime and shares the pleasures of trying to shake up conventional interpretations of the past, in this case of the nature of Swift’s friendship with Esther Johnson, that have with the help of Swift’s early editors such as Deane Swift naming Swift’s letters to Esther Johnson a Journal to Stella acquired unhelpful hardened arteries.

From the Preface

On a cool, sunny Saturday, July 16th, 1994, in Glasnevin, a suburb just north of Dublin, where I was trying to find out what had become of Delville, Patrick Delaney’s 11-acre estate where Jonathan Swift was often entertained during the 1730s, I stopped at a bridge over the Tolka River, along which I knew the estate had lain, and saw a man in an Irish-wool sweater looking down over the bridge into the river, counting, he presently told me, the trout that were just beginning to return. I interrupted him, as I had so many people in the past few weeks, to ask for help, in this case to ask whether he had ever heard of a Delville estate or of anything now named Delville. He hadn't, but he introduced himself as Joe Stone, a supervisor for the Telephone Company, and he offered to take me to the neighboring Catholic church where he thought the sacristan, Frank, might know. Frank knew a lot about Delville: that an order of Catholic Sisters had bought the Delville property in the 1940s and had established a hospital named Bons Secours, which, as it turned out, was on a hill within sight of the Tolka River bridge where Joe and I had met. Frank remembered the Delville manor house before it was torn down and replaced by
the hospital, and he remembered that as a child, with his friend Tony Dougherty, he bought apples grown on the estate at a basement window for a penny a piece. So off we went to Tony's house, just around the corner, where the apple story was confirmed, and a racier story, that Tony and Frank had regularly “nicked a pip,” was denied, unconvincingly, by Frank. As the story was being told and retold, Joe (the trout watcher) was being teased by Frank and by Tony and Tony’s family, for not knowing these crucial details of their childhoods, for he was, they said, “only a blow-in”: that is, he had only lived in Glasnevin (though he was born in nearby Dublin) for 35 years.

As I continued my search for houses of other friends of Swift in other parts of Ireland I met other blow-ins, like Michael Hurley of Baldoyle, who took part of his Saturday afternoon to show me Belcamp, the beautiful home of Swift’s lifelong friends, the Grattan family, which celebrated in 1994 its centenary as a Catholic school. Michael, an executive at Cadbury's Chocolates and the author of two local histories of Baldoyle, knew everyone in town that we passed, but, he told me, he was still thought of as a blow-in by some, because although he had been born in Baldoyle, his parents had not.

Jonathan Swift, born in 1667 in Dublin (probably at 7 Hoey’s Court in St. Werbergh’s parish, a few blocks south of the Liffey, a stone’s throw from St. Patrick’s Cathedral, where at the age of 45 he was appointed Dean), was another such Irish blow-in, with a generosity, a love of conversation, and a capacity for friendship much like those overflowing in Joe, Frank, Tony and Michael in 1994. Swift’s blow-in status resulted from the choice made in 1659 by his father, also named Jonathan, at age 18: to emigrate to Ireland from his family home in Herefordshire to try to make a better living than he could imagine in England in the aftermath of the English civil war. Swift’s father’s life in Ireland was tragically brief. After serving as a law clerk at the King’s Inn in Dublin for eight years, and being married to a young woman named Abigail Erick for less than three years, he died in early 1667 (most likely in March), poisoned by mercury he took to cure the “itch,” seven or even eight months before his second child, our Jonathan, was born. The wife he left with so much responsibility when he died, 27 when she gave birth to young Jonathan, was another blow-in, orphaned in Dublin by the age of 23, the daughter of an Anglican minister who emigrated to Ireland during the 1630s because his puritan leanings had made him unwelcome in his original parish in Leicestershire.

From Chapter 2, “Kidnapped”

Swift’s childhood was enhanced by the sometime presence of his “granddame.” Since his maternal grandmother, Elizabeth Imins Erick, died in 1663, four years before he was born, his frequent references to his “granddame” must all be to his father’s mother, Elizabeth Dryden Swift, from Goodrich. Widowed when her husband Thomas died in 1658, Elizabeth was alive at least until 1680 when Swift was 13, and possibly for several years beyond that. He could have known her through a childhood trip or trips to Goodrich. More likely, through, she lived regularly in either the William or Godwin Swift household in Dublin. From surviving Herefordshire Hearth Tax
Records and Exchequer Port Book records, we can reliably infer that Elizabeth Swift was living on her husband’s estate at Goodrich in 1665, seven years after her husband’s death, that she left the family home, allowing one of her daughters, also named Elizabeth, to live in it, some time between 1670 and 1673, and that she was living in Ireland in 1680. That places her very likely in Ireland between 1670 and 1680 and possibly beyond – we don’t have a date for her death – during at least the years when young Jonathan was growing from 3 to 13. In later life, Swift remembered his grandmother as a reliable sage. He recalls her folk wisdom and other habits six times in his correspondence and in his poetry:

1) To Esther Johnson he wrote in 1713 “My Grandmother used to say, More of your Lining, and less of your dining” (JC 502).
2) To Knightley Chetwode he wrote in 1715 “My grandmother used to say that good feeding never brings good footing” (C II 119).
3) To Charles Ford in 1721 he wrote, “I find there is less trusting in Friends than ever our Grandmothers warn us again[sf]” (C II 371).
4) In his 1724 poem, The Answer to Dr. Delany, Swift remembered that when his grandmother heard something she didn’t like, it made my Grand-Dame always stuff-her-Ears, Both Right and Left, as Fellow-sufferers (39-40).
5) Grandmother Swift also finds a place in his poem Upon the South Sea Project (1720):
   The sea is richer than the land,
   I heard it from my grammam’s mouth,
   Which now I clearly understand,
   For by the sea she meant the South (105-108).
6) Even as late as the 1736 Legion Club, Swift reinforces his point that the wickedness of parliament is proportional to its proximity to the church,
   Making good my grandam’s jest, Near the church – you know the rest (7-8).

All these examples imply that Swift recalled frequent contact with his grandmother and not just an occasional visit. This is the tough, slightly cynical, and spirited woman whom we first met in Bruno Ryves’s Mercurius Rusticus account of her courage during the civil war.

From Chapter 52, “England is My True Home, But I’ll Be Right Back Home (to Ireland)”

We know Swift’s life in great detail for the coming three years because of the almost daily letters he wrote jointly to Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley between Sep 9th, 1710 and Jun 6th, 1713. He had before this written frequent letters to Hetty and Rebecca every time they were separated, but in one of the first of his 1710-1713 letters, Swift implies that his style this time may be unique: “Henceforth I will write something every day to MD, and make it a sort of Journall; . . . and I shall always be in Conversation with MD” (JC 7). A few days later, on Sep 16th, he asks, “Tell me, do you like this journal way of writing? Is it not tedious and dull?” (JC 13). Swift wrote his letters to both women, though when he stops to address just one of them, he
much more often addresses Hetty than Rebecca. His intimacy was with both, but his love and his deep, deep trust was directed only to Esther Johnson.

Paradoxically, it is during this, Swift’s longest period away from Hetty (nearly three years) that we learn most about their intimate and comfortable relationship. The women saved Swift’s letters from 1710-1713 and Swift in turn saved them after Esther’s death in 1728, though he had no inkling that he was saving them for posterity. Under Hetty’s endorsement of his first letter, he wrote, “Letters to Ireld from Sept. 1710 began soon after the change of Ministry. Nothing in this” (JO 5n). He gave a packet of these letters to his cousin Martha Whiteway for safekeeping in his final years, which she in turn passed to her son-in-law, Deane Swift. Others were saved by Rebecca Dingley and then by her executor, Rev. John Lyon (AB viii-x).

Swift consistently addressed these letters to “MD” (“my dears”), or sometimes MC (“mes chéris”?). ME, which he also used occasionally, perhaps means “mes enfants.” He never addressed Esther Johnson in these letters as “Stella,” the name he used for her in his birthday poems after 1719 and in only three of his surviving letters during the last ten years of her life. Deane Swift edited the more than half of Swift’s 1710-13 letters that he received from his mother-in-law, Martha Whiteway, but he edited very unhelpfully: “To avoid perplexing the reader,” he wrote, in his 1768 edition of these letters, “it was thought more advisable to use the word Presto for Swift.” He also inserted “Stella” in place of any term that Swift used for Esther Johnson. The letters Deane Swift used have since been lost, so we can’t check to find the names Swift actually used. Following Deane Swift’s lead, Thomas Sheridan, when in 1784 he published the full set of journal letters that we now have, titled them Dr. Swift’s Journal to Stella, the title by which they are still unfortunately known. The letters after February 1712, i.e. the letters that Sheridan had but Deane Swift didn’t, still survive, and we see in them Swift’s frequent use of “Ppt” or “saucebox” for Esther Johnson and “Pdfr” [poor dear friend?] for himself. Judging from what Swift called Esther Johnson in the original letters that survive, this collection of 1710-13 letters should be called The Journal to Saucebox (JC 17), or The Journal to Poppet. Both poppet and saucebox give us a more accurate sense of how Swift felt about Esther Johnson at the time he wrote this journal than does the name Stella, which was his retrospective, late-life name for her.

In these letters, written twenty years after he met Esther Johnson and ten years after he took her under his protection, Swift and Hetty (I’ll call her Hetty for most of the rest of this book because this seems to have been his most common public name for her, saucebox and poppet being his unshared, more intimate names for her) sound like fully comfortable and respectful domestic partners. Political intrigue was Swift’s principal occupation for these three years. Impressively, the views Swift expresses in these letters to Hetty and Rebecca are entirely congruent with the views he expresses in his pamphlets, which makes the letters an important window into his integrity. A striking feature of these letters is that in them he treats all subjects, political or social, in human terms and with equal interest. His daily entertainment was chiefly visiting friends, as often women as men. His relaxed, playful letters in this journal are the kinds of letters that Lady Mary Wortley Montague wanted,
but didn’t get, from Alexander Pope in 1716-18 when she was in Turkey. Swift’s letters make it evident that he was habitually energetic, a striking contrast, for example, to Samuel Johnson and his characteristic indolence.

As Swift was writing to Hetty and Rebecca, he cast many of his comments into the form of “conversations” with the young women:

1) “I am rising to go to Jervas to finish my picture, and ‘tis shaving day, so good morrow MD; but don’t keep me now, for I can’t stay” (JC 10).
2) “I must not end yet, because I can’t say good night without losing a line [wasting a space at the bottom of the page], and then MD would scold; but now, good night” (JC 20).
3) “So now to your letter, brave boys” (JC 21).
4) “Why do you trouble yourself, Mistress Ppt, about my instrument? I have the same the archbishop gave me; and it is as good now the bishops are away” (JC 23).
5) After writing of his plan to “open my business to [Harley],” he adds, “which expression I would not use if I were a woman. I know you smoakt it; but I did not ‘till I writ it” (JC 27).
6) “I think I have brought these lines pretty straight again” (JC 28).
7) “I think I am civiller than I used to be; and have not used the expression of (you in Ireland) and (we in England), as I did when I was here before, to your great indignation” (JC 31).
8) “Poor MD’s letter was lying so huddled up among papers I could not find it” (JC 33).
9) “I don’t write as I should, because I am not in bed: see the ugly wide lines” (JC 33).
10) “Lord, I dreamt of Ppt, &c. so confusedly last night” (JC 38).
11) “I won’t open it yet! Yes I will! No I won’t; I am going; I can’t stay ’till I turn over [to the other side of the page]. What shall I do? My fingers itch; and I now have it in my left hand; and now I’ll open it this very moment” (JC 38).
12) “God Almighty bless poor dear Ppt, and her eyes and head: What shall we do to cure them, poor dear life? Our disorders are a pull-back for your good qualities. Would to heaven I were this minute shaving your poor dear head, either here or there” (JC 44).
13) “My pen is apt to ramble when I think who I am writing to” (JC 44).
15) “If you will write, shut your eyes, and write just a line, and no more, thus ‘How do you do, Mrs. Ppt?’ That was written with my eyes shut. Faith, I think it is better than when they are open; and then Dd may stand by, and tell you when you go too high or too low” (JC 49).
16) “I have been scribbling [i.e. writing for publication] this morning, and I believe shall hardly fill this side to-day, but send it as it is; and it is good enough for naughty girls that won’t write to a body, and to a good boy like pdfr” (JC 14).
17) “Stop your receipt in your ___ I have no need on’t” (JC 50).
18) “I wish you could hear me repeating all I have said of this in its proper tone, just as I am writing it. ‘Tis all with the same cadence with oh hoo, or as
when little girls say, I have got an apple, miss, and I won’t give you some” (JC 51).
19) “I an’t sleepy yet. Let us sit up a little longer, and talk” (JC 80).

What better invitation did Esther Johnson ever receive than this last from Swift? And by extension, what better invitation have we ever received? And what better invitation can we give our students and our fellow American and world citizens.

State University of New York at Stony Brook

Notes

1. The Herefordshire Hearth Tax rolls suggest that Elizabeth Swift left her home in Goodrich some time between 1665 and 1673. In the 1680 Chester shipping records, we find several shipments of cattle in the name of Elizabeth Swift: 1) 15 Jun 1680 Elizabeth Swift Mrs. (?) Ir Sheep 1£ 5s 2d – In the Happy returne [name of the ship] pd; 2) [presumably also 15 Jun 1680] Elizabeth Swift ind [indigena]: 106 Ir sheepe – In the Happy Returne pd. 3) 21 Jun [1680] Elizabeth Swift ind 42 Ir. Cattle, 40 Sheepe – In the Lamb of Chester, Richard Innsworth, Master a Dublin 5£ 11s 2d; 4) July 6 [1680] Elizabeth Swift ind 49 Ir cattle, 337 sheepe and other goods 6£ 11s 2d – In the Welcome pd; 5) July 6 [1680] Elizabeth Swift ind 96 Ir sheepe – In the Darien Swan pd £ 2s 9 1/2 d (Hinton, Port Books, E190, 1343/12). Swift’s memories of his Grandmother’s sayings, the hearth tax records, and these shipping records suggest that some time between 1665 and 1673 Elizabeth Swift left Goodrich for Dublin, that she lived with either William or Godwin Swift, and that her name was used for the 1680 shipments in order to pay the lower customs duties that indigenous residents were entitled to. Elizabeth was presumably helping to stock the family’s Goodrich farm now managed by her daughter and son-in-law, Thomas and Elizabeth Vaughan.

2. Rogers gives “Near the church and far from God” as the proverb that Swift alludes to here, an appropriate proverb from the lips of a knowing wife of a clergyman (892).


4. See Sheridan, 1784, I i, for Sheridan’s explanation of this title.

5. Or The Journal to the Saucy Monkeys or The Journal to the Dear Rogues or The Journal to the Young Women or The Journal to the Brave Boys. Feb 9th, 1712 is the first Journal letter unedited by Deane Swift.

6. We know Hetty’s voice only indirectly, when Swift quotes or paraphrases something she has written.

7. Frank Ellis, too, in his edition of Swift’s Examiner and Arthur Mainwaring’s Medley, noted that Mainwaring couldn’t find any deliberate untruths in the Examiner either (Ellis, Examiner, xlii).
Rambler 2 and Johnson’s Dictionary: Paratextual and Intertextual Entanglements with Pope, Statius, Dryden, Gay, and Milton

By Anthony W. Lee

“Find one item, one detail, until it becomes an inexhaustible possibility.”

Detective Somerset, Seven

“I have confined my imagination to the margin.”

Johnson’s Preface to Shakespeare

My approach will be to look at small things, things typically considered marginal: both literally (i.e., mottoes, which occupy the margins of the page) and figuratively (i.e., unimportant) by some. It is my hope that by the time I am done here, some of you will be persuaded to agree with Detective Somerset’s postulate that we should seek to “find one item, one detail, until it becomes an inexhaustible possibility.”

French theorist and critic Gérard Genette has developed the concept of transtextuality, which is his general, inclusive term for the relationships between a text and other texts. He has identified five transtextual regimes, two of which I use here. The first is intertextual: “A relation of co-presence between two or more texts … most often, by the literal presence of one text within another.” These typically consist of quotations, allusions, plagiarism. The second is paratextual, that is, liminal devices and conventions both within (“peritext”) and outside (“epitext”) the book that mediates it to the reader. These include titles, forwards, dedications, notes, epigraphs, epilogues, etc. For us today, the salient example of the paratext is the periodical essay motto.

We will primarily consider two Johnsonian texts, the Dictionary and the Rambler, and their summoning of precursors such as Statius, Virgil, Dryden, Milton, Pope, and John Gay. Johnson’s Rambler, a series of 208 periodical essays, is considered by many to be one of his greatest literary achievements, one rivalled only by the Lives of the Poets, and, for some, Rasselas. And the importance of the Dictionary perhaps requires no explanation for this learned audience. Johnson was at work on the two projects simultaneously, the latter from 1747 to 1755 and the Rambler between 1750 and 1752.

We begin by looking at Rambler 2, on “the necessity and danger of looking into futurity” (Yale Works, 3:xi). Following the Spectator, Johnson used classical mottoes to introduce his essays. In many respects, he may be seen as following in the footsteps of Addison and Steele, despite the significant differences separating their respective periodical projects. The motto in both served as a textual portal into the essay, serving as an oblique précis. Given the close association of the motto with the epigram, proverb, maxim, etc.—genres with strong moral connotations—the motto melds snugly with Johnson’s overriding ethical emphasis.

This one is taken from the epic by the Latin Silver Age poet, Statius: Thebaid, 6:400-401. Here is a prose (Loeb) translation of lines from Statius: “To stand still is torture; a thousand paces are wasted before the start, the heavy hoof strikes the absent flat.” Both the Spectator and Rambler were
aimed primarily at a literate, middle class audience. Many of the readers would have known Latin, but many would not—and even less would have known Greek. The classical motto may have been designed to lend an aura of intellectual prestige to the enterprise; nonetheless, some readers would require a translation. Therefore, lists with English translations were quickly produced, initially by James Elphinston in Scotland, with Johnson’s approval, in what is known as the Second Edition, or the Edinburgh Edition in six octavo volumes. Volume one of this edition, containing Nos. 1-26, was published with “The MOTTOS in English.” Little is known about the early relationship between Johnson and Elphinston. The two became friends, although the friendship was at times prickly. One of Johnson’s greatest letters is that to Elphinston dated 25 September 1750, occasioned by the death of the latter’s mother, a remarkable contribution to the genre of ethical consolation.

_Rambler_ 2 exemplifies an Elphinston translation that Johnson at least initially approved, but later had second thoughts about. It is virtually unrecognizable as Statius and is more properly a platitudinous verse paraphrase of the essay’s content rather than a precise translation: “Fond fleeting hope, with prospect ne’er destroy’d, / Roams ere she flies, defeated while enjoy’d.” In the Gentleman’s Magazine for September 1750 (the same month as Johnson’s letter of consolation), are printed translations of the mottoes for the first thirty _Ramblers_ (Tuesday 20 March 1750 to Saturday 30 June 1750). These are clearly from the Edinburgh edition, although this is not stated.

The next edition, in truth the third, although the great Johnson bibliographer David Fleeman denominates it the “Second London Ed.,” six volumes in duodecimo, appeared in 1752. This one also lists motto translations on a separate sheet at the end of the last volume. Here we discern a change—Johnson drops Elphinston’s fumbling verses and replaces them with two couplets from Alexander Pope:

Th’ impatient courser pants in every vein,
And _pawing_, seems to beat the distant plain,
Hills, vales, and floods appear already cross’d,
And ere he starts, a thousand steps are lost.

Then, in 1756, a new edition was published in four volumes. This is the last edition revised by personally by Johnson and served, controversially, as the copy-text for the _Yale Edition of the Works of Samuel Johnson_. Here is the appearance of the beginning of _Rambler_ 2 from this 4th edition. We see that instead of placing them on a sheet apart, the translation is directly appended to the motto. This will become the standard procedure for all succeeding editions of the Johnson’s periodical essays in which translations are provided.

Perhaps you will allow me to pause and ask a question. Do we have any Pope readers in the room? Does anyone notice anything provocative about the Pope translation? It in fact appears not to be a translation at all but part of an original poem by Pope, _Windsor Forest_. It was published on 7 March 1713, but this is from a transcript of his 1712 MS. Robert M. Schmitz _Pope’s
Johnson was a mentor famously generous to younger authors. He helped John Hawkesworth launch a periodical series, *The Adventurer*, patterned closely upon the *Rambler*, which he vigorously promoted and to which he contributed approximately twenty-nine essays, as well as many of the mottoes (Bibliography, 1:338; Life, 1:253, n. 2). In one of the essays he penned, No. 45, he recurs to the Statius passage, where Johnson does the same thing again. He offers the same lines from Pope as a translation. What’s going on here? Why did Johnson use a passage from an original poem to supply a translation for a Latin poet, not once but twice, in 1750 and again 1753?

In 1751, seven years after Pope’s death, William Warburton, his friend and apologist, edited a nine-volume edition of Pope’s works. In it, of course, *Windsor Forest* was included. Here is the note Warburton appended to 1.151:

These lines Mr. Dryden, in his preface to his translation of Fresnoy’s *Art of painting*, calls *wonderfully fine*, and says *they would cost him an hour, if he had the leisure to translate them, there is so much of beauty in the original*; which was the reason, I suppose, why Mr. P. tried his strength with them.

So, the *Windsor Forest* passage is in fact a translation of the lines from Statius’ *Thebaid*. According to Pope’s bibliographer, Reginald Harvey Griffith, the Warburton edition appeared in June of that year. During the following year, the 2nd London edition of the *Rambler* began appearing in January 1752, and the sixth volume, containing a list of translations at the end that first used the *Windsor Forest* lines, was advertised in July 1752 in the *Gentleman’s Magazine* (Courtney and Smith, 33; Poems, 138). Johnson also refers to the Warburton edition later in his *Lives of the Poets* (1779-81) some four times (once in the “Life of Tickell” and three times “Life of Pope”). So, it is most likely that he read Warburton’s note and that it influenced his decision to use the lines from *Windsor Forest* in the 2nd London edition.

In addition to identifying the lines as a classical translation, Warburton goes on to make an important point: Dryden’s offhand comment spurred Pope to do what his poetic master disdained or neglected. The Dryden/Pope relationship is one of classic examples of what I call elsewhere call symbolic mentoring. The Warburton note exhibits a pregnant and representative example of the phenomenon, for it combines the energies or respect and emulation with those of agon and competition that complexly mark these sorts of relationships.

Here is the original passage from Dryden that Warburton refers to, from the preface (“Parallel of Poetry and Painting”) to his 1695 translation of
Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy’s 1668 *De Arte Graphica* (“The Art of Painting”), undertaken amidst his great Virgil translation:

But Virgil knew how to rise by degrees in his expressions; Statius was in his towering heights at the first stretch of his Pinions. The description of his running Horse, just starting in the funeral games for Archemorus, though the verses are wonderfully fine, are the true image of their author—

\begin{quote}
Stare adeo nescit, pereunt vestigia mille
Ante fugam; absentemque ferit gravis ungula campum,
\end{quote}

which would cost me an hour, if I had the leisure to translate them, there is so much of Beauty in the Original.

Johnson was familiar with the passage; he quotes it in the 1755 *Dictionary of the English Language*, under “fustian”:

\begin{quote}
FU'STIAN. adj. [from the noun.]
1. Made of fustian.
2. Swelling; unnaturally pompous; ridiculously tumid. Used of stile.
\end{quote}

Virgil, if he could have seen the first verses of the Sylvæ, would have thought Statius mad in his fustian description of the statue on the brazen horse. (Dryden’s Dufresnoy)

Incidentally, W. K. Wimsatt, reports that Johnson quotes 157 times from Dryden’s Preface to Dufresnoy, a total that, moreover, represents roughly 38% of the 415 illustrations taken in all from the 1695 Dufresnoy. My own analysis shows that Johnson’s Dictionary quotations from the passage in which Dryden’s citing of Statius is embedded include (at least) seventeen entries—that is, just under 11% of all the examples from the Preface. Based upon the evidence found in the Dictionary, the stretch of prose surrounding the Statius lines compellingly commanded Johnson’s attention.

He refers to it again, more than two decades later, in his “Life of Dryden”:

His [Dryden’s] comparison of the first line of Virgil with the first of Statius is not happier. Virgil, he says, is soft and gentle, and would have thought Statius mad if he had heard him thundering out

\begin{quote}
Quæ superimposito moles geminata colosso.
\end{quote}

Statius perhaps heats himself, as he proceeds, to exaggerations somewhat hyperbolical; but undoubtedly Virgil would have been too hasty if he had condemned him to straw for one sounding line.
Virgil was an important symbolic mentor to Statius. The first line of the Statius quotation used by Pope and Johnson is in fact a misquotation: it includes a substitution of Statius’ original words with those from *Georgics*, 3:84, *stare loco nescit*. What we witness here is a case of what might be called, to borrow a Freudian term, textual over-determination, a small literary site in *Rambler* 2 that is densely saturated with several literary voices. Johnson is implicated in this phenomenon, for he at once observes, absorbs and redeployes these intricate intertextual veins in his own work in the *Rambler*, the *Dictionary*, and elsewhere.

So where does all this leave us? What are we to make of these intertextual intersections? This is where the notion of entanglement might become useful. I take the word “entanglement” and concept from quantum physics:

Physics. A correlation between the states of two separate quantum systems such that the behaviour of the two together is different from the juxtaposition of the behaviours of each each considered alone.

(*OED*)

I use the term metaphorically here. Quantum systems = individual texts. This metaphor suggests that the relationships between texts, or paratexts, fragments from larger textual systems—i.e., a motto, a *Dictionary* quotation, couplets from a poem—operate through dynamic and interactive exchanges. In the case of the motto to *Rambler* 2 and Pope’s *Windsor Forest* lines, we see a reciprocal relationship, in which the reading of one influences our reading of the other, and vice versa. We see in the motto Johnson’s recognition of an intertextual influence by Statius upon Pope, as well as the intricate cross-hatchings of all the other authors we have identified—Dryden, Virgil, etc.

As Derrida has observed, “each grafted text continues to radiate back toward the site of its removal, transforming that, too, as it affects the new territory”\textsuperscript{18} This suggests that we apprehend Pope’s couplets in a new way, through their entanglement with Johnson’s text. We are invited to consider the importance of Pope’s relationships with both Statius and Dryden as symbolic mentors, in both the construction of his career and the crafting of his verse. Likewise, we read Johnson differently as well. *Rambler* 2’s motto reverberates not only throughout the essay but autotextually across Johnson’s oeuvre—the *Dictionary*, the *Adventurer*, the *Lives of the Poets*, etc. In *Rambler* 2, the pawing coursers connote Johnson’s enthusiasm for his periodical essay series, as he stands at the threshold of its inception, making “a new entrance into the lettered world” (*Yale Works*, 3:13). The threshold is Janus-like, however, for it looks back to earlier writers, and prepares the reader for the quotations and allusions soon to come: Horace (twice), Epictetus, and Cervantes emerge later in the paper. If, as Johnson informs us, “the natural flights of the human mind are not from pleasure to pleasure, but from hope to hope” (*ibid.*, 3:10), his practice requires that the creative endeavors of the present and the expectations of the future must be thoroughly grounded in the wisdom of the past, within the cultural heritage of ancient Greece and Rome, as well as the European Renaissance. This, I think, is the ultimate meaning of his famous remark from...
the last paragraph of this essay, “men more frequently require to be reminded than informed” (ibid., 3:14). That is, Johnson’s entire Rambler collection can be profitably read as a majestic and sweeping effort to collect the best that has been thought and written from antiquity through the early eighteenth century and to present it as a monumental compendium to his contemporary audience and for posterity.

Considering intertextual relationships in this light, through the paratext of the motto, I think, allows us to better understand T. S. Eliot’s famous remark, no poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. … What happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it. The existing monuments form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them. The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the whole existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered; and so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted; and this is conformity between the old and the new. 19

The paratextual and intertextual entanglements we are observing encourage to read texts in new ways, not as self-contained, isolated monads but rather as points of articulation within larger networks of interconnection and dynamic interaction. As Herman Meyer has observed, “in general it might be maintained that the charm of the quotation emanates from a unique tension between assimilation and dissimilation: it links itself closely with its new environment, but at the same time detaches itself from it, thus permitting another world to radiate into the self-contained world of the novel.” 20

Meyer’s “radiation” is itself entangled in Derrida’s remark that the “grafted text radiates back”: the two comments operate reciprocally, moving from text to intertext and intertext to text in a revolving oscillation that both exemplifies and illuminates the creation of intertextual meaning. If taken in its totality—impossible for the mortal mind—the entanglements radiating amongst all the texts in literary history constitute a vast vibrant universe, an intertextual totality where such paratexts as the Rambler motto and the Dictionary quotation afford brief, if tantalizing, glimpses of sub specie aeternitatis.

A question that might come to mind at this point is this: was Johnson aware of the intertextual field that I am suggesting here? I have tried to make the case frequently in the past decade or so that he possessed an acutely intertextual sensibility, although he would not have recognized the concept in quite the same way as I do. So, the answer would be a qualified yes, but one possessing a much more restrictive sense. See, for example, this quotation from the Preface to the Dictionary: “I have sometimes, though rarely, yielded to the temptation of exhibiting a genealogy of sentiments, by showing how one authour the thoughts and diction of another.” (Yale Works, 18:98). In my work, I have found that the adverb “rarely” to be a rather large understatement.
I have found many instances of these intertextual genealogies throughout his body of work, as well as in the *Dictionary*.

Let me conclude with two examples of genealogies from the *Dictionary*, found in the entries for “Dispeople/Dispeopler” and “Whistle.” Augustan poet John Gay dedicated his poem *Rural Sports* to his recently acquired friend Alexander Pope in 1713; the title page in his 1720 version commemorates the friendship, “A Georgic: Inscribed to Mr. Pope.” This inscription, and the subsequent prefatory lines, indicate that Gay was generically following the tradition of Virgil’s *Georgics* and Pope’s *Windsor Forest* (itself an English georgic). *Rural Sports* was originally published in January 1713 and was republished in a revised form later that year. Gay read the 1712 *Windsor Forest* MS we noted earlier, and incorporated allusions from it into his own poem. Inspection of Johnson’s *Dictionary* reveals some of these assimilations:

*Dictionary*: Dispeople:
Kings, furious and severe,
Who claim’d the skies, dispeopled air and floods,
The lonely lords of empty wilds and woods.  (Pope)

*Dictionary*: Dispeopler:
Nor drain I ponds, the golden carp to take;
Nor trowle for pikes, dispeoplers of the lake. (Gay)

Because of grammatical necessity (one involving a verb, the other a noun), Johnson separated the two passages; yet he directly positioned them so that the resemblance between them becomes rather obvious. Neither Gay nor Pope’s twentieth-century editors noted the congruence; but they would have had they consulted Johnson’s *Dictionary* for this unusual word, “dispeople.” Gay’s (*Rural Sports*, ll.263-64) allusion to Pope is apt, for the latter’s verses (*Windsor Forest*, ll.46-48) denominate tyrants who despoil the landscape and human cities. Gay’s pike is analog to the ancient English kings, as this passage from *The Compleat Angler* (pt. 1, ch. 8)—quoted, incidentally, in the *Dictionary* under “pickerel-weed” and one consulted by Gay for his piscatory research,—makes clear: “The luce or pike is the tyrant of the fresh waters; they are bred, some by generation, and some not; as of a weed called pickerel-weed, unless Gosner be mistaken.” But the two entries also suggest a backward extension of the genealogy. Immediately preceding the Pope quotation in the “dispeople” entry we find: “His heart exalts him in the harm / Already done, to have dispeopled heav’n” (Milton). This of course is from *Paradise Lost* (7:150-51), describing the original and type of the tyrant, Satan. Not only did Johnson discern the connection between Pope and Gay, he provides an intertext that operates as the source for both. It is thus evident that, used in a way that carefully examines the authorities it exhibits, the *Dictionary* enables us to make discoveries of influence that enhances our apprehension of the richness and intertextual density of these passages.

Speaking of Milton, let us take one last look at the *Dictionary*, the entry for “whistle” (v.n.) (def. 1), where we find these passages:
While the plowman near at hand
Whistles o’er the furrow’d land. (Milton)

The ploughman leaves the task of day,
And trudging homeward whistles on the way. (Gay)

The similarity between “L’Allegro” (ll.63-64) and Rural Sports (ll.91-92) indicate direct influence, apparently one that caught Johnson’s eye—and so too should catch ours as well. The two whistling plowmen and the context of the walk on a spring or spring-like day found in both quotations suggest that Gay takes Milton as his intertext. That both couplets are immediately followed by dairy scenes, Milton’s “milkmaid … blithe” and Gay’s “stroakings of the damsel’s hand,” strongly support the identification. The Dictionary entry for “whistles” thus suggests the importance of Milton as one of Gay’s precursors—something, again, that Gay’s Oxford editor did not recognize.

In conclusion, this presentation recommends that Johnson’s Dictionary may be understood to operate as a versatile instrument in the tool box of literary scholarship, a repository of literary creativity in its own right, quite apart from its more obvious lexicographical functions. And it also urges that paratextual elements such as quotations, mottoes, and allusions and the intertextual network in which they cohere be taken more seriously as sites of literary and critical power. My work suggests that Johnson deploys these connections in his writings in ways that demonstrate his intertextual mastery of the Western tradition as well as his creative use of this tradition to offer new contributions, perhaps in a way that T. S. Eliot would recognize and approve, had he deigned to burrow with the mole-like tenacity that I pursue. But this is, if I may be permitted my own intertextual allusion, to compare small things to great. Thank you.
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Notes

1. This is a talk that was delivered to the Washington Area Group for Print Culture Studies at the Library of Congress on 17 November 2017. I would like to thank the group organizers, Sabrina Baron and Eleanor Shevlin, for their kind invitation to speak.


3. The other three are architextuality, or the relation of texts to larger modes and genres; metatextuality, or commentary upon a text (e.g., literary criticism); and hypertextuality, or the deliberate reworking of a previous text (e.g., pastiche).


7. See Bruce Redford’s remarks, Letters, 1:x-xi.
8. See Letters, 1:58: “I think many very happily performed.”
12. Indeed, Walter Harte (1709-74) Pope’s younger friend used these lines in his Thebaid translation (Poems on Several Occasions [1727, 138, 213-14]). It is possible that Warburton based his note upon this passage.
17. Furthermore, a change made in the Rambler to the Latin of Statius as found in Dryden’s Preface demonstrates how closely Johnson read the text there. The first three words in Dryden’s quotation differ conspicuously from the Latin normally shown in editions of Statius from the late fifteenth century until the present day, where the verse, Thebaid, 6:400, begins with the words stare adeo miserum est (in literal translation “to stand still is distressing indeed”). Dryden wrote Stare adeo nescit (again literally, “to stand still it indeed knew not how”), which, as Edmund Malone was apparently the first to comment upon in print (See The Critical and Miscellaneous Prose Works of John Dryden, ed. Edmond Malone, 4 vols. [London, 1800], 4:344-45), was a contamination of Statius’ text with Virgil, Georgics, 3:84, stare loco nescit (also said there of a restless horse). Johnson evidently noticed a discrepancy and silently emended Dryden’s text by replacing the adeo that had survived from Statius with Virgil’s loco. As the wording of the Latin is not exactly reflected in Pope’s Windsor Forest, it is impossible to say now why Johnson did not remove the fragment from Virgil entirely and restore the original text—whether he too misremembered (or, at least in part, trusted to Dryden’s
memory) or whether he merely preferred for aesthetic reasons to keep the three words from the *Georgics* rather than use Statius’ three elisions in four words. Whatever the case, considerable thought was clearly put into the *Rambler* 2 motto.


“I am never with this man without feeling myself bettered & rendered happier.”

by Linda E. Merians

My title quotes a note Boswell wrote in his *London Journal* in June 1763, just weeks after he met Johnson.1 This sentiment expresses perfectly how I felt when I had the pleasure of being with John Radner. Like so many of you, I admired John both as a person and as a scholar. John went deeper than anyone else ever has into the Johnson-Boswell friendship. Thankfully for us and future generations of eighteenth-century scholars, John was not in a rush to proclaim or to publish. His work is persuasive and authoritative because he wisely let it take the time it needed. Its depth relied on both his coming to rich understanding of both figures and his own knowledge of family relations, the human, and, perhaps more specifically, the male psyche. Above all, John’s work is humane and authentic.

As John explored and exposed the dynamics of this curious relationship, he listened in the way an analyst does—to Boswell and Johnson through their texts, their letters and journals. John also listened to us, considering our responses to his papers at EC/ASECS and other gatherings and weighing notes he exchanged electronically with many of us here today. For example, the following is an excerpt from an email he wrote to me on April 29, 2009 after contemplating notes I sent him about his earliest chapters. Talking about the summer of 1763:

I think you’re right that Johnson did not find Boswell a “friend” at this point; and one of the questions I want to consider in a paper I’m giving at Houghton this summer, focusing on SJ’s early letters to Bennet Langton, Robert Chambers and Boswell, is at what point and in what ways he found each a “friend” rather than simply a mentee. For Boswell this came in June 1771.2

Had John not attended Harvard, had he not had the famed Walter Jackson Bate as his teacher, would he have written his Honors Thesis on Johnson’s religion?
Bate left a positive mark on John, as we learn in the introduction of John’s *Johnson and Boswell: A Biography of Friendship*

[his] “presence inspired all the students in a graduate seminar on Johnson to surpass ourselves, and then my reading his masterly *Samuel Johnson* (1977), confirmed his role as a key reader of anything I would write about Johnson. Throughout this project, I have been collaborating with Bate, and also competing: seeking originality without rejecting his hard-earned, brilliant, movingly expressed insight concerning Johnson’s character and life.”

John’s use of the word “competing” in his praise of Bate is not accidental. Feelings of competitiveness fascinated John; he explores it throughout his work on Boswell and Johnson and, as you will hear at the conclusion of my paper, he pondered it in relation to his own life.

We revere Bate’s biography now, but let’s remember that when it was published its daringness was questioned by some. In a long 1978 review, Frederick Troy, calls the biography “the most searching, detailed and comprehensive study of Johnson since Boswell and probably, as well, the most important.” Yet, then he wrote:

Bate’s methods and assumptions in attempting to write a kind of psychobiography are as important and as open to challenge as the conclusions to which they lead. And I believe that not all serious students of Johnson will agree fully with either. A strongly subjective tone can be felt throughout: the book is clearly a labor of love, a product of many years of study and reflection; it is infused with deep personal feeling and conviction, and one sense a strong identification between the author and his subject.

Wrestling with how to engage and employ one’s own instincts and life experiences is sometimes a struggle for all who engage in biographical work.

Where can what we know about life inform our work so that it becomes truer and deeper than the facts? I recently read Richard Holmes’s *This Long Pursuit: Reflections of a Romantic Biographer* (2016). You’ll remember that Holmes is the author of *Dr. Johnson and Mr. Savage* (1993). In the opening pages of his new book, Holmes describes his practice of keeping a “Two-Sided Notebook”:

It seems to me that a proper research notebook must always have a form of ‘double accounting’. There should be a distinct, conscious divide between the objective and the subjective sides of the project. This meant keeping a double-entry record of all research as it progressed (or, as frequently, digressed). Put schematically, there must be a right-hand side and a left-hand side to every notebook page spread.

On the one (the right) I would record the objective facts of my subject’s life, as minutely and accurately as possible (from the letters, the diaries, the memoirs, the archives). But on the other (the left) I would
also record my most personal responses, my feelings and speculations, my questions and conundrums, my difficulties and challenges, my travels and my visions. Irritation, embarrassment, puzzlement or grief could prove as valuable as excitement, astonishment, inspiration, or enthusiasm. The cumulative experience of the research journey, of being in my subject’s company over several years, thus became part of the whole biographical enterprise. Only in this way, it seemed to me, could I use, but also hope to master, the biographer’s most valuable but perilous weapon: empathy.5

Holmes’s point about empathy prompted me to think about John and his work, not only because of the empathy he felt for Johnson, but also because of how deeply he felt it for Boswell. The following might be stating the obvious, but it must be said: had John not had such empathy for Boswell, he would not ever have come as close as he did to understanding Johnson and his desire for friendship with the troubled Scottish young man!

I think part of what attracted John to the Boswell/Johnson relationship was the sense of hope that the friendship lent to each man. It is easier to see this from Boswell’s side. His London Journal records his eagerness to meet Johnson. When their relationship was on a good initial foundation, as it was by June 14, 1763, we can sense Boswell’s elation. This is when he wrote the line I’m using as the title of my talk: “I am never with this man without feeling myself bettered & rendered happier.”

Those first heady encounters gave Boswell tremendous hope that some of his knottiest issues could reach resolution. For example, on June 25, 1763, Boswell and Johnson were both at Clifton’s and then they went to the Mitre Tavern in Fleet Street. This was the night when Boswell “told my history to Mr. Johnson, which he listened to with attention.” Boswell reports Johnson as saying: “Give me your hand. I have taken a liking to you” (Pottle, 283). Later in the conversation, Boswell told Johnson about his difficulties with his father, and he perceived Johnson taking his side, which was what he wanted and needed: “your father has been wanting to make the man of you at twenty which you will be at thirty” and “a father and a son should part at a certain time of life. I neve believed what my father said. I always thought that he spoke ex officio, as a priest does.”6 That Johnson agreed to mentor Boswell, to give him a plan, gave him hope that someday his father would be proud of him and, as crucially, that he might be able to control some of his baser instincts and emotional tendencies. One wonders if he had Johnson’s proclamation about friendship, “Life has no pleasure higher or nobler than that of friendship,” in mind when he wrote on July 7, 1763: “True friendship is a noble virtue. None but finer souls can possess it. I am very happy in that respect.”7

Friendship was a noble pursuit for Johnson, but it was also a necessary one. It gave him hope. It kept his mind engaged in a positive fashion, and in so doing it helped him chase away the dark melancholy that dogged him throughout his life. The number of times John explored the theme of melancholy in his book, articles, and papers suggests that he was deeply curious and moved by these discussions (be they oral, epistolary, or formal
prose). Melancholy linked Boswell and Johnson and, perhaps, it was one of the qualities that framed their friendship, which helped to move them from mentor/mentee to friends.

In relation to melancholy, Johnson believed that most men were, as he called it, “distressed by that malady.”* The Life of Samuel Johnson demonstrates Boswell’s understanding of Johnson’s suffering; he writes with compassion of Johnson’s bout when he was in his 20’s:

The ‘morbid melancholy’, which was lurking in his constitution, and to which we may ascribe those particularities, and that aversion to regular life, which, at a very early period marked his character, gathered such strength in his twentieth year, as to afflict him in a dreadful manner. While he was at Litchfield, in the college vacation of the year 1729, he felt himself overwhelmed with an horrible hypochondria, with perpetual irritation, fretfulness, and impatience; and with a dejection, gloom, and despair, which made existence misery. From this dismal malady he never afterwards was perfectly relieved; and all his labours, and all his enjoyments, were but temporary interruptions of its baleful influence. (Evans, 22-23)

In the same conversation, Boswell recounts that Johnson admitted that at this time of his life he “did not then know how to manage it,” which puts into context the advice Johnson gave Boswell when he first raised the subject on July 22, 1763, still very early in their friendship:

I complained to Mr. Johnson that I was much afflicted with melancholy, which was hereditary in our family. He said that he himself had been greatly distressed with it, and for that reason had been obliged to fly from study and meditation to the dissipating variety of life. He advised me to have constant occupation of mind, to take a great deal of exercise, and to live moderately; especially to shun drinking at night. “Melancholy people,” said he, “are apt to fly to intemperance, which gives a momentary relief but sinks the soul much lower in misery.” He observed that laboring men who work much and live sparingly are seldom or never troubled with low spirits. It gave me great relief to talk of my disorder with Mr. Johnson; and when I discovered that he himself was subject to it, I felt that strange satisfaction which human nature feels at the idea of participating distress with others; and the greater person our fellow sufferer is, so much the more good does it do us. (Pottle, 319)

Throughout their conversations and letters, we can see that Johnson consistently gave Boswell advice about coping strategies. In March 1776, for example, Boswell and Johnson went to Oxford to visit with Mr. Scott, who was not in residence. Therefore, the two sat together that evening at the Angel Inn and talked about melancholy, among other subjects. Johnson described his cure: diversion:
A man so afflicted, Sir, must divert distressing thoughts, and not combat with them. Boswell. May not he think them down, Sir. Johnson. No, Sir. To attempt to think them down is madness. He should have a lamp constantly burning in his bed-chamber during the night, and if wakefully disturbed, take a book, and read, and compose himself to rest. To have the management of the mind is a great art, and it may be attained in a considerable degree by experience and habitual exercise. (Evans, 276)

On their return to London on March 28, 1776, Boswell steered the discussion back again to melancholy, prompting Johnson to remark.

Some men, and very thinking men too have not those vexing thoughts. Sir Joshua Reynolds is the same all the year round. Beauclerk, except when ill and in pain, is the same. But I believe most men have them in the degree in which they are capable of having them. If I were in the country, and were distressed by that malady, I would force myself to take a book; and every time I did it I should find it the easier. Melancholy, indeed, should be diverted by every means but drinking. (Evans, 293)

Johnson did not hesitate to slap Boswell down when he thought his friend was giving in to melancholy. In a letter to Boswell written on April 8, 1780, Johnson fumed:

You are always complaining of melancholy, and I conclude from these complaints that you are fond of it. No man talks of that which he is desirous to conceal, and every man desire to conceal that of which he is ashamed. Do not pretend to deny it: *manifestum habemus furem*; make it an invariable and obligatory law to yourself, never to mention your own mental diseases; if you are never to speak of them, you will think on them but little, and if you think little of them, they will molest you rarely. When you talk of them, it is plain that you want either praise or pity; for praise there is no room, and pity will do you no good; therefore, from this hour speak no more, think no more, about them.9

A few years later in another letter, dated December 24, 1783, Johnson was less loquacious: “Of the exaltations and depressions of your mind you delight to talk, and I hate to hear. Drive all such fancies from you” (Redford, 4: 262). Johnson had tremendous fear of losing himself to melancholy, which would, he was sure, lead to another breakdown. Bate’s premise is that Johnson had two significant breakdowns caused by melancholy, the second being in 1764, which served as a mid-life warning of sorts.10 In *Meditations*, which Boswell cites in the *Life*, Johnson famously wrote of this period, “This is not the life to which heaven is promised” (Evans, 131). Boswell describes this period in the *Life*:

He was so ill, as, notwithstanding his remarkable love of company, to be entirely averse to society, the most fatal symptom of that malady. Dr. Adams told me, that, as an old friend, he was admitted to visit him, and
that he found him in a deplorable state, sighing, groaning, talking to himself, and restlessly walking from room to room. He then used this emphatical expression of the misery which he felt: “I would consent to have a limb amputated to recover my spirits.”

Perhaps Johnson was so afraid because he had seen the ruinous impact of what happened when melancholy takes one to an even darker path. Recall his recollection of William Collins, as it appears in *Lives of the Poets*:

> The latter part of his life cannot be remembered but with pity and sadness. He languished some years under that depression of mind which enchains the faculties without destroying them, and leaves reason the knowledge of right without the power of pursuing it. . . . Such was the fate of Collins, with whom I once delighted to converse, and whom I yet remember with tenderness.

I wonder also if Johnson’s memory of Richard Savage is relevant? Johnson’s cautions over the years to Boswell about melancholy suggest the depth of his friendship for him.

To conclude, I want to return to John Radner’s personal life and one of his own deep friendships. John had a close friend who struggled with mental illness and emerged from it to find some level of serenity, which is probably the best any of us can hope for. I think this friendship gave John tremendous insight, not only about himself but also about the malady that cemented the Johnson-Boswell friendship. After John’s death, I found an obituary he had written about his friend and Harvard roommate, Paul Myron. They had known each other in high school, but did not become close until they moved to Cambridge. Paul died in 2012, and at his funeral John described this time in their friendship: “we became close only as roommates in college, coping together with the social and academic challenges of Harvard, constantly measuring ourselves against each other. Paul was always deeper delving than I.”

As John describes him, Paul had a hard life; he experienced bi-polar episodes at Harvard and subsequently throughout his life. Yet he became a psychoanalyst, engaged in his passion for music, and carried on. Due to his manic-depressive disorder, Paul had to retire early, and it was then that he found things that brought him satisfaction. When Paul turned 60, John noticed that Paul’s tendency to aggressiveness waned, and he was, as John wrote, “more at ease, more accepting of all he had done--and not done.” In his obituary, John goes on to explain that, when they met in these later years, it was with much less tension: “we could better appreciate Paul’s insightfulness, informed comments, his humor, his astute assessments of others and his openness in expressing emotions, his strong attachment to people and books that fully engaged him, his generosity and gentleness.” This description of Paul is very Johnsonian, and also so very John Radnerian, both in its truthfulness and its positive framing of a difficult life.
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6. See above. These quotations can be found in a list Boswell recorded on June 25, Pottle, 284.
10. W. Jackson Bate, Samuel Johnson (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977). See chapter 8, where Bates explores Johnson’s first breakdown after he left Oxford in December 1729. At the end of chapter 20, where Bates introduces the subject of Johnson’s second breakdown, he writes that in January 1764, Johnson was “rapidly entering a psychological crisis in which all that he had most dreaded in his past seemed at least to be catching up with him” (p. 366). Bates devotes chapter 21 to a discussion of one of the darkest periods in Johnson’s life.
11. In light of his own bouts with depression, it is interesting to see that Boswell describes period in Johnson’s life when he “was afflicted with a very severe return of the hypochondriak disorder, which was ever lurking about him” (Life of Johnson, Evans, 132).
13. John’s tribute to Paul can be found at http://www.harvard60.org/myron.pdfs.
A Tale of a Tub on the Roman Index: Further Evidence

by Hermann J. Real

A Tale of a Tub, Jonathan Swift’s first succès de scandale, was published on 10 May 1704 but was placed on the Index librorum prohibitorum as late as 17 May 1734. While it is not surprising that the Congregazione dell’Indice (Index Congregation) reacted to what it would have felt to be a painful thorn in the Church’s flesh, one does wonder why it seems to have taken some 30 years to realize this. The explanation is more complicated than has been assumed so far.

As Sybil Goulding surmised in her pioneering monograph on the influence of Swift in France almost a century ago, the Index Congregation’s response was not to the Tale’s editio princeps of 1704, but to its first French translation, Le Conte du Tonneau, by the French-writing Dutch journalist and man of letters Justus van Effen (1684-1735). The first edition of Le Conte du Tonneau was brought out by The Hague publisher Henri Scheurleer in two volumes in 1721, followed by a second “edition” in 1732, also by Scheurleer, and ostensibly in time for the Index Congregation to have responded by 1734; together these were the first titles to disseminate knowledge of the Tale more widely on the Continent. After all, as the language of international diplomacy and that of many Francophone Continental courts and principalities, French was the lingua franca of the time. Accordingly, the members of the Index Congregation, as a rule all cardinals assisted by secretaries and administrators, tended to focus on publications in Latin, French, and Italian, while ‘marginal’ languages like Spanish, German, and English would be largely ignored. The archives of the Congregazione dell’Indice, which have to be distinguished from those of the Holy Office, “its little sister,” and which are housed in the Vatican Library, have more recently been opened to qualified researchers by the decision of Pope Benedict, himself originally a scholar, and this has made it possible to clarify some of the ‘facts’ surrounding the Tale’s being placed on the Roman Index.

For one thing, the Index Congregation’s response was not as dilatory as it seems. New archival material makes it certain that one of its members took offence at van Effen’s first edition of Le Conte du Tonneau of 1721 and decided to make it an issue for the Congregation (I, 126-27). But we do not know exactly when this happened; in other words, when the (anonymous) member who denounced the work held a copy in his hands, whether he reacted spontaneously on receiving this copy, or whether his reaction was delayed. In fact, there are reasons to believe that proceedings may not have been opened against Le Conte du Tonneau before 1728 or 1729.

For another, while there is no evidence of when precisely in 1721 the first edition of Le Conte du Tonneau was published, given the fact that the first (appreciative) review encouraging sales appeared in the Boekzaal of March-May 1721 it seems safe to assume that publication occurred at some stage in the first quarter of 1721. Allowing for some months to travel from Holland to Italy, any initiative to ‘examine’ Le Conte du Tonneau with the intention to
have it eventually placed on the Index by the Pope, Clement XII, would perhaps be taken at the end of 1721 or the beginning of 1722 at the earliest, the terminus post quem.

Finally, the driving force in this case was Father Gianfrancesco Baldini (1677-1764), CRS (Ordo Clericorum Regularium a Somasca), a physicist, philosopher, and classical scholar by orientation and intent, who may have been commissioned, or have offered himself (III, 80), to report on Le Conte du Tonneau, because he seems to have had a good command of French. Father Baldini was appointed relator (“reporter, correspondent”) to the Congregazione dell’Indice on 27 January 1728 and promoted to the status of consultor (“Advisor”) on 1 February 1729. His first report for the Congregation, out of a total of seventeen, is dated 5 July 1728, a fact which explains not only the relatively long interval of more than a dozen years between the publication of van Effen’s translation in early 1721 and its public condemnation on 17 May 1734 but also why nothing seems to have happened in this case between 1721 and 1728 (III, 80-83). Obviously, Baldini could not have become active before he had been appointed relator. At the same time, his willingness to report on incriminated literature accounts for his prompt promotion to consultor, a common ‘reward,’ a year later (III, xv).

The Reverend Father delivered his report on Le Conte du Tonneau to the Index Congregation, in Latin, at its afternoon session in the Palazzo Apostolico del Quirinale on 11 January 1734. The session was presided over by its Prefect, Cardinal Giovanni Antonio Davia (1660-1740), and the Decretum was also signed and sealed by him: “In quorum fidem Manu & Sigillo Eminentiss[imi] ac Reverendiss[imi] D[omini] Cardinalis De Via, praedictae Sacrae Congregationis Praefecti, praesens Decretum signatum & munitum fuit.” Approximately two thirds of Baldini’s report dealt with the analysis and evaluation of the Tale, which comprised the first volume of van Effen’s translation, while the final third focused on the opera minora of the second, such as the Argument against Abolishing Christianity and Various Thoughts, Moral and Diverting.

Predictably, Baldini’s purpose was not benign. His concern was to club somebody whom he perceived to be his ‘enemy’ with his own ideological yardstick rather than to make an effort to understand him. In fairness, his presentation of the Tale’s religious allegory – the history of the Father’s will and the subsequent narrative of the three brothers – was remarkably clear and precise; it profited no doubt from the ‘explicative’ bias of van Effen’s translation, and it also paid grudging tribute here and there to the author’s subtlety and wit. But the Reverend Father also mistook what Swift had declared to be an exposition of “numerous and gross Corruptions” in three Christian churches for an outright attack on religion. More particularly, he took exception to the wilfully erratic and freakish behaviour of ‘Lord’ Peter, in whom he saw not only the Papacy and the Catholic Church represented (“in Petro repraesentari Romanum Pontificem, seu Romanam Ecclesiam”) but also its most sacred teachings, sacraments, and institutions held up to ridicule and excoriated (“risu exponit quod magis augustum, sanctum et venerabile apud nos”). Given this analysis, his verdict was inevitable: in one word, this English author by the name of Swift upturns the very foundations of Religion (‘nationale
Anglus, professione doctor, nomine Swift ... uno verbo, Religionem omnem a fundamentis convellit"). Consequently, Baldini, in his concluding sentence, implored his colleagues of the Index Congregation both to condemn any reading of the Tale as well as to ensure, as far as possible, that a dangerous work like this was kept away from the Italian shores (“rogare ausim non ut vetent ejusmodi librorum lectionem ... sed ut arceant a litoribus nostris, quantum fieri possit, tales libros, quorum lectio periculi plena est”).

The Reverend Fathers were apparently only too glad to adopt their advisor’s recommendation and prohibited Le Conte du Tonneau, a book, they declared, whose author rejected and ridiculed the Catholic religion and which therefore had to be forbidden (“in quo Autor fabulam fingit ut Catholicam Religionem confutet, et deridet. Quare Eminentiissimi Domini prohibendum decreverunt”). A bare four months later, on 17 May 1734, their Decretum was made public by means of a printed bando, a large broadsheet, which was nailed to the doors of some major Roman churches and subsequently forwarded to bishops and papal ambassadors (I, viii-ix, 126-27). If this story proves anything, it is that the Dean of St Patrick’s was eventually taken seriously by one of his most devoted adversaries, the Catholic Church.

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

Notes

7. For this and a great deal of the subsequent information, I am deeply indebted to two superb volumes Römische Bücherverbote: Edition der Bandi von Inquisition und Indexkongregation, 1701-1813, Römische Inquisition und Indexkongregation, Grundlagenforschung, I, eds Hubert Wolf, et al. (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 2009), vii-xv, xxix-xxxviii; Prosopographie von


“Not in the ESTC”

Despite Progress in the ESTC, OCLC Still an Important Supplement

I wish to update and supplement topics discussed in “Who Will Edit the ESTC? (And Have You Checked OCLC Lately?),” published in Analytical and Enumerative Bibliography, n.s. 12 (2001 [2002]), 288-304. With examples from Lyttelton, Smollett, and Young, I called attention to editions and issues not in the ESTC and also records for issues that were of the same edition but not so recognized. Also various classes of common oversights and errors were noted. Besides many minor collections, a number of major collections had not reported holdings to the ESTC. Several have now done so, with the U. of Edinburgh, including New College, adding 16,039 records and Princeton 15,000 for 1701-1800 to the ESTC, but even today many important collections have reported a small portion of their relevant holdings, such as Glasgow’s Mitchell Library (1478), the Victoria and Albert Museum National Art Library (1172), and the University of Newcastle (127)--by comparison, the National Library of Scotland (NLS) has 44,000 ESTC records for 1701-1800; the U. of Glasgow, 12,359; and the Folger, 16,094. In 2001 I stressed the value of supplementing the ESTC with other resources, especially OCLC’s WorldCat, because ESTC, without the grant funding formerly enjoyed, was not likely to gain records as frequently as OCLC.

Today I might add COPAC, which boasts the records of about 90 research libraries in Great Britain and Ireland (aside from National Library of Ireland [DN] and Trinity College [DT], Irish library records are rarely seen), but my searches thus far find it contains very little to add to ESTC and, as with OCLC, one is confronted with multiple records for the same edition and the filtering of what is printed on paper from other formats does not work well. What I found of value were not really new titles or even editions but added copy locations; however, many claims by libraries for printed copies turned
out to be e-texts: if the ESTC has three locations for a pamphlet and COPAC lists 16, or even if ESTC lists one location and COPAC adds universities in Cardiff, Manchester, and Leicester, one hesitates to inquire whether any printed copies are among these ghostly records, but COPAC did add a copy at Aberdeen U. for one record and another at Glasgow for a second rare edition. Certainly I would recommend supplementing the ESTC with bookselling websites on the internet, such as Abebooks, whose utility is demonstrated below, and such printed resources as L. W. Hanson’s *Contemporary Printed Sources for British and Irish Economic History 1701-1750* (1963) and David Foxon’s *English Verse 1701-1750* (1975).

The ESTC, which boasted 464,000 records around the end of August 2001, has now passed 500,000 records, with additions made in recent years by the BL, the Huntington, the NLS, and a handful of other research libraries. Though well over fifteen years have elapsed from my article in the once well-distributed *A&EB* journal, the ESTC records for editions that I cited usually have the same shortcomings today. Four of five rare editions of Edward Young’s works noted as held by research libraries but not in the ESTC (p. 297) are still not recorded. Multiple issues of the same edition (issues with varying places or dates but the same type-settings after the title-page) remain unconnected in ESTC (pp. 290-91). This past December I again considered the inclusiveness of ESTC records, while looking into records for early 18C Dublin printers.

The Dublin printer Cornelius Carter, who often used the initials “C.C.” on his imprints, sometimes with his address in the Post Office on Fishamble Street, printed at least a dozen extant items that are not recorded by the ESTC. These omissions and the failure to mark Carter’s role in recorded works reduce his place in the history of Dublin printing. For instance, if one looks up Carter or “C.C.” as publisher for 1713 in the ESTC, one finds nine records, but I can expand this to 15 by including periodicals that Carter published during 1713 but listed under other years and adding editions in the ESTC with Carter’s cut ornaments or other signs of his printing, partly distinctively poor typographical inventory and partly by the nature of the publication (such as its ideological slant). For example, one can identify as Carter’s: *The R-----r’s SPEFCH [sic] at Mr. B----se’s Convinticle [sic, for Conventicle] The Women and Children being withdrawn, by Order of Mr. B----se* (no imprint or cut off), ESTC T212769, 1-p. folio, sole copy at DN (on ECCO). ESTC knows of no imprint but gives [Dublin: n.s. 1713]. This seems the right date, for it is a satire of the Recorder John Foster in the fall election of the new Mayor, but ESTC wrongly gives Forster as the author. This mock speech has the speaker boast of having “broken every Trust Repos’d in me for your sake”—that is the Dissenters’ sake—presumably “B--se” is Rev. Joseph Boyse. The Recorder pleads, “Did not I then Refuse to undertake the Church’s Cause?” This broadside has Carter’s unframed factotum with seven flowers, tulips at top and sides and multi-petal flowers at corners. This ornament appears on p. 1 of the broadside *The Humble Address Of the Right Honourable the Lords . . . in Parliament Assembled, Presented to Her Majesty, On Tuesday the Eleventh Day of December, 1711* (T202697), giving Carter’s address before 1713
(used with his name, for instance in Wm. King’s *Vindication of the Reverend Dr. Henry Sacheverell from the False, Scandalous . . .* [“Re-printed in Dublin by C. Carter at the Old Post-Office in Fish-shamble-street,” 1711], T193236).

But there are also editions not listed in ESTC that Carter printed. Four can be found in David Foxon’s *English Verse 1701-1750* (1975)---

*The Great Hero, and the little one: or, a dialogue between Prince Eugene, and Marshall Boufflers, on the surrender of Lisle* (Dublin reprinted by C. Carter, 1708), Foxon G269, with title carried down from an Edinburgh edition of 1708, G268, also not in the ESTC (but in fairness to ESTC, it should be noted that ESTC has and Foxon lacks the London edition in 1708, T231553).


--*The Character of a Welsh-man, or, Poem in praise of St. David . . .* (D: Printed by C.C. [Cornelius Carter], 1721”); Foxon C126; OCLC 54165143.

--*A New Song, call’d the Twitcher. Which was sung by Mr. Layfield, at the Play-house the 29th of May last, 1721* (Dublin: C. Carter, 1721), Foxon N197.

These oversights in the ESTC encouraged me in late December to look for other Carter editions in OCLC’s WorldCat, where I found the following five editions (in some cases unrecorded titles) not in ESTC:

--*The Last Speeches and Dying Words, of John Riley, Alexander Bourk, Martin Carroll [et al.], . . . who were executed on the 26th of June, 1714.* (D: Pr. [sic] by C. Carter, 1714) in OCLC, citing 1 copy at C; 1 sheet, 34 x 21; OCLC: 79564941, entered 20020526;

--McCormock, Darby, et al. *The Last Speeches [sic] and Dying Words of Darby McCormock, James McManus; Hugh Ferloy, Edward McMahan, Anne Butler alias Morris; Rose Gorman and Sisly Burke, who are to be executed near St. Stephens-Green on Saturday the 12th instant, 1720* (Dublin Printed by C. Carter.” [1720]), N505407, sole copy at National Library of Scotland, in J. Crawford, *Bibliotheca Lindesiana*, #1196; dated at the end by “Tho. Foulks, Keeper in New-Gate” on “12th of March 2710 [sic].” OCLC no. 952161827; entered 20160524;

--*The Beaux Catechism . . .* (Dublin: Printed by C. C, 1724), broadside, with signature “Given at our Council chambers at Lucas’s May the 18th 1724. J. Foppington, W. Featherbrain, R. Cork-Head.” OCLC record 54147890.


--*Declaration of the bankers of Dublin, August 15, against importing and uttering the half pence or farthings coined by William Wood (“Dublin: Printed by C. C., 1724”);* sole copy at Columbia U. OCLC: 67775213; entered 2006.

As noted in my review below of Sabine Baltes-Ellermann’s *Jonathan
Swift’s Allies, there are other declarations of refusing Wood’s half-pence that are in OCLC but not in ESTC (the anthology includes some of these).

Of course, I also found that OCLC had copies not recorded in the ESTC of some rare recorded editions printed by Carter, many located in only a single library in ESTC. But OCLC locations must be treated suspiciously. Some records that are for “books” have false locations for libraries that, in fact, have only an e-copy (as the ECCO online copy). After I encountered about half a dozen copies at the U. of Minnesota for very rare Carter printings, copies not in ESTC, I checked the library’s online catalogue and found all but one were for e-copies (mostly ECCO). But the labor might have been worthwhile, for MnU adds a third copy to the two listed in ESTC for The Lord [John] Haversham’s Vindication of his Speech in Parliament, November 15. 1705” (1706), N18919. A better example of an important OCLC addition to the location record is The Humble Representation of the . . . Parliament Assembled, Presented to Her Majesty on Saturday the Tenth Day of February, 1710. With her Majesties most gracious Answer (London, printed: and re-printed at the Old Post Office in Fish-shamble street [1711]); for this edition, ESTC (T191002) only cites a copy at DT, but OCLC has a copy at McMaster U., in a record updated on 20160202 and linked to ESTC T191002.

Although OCLC has some titles printed by other early 18C Dublin printers and not listed in the ESTC, such as by Andrew Crooke, George Grierson, Gwyn Needham, and Elizabeth Sadleir, I have not expanded the known extant works printed by some others, such as Daniel Tompson. And oversights and errors will become all the rarer if corrections and addition are sent to the ESTC.

In some rare OCLC records, the cataloguer for an item not in the ESTC indicated “not in ESTC”; in several cases the edition has by now been added to the ESTC, but in many the tag is still accurate, and ESTC cataloguers would find about ten editions in OCLC to enter in ESTC were they to search by those keywords. These include items catalogued in the past decade by the Folger, Illinois, Oxford, Penn, and two by the U. of North Carolina including a reprint over 200 pp. long, The English Hero: or, Sir Francis Drake Reviv’d, attributed to Nathaniel Crouch (D: Printed by W. Wilmot for S. Fuller, 1727).

I conclude this section with some positive news, an article stressing recent additions to the ESTC. On 15 November 2015 Christine Love-Rodgers posted “Look, There’s a Libretto in the Library!” on New College Librarian, at libraryblogs.is.ed.ac.uk/ newcollege Librarian/ 2015/ 11/16/ look-theres-a-libretto-in-the-library. Love-Rodgers begins by noting New College Library has the rare first printing in England of the libretto of Handel’s Messiah not previously listed in the ESTC (though it was recorded in the College’s sheath catalogue dating back to 1936). It was catalogued “As part of the Funk Donation Project” by the college’s staff, which has identified many editions presently only recorded for New College. The project’s main cataloguer earlier in November had announced that the work seemed completed, with digital images of “their title-paged added to the University’s image database,” and that the project had recorded “hundreds of pamphlet which were unique to ESTC.” The resulting records have also been added to the COPAC catalogue.
Some Obscure and Faulty Early 18C London Printers

In a conference paper last summer (forthcoming in Reading Swift VII), I discussed how fragile the record is for what was printed in Dublin early in the 18C, how very few editions by some printers exist in more than a couple copies, implying that many likely printed are not extant. But while looking for little known London printers early in the century, I found that there is also a fragile or spotty record for what was printed in London, particularly for printing directed at the bottom of the market as those works sold by chapmen and street venders. In part the type of publication impacts survival, as I see with the printer D. Bridge--his books tend to survive in good numbers but many of his shorter publications are extant in two or fewer copies. But in some cases even the existence of a printshop is fragile knowledge. Was there a printer named D. Browne? Two 1704 imprints give “L: Printed by D. Browne,” one adding “in Bartholomew-Close” (T96202, 3 copies, 8vo, 8p, ECCO), the other being a broadside existing only at the Huntington (N31717, not ECCO). This is not the publisher Daniel Browne at the Black Swan without Temple Bar in 1705, nor is it likely to be the printer Daniel Browne active in 1742-1754. Rather he is someone recorded in Stationers’ Company records for printing illegally in 1702 an abridgment of the Book of Martyrs and another work beginning Observations in 1705 (A. Shell and A. Emblow, Index to the Court Books of the Stationers’ Company, 103-104) and several of his imprints appear around 1715. Moreover, we can’t be certain exactly when various publishers added or left the printing side of the business. One wonders whether a number of printers for whom the ESTC has but a single record are false imprints. In 1714, for instance, there are single editions for persons unrecorded in other years, as “J. Cuxon,” who might be an apprentice turned over from one master to another in 1717; an “N.N.,” and a “J. Carrett.” The last is all the more likely a mask as appearing on the imprint of a Whig satire Magdalen-Grove: or, a Dialogue between the Doctor and the Devil (the Devil mentions Swift as one of his agents). Sometimes we are on firmer ground because the named printer has long left the trade, as in To his M---y, the Loyal Address of the Tories (Printed by W. Davis, near Cornhill, n.d.), N71084, ESTC from Foxon gives range 1714-15, noting it satirizes Tory attitude to King George. This is the first (unlikely) W Davis imprint since 1689.

Scholars tend to see 18C editions by major printers of canonical authors, and one consequence of the scarcity of work by minor printers is that all London printing can seem more superior to provincial printing than it was. A broad search of London printers reveals many are faulty printers with poor equipment who produced work one might suppose was printed in Ireland or Scotland. One such printer is Andrew Hinde, about a dozen of whose works are on ECCO. He uses illustrative woodcuts in half a dozen pamphlets but doesn’t have cut headpieces, factotums ornamental initials and tailpieces and often employs rules of short pieces. He produced a number of eight-page octavos, some unpaginated and many crowding texts to fit a sheet. Misspellings are relatively common. He did in fact print a book in Dublin, misspelling it “Bublin” in the imprint. One late production misspells “February” as “Feburary” and “printed” as “prented.” The record of Hinde’s
output is sketchy. Of 25 ESTC records for works printed by Hinde, only one work is over a sheet in length, an 8vo in two sheets, known in 2 copies; 8 are folio broadsides, and 8 are half-sheets of 8vo. Moreover, of the 25, 16 exist in one copy, 8 in two, and 1 in three; thus, on average only 1.3 copies exist per edition (though two records for a single copy could be same edition).

Another faulty London printer with a fragile record is Daniel Pratt, a printer-publisher not apparently in the Stationers’ Company, active 1715-1731 at the same address, most fully given in a 1720 imprint as “at the Bible and Crown, at the Corner of Church-Lane, over against York-Buildings in the Strand, 1720.” ESTC for Pratt as publisher has 20 hits, of which there are a combined 45 copies; of the 20, there is but one copy of 11 editions; and but two copies of 3 others. The most is 7 for The Accomplish’d Lady’s Delight, a non-fiction based on Hannah Wooley, 10th ed. (for Daniel Pratt at the Bible and Crown against Hungerford Market in the Strand, 1719), 12mo, 190pp., with a generic frontispiece (a common feature of his editions); the next is 5 for The Life of Oliver Cromwe1. Pratt publishes much that is educational, many chapbooks and juvenile and easy fiction (much that others printed, too); many of these books have woodcut illustrations, sometimes used repeatedly in the same book, as in The English Rogue Revived (c. 1725); a few have cut ornaments (several are fragments—probably others’ discards—and some others have unconventional designs). But principally he (or his printers) relies on designs of cast-pieces. His booklist indicate much he published, if with his imprint, did not survive. The first imprints for Pratt reveal him as only a publisher; in 1720 and 1721 there are “printed and sold by” imprints; in 1723 there is only one “for” Pratt; then in 1724 occur two “Printed by D. Pratt” imprints and another probably occurs in 1726 though undated. There are still “printed for” imprints with other sellers in 1727-29, but the 1730 edition of Packe’s Mineralogia indicates he printed it for the author. Aside from one 4to and one 8vo, possibly printed by others, Pratt’s books are restricted to 12mos, a format less often preserved.

What Tends To Be Missing from ESTC, with Illustrations from Abebooks

The fragility of the bibliographical record of what was printed is affected by such considerations as geography, the success of the printers & publishers and authors involved, and the nature of the publications, their content and length, their readership, etc. Libraries and affluent collectors didn’t bother preserving some things, like newspapers, job printing, and ephemera. Some of this material has not been catalogued by ESTC but may well be found conserved in good measure. It should be remembered what the ESTC catalogues. Besides including all works printed in Britain and its territories, and all works printed elsewhere “wholly or partly in English or other British vernaculars,” ESTC includes “false imprints claiming publication in Britain or its territories in any language.” But as the BL/ESTC website also indicates: “Engraved music, maps, and prints are excluded; although atlases and texts which are fully engraved do appear in ESTC. Some other categories of material are excluded, for example trade cards, playbills and playing cards.”
One class of popular literature catalogued in the ESTC is devotional pamphlets and books, like the Established Church’s “A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving.” A search in 1701-30 for this exact title brings up 43 records: 28 for London, 13 Dublin, and 2 Edinburgh (both with no publisher: 1707 in 5 copies and 1716 in 3). The London editions are printed by the King’s printers and are almost all extant in over a dozen copies. The Dublin editions are mostly by King’s printer Andrew Crooke with sometimes a competitor, but, and here is one place geography matters, on average Dublin copies exist in no more than two copies. The liturgy for 16 June 1713 (for concluding a just peace) is printed by King’s printer Andrew Crooke and interloper Andrew Hinde, both existing in 1 copy; the London edition by John Baskett et al, exists in 43 copies; and the Dublin liturgy for 25 April 1723 (for protection against plague) printed in 8vo by Crooke, by C. Hicks, and by an unnamed interloper all are extant in one copy; while the London edition in 4to exists in 34. But all editions, even London editions, for some devotional publications have not been well preserved, probably in part because the titles were commonly reprinted. Most of the 36 editions dated 1701-30 of A Weeks Preparation towards receiving the Lord’s Supper typically exist in two or fewer copies. There were many comparable guides. Last year Abebooks listed an unrecorded edition of the best-selling devotional first published in 1673: Officium Eucharisticum: A Preparatory Service to a Devout and Worthy Reception of the Lord’s Supper by London divine Edward Lake, D.D., a chaplain to the Duke of York’s daughters: the 26th edition, “To which is added, a Meditation for every Day in the Week” (by Geo. James for Abel Roper, 1721), 12mo: pp. [viii], 160. That edition number is not an overestimation: ESTC records two copies each of 25th and 27th editions in 1716 and 1724. Presently Abebooks lists an uncut copy with the bookplate of the Earls of Macclesfield Library in Shirburn Castle John Jeffery, Forms of Prayer for the Morning and Evening, bound with his A Plain and Short Discourse Concerning the Last Supper, 2 vols. in 1 (L: J. Payne and J. Bouquet. 1751), separately paginated but bound together and advertising each other on their back pages. The sole editions in ESTC for these works are respectively Norwich 1706 and London 1699. For long little valued, much devotional material yet to be recorded is on Abebooks A Collection of Psalms and Hymns from Various Authors compiled by Thomas Robinson, 4th ed. (Leicester: J. Brown, 1795) and The Book of Common Prayer with a Psalter (Oxford: W. Jackson and A. Hamilton [1783?]), bound with a 1783 Bible by the same publishers, not in ESTC. Also The Whole Book of Psalms Collected into English Meter by Thomas Sternehold . . . (W. Pearson for Stationers Co., 1707), unpag., bound with a 1710 Book of Common Prayer.

Popular literature for the lower classes and the less literate often has disappeared (or isn’t recorded), making it hard to construct a history of reading as well as these genres. This reading class’s literature was shorter in length and less often bound, owned by people less able to protect paper against mold, mice, and worms, more apt to be in dire need of paper for the exigencies of life. (I myself have lost books to mold.) For instance, The Pleasures of the Single Life, attributed to Edward Ward and to Sir John Dillon, is recorded for 12 London editions 1701-09; some by major publishers like H. Hills exist in many copies but six (including four printed on half a sheet) exist in a single
copy; there are four editions in Dublin during the period, three extant in one copy and one in two. There are six editions printed in London 1700-1730 of The Famous Histories of Seven Champions of Christendom, attributed to Richard Johnson (d. 1659?), and five of these exist in three or fewer copies. The eight extant editions of Guy of Warwick printed in London 1701-30 are extant in an average of three copies. Many school books, primers, cookbooks and the like have not survived to judge from the extant copies of those that have—it is not difficult to own the only known copy of a Latin editions for students. Works not in English printed in 18C Great Britain are not quickly scooped up: Abebooks now offers Fénelon’s Les Aventures de Télémarque (London: Spilsbury, 1798) and a Welsh version of The Imitation of Christ as translated by Hugh Owen (Shrewsbury: Durston, 1737). Even with many collecting cookbooks, presently we find an unrecorded edition of Susanna Carter’s The Frugal Housewife, or Complete Woman Cook . . . to which are added Twelve New Prints (E. Newbury, c. 1795 but not the 1795 edition).

Survivals rates are low for English classics frequently reprinted later in the century, when these were often printed in provincial towns and Scotland, making it hard to assess the reputation and reception of even major authors. For Edward Young’s The Complaint or Night Thoughts, there are 29 editions in the ESTC for the 20 years following 1765, the year of his death. Eighteen of these 29 editions of what is a lengthy and revered work exist in four or fewer copies, several in single copies. Right now Abebooks lists unrecorded editions of such popular reprints as Elizabeth Rowe’s popular Devout Exercises of the Heart (London: B. Tooke, 1762), 8vo, 175pp.; Butler’s Hudibras (Edinburgh: J. Watson in Edinburgh 1797), 12mo, 304 pp.; and Fielding’s Amelia (for Harrison & Co., 1782, 4 pts in 299 [1] pp, bound with a Tom Jones with the same publisher and date. Piracies are often very rare (a number of the rare editions of Young’s Complaint are such). One piratical reprint on the market now is Cobbleriana. Consisting of Essays, Letters, &c. . . . By a Cobbler of Drury Lane (London: C. D. Piguenit, 1769), 2 vols. 12mo: [xxii], xxxii, 252; [xii] 261, [1], with frt. This is a knock-off of Cobbleriana . . . of Johnson, the Cobbler, of Drury Lane, also 2 vols (J. Wilkie, 1768), according to bookseller John Hawkes, with an epistolary novel in a “facetious style” in vol. 1 and poems & essays in vol. 2, and it precedes by a year the earliest imprint for Pequinet in the ESTC (dozens of editions follow)—though not in ESTC, OCLC records a copy at Berkeley.

Reissues with cancellars titles are frequently discovered to be unrecorded, sometimes because their publishers failed to survived, as seems the case with the reissue of Albert Durer Revived: or, a Book of Drawing, Limning, Washing, or Coloring of Maps and Prints (for Thomas Glass, 1731), folio, with frt portrait of Albrecht Dürer, title-page, and 19 full-page engraved illustrations. ESTC has only a 1730 imprint listing “T. Glass” as a seller (The Art of Painting in Miniature, N16273). And there are a good many 18C fully engraved works missing from the ESTC that are entering the market and held by libraries (a substantial percentage of “fully engraved” works in ESTC entered with Wing entries). The output of printers specializing in rolling press work, like John Cluer of London, is poorly recorded.
As the ESTC’s exclusions noted above suggest, single sheets beginning “Advertisement” or serving that purpose are often unique copies when located, some of which appear on Abebooks, as now The Last Night. New Theatre, Wickham-Market. By the Phoenix Company of Comedians. On Tuesday Evening, December 17th, 1799, Will be presented a New Tragic Play . . . (Sheridan’s Pizarro, printed in Woodbridge by R. Loder. Some unrecorded advertisements on the market involve unrecorded books, as the 8vo sheet, Just Publish’d Spelling New Modelled: or, The Most Natural and Easy Way to Spell, by William Parton (L: R. Baldwin & Jefferies, 1745), evidently the tp setting with “Just Publish’d” added at the top. Many prospectuses remain unrecorded, as now on Abebooks that for lectures by William Curtis: Prospectus for his Annual Course of Botanical Lectures, to begin 13 May 1788 “at his Botanic Garden, Lambeth March . . .” (later published). Abebooks offers unrecorded broadsides involving legal disputes, as several offered by SessaBooks involving Ruth Pollock’s claim to be widow to the late Captain George Campbell, 1717. My favorite dirty-laundry broadside from SessaBooks now on Abe is Petition for the Laird of Kilravock and Others the Vassals of Lovat [Edinburgh, 1702], in which, according to the bookseller, “The tenants of the Lovatt estate petition for a delay in producing the writs and securities of their holdings, as the protracted dispute between the Lovat family and the infamous Captain Simon Fraser of Beaufort . . . has left them in a sorry state regarding the payment of creditors.” Captain Fraser “attempted a forced marriage to the family’s heiress, young Amelia Fraser, before successfully kidnapping and wedding her mother, the dowager Lady Amelia Murray.”

A variety of single printed sheets is now offered for sale on Abebooks. Some relate to the history of reading, such as forms printed for Derby Union Book Society (c. 1784). Unrecorded single-sheet songs and ballads are often on the market, including one by composer Charles Dibdin, about whom we learned much from Nancy Mace’s 2017 EC/ASECS slide lecture: Jervis for ever. Written as a Forecastle Effusion, and Most Heartily Inscribed to the Jolly Tars who nobly dubb’d the Dons on the 14th of February 1797, honoring the sailors who defeated the Spanish at the Battle of Cape St. Vincent (Hull: Printed by W. Savage). Also listed is the sort of item usually sold at auction: an unrecorded bawdy song sung to the Anacreontic Society by Mr. Huttley (erased and replaced in MS by “Edwin”): TNUC or the Roundelay (L: J. Fentum, 1781). 2 pp. of music (key of F, 6/8 time) and lyrics fully engraved, with six verses, the fifth of which includes “But should she be Prudish and say she’s afraid / On her back lay the lovely sweet blushing Maid / Then kiss her tho’ Maid or a Widow she be / And she’ll pant ‘till you enter her T N U C.” Even priced high, this will sell before the many municipal and town council notices, as those dating 1723 Edinburgh and Manchester 1795 now on ABE.

Much that is on the market and unrecorded is utilitarian literature, often the sort that was used hard or that newer editions made obsolete. This includes two 1710 editions printed by Richard Mount, The Sea-Man’s Practice and The Mariners New Kalender. Also unrecorded and now on Abebooks are The New Ready Reckoner; or, Trader’s Sure Guide, 6th ed. (Edinburgh: D. Paterson, 1789) [4], 235; and, the first known edition though the fourth, of Dr. Stephen Freeman’s The Ladies’ Friend; or, Complete Physical Library (London: for
The author, 1783), 12mo: 324p.; presently the earliest ESTC record for this evolving text is a 1788 expanded edition formatted as Q&A. There are also unrecorded items for sale concerning the military, for instance: Proceedings of the Trial of Admiral Keppel [7 Jan. 1779], possibly drawing on other longer accounts, such as that published in London for J. Almon, but this account is “Printed for the Booksellers,” pp. iv + 50; and The Proceedings of a General Court-Martial Held on Lieutenant [Peter] Squair, printed by Philip Mourant in the Island of Jersey, 1796, pp. 61 [1], 64--Squair was found not guilty of embezzlement and conduct unbecoming an officer (as drinking with NCOs)--ESTC has only a psalms in French printed by Mourant in Jersey, 1794.

The sort of literature that is most unrecorded is not on the market: it’s newspapers, particularly provincial papers. One encounters a lot of conjecture and unsubstantiated generalizations in a work like Robert Munter’s The History of Irish Newspapers, 1685-1760. To judge from ESTC, OCLC, and Newsplan, over half a century later the materials have not been discovered to write a solid history. And the same is true for the histories of some other genres, as broadsides with mourning elegies or invitations to funerals (“You are invited to accompany the corps [or “corpse”]”).

James E. May
Lancaster, Pennsylvania


Devoney Looser’s latest full-scale contribution to Austen studies is an original, important and well-written book. It is valuable for the highly unusual areas she studies, for information about and clear descriptions of texts probably unknown to many Austen scholars and/or Janeites alike (this is a feat), for the critical intelligence and close reading she applies to some of these; and, for her tales of poignant lives of a few people who ought to be remembered for the significant contribution they made to the ways many people read Austen’s texts today. For example, George Pellew, who wrote the first dissertation on Jane Austen, was a sensitive, depressive man unable to support himself or navigate the competitive commercial world which appropriated his book. He allowed himself to be drawn into debates with parapsychologists, and a half-mocking suggestion that he seems to have argued weakly against that he might return from the dead enabled an unscrupulous fraudulent spiritual medium to claim to bring him regularly back from the dead for the amusement of audience which included people to make a profit from such material since a respectable celebrity had begun to attach itself to anyone who could be attached to the name Jane Austen (185-96).

Unlike some reviewers, e.g., Amy Bloom, John Sutherland and Ruth Bernard Yeasley (see “Which Jane Austen,” New York Review of Books, 44:14 [2017]: 63-65), I will not against Looser’s “doggedly populist stance” (Yearsley’s phrase) fall into the trap of taking her or others to task for her many
refusals to evaluate evidence and assertions about Austen. I will, though, take exception to her blaming repeatedly as culprits the world of scholarship presented as a monolith elite, irredeemably “haughty, highbrow” (Looser's words) snobs, dense in our relentless determination to erase or ignore the powerless fan, malign the popular funny film, published sequel, widely-attended-to blog or YouTube, or mock as hopeless those inventing fantasy Austens in order to appease schoolboards. In Austen’s famous sentence, let us not desert one another, we are an injured body; de- or unfunded, derided, part of humanities departments “swept away” with the “useless rubbish of past centuries” (I quote the Reverend Obadiah Slope interviewing Mr Harding in Anthony Trollope's *Barchester Towers*). We are made instruments of privately-supported corporations, and, when kept, most of us by no means overpaid or over-benefited. Devoney Looser is herself a privileged member. The strength of her book derives from following the standards of hard research into primary documents, paying meticulous attention to minute detail, using empirical methodology, closely reading accurately and researching into how a particular text, image or event came about. She honors a humane politically liberal, feminist, progressive (pro-LGBTQ) agenda, evidence for which she a tad too cheerfully (“Stone-throwing Jane Austen”) finds among force-fed and imprisoned suffragettes and in early stage plays which anticipate late 20th-century film adaptations and some Austen sequels.

Indeed, the more popularly-aimed (non-academic) reviews, e.g., Jane Smiley’s (“The Austen Legacy: Why and How We Love Her, and What She Loved,” *New York Times Book Review*, for July 11, 2017, on-line https://tinyurl.com/ycvw2ab5), pass over the first half of Looser's book, as academic di rigueur, which “plod forward in their necessary way.” Looser begins with the three initiating (“first wave”) framing books (“Introduction,” “Part One”). Sliding over James-Edward Austen-Leigh's sentimentalized *A Memoir of Jane Austen*, and Edward, Lord Brabourne's edition of carefully selected, rearranged letters by Austen, she moves to dwell with praise on Constance and Ellen Hill's time-traveling idyllic fantasy, *Jane Austen: Her Home and Friends* for its invention a magical “Austenland,” where the Hills repeatedly find nothing but safety, kindness, and relics suggesting contented activities. Looser dismisses as not influential Margaret Oliphant’s acid reaction to this kind of thing (8). I suggest Virginia Woolf’s demonstration of how the Hills’ pseudo-biographies “license mendacity” should not be dismissed, even if we cannot be sure how many people were influenced by *The First Common Reader* (it does contain the often-quoted essay, “Jane Austen”).

This picturesque legacy gives way to book illustrations done in a darker mood, much less well-drawn than Ellen Hill’s and poorly printed. The unfortunate Ferdinand Pickering (another depressive drawn to Austen, himself coping with an impoverished violent family) chose and drew solemn, serious, melodramatic linchpin moments in the six stories, often the same ones that serve as hinge-points in contemporary filmed dramatic romance mini-series and cinema hits (Chapter One). From a welter of other hitherto ignored or undiscussed images unearthed by Looser, we can see how Hugh Thomson’s at the time innovatively comic drawings achieved prominence: in debt, and professionally known in other areas of life, Thomson was hired to draw many
more illustrations per volume than had been done before; and, in comparison
to most before (in whatever mood), his are filled with alert life-feeling energy.
These volumes sold and other competent illustrators imitated his (Chapter
Three, 50-62). Unfortunately, Looser’s identification and innovative close
readings of other particular illustrators’ lives and pictures are undermined by a
paucity of reprints. She wants us to believe in the special loveliness and period
romanticism of A. F. Lydon’s landscapes for *Mansfield Park*, but we are given
only one (Chapter Two, 39-47), not enough to judge. David Gilson in *Jane
Austen in Context* (ed. Janet Todd [2005]), provides two more (137, 139-42).

In all this Looser is doing what scholars have done for a long while: in
areas of conventional scholarship most people recognize, describing accurately
what she has chosen for mapping her Austen tradition. In the dense chapters on
“Austen, Dramatized” (Part Two), she again identifies new texts, fearlessly
corrects false information and wrong conclusions. She congratulates herself:
“We can now identify” the “connection” another recent critic has seen between
the MGM *Pride and Prejudice* and Thomson’s illustrations” (131), and
sometimes extrapolates on thin evidence, as when she claims pervasive
influence for Rosina Filippi’s Austen-derived dialogues for expensive English
and American girls’ schools and private colleges (83-88). In these all-strong-
girl scenes, Looser finds early woman-centered proto-feminist scenes similar
to those in professionally staged plays by, for example, Mary Keith Medbury
McKay and Margaret McNamara, a feminist-socialist-pacifist (*Elizabeth
Refuses* is still in print). She even turns up two lesbian stage plays. We learn of
how Eva Le Gallienne played Jane to her partner-actress, Josephine
Hutchinson’s Cassandra; Eleanor Holmes Hinkley (attended Radcliffe) called
her “gender-bending” biographical play, *Dear Jane*, which, while it may have
“veered sharply away from … the perfectly pious Christian heroine,” also
included the hilarity of the inane. Hinkley is said to have enlisted her cousin
T. S. Eliot to play the valetudinarian Mr Woodhouse in a “stand-alone
dialogue” (Chapters Four through Six, 83-96, 113-23). Some intriguing
histories of actors and playwrights’ lives, are followed by a full-scale book
history-like and film study of the famous (though not initially commercially
successful) 1940 MGM *Pride and Prejudice* and a never realized (lamented by
Looser) 1970s screenplay for a satiric *Pride and Prejudice* that seems a blend
of burlesque, TV situation comedy; and crudities in the vein of the recent *Pride
and Prejudice and Zombies* (2016). A deleted scene from one of the many draft
MGM scripts, would have had Laurence Olivier, already associated with
Heathcliff, act out some “Bronte-brutal” (136), complete with metaphoric rape
(Chapter Seven).

Some intriguing histories of actors and playwrights’ lives, are followed by a
full-scale book-history-like and film study of the famous (though not initially commercially successful) 1940 MGM *Pride and Prejudice* and a
never realized (lamented by Looser) 1970s screenplay for a satiric *Pride and
Prejudice* that seems a blend of Mel Brooks, TV situation comedy, crudities and murderous intrigues in the vein of recent *Jane Zombie*, and inverse or
anti-feminism. A deleted scene from one of the many draft MGM scripts,
would have had Laurence Olivier, already associated with Heathcliff, act out
some “Bronte-brutal (136),” complete with metaphoric rape (Chapter Seven).
Since frankness and personal reaction are the order of the day, I’d like to emphasize, as Looser does not, how many women she names as centrally active in different phases of these appropriations of Austen (passim). Read any history of 1930s and 40s “classic” films and plays, illustrations for the 1860s, or early TV, it is just about all men all the time. Not here. Still, Looser does fall into Darcymania (Chapter Five). The question often is: does a given actor or scene or plot-design emphasize Darcy or anticipate a gothicized Olivier, who is said to anticipate the “swoon-worthy” Colin Firth of Andrew Davies’s super-best known sociological event of a mini-series (the 1995 A&E Pride and Prejudice)? I read differently one critic’s “extreme disappointment” (100-2) with a beloved stage actor’s Darcy because he “incomprehensibly” resembled another actor playing Sydney Carton. I suggest for Firth’s archetype one would do better to look at how Ronald Colman performed Carton as “somber dignified” “costumed romance and melodrama.” Colin Firth comes out of that kind of gentlemanly masculinity in melodrama; and after him so too Matthew MacFayden (Joe Wright’s 2004 Pride and Prejudice), and most recently Matthew Rhys (Juliette Towhidi’s 2013 Death Comes to Pemberley). These are part of the Austen tradition too. By contrast, Looser has little use for Greer Garson (“affected, silly” 137) and we hear nothing of the tradition of Elizabeth Garvie, a favorite for Elizabeth Bennet (from the 1979 BBC Fay Weldon Pride and Prejudice).

The material that reviewers have been most attracted to, and where Looser does her best to regale us with what she finds “amusing,” includes later and most problematic parts of her book, “Jane Austen, Politicized (Part Three, Chapters Eight and Nine)” and “Jane Austen, Schooled” (Part Four, Chapter Eleven). Her central contention that Jane Austen has been framed from a political viewpoint and used in political debates almost since she was first written about and discussed is incontestable. As she says, how one defines politics matters, and as long as we don’t define the word narrowly (unrealistically), and include art which “comments on the exercise of power, status, and authority,” and in Austen’s case, “particularly in regard to families, economics and gender roles,” Austen is a political writer. Nonetheless, in these chapters what she goes about to demonstrate is that we can find Austen discussed politically and used in political discussion in the British parliament in 1872 (141-42) and in “tony private men’s clubs;” as an image or name in banners and posters (which she insists were taken seriously) in suffragette marches and feminist pageants. She cites critics and authors overtly political in the narrower and broader senses who defend or attack Austen and differ considerably in their philosophical and other views, among the better known, G. K. Chesterton, a political reactionary, William Dean Howells, a socialist (151-52, 161-63) and among women, Annie Gladstone (159-61) and Cicely Hamilton, once an important writer (169-74). Looser studies widely-distributed schooltexts since the mid-19th century for readings, handbooks for tests, abridged (gouged-out) Austens, and discovers they “reinforce social structures at the time, especially in terms of class, taste, and culture” (199). That’s still true (220-21). Jane Austen is made to stand for whatever is the mainstream view, and her texts explicated to support these in the blandest ways, e.g., Emma needs to learn “each of us has his own life to live; we cannot
make ourselves dictators of the lives of others” (206).

The trouble is Looser says more than once that it doesn’t matter if none of these purveyors of Austen or her books ever read about her for real or in decent unabridged texts. What are we endorsing, “celebrating” or “studying [for] historical nuance and cultural scope,” if ignorance and misunderstanding are its basis and these texts produce opposed and contradictory readings or responses (221)? When she says Samuel French handles “an astonishing 332 Austen-inspired school and community theater productions from 2012 to 2017” I don’t see how she can conclude a “performed Austen” is globally prevalent (220). She enters earnestly into imbecilic abuse (a reprint of a menu depiction of a clueless maid in tattered uniform peering guiltily at the broken bits of a bust of Austen for a rich men’s club, 154-56), and ill-natured anti-intellectualism (a National Lampoon mock-ad featuring as simpletons an earnest male supermarket employee and smiling leisured housewife, 212-14) in the same spirit as she complains that a non-condescending, non-exploitative educational engagement with Austen’s texts by Josephine Woodbury Heerman (a 1908 edition of Pride and Prejudice for Macmillan Pocket Classic, 203) has not been as distributed or valued as Chapman’s 1924 first scholarly texts based on a study of the first printed editions and (where they exist) manuscripts.

This is a book mostly about social, political, and economic behaviors, personal lives, book and film and stage history, all of which can be connected back to a group of texts written by a woman named Jane Austen. In her “Coda” Looser pleads with her reader to “recognize” “please” that Austen’s “critical and popular legacies” move happily in tandem (217-18), that “popularity” (celebrity might be better word) is “not killing” Austen (219). She has apparently written this book to deny that Jane Austen or her texts (she does not distinguish between the biography and the texts) are being made “ridiculous,” and ends on the confession that she is “part of the problem” (222). Why? Because she is an Austen scholar who is also a professional roller-derby skater “under the name of Stone-Cold Austen” and because a number of her significant life events happened and continue to happen (e.g., an “Austen-scholar husband” and this book) as the result of an early and continuing personal engagement with Austen’s novels. To combine such experiences is “preposterous” (222). I confess I find her to be boasting and wrestling with a non-existent bugbear and mortification (if she is mortified). Powerful and high status members of societies have always used and will continue to use exclusion and stigmatized descriptions to control and marginalize and keep from less powerful people not just genuinely subversive and transgressive texts and pictures but anything they value unless they own some version of the object or experience they can conspicuously consume. That this is so is no reason to stigmatize the academic profession (let us now remember Johnson’s couplet, “There mark what Ills the Scholar’s Life assail / Toil, Envy, Want, the Patron and the Jail,” Vanity of Human Wishes, ll. 158-59) nor, in this year, explicitly undervalue the difference between knowledge and illusion, credible evidence and lies.

Ellen Moody
Independent Scholar

Anthony Ashley-Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713), is not a household name today, but he was one of the most influential English philosophers of the eighteenth century. His career of published writings began in 1698 with an edited volume of Benjamin Whichcote’s sermons, followed over subsequent years by a variety of other writings, most of which were extensively revised and collected together in the first two volumes of the 3-volume *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711), the work for which he is best known. The third volume consisted of “Miscellaneous Reflections” on the preceding “treatises” by Shaftesbury, writing in the voice of an anonymous and ironic commentator. Taken together, the treatises comprising *Characteristicks* address an astonishing range of topics, including moral philosophy, poetics and literary theory, aesthetics, history, politics, and theology, all written in a prose style that was considered a model of elegance. It was extraordinarily successful for a work of its nature, going through at least 13 editions in English over the course of the 18th century. For the second edition (published posthumously in 1714), Shaftesbury commissioned Simon Gribelin (1661-1733) to provide emblematic engravings according to his detailed instructions to accompany key parts of the text. These enigmatic engravings proved very popular and were included in many subsequent editions of *Characteristicks*, including Baskerville’s in 1773.

The present publication is the latest instalment in the *Standard Edition* (hereinafter referred to as *SE*) of Shaftesbury’s writings, edited by the Shaftesbury Project, based out of Friedrich-Alexander Universität (Erlangen-Nürnberg). Volumes of the *SE* began appearing in 1981. Though the editors made some unfortunate editorial choices in the earlier volumes of the 1980s, for which they were duly criticized, the edition’s volumes have since become an invaluable source of scholarship and commentary on Shaftesbury’s work, especially his unpublished writings. The editorial principles are sound, and the scholarship is thorough and exemplary. This is the first of a projected five volumes of Shaftesbury’s correspondence.

Some of the letters included in the *SE* — though a relatively small proportion of the whole — will necessarily have already been printed elsewhere, especially since collections of Shaftesbury’s correspondence began appearing within a few years after his death. For example, in 1716 was published *Several Letters Written by a Noble Lord to a Young Man at the University*. This was followed in 1721 by John Toland’s unauthorized collection, *Letters from the Right Honourable the Late Earl of Shaftesbury, to Robert Molesworth, Esq.* Another collection appeared in 1830 (2nd ed., 1847) in the form of Thomas Forster’s *Original Letters of John Locke, Algernon Sidney, and Lord Shaftesbury*. A much later collection worth mentioning, though more narrowly focused, is Rex A. Barrell’s *Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713) and ‘Le Refuge Français’* (1989), which
brings together letters to and from Shaftesbury and various French members of the republic of letters, including Pierre Bayle, Jacques Basnage, and Jean le Clerc. Many of these are in French, for which Barrell did not provide translations (nor does the SE).

Perhaps the best-known and most referenced collection of Shaftesbury’s correspondence was contained in The Life, Unpublished Letters, and Philosophical Regimen of Antony, Earl of Shaftesbury (1900), edited by Benjamin Rand. It printed 147 letters, all by Shaftesbury; letters received from correspondents were not included, a choice which at times robbed the reader of context. This has been remedied in the SE, which includes letters addressed to Shaftesbury. Furthermore, although Rand’s was extremely valuable as being the most comprehensive collection of Shaftesbury’s correspondence prior to the SE, his editing was not always to be trusted. To take one example, the surname of Henry Trench, the young Irish draughtsman Shaftesbury employed during his time in Naples appears in Rand as “French”. Also, it was not his intent to make a complete edition of the correspondence, and his selection did not include letters which could be deemed embarrassing or indiscreet.

To give some idea of the expanded scope of the SE compared with Rand’s edition, this first SE volume of correspondence contains 100 letters, 64 of which are Shaftesbury’s. They cover the period December 29, 1683 to February 16, 1700. For the same period, Rand’s collection contains only 19 letters. Rand provided a modernized text and supplied very few notes. By contrast, SE preserves Shaftesbury’s spelling and other incidentals, as well as — to the extent possible — the layout of the letters. The footnotes are extensive, even daunting. As the foregoing comparison with the Rand edition implies, a great quantity of Shaftesbury’s correspondence has never before been printed prior to its inclusion in the SE. Even for those letters which have been previously published, the SE should supersede all previous editions.

The introduction by the SE editors contains a helpful overview of all the earlier collections of the letters. In addition, a headnote at the beginning of each letter notes which of these earlier collections a letter previously appeared in, where applicable. If previously unpublished, the headnote supplies the manuscript source.

The letters from the period covered in this first SE volume of Shaftesbury’s correspondence give scholars a deep insight into the several events and episodes in the life of the young Lord Ashley (as the third Earl then was) during his precocious rise to adulthood. Perhaps foremost among these is his deep involvement in the management of his family’s vast estates, as he tried to fill the void left by his peevish and invalid father, a cipher who was cuttingly described by Dryden as “born a shapeless Lump, like Anarchy.” To compare, one might imagine the plight of an 18-year-old thrown into the role of de facto President and CEO of a mid-sized corporation. His efforts were not always appreciated by his parents, especially it seems, when his advice extended to personal affairs, the education of his brothers, for example. Youngest brother Maurice turned out alright in the end, but the middle brother, John, died in Barbados after being sent to sea on Lord Ashley’s recommendation. It seems that his parents held him in some degree responsible for this.
Lord Ashley’s situation was not helped by the fact that his parents’ marriage was on the rocks. The Countess had not resided in the family domicile at St. Giles, Dorset, for over five years and seems to have been on speaking terms neither with her husband nor eldest son. Nevertheless, Lord Ashley was given (or took upon himself?) the burden of patching things up between his mother and father. Partly through much filial bending of the knee with the Countess and her relations, partly through the dismissal of the Earl’s dishonest steward, mother and father were eventually reunited, though St. Giles did not thereafter become a centre of connubial peace. All this is rather painfully portrayed in this volume. Although young Ashley can come across as cold and perhaps a bit precious, one cannot help sympathizing with him when allowances are made for the difficult position in which he was placed.

Among the family’s business interests was a concern in the Carolina colony, for which Lord Ashley’s father was nominally one of its Lords Proprietor. The colonists were refractory, even rebellious, and the Lords had great difficulty in enforcing their will. Ashley’s correspondence on Carolina affairs show this, and makes evident his frustration with some of the leading colonists. The editors note that in 1694 there had even been a suggestion of sending Ashley there as governor. This did not happen, and it was not long before his interest in it was signed over to his brother Maurice.

Of Ashley the politician, we see his drift towards committed Whiggism (of the country rather than the court variety). During his brief stint as an MP, we see that he approached his role with typical workaholism, and that it took very little time for him to become disillusioned with politics, with his fellow Whigs, and with human nature more generally. His reflections on his political experience are in marked contrast to his reputation as the philosopher of optimism.

Of course, Shaftesbury scholars will read his correspondence desiring to see something of his development as a writer and thinker. They will not be disappointed, even in this early correspondence. Through letters from Pierre Bayle, we see his growing involvement in the republic of letters, his avid book collecting, and his intense devotion to classical studies.

A substantial quantity of Shaftesbury’s correspondence before 1704 was with John Locke, his grandfather’s famous friend and family advisor. For the most part, these letters will have appeared previously, in E. S. de Beer’s massive collection of Locke’s correspondence. In these letters, we see that, intellectually, the young Ashley was no mere disciple of Locke. When pressed by the latter to share what would eventually see unauthorized publication as the Inquiry concerning Virtue (1699), Ashley is reticent, anticipating that the ideas expressed therein were unlikely to find favour with Locke. A lengthy letter of September 29, 1694, is particularly instructive for the light it sheds on Ashley’s attitude towards philosophical speculation, and by implication, on what he may have thought of Locke’s studies. He is not interested in abstruse metaphysics or intricate questions of natural philosophy, except insofar as these can make us better persons: “Itt is not with mee as with an Empirick, one y’t is studying of Curiosities, raising of new Inventions y’t are to gain credit to ye author…. What Signifys itt to know (if wee could know) what Elements y’e Earth was made from…. What I count True Learning, & all y’wee can profit
by, is to know our selves” (201 ff.). Many of the remarks in this letter prefigure themes found in his later published works, especially *The Moralists*. One can also easily read it as casting mild aspersions on the occupations of the elder philosopher.

Regarding the volume itself, as mentioned, prefixed to each letter is a headnote explaining its provenance and previous publication (if applicable). Where the sender or addressee is new, the headnote also contains brief biographical details. The letters are divided into periods, and each period begins with an outline by the editors of events in Shaftesbury’s life and affairs. This additional context is particularly helpful for those early years during which the correspondence is relatively sparse. After each letter, details are supplied regarding any other physical peculiarities in the source manuscripts, including address, postmarks, endorsements, and annotations. Where possible, the copy-texts of the letters are the originals. The text is unmodernized and faithful to the originals (including, for example, “ye” and “yt” for “the” and “that”). Also included are an excellent bibliography, critical apparatus, alphabetical list of correspondents, chronological list of letters, and index. Perhaps most importantly, there are six very substantial appendices devoted to various facets of Shaftesbury’s life as they relate to the correspondence. Each cites extensively from relevant documents beyond the correspondence. These appendices, amounting to over a hundred pages, alone almost make the book worthwhile, and they form a valuable supplement to Robert Voitle’s indispensable 1984 biography of the third Earl.

James Pratt
York University


*Invoking Slavery* is an ambitious collection of eight short but lively and dense essays and one summary review. In the introduction, Swaminathan and Beach assert that their project seeks to revisit Orlando Patterson’s *Slavery and Social Death* to “take a more holistic approach to slavery in the period, one that works outward to encompass other discourses about slavery.” As such, the collection brings together pieces that “examine the ways in which racialized systems of slavery in the New World interlocked with and depended on the subjugation of a class of poor English, Scottish, and Irish indentured servants and transported criminals who were essentially slaves themselves.” This results in the highlighting of continuities rather than differences between those victimized directly by the transatlantic slave trade and those by other forms of involuntary servitude. For the most part, the effort is successful. The question remains, however, whether the approach disregards vital distinctions between
the multiple forms of slavery discussed and the chattel slavery of the triangular trade. While elasticizing the term “slavery” opens new avenues for the study of eighteenth-century literary history, the loss of the essential difference between chattel slavery and other slaveries at times performs a dangerous and disappointing erasure of racial distinction.

The essays are divided into three sections: The “enslavement of British subjects in foreign locales; the use of the discourses of slavery in political rhetoric; and the history of servitude as a form of actual or metaphorical enslavement.” The first section makes a strong case for the collection by drawing attention to the myriad ways in which British identity becomes complicated by experiencing captivity by “others.” Beach’s “The Good-Treatment Debate . . .” uses a 1670 text, The Adventures of (Mr. T. S.) An English Merchant, Taken Prisoner by the Turks of Algiers and carried into the Inland Countries of AFRICA, to show that white British captivity narratives, which emphasize “kind” masters, reveal how the exploitation techniques of masters as described by Patterson are both effective and invisible to their victims. He deftly explores how T. S.’s position as a British male sex slave blinds him to his inculcation into slave ideology. Amy Witherbee’s essay, “Love’s Slave: Court Slaves in the Early Eighteenth-Century Imagination,” looks beyond the racial anxieties of oriental tales to analyze luxury goods and global trade. She argues that in Arabian Nights’ Entertainments and other oriental tales, “Slavery becomes a valuable trope . . . not merely because it is a cornerstone of the Empire’s trade but because of the way that the slave blurs boundaries between subject and object and mimics the increased mobility of both.” This approach is valuable in not avoiding issues of racial anxiety but looking beyond into how race was a factor in alleviating concerns regarding power imbalances caused by luxury goods.

Swaminathan’s essay on Defoe’s Captain Singleton takes up the manner in which Defoe anticipates many of the anxieties surrounding the ethics of African slavery. She raises interesting questions about how Defoe explores these anxieties in the moment before “African slavery had effectively replaced all other notions of slavery in the public imaginary.” By showing how Singleton’s experiences coincide with elements of slavery described by Patterson, Swaminathan’s is able to both compare and contrast the experiences of Singleton with those of Olaudah Equiano and Swamp maroons.

The second section, “Political Invocations of Slavery and Liberty” contains essays by Jeffry Galbraith and Brett D. Wilson. Galbraith’s “Slavery and Obedience in Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama” suggests that stage invocations of “slavishness” were, in fact, a form of resistance against absolutism; characters depicted as choosing submission instead of being forced into it could be interpreted as maintaining their agency. While the idea has merit, Galbraith is perhaps too narrow in his argument that the Exclusion Crisis frames these plays’ subject matter. For example, in his discussion of The English Frier (1690), he quotes Lord Stately’s comparison of “ecclesiastical blacks” to “the blacks we have from Guinea,” and merely notes: “If the slavery of sub-Saharan ‘blacks’ is a function of their race, the ‘ecclesiastical black’ demonstrates a form of mental bondage that vitiates his ability to choose for himself.” This hasty comparison of African slavery to the
unthinking obedience of the ecclesiastical black risks defining African slaves as also unthinking. Wilson’s “Hannah More’s Slavery and James Thomson’s Liberty,” is more successful in that it puts More's Slavery: A Poem at the center of his argument that multiple definitions of slavery allow greater interplay between various iterations of “slavery” and “liberty.” By beginning with More and working back toward Thomson’s Liberty (cited by More in her epigraph), Wilson creates a literary genealogy linking Thomson’s call for “cohesion and social love” to More’s appeal to a British feeling for liberty.

In the final section, “Invocations of Slavery in British Systems of Slavery,” Laura Martin, Ann Campbell, and Roxan Wheeler explore representations of indentured servitude and the British servant class. Martin’s essay looks at how the mistreatment of colonial servants and slaves exposes “the contradiction of paternalism and colonialism.” Using three texts—Richard Ligon’s A True and Exact History of the Island of Barbados, Steele’s “Inkle and Yarico,” and the anonymous 1736 Yarico to Inkle—she examines how incarnations of the Yarico and Inkle myth reveal ways in which African and indigenous slaves are depicted as faring better than imported European counterparts, thus dividing servants from slaves. Particularly interesting is Martin’s tracking the erasure of the colonial servant/indigenous slave relationship from its first appearance in Ligon to the anonymous 1736 version, showing how the ownership of slaves empowered the colonial mercantile class, while the erasure of servants kept any “true” bourgeois revolution at bay. A less successful attempt follows in Campbell’s essay on Sally Gunning’s Bound, a novel written in 2008, and based on the trial of an indentured servant, Hannah Bangs, who is either indigenous or black. In the novel Hannah is renamed Alice and becomes white because “all female indentured servants, regardless of race were subject to the same draconian statute used to prosecute Nuttup.” Campbell reads this fictional “Alice” against the history of indentured servant women in the Caribbean and North America, arguing that “all forms of the indenture are connected.” This assertion would ring truer had she integrated details from the original case into her analysis, drawing a more fine-grained comparison between the real-life Hannah and the fictional Alice, or at least problematizing Gunning’s choice. At best, the omission of the archival materials is a missed opportunity; at worst, an erasure of racial distinction within the practice of slavery that the editors hoped to avoid.

Wheeler’s “Slavey, or the New Drudge” is careful to avoid this problem in exploring the epithet “slavey.” She analyzes texts written between the 1750s and 1780s, a period that saw a marked spike in comparisons between British servants and West Indian slaves, particularly in proslavery texts. By the 1820s the word became slang for “a white servant of either sex,” revealing how “lower” forms of servant work had been racialized. Wheeler’s essay makes for satisfying reading.

In the summary essay ending the collection, Boulokos reiterates points made in the introduction. He also suggests that the collection has made the “transatlantic paradigm problematic for reconstructing eighteenth-century British awareness of slavery in two key ways. First, it inscribes the racialized system of plantation slavery as the primary or most obvious referent of the term slavery. Second . . . it subtly redefines the historical meaning and
framework of eighteenth-century British slavery, which becomes the setting for the scene of nineteenth-century U.S. slavery.” Both points have validity particularly for looking forward to modernity. However, except for Witherbee’s essay, the volume does not so much break the standard transatlantic paradigm as slightly redefine it. For that alone, however, one should be grateful to the authors for providing added dimension to trans-Atlantic studies.

Lenora Warren
Colgate University


Tara Ghoshal Wallace’s Imperial Characters: Home and Periphery in Eighteenth-Century Literature succeeds with a preponderance of selective but finely-faceted and typically historicized close readings of English and Scottish literature, especially novels. In addition to offering such attentive exfoliation of primary material, the book stimulates the reader with some unexpected pairings and an innovative structure. Throughout, the book looks at how the project of British imperial and cultural hegemony is implicated in the literary construction of British identity. Primarily, the book rehearses the ways that its literary sources engage the riskiness of the British imperial project (especially in Scotland, India, and North America) – its risky implications for the lives and experiences of British subjects.

The book’s structural approach is noteworthy; bracingly unsettling and even counter-intuitive, the layout is implicitly interrogative. A brief preface about Wallace’s personal investment in the book’s questions is followed by an introduction, two chapters, an entr’acte, and two more chapters. The introduction brings together two works that were published two centuries apart in time (the English Aphra Behn’s Oroonoko and the Scottish Robert Louis Stevenson’s Master of Ballantrae). The chapters themselves proceed chronologically from the early eighteenth century onward, and each one (but not the entr’acte) is preceded by an epigraph from Behn and one from Stevenson. Chapters 1 and 3, like the introduction, each bring together a text by an English author and one by a Scottish author (Alexander Pope and James Thomson in chapter 1, Robert Bage and Elizabeth Hamilton in chapter 3); chapter 2 maintains the pattern with Daniel Defoe and Tobias Smollett, but adds a second Defoe novel. Chapter 4, however, changes course by focusing on (two novels by) a single (Scottish) author, Walter Scott; the single-author focus is shared by the “Entr’acte,” which comes between chapters 2 and 3 with a discussion of Mary Wollstonecraft. The generic emphasis throughout, including in the entr’acte, is primarily novelistic, although chapter one treats
verse. And there is no concluding chapter, afterword, or epilogue. Instead chapter 4 ends with this wisdom:

In *Guy Mannering*, Walter Scott maps out some of the ways imperial experience can be productively brought home and cautions readers who might too easily credit tall imperial tales; in *The Surgeon’s Daughter*, he figures for us, sometimes with ferocious humor, the inevitable darkening of the national character when imperial rhetoric stamps out the practice of suspicious reading. (166)

These parting words provide closure less than they resonate with the image on the book’s cover, of an elephant turned trampler-executioner, taken from an eleventh century Hindu temple carving photographed by Wallace. Taken together, the image and the words implicitly conjure the skull of Richard Middlemas, in *Surgeon’s Daughter*, being crushed by the elephant’s foot under order of Hyder Ali.

The complicated, uneven structure of *Imperial Characters* works with the content to create meaning by way of its decolonizing structural moves and its fruitfully uneasy juxtapositions. Here are intricate but “the kinetic movements of a restless text,” here indeed is a “text that enacts,” in order to study, “the opportunities, disruptions, and dangers of imperial adventurism” (17). As in Stevenson’s own *Master of Ballantrae*, in Wallace’s hands some of “disparate elements of Britain’s imperial reach come together, not to point to potential union but to point up irreconcilable incongruities” (18). Seeing in Stevenson and others a “belated recognition of difference that cannot be resolved by military, political, or ideological manipulations,” Wallace introduces “a corrective to the kind of postcolonial criticism that posits collusion between literary text and imperial agenda” (19). The argument, in fine, is this: “popular and authoritative British writers from Alexander Pope to Walter Scott warn that imperial power poses grave social and moral dangers for the metropole. If at times these warnings come in the shape of fear of contagion from colonial possessions (savagery from America, lethargy and disease from Asia), such xenophobia coexists with a recognition that European imperial values and practices taint both colonizer and colonized” (18). Along the way, the book’s movements are not disjointed so much as they are many-jointed, as the chapters’ double epigraphs from Behn and Stevenson suggest.

The introductory chapter, “Roaming the Globe,” sutures together the book’s chronological peripheries as an entree into the layered fabric that the book unfolds. In Behn, we see the “[d]egeneracy of character coexists with imperial power” (21), and the “unstable, even contingent nature of colonial loyalties to the home government” that similarly “occup[y] a number of texts considered in this book” (23). Likewise, in Stevenson as in others, “the center that exerts such fitful and problematic influence on the peripheries is itself subject to political, economic, and moral decay” (26). Just as the party politics of Stevenson’s London have “the power to unleash a chain of events that leads ultimately to that final moment when so many imperial subjects come together in the frozen wilderness of America” (26), the chapters of *Imperial Subjects* are ever-conscious of how “the long arm of the center reaches out” (25): with a
nature “always already corrupted” (28), “the specter of home haunts the periphery” (24).

Chapter 1, “Global Nationalisms: Alexander Pope’s *Windsor-Forest* and James Thomson’s *Seasons,*” sees “the imperial contradictions in the poems, arguing that both texts manifest misgivings about the deleterious effect of empire on both occupier and occupied”: “Pope and Thomson register the violence inherent to imperial expansion” (36). But Pope maintains a consistent “dystopic vision,” whereas Thomson “devises a strategy of reassurance by constructing equivalences between imperial and domestic ideologies” (36). Wallace, sensitively pressing on the imagery of “Pan’s flocks, Pomona’s fruits, Flora’s blooms, and Ceres’s harvests” (39), maintains that Pope’s poem “articulates its contradictions strategically” as a way of airing “misgivings about the winners in imperial contests” (38, 45). The chapter effectively engages Pope’s couplets, the rhythms of which “not only reiterate the dual trajectory of imperial travel, but also point to the doubleness of the imperial gaze, invoking a kind of reverse chronospatial movement” (40). As for Thomson, Wallace examines how he “tames” the “brutalities” of “the imperial project . . . within domestic space” (53): “he figures colonized people as less-evolved versions of ruling-class British males, similar to women and working classes, and, like them, subjugated for their own and society’s good” (54).

Chapter 2, “Familial Identifications: Daniel Defoe’s *Colonel Jack* and *Moll Flanders* and Tobias Smollett’s *Humphry Clinker,*” brings together two writers who “seem to come from different ideological worlds regarding Britain’s imperial ambitions,” the one “optimistic” and the other “scathing” (67). The chapter argues that Defoe’s novels not only make home the object of desire,” but that they “make a conscious case for repatriating successful colonists by suggesting that true gentility can reside only in Britain” (104, 69). Through Jack and Moll and Jemy, “Defoe anticipates the problems for British imperial ambitions if American colonists become too comfortable, too settled, and too independent in the new world” (87). Smollett, in comparison, “actively argues against emigration by showing how colonial adventuring has damaged the social and political health of the mother country and by depicting life in America as dangerously savage” (90). The ensuing discussion usefully conflates Scotland and Wales under the mantle of a British “home,” in order to suggest that Smollett “insists that Britons should stay home” (104). A quibble: the chapter does not really account for the extent to which Lismahago’s success with the Brambles is dependent upon his having left his Scottish home; his imperially damaged body and his stories are at least as fascinating to them as the “colonial spoils” of his gifts (103). Still, Wallace convinces the reader that Defoe and Smollett both emphasize “the satisfactions inherent in identifying with the privileged family of Britons” (104).

The short “Entr’acte. Between Empires: Wollstonecraft’s *Maria, or The Wrongs of Woman,*” sees in Maria’s travails an “indictment” of “the appalling effects of a new ideology of consumerism” that “comprehensively reject[s] the New World as a desire alternative to oppressive conditions prevailing in Britain” (105). Indeed, Wallace defines *Maria* as, on the one hand, an “anti-emigration narrative” that depicts “America as a site of crass commercialism”
(111). On the other hand, Maria expresses the “tantalizing” possibility of imperial activity in Asia (112).

Thus enters the book’s second half, which “turn[s] away from the Wild West to witness the sun of the British Empire rise in the East” (113). Chapter 3, “Peripheral Visions: Robert Bage’s Hermsprong and Elizabeth Hamilton’s Letters of a Hindoo Rajah,” foregrounds how in both Bage and Hamilton, “[t]he character of the imperial center . . . becomes the subject of scrutiny from the peripheries” (115). While the two authors “approach their subjects from opposing ideological camps,” both “foreground colonized spokesmen” in a way that “complicates their ideological positions” (115). Wallace maintains that for Hamilton, “the only hope for the imperium lies in a willingness to see through the eyes of cultural others, to respect and even emulate,” while for Bage a love of “radical individualism . . . is undercut by the hero’s membership in the ruling elite of the home country but underscored by that hero’s rejection of traditional aristocratic virtues” (115). In sum, “where Hamilton wants the British to know about the rich culture of the subcontinent they are about to rule in entirety, Bage reminds them of another continent’s natural civilization that they have done so much to destroy,” so that, “whether peripheral vision gazes at center from the vast historical and literary heritage of India or from the expansive spaces of America, Britain looks like a very tight little island indeed” (145).

Chapter 4, “Rhetorical Manipulations: Walter Scott’s Guy Mannering and The Surgeon’s Daughter,” is a relatively brief chapter that does double duty as the closing pages of Imperial Characters. Scott’s Mannering emerges as “a cautionary tale about imperial fictions,” while his Surgeon’s Daughter “explores the consequences when the heated rhetoric of imperial conquest and romance overwhelms the subtleties [Scott] had coded in his earlier narrative about the British presence in India” (147). Pointing to the “dystopic” ending of Surgeon’s Daughter (165), Wallace reasonably asks, “What is Walter Scott doing?” (164). The answer given is persuasive: “Surgeon’s Daughter thematizes the effects of imperial practice and rhetoric when they are freed from the kind of checks he has proposed in Guy Mannering; he shows what happens to national character and national literature when audiences at home succumb to the fictions of empire” (165).

Acknowledging the “truism in postcolonial studies that the psychology of imperialism depends on Othering and objectifying those whose lands and lives are being appropriated” as well as those who are “marked for subaltern status” (28), Imperial Characters traces how the literary construction of the national British character “engage[s] in and with these forms of construing colonized populations” (29). Wallace easily convinces the reader that her collation of texts, if “somewhat arbitrary and personal,” is nothing less than “an important archive for any discussion of empire in the eighteenth century” (34). Moreover, Imperial Characters remains freshly relevant and newly intriguing as the twenty-first century wears on in interesting ways.

Eighteenth-Century friendships, whether fictional or not, continue to be an intriguing topic, closely associated with general developments towards both a new breadth and depth of sociability and a new insistence on individuality during the long eighteenth-century. Every literary critic immediately thinks of their favourite novels and the varieties of friendship presented in them, so it is important to begin this review with the author’s statement of what her study is not intended to be: it “does not aim to be a comprehensive investigation of all forms and aspects of friendship referred to in novels of the later Hanoverian period” (4-5). Instead, in an ambitious and innovative move, it sets out to show how friendship ties into the various literary experiments we now associate with the second half of the long eighteenth-century, arguing that friendship “as a motif and as a structural principle has informed the diversification of the genre” (2). Berndt singles out four main aspects associated with the development of the novel as a genre: part I introduces friendship as a means of questioning ethical conventions, part II regards friendship as a means to bridge the gap between private and public spheres, e.g. by means of philanthropy, and “a morally accepted framework for social reform” (p. 91). Part III discusses the contributions of friendship to the use of narrative perspectives as a means to promote enlightened citizenship, and part IV outlines how friendship as a device can be used to strengthen the coherence of plot, and offers an alternative to the common focus on the romance between hero and heroine. To illustrate these developments, Berndt analyses two novels in detail for every one of these four parts, here given in the order in which they are discussed: Frances Brooke’s *The History of Julia Mandeville* (1763), Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein* (1818), Sarah Scott’s *Millenium Hall* (1762), Helen Maria Williams’s *Julia* (1790), Charlotte Lennox’s *Euphemia* (1790), Walter Scott’s *Redgauntlet* (1824), Jane Austen’s *Persuasion* (1818), and finally Maria Edgeworth’s *Helen* (1834). Besides, she discusses or at least briefly mentions many others that were not selected for detailed study.

A fifth main development, the rise of women novelists, may actually be added to this study since of the eight novels Berndt discusses in detail, seven were written by women. Throughout the study Berndt proves her close study of the aspect of gender in both the novels she has studied and the criticism she has based her work on, and even though she claims that she does not want to make a distinction either between male and female writers, or between male and female characters, when it comes to friendship (p. 16), she does see the first two novels as the writers’ attempts to “disclose the disruptive potential of patriarchal authority” (p. 40). With a focus on both homosocial and heterosocial friendships (using the terminology introduced by Eve Sedgwick and Emma Donoghue), Berndt both acknowledges her debt to critics who have worked on friendship and the novel before and challenges what she sees as a too narrow focus on either friendships between women or friendships between men, claiming that Enlightenment sociability entailed the possibility of male-female friendship on an equal level (pp. 10-11; 15-16) and arguing that the
novels’ refusal to “discriminate between friendships on the basis of the sexual body” (p. 237) enables them to transcend any restriction to the private sphere.

Berndt’s dense introduction poses a challenge to every reader not up-to-date in the topic as it manages to briefly outline the study, present the eighteenth-century novel, discuss the state of the art of friendship-scholarship, and summarize the main philosophical arguments concerning friendship published throughout the long eighteenth century all in the space of some thirty-five pages, in a veritable tour de force skilfully presenting the interconnections between these diverse fields in the central topic, friendship. The study continues in a similar vein, covering a wide range of genres as well as criticism: part II alone deals with utopian writing, women’s rights, philanthropic movements and social reform, as well as the two novels chosen to illustrate her claims. Berndt is not interested in the writers’ personal assumptions about friendship, instead, she links each novel to particular contemporary philosophical ideas on friendship, arguing that “in the second half of the long eighteenth century, novelists take up philosophical friendship debates, which motivate their experimentation with new novelistic genres, different plot strategies and alternating narrative perspectives” (35). The solitary protagonist of Frankenstein, for instance, is incapable of friendship, Berndt argues, and this incapacity ultimately blocks the development of a sympathetic self (p. 78).

The novels are selected because the friendship motif, according to Berndt, is vital to our understanding of these particular stories on several levels. Berndt thus introduces various definitions of friendship in the four parts, and in the Introduction she insists on a very broad understanding of friendship, based on “the comprehensive conception of friendship in Enlightenment philosophy” (p. 17), which does not distinguish between friendship that is inherent in a romantic relationship or close kinship or even (some) socio-economic relations, between a friendship that is of substantial importance to the plot, and a friendship that seems to be introduced only because it reveals some positive traits of the protagonist’s character. From a narratological perspective, this may indeed be necessary: the relationship between Lady Russell and Anne Elliot, or the barely renewed intimacy of the heroine with Mrs Smith are clearly important to Austen’s Persuasion, for instance, even if these friendships as such are somewhat below the ideal so often maintained in other novels. (Lady Russell, I guess, might be an example of the second prevalent meaning of “friends” in the eighteenth century, which, according to Lawrence Stone denotes all the folks who felt entitled to meddle with a young woman’s marriage hopes. The value of Lady Russell’s friendship in the novel, as Berndt proves, is paradoxically that of being outgrown by the heroine: Anne gains self-consciousness as well as self-confidence in re-positioning her mother’s friend in the hierarchy of her own choices [p. 199].) Berndt’s study does not stick to a narrow narratological perspective, though, but often diverges into socio-historical aspects, and in a footnote halfway through the study, even Berndt has to admit that she does make a “distinction between significant friend(hip) and mere formal references to friend characters” according to contemporary cultural distinctions (p. 145n).
A minor but to me, somewhat painful aberration is Berndt’s dismissal of ‘Fanny’ Burney as a conduct-book novelist of little originality (pp. 41, 144, 185). (The heroine’s attempts to be a friend to Mrs Berlinton in *Camilla* might, I think, actually be a fairly good example of a new way to use the conventional false friend to advance the plot: Camilla genuinely tries to stop her friend from doing harm to herself.) In her discussion of the epistolary novel (part III), Berndt is interested in the analysis of characters as part of networks, as well as in techniques that “bridge the presumed rift between public and private” by introducing what she terms “civil agency” (p. 145). As the study is focused on novels on the later Hanoverian Age, Richardson’s widely influential depiction of friendship and his extensive use of multiple perspectives are understandably given short shrift (cf pp. 135; 143), but Berndt’s assessment of the friendship between Clarissa and Anna Howe in Richardson’s masterpiece as not yet fully developed may also be challenged, since her claim that “Anna’s inconsiderate and selfish rejection of her friend Clarissa after the latter has been raped” (p. 95) envelopes their friendship in the narcissism of sentimental relations is rather harsh: surely the seeming desertion is only one of Richardson’s many plot devices to keep his readers in suspense? After all, the women’s friendship proves to be stronger than Lovelace’s machinations.

In her conclusion, Berndt outlines the ways in which “friendship correlates aspects of genre with other discourses of the time” (232), taking over the philosophical debates on friendship to be continued in the realm of fiction. She also discusses the negative impact the friendship motif may have had in strengthening “the institution of the patriarchal family” (p. 235) since it seemed to suggest that an outside attachment to a friend might be an acceptable substitute to the lack of an egalitarian partnership at home. The book is clearly intended for a more advanced readership, but among that, many may find themselves persuaded that the friendship motif in literature is well-worth their further attention.

Mascha Hansen
University of Greifswald


Sabine Baltes-Ellermann begins her edition of texts from the 1720s with an introduction to the subject suiting readers from all disciplines:

The conflict between the English government and the people of Ireland in the early 1720s about a patent [to William Wood] for coining copper money was a watershed in eighteenth-century Irish history which impressively highlighted the tensions and ambiguities in the relationship . . . Originating in a scheme of private money-making, the affair
fermented into a fierce dispute . . . about economic, constitutional, and moral principle, a dispute Ireland had hardly ever experienced in that form and on that scale before. The controversy about Wood’s Halfpence has hitherto aroused interest chiefly because of the involvement of Jonathan Swift as the Dublin Drapier who vigorously . . . [defended] Ireland’s economy and constitution. However, a focus on Swift’s contributions alone tends to leave the picture of the dispute incomplete, because . . . there appeared more than a hundred pamphlets and broadsides in prose and verse written by other authors. (17)

Though initiated by the elites, that outpouring of public protest, “the largest body of ephemeral literature [on a single issue] ever published until that time,” demonstrates that it was “the Irish population at large,” all classes and creeds, united to defend their welfare and traditions, that sustained the rejection of the coinage, leading to the King’s withdrawing Wood’s patent in 1725. There are good reasons for teachers in democracies besides Ireland to maintain the story of this victory, which in part means keeping at least one of Swift’s Drapier’s letters on the syllabus of 18C literature classes and providing the context that Jonathan Swift’s Allies offers (yes, working people lose battle after battle, but . . .). Besides the legend of the Dean, the struggle led to a bibliographical explosion as one sees from the marked increase in ESTC records for 1724 (124 in 1720 and 161 in 1722 vs. 256 in 1724), presumably as much due to conserving the record as to the increase in printing, but in any case providing an improved window into the economy and the politics of early 18C Ireland.

This second edition of Baltes-Ellermann’s anthology is distributed in the Münster series by Peter Lang. The first edition was published by Academica Press of Washington, DC, in 2004, in its Irish Research Series (464 pp.), but it was poorly marketed and insufficiently reviewed. This second edition, while relying on much of the introduction and most of its texts, “also draws on a number of books and articles . . . that have appeared since,” and it removes at least one item as lacking the intent to protest (old #5) and adds a few new selections (e.g., 11 and 105) to the pamphlets, poems, and songs included. The groundwork for the anthology was laid by Baltes-Ellermann’s dissertation, completed at Münster under the direction of Hermann J. Real and published (by “Sabine Baltes”) as The Pamphlet Controversy about Wood’s Halfpence (1722-25) and the Tradition of Irish Constitutional Nationalism (Münster Monographs, 27 [Peter Lang, 2003]). That volume was, in both senses, very well reviewed (favorably and with a clear explanation of the controversy’s principal issues and Baltes’s accomplishment) in the East-Central Intelligencer by Wanda Creaser of Arizona State U. (18, no. 2 [May 2004], 27-29). That book’s production allows the author now to provide a consensus view of the history of and issues in the dispute, drawing in Irvin Ehrepreis and Oliver Ferguson’s books without much qualifying criticism.

Although there are 108 numbered selections, the volume offers about 128 texts, for nos. 3, 30, and 89 are groupings of multiple related tracts (3 and 89 being Parliamentary addresses and 30a-o being declarations that groups will refuse the half-pence). The 450+ pages of 18C texts considerably expand literature available to a scholar working on this period. There are over 100
texts from Dublin in 1724 (ECCO has only 150 and these include many duplicating editions of Swift works available to one in any number of editions). The range of the sampling is worth stressing: the anthology includes parliamentary addresses, economic tracts, satirical prose and verse, and many diverse broadsides, as parodies of gallows speeches. Selected texts are almost all complete, with material cut noted (e.g., #5). They are arranged chronologically for the most part, with some grouping by authorship, intent, and genre. The introduction provides a good historical account of the dispute over Wood’s patent, from, in 1723, the first alarms by an “artificer in metals and a citizen of Dublin” (James Maculla), offering from the start most major criticisms later replayed, and the objections of Parliament, spurred by Archbishop William King and others, through loud clamor in part orchestrated by Swift beginning in February 1724 (often marked by exaggeration and imaginative play), to the grand-jury trial of printer John Harding, and the post-dispute celebrations of the victory and Swift’s role as the M.B., drapier. Baltes-Ellermann provides a clear and connected account of the principal documents and their arguments; those included and some not included are described and summarized, breaking down the Irish and the Walpole administration strategies. The focus of Irish protests varied in passing phases, emphasizing such issues as economic ruin and then constitutional liberties. The inclusiveness of the selected texts illustrates not only these appeals but stresses the diversity of Swift’s allies, from the Irish Parliament to the Dublin guilds and the provincial towns. It is also worth noting that opposition texts are included: #46 is pro-Wood, nos. 87-88 involve a defender of Wood’s, John Browne’s, efforts to apologize and defend his earlier position, and #104 is a rare attack on Swift, probably by Jonathan Smedley. In addition, the headnotes to all texts guide the reading with discussions of context, authorship, and strategy, often explaining logical and rhetorical appeals and linking the text with others. The footnotes record copy-text, identify and translate mottos, gloss legal procedures, literary allusions, and historical references. Some contain relevant biographical details, as those on Edward Southwell and John Law (pp. 120 and 165). There is a six-page glossary for learned and slang words employed in the texts (such as “agio,” “baubee,” “scissel,” and “sess”), and a three-page biographical index of principal historical figures and authors.

Baltes-Ellermann has excluded Swift’s Drapier letters, for her volume is not so much a “case-book” on the dispute as a supplement to other volumes that scholars have relied on. However, other publications attributed to Swift are included (e.g., #35). By my count half of the selections are not to be found on ECCO. Furthermore, some texts that are on ECCO are defective and illegible on ECCO, but now they can be read with ease and speed--and they are bound for use, ready to store MS notes--not a salad of printed photocopies in a manila folder. The first edition was produced before ECCO was available and so often different copies were selected for transcription. In one case, she chose a copy at the National Library of Ireland (DN) with complete imprint but ECCO digitizes an imperfect BL copy on which the imprint-less ESTC record is based; thus, we thus learn the printer (Wm. Wilmot) of the pamphlet *A Soldier’s Plea*. Also the excerpts from newspapers, as for poems and
declarations, are not to be found in the digitized Burney Collection, but would require access to microfilm held by few libraries.

In addition to expanding upon ECCO, Baltes-Ellermann has expanded upon ESTC. Among the anthologized texts not recorded in ESTC are #33: *An Excellent New Song Made by a Lover of his Country: against Woods’s Brass Half-pence*, lacking colophon, sole copy at Yale; and three works on broadsides only recorded in OCLC for the Forster Collection at the National Art Library (LVA) and reproduced from microfilm at Trinity College (DT): #30e, *The Flying-Stationers Declaration* (D[ublin]: n.s. 1724), #34: *Woods’s Confession to the Mobb of the City of Dublin* (D: Printed by C. C[arter], 1724), and #96: *A Second Song Sung at the Club at Mr. Taplin’s The Sign of the Drapier’s Head in Truck-Street* (D: n.s., 1725). Another reproduced from film at DT that I cannot trace in ESTC or OCLC: 30f: *The Declaration of the Corporation of the Butchers* (D: Printed by Gwyn Needham, in Crane Lane), but as usual the editor provides the full imprint. Another item transcribed that is missing from ESTC is an “engraved copper print showing an allegory of the halfpence affair” (#39, “Printed for Miles Lockyer,” this publisher also unrecorded in ESTC)—it is illustrated in the volume’s frontispiece.

I miss references of texts to the ESTC. They would allow Baltes-Ellermann to improve the most essential tool in 18C studies while also allowing her readers to draw support from it. Also, in cases of multiple editions with the same title and imprint, the ESTC record number would clarify the edition reproduced. This is the situation with David Bindon’s *Some Reasons Shewing the Necessity the People of Ireland Are under, for Continuing to Refuse Mr. Wood’s Coinage* (D: Printed in the Year, MDCCXXIV), #25. The text copied is identified as Yale’s, but that copy is not recorded for either ESTC record T69228 or T155363. However, as the presence of a comma after “Year” in the imprint suggests, and other variants indicate, we are offered T155363. Another revealing case involves *The Present State of Ireland Consider’d: In a Letter to the Revd. Dean Swift. By a True Patriot* (no place or publisher, 1724), which was printed by two printers with the same words in title and imprint. Here the note, on the source gives us the call number of a Trinity College copy, thus identifying it as T179299 (a fact also suggested by the italicizing of “Patriot” in the transcription). That note also indicates that the DT copy “differs in pagination and typescript from that held” by Yale, which, unless there is a third edition, means that Yale has an unrecorded copy of T217018, hitherto only located at the DN and not listed by Teerink. My cross-checking identifies some corrections to ESTC besides that for *A Soldier’s Plea* noted above. For instance, Baltes-Ellermann identifies the proper format for #23, wrongly called a 12mo by ESTC. Not surprisingly, given her mastery of the Wood’s-patent literature, Baltes-Ellermann offers trustworthy conjectures regarding dates. Another Letter to Mr. Harding the Printer (D: J. Harding, n.d.), #20, has the conjectured date “[1725?]” in ESTC T87748, but she gives [1724]. She does not ascribe this work to Swift, as does the ESTC. She is much less prone to attribute material to Swift, presumably due to her knowing and appreciating the quality of so many texts unlikely to be his. However, she sometimes offers her expertise in conjectured attributions to Swift, as for his writing *A Letter from a Lady of
Quality (#27, p. 210n.) or against his writing the poem To his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin (#52, p. 326n.). Attribution notes concern other authors as well, such as identifying nos. 24-25 as by David Bindon Jr., not Bindon Sr.

As for the textual editing, the copy-texts are usually the first (often the only) editions of publications, sometimes from microfilm held by Trinity College, as for newspaper articles (e.g., Declarations taken from newspapers); other texts are transcribed from the 1935 Herbert Davis edition of Drapier’s Letters, various editions of Swift’s Works (1735 through Scott’s in 1814), and Harold Williams’s 3-vol edition of Swift’s Poems. (Presumably some items, not known as separate publications, were published but are no longer extant [e.g., #35]). These sources are usually textually very close to first editions not directly copied by Baltes-Ellermann, such as that for #53, where the text derives from Williams’ faithful reproduction of Harding’s 1724 broadside. When the microfilm at DT is the stated source, we ought to learn the location of the copy filmed, though often that can be surmised as shown above. Texts were transcribed with very few alterations, never for modernization, but sometimes with probably unnecessary corrections, such as correcting “beleive” (p. 141). The emphatic accidentals are almost all preserved, as full caps and italic font (but not black letter), but the editor occasionally inserts italics to call our attention to language not quoted by an author but expected to be recognized as another’s (e.g., to identify the Privy-Council’s language discussed in a text [169]). Not surprisingly, my collations reveal some transcription errors involving punctuation and capitalization (e.g., 213, 313), but almost none altering substantives. In one case (#61), Harding’s imprint date of 1724/5 is reproduced as “1724”; in another “Short” in the head-title is added to the title A Defence of the People of Ireland (#47). One can think of a few potential additions, as several more declarations (especially The Declaration of the Corporation of the Holy-Trinity, absent from ESTC, and perhaps Carteret’s and the King’s proclamations summarized in the introduction). But the anthology is sufficiently representative and long as it is. Jonathan Swift’s Allies belongs in all research libraries: it is an indispensable resource for all researching 18C Irish history & literature.—J.E.May

**EC/ASECS meets 25-27 October 2018 in Staunton, Virginia**

by Peter Staffel, Executive Secretary, EC/ASECS

The 2018 EC/ASECS meeting will take place 25-27 October in beautiful Staunton, Virginia, which locals call “Stan’un” and tourists, being map literalists, call “Stahton.” The conference theme will be “Performing the Eighteenth Century,” which the committee is convinced presents all manner of excellent opportunities for presentations and papers. Since no one threw themselves under the bus in acquiescence to my pleading, I have agreed to bite the bullet and chair/host the conference, especially since I came up with the location. Others will hopefully join the committee, as already has Eleanor Shevlin, goddess of conference organization, unable to say no when asked for
help! Contact me at staffelp@westliberty.edu. Staunton is thirty miles west of Charlottesville, southwest of Fredericksburg, in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains, nestled in Virginia’s gorgeous, historic Shenandoah Valley—and on an AMTRAK route as well as I-81 N/S and I-64 E/W!

We will hold the conference in the Stonewall Jackson Hotel, a lovely old-fashioned inn with all the amenities. AND—wait for it—right next door to the American Shakespeare Center [americanshakespearecenter.com], a year-round repertory company in the world’s only recreated Black Friar’s Theatre. Once the Center has published its autumn season, I will alert you to an excellent way to spend your Friday evening during the conference: Eat a delicious three course meal in the hotel (with wine)—call it a banquet, if you like—see a play at the Black Friars, and come back to the hotel for a late evening piano recital by our very own Maestro, Robert Mayerovitch, in the lobby of the Stonewall Jackson—or some combination of the three. Wow! Whatta Friday! We will line up tours of the town on Saturday afternoon, as well as roll out our usual excellent scholarly offerings by all of you—well, not ALL, but many of you.

Because we are neighbors to the ASC, I have scheduled for our plenary speaker Professor Paul Menzer, Director of Mary Baldwin University’s Master in Shakespeare and Performance Program (for information on the program and Prof. Menzer https://go.marybaldwin.edu/Shakespeare/graduate/) I am, likewise, negotiating with members of the faculty for possible panels and demonstrations, as well as student assistance. I think this will add an enjoyable new dimension to our conference.

Panel proposals are due by 15 March 2018; proposals for individual papers and completed panels are due by June 1, 2018. You can reach me at ECASECS2018@gmail.com, and the conference website can be found at http://ECASECS2018.wordpress.com or through a link at our EC/ASECS home webpage. We encourage all graduate student presenters to submit their papers for the Molin Prize [pronounced mo LEEN] (check the conference and the EC/ASECS website for further information about the award).

We do not have a site or chair for the next conference, i.e., autumn 2019. Campuses seem harder and harder to manage due to available space on Fridays—during normal college classes. However, many universities have an on-campus (or very nearby) conference facility, like the University of Delaware. Cities, like Philadelphia and Baltimore and Pittsburgh, likewise have numerous excellent hotels with small conference amenities as well. Destination sites, like Cape May, are also very doable, as we know from experience. And, of course, there are large and medium-sized cities in our region that we have not visited yet, like Richmond and Williamsburg. EC/ASECS has numerous experienced past-conference chairs who are more than willing to offer help and guidance, so, please, consider hosting next year. If you are interested or curious, contact me. By the way, I could use some help in 2018, so anyone who wants to volunteer or who could encourage graduate students to come and help, please let me know.

I also could use some “intellectual” help with the Oral/Aural Experience. Susan Beam and I have exchanged some emails and gotten laughs at the other’s expense for the amazing “suggestions” autocorrect/spellcheck has substituted or recommended for a word it didn’t recognize. I am reminded of
the new Prairie Home Companion radio show *Live from Here’s* occasional spot called “Autocorrect Theatre Company.” They do very abbreviated versions of instantly recognizable standards but modified by autocorrect. I have had a few similar experiences when typing in passages for identification on exams—hilarious or mind-boggling. I want to invite any and all members to send in or present passages that we all probably know but which have been “re-imagined” by autocorrect. Just type in bits that have words which probably mean something rather different now than they did then, and see what the machine says—phones are excellent vehicles for this. I look forward to seeing as many of you as possible in Staunton, however you wish to pronounce it.

West Liberty University

**Financial Report & Minutes of the 2017 Business Meeting**

I am distressed to report that our financial situation is not nearly as positive as it has been for some years. This is due to two primary causes: the considerable overrun of our conference’s costs in Washington, and the significant under-payment of annual dues, which I noted obliquely in this year’s dues letter (or as Brij Singh appropriately calls it, a “dunning” letter).

I will attribute the problems in DC to two greenhorns running the show. We try to set our conference registration fees to cover conference expenses as closely as possible. We assumed that a much larger crowd would turn up than did. Cities like DC and Philadelphia generally produce large numbers of conference goers. Not this time. Granted, we were late getting the final information published and my attempt to use email rather than another (expensive) postal contact certainly played detrimental roles. Thus, we ordered more food than necessary as well as contracted for too many rooms. Sort of a perfect storm. The conference came in several thousand dollars “over” budget.

Our present dues membership could still have rescued us, paying for our postings and conference overrun. Alas, here is the basic breakdown: setting aside 55 lifetime memberships, under 100 of nearly 400 members carried on the rolls into 2017 paid dues. OUCH! Each of the two annual mailings (dues letter and conference registration) cost about $400; the expense of the newsletter is much higher—approximately $3000 per year less $400 subvention, and one of our long-time donors has retired. You see the problem.

The lifetime option ($250) has been a very attractive one, and it has certainly bolstered the bank account since its inception. However, it is not like “sustaining membership” on NPR that keeps coming in each year. Plus, we have been blessed, partly due to the Molin Prize, with a significant and growing population of graduate students, whose dues is $15/annum. While we are thrilled to welcome new faces at the conferences, too many grad students are one timers, even though we continue to send our newsletter to them for several years after they last paid dues. We hope that these potential regulars will keep their membership active until they get that fabulous paying first job.

We have two potential cost-saving options. The Executive Board agreed that we should drop members from the rolls after they have gone three years
without paying, which I think is fair. What I would prefer to see members do is simply notify me by email if they do not wish to continue as members. This even applies to grad students who may have joined to attend a conference in their backyard. But I hope most of you will support the society by paying dues. Please remember that dues are annual, whether you come to the conference or not. I am not going to badger you. However, we are in need of a steady “income stream” from our dues-paying members to cover costs: roughly 160 members paying regular dues would finance the newsletter and dues letters. Another 100 would make up any cost overruns at the convention, although I do not expect that to happen again. But a cushion would be nice. Thank you!

Our longer term scheme to cut costs involves going electronic. We will eventually save close to $4,000 if we do. Thus, I am asking all of you to send me your active email address. We could set up an ECASECS list serve for our two annual letters and even send out periodic reminders of various goings on. Sometime in the not too distant future, the newsletter, too, will go electronic. What we need is a successor to Jim May who has the inclination and skill to produce an e-newsletter. (He longs to be replaced.) Oh, our bank balance is approximately $1,500, now growing from promptly paid dues—yay!

Minutes of the Business Meeting

After a delicious lunch served up by Howard U.’s Sodexo crew, the membership was called to order. Peter Staffel, as Executive Secretary, thanked Emily Kugler for organizing the conference. Eugene Hammond of Stony Brook U. presented the annual presidential address, and while our presidential addresses do not necessarily follow a particular pattern, like plenaries generally do, Gene’s presentation was like none I have been privileged to hear before. A combination of scholarly discussion of his monumental two volume biography of Jonathan Swift, personal academic memoir, and the reflections on the state of our nation near the end of the first year of Donald Trump’s presidency, Gene’s talk was, by turns, fascinating, challenging, funny, frightening, and engaging. I have always felt a certain liveliness emanate from Gene in personal exchanges, and that same aura permeated the podium. I hope that spontaneity comes through for readers (see the address above).

The business end of the meeting was relatively quick and painless, as usual. The Executive Secretary announced that the 2018 conference would be in Staunton, Virginia, a jewel-box of a town west of Charlottesville in the Shenandoah Valley, not very far from last year’s conference at Mary Washington. Sylvia Marks accepted the nomination for Vice-President with a combination of good cheer and resignation. Anthony Lee seemed to actually be thrilled to be nominated for the Executive Committee and assume a role in the Molin Prize selection. Thanks to both for their willingness to serve! Jim May acknowledged printing subvention funds from James L. West and Robert D. Hume of Penn State Univ. (after thirteen years of support, James L. West’s now comes to an end with his retirement). Jim encouraged contributions that would expand the newsletter’s coverage to reflect the members’ interests.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Staffel, EC/ASECS Executive Secretary
Chelsea Berry Wins 2017 Molin Prize

The 2017 S. Eric Molin Prize for the best paper by a graduate student has been awarded to Chelsea Berry of Georgetown University (History). Her paper delivered at the EC/ASECS annual meeting in Washington, D.C. in November 2017 is entitled "Black Medical Practitioners and Knowledge as Cultural Capital in the Greater Caribbean." Berry explores these practitioners' complex relationship to their sources of medical knowledge, both traditional and textually-mediated; the controversial nature of their practice in the eyes of religious authorities and other medical practitioners, despite widespread demand for their services; and their diverse networks of medical knowledge and practice. The paper focuses on a specific case of two practitioners denounced for "sorcery" in Salvador de Bahia (Brazil) in 1749, thus addressing the sometimes overlooked Portuguese Atlantic. Berry analyzes the text of the accusation in the case, which the inquisitors ultimately declined to put to a full trial. Her analysis is based in a close examination of the details of this one case as reflected in the archive, while being positioned convincingly within a comparative discussion of wider patterns of medical practice among blacks and slaves across the New World. The committee, comprised this year of Joanne Myers, Ellen Moody, and chair John Heins, felt that Berry's paper exhibited remarkable original research into primary sources, a sure-handed analytic approach, and an admirable clarity and precision.

John P. Heins, Molin Committee Chair
Research Library, National Gallery of Art

Delaware Press Launches Swift Monograph Series

The University of Delaware Press invites submissions for its series “Swift and His Contemporaries.” The series’ general editor is Ashley Marshall of the University of Nevada, Reno, author of Swift and History: Politics and the English Past. The advisory board includes Brian Cowan, Ian Gadd, Eugene Hammond, Greg Lynall, Hermann J. Real, James Ward, Howard Weinbrot, and Abigail Williams. The series will publish new books on Jonathan Swift and his contemporaries and on topics related to the literary, social, religious, economic, and political issues of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The press and series editor encourage submissions not only on Swift himself, but also on other major and minor writers, statesmen, philosophers, and intellectuals of the time. Given the interdisciplinary nature of Swift’s career and his canon, they welcome contributions from a wide range of disciplines. This series will feature monographs that explore a particular topic in depth or offer new critical editions of primary works or collections of essays. For further information or to submit a manuscript or proposal, contact marshall @ unr.edu.
Additions and Corrections to the Directory
(The last full directory was published in the October 2015 issue.)

Berry, Chelsea. new member: cb1098 @georgetown.edu; History Dept. / Georgetown Univ. / Washington, DC  20057
Bowden, Martha. new address: 1904 Grenache Lane / Kennesaw, GA 30152
Capmartin, Sophie. (Dept. of French and Italian, Tulane U.) 3217 Cadiz St. / New Orleans, LA 70125
Chao, Noelle: new member: English Dept. / U.S. Naval Academy / 107 Maryland St. / Annapolis, MD  21402-5044
Curley, Thomas. new member: (English, Bridgewater State University) tcurley@bridew.edu; 165 Grange Park / Bridgewater, MA  02324
Fenner, Courtnee. new member: English Dept. / Howard Univ. / Locke Hall / 2441 Sixth St., N.W. / Howard Univ. / Washington, DC 20059
Fezzey, Hilary. new member: hfezzey@uwsuper.edu; English Dept. / U. of Wisconsin--Superior / P.O. Box 2000 / Superior, WI 54880
Frail, Robert J. new address: globaled1@mindspring.com; 404 East Stiger St. / Hackettstown, NJ 07840
Garrett, Nicole. new member: Nbgarret @gmail.com; English Dept. / State U. of New York at Stony Brook / Stony Brook, NY 11794-5350
Giblin, Kaitlyn. (English) kaitlyngiblin@gmail.com; Center for Teaching & Learning / Marymount U. / 2807 N. Glebe Rd. / Arlington, VA 22207
Glover, Brian. (English Dept. / East Carolina Univ); gloverb@ecu.edu; 1407 N. Overlook Dr. / Greenville, NC 27858
Hogan, Margaret. new address: 103 Marked Tree Rd. / Needham, MA 02492
Jackson, Spenser. new member: s.jackson1 @uq.edu.au; Institute for Advanced Studies in Humanities / U. of Queensland / St. Lucia QLD 4072 / Australia
Jones, Kelly Houston. new member: jonesk@apsu.edu; Dept. of History and Philosophy / Harned Hall / Austin Peay State Univ. / P.O. Box 4486 / Clarkesville, TN 37044
Lieske, Pam. new address: 17586 Eastbrook Trail / Chagrin Falls, OH  44023
Lucas, Wendy. new member: wendyc@uca.edu; History Dept. / U. of Central Arkansas / 201 Donaghey Ave. / Conway, AR 72035
Michaels, Blake. new member: (grad. studies, History Dept., Lehigh U.) blakemic2009@gmail.com; 110 Orchard Dr., Apt 2 / Whitehall, PA 18052.
Mitsein, Rebekah. new address: 17 Harvey Place / Newton, MA 02465-2020
Myers, Jacob. new member: English Dept. (New North 306) / Georgetown University / 3700 O St., N.W. / Washington, DC 20057
Phillips, Chelsea. Theatre Dept. / Villanova U. / Villanova, PA 19085
Rhodes, Marissa new member: marissac@buffalo.edu; History Dept. / 546 Park Hall / State Univ. of New York at Buffalo / Buffalo, NY 14260-4130
Roberts, Marilyn. new address: 641 Campbell Flat Rd / Norwich, VT 05055
Roney, Jessica. new member: jessica.roney@temple.edu; History Dept. / Temple U. / 950 Gladfelter Hall / Philadelphia, PA 19122
Rosenthal, Jamie. new member: jrosent@email.unc.edu; English Dept. /
News of Members

Having moved this year, I’m aware of how tedious it is to let everyone know a new address, but I remind members to let Peter Staffel know your new address when you move, for remailing the last issue to members added $25 to its postage costs and many a trip to the post office. I can’t mention Peter without adding my thanks to him (and surely his wife Mary-Bess Halford) for organizing our 2018 meeting in Staunton, VA (see above). I begin the news of members by surveying the fall 2017 EC/ASECS and its participants, with special attention to new members. There were many new members in Washington, which offers hope for our graying membership. It remind us of the importance of getting faculty to plug our conferences, noting the discounted dues & fees for grad students. We will send issues of the newsletter to anyone who’ll pass them on as inducements to young scholars.

We are pleased to welcome Victoria Barnett-Woods, an English Ph.D. candidate at George Washington U., who is working on Caribbean literature & culture. She set up the website https://18thcenturycaribbean.com as the future site of a digital mapping project. Her dissertation, entitled “Reading the West Indies: Empire, Slavery & the Rise of the Novel,” examines “how the imperial history of the Caribbean contributed to the rise of the novel as a form.” In 2016 she published in Women’s Studies the essay “Models of Morality: The Bildungsroman and Social Reform in The Female American and The Woman of Colour” (45.7:613-23). We were pleased to meet Noelle Chao (English, Naval Academy) at the fall meeting. She read the paper “The Arts and Indifference in The Wanderer.” Noelle works on the novel, music, and sound studies. Several people who heard Lorna Clark speak at the fall meeting were delightfully surprised at all they learned regarding juvenile writings by the Burney family. The distinguished Johnsonian Thomas Curley joined the Society last fall to participate in Tony Lee’s session on modern author’s relationship with Samuel Johnson. Tom’s paper examined Samuel Beckett’s attempt to write a play on Johnson’s love for Hester Thrale; although that long effort failed, Tom noted convincingly that in Krapp’s Last Tape Beckett pictures Krapp at the start just as Johnson had been in the draft of the Johnson play. Tom edited Robert Chambers’ A Course of Lectures on the English Law: Delivered at the University of Oxford, 1767-1773, 2 vols. (Wisconsin, 1986), and he wrote the authoritative biography of Chambers, whom Samuel Johnson
assisted with the lectures: Sir Robert Chambers: Law, Literature, and Empire in the Age of Johnson (1998). Tom’s other books include Samuel Johnson, the Ossian Fraud, and the Celtic Revival in Great Britain and Ireland (2009).

Also at the Washington EC/ASECS, William Everdell offered an in-depth examination of the impact of German Pietism and its role in the counter Enlightenment (starting by reviewing the concept of a counter Enlightenment). Bill focused the second half of his talk on Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf (1700-1760), aka Brother Ludwig, with an examination of his ecumenical “religion of the heart” and its impact on the Moravian missionary movement from America to Africa (which he supported) and on authors & intellectuals outside that movement. Courtnee Fenner of Howard U. pulled a double shift at the fall meeting: after chairing a session she presented her paper “‘My Dear Pretty Jenny’: The Blackening of Jenny Diver in John Gay’s The Beggar’s Opera and Polly: An Opera.” During October Courtnee also presented a paper at the Victorian Institute conference: “‘Ha! This is Surely a Woman’s Hand’: Corporeal Silences and Refusal in Mary Seacole’s Life-Writing and Iconography.” Hilary Fezzey is a new member from U. of Wisconsin--Superior, where she teaches World Literature and The Age of Pope, Swift, and Gay. At the EC/ASECS, Hilary gave an interesting paper on the autistic behavior of actual and fictional persons during the 18C, particularly as the behavior or disability cut into the characters cultural capital as suiting them to marriage, respectively, Arabella from Charlotte Lennox’s Female Quixote and Hugh Blair. Blair dressed and performed small talk indecorously and ended up with an annulled marriage. Nicole Garrett is finishing her dissertation at Stony Brook on “The Enlightenment Individual in Narratives of Maternity: Secularism and Religious Feminism.” Nicole’s many publications while in grad school include co-editing with Heidi Hutner the Broadview editions of Frances Sheridan’s The Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph (2011) and Conclusion of the Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph (2013). She also contributed a biography of Sheridan to the Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of British Literature (2015). We also welcome Kaitlyn Giblin, who is in graduate studies at Marymount University, where she works in the writing center. Kaitlyn spoke at the Burney session in Washington on “‘To nobody belonging, by nobody was noticed’: Navigating the Bounds of Feminine Authority and Female Authorship in Frances Burney’s Evelina.”

After a well catered lunch and Peter Staffel’s enthusiastic invitation to the 2018 EC/ASECS in Staunton, VA, Gene Hammond offered the Presidential Address, whose revised text is our lead essay. Gene’s comments on the increased opposition to our mission as scholars and humanists within the current zeitgeist were further developed as the microphone was passed about the room. Various causes and consequences of the disrespect directed at academics and scholars were offered, and I was left thinking about how the burden of truth-seeking is too little applauded even by ourselves. Spenser Jackson wins the fall conference award for most miles traveled: he came from the U. of Queensland, where he has a postdoc at the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities. In 2012-13 Spencer enjoyed an Ahmanson-Getty fellowship at the Clark Library. Spencer spoke on Tory abolitionists and “Phyllis Wheatley’s Republican Political Poetics.” His dissertation at UCLA
in 2012 was published as God Made the Novel: Political Theology in 18C Britain, which starts with Dryden’s panegyrics and moves to Richardson and Edgeworth, examining form and character in a theological light. Traveling across town was new member Jacob Myers, a Ph.D. student at Georgetown. His research focuses on emotional / sensory perception and affective approaches to the body in the novel. In 2015 Jacob enjoyed a Fulbright scholarship to Macau and presently he’s conducting research for the U.S. State Department’s Diplomatic Reception Rooms.

We thank Emily Kugler for organizing the fall meeting despite being a new Asst. Professor at Howard U., just learning its ropes (she replaced Ann Kelly on Ann’s retirement last year—Ann is now volunteering in several ecological projects, guarding the streams in one case). Emily had a number of last minute problems to deal with, including Tara Ghoshall Wallace’s cancellation of her keynote lecture due to illness. Assisted by Kathy Temple, Emily set up several workshops for graduate students. Both Emily and Kathryn also presented papers, Kathryn’s entitled “Mixed Emotions: The Declaration of Independence, Adulation and Resentment” and Emily’s on “Petitions and Pamphlets: Transatlantic Biographies of Enslaved Women.” That panel was completed by Hugh Ormsby-Lennon’s “‘From ‘The Tail of the Tub’ to Bagatelles and Beyond: Dean Swift and Ben Franklin.”

The conference began with a good session on Johnson and Boswell as a tribute to John Radner—his wife Elly (Eleanor) attended. Ann Kelly led with an account of Johnson and Boswell’s trip to McKinnon’s cave in the Hebrides, with comparative recollections of her own family’s travel to the cave; Linda Merians examined Johnson and Boswell’s relationship and discussed John’s achievement, his capacity for empathy and ability to bring life experiences into scholarship (the paper is reprinted above); Beth Lambert explained why Boswell was never able to become a good friend of Edmund Burke (Boswell sought out Burke’s help, and received some, but Burke distrusted Boswell for his jotting down private conversations with the view to printing them, Burke and his family putting a particular premium on privacy); and Henry Fulton discussed Dr. John Moore’s connections with Johnson (whom he probably met once) but more especially with Burke and Helen Maria Williams. John had intended to chair something like this session in honor of his colleague at George Mason, Sven Eric Molin. John along with Beth Lambert and Stephen Ackerman offered tributes to Eric in the December 1987 Intelligencer, following Eric’s death 5 November, shortly after attending our meeting at Ursinus College, chaired by Peter Perreten. (I’ll send these recollections to anyone wishing to read them.) John, who met Eric in 1974, the year he started at George Mason, took to Eric immediately, and they often met for 18C talks and traveled to EC/ASECS conferences together. Among the paragraphs on Eric’s character, stressing his collegiality, generosity, and humanity, is one describing Eric as conversationalist, which reflected John’s own values: “He loved good talk, which meant lively talk but also friendly talk, unassertive talk, talk that might be expressive but always playfully so. He delighted in wide-ranging conversation that moved effortlessly from topic to topic, while remaining alert, engaged, sympathetic, and intellectually honest. And he sought to turn his interactions with students in the classroom into such
a conversation, drawing freely on anything that might seem relevant . . . in their effort to understand books and the writers of books, and to bring the familiar and alien a bit closer. . . . He was not self-effacing, and certainly not un-opinionated or unassertive (especially when issues were clearly political, when someone seemed to be getting screwed). . . . But he didn’t show off. And he was always interested, always more than willing to pay real attention to what others were thinking or doing, always encouraging.”

*Nancy Mace* has been offering very detailed examination of music publishing in Britain at our recent meetings, and this time she examined the career of Charles Dibdin, a self-publishing performer who’ll become a major London music publisher (esp. of songs). He battled pirates repeatedly, taking some to court and signing copies of his self-publications to signify them as the genuine article. Nancy has spent much time in 2017 working in archives in the London area while staying in a small but convenient flat she’s let (near the BL). Also on Eleanor Shevlin’s Bibliography & Book History panel, *Juliette Wells* delivered an enjoyable account of the American Quincy sisters’ (Eliza Susan and Anna’s) appreciation of Jane Austen. Eliza Susan corresponded with Austen’s brother Francis, a retired admiral, and one of the two published what sounded like a perceptive essay on Jane Austen in *The Atlantic*. The paper involves material in Juliette’s *Reading Austen in America*, her 2017 follow-up to her 2011 *Everybody’s Jane: Austen in the Popular Imagination*. *Sylvia Kasey Marks*, who’s rarely missed our meetings over the past several decades, has been wisely elected our new Vice President. Sylvia gave an interesting talk on playwright Arthur Miller’s radio play on the forger William Henry Ireland (1939, the script being at the Harry Ransom Center in Austin)—Ireland confesses from beyond the curtain of death. *Donald Mell’s* Swift session this fall was one of his best, including a publishable paper by *David Palumbo* on Swift’s correspondence with Mrs. Mary Pendarves (later Delany), examining both correspondents’ rhetorical strategies and what made the exchange thrive and then die. David had flown in from the Los Angeles area where he is working during a sabbatical. *Gene Hammond* offered a substantive review of Swift’s relations with his family (“Did Swift Hate His Relatives?”—apparently only a very few, as Deane Swift, but generally Swift had normal and warm relations with family members). Also at Don’s session we heard *Lorna Clymer*’s account of the serious side of the tradition underlying Swift’s occasional poetry, and *Ann Kelly* on “The Swift Meme” in today’s popular culture, as seen via Google searches.

We’re pleased to welcome a number of new members who participated in sessions on historical topics at the fall meeting. *Jessica Roney* of Temple chaired a session on “Philadelphia’s Connections to an Atlantic World.” Jessica is the author of *Governed by a Spirit of Opposition: The Origin of American Political Practice in Colonial Philadelphia* (Johns Hopkins UP, 2014). She is now writing a book entitled “A Revolutionary Inheritance,” treating settler societies in the U.S. and Canada during the first decade after the American Revolution. New members on her panel included *Marissa Rhodes* of SUNY Buffalo, who spoke on “Foreign Succor for Fledgling Citizens: Foreign Indentured Wet-Nurses in the Early Republic,” *Blake Michaels* of Lehigh U. spoke on “Building Political Networks Outside the
City Limits: Philadelphia’s Ties to Germantown and Surrounding Areas, 1750-1776.” And Jay Donis, also of Lehigh, spoke on “Capital Consent: Political Legitimacy on the Pennsylvania Frontier.” This session fully supported the conference theme, “Capital Culture & Cultural Capital.” Several sessions involved slavery and race relations in the new world. At one chaired by Courtnee Fenner of Howard U., Wendy Lucas and Kelly Houston Jones presented “Social Status and Slaveholding in the 18C Virginia Lowlands: Glimpsing Deference in Probate Records, and Chelsea Berry offered “Black Medical Practitioners and Knowledge as Cultural Capital in the Greater Caribbean,” for which Chelsea received the Molin Prize (see above). Wendy Lucas, the chair of History at the U. of Central Arkansas, works on material culture and such topics as women, gender, sexuality, and the relations of Native American and European cultures. She teaches courses in Gender in American History, the History of Witchcraft, and Colonial and Revolutionary American History. Kelly took her Ph.D. in 2014 from the U. of Arkansas and is an Asst. Professor of History at Austin Peay State U. Chelsea Berry is writing her dissertation in Georgetown’s History Department on ideas about “poison, medicine, and sorcery . . . through the lens of poison trials in 18C Bahia, Martinique, and Surinam.” More generally, she’s interested in the “movement, interaction, and evolution of ideas in the early modern Atlantic world.” And at a session on the Transatlantic Imagination, held Friday and chaired by Victoria Barnett-Woods (GWU), Jamie Rosenthal, who’s working on a book about “Bonds and Bondage: Sex in the Age of Revolution,” offered a mix of historical and fictional examples in “Sexuality and Slave Rebellion in the 18C Caribbean”; and Lisa Vandenbossche, writing a dissertation at the U. of Rochester about sailors and the literary imagination (aided by a Folger fellowship), delivered “‘Venereal Distemper’: The Contagious Threat of Illicit Trade in the Journals of Captain James Cook” (on how, during his third voyage, Cook tried to prevent the spread of VD to, and the birth of offspring by, islanders via commodity exchanges). Leah Thomas, third on the program, working on a book related to “Beauty and Commerce,” presented “Materializing the Immaterial: Creating Capital in a Mirrored Mirage,” aided by a beautiful handout and slides of maps and illustrations.

Jeremy Wear, a new member from the Univ. of Montevello, presented “Theorizing Free Trade in Defoe’s General History of the Pyrates” at the session on “Capitalism and Daniel Defoe,” where Jonathan Williams, who received his Ph.D. in 2016 and is a lecturer at the U. of Maryland, spoke on “Crusoe’s Resignation and the Matter of Liberalism.” The panel was completed by Joseph Rudman of Carnegie Mellon, whose papers I try never to miss as he has so much expertise in attribution studies. Joe offered “A Riposte to the Rothman Group’s Stylistic Study of Defoe’s Contribution to Robert Drury’s Journal” (known as Madagascar, an account of shipwreck supposedly experienced by the teenage Robert Drury--the actuality of the shipwreck is itself the center of a dispute). One of the more tightly focused sessions involved “Censorship in the Enlightenment,” chaired by Marie Wellington. It offered T.E.D. Braun’s “Cyrano censure”; Christine Clark-Evans on Montesquieu’s defense of The Spirit of Laws; and Erlis Wickersham’s “The Contribution of Rahel Varnhagen’s Salon to Late 18C Berlin.”
*****

In fall 2017 Charles Benson, former Keeper of Early Printed Books at TCD died. While a hard-working curator, working to see the collection built up and catalogued, Charles helped scholars in the reading room and through correspondence. He wrote many articles on Irish book history and co-edited with Siobhán Fitzpatrick the superb festschrift honoring M. Pollard, That Woman! Studies in Irish Bibliography: A Festschrift for Mary Paul Pollard (D: Lilliput Press, 2005). He was working on a dictionary of 19C Dublin printers. In June I saw him researching a book for a colleague in the RIA, looking healthy and well. The preeminent Blake scholar G. E. Bentley, Jr., died on 31 Aug. 2017, and is remembered by his colleague and friend Karen Mulhallen in the Fall 2017 issue of Blake: An Illustrated Quarterly. Though born in 1930, Bentley was still active, publishing The Edwardses of Halifax: The Making and Selling of Beautiful Books in London and Halifax, 1749-1826 in 2015 and contributing two notes to the last N&Q. Years ago Bentley donated to the U. of Victoria in Toronto books, papers, photographs, and microfilm related to Blake. Philanthropist Lloyd Cotsen died in Beverly Hills on May at age 88. He spent his fortune from Neutrogena collecting children’s books and folk art and supporting museums; he donated a collection of 40,000 books to the Firestone Library of his alma mater, Princeton. And Joseph Gallanar, a historian, in EC/ASECS for 30 years, died in August at age 89.

Ann Kelly sent in the following remembrance of Steve Ackerman [“S. J. Ackerman”], formerly an active member: “On January 5, 2018, our dear friend Steve Ackerman died after a brief illness. Early on, before there were organized 18C societies, Steve and others in the DC area met in each other’s homes to share our research with one another. Steve’s dissertation was on Dr. Samuel Garth, and he published a few short articles on him, but Steve’s real interest was in the raucous world of American politics, for which the politically-engaged satiric wit of the 18C provided an excellent context. Steve’s quirkiness, intellectual brilliance, and wryly humorous outlook on life made him an engaging raconteur—qualities that infused his writing. A sixth-generation Washingtonian, Steve developed deep historical knowledge of the Capital Region. His book-length history of ‘The First Sit-In, 1939: S.W. Tucker and Alexandria, Virginia’s “Library War,’’ involved extensive conversations with the surviving participants and archival research. Another project was Making Eastern Market: Heart of Capitol Hill Since 1805 (Folger Park Press, 2009). Recently his interest focused on the Grover Cleveland administration. Very well received, his feature story ‘The First Celebrity First Lady: Frances Cleveland,’ in the Washington Post Magazine was illustrated by items from his extensive collection of American political paraphernalia, which includes sheet music, posters, banners, flyers, and buttons, with items from virtually every American presidential campaign, beginning with George Washington’s. Before his death, Steve arranged to donate his collection to the District of Columbia Public Library. Steve had a wide circle of friends, from many walks of life. He will be sorely missed.”

Jennifer Airey is now editing Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature and serving as the President of the Aphra Behn Society and co-directing the U. of Tulsa’s Institute of Trauma, Adversity, and Injustice. Susan Beam, our website

The Spring 2017 Restoration has Anna Foy’s review of Courtney Weiss Smith’s Empiricist Devotions (41, no. 1: 109-12). Also here we find Melanie Holm’s essay “Authorial Sovereignty: Pleasure and Paratext in Margaret Cavendish’s Blazing Worlds” (5-28). Alexander S. Gourlay published “Blake Writes Backward” in the fall Huntington Library Quarterly devoted to Blake’s manuscripts (80: 403-21); Sandy discusses how Blake’s “drypoint retrography” has “sufficiently distinctive” lettering to allow identification of his graphic work; and he goes on to relate this lettering technique to Blake’s relief and intaglio etching for his illuminated books. George Hahn has published in the November issue of Modern Philology (vol. 115.2) the review article “War in British Romantic Literary Scholarship,” and a recent issue of The Scriblerian contains his review of Evert van Leeuwen’s Poetic Meditations on Death: A Gothic and Romantic Literary Genre of the Long

Ashley Marshall’s Swift and History: Politics and the English Past (2015) was reviewed by Alan Chalmers in Modern Philology, 115.1 (August 2017), E4-E7; by Matthew Gertken in Cambridge Quarterly, 45.1 (March 2016), 85-91, and by John Owen Havard in Scriblerian, 50.1 (Autumn 2017), 60-62. Ashley has been on sabbatical this academic year, visiting the Ehrenpreis Centre and other libraries but spending much of the fall in Bilbao and is now back writing in Reno, while looking forward to biking with her partner from Canada down to Mexico this summer. Ellen Moody also has a dream vacation planned for this year, travelling with her adult daughters to Milan to see the World Ice Skating championships. Last year Ellen reviewed Nick Holland’s In Search of Anne Bronte for victorianweb.org. This spring Ellen is teaching a course on the later Virginia Woolf books like Flush and Orlando for Osher LLI at American U. and another on “Sexual and Marital Conflicts in Anthony Trollope’s Fiction” at its George Mason campus (including He Knew He Was Right). Ellen is writing an essay entitled
“Presences among Us Imagining People: Modernism in Johnson’s and Woolf’s Biographical Art” for Tony Lee’s “Modernity Johnson” volume on contract with Clemson U. Press. In April Ellen will present “Close Reading as Critical Theory” on critical remarks on biography in two of Woolf’s biographies on a panel chaired by Tony Lee at the NEMLA in Pittsburgh. Carla Mulford published the review essay “Appreciating Benjamin Franklin” in Early American Literature, 52, 3 (2017), 729-48, treating works on Franklin by George Goodwin (on Franklin in London), Corey Mead (on the glass armonica), and Richard Margolis (on terra-cotta portrait medallions by Nini). Carla’s now writing the book “Benjamin Franklin’s Electrical Diplomacy.”

The past few months have seen two publications from Melvyn New. The December 2017 issue of The Library contains his and M. C. Newbould’s “Reconsidering a Sternean Attribution: Cambridge University Library’s ‘Sterne Volume’” (18.4: 478-86). The essay is a thorough correction to the repeated and mistaken assertion by scholars that a volume in the Bradshaw collection with six words in MS attributed to Laurence Sterne was in Sterne’s possession and thus a link with his family’s roots in Ireland. The folio collection of broadsides, pamphlets, and MSS from Ireland, assembled in the 1730s and referred to by collector Henry Bradshaw as his “Sterne vol.,” is shown to have been collected by someone in the Stearne family, a family including Bishop John Stearne, a friend of Swift, and his cousin Enoch Stearne, clerk to the Irish House of Lords. This fact, known but apparently uncited in print by Swift scholars David Woolley and James Woolley, puts a misunderstanding to rest, and the volume with its 18C Irish annotations will now be of greater interest for Swiftians. The second article from Mel might have been a book of interest to all working on literary history and criticism and particularly those working on Sterne and Richardson or either singly: “Richardson’s Sir Charles Grandison and Sterne: A Study in Influence” (Modern Philology, 115.2 [Nov. 2017], 213-43). Through his own experience as the editor of Sterne and recently the editor of Sir Charles Grandison, Mel masterfully illustrates how our perception of influence is “lodged in the beholder’s eye,” locked into a sequence of texts read. He shows how it might seem from verbal and thematic materials that not only did Richardson’s Sir Charles Grandison influence Sterne’s Tristram Shandy but that the other achronological influence occurred, with TS impacting SCG. Another major point involves how reading Sterne as if he were influenced by Richardson allows one to understand “two seemingly irreconcilable aspects of Sterne’s works, the bawdry and the Christian sentimentalism” (illustrations of both are discerned in Grandison and in Sterne’s novels). Mel offers a provocative discussion of polygamy in Richardson’s novel and thought and ultimately relates it to Richardson’s belief in a Christian sentimentalism that diminishes the self with the recognition that “in our happiest prospects, the sighing heart will confess imperfection.” Mel also examines how Sterne’s A Sentimental Journey can be read as “a conscious rewriting of Richardson’s [Grandison’s] ‘sentimental journey’, ’ despite the obvious differences between Yorick and Sir Charles, and further that ASJ can be read as a critical rewriting of Tristram’s unsentimental travel through France in Tristram Shandy, vol. VII. Thus the essay demonstrates the fruitfulness of juxtaposing and closely reading,
comparatively, great novels, conversing in the eternal canon. Among the questions this comparison raises is whether “Sterne’s bawdry is a critique of what he considered Richardson’s reticence to discuss the body . . . [or] intended to make overt what he realized was the underlying, necessary, and too often overlooked physical (sexual) prowess of Richardson’s ‘good man’” (235-36). This was but one of half a dozen “oh-my-god” moments for me while I read the essay. I’m sure the edition Mel has prepared with Elizabeth Kraft and E. Derek Taylor for the Cambridge Richardson will lead to a favorable re-evaluation of Richardson’s last novel and of Richardson himself.

Michael Newman in Eighteenth-Century Studies favorably reviews The Other Adam Smith by Mike Hill and Warren Montag (2014). Maximillian Novak has been honored by the Defoe Society with a “best essay” contest named for him; the first deadline is 1 March 2018 for an essay (in book or journal) published in 2016-17, with the prize of $200. Congratulations to Leah Orr on the publication by Virginia last fall of her Novel Ventures: Fiction and Print Culture in England, 1690-1730 (we have a review copy). Also Leah published “John Bull and the American Revolution: The Transatlantic Afterlives of Arbuthnot’s Character.” Journal of British Studies, 56.1 (2017), 51-69, and in 2016, “Dido and Aeneas in 18C England: Virgilian Imitation and National Identity” in Classical Receptions Journal, 8.4: 429-46. Adam Potkay contributed “Rhetoric and Philosophy in the 18C” to The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies, ed. by M. MacDonald (2017). Elizabeth Powers spoke at the Goethe Society of North America’s November meeting in College Park on digital Goethe drawing on her experience blogging on Goethe studies. We thank Hermann Real for his note above on A Tale of a Tub and the Roman Index. As a reward for organizing the 7th Münster Symposium on Swift, Hermann was this winter editing, with co-chair Kirsten Juhas and others at the Ehrenpreis Centre, the papers for publication by Wilhelm Fink in 2018. Hermann in April will present “Holy Wrath or Divine Vengeance? Revenge in Jonathan Swift’s Eschatology” at an interdisciplinary colloquium on revenge.

John Richetti has published A History of 18C British Literature (Wiley-Blackwell, 2017), and this year will see the publication of his Cambridge Companion to Robinson Crusoe. In October we learned that Albert Rivero and George Justice signed a contract to have their annual The Eighteenth-Century Novel, formerly with AMS, published by the Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies and distributed by University of Chicago Press. Al published “Samuel Richardson’s Critical Reception since 1900” in Samuel Richardson in Context, ed. by Peter Sabor and Betty Schellenberg (Cambridge UP, 2017). This spring Al is teaching a seminar on Jane Austen at Marquette. Beverly Schneller has been working on “Higher Education Redesign for New Majority Learners,” expected from Rowman & Littlefield later this year. She is writing up a presentation on teaching the French Revolution in first-year seminars using the “Reacting to the Past” Harvard Curriculum Casebook. The course theme was “Actions, Decision, & Outcomes,” and students debated for their political factions--though few knew any of the history, students became fully engaged. Beverly’s essay “John Hill and Mary Cooper: A Case Study in 18C Publishing” appears in Fame and Fortune: Sir John Hill and London Life in the 1750s, a collection of revised
papers from a conference a few years ago, ed. by Clare Brant and George Rousseau (Palgrave, 2017). In addition, the collection has several biographical studies of Hill by the editors, two essays on Hill and satire by Adam Rounce and Julie Peakman, an essay by Min Wild on Hill and Smart, several essays on Hill and botany, and more. Norbert Schürer has two reviews in this Winter’s Eighth-Century Studies: India, Modernity and the Great Divergence: Mysore and Gujarat (17th to 19th Centuries) by Kaveh Yazdani (2017), and Stealing Books in 18C London by Richard Carlton, Matthew Mauger, and Christopher Reid (2016). Norbert praises the latter, a study based on the Old Bailey Proceedings Online, which identifies 721 book thefts between 1674 and 1820 and examines trial procedures, the accused and accusers. Two-thirds involved larceny, and the accused were usually assumed guilty; thus the trial focused on lessening the value of what was stolen (theft of over a shilling’s value meant grand larceny, which could be lead to capital punishment).

Cal Winton voyaged by ship to South Africa in January to renew work there on Sir Richard Steele’s grandfather’s diplomatic and trade mission in the 17C. Cal was joined by his son Will, who took photographs for the projected book. In Captain Steele (1964), the first of his two volumes on Steele’s life, Cal sketched this earlier Richard Steele’s heroic enterprises, remarking “the grandfather deserves his own chronicler”--now Cal, as in a paper at the Fredericksburg EC/ASECS, is undertaking that journey. He hoped to attend the SCSECS after his return. James Woolley and Stephen Karian delivered the typescripts for the first three volumes of their four-volume Cambridge edition of Swift’s poetry to the general editors and the press.

Forthcoming Meetings & Events, Resources, Publications, &c.

ASECS and the SEAASECS meet 22-25 March 2018 in Orlando. ASECS meets in Denver on 21-24 March 2019, then St. Louis on 24-28 March 2020.

The Mid-Atlantic Conference on British Studies holds its annual meeting at the Univ. of Maryland on 7-8 April, 2018, co-chaired by historians Nicholas Popper of William & Mary and Kate Hinmarch-Watson of JHU. The 2018 meeting of the 18C Ireland Society will occur in Waterford, 8-9 June, organized by Ivar McGrath (ivar.mcgrath@ucd.ie) and Dr. Jeffrey Cox in partnership with Waterford Treasures and Christ Church Cathedral in Waterford. Events and sessions will across the town to highlight Georgian buildings. Proposals were due 2 March. The ECIS also sponsors the Irish Conference of Historians, meeting on 26-28 April 2018 at U. College Cork.

The conference “Charles Macklin and the Making of Georgian Theatre” occurs at Notre Dame London Gateway on 22-23 June 2018; proposals due 31 March to Ian Newman and David O’Shaughnessy (DOSHAUG@tcd.ie).

The Midwestern ASECS meets 12-13 Oct. 2018 at the Holiday Inn in Sioux Falls, SD, with the theme “18C Frontiers,” chaired by Sharon Smith and Scott Breuninger of the U. of S. Dakota (Sharon.Smith@sdstate.edu).

We in EC/ASECS meet in Staunton, VA, 25-27 Oct. 2018 (see above).

The International Society for 18C Studies (ISECS) has updated its directory at www.isecs.org under “ISECS-direct.” See p. 65 of the last Intelligencer for ISECS news in 2016. The next Congress, on “Enlightenment Identities,” is 14-19 July 2019 in Edinburgh organized by the British SECS and hosted by the Univ. of Edinburgh. The 18C Scottish Studies Society will use the Congress as its 2018 meeting. We’ve read that Brycchan Carey has stepped up as BSECS’s principal organizer. See www.bsecs.org.uk /isecls/.

As reported in the August 2017 Children’s Book History Society Newsletter, Brian Alderson has donated his collection of over 20,000 children’s books, dating from the 17C, to Newcastle U. and Seven Stories: The National Centre for Children’s Books. Alderson curated an exhibition from June to September 2017 at the Newcastle U.’s Philip Robinson Library to mark the occasion, preparing for the show a delightfully written and illustrated bibliographical catalogue, A Lilliputian Miscellany: Bio-Bibliographical Notes on a Collection, published by the Library and the Centre. The biographical notes include occasional accounts of the acquisition of the item (Alderson
began collecting items in the collection in 1951). Alderson remarks that “this small exhibition . . . tries to show, in little, the interplay between discovery and explication which lies at the root of collecting.” Alderson has been the foremost authority on children’s book history for decades and founded the Children’s Book History Society in 1969. This August 2017 issue of the *CBHS Newsletter* also has a summary of Adrian Seville’s lecture at the Society’s AGM in March 2017 entitled “Childhood through the Eyes of the Goose,” on the dice-and-board “game of the goose” that anticipates Candyland and Shoots and Ladders, etc., a game dating back at least to Italy in 1480 and sometimes a drinking/gambling game, but adapted for educational purposes in 17C France and late 18C England. (Landing on the goose allows your dice total to be doubled, etc.) Alderson also produced an illustrated 23-p. occasional paper (#12) distributed with the Dec. 2017 *CBHS Newsletter*, entitled “Some Notes on the Early Publishing and Illustration of Poetry for Children.” Alderson’s co-editor of the *CBHS Newsletter* remains Pat Garrett, who was honored at the 2017 AGM after stepping down from the Society’s chair--Pat had held the position for 47 years! The membership gave her, a collector of ABCs, a set of alphabet blocks with illustrations and multiplication sums that she described with illustrations in the May issue (where we also find Dennis Butts’ “Parables from Prison and the Asylum: The Children’s Verse of Christopher Smart”).

The * Folger Shakespeare Library* has on exhibition through 3 June “Beyond Words: Book Illustration in the Age of Shakespeare, displaying prints & books while examining the production of illustrations in the period.

New Orleans was founded 300 years ago, in 1718, and the *Historic New Orleans Collection* is holding through 27 May an exhibition on the city’s Founding Era (the first few decades and its earliest inhabitants) at its main exhibition hall on 533 Royal St. in New Orleans. “Beginning with the region’s Native American tribes, through the waves of European arrival and the forced migration of enslaved African people,” the exhibition “reflects on the complicated and often conflicted meanings” of the settlement. Besides works on paper, the exhibit offers ethnographic & archaeological artifacts, scientific and religious instruments, and paintings—75 objects in all, some on loan.

On 21 January the *Clark Library* celebrated its reopening.

Early in 2017 the *Library Company of Philadelphia* announced that Dr. Michael J. Barsanti was selected as the new Edwin Wolf 2nd Director, that is, its CEO, succeeding Dr. Richard Newman. Barsanti has a Ph.D. in English from Penn, has worked at the Rosenbach Library, the Pew Center for Arts and Heritage, and at the Free Library of Philadelphia Foundation. Another recent announcement is that the Library Company has launched the 4th year of its Mellon Scholars Program “after receiving a three-year grant of $500,000 from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to continue to engage scholars who are diversifying university faculty, contributing groundbreaking research to the field of African American history, and excelling in the field of academia.”

The *New York Academy of Medicine and its Library* at 1216 Fifth Avenue in New York City every year offers a program of lectures. This year’s included, on 31 January, James Delbourgo of Rutgers’ lecture “The Origins of Public Museums: Hans Sloane’s Collections and the Creation of the British Museum.” Lectures typically occur at 6 p.m. and are free but require advanced
registration. The Academy, founded in 1847, “is home to one of the most significant historical libraries in medicine and public health in the world . . . housed in the Academy’s magnificent 1926 building on Museum Mile.” A year ago Manuel Schonhorn mentioned that at a Columbia U. 18C seminar he and Al Coppola had discussed the “pleasant researching-reading time they’d recently enjoyed” at the Academy’s library. On enquiry Manny wrote, “Its rare book Librarian, Arlene Shaner, is as knowledgeable and gracious as a Librarian could be. It would be difficult to duplicate its rich holdings in early and modern medical texts anywhere in the city. It should be better known.”

The Smithsonian’s Museum of American History offers a free exhibition on the role of “Religion in Early America” through 4 June.

In January the Bibliographical Society of America awarded its 6th triennial Wm. L. Mitchell Prize for Bibliography or Documentary Work on Early British Periodicals to Paul Tankard for his edition Facts and Inventions: Selections from the Journalism of James Boswell (Yale UP, 2014). Tankard, who took his Ph.D. from Monash U. in 2003, is a Senior Lecturer at the U. of Otago in New Zealand. His edition provides a lengthy, insightful introduction to Boswell’s career, strategies, manner, and achievement as a frequent writer for the British press and also to the fourteen newspapers and magazines to which he contributed. With assistance from Lisa Marr, Tankard edited 130 pieces of journalism dating 1758-1794, grouped by theme, the great majority unpublished since the 1800s. They receive commentary in headnotes and fulsome footnotes. The apparatus filling out the volume’s 500 pages includes a section with attribution details and textual variants (some in Boswell’s hand on his archive of clippings), a chronological list of articles, a bibliography, index, and 19 plates. Tankard’s work reveals Boswell as a “busy professional writer with an almost constant presence in the British press,” to which he contributed over 600 pieces. The next Mitchell Prize covers publications in 2017 through to the submission deadline in fall 2019.

ASECS’s 2018 A. C. Elias, Jr., Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship was awarded to Kelly J. Hunnings of the Univ. of New Mexico and Kevin Murphy of the SUNY Stony Brook. Hunnings’s proposal is entitled “Ireland and the Laboring-Class Poetic Tradition: The Ecology of the Domestic in Mary Barber’s Verse”; Murphy’s, “Coercion and Sworn Bond in the 18th-Century British Atlantic.” The fellowships will assist both in conducting dissertation research on primary materials in Ireland during summer 2018. The Elias Fellowship, named for our late colleague who founded the fellowship, disperses $2500 annually to support “documentary scholarship on Ireland in the period between the Treaty of Limerick (1691) and the Act of Union (1800), by enabling North American-based scholars to travel to Ireland and Irish-based scholars to travel to North America for furthering their research.” For 2019 awards, submit applications by 15 November 2018 to Jason McElligott, The Keeper, Marsh’s Library, St. Patrick’s Close, Dublin 8, Ireland (jason.mcelligott @ marshlibrary.ie) and James May, 1423 Hillcrest Rd, Lancaster, PA 17603 (jem4@psu.edu). Applications consist of the coversheet downloaded at the ASECS fellowship website, a CV of no more than 3 pp., a description of the project (3 pp. or less,
treating its contribution to the field and work done and to be done during the proposed research period, a 1-p. bibliography of related studies, a short budget, and two signed letters of recommendation. Please submit all but the letters as one Word file or PDF. Further info is available at ASECS’s website.

Consider submitting a revision of your conference paper to ASECS’s Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture, with papers read at ASECS and its affiliates. The submission deadline for the last volume was in August. See p. 76 of our March 2017 issue or contact Eve Bannet at etbannet@ou.edu.

After the death of AMS Press, one of the important 18C annuals was left adrift, but we are happy to report that The Eighteenth-Century Novel, edited by Albert Rivero and George Justice will continue with volumes contracted to be published by the Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, which has a distribution arrangement with the U. of Chicago Press, two reliable and hard-working publishers. One advantage of the new arrangement is that “Chicago as a matter of course publishes ACMRS titles in electronic format” (something AMS could not do for ECN’s vols. 1-9). So, keep the journal in mind (contact albert.rivero @marquette.edu and gljustic@asu.edu).

Journal notes: The 2017 Book History, its vol. 20, has four essays on our period: Matthew Hill, “The Book Trade in Colonial Philippines” (focused on imports to Manila, 1571-1821, drawing on Inquisition records in Mexico City, finding that the booktrade wasn’t greatly impacted by the Inquisition (40-82); Tamara Hunt, “Servants, Masters and Seditious Libel in 18C England” (83-110); Robert Darnton, “The Travels of a Publisher’s Rep, 1775-76” (111-25); and Gunilla Törnvall, “From Copperplate to Color Lithography: On the Modernization of an Illustrated Flora, 1800-1900” (126-49). The fall 2017 issue of Dieciocho (40, no. 2), a strong issue from David Gies with the usual bibliographical survey of recent publications in 18C Hispanic studies (“Cajón de sastre bibliográfico”) has several essays focused on specific works, such as Frieda Koeninger on “Race at the Intersection of Religion, Aesthetics, and Politics: Comella’s El negro sensible and the Censors,” and some more general essays likely to interest scholars outside the field, such as Alfredo Poggi on the first books printed by Jesuits at Rio de la Plata, Rosa Calafat Vila on the regulation of theatre in Mallorca, and Tim Foster’s “‘Bienvenido Mr. Adams’: Anti-Catholicism, the Black Legend, and Racial Politics in the Founding of American-Spanish Relations.” The Spring 2017 issue includes a 51-p. essay by Catherine Jaffe, Ann Rueda, and Mark Malin on “Quixotes and Quixotisms in the Hispanic Enlightenment.” The final 2017 issue (no. 3 of v. 52) of Early American Literature has Laura Stevens’s presidential address at the SEA conference she organized in Tulsa last year and the special section “Literary Loyalism.” Issue no. 2 includes essays on James Grainger, on Swift’s satires in early America, and on “Writing India in Early American Women’s Fiction” (by Anupama Arora and Rajender Kaur,” 52:363-88). The Sept. 2017 Eighteenth-Century Music has essays on “Keyboard-Duo Arrangements,” Samuel Howard and music for the installation of D. of Grafton as Chancellor of Cambridge U., 1768,” “William Bates and his Concertos in Ten Parts,” and Vivaldi and the Seasons. The Spring 2017 Eighteenth Century: Theory & Interpretation has six essays from a

Two essays in the Winter 2017 ELH might interest some of our readers: Joseph Hone’s “Daniel Defoe and the Whig Tradition in Satire” (84: 865-90) and Laura Baudot’s “Joseph Addison’s Lucretian Imagination” (891-918). The Huntington Library Quarterly for Autumn was devoted to “William Blake’s Manuscripts” and ed. by Mark Crosby. The Dec. 2017 issue of BSECS’s Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies is devoted to “Fashion and Illness in 18C and Romantic Literature and Culture.” The French society for 18C studies similarly devoted its first 2015 volume, Vol. 46 of Dix-huitième siècle, to “Raconter la maladie.” Vol. 48, the first of 2016, 770 pp. in length, has the theme “Se retirer du monde” (but, as ever, it includes varia and over 100 pp. of book reviews). The Canadian SECS’s Lumen, has among the 11 essays in its 36th volume (2017) a number of bibliographical and textual studies; of special note are: Gary Kelly on cheap print and citizenship, David Smith on bibliographical problems involving Mme de Graffigny, Annie Champagne on Didot’s editions of Racine, Catherine Fleming on Tonson and Dryden, and Chance David-Pahl on The Rambler and Idler. In December’s Notes and Queries Emily Lorraine de Montluzin presses forward with “Attributions of Authorship in the Gentleman’s Magazine, 1803-1804” (64: 556-66), and G. E. Bentley, Jr. provides “Copperplate Printers in London 1775-1840: A Checklist” and an account of “William Blake and Richard Edwards as Joint Venturers in Young’s Night Thoughts (1797)” (542-48, 552-56). The William & Mary Quarterly’s October 2017 issue was a joint issue with The Journal of the Early Republic, with essays on “Writing to and from the Revolution.”

The three 2017 issues of Eighteenth-Century Life (Volume 41) were “special” issues in one or two senses. January 2017 has the focus “Poetry and Popularity in Eighteenth-Century Poetic Miscellanies: New Findings from the Digital Miscellanies Index” and guest editors Abigail Williams and Jennifer Batt (who contributed an introduction on pp. 1-6). Both scholars have been instrumental to the success of the Digital Miscellanies Index on the WWW and centered at Oxford. The issue offers ten essays, including Batt’s “‘I know not who was the Author’?: Disputed Authorship in the Digital Miscellanies Index”; Adam Rounce’s “The Digital Miscellanies Index and the Canon”; Claudine Van Hensbergen’s “Unlocking The Cabinet of Love: Rochester, Reputation, and the 18C Miscellany,” focused on what the 18C public thought Rochester wrote; Kathleen Lawton-Trask’s “Lady Mary Wortley Montagu: New Insights from the Digital Miscellanies Index”; John McTague’s “Censorship, Reissues, and the Popularity of Poetical Miscellanies”; Simon Dickie’s “Deformity Poems and Other Nasties”; and essays by Abigail Williams on “Miscellanies and Sociable Reading” and by Don Nichol on the Foundling Hospital for Wit. April 2017 is entitled “Ideas and Enlightenment in the Long 18C: Selected Papers from the Fifteenth Nichol Smith Seminar,” ed. by Jennifer Milam and Nicola Parsons. These Nichol Smith seminars began bringing scholars of the Enlightenment together four years after the purchase of David Nichol Smith’s collection by the National Library of Australia in 1962. Smith (d. 1962) was an Oxford professor who repeatedly was a visiting professor at the U. of Adelaide. The locations have varied; this
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15th seminar occurred in 2014 at the U. of Sydney. Essays in the collection treat Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, William Godwin, Catharine Macaulay, Mary Hays & J.-J. Rousseau, Charlotte Lennox, the personae of the political shoemaker in the late 18C, and immigrants & citizenship in Enlightenment Milan. The September 2017 *ECL* developed out of the panel “Historical Criticism and 18C Studies” at the 2015 ASECS, with papers by Margaret J. M. Ezell, Robert D. Hume, and Howard D. Weinbrot, and a response by James A. Winn. Noticing the topic’s importance, the distinction of the speakers, and the session’s popularity, editor Cedric D. Reverand persuaded the speakers to enlarge their papers into the essays in the issue. Ezell’s title is “Big Books, Big Data, and Reading Literary History” (3-19); Hume’s, “The Problematics of ‘Evidence’ in Historical Scholarship and Criticism” (20-56); and Weinbrot’s, “Historical Criticism, the Reclamation of Codes, and Repairs to Literary History: The Examples of Fielding and Richardson”—treating empirically genre codes, allusions to literary traditions, and the like clues (57-88).


Note the inauguration in 2012 of *Studi Goldoniani: Quaderni annuali di storia teatro e della letteratura veneziana nel Settecento*, published by Fabrizio Serra of Pisa & Rome, a peer-reviewed journal devoted to 18C theatrical literature and Venetian literature, with a particular focus on Carlo Goldoni and Carlo Gozzi. The editors, Cesare De Michelis and Gilberto Pizzamiglio, hope to profit from and support national editions of these two playwrights. The journal’s website offers the 2012 issue as a sample with free downloads of PDFs of contents (www. libraweb.net/riviste.php?chiave=117). That issue, c. 200 pp., contains about ten articles, such as Anna Scannapieco’s “Carlo Goldoni direttore e ‘salariato’ dei suoi comici.” Near the end we find “Bibliografia goldoniana (1996-2000)” by Anna Bogo (157-78), and later annual issues continued to catch up--Sandro Frizziro compiled “Bibliografia goldoniana (2006-2010)” (3 [2014], 143-68). The editors conceive of their annual as a new series building on the 8 vols. of the original *Studi Goldoniani* 1968-1988: this 2012 issue is “9” and “n.s. 1.” Between 1988 and 2012 there was another Goldoni journal: *Problemi di critica goldoniana* (1994-2009).

Decades ago while reviewing for *ECCB* Paolo Alatti’s *Introduzione à Voltaire*, in the series Gli Scrittori (Rome: Laterza, 1989), Rémy G. Saisselin
remarked that he could “think of similar series in France and England, but he cannot think of anything approaching it in the United States, where scholarship and trade publishing are worlds apart. The book testifies to the health of Italian scholarship and the public’s interest in literature as well as the greater interest of Italian editors in literary history. Although an ‘Introduction,’ Alatri’s little volume is worthy of interest even to levels of graduate study.” (Laterza published many series throughout the 20C, including one on “Gli scrittori italiani” begun by Benedetto Croce in 1910.) Saisselin’s remark overlooks the G. K. Hall’s Twayne series, still publishing good volumes in the 1980s, but it seems accurate as a prediction for our present. A quarter of a century ago, publishers thought there was still a market for reference guides to major authors as well as anthologies of the “Critical Heritage.” But more telling were the introductions for non-specialist readers who didn’t read to write, who participated in a cultural ideal of knowing a little about all major authors—as they felt they should know something about major painters and composers. One can’t look over ECCB volumes surveying 1980s publications without some envious reflections on the state of public education and interest—a cultural shift occurred related to less public support for philharmonics, etc.

**Two websites of note:** Gerard Carruthers is the general editor of *Editing Robert Burns for the 21st Century* (2016-): http://burnsc21. glasgow.ac.uk, housed at the Center for Robert Burns Studies at the U. of Glasgow as part of a project to produce a multi-volume edition of Burns (funded by the Arts & Humanities Research Council). It includes info on the edition, a blog, news of events, exhibitions, and files of digital resources produced to aid the edition: on commonplace books, journals of tours, prose, and songs (files for “Songs for The Scots Musical Museum” and for “Songs for George Thompson”).

**Rousseau Online** was set up c. 2012 at http://www.rousseauonline.ch, posting a searchable-version of the 17-volume Geneva edition of his works (De Peyron & Moutou1780-1789), employing the copies of the Bibliothèque de Genève. Enrico Natale of Infoclio.ch is the Swiss director of the project, and the texts were digitized by Prof. Joseph Gallandar. The site offers a separate file for maps and illustration intended to become integrated with text. The texts are available as PDFs or an Epub format suited to smarforms and other devices. The site was well reviewed in detail by Angela Hunter on *H-France*, 13 (Feb 2013) www.h-france.net/ vol13reviews/ vol13no22hunter.pdf Hunter noted that for the first time Rousseau’s complete works were searchable and the searches were quickly completed; she also indicated that better search-software was coming via the cooperation of ARTFL.

From Jason McElligott we learn of a project by forensic anthropologist Dr. René Gapert and Deputy State Pathologist Dr. Linda Mulligan that recreated from various remains the faces of Jonathan Swift and Esther Johnson. Swift’s Stella. To quote the project summary: “CT scans of skulls of both and the death masks of Swift “were used to generate 3D printable models via FDM (Fused Deposition Modelling) . . . . Anatomical Forensic Facial Approximation guidelines were employed to distort the death masks of Jonathan Swift to fit the skull cast, to depict how he may have appeared in his mid 60s. . . . The skull cast of Stella was used along with portraits for reference with a forensically-estimated mandible.” See www. facebook.com
The colored recreations depict very attractive, friendly people (Swift’s face as recreated is the visual equivalent of Gene Hammond’s biographical portrait.)

18C in the news: At an historical archaeology conference in January held in New Orleans, research by the Queen Anne Revenge Conservation Lab revealed that Blackbeard’s flagship, sunk in 1718 off Beaufort, NC, employed pages of a recent book to form a gasket plugging a cannon. Researchers reassembled 16 fragments, the largest the size of a quarter, under water for 300 years, and discovered it was Capt. Edward Cooke’s A Voyage to the South Sea, and Round the World . . . 1708, 1709, 1710, and 1711 (1712). Another maritime story involves the discovery by Garrick Hitchcock that La Comte de Pérouse’s crew surviving a wreck in 1788 off Vanikoro Island sailed west to the Great Barrier Reef near the Murray Island. Hitchcock found accounts in Indian newspapers in late 1818 of a sailor recording how he had lived on islands near Murray, where islanders had European weapons and clothing and a watch left by men killed 30 years earlier when they stormed villages.

Significant Recent Books and Essays 2014-2016


Beales, Ross W., Jr. “Ebenezer Parkman’s World of Print: A Country Parson and the Print Culture of 18C Anglo-America.” Library & Information History, 31 (2015), 229-57. [Beales uses a “lengthy diary” of Parkman (1703-82) of Westborough, Mass., to identify his reading and the acquisition and distribution of such texts (gifts, loans, purchases); he also covers Parkman’s publications and efforts to promote those by others.]


Eamon, Michael. *Imprinting Britain: Newspapers, Sociability, and the Shaping of British North America*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s UP, 2015. Pp. 288; 3 appendices; bibliography; 6 illus. [Focused on Halifax and Quebec City. On how colonists turned to printed products to shape their culture and create a public space (divided into “Print as Sociability” and “Print and Sociability”); with appendices listing clubs, plays, etc.]


Gerona, Carla. “With a Song in their Hands: Incendiary Décimas from the Texas and Louisiana Borderlands during a Revolutionary Age.” Early American Studies, 12, no. 1 (Winter 2014), 93-142. [On late 18C traditions involving anti-Bourbon songs in Spanish and French and exchanges between song-writers (people singing songs with “ribald and incendiary lyrics” were prosecuted in Nacogdoches c. 1790).]


Nixon, Cheryl L. “Ann Radcliffe’s Commonplace Book: Assembling the Female Body and the Material Text.” Women’s Writing, 22, no. 3 (2015), 355-75. [Nixon examines what she characterizes as the “most extensive manuscript source” by Radcliffe. It contains records from May-Nov. 1822, written while she was struggling with pain from a fatal disease.]


Overton, Bill. “From Verse to English: Behn’s Version of Tallement’s *Le Voyage de l’isle d’amour* (1663).” *Women’s Writing*, 22 (2015), 55-68. [Behn’s translation of Abbé Paul Tallement’s *Le Voyage*, a mixture of prose and verse, translated into a long poem with narrative passages by Behn, whose skill as translator is under-appreciated (she preferred loose translation). Her translation of *Le Voyage* reflects differences in the original’s and Behn’s cultures’ practices and aesthetics.]


**Cover illustration:** “Dr. Johnson, Goldsmith and Boswell. At the Mitre Tavern, Fleet Street.” From an engraving by R. B. Parkes after the picture by Eyre Crowe, A.R.A. Reprinted from Boswell’s *Life of Johnson*, ed. by Roger Ingpen (Bath: Bayntun, 1925), with thanks to Anthony Lee for the selection.