

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer



March 2023

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

N.S. Volume 37, Number 1: March 2023

Published by the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies

Editor: James E. May
1423 Hillcrest Road
Lancaster, PA 17603
JEM4@psu.edu

Executive Secretary: Peter Staffel
Humanities Dept., West Liberty University
208 University Dr., CUB #130,
West Liberty, WV 26074
plstaffel@gmail.com

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer is distributed twice a year (spring and fall) to members of the East-Central American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies. For membership information, contact Executive Secretary, Peter Staffel, at his address above. Annual dues are \$25 for regular members; \$15 for students; \$40 for joint memberships. For information about the EC/ASECS, see the current EC/ASECS homepage, www.ec-asecs.org (maintained by Susan Cherie Beam). The next submission deadline is 7 September 2023.

Through this newsletter, scholars and teachers can pass along to colleagues news, opportunities, and practical tips normally not communicated in scholarly journals. Members are encouraged to submit book reviews, notes and essays, notices, accounts of travel, conferences, concerts, and exhibitions, pedagogical advice, light verse, and queries. They are asked to report news of their publications, lectures, grants, and on-going projects. Please submit contributions as an attachment in Word 2003 or 2010 or in RTF. Pertinent articles are indexed in *The Annual Bibliography of English Language & Literature*, *MLA International Bibliography*, *The Scriblerian*, and *Year's Work in English Studies*.

The *EC/ASECS Newsletter* was founded in January 1978 by Leland D. Peterson and later edited by W. R. McLeod (1981-1983) and Kevin Berland (1983-1986). This newsletter was entitled *The East-Central Intelligencer* from 1988 until February 2005. Indices for preceding volumes appear in the issues of May 1992, September 1996, September 2001, January 2005, January 2008, and October 2011; the January 2005 contains a register of EC/ASECS newsletters 1978-2004. Penn State University Library has archived n.s. Vols. 1-36; Old Dominion University has archived issues from 1987-2009. Issues for May 2007 through March 2022, the indices for 1992-2019, and a table of contents for issues since December 1986 are all available at the Newsletter Archive of the EC/ASECS website noted above. The *Intelligencer* has been printed by Action Graphics of Clearfield, PA, since 1986.

Uncovering Information about Non-White Experience in Eighteenth Century Petitions

By Anna Foy

Prefatory Note: The EC/ASECS Presidential Address that Anna Foy delivered at Winterthur last October is being prepared for journal and monograph publication. What follows below are the introductory comments that she delivered at the conference, originally part of a talk called “Phillis Wheatley’s Good Trouble.” In lieu of providing the body of the talk itself, she offers a meditation on the general importance of the petition as a genre containing important information about non-white experience in the eighteenth century.

Phillis Wheatley’s Good Trouble

I’m so glad that we can meet here in person for this EC/ASECS conference gathering, after a two-year hiatus. From the time I was in graduate school, EC/ASECS has been an unusually warm conference community. I’ve made lifelong friendships here, dating from that very first conference, and I have always been grateful for the opportunity to gather in the mid-Atlantic in the fall, which is arguably *the* most beautiful season in the region.

I suspect that many of you here were present at Suvir Kaul’s brilliant keynote on Falconer’s *Shipwreck* yesterday. I want to take a moment to say that, as Suvir’s former student, I have learned more things from him than I can put into words, most especially from his humanity, his intellectual rigor, his sense of humor, and also the global ground that he has broken for the study of 18th-century English poetry. Professor Brijraj Singh’s lovely introduction of Suvir opened this track, and I wanted to add to it these words of admiration.

Today I’m going to talk to you all about a theory that I have been developing in the last couple of years about a book of poetry published by the colonial American poet Phillis Wheatley—or Phillis Wheatley Peters, as she is now sometimes called, in deference to her chosen married name. The book was called *Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral*, and it was first published in 1773, on the eve of the American Revolution. With it, Wheatley became the first person of African descent to publish a book in English, one of the first few American women to publish a book of poetry in English, and a person who, from what we know, ultimately liberated herself from enslavement partly or wholly through the writing of this book. She had been kidnapped around the age of seven or eight from West Africa, as the book itself explains both in the paratext and in a few of her poems; and, after arriving in Boston and being purchased by the Wheatleys, she received substantial educational training from members of the Wheatley household in English reading and writing, as well as a bit of Latin—learning that is amply demonstrated in her book. I don’t think the general historical importance of Wheatley’s published writing has ever been doubted—its firstness in Black, American, and African-American genealogies of poetry. But the quality and

significance of Wheatley's poetry have been subjects of fierce scholarly debate. Wheatley has been called a mediocre imitator of Pope, whose poetry she is known to have read; she has been decried as a race traitor; and, because she composed some of her poems on demand, particularly for white audiences, she has been classified deprecatingly as an "occasional poet," whose book of poems is perceived accordingly as a kind of haphazard collection. The last two decades, happily, have been comparatively good to Wheatley; and I have found myself persuaded by recent work from scholars ranging from Honorée Fanonne Jeffers on Wheatley's suppression of emotion, to Tara Bynum on Wheatley's sense of community, to David Waldstreicher on her politics, that we are only properly beginning to appreciate this remarkable author.

My own work on Wheatley comes from a larger experiment in interpreting eighteenth-century English-language poetry by reviving theories from dusty old neoclassical treatises on poetry's instrumental functions, such as the idea that epic was a genre for "forming the manners," or the idea that poetry in general could "manage the passions" of susceptible audiences, an idea to which Wheatley and others of her era subscribed. My theory—portions of which I'll share with you today—is that Wheatley's volume of poetry, *as a collection*, was designed to manage the passions of its largely white audience with respect to slavery and enslavement. Her collection as a whole asks and answers, *What do we do with our grief?* In particular poems, Wheatley acts not just as an elegist, remembering the life of any given person, but as a manager of grief, managing the passions of the living. She is also not just a theologically-inclined grievant, but what we would recognize as a secular poet of grievance and petitioning: of asking the powers that be for relief from prolonged injury. In this drama of asking for relief, she made some of these pleas at first privately, in manuscript, but eventually with high publicity in the world of print. Particularly in this latter respect, Wheatley can be understood a forgotten progenitor of now-familiar strategies of nonviolent protest and change-making, via the creative public demonstration of grievances about civil rights, summed up by the late Congressman and activist John Lewis as "good trouble."

[Foy proceeded to expand upon her theory that Wheatley's *Poems on Various Subjects*, as a volume, was framed by an examination of grief and centered on the articulation of a grievance or "petition." Foy argued on the basis of its structure and content that "To the Right Honourable WILLIAM, Earl of DARTMOUTH, His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for North-America" constituted a formal petition for relief from slavery according to the norms of the day. She pointed out that this poem appeared shoulder to shoulder in the newly-appointed Secretary of State's papers with numerous prose petitions from irritated white colonists and other colonial information collected by Thomas Wooldridge, the emissary who met Wheatley in person and requested that Wheatley write a poem to Dartmouth as an illustration of her knowledge and talent. Foy also noted resemblances between Wheatley's Dartmouth epistle and a group of petitions for freedom made on behalf of enslaved colonists to Massachusetts governors and

legislative members in the early 1770s, in the years following the publication of the Dartmouth poem.]

What Can We Learn from Petitions?

Petitions constitute an important genre of evidence about the lives and aspirations of non-white colonists in the Atlantic World during the eighteenth century. We often think of the right to petition as a relatively modern phenomenon, reserved for privileged, enfranchised citizens—a right enshrined in the U.S. First Amendment alongside the right to free worship as a cornerstone republican right, not to be abridged by Congress, and a right foreshadowed slightly earlier in the collective assertion of the white male signatories of the Declaration of Independence that petitioning for redress in “the most humble terms” should have been enough to sway the British monarch toward righteous correction of past injuries:

In every stage of these Oppressions We have *Petitioned* for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated *Petitions* have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people. (my emphasis)

In fact, petitioning was seen in the eighteenth century as an ancient and important British right—a right distinctly “protected from formal political retaliation by governmental authorities” if the document was presented as a petition, with sufficient displays of humility (Mark 2202). Moreover, despite the seeming suggestion in the Declaration that only “free people” could petition, during the colonial era, in many American colonies, the right to petition the governor, the legislature, and the local courts was accorded to colonial inhabitants from every social station, including unfree people: indigenous petitioners, foreigners, women, and enslaved persons (2182). Extant petitions therefore provide essential written evidence of the ambitions and concerns of people who did not ordinarily have access to writing or books—individuals and groups whose voices may otherwise seem ill represented in the archives.

1. Petitions as Sources of Autobiography and Personal Narrative

A petition was a formal request, typically made of a deity or secular authority. In accordance with formulas then typical of the genre, this formal request often included narrative information about the petitioner’s life story and the circumstances that occasioned the request. Wheatley’s Dartmouth epistle, for instance, like other petitions written by or on behalf of enslaved petitioners in her era, contains some of the only surviving information about the petitioner’s life in Africa, before her transportation to Boston as a child. The penultimate verse paragraph of the Dartmouth poem contains this spare, poignant description of injuries related to Wheatley’s “case”:

I, young in life, by seeming cruel fate
Was snatch’d from *Afric*’s fancy’d happy seat:

What pangs excruciating must molest,
 What sorrows labour in my parent's breast?
 Steel'd was that soul and by no misery mov'd
 That from a father seiz'd his babe below'd:
 Such, such my case. (Wheatley 82)

One challenge of interpreting petitions from the eighteenth century is that petitions were not merely expressive; they represented a life strategically, in order to put forward the best “case” for the petitioner. This generic requirement may help to explain Wheatley’s tantalizing elusiveness in relating her African history. During the Q&A at Winterthur, EC/ASECS members wondered what Wheatley meant by “*Afric’s fancy’d happy seat.*” Should we read this line as a reference to Wheatley’s fantasy of returning to Africa as a “happy” place to live? Should we read it as an admission that Africa was *not* actually a “happy seat” for Wheatley or others, even though some folks imagined it otherwise? And what should we make of Wheatley’s brief reference to her parent or parents, or the circumstances during which she was “snatch’d” from Africa by an unnamed slave trader? For instance, Wheatley mentions specifically that she was “seiz’d” by a slave trader from her “father.” What of her mother or other family members? Whether because of a transcription error or a willful specification, Wheatley shows herself wondering before the Earl of Dartmouth about “[w]hat sorrows” may “labour” in only *one* “parent’s breast” (singular).

2. Petitions as Evidence of Community and Community Organization
 Elements of Wheatley’s appeal to Dartmouth bore a resemblance to then-contemporary freedom suits made to the Massachusetts governor and legislature that were brought on behalf of enslaved petitioners (Massachusetts Historical Society; point elaborated in Winterthur talk). As in this instance, the historical record offers substantial evidence of community organization via petitioning. Although petitions made on behalf of individuals remained common in the eighteenth century, some petitions of the period showed multiple signatures or were made on behalf of a group of people (as in Wheatley’s appeal to Dartmouth, which asserts rhetorically, “[C]an I then but pray / Others may never feel tyrannic sway?”). One of the best known examples of community organizing and communal voice via petitions appears in the extant writings of the Mohegan preacher Samson Occom, who lent his literacy to helping the Mohegans and other Native communities compose collective petitions (Brooks 141-44). In the wake of the Revolutionary War, for instance, Occom helped the Brotherton Tribe write to the U.S. Congress to request a grist mill, a saw mill, “all manner of Husbandry Tools,” and “a little Libery, for we would have our Children have some Learning” (Occom 150). An extant version of this petition begins as follows:

To the Most August Asembly, The Congress of the Thirteen United States, in this Boundless Western New World, Now Conven’d at the City of New York—

Your ancient and Most true and Sincere Friends and Brethren, the
aboriginal Nations of this Great Indian World,—Sendeth Greeting
We intreat that of your Great ^Noble^ Excellencies and Clemencies,
You Would listen to us, and hear us few Words—

The Most Great, The Good and The Supream ^Spirit above^ Saw fit to
Creat This World, and all Creatures and all things therein; and the
Children of man to Inhabit the Earth and to enjoy, and to ^over^rule all
the rest of the Creatures in this World—and the good, and the Great
^govr^ of the Worlds,—Saw fit in his good pleasure, to Divide this
World by the Great Waters, and he fenced this great Continent by the
Mighty Waters, all around, and it pleased him, to Plant our foure Fathers
here first, and he gave them this Boundless Continent, and it was well
furnishd, and Stored with all Necessaries of Life for them, and here they
have livd and Spread over the Face of this Wilderness World, no man
knows ^how or^ how long. (148-49)

This petition seems historically significant less because of the “ask” itself (i.e., the books and tools) than because of the extraordinary way that the petitioners, quietly invoking early chapters of Genesis, frame their spiritual relationship to the land by asserting their own historical priority in relation to European claimants to the region: “The Supream ^Spirit above^...Saw fit...to Plant our fore Fathers here first.”

3. Petitioning as Proof of Resistance and Resilience

In all of these cases, surviving petitions provide important documentation of moments of resistance and resilience. Wheatley’s Dartmouth poem made a plea for freedom from tyranny on behalf of all American colonials, including enslaved petitioners who had been kidnapped from the coast of Africa and sold into slavery. Although Wheatley was freed soon after the publication of her *Poems on Various Subjects*, Dartmouth himself, from what we know, never granted her broadest requests, which were to see to it that no one else saw “tyrannic sway” in the North American region. Rather, she reported that when she met Dartmouth during her visit to England, he gave her “5 guineas, and desird me to get the whole of Mr. Pope’s Works, as the best he could recommend to my perusal, this I did, also got Hudibras, Don Quixot, & Gay’s Fables” (qtd. Carretta 118). But reading her plea 250 years later serves as plain evidence of her active non-acquiescence to the condition of enslavement.

Conclusion

In 2007, meditating on a “flurry” of then-recent, unsuccessful lawsuits aimed at winning reparations for slavery, Saidiya Hartman deemed petitioning a genre past its prime, at least when it came to requesting real redress for centuries of injustice and injury. “I fear that petitions for redress are forms of political appeal that have outlived their usefulness,” Hartman wrote (166). Hartman called herself “agnostic about reparations” because of this concern for non-utility:

Who could deny that the United States had been founded on slavery or disregard the wealth created by enslaved laborers? Or brush aside three centuries of legal subjection? Yet I remain agnostic about reparations.... Are reparations a way of cloaking the disasters of the present in the guise of the past because even our opponents can't defend slavery now? ...

I had grown weary of pleading our case and repeating our complaint. It seems to me that there is something innately servile about making an appeal to a deaf ear or praying for relief to an indifferent and hostile court or expecting remedy from a government unwilling even to acknowledge that slavery was a crime against humanity. (166)

Even as Hartman judged the genre of the petition—in its early-twenty-first-century incarnations, at least—as an “innately servile” tactic for achieving justice, she made grammatical room for the possibility that petitioning *once* constituted a courageous and viable means of seeking redress for injuries sustained through a racialized system of slavery. Perhaps seeking historical evidence of many generations of timely, ungranted petitions can be part of academia's reparations for past and continuing injuries—a kind of greater accounting for injustices that turned on prior moments failure to hear complaints and formal petitions. The historical record holds more forceful evidence of resistance to enslavement and injurious discrimination than has sometimes been assumed.

University of the South

Works Cited

- Brooks, Joanna, ed. “Petitions and Tribal Documents.” *The Collected Writings of Samson Occom, Mohegan: Leadership and Literature in Eighteenth-Century Native America*. New York: Oxford U. Press, 2006, pp. 141-44.
- Carretta, Vincent. *Phillis Wheatley: Biography of a Genius in Bondage*. Athens, GA: U. of Georgia Press, 2011.
- Hartman, Saidiya. *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2007.
- Mark, Gregory A. “The Vestigial Constitution: The History and Significance of the Right to Petition.” *Fordham Law Review*, vol. 66, no. 6, 1988, pp. 2153-2231.
- Massachusetts Historical Society. “The Struggle for Freedom.” *African Americans and the End of Slavery in Massachusetts* [http:// www.masshist.org/features/endofslavery/struggle](http://www.masshist.org/features/endofslavery/struggle). Accessed 25 March 2023.
- Occom, Samson. “Brotherton Tribe to United States Congress.” *The Collected Writings of Samson Occom, Mohegan: Leadership and Literature in Eighteenth-Century Native America*. Edited by Joanna Brooks. New York: Oxford U. Press, 2006, pp. 148-50.
- Wheatley, Phillis. *The Writings of Phillis Wheatley*. Edited by Vincent Carretta. New York: Oxford U. Press, 2019.

Burns and the Mysterious “Authoress”

By Patrick Scott

The annotation in editions of Burns has often been surprisingly patchy. One of the poets Burns regularly quoted, Edward Young, mocked editors who explain the easy bits and glide over the problems: the “commentators each dark passage shun / And hold their farthing candle to the sun.” Burns wrote gallantly to Clarinda that Jean Armour was a mere “farthing taper” while she was the “meridian sun” (Burns, *Letters*, I: 244), but no editor has annotated the phrase. The problems that editors shun can stay shunned a very long time.

I had been puzzled by one of these mysteries, the identity of a young poet Burns was helping in the spring and summer of 1789. Writing from Ellisland on 21 April, he explained to Mrs. Dunlop why he hadn’t answered her letters:

A parcel of Poems, now in the current of subscription, have given me, & daily give me, a world of trouble in revising them.—They are hopeless trash; but the Authoress is a poor young creature whose forefathers have seen better days; for which consideration I submit to the horrid drudgery. (*Letters*, I: 397)

Seven weeks later, on June 8, the “horrid task” was still unfinished, and he recycled the same excuse for not having written to Robert Ainslie:

I have been condemned to a drudgery beyond sufferance, though not, thank God, beyond redemption. I have had a collection of poems by a lady put into my hands to prepare for the press, which horrid task ... was of itself too much for me. (*Letters*, I: 413)

Who, I wondered, was the “poor young creature” whose poems Burns was preparing for publication? Neither of the Clarendon editors, Ferguson in 1931 nor Roy in 1985, risks a footnote. The letter to Mrs. Dunlop was first published by Wallace in 1898, but he doesn’t comment. The other letter, to Ainslie, was printed by Cromek in 1808, over 200 years ago, yet with one exception (Scott Douglas, discussed below), none of the major Burns editors even mentioned there was a mystery to be solved.

One obvious candidate might seem Janet Little (1759-1813), Mrs. Dunlop’s dairy-maid, whose poems were published by subscription, but not till 1792. It would be odd, however, for Burns to write to Mrs. Dunlop about a protégée of hers in the impersonal terms of the April 24 letter. In any case, all the dating seems to rule Little out. In a letter on 24 December 1788, Mrs. Dunlop had first mentioned Little as a “Rustic poetess” who wanted to be a chamber maid, and promised to let Burns see some of her work. It was 12 July before Little wrote to Burns introducing herself as if for the first time, sending him a poem cheekily imitative of his style, and not yet mentioning any projected book (Currie, II: 239-243). It was 13 July 1789 before Dunlop wrote, apparently independently, mentioning Little by name and sending

Burns a different sample poem for his comments, and it was 6 September before Burns responded to Mrs. Dunlop that he had received a letter and poetic epistle from “your poetess” but hadn’t known how to reply (Wallace, I: 190, 274-275; *Letters*, I: 438). It was a year later still, on 23 September 1790, when Dunlop asked Burns to do a sample revision of a Little poem, and “write over a verse or two” of one of Little’s poems “just as a thing should be done for the press” (Wallace I: 103), and it was another fifteen months, in January 1792, before Burns mentioned he’d been sent the subscription list for Little’s book (*Letters*, I: 129).

A second, possibly more plausible, candidate was suggested by William Scott Douglas, who would not have known Burns’s April letter to Dunlop, but added a rather tentative footnote about the mysterious young poetess to Burns’s June letter to Robert Ainslie:

We suspect that the reference here is to a parcel of poems, and particularly a very long one by Helen Maria Williams, on “The Slave Trade,” which were sent to him from London to peruse and critique. He performed his task and sent his remarks to that lady about the end of July. (Scott Douglas, 1877, V: 239).

Scott Douglas seems to be the first to print Burns’s detailed critique of Williams’s poem (V: 242-246; *Letters*, I: 427-431), but Burns’s introductory or covering letter (which had been printed by Currie, II: 249-250) make clear that his criticisms were not to lick a neophyte’s manuscripts into shape, but were unsolicited comments on a poem William had already published, *A Poem on the Bill Lately Passed for the Regulation of the Slave Trade* (London: Cadell, 1788). Burns’s undated comments, generally laudatory, are linked to the line numbers in the printed text he had been sent. In addition, while Williams’s first poetry collection, in 1786, had been preceded by *Proposals*, and included a long list of subscribers, there was no subscriber list in her next collection, which was not published till 1791. In 1789, Williams was hardly a ‘poor young creature’, and Burns was hardly likely to comment on her poems so impersonally and disparagingly when writing to Dunlop, given Dunlop’s friendship with Dr. Moore.

If Burns’s Authoress was not Little or Williams, what criteria might one set? It needs to be someone reasonably described as a Lady, from a family with forefathers who had come down in the world, not a recognized author, but presumably publishing a volume of poems by subscription in late 1789, 1790, or perhaps very soon afterwards. It seems likely that the Authoress would be Scottish, and perhaps during Burns’s Edinburgh and Ellisland period the forefathers to whom Burns felt a duty might have been Jacobite. Given the way Burns wrote about her it could not be someone known to Mrs. Dunlop.

There were relatively few books of poetry published in those years by unrecognized Scottish women poets. Two promisingly-named sisters, Maria and Harriet Falconar, aged 17 and 14 respectively, had published a pamphlet *Poems on Slavery* and a larger collection *Poems* (both London: J. Johnson, 1788), the latter with a subscribers’ list of some 500 names. The Falconars would follow up with *Poetic Laurels for Characters of Distinguished Merit*

(London: at the Logographic Press, 1791), which listed just a hundred subscribers. All three titles were printed in London, and there's nothing to link the Falconar sisters to Burns.

A much more plausible candidate for the mysterious Authoress is Miss Rebekah Carmichael, author of *Poems: By Miss Carmichael* (Edinburgh: for the Author and sold by Peter Hill, 1790; ESTC T104666). Her publisher, Peter Hill, had worked for Burns's Edinburgh publisher, Creech, and had recently set up himself as bookseller and publisher. During the Ellisland period, Burns was in regular contact with Hill about books for the Monkland Friendly Library Society as well as for purchases on his own account. Miss Carmichael was an orphan, with family connections to aristocratic Steuarts or Stewarts that I have not yet pinned down; she married soon after her book came out, becoming Mrs Hay, but her husband died young, leaving her a penniless widow. Her only son, David Ramsay Hay (1798-1866), later well-known as an artist and painter-decorator at Holyrood and Abbotsford, was supported as a boy and in his first employment by her banker-brother, David Ramsay, owner of the *Edinburgh Evening Courant*. Burns contributed a theatrical prologue to Ramsay's *Evening Courant* in April, 1787, political letters in November 1788 and February 1789, and his 'Elegy on the Departed Year, 1788' in January 1789 (Egerer items 1242, 1244, 1245, 1247; Kinsley, I: 454-455).

Miss Carmichael's book was published by subscription, with a subscriber list running to 500 names. Among these were several of Burns's friends or business acquaintances, notably Robert Aitken, John Beugo, and William Smellie. William Creech subscribed for 12 copies, and the list includes the entry "Mr. Robert Burns, 2 copies." Other names suggest support that was social or familial, rather than literary. There were 18 different Ramsays among the subscribers, accounting for 25 copies, headed by Sir George Ramsay, Bt., his wife, and his mother, the Dowager Lady Ramsay. A "Mr. James Hay," perhaps Miss Carmichael's future husband, also subscribed for 2 copies, and a Miss Hay, Mr. Hay of Newhall, and Mrs. Hay of Pitsour might be future in-laws. Carmichael's brother appears in the well-known composite portrait of Robert Burns's inauguration at Lodge Canongate Kilwinning No. 2, so there may have been a charitable Masonic network anxious to support publication. The book was dedicated to the Right Honourable David Steuart-Moncrieffe of Moredun (1710-1790; spelling varies), one of the Barons of His Majesty's Court of Exchequer in Scotland, who died, inconveniently for any patronage Carmichael might have anticipated, on 17 April 1790, very soon after publication.

Burns certainly knew Carmichael. Two years earlier, he had given her his own copy of Robert Fergusson's *Poems* (Edinburgh, 1782), in which he had previously written his lines to his 'elder Brother in the muse', and to which he added a glowing inscription:

This copy of Fergusson's *Poems* is presented as a mark of esteem, friendship and regard to Miss R. Carmichael, poetess. By Robert Burns. Edinburgh, 19th March 1787. (Gibson, 1881, p. 287; Henley and Henderson, II: 408-409; cf. Kinsley, I: 303)

Burns also certainly knew Carmichael's brother David Ramsay. Burns's Edinburgh acquaintances that first winter included Dr. Robert Anderson (1750-1830), who later wrote to James Currie that he "saw Burns, for the first time, in the house of my friend Mr. David Ramsay, printer of the *Edinburgh Courant*, who had invited a large company to dinner, on purpose, to see him" (*Burns Chronicle*, 1925, 14). This must have been quite soon after Burns arrived in Edinburgh, because Anderson says Burns "visited me frequently during the winter" and also reports that Ramsay consulted him and Burns about a submission to the paper, "Verses Addressed to Burns," because it had questioned Burns's disclaimer of book-learning; Ramsay printed the verses with Burns's approval in the *Courant* for 12 March, 1787 (*ibid.*, 16; cf. Scott, *Robert Burns: A Documentary Volume*, 182).

Anderson also passed along to Currie an anecdote "not generally known" from Burns's older friend Alexander Dalziel, Glencairn's factor, which confirms that Burns and Miss Carmichael had met through David Ramsay, and adds a story about the connection unsubstantiated by any other source:

A Miss Carmichael, a young poetess, who adored Burns & studied his manner, had been invited to dine with him at Mr. Ramsay's. Sometime after she took the romantic resolution of commencing a sentimental correspondence with him, and sent him a card requesting a meeting in the glen between Arthur's Seat and Salisbury Crags. Though she was not handsome, he had little confidence in his own virtue, & in the delicate embarrassment of the moment, he called upon Mr. Dalziel, who happened to be in Town, shewed him the card, & begged he would accompany him to the place of meeting. Dalziel readily agreed to go, & kept his appointment; but, in the interval, Burns changed his mind, & thought proper to go alone. The end of this adventure is not known. Miss C. afterwards published a small volume of poems, & is since dead. (*ibid.*, 17)

Anderson's story is secondhand, but on central point his veracity is easily documented. Dalziel was visiting Burns in Edinburgh at the relevant time. Dalziel wrote to Burns on Thursday, 8 March 1787, that he would be in Edinburgh "next week," asking him to book him a well-aired bedroom for 8-10 days, where "I may have the pleasure of seeing you over a morning cup of tea," and teasing him about rumours of his "great intimacy" with aristocratic Edinburgh ladies (Currie, 1800, II: 46-48; attribution to Dalziel, in Ewing, *Letters Addressed to Robert Burns*, 1938, 2, letter 13). Anderson is wrong about a later part of Carmichael's story, not affecting the central anecdote, because she was not dead in 1799 when he was writing; a pathetic letter from her in the British Library, asking assistance because she was "weak and ill," enclosed her poem "On seeing the funeral of Sir William Forbes," and Forbes didn't die till 12 November 1806 (Henley & Henderson, II: 409). Along with the Fergusson inscription, the Anderson-Dalziel anecdote confirms at least some literary or social contact between Burns and Carmichael in the first months of 1787.

Carmichael's *Poems* also confirm Burns's influence. The clearest examples, as Robert Crawford hinted in his comments on the Fergusson inscription, are her second poem, "The Twa Dows," a dialogue in Scots using a modified standard Habbie, and a later sprightly and assertive poem, "A Young Lass's Soliloquy," also in Scots in the same verse form (see Crawford, *The Bard*, 255). Although many of the poems are conventional, and some rather self-pitying, few could fairly be dismissed as silly.

So why did Burns turn against Carmichael's poetry so strongly between 1787 and 1789? One reason may have been that in 1787 he was simply being polite when shown single poems, while in 1789, because of earlier promises to her or Ramsay or the more recent insistence of Hill, he had to work through a whole parcel of her work. Second, in Edinburgh in 1787, he was an eligible unmarried celebrity; by 1789, he was married, tenant of a farm, and with a second full-time career looming, as well as literary projects of his own.

But, third, between 1787 and 1789, Burns himself had changed, especially in political orientation. In his first winter in Edinburgh, according to Anderson, many of his friends and sponsors were establishment men, backing Pitt and the King, with a legacy of Jacobitism. By the spring of 1789, Burns had developed connections and sympathies with disgruntled Whigs and London reformers, notably with Peter Stuart of the *Star*. Insofar as they are political, Carmichael's poems remain pro-Pitt. In "The Twa Dows," when one bird complains, the other praises the king and the king's "trusty friend," telling his brither Pigeon to "Envy not the rich an' great," who "hae griefs ye dinna ken" (Carmichael, 5-7).

Burns had been particularly incensed that spring by a recent poem or poems in Ramsay's *Edinburgh Evening Courant* praising the Edinburgh authorities for cracking down on immorality. In writing to Peter Hill on April 2, 1789, on a sheet of excise paper, and suggesting Hill should write or plagiarize an ode in praise of Burns's prudence and economy, Burns added scathing advice on where to plagiarize:

if you are going to borrow, apply to our friend Ramsay, for the assistance of the author of those pretty little buttering paragraphs of eulogiums on your thrice-honored & never-enough-to-be-praised MAGISTRACY—how they hunt down a housebreaker with the sanguinary perseverance of a bloodhound—... how they steal on a thoughtless troop of Night-nymphs as a spaniel eyes the unsuspecting Covey—or how they riot o'er a ravaged B—dy-house as a cat does o'er a plundered Mouse-nest.... you should get that manufacturer of the tinsel'd crockery of magistrat'ial reputations, who makes so distinguished & distinguishing a figure in the Ev: Courant to compose or rather to compound something very clever on my remarkable frugality. (*Letters*, I: 390)

The excerpts above constitute less than half of Burns's flyting of the *Courant's* unnamed contributor. It would make a neat conclusion to this investigation if it had been Carmichael writing the *Courant* poems that had so incensed Burns. I think that is unlikely, based on the poems in her

collection. If it was not her, then someone else must have written “those pretty little buttering paragraphs of eulogiums,” leaving another mystery for Burns’s editors to solve or shun. What the letter to Hill indicates, however, is that by 1789 Burns saw Ramsay as supporting authorities that Burns scorned and that he despised the poet or poets Ramsay was publishing in the *Courant*. Insofar as Carmichael was a dependent of Ramsay, that may have been enough to sour Burns on the parcel of her poems he somehow felt obligated to revise for the press.

There is no direct documentary evidence to support the identification given here, that the “poor, young” “Authoress” whose poems gave Burns such “horrid drudgery” was Rebekah Carmichael. Burns does not name her in his letters about revising the poems, and none of his contemporaries name her in this connection, neither during her life-time, nor, I think, afterwards. Annotation, like most scholarly research, falls on a spectrum, from reasonable certainty to wild conjecture. The identification here is therefore a suggestion, rather than a proven case, but Rebekah Carmichael seems the most plausible candidate so far and surely warrants the consideration of future editors.

University of South Carolina

Sources and Acknowledgements: Most of my sources are given in the text, referencing standard Burns editions. Nobody seems to know Carmichael’s dates or much about her life, and I have not been able to find out why she was Carmichael before marriage when her brother David (if he was her brother, not a cousin or half-brother) was surnamed Ramsay. There is one reference to a “Rebekah Carmichael, niece of the Lady Stewart,” in the confirmation records of the Episcopalian minister in Leith, for August 28, 1751 (*Scottish Antiquary, or Northern Notes and Queries*, 9 (1895), 13), but someone old enough to be confirmed in 1751 seems unlikely to be the same Rebekah Carmichael Hay who gave birth to David Ramsay Hay in 1798, or could be described as a poor young thing in 1789. Carmichael’s *Poems* is accessible on ECCO, Google Books, and HathiTrust..

I first came on Anderson’s letter to Currie, with the anecdote from Dalziel, not as first published in the *Burns Chronicle*, 1st series, 34 (1925), 8-19, but in Robert Fitzhugh’s underutilized biography *Robert Burns, the Man and the Poet, A Round Unvarnished Tale* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1970), 132-133, and it is also mentioned briefly in Robert Crawford, *The Bard* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2009), 255. The text here, corrected from the Cowie MS, is taken from the *Letters of James Currie*, edited by Gerard Carruthers, Kenneth G. Simpson, and Pauline Mackay, at <https://jamescurrie.gla.ac.uk/details.php?id=73>. Burns’s relationship to Helen Maria Williams and his letter to her in July/August 1789 are discussed by Nigel Leask, “Burns and the Poetics of Abolition,” in *Edinburgh Companion to Robert Burns*, ed. Carruthers (Edinburgh UP, 2009), 47-60 (52-55).

Personal acknowledgements: Gerry Carruthers, Bill Dawson, and Nigel Leask responded encouragingly to my first enquiries about the unannotated letter(s). For tracking poetry volumes with subscription lists, Matt Sangster

had recently emailed me about the Newcastle Robinson-Wallis project from the 1970s on 18th-century subscription lists, and James Caudle reminded me to look at R.C. Alston's more accessible guide: the curious may consult: P.J. Wallis, "Book Subscription Lists," *The Library*, 5th ser., 29.3 (1974), 255-286; F.J.G. Robinson and P.J. Wallis, *Book Subscription Lists, A Revised Guide* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Harold Hill for the Book Subscription List Projects, 1975); R.C. Alston, C. Wadham, and F.J.G. Robinson, *Eighteenth-Century Subscription Lists: A Checklist* (Newcastle: Averro, 1983); P.J. Wallis and R. Wallis, *Book Subscription Lists Extended Supplement* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Project for Historical Biobibliography, 1996).

An Exercise in Making Matter Matter Samuel Johnson Dictionary Sources

[<https://www.sjdictionarysources.org/>]

by Brian K. Grimes

My topic is the mid-18th-century "matter" (substance) of Samuel Johnson's 1755 and 1773 folio editions of his *Dictionary of the English Language*, and how this substance might "matter" (be of use) today. I hope to demonstrate how organizing and making accessible the details of the *Dictionary* can make the substance of the work, including the authorities cited for quotations and the exact texts from which the quotations were taken, of use in teaching and research.

Johnson's definitions, along with the body of poetry and prose he quoted to illustrate the meanings of words, has provided a stable foundation of our language. Our current modes of expression have changed from Johnson's era, and we do not use many of the "odd" words he recorded. A large number of new terms have been added to the language over the last two hundred and fifty years, but most of the words we use in written communication can be found in some form in his *Dictionary*. If a large ball of snow is rolled down the hill, accumulating debris, the essential water in the snow remains. If I examine the words in the sentence that we have just read, I find that all but "debris" (a word of French origin not in the *Dictionary* but in use at the time) are contained in Johnson's *Dictionary*.

Understanding the significance of a great literary accomplishment, I think, requires understanding its intent and scope. One aspect of the scope of Johnson's *Dictionary* is the wide range, both topical and temporal, of sources he drew on. Johnson used the published works of several hundred authors to illustrate the best use of words by the best writers, and to differentiate many senses of the same word through the selected quotation examples.

The two quotations from the *Dictionary's* Preface are relevant: "*The Chief glory of any people arises from its authors.*" And, with respect to dictionaries: "*Every quotation contributes something to the stability or enlargement of the language.*" The focus on enlargement of the language indicates an intention to familiarize users of the *Dictionary* with expressions that may enhance the communication of ideas. This was perhaps also

Johnson's motivation for his use of unusual words in his parallel production of the *Rambler* essays.

Johnson's *Dictionary* influenced English and American authors directly for more than 150 years, and indirectly into the 21st Century. Robert Burns was said to have read the entire 2000-page folio *Dictionary* to qualify himself for the profession of literature.

There are many dimensions to literary criticism of any work. My efforts on the *Dictionary* are at the most basic level: determining the identity of the authors quoted, identifying biographically who those authors were, and documenting the specific texts that Johnson consulted.

In this paper I offer some context of Samuel Johnson and the text he referred to as "my book," and describe an exercise in documenting and making available basic information on the sources of the Dictionary quotations. (I have provided for further information web addresses of specific pages of the web site throughout this text.)

Who was Samuel Johnson?

Born in Lichfield, Staffordshire, England, in 1709, Samuel Johnson was the son of a bookseller, and apart from a few years in a rigorous grammar school, was largely self-educated in his father's bookshop and then spent 13 months at Pembroke College, Oxford, before leaving due to lack of funds. He married a Birmingham widow 21 years older than himself, unsuccessfully started a school, and moved to London to unsuccessfully promote production of his play, a tragedy set in the Ottoman Empire. His London work as a writer, as a cataloger of the enormous Harley Library, and as an editor for the *Gentleman's Magazine* induced a group of London publishers to commission from Johnson an English dictionary, which he delivered after eight years rather than the promised three. The *Dictionary*, his essays, biographies, edition of Shakespeare, and *Lives of the Poets* established him as the central figure of eighteenth-century English literature for his contemporaries and Boswell's subsequent biography converted his status to an eccentric genius. The late 20th Century re-centered attention on Johnson's literary output and noticed his unusual role in mentoring women writers and his opposition to slavery and the exploitation of indigenous peoples.

What is Johnson's Dictionary? [<https://www.sjdictionarysources.org/what-is-the-johnson-dictionary.html>]. The full title, with red lettering here in bold, reads: A Dictionary of the **English Language**: In which the Words are deduced from their Originals, and **Illustrated in their Different Significations** by Examples from the best Writers. To which are prefixed **A History of the Language**, and An English Grammar. By **Samuel Johnson**. In Two Volumes.

This is the brief web page information provided about the *Dictionary*:

- Johnson's *Dictionary* was commissioned by booksellers in the 1740's, and the first edition published in 1755 with a revised edition in 1773.
- Samuel Johnson (1709-1784) compiled the *Dictionary* as essentially a one-person effort.
- Definitions for over 40,000 words (many with multiple senses)
- Illustrations of word use by more than 115,000 quotations.

- Johnson himself turned the pages of about 2000 poems, essays, and books, marking for his six assistants the word and the quotation illustrating the word to be copied and alphabetically arranged.
- Johnson then provided definitions for each sense of each word (about one-third of his definitions survive today in the much larger *Oxford English Dictionary*).
- An Abstracted edition was also issued which contained the definitions, but not the illustrative quotations (the word list in all Abstracted editions is that of the 1755 1st Folio edition; some words considered obsolete for common usage were not included in the Abstracted edition - an example of a word omitted is *exility*).

The spectrum of sources quoted to illustrate the dictionary definitions is a compendium of English poetry and prose from Littleton in the late 15th century to Johnson and his contemporaries in the 18th century, with glances at foundations of English back over the centuries and at the foundations of literature back to Aristotle, Sappho and Homer. The sources quoted include philosophy, history, law, and theology, and the quotations often impart practical or moral guidance. The *Dictionary* is beyond a compilation of definitions, it is itself a work of literature.

Johnson's method in developing his dictionary was inductive: he marked words and quotes from several hundred authors. Several transcribers copied the quotes and alphabetized them by the word that the quote illustrated. Johnson then composed a headword definition and subdivided shades of meaning of the headword by part of speech and sense of the quotations. Often just one or a few senses are given, but the active form of the verb "to take" was subdivided into 123 senses in the 1755 Dictionary, with a few more added in the 1773 4th edition.

The production of the *Dictionary* was hurried, and the citations often were only referenced to an author and not the work quoted. Some authors with the same surname were not distinguished (there were four additional Browns added in the 1773 4th edition, generally not distinguished from Thomas Browne, who was quoted extensively in 1755, and all, including Thomas Browne are cited in the Dictionary as "Brown" without an "e.") Contemporaries generally did not notice the editorial looseness of the attributions and only quibbled with the senses, grammar, and etymologies.

The scope of the work was vast: about 40,000 head words with a total of about 60,000 senses defined and illustrated by about 115,000 quotations. The editors of The Yale Edition of Samuel Johnson's Works, in Volume 18 (2005), present a thorough treatment of the *Dictionary's* Preface, History of the English Language, and Grammar of the English tongue, but the editors state that the body of the dictionary was not addressed because of its vast size. This raised in my mind the question of whether, given the rapid advance of electronic tools, some aspects of the *Dictionary's* word list now could be usefully addressed in a systematic manner.

For the last few years I have been intermittently collecting information on the authorities Johnson used in compiling his 1755 and 1773 folio dictionaries. After validating the idea with Johnsonians at the Pembroke 2015 Johnson/Shakespeare conference, in 2016 I launched a web site to serve up as my public electronic (a word not in the *Dictionary*) note-cards

for each authority. In addition to establishing the identity of the sources Johnson referenced, often by only a surname, I have attempted to identify the specific texts he quoted from and the approximate number of citations from each text. I also have attempted to "humanize" (a word that is in the *Dictionary*!) the cited author by providing a portrait, when available, and a very condensed biographical summary.

The author-page format on the Samuel Johnson Dictionary Sources web site is:

- Authority as cited in the *Dictionary*
- The established authority cited, with birth and death dates
- Portrait (when available)
- BKG Bio-tweet (arbitrarily restricted to 124 characters, including spaces - this was, I think, the allowed length of the first "tweets")
- Approximate number of citations in the 1755 and 1773 dictionaries (based on electronic searches).

The importance of Anne McDermott's work in transcribing the 1755 and 1773 dictionaries can't be overstated. McDermott's research results were recorded on a CD (*A Dictionary of the English Language, The First and Fourth Editions*, edited by Anne McDermott, Johnson's Dictionary Project: The University of Birmingham, [Cambridge U. Press, 1996]). Word list entries are transcribed with 1755 and 1773 definitions and quotations for each headword. The search capability is useful, although somewhat limited, and images of each headword entry are also available in a separate file on the CD. The 1996 CD technology was bespoke and not compatible with the Windows 95 operating system, so a "DOS Box" installation was needed on my computer. This DOS innovation was developed by computer game aficionados to enable them to play the earliest computer games.

Works cited including

--Exact titles of the works cited, and whether the edition cited can be determined (For this part of the effort, access to a University book and journal database was essential.)

--Headwords under which the author's quotations appear (For authors with large numbers of citations, only a sample of headwords are presented)

An example of an author page is that for Charlotte Lennox [<https://www.sjdictionarysources.org/lennox-charlotte-female-quixote-shakespeare-illustrated.html>]. The Lennox web page content includes:

Authority Cited: [Lennox, Charlotte] *Female Quixote, Shakespeare Illustrated*

Author name and dates: Charlotte Lennox (1729/30 -1804) Birth date per "Charlotte Lennox's Birth Date and Place," Carlile, Susan, *Notes and Queries*, 2004 Dec, Vol.51 (249)(4), pp.390-92. (Thanks to I.M. Grundy for pointing out this source.) At the age of 25, Lennox is the youngest person cited in the 1755 *Dictionary*!

BKG Bio-tweet: Author: novels, play; poet; transl.; mentored and highly regarded by SJ & Richardson; thought unladylike, volatile by women

Categories (list of works cited – preliminary) [BKG Note: About 20 Lennox cites [i.e. citations] in 1755 *Dictionary* vol. 2. Four of these cites do not appear in the 1773 *Dict.* No Lennox cites were identified as added in the 1773 *Dictionary*. Lennox's name does not appear on the title page of the works cited.]

- *The Female Quixote; or, the adventures of Arabella. In two volumes, The second edition: revised and corrected.* 1752, London: printed for A. Millar, over-against Catharine-Street in the Strand; *pique; simplicity; singular; solemnity; suppose; talent; view* (1755 *Dict.* only); *visionary; volubility; wildly*

- *Shakespear illustrated: or the novels and histories, on which the plays of Shakespear are founded, collected and translated from the original authors. With critical remarks. In two volumes. By the author of The female Quixote.* 1753, London: Printed for A. Millar in the Strand; *Shakespear illustrated: or the novels and histories, on which the plays of Shakespear are founded, collected and translated from the original authors. With critical remarks. The third and last volume. By the author of The female Quixote.* 1754, London: printed for A. Millar, in the Strand; *sally* (v. 3, p. 125); *starry* (v. 3, p. 79); *unravel* (v. 3, p. 268); *uncle* (v. 2, p. 274); *unnecessary* (1755 *Dict.* only, v. 1, p. 35); *virtue* (v. 3, p. 125); *wherever* (v. 1, p. 24); *whetstone* (v.3, p. 62); *wonderful* (1755 *Dict.* only, v. 2, p. 80); *wreath* (1755 *Dict.* only, v. 3, p. 126); [**BKG Note:** Vol. 3 of *Shakespear Illustrated*, published in 1754, is perhaps the most recently published work from which SJ took quotations for the 1755 *Dict.*]

Because the Lennox publications came late in the *Dictionary's* compilation process, we can also tease out some temporal information with respect to Johnson's progress on the 1755 *Dictionary*. All of the Lennox citations are in *Dictionary* volume 2, and all but one are not earlier than the letter "S." As the earliest "S" entry, *sally*, is from the 1754 publication, we know that Johnson was still in the compilation phase in 1754. The single quotation under the letter "P" might indicate that Johnson was handling the proof sheets for that letter in 1754.

Outcomes of my work on the sources of Johnson's *Dictionary* include:

- A ready, and searchable, reference for SJ's *Dictionary* sources
--Links to any author name can be brought up by a search from the Home Page. This will include the author page and any other pages on which the author is mentioned.

--For inexact quotations, I have usually noted "perhaps from memory" on the author page. A search for "memory" from the home page will bring up links to a little over 100 author pages. This is, perhaps, data for an interesting paper on the scope of Johnson's previous reading when coupled with the information on authors with only one or two citations.

- Documentation of texts, and sometimes the editions of texts, cited for each author

--Phillip Miller's *Gardeners Dictionary* is an interesting example. I have determined that Johnson used the 1748 Abstracted Edition, 3 v., not a Folio

edition, as thought by Wimsatt in *Philosophic Words*, 1948 (there is a unique entry in this Miller edition under *Triticum* (wheat). The *Dictionary* entry for "wheat" uses the word "preserved"; "preferr'd" is the word found under "Triticum" (wheat) in all of the Miller editions examined, except the 1748 abridged edition. Lane Cooper, in *PMLA*, 1937, assumed that there was a transcription error in the *Dictionary* entry, which appears not to be the case.

Johnson's "oats" definition may be based on Miller! In Miller, under "Avena" (oats) we read: "*Oats are a very profitable grain, . . . being the principal grain which horses love . . .*"; and, "*The meal of this grain makes tolerable good bread, and is the common food of the country people in the North.*" So Johnson's famous definition of "Oats" ("A grain, which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people") appears to be a clever reformulation of Miller's information. ([https:// www.sjdictionarysources.org/miller-philip.html](https://www.sjdictionarysources.org/miller-philip.html))

- Scholarly research stepping stones [published in *The Johnsonian News Letter*]:

--Scaliger: www.sjdictionarysources.org/scaliger-joseph-justinian.html

The original manuscript of Scaliger's "Tears of the Lexicographer" poem was traced to the Leiden Library and a copy of the manuscript poem, with the library's permission, has been posted on the web page [the manuscript poem is not shown here].

The Scaliger web page text notes: In addition to three Scaliger cites for etymologies in the 1755 *Dict.*, Johnson in its Preface says "a writer will . . . sometimes faint with weariness under a task, which *Scaliger* compares to the labours of the anvil and the mine." Yale Vol. 18, pp. xxiv, 111, points out the citation of the "tears of the lexicographer" poem (epigram) in the *Dict.* "Preface," and, based on the title of the poem (provided by an editor in *Poemata omnia*, the posthumously published poems of Scaliger) suggests this is based on an Arabic Lexicon by Scaliger. Jan De Jonge, Henk, in *Quaerendo*, 1975, states that Saliger completed a manuscript of *Thesaurus linguae arabicae* in 1597, which, in his 1607 Latin testament, he forbade to be published and which is now in the Leiden University Library. With the kind assistance of the Leiden University Library, I have determined that the Scaliger poem appears at the end of Scaliger's MS Preface to the *Thesaurus* [ms. Or. 212 in the Leiden Library].

--Johnson self-quotations: [https:// www.sjdictionarysources.org/Johnson-samuel-irene-savagers-quos-life-london-rambler-vanity-of-human-wishes-johnson-vanity-commentary-on-popers-quos-essay-on-man.html](https://www.sjdictionarysources.org/Johnson-samuel-irene-savagers-quos-life-london-rambler-vanity-of-human-wishes-johnson-vanity-commentary-on-popers-quos-essay-on-man.html). Fifty-four Johnson self-quotations are documented on the Johnson author web page. The academic documentation of Samuel Johnson *Dictionary* self-quotations began with W.K. Wimsatt and M.H. Wimsatt in 1948, followed by W.R. Keast in 1955 and 1956, and is now perhaps completed by Anthony W. Lee in 2018, and Brian Grimes in 2018. The alphabetical tabulation documents the text for the quotation and notes the first identifier of the quote.

--Historical Context for Authorities: [https:// www.sjdictionarysources.org/context---history-relevant-to-authors.html](https://www.sjdictionarysources.org/context---history-relevant-to-authors.html)

A list of all authors cited in both the 1755 and 1773 dictionaries is given, ordered by death date. A parallel historical events chronology is

provided, and numbers of *Dictionary* citations are given for each author, and subtotals of 1755 *Dictionary* cites and added 1773 *Dictionary* cites are given by era. The Historical Context page is an uploaded table and not searchable on the web page. But the 20-p. table can be downloaded and searched in pdf or Word.

Questions or comments emailed to the *Samuel Johnson Dictionary Sources'* home page are welcome (sjdictionarysources@gmail.com).

As a final note, one of the challenges of modern consultation of Johnson's *Dictionary* has now been surmounted. Current *Dictionary* users have the challenge of the pre-1800 orthography of the "long s" which appears as an "f" with a stroke on the back instead of the front. The Samuel Johnson Dictionary Online webpage being constructed under the direction of Beth Rapp Young, Univ. of Central Florida, now has the 1755 edition readable and searchable in modern orthography. The 1773 *Dictionary* is under development.

Johnson's Dictionary Online: <https://johnsonsdictionaryonline.com/>

Mukilteo, Washington

The Cervantes Project at Texas A&M University

The 2023 annual meeting of the South Central Society for 18C Studies met 24-25 February near Texas A&M University, chaired by Samara Cahill, who chose as a theme "The Quixotic Eighteenth Century." The theme was in part determined by the rare-book exhibition and plenary lecture offered by Professor Eduardo Urbina on "*Quixote* in the English Eighteenth Century: The Cervantes Collection and Digital Archive at Texas A&M University." Urbina recounted the historical growth of his project and illustrated the digital resources it offered. He noted that Miguel de Cervantes's novel (2 vols.: 1605, 1615) was first raised into a classic within England via many Spanish and English-language editions (the first translation of Vol. 1 1612, Vol. 2 1620), and the first critical edition. Though it was not eagerly bought up and reprinted, Rev. John Bowle produced by subscription the first critical edition in 1781 (London, then Salisbury) texts in vols. 1-2, annotations in vol. 3, and index in vol. 4 (ESTC T59471, on Google Books and ECCO). And as has long been recognized no fiction from outside England had more influence on English fiction than *Don Quixote*--a point we were reminded of by the exhibition at the Cushing Library, with pages opened in works by Richard Graves, Charlotte Lennox, Henry Fielding, and Tobias Smollett,

Back in 1995 Urbina began the Cervantes Project "dedicated to the development of a comprehensive digital archive based on the works of Miguel de Cervantes. In partnership with the Center for the Study of Digital Libraries and the Cushing Memorial Library and Archives, a division of Texas A&M University Libraries," its goal was "to create an online repository of textual, documentary, bibliographic, and visual resources to serve the needs of students and scholars interested in Cervantes' life, times, and work, and focused in particular on the study of *Don Quixote de la*

Mancha." (The web oversight is now under the Center of Digital Humanities Research; see codhr.dh.tamu.edu and www.cervantes.dh.tamu.edu). This is an international project with much funding from Spanish institutions, particularly the Santander bank (thus search too for "Proyecto Cervantes"). With over a million dollars in funding to subsidize the project, Urbina was for a time buying an early edition every day, often from eBay. Central to the project is an electronic variorum edition of *Don Quixote* and, broadening its scope, an investigation into the influence of the *Quixote*, and the illustrations in all related works. The digital archive of illustrations includes roughly 60,000 "annotated and searchable high resolution images, linked to editions of the *Quixote* in Spanish and English." Commentary on the digital archive and such productions as "Textual Iconography of *Don Quixote*" (2013) were co-edited and co-produced by Urbina with art historian Fernando González Moreno of the Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha. Their collaborative harvests from the project include "*Don Quixote* Re-Depicted" in '*Don Quixote*': *The Re-Accentuation of the World's Greatest Literary Hero*, ed. S. N. Gratchev (2017). An early publication on illustration is "*Don Quixote* Illustrated: Textual Images and Visual Readings: Iconografía del Quijote, *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America*, 28.2 (Fall 2008), ed. by Eduardo Urbina and Jesus G. Maestro, with a preface and seven essays from a 2005 conference at the Cushing Memorial Library, the occasion as well of a exhibition and its catalogue: *The Legacy of Don Quixote in Print (1605-2005)*. Professor Urbina and his colleagues published many updates and discussions of the database (technical details on the digitized information was offered by Urbina, Richard Furuta and Steve Smith in "Textual Iconography of the Quixote; a Hypertextual Digital Archive at the Cervantes Project" (Cervantes.tamu.edu/pubs/Textual-Iconography.pdf)."

There is a site map for the Cervantes Project at www.cervantes.dh.tamu.edu: the main areas include the Cervantes International Bibliography Online (recording all related to Cervantes), Texts of the Cervantes Digital Library of complete works in several versions (princeps, old-spelling, modernized), along with interfaces, links and search engine), the Cervantes Digital Archive of Images, Links to useful websites, News related to Cervantes, a Biographical essay, and webpages on the project and site itself. The huge collection at Texas A&M that Urbina acquired for the project is easily found on the WWW (cervantes.dh.tamu.edu). Besides translations and adaptations, the collection includes imitative works like Smollett's translation of Le Sage: *The Adventures of Gil Blas*. Thus, the Cervantes Project's digital image collection includes an account of illustrated novels and translations by Smollett. The "Complete Editions List" for the Cushing has 1552 items, offering imprint information, title, author/translator/editor, language, format, references, bibliographical notes, and images--for the last it offers a browsing and examination tool for all the illustrations and also title-pages in these editions. There are hundreds of long-18C editions in the collection, bought by Urbina with grants supporting the productions of the Quixote Project.--JEM

The Aural/Oral/Visual Experience in the College Classroom

By Linda Troost

My undergraduate students, even the English majors and minors, avoid courses in poetry, especially poetry in the older periods. My solution: having students do a variety of projects on eighteenth-century poetry that marry image and word, sound and text. These projects give them tools that greatly enhance their ability to read Augustan (and later) verse. In class, they learn the usual: to identify poetic forms, literary devices, and patterns of rhyme and meter; to research historical contexts; and to support their interpretations with evidence from the text. And, in EC-ASECS style, they recite poetry, which helps them read closely without losing awareness of larger structures; develops their ability to visualize character, setting, and action; helps them identify tone; encourages creativity; and develops presentation skills.

However, the vehicles for demonstrating their knowledge of these matters are not only the traditional essay, scansion exercise, examination, or oral report. My students also write blog posts, make memes (digital posters), do annotations, and complete a variety of digitally inflected assignments. And once I realized how much anxiety the oral-interpretation activities were causing, I shifted some of them to a digital format. In fact, these video-poem projects have proved the most useful and delightful, and they have made it easier for students to read aloud in class later in the semester.

What is a video poem? Quite simply, it is a video of someone reading poetry aloud. Students select a poem or a section of a long poem, choose images, either of the “mood” (abstract) or “annotation” (drawings or photos) type, and assemble a video with a voiceover of their reading the poem aloud while the images play across the screen. Their primary aim is to convey meaning through sound, but the process of integrating text and image also enhances sensitivity to imagery (both literal and metaphorical) and allows them to apply their learning about poetic form, literary devices, and patterns of rhyme and meter in order to produce a good oral interpretation.

Many apps can be used to make videos, but I like working with Adobe Express (known as Adobe Spark before December 2021). Its video platform is template-driven and easy to grasp, it is strong on ethics (privacy, copyright awareness), it is usable on both personal and computer-lab machines, and, finally, it is free for educational use. Students can share their videos with others in the class and even with family and friends. I hope some English majors will be including their projects in digital portfolios of their college work to show to employers as a demonstration of their speaking, presentation, and organizational skills.

The assessment of the videos is straightforward. I grade on the focus of the project, the organization and effectiveness of the content, the quality of the speaking, the relevance and coherence of the images, and the proper crediting of source material. And the videos are often quite good. Since students must listen to themselves reading, they devote time to this project, sometimes recording a passage ten times until they feel it is right. (And reading a passage ten times will certainly help develop comprehension.)

These are never slap-dash productions. Since they are also sharing their work in class and sending links to family, the students take great care in producing polished work. In class, each student presents the video poem to the others, introducing it with a short presentation. And one can add a competitive note. One year, we took a vote as to which video would receive the Oscar for Best Poetry Video; another year, we premiered the videos at the PrezTech Challenge, a showcase of digital projects by W&J students. (Video poems are projects that also lend themselves to wider distribution by your department or publicity office, provided you have obtained written releases from students.) What follows is a copy of the assignment and a sample release form.

The Poetry Video Project

Your task: create a video that interprets either approximately 30 to 40 lines of a long poem (for example, *The Rape of the Lock*) or a complete poem of comparable length. Present it to the other students in the class, introducing it with a short commentary on why you selected this poem or section of a long poem, what you hoped to convey with the images, and what you learned about the poem by creating this video.

Preparation

- Pick a passage or complete poem of suitable length that is grammatically self-contained and works nicely as a unit. Select from works on our syllabus.
- Divide your passage into at least four logical units. That might be one or two stanzas or three to six couplets. Break units between sentences.
- Think about what might make a good accompanying image for each unit of text. The images may be eighteenth-century engravings or paintings, modern pictures or photographs, or abstract images. The images need to support the meaning and tone of the poem.
- Locate and download images you wish to use and keep track in a document of your image sources (a hyperlink will do). If you want to use part of an image (for example, a closeup of a detail), prepare and save that as a separate file (a screen snip is one easy way). I suggest you set up a project folder for storing the images and the source list.
- Be mindful of copyright. Eighteenth- and nineteenth-century images are fair game as they are out of copyright. Your own photos are good, too. Newer images created by others must be acknowledged on your credits page if still under copyright. If using recent images, look for those tagged with Creative Commons licenses if you plan to share your video with those outside the class. Openverse (<https://wordpress.org/openverse/>) and Pexels (<https://www.pexels.com/>) are good resources for locating images and other materials.
- Thing to think about. Suitability of the images used: they need to convey the meaning and mood of the lines they illustrate. The images do not need to be literal illustrations of the action, but their connection to the lines of poetry should be apparent to the viewers. The most-visually-coherent videos tend to use images that match each other visually (all engravings, all b/w photos, etc.).

- Once you have outlined the project (divided the poem into units and selected the image for each unit), you are ready to start production. You will use a free online app called Adobe Express.

Setting up Your Adobe Account

- From your browser, go to [https:// www.adobe.com/express/](https://www.adobe.com/express/).
- You should be on a page called Adobe Express—Get Started for Free.
- Select the Sign up button (purple, upper right).
- You will have several account log-in options on the left of the screen (Google, Facebook, Apple, Email); I recommend Email since it will let you set up an Adobe ID and maintain a separate password from your other accounts. (Do not bother with “Teacher or student?” section on the right: you are not working with a class code.)

Logging into the Main App

- Now that you have an account, you are ready to start.
- From your browser, go to [https:// www.adobe.com/express/sp](https://www.adobe.com/express/sp). (Adobe Express was once named Adobe Spark; you will find traces of that name).
- Choose the relevant log-in link. (If you went with Email, choose the last option, Adobe ID.)
- Sign in (select Personal Account if that option is presented).
- Enter your password.
- You will be sent to the opening screen for Adobe Express.

Getting to the Video App

- From the opening screen, select the circular button with the white plus mark (pink, upper left). It is just below the Adobe Express logo. This opens a new page.
- From the first column (Create new), choose Video, last item on the list.
- On the next two pages, choose these options to bypass Adobe’s idea generators: Skip and Start from scratch. They are both purple buttons
- The video app will open.

The Storyboard

- A video project starts with a storyboard, that is, a series of slides: a title slide, several body slides, and a closing credits slide (automatically generated). The storyboard for your video is at the bottom of the screen. Add slides by clicking on the white slide with the plus on it. Start by adding five.
- To edit a slide, click it in the storyboard. It will appear on your main screen. Select the plus icon in the center of the screen and choose Photo from the four choices (Video, Text, Photo, Icon) to add an image. Upload your image from your project folder. To add text (for a title slide), select Text. If you want a blank screen for part of your narration, leave the slide blank.
- Do the same for each slide until you are finished.
- If you have leftover slides, you can delete them from the storyboard: click on the unwanted slide and then on the circle with the three white dots. Delete will be an option.
- If you need to rearrange slides, you can drag them from the storyboard.

The Design

This can be sorted out either before or after you arrange your storyboard and record your narration. On the upper left, you will see four tabs: Layout, Theme, Resize, Music.

- **Layout.** Unlike the other three options, this works on a slide-by-slide basis. Fullscreen is the default. To change that, in either the storyboard or the screen, select the slide you want to format; then choose the layout you want for that slide. You can easily change your layout later. The layout for the credits slide cannot be changed.
- **Theme.** Free accounts offer a small number of tasteful video themes, and they will save you from making poor design or bad accessibility choices. You can easily change your theme later.
- **Resize.** Do you want a square or a widescreen video? For this project, it does not matter which you choose. You can change your video size later.
- **Music.** There are several copyright-free options of mood music offered by the app. You can also toggle music off. The important thing is to ensure the music is appropriate to your poem and not too loud—there is a slider for making volume adjustments. You can also upload your own soundtrack but be aware that copyright could be an issue. For a list of sites that provide some other music options, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/about/program-areas/arts-culture/arts-culture-resources/legalmusicforvideos/>. You can easily change your sound options later.
- **Thing to think about.** Suitability and volume of the music, should you choose to use some. The music needs to support the mood and not overpower or distract from the reading.

The Narration

- Once the slides are loaded, record your narration. Your computer will probably ask if the app may use the microphone—you need to allow it. Select the slide from the storyboard that will be your starting point, press and hold the microphone button (purple, bottom center), and begin reciting that unit of text with feeling and verve. Let go of the button when you are done.
- **Thing to think about:** Quality of your oral interpretation: correct pronunciation, appropriate inflection and tempo for the content, slight emphasis on the more important words, brief pauses where grammatically appropriate. (In fact, your sense of the grammar of the passage and understanding of what you are saying is the most important aspect of your reading.)
- Test-drive the slide by selecting the play button (triangle in a rectangle, lower left). Rerecord as needed to perfect pacing and timing.
- Each unit of narration goes on its own slide. The app limits you to 30 seconds per slide, but your typical unit will be 10 to 15 seconds.
- To test drive the entire video, select the play button on the storyboard (triangle in a circle, far left).

Final Touches

- Add an opening slide with a title (the title of your film should include the name of the poem and the poet) and your name as the narrator. Add

image and music credits to your credits slide. You can use MLA style or just give names of images/music and hyperlinks.

- Choose Preview (top, center) to see the finished product.

Sharing the Video with your Audience

- You are done. Choose Share (top, center) > Publish. Give your video a name and select Create a Link. Save the link. (Optional features: you can choose a category and permit Adobe to feature your video on its website—or not). Share that link with me by email or through the CMS. Feel free to send it to friends and family, too.
- You can return to the app to edit your video as often as you wish. From the Adobe Express page, look in Projects (left bar) to find your video project. If you make edits, remember to update your link by selecting Share > Publish and click the new element: Update link. This will refresh the video for your viewers.
- Adobe will host your video: it can be viewed by anyone with the link.
- You can also download your finished video as an mp4 file for placement on YouTube or Vimeo.

Permission to Publish or to Share

The undersigned grants all representatives of [name of institution] permission to share publicly the poetry video created in [name of course] for as long as needed. The creator retains copyright and warrants that the contribution is original, that it is not in any way libellous or unlawful in the United States, and that it does not infringe any copyright or other proprietary right. [Signed] [Name printed] [Date]

Washington & Jefferson College

Greg Clingham (editor). *The New Cambridge Companion to Samuel Johnson*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022. Pp. xiv + 267. ISBN 978-1-108-96578-1; paperback, \$34.99.

This attempt to give students of Samuel Johnson a new view begins delightfully with its cover art, a “drawing of Johnson . . . made by Lady Anne Lindsay at a social event in November 1773 at Prestonfield, Edinburgh . . . while Johnson and Boswell were on their Highland travels” (xiii). The drawing was unknown until discovered and published by Greg Clingham, first in *The Burlington Magazine* (2019) and now here. The Introduction and seventeen essays that follow have some new things to say but more often summarize approaches and information about Johnson that have become traditional, the latter seemingly characteristic of “handbooks” and “companions.” The original Cambridge Companion to Johnson appeared in 1997 and a Johnson “Handbook” is hot off the Oxford press, the latter including articles by six of the contributors to the work under review. Who is the intended audience? I have already, in my opening sentence, begged the question. Contrast the opening sentence of Robert DeMaria’s recent review

of *The Cambridge Companion to Eighteenth-Century Thought*: “This volume, like many of the roughly 700 other Cambridge Companions, provides an overview of an important intellectual topic; it does not attempt to make new discoveries; it aims merely to survey the known landscape . . . with precision and in writing that is both clear and answerable to the complexity of the subject” (*ECS* 55 [2022] 561). Put another way, are well-written and comprehensive surveys of previous approaches to a chosen topic sufficient to justify, if not publication, at least scholarly interest, or is a fresh and stimulating, perhaps convincing, argument a desideratum?

My prejudice is obvious already, but in fairness to all contributors I will write at least briefly about each article. First, some housekeeping. The text is well produced in the sense that I noticed only a single typographical error, and I think the presence of a prefatory cue titles list wise and useful. Most of the items on the list are from the Yale Johnson, with a couple of Boswell titles and a few other works that have published frequently on Johnson, e.g., *Age of Johnson* and *Johnsonian News Letter*. As a result, the text of the articles themselves is relatively uncluttered with footnotes. It was easy for me to verify almost all quotations from original sources—I checked none of the secondary sources—and there’s the rub. There are at least 117 errors in transcription. Indeed, all of these are undetectable unless one goes back to the source. They include the deletion or addition of a word or two, page references being off a bit, erroneous volume numbers, addition or deletion of italics, and so on. Nor are all the contributors equally guilty. Here are eight (of the eighteen) writers that, in my opinion, fulfilled their responsibility to both their editor and their readers and had fewer than five such errors in their contributions: Min Wild, Lynda Mugglestone, Martine W. Brownley, Clement Hawes, Tom Mason, Paul Kelleher, Heather McPherson, and Robert DeMaria, Jr.

Min Wild’s “Johnson, Ethics, and Living” breathes new life into a well-worked topic by tracing Johnson’s “relationship with three of his favored ethical writers—Isaac Watts, William Law, and Cicero” (15). She maintains, probably correctly, that “it took Johnson to bring truly rigorous, combative, vivid, and accurate ways of talking about morality to the new forums of the secular: the tea table, the coffeehouse, and the schoolroom” (15). It is hardly new to connect Johnson’s personal charity toward the motley members of his household with his Christian view, but it is new, and quite fine, to contrast this view, similar to Law’s, with Cicero’s “measured calculus,” which maintained that “in acts of kindness we should weight with discrimination the worthiness of the objects of our benevolence.” Min summarizes, “Cicero’s expediency is not the same as Johnson’s pragmatism, because [Johnson’s] follows the simple and absolute prescription of the Christian Gospels: you help those in need because they are in need” (23). In “Johnson and the *Essay*,” Philip Smallwood begins well with a consideration of the meaning of the word: “Johnson’s attempts to define the essay in his *Dictionary* of 1755 reflect the elusiveness of its generic attributes. . . . Johnson, who noted in his *Dictionary* a stress on either syllable of the English noun, and thus the lingering resonance in English usage of the French, suggests how, after the very different manner of Montaigne, his own written thoughts may in their own fashion express ‘trials,’ ‘attempts,’ [and]

‘soundings’” (28). Several interesting observations follow (e.g., “There is a fresh start with each successive periodical essay” [39]), but in the end, his topic is simply too broad for a short “essay.” Still, to give Smallwood his due, he can follow a rather common observation—the *Idler* is lighter than the *Rambler*, but not all *Idlers* are light—with this type of excellent summary: “*The Adventurer* is a comradely enterprise; *The Rambler* a work of lonely repetitive toil and individual tenacity” (31).

Johnson read deeply in the Renaissance humanists and Anthony W. Lee has read deeply in Johnson, with the result being an article few could quarrel with. In “Johnson and Renaissance Humanism” Lee observes that “Johnson knew many of [the humanists] as well as the back of his hand,” and considers “his relationship with three in particular,” (43), More, Bacon, and Montaigne. To possible objections that some of his links are not completely convincing, he speaks of “thematic congruence” and suggests that perhaps the earlier writers and Johnson were “drawing upon common topoi,” but his observations are always interesting and invariably supported by external evidence—for example, in the introductory matter to the *Dictionary* “Johnson quotes more specimens of Thomas More’s poetry and prose than any other author’s” (45).

Lynda Mugglestone’s impossibly broad topic in “Johnson and Language” had me writing in the margin at one point a paraphrase of Toynbee’s (?) definition of history as “one damned thing after another.” Despite the obvious difficulty of tying together thematically a selection of items from the *Dictionary*, she does at times provide a novel perspective. For instance, it somewhat weakens the view that Johnson’s definition of oats (“A grain, which in England is generally given to horses, but in Scotland supports the people”) is illustrative of his prejudice against Scots to learn that it had antecedents in earlier lexicography and was assimilated widely in other dictionaries (55).

Despite the curious omission of any mention of Catharine Macaulay, Martine W. Brownley’s “Johnson and British Historiography” is one of the best articles in the collection. Her thesis reconciles the seeming contradiction between Johnson’s “high regard for history reflected in his personal life and career” and “the deep skepticism that Johnson repeatedly expressed about history as both the knowledge and narrative of the past” (70). She demonstrates that “many of Johnson’s misgivings stem . . . from his reactions to the kind of English history that was being written in the first half of the eighteenth century” (70). Her examination of those early-century histories leads to an explanation, for instance, of Johnson’s praise of Goldsmith’s *Roman History* as “‘an abridgement’ superior to Lucius Florus’ *Epitome*,”—showing Johnson’s understanding of the popular historical subgenre, the compilation (72-73). An awareness of the period’s tendency to use history to convey political commentary—seen even today in the books of “history” produced by television commentators and their ghostwriters—aroused concern in Johnson. She cites here Johnson’s criticism of Thucydides: “there is more said than done” (74). Her Coda on Hume, Robertson, and Gibbon ties up a conspicuous loose end: “the problem was not that Johnson misjudged them. It was that he simply refused to judge them at all” (81).

Freya Johnston spends more time in “Johnson and Fiction” on his view of other fiction-writers than on his own efforts. Well documented previously is his concern about the influence of popular writings on human behavior, especially on the impressionable, which shaped his preference for Richardson over Fielding. There are too many obvious observations here to suit my taste: of Johnson’s explanation of how to read Richardson, “By ‘sentiment’ Johnson meant something like the thoughts or morals contained in Richardson’s work, to which the plot or story must be considered subordinate” (86). The argument that Richardson’s epistolary form contributes to the prioritizing of sentiment over plot seems too simple:

This kind of writing gains in immediacy and intimacy in the sense that each correspondent is narrating a story in which he or she is also playing a part, and the outcome of which is unknown to the characters themselves; at the same time, it loses momentum in the sense that everything we are reading is a minutely detailed retrospective account of something that has already happened. (86)

Much the same could be said, and has been, of many different types of limited narration. Still, Johnston makes several valuable observations, among them, that in mid-century literary forms of fiction were proliferating and mutating: “in the same decade in which [the multi-volume] *Sir Charles Grandison* (1753) was published,” Johnson had defined novel as “a small tale, generally of love” (87). And, more generally applicable, “the solitary reader or thinker always strikes Johnson as an inherently more vulnerable and pitiable figure than the spectator who is one of a crowd” (92).

Three articles whose titles suggest they may not have appeared in a Companion fifty years ago are Samara Anne Cahill’s “Johnson and Gender,” Nicholas Hudson’s “Johnson, Race, and Slavery,” and Paul Kelleher’s “Johnson and Disability.” Cahill writes that Johnson was “known as a misogynist for most of the twentieth century—largely due to anecdotes from James Boswell” (94). Boswell, by this standard, was / is also known as a misogynist, and perhaps both labels indicate the dangers of labeling. Anyone who reads Johnson today would realize the falseness of the characterization. Cahill defines terms like “feminist orientalism,” lays out exclusions—the chapter “will attend to gender [but] will not further consider queer and trans eighteenth-century studies” (95)—and makes “a few acknowledgements”:

(1) Johnson was an apparently heterosexual man who was sensitively attuned to the degree to which heterosexual men benefited from their status as such; (2) Johnson took heteronormativity to be natural while recognizing the injustices to which women were subject; and (3) Johnson’s (complex and evolving) support of women did not preclude him from participating in nonintersectional discourses that privileged Christian women and men at the expense of other groups. (96)

Much more jargon follows, putting obvious truths about Johnson into the new bottles of Cahill’s sub-discipline. Another example: “Johnson problematically contradistinguishes Christian and Muslim masculinities in a

way that valorizes Christianity at the expense of Islam while nonetheless defending (Christian) women's moral agency" (100). It is really difficult to identify a reading audience who would need to be told parenthetically that Constantinople is modern-day Istanbul (102) but who would not stumble over the remark that Johnson's "two major works of fiction [were] *Irene* and *Rasselas*" (99).

Most students of Johnson are familiar with this bon mot, "Here's to the next insurrection of the negroes in the West Indies," which owes some of its humor to the situation; according to Boswell it was Johnson's toast when in the company of "some very grave men" at Oxford (Boswell's *Life*, 23 Sept. 1777). And most students know at least some of the details of his relationship with Frank Barber, the former slave who was his servant for many years. Nicholas Hudson goes much deeper into the topic, focusing especially but not exclusively on the case of Joseph Knight, a Jamaican slave who "attempted to escape the clutches of his vaunted master in Scotland" (111). The legal brief Johnson dictated to Boswell at his request in 1777 is properly designated as his "major statement on slavery" (111). Hudson provides an immediate context from recent judicial decisions in Britain—where *habeas corpus* was beginning to prevail over the slave owners' property rights—and a more general context. The last twenty years of Johnson's life saw the strengthening of the soon-to-be-victorious abolitionist campaign, and "no issue so clearly showed the differences between Boswell and Johnson as their attitudes toward slavery" (116). This is an informative and well-written argumentative article, among the best in the collection.

Kelleher's "Johnson and Disability" should be credited for not allowing the tail to wag the dog, as so many trendy articles do. We are given enough of the modern critical background to understand the terms (e.g., an "impairment is a physical fact, but a disability is a social construction" [208]), but the focus remains on the subject at hand. Kelleher calls attention to how much Macaulay's vicious caricature of Johnson relies on a description of his physical impairments, and, lest we attribute this to an unenlightened past, he also points out that the brief description of Reynolds' 1756 portrait from the online National Portrait Gallery begins with a gratuitous remark, "Massively ungainly and plagued with nervous tics, Dr. Johnson was a victim of melancholia and could not bear solitude" (204). While this article breaks no new ground, the material assembled makes it always interesting and, on occasion, highly suggestive. For example, the lifelong tendency of the greatest actor of the day, David Garrick, Johnson's former student and friend, to mimic Johnson's unusual physical behavior is well known. It is recorded by Boswell. But I have never seen it pointed out that to a lesser degree, Boswell too may have attempted to emulate Johnson physically. Of course, as Kelleher concludes, Johnson was inimitable.

A topic that certainly would have been included in a Companion fifty years ago is Clement Hawes' "Johnson's Politics," but he advances the ball significantly down the field after a brief summary of Tory Johnson. (His statement that to understand Johnson's provocative conversation on political matters, we should always attend to "the crucial matter of tone" [121] is a helpful reminder.) The focus is on Johnson's "greatest political contribution," "a critical and penetrating perspective on an expansionist

Britain” (122). Hawes moves smoothly among Johnson’s writings, and a short review cannot do justice to the many insights, which include these: “There is an anti-colonial subtext to Johnson’s sympathies for the Highlands, now tapped as a source of recruits for the British army. . . . Johnson’s reframing of the Highlanders as victims of internal colonialism illustrates his compelling and habitual reworking of conventionally national perspectives” (123). And “Johnson . . . sensed the potentially dangerous falsification of history in such undertakings as the eighteenth-century ballad-collecting project. . . . The point . . . is not that the ballads are racist *per se*, but that Percy’s presentation of them through the category of ‘Anglo-Saxon’ is fraught” (129). Some readers of Johnson, including this reviewer, have recognized the importance of his religion to *Rasselas*, but no one previously, to my recollection, has drawn the following anti-imperial conclusion: “[The work’s] main characters are Africans: Coptic Christians who do not owe their Christianity to Europe’s colonial impact on Africa” (131).

Often some articles in this collection are uneven in the sense that they move back and forth from probably original critical insights to the repetition of commonplaces. This seems true of John Richetti’s “Johnson’s Poetry” and Tom Mason’s “Johnson’s Editions of Shakespeare.” Impressive indeed is, for instance, Richetti’s discussion of Johnson’s disdain for “empty artifice,” exemplified by this passage from *Lives of the Poets*: “Where truth is sufficient to fill the mind, fiction is worse than useless; the counterfeit debases the genuine” (142), which underlies Johnson’s strictures against Gray’s *The Bard*. This is immediately followed, however, by a lengthy paragraph explaining who Juvenal was, what the sub-genre of imitation is, and what the century’s view of classical literature entailed. Tom Mason may be accused of twice whiplashing his reader. We are given a sophisticated reading of Johnson’s reaction—“this dreadful scene . . . not to be endured”—to the handkerchief scene in *Othello*: “Othello would be transferring all guilt to Desdemona, condemned in the state which Hamlet fears for his father, unhouseled, unaneled” (156). But then comes a paragraph explaining that “the word ‘nature’ had a rather different force and scope for Johnson and his contemporaries than any of the many meanings obtaining today” (158). Mason reverts to deep and interesting scholarship by the article’s conclusion, a discussion of a scene from 2 Henry VI which depends on a passage in John Strype’s *The Life of the Learned Sir John Cheke* (1705) and a copy of Warburton’s edition heavily marked up by Johnson for the *Dictionary*.

Fred Parker is the contributor who has responded best to the dilemma of writing for a seemingly diverse audience. His title indicates an awareness of the issue: “Johnson’s *Lives of the Poets*: A Guided Tour.” He recognizes his assignment—if it was assigned—is challenging: *Lives* is “a difficult book for the modern reader to break into, given its length, its miscellaneous quality, its unfamiliar mixing of biography and criticism, and the historically remote figures and matters with which it deals” (164). Parker modestly aims “to point out, like a tour-guide, some striking passages and features of the work” (164). He accomplishes far more.

As we visit the literary equivalents of the Coliseum and St. Peter’s—namely, Cowley (the metaphysical poets’ discussion); Gray (the *Elegy*); Savage; Milton; Swift; Dryden; and Pope—we are treated to one display of

understanding after another. Johnson's famous formulation of the common reader in discussing Gray leads Parker to observe, "Gray's stanzas *create* the experience of memory. The poetic effect is close to the content here, for Gray's dead villagers are crying out to be remembered" (167). Parker is good throughout but especially so regarding Johnson's comparison of "Dryden's casualness with Pope's perfectionism" (173). "On the face of it, Johnson is explaining how it is that Pope's product is often better than Dryden's. But we also feel that what Dryden loses by one measure he gains by another. Leaving much to be forgiven, he invites his reader's 'candour' or generous kindness, which is the more readily granted because the poetry sets out merely to please, with none of the competitive stressfulness associated with excellence" (174). Having begun and then abandoned writing a dissertation on *Lives of the Poets* back in the Dark Ages, I am amazed and humbled by what Parker has done in just fourteen pages.

The next two essays, "Johnson as Biographer" by Leo Damrosch and "Johnson and Travel" by Anne M. Thell, suffer in comparison with Parker's, and it is perhaps unfair but unavoidable to see them as pedestrian. Damrosch touches all the obligatory bases, with glances at the early biographies ("journeyman work"), and Savage ("the one truly impressive [early] work" but one that "suffers . . . from closeness to its subject" [178]). Turning to *Lives*, we are reminded, if not informed, that the project "began as a commission from a consortium of forty-three booksellers" (179), and so forth, with obligatory stops at *Rambler* 60 and Boswell's *Life* ("The biographical part of literature is what I love most"). Incidentally, the actress of *Cato*, Mary Porter, died in 1765, not 1767, a simple typo I suppose that unfortunately crops up in a sentence emphasizing Johnson's memory over many years (182).

Anne M. Thell leads us upon an even more rocky road. Her thesis—"Johnson's enduring interest in travel . . . reveals a more complex engagement with the material world—and Lockean empiricism more broadly—than we often recognize" (191) is certainly possible, but one wonders if tracing to Locke rather than to the expanding general eighteenth-century geographical opportunities is the proper emphasis. Humpty Dumpty's edict on diction came to mind when Thell assumes "Johnson's pragmatic materialism" (191), showing a conspicuous rejection of the most typical use of the second word. She "foregrounds" (to use her favorite verb) her own abstractions over Johnson's direct expressions: *A Journey and Rasselas* "engage but also critique the form's primary conceits and assumptions to consider underlying questions about our capacity to observe otherness" (192). She defines Grand Tour as "a well-trodden Continental path through France and Italy that focused on classical learning and art, while men of lesser means might see the world as a sailor or privateer" (194). I doubt that any British sailors of the day was motivated by the more recent slogan, "Join the Navy and see the World." *Rasselas* was not Johnson's "only work of prose fiction" (196); it is many things but not "an anti-travelogue of sorts" (196), although it is true, I think, that "the text . . . shatters the certainty, confidence, and observational gains that usually underpin the travel genre, as Johnson forces readers to feel the frustration of

not knowing and to recognize . . . the formal conceits and deceptions that we rely on but often fail to discern or examine” (198).

Heather McPherson’s “Representing Johnson in Life and After” is a one-off, dependent heavily on ten b/w illustrations. As a non-expert I enjoyed learning about death masks and double portraits as related to images of Johnson, and this commonsense, albeit not groundbreaking, article is always informative: “the erroneous belief that he cared little about his image is contradicted by his willingness to pose for portraits and his awareness of their power in shaping his public image and posthumous reputation” (218).

A fitting concluding article is Robert DeMaria, Jr.’s “Johnson among the Scholars,” which begins by suggesting a distinction between Johnsonians, that is, those learned in Johnson’s works, and academic critics. Neither category is mutually exclusive, but in terms of the history of the Yale edition of Johnson’s works, it is crucial, for “what is lacking in many devoted Johnsonians is an acutely critical approach to Johnson’s works” (240). DeMaria summarizes: “the distinction comes down to a concern for Johnson’s texts versus a concern for the person who created them; a hard-headed materialism versus a romantic love of a lost personality and a bygone age—in short, it’s biography vs bibliography” (241). DeMaria writes beautifully and his anecdotal approach to the Yale project is surely the proper one. He knows, of course, that without the Johnsonians, there may not have been a modern edition of Johnson’s writings at all, and he diplomatically summarizes disputes rather than taking sides. It is good to have a personal explanation from the scholar who led the Yale edition to a long-delayed completion of why the edition is an academic example of how the camel (a horse built by a committee) came about.

Robert G. Walker
Washington & Jefferson College

Adam Sill. *Against the Map: The Politics of Geography in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2021. Pp. xiv, 302; 36 illustrations; bibliography [265-83]; index. ISBN: 9780813945996: paperback: \$45.00. (Available in hardcover: \$115.)

While the eighteenth century was plentiful with maps, and literary texts abundant with geographical descriptions, few studies of the intersection of cartography and literature of this period exist. Such a study requires knowledge about cartographic history and literary scholarship. Adam Sill’s *Against the Map: The Politics of Geography in Eighteenth-Century Britain* engages the literature of cartographic history and of the literary imagination. This monograph is a much-anticipated contribution to eighteenth-century cartographic studies (see Sills, “Eighteenth-Century Cartographic Studies: A Brief Survey,” *Literature Compass* 4, no. 4 [2007]: 981–1002). The title *Against the Map* implies a resistance to cartography, which Sills aptly identifies as “cartographic resistance”: “any activity that either directly or covertly challenges and opposes the cartographic imperatives of the nation-state” (6). This resistance is as concrete as violence against surveyors for

landowners in Ireland to the abstract antiquarian mapping of Scotland as resistance to nation-state modernization. In addition to his historicist and geocritical approaches, Sills applies a Marxist lens to his literary and cartographic analysis, while he frames his analysis through nation and identity. His methodology, discussed in his introduction, is that of imperial cartography, the map as a tool of empire and identity. Theories of the hegemonic map imply monolithic empire building (6-8) and identity making (9-10) that Sills contests through what he conceives as “the heterotopic conceit” (10–11). He posits “cartographic resistance” by locating spaces and acts of resistance and fragmentation within primary literary and historical texts against an idea of the hegemonic, monolithic map.

In chapter one, “John Bunyan, Neighborhood, and the Geography of Dissent,” Sills reveals a dichotomy between Christian believers and charlatans to demarcated religious dissent in Paul Bunyan’s works, especially *The Pilgrim’s Progress* (1678). While Sills explains that mapping, for the state, is for the purpose of “uniformity and conformity” and that Bunyan represents “the neighborhood as a place of contagion” (23), Sills suggests that the state’s mapping project either forces or excludes individuals into or from a neighborhood. He proceeds to read Bunyan’s *The Pilgrim’s Progress* as a class allegory, “where evil and malicious characters often take on the guise of the new gentry and the poor and downtrodden are portrayed as good and righteous” (37). Thus, Sills argues that Bunyan’s text illustrates “cartographic resistance” against the “surveying and mapping” that comprised “the institutionalization of private property” (37) that led to proprietary forms of exclusionary space (38). In this chapter, Sills includes only Bunyan’s allegorical map, *Mapp Shewing the Order & Causes of Salvation & Damnation* (1663), to suggest the permeable and impermeable borders (40) of “the local that is bounded and separate from the national body” as “relational” space (41). Sills concludes with “neighboring bodies” (41) and “Dissenting churches” (42) to refocus space to anticipate “political and social movements” of the eighteenth century (42).

In his next chapter, “Aphra Behn and the Colonial Scene,” Sills refocuses space transitions to Behn’s “scenic stage” as a frame for British colonialism and Britain’s “triangular trade” (43), i.e., the transatlantic slave trade. Connecting maps to worldliness and commerce especially to that of the African slave trade in Behn’s *Oroonoko* (1688), Sills includes maps that feature scenes of African slavery. He analogizes imperial mapping with the British stage: as the map depicts a scene, so does the stage, and likewise Behn’s novella *Oroonoko*. Sills avers that Oroonoko’s curiosity about European maps and globes from “an English slaver, thus reforc[es] the connection between a specific mode of geographic understanding and representation and the consolidation of the slave trade” (60). To set the stage, Sills compares a “discovery scene” from Behn’s *The Forc’d Marriage; or, The Jealous Bridegroom* (1670) to scenes in *Oroonoko* particularly the one in which Oroonoko gains entrance to Imoinda’s apartment, when she has been taken by the Coramantien king (68–69). Sills juxtaposes these permeable spatial boundaries in these scenes with the fragmentation of slavery in the geographic space of Suriname through the power of the state. Because Oroonoko is executed and cannot establish a maroon colony, Sills

posits that “the map . . . cannot accommodate or allow for ‘other’ spaces . . . that would contest or challenge in some fashion the legitimacy of British rule” (73–74). While maps themselves do not preclude maroon spaces, the maps Sills incorporates exhibit fragmented scenes that are components of a broader imperial vision.

Sill’s third chapter, “Surveying Ireland and Swift’s ‘Country of the Mind,’” traces British colonialism in Ireland. He divides this chapter between the history of the English survey of Ireland and analysis of various genres of Swift’s writing. The historical trajectory of surveying in Ireland reveals England’s mapping Ireland as a plantation colony that precipitated England’s approach to its American colonies. The English mapping of Ireland also demonstrates delineation and designation of private property that displaced the non-property-holding Irish. The “cartographic resistance” Sills emphasizes in this chapter is Irish rejection of and even violence toward English surveyors (84–85). Despite this “cartographic resistance” from “Gaelic Ireland” (85), English surveyors relied—and needed to do so—on “local inhabitants” as illustrated in the Bodley Survey in Ulster (87). Sills acknowledges a dearth of scholarship on cartographic resistance in eighteenth-century Ireland and thereby turns to Swift’s critique of maps. Thus, Sills posits that Swift’s “cartographic resistance” derives from Swift’s experience and knowledge of Ireland’s colonial history. Sills provides examples of Swift’s satire of English surveyors and mapmakers of Ireland (99). He employs Swift’s economic and demographic critique in “A Modest Proposal” (1729) and his geographic critique in “On Poetry: A Rhapsody” (1733). Sills returns to the idea of the map as “worldliness” in Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726), vanity that he connects to in Bunyan’s work (102). He argues that Swift provides a satirical critique of English mapping and a romantic sense of Irish patriotism that portray Ireland “as a heterotopic space” (126).

Sills explores the amorphous space of the market in the fourth chapter, “Daniel Defoe and the Limits of the Market,” in which he discusses the marketplace as a mappable economic geography, one like the American colonies and Ireland, that is unstable. Continuing his trajectory of mapping as a tool of empire and the nation-state, he enlists trade as part of the colonial nation-state project. His discussion of trade includes taxation (130) and “illegitimate forms of trade” (133). The former was mapped through cadastral mapping, but the latter was unregulated and thus more challenging for nation-state mapping; hence, Sills associates the regulation of trade with mapping and that mapping was a means for regulating trade. As illegitimate forms of trade went unmapped and resisted mapping so did market fluctuations, unstable social dynamics, and deregulation forces (135). He explains that nation mapping included marketplaces, incorporating the market, or commerce, into national identity. He employs seventeenth-century maps by John Sellers and John Ogilby that list market towns and tables. While he does not include maps by Herman Moll, Defoe’s contemporary who was notable for his lists, he does cite Moll’s relationship with Swift, Defoe, and William Stukeley (147, 254n33, 171, 258n13). Sills concentrates on Defoe’s nonfiction—*A Tour thro’ the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1724), *The Compleat English Tradesman* (1726), and *Brief State of*

the Inland or Home Trade, of England (1730)—analyzing the variability of trade in these texts and a desire for market stability (153). This instability suggests the market's resistance to mapping. Another aspect of the market is restrictions, excluding individuals or cities from participating in the market, which creates unnecessary poverty within the nation. Mapping markets may expose these deficits so that the nation-state may better regulate trade, as Sills acknowledges (163). Hence, "Defoe's rhetoric of improvement" (163) weaves the market's volatility "into the fabric of national life" (164), making the market an aspect of national identity.

Sills posits increased modernization and domesticity in Scotland reflected cultural changes "from barbarity to civility" acquired through the home, not the nation-state, as articulated in Samuel Johnson's *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland* (1775), in Sills's fifth chapter, "This Old House and Samuel Johnson's Scotland." Maps and surveys like those by John Adair, James Anderson, John Knox, and Herman Moll emphasize Scotland's potential for commerce and the country's relationship with England (171), while antiquarian maps by Robert Sibbald, Stukeley, and others claim Scotland's past connection to England. Sills compares this imperial mapping with antiquarian mapping, suggesting that "both approaches to the mapping of Scotland ultimately rely on many of the same cartographic practices and technologies to legitimate their competing claims on the land" (177). Antiquarian maps and "the economic maps" highlight past Roman occupation of Scotland, which unifies Scottish interests with those of England (178–89). Hence, antiquarianism in cartography and Johnson's *Journey* may be resistance to modernization, commercialism, and utilitarianism (195). Significantly, Sills includes Johnson's critique of and ambivalence regarding imperial geographic applications of mapping especially in Johnson's "Review of Lewis Evans' Analysis of a *General Map of the Middle British Colonies in America*" (1756). Johnson's romanticization of Scotland's "primitive" past situates Scotland as a "*terra incognita*" for England (205) and a prehistory for England as Scotland fears the relics of past civilizations that illuminate a move from a "violent and turbulent period" to a "more genteel and civilized" one, the latter represented by England (211). Examples from Johnson's *Idler* and *Rambler* (216–17) define Johnson's concepts of home and "authentic self" (218) "conceived against the map," where space is "an instrument of moral and social reform" that unites Scotland and England (219).

Sills revisits the concept of the neighborhood in his conclusion in which he connects Bunyan's neighborhood of dissent in *The Pilgrim's Progress* to Jane Austen's neighborhood of affect in *Mansfield Park* (1814). The conclusion logically and chronologically transitions from Johnson's correlation of the home as nation to Austen's community as nation. Like Johnson's home, Austen's neighborhood is a heterotopic space that resists imperial mapping while it comprises the vitality of the nation-state, a "space" on which "the moral condition and identity of the nation" depends (231). Therefore, these aspects of nation-building and identity extend beyond imperial mapping that delineate private property, colonialism, and trade. Sills's returning to the neighborhood in his conclusion offers a cohesive framing and tidiness, much like the idea of the imperial, hegemonic map,

which is “the map.” Sills’s study reflects an implicit narrative within individual maps, not “the map,” working against the hegemonic map that also simultaneously constructs it. “The map” is given too much agency, for mapmakers chose what to include and what to omit; they made these choices within the context of their employers, markets, and milieux. Hence, Sills’s well-researched *Against the Map* demonstrates that no hegemonic map exists, but that it is an idea through which maps are conceived and analyzed as tools of empire.

Leah M. Thomas
Virginia State University

Henrietta Harrison. *The Perils of Interpreting: The Extraordinary Lives of Two Translators between Qing China and the British Empire*.

Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021. Pp. xiv + 341; maps; illustrations; notes; glossary; bibliography; index. ISBN: 978-0-691-22545-6; hardcover, \$29.95.

The Perils of Interpreting offers extraordinarily fresh information deftly crafted into a narrative embracing biography, imperial history, maritime history, British political history, religious history, and the history of Chinese and British relations. Harrison, an adroit storyteller, designed the book as a chronologically told story of two men, two cultures, and two imperial powers attempting to communicate between worlds. With a helpfully clarifying list, “Dramatis Personae” (xi-xiv), the book stages its findings in twenty chapters split into four chronological parts. Its focus remains throughout on two exceptional men – Li Zibiao, born in China, trained as a Catholic in Naples, and George Thomas Staunton, the son of a British baronet and interpreter in an embassy to China - whose language skills and openness to other cultures made possible, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, a moment of hope that aggression, whether commercial or martial, could be averted and peaceful relations succeed.

The larger theatre of empire in which Li Zibiao (1760-1828) and George Thomas Staunton (1781-1859) played parts might be familiar to many who study global relations, particularly Britain’s relations with China in the long eighteenth century. The fifty years between the 1793 Macartney embassy to China and the First Opium War form the center of the action. The era is significant for several reasons. Manchu Qing China was, as Harrison shows, not the isolated region deeply entrenched in old ideals hearkening back to an ancient tribute system. Founded by Manchu warriors who conquered China in the seventeenth century, Qing China embraced a culture significantly different from that of classical China, which had harbored an ancient tribute system and conceived itself as the center of all civilization. In Harrison’s view, Qing China has been misrepresented as backward, whereas its culture was quite different from earlier dynasties. When the British arrived in the 1790s for an embassy, the Qing empire was in the midst of rapid expansion westward. In the middle of the century, having opened up the town of Liangzhou, Li Zibiao’s homeland and a

contested terrain of shifting power among Chinese, Mongol, and Tibetan states, Qing China was fostering a community of several different cultures even as expansion created significant business opportunities (20-23). As Harrison phrases it, “Liangzhou was booming,” and the relative social and economic stability of the Qing empire “allowed the old Silk Road trade route to be reopened and the irrigation system to be expanded” (20). The Manchu language was used in Liangzhou. Indeed, “it was not safe for Chinese to write about them [Manchu peoples] as foreigners” (24), Harrison says, indicating that the seeming stability came at the cost of spoken freedoms. The potential fragility of the imperial system relied on translators’ carefully spoken and written discourse, as indicated by the book’s title, which speaks to the perils of interpreting.

The imperial situation for Britain was also fragile: “Britain’s empire, which had seemed near collapse with the loss of the American colonies, had shifted east and moved into a second phase with the consolidation of control in India” (6-7). George Leonard Staunton (George Thomas’s father, who would accompany Macartney to China) was already in India when he “came to believe, as others did that Britain’s overseas empire might easily collapse” as a result of difficulties and accusations of corruption and mismanagement of the East India Company and the Company’s increasing competition (and battles) with Mysore (31-33, quotation at 31). The situation in Madras was difficult: Tipu Sultan, the new ruler of Mysore, presented a significant threat to the British in Madras at the time Macartney and Staunton were there. Clearly concerned about his personal circumstances at that time, Staunton wrote, “As to public affairs here, they are in the same uncertain, and, I fear, dangerous state, with the rest of the British Empire. . . . If we have not a peace soon with the powers of this country, we must, as a state, be ruined” (32-33).

The fragility of the imperial, cultural, political, and economic circumstances helps underscore the significance of the activities that fell into the hands and care of two singularly important translators, Li Zibiao and the much younger George Thomas Staunton. Both men grew up in environments that partook of, yet set them apart from, their home cultures. Their unusual upbringings made them more open-minded and perhaps more curious about and accepting of the worlds in which they played parts. Although stories of diplomacy more frequently feature the diplomatic players from royal or ruling classes, Harrison’s story features, by contrast, the lives of interpreters who in effect practiced interpersonal diplomacy during the encounters between the British and Chinese.

Li Zibiao, born into a large Catholic family in the northwest frontier town of Liangzhou, was called by the Christian name, Jacobus (James). His youth in his home region was relatively short-lived: he was sent (in 1773) at age thirteen to Naples, Italy, where he studied theology and philosophy in the College of the Holy Family of Jesus Christ, known as “the Chinese College” (38). Li Zibiao, whose “cheerful sincerity” (46) brought him several close and trusting friendships particularly among Europeans, excelled in the study of rhetoric and several languages, including Latin, formal Chinese, and Italian. He also likely studied Greek and Hebrew, in addition to metaphysics and probably some form of economics. The head of

the College described Li as “a young man of excellent ability, wonderfully hard working, prudent, devout, exemplary” and as “the best talent among all the Chinese, Levantines, and Europeans” (45). Li, beloved among the students for his steady cheerfulness, was ordained as a priest at age twenty-four in 1784. He remained in Naples nearly twenty years.

George Thomas Staunton, twenty-one years younger than Li, came from an entirely different world, one where his baronet father, George Leonard Staunton, determined all aspects of his education, even though he was far away at his son’s birth. Staunton wrote from Madras that “all my energies will centre in him [his son]” (51). The early loss of his mother (George Thomas Staunton was only three years old when she died) meant that the boy experienced a relatively harsh upbringing at the hands of different teachers and a father who found that threatening his son with the idea of placing his hand in the fire was “an effective way to make the little boy behave” (51; see 120). The boy became shy as a result of his untraditional education, which included learning Latin alongside English – so much so that by the time he was eleven, his father only spoke Latin to him “even on the most trivial of topics,” which was “reported in the newspapers as something amazing” (52). Young George Staunton experienced a modern and very unusual education from expensive tutors and teachers. He was early on introduced to mathematics, economics, meteorology, and botany, and he mastered Latin, ancient Greek, and eventually Mandarin Chinese. Because of his father’s peculiar educational methods and enthusiasms, George Thomas Staunton experienced an education that, Harrison concludes, “would always separate him from men of his own class and background” (58).

The interpreters’ knowledge and cultural understanding of the other side is essential, as Harrison reveals in the second section of the book, detailing Li Zibao’s selection as a translator for the Macartney embassy to China. To George Leonard Staunton fell the task of finding suitable translators for the Macartney embassy. After failing to find someone suitable in France, Staunton travelled to Li’s college in Italy, where Li was chosen, along with a friend, Ke Zongxiao, to return to China with the embassy. Deeply touched by the honor, Li found himself treated with great courtesy and respect. He and Ke dined with the Stauntons and enjoyed helping George Thomas Staunton learn Chinese. They stayed in the Staunton household in London for four months as the British prepared for the embassy. Staunton clothed both interpreters as gentlemen and priests and took them to meet Macartney, with whom they spoke Italian and Latin and discussed rare books and a set of Matteo Ripa’s engravings of the Chinese emperor’s palace in Chengde. Li astutely realized that the embassy, which was characterized as a mission of diplomatic importance between the two empires, was designed to gain the East India Company a port. He wrote privately that “the ultimate aim of this embassy to the Emperor of China (though it is concealed as is usually the case with affairs of great importance) is to be able to obtain some port near Beijing where only the English will be allowed to trade, so that they will be exempted from the demands of the company of merchants in Canton, can do their business freely and increase their profits” (67). Harrison thus shows us that, while the Macartney embassy has been understood as “an attempt to establish modern

international relations between Britain and China,” Li’s assessment was more accurate (67). The British sought an exclusive trading port.

Disputes over Macartney’s refusal to kowtow, which at first brought on Qianlong’s great anger, ultimately led to a relenting by the ruler, who was brought to conceive of the embassy “as more than simply a congratulatory tribute mission” (117). After discussions about India and Russia with Qianlong’s financial minister, Heshen, Macartney explained that Britain aimed for “the extension of commerce for the general benefit of mankind” (117). The public meetings between Macartney and the emperor were pageantry, meant to exclude discussions of trade, because such discussions were “beneath the dignity of kings and aristocrats in both China and England” (126). Li had hoped for an imperial edict in China that would allow Christians to practice their religion there. Such an edict never materialized, but he felt gratified that he “had been accepted by both sides” (139). Macartney’s requests for access to a port fell on deaf ears. But George Thomas Staunton’s words, spoken in Chinese to the emperor, delighted and astounded those in the audience. In the years immediately following the embassy, Li Zibao “never adopted a stark vision of the differences between China and Europe” (151). He had spent too many years in Naples to reject Europe and Catholicism. He later wrote, however, that “no one, not even a complete idiot, would have undertaken” the embassy “if he had understood the danger” (129).

In the third section of the book, Harrison traces the efforts of George Thomas Staunton, who worked with the East India Company in Canton (Guangzhou). His father helped get him the mission, and Staunton was deeply concerned that he might fail, but he quickly learned to adopt a style of speaking and writing suitable to his various audiences: “translation was a matter not just of individual words but also of writing in a style that would fit with the character and reputation of the author” (164). These were not easy years for Staunton. He lost his father, travelled home and was named baronet, and returned to Canton in 1804. His wealth grew as he brokered with Chinese merchants and became a banker for British investors. He developed a deep interest in diplomacy, trade, and translation, all of which assisted him as he began learning Chinese law. When the British fell into disputes with the Portuguese over Macao, however, Staunton’s fortune changed: the British occupation was not acceptable to the Qing, and the new Jiaqing emperor distrusted the West and Christianity. While Staunton argued that the British naval vessels at sea had created the problem for the East India Company, he came to realize that, as Harrison phrases it, the “world in which he had lived and made his translations was coming to an end” (194).

Chinese and British relations fell into a steady downhill path in the early nineteenth century. Staunton, chosen to support the Amherst embassy in 1816, witnessed significant tensions on both sides, and he realized he would have to leave China forever. Amid the growing tensions between China and West, both Li Zibiao and George Thomas Staunton found their lives transformed. Li was forced to go into hiding. Staunton began making his ideas public, first about China and then about how the working classes are not diminished in intellect but in education, because they lacked opportunities for learning. Staunton argued that China “should be treated like

any other country and the Chinese as ordinary people” (246), yet when Britain declared war on China in 1839 (known as the first opium war), Staunton voted in its favor. Li fled from the crackdown against Catholics in China but eventually returned to live his last days in Machang, where he enjoyed renewed friendships with Catholics in Europe and where he embraced his older age, thankful that “he had been able to embrace his sacred ministry for more than thirty years” (232).

For those among us who study the making and breaking of empires, our tendency is to read statesmen's papers, diplomatic correspondence, published and private reports about missions, business transactions, and fictional and nonfictional accounts of experiences. Harrison's approach includes these elements, but her microhistorical tendencies and deep attention to the details of everyday life enhance and enrich readers' knowledge, revealing the significance of the lives of the somewhat extraordinary ordinary people who shaped imperial interactions. Harrison's attention to interpretation, its delicacy, its omissions as well as its expressions reveals how power inheres in language, and power is as much in the hands of translators as in the hands of leaders of state. This fascinating, deeply researched, highly informed account is microhistory at its very best.

Carla J. Mulford

Pennsylvania State University, University Park

The Correspondence of James Boswell and Sir William Forbes of Pittsligo. Edited by Richard B. Sher. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2022. Pp. cxxix + 431; chronology; 4 appendices; 3 illus.; index [379-431]; errata slip with corrections to pp. 146, 220-221, and 381. ISBN: 9780300250381 (Yale), hardcover: \$125.

Hannah More recalled “being made by Sir William Forbes the umpire in a trial of skill between Garrick and Boswell, over which could most nearly imitate Dr. Johnson's manner. I remember I gave it for Boswell in familiar conversation, and for Garrick in reciting poetry” (*Johnsonian Miscellanies*, ed. Hill [1897; rpt. 1966], 2: 195). Richard Sher does not mention the anecdote but his magisterial edition of the Boswell-Forbes correspondence allows us further to parse the occurrence. Although Forbes never became an official member of The Literary Club, the Edinburgh banker formed memorable and rather close friendships with several of its members via his even closer 36-year friendship with fellow Scot James Boswell, ended only by the latter's death in 1795. Those English friends included especially Bennet Langton and Sir Joshua Reynolds. Here Forbes engages in the amusement—I assume Johnson is not in attendance—but two steps removed. He obviously would not attempt to compete with Garrick's dramatic skills and Boswell certainly would not have ceded his place in the contest, but Forbes does not even judge; instead, he chooses the judge. It is possible to see in this the prudent personality of a man who for almost four decades provided Boswell with excellent advice on his financial affairs and related choices of life—advice almost always ignored.

As part of the Research Edition of Boswell's works—as opposed to the trade or “reading” edition—this volume's annotation “turns outwards from the text . . . so as to relate the documents to the various areas of scholarship which they can illuminate: history (literary, linguistic, legal, medical, political, social, local), biography, bibliography, and genealogy, among others” (vii). That it is a single-correspondent volume signals both the significance of the Boswell-Forbes relationship and the importance of Forbes himself: Sir Walter Scott wrote that Forbes was “unequaled, perhaps, in the degree of individual affection entertained for him by his friends, as well as in the general respect and esteem of Scotland at large” (lxix). The last period of Boswell's life, in which he achieved his greatest literary success, is the least fully documented—except for this correspondence. Compared with other correspondence, the one between Forbes and Boswell is most nearly complete. It provides views of the Scottish and London Boswell, with Forbes participating in both realms.

Sher brilliantly chooses to provide his readers with a dual biography in a lengthy introduction, comparing and contrasting the lives of the two men in some detail, so that the chronologically arranged letters that follow are far less puzzling than they may have otherwise been. Some of the extensive annotation of the letters is reinforcement for anyone who keeps the introduction in mind. A certain amount of repetition is inevitable in this process, but I found it understandable and not excessive. Cross-references are plentiful and helpful.

Much of what Sher discovers allows us to put in a slightly new perspective some well-known facets of Boswell's life. His continual financial difficulties were serious and self-inflicted, as Forbes's letter to Samuel Johnson of 13 July 1784 makes clear. Forbes hoped to enlist Johnson's help in persuading Boswell to abandon his long-mentioned scheme of moving to London and working at the English, rather than Scottish, bar. Forbes, as Boswell's banker, knew that the numbers just did not work: “Mr. Boswells estate tho' a very good one, I believe about £1500 a year, from various rent-charges does not afford him of clear above half that from an income which I am afraid is very inadequate to the support and education of numerous family in London, without a degree of rigid œconomy which can scarcely be expected from one who has been accustomed to the comforts and conveniences of an elegant and hospitable table for a dozen years past” (45-46). Previously, Forbes had repeatedly advised Boswell against such a move, but Boswell persisted and failed in London, both at the bar and in securing a seat in Parliament. Ironies abound as Forbes himself was able to attain several of Boswell's goals: he turned down more than once a parliamentary seat and succeeded financially to the extent that he was able to repurchase a long-lost family estate (thus becoming “of Pitsligo”). A further irony: Sher suggests that Forbes's friendship in a sense allowed Boswell to indebt himself further than he would otherwise been able to do by creating an “inheritable bond” on one of his properties. This is an eighteenth-century version of the contemporary “reverse mortgage” (shades of Fred Thompson and Tom Selleck!) with the exception that the debt and indebted property were passed to Boswell's heirs

upon his death. Over the years Boswell barely made the interest payments and reduced the principal not a whit.

Another area in which Boswell consistently ignored Forbes's advice was his tendency, under the excuse of truthfulness, to portray in unflattering ways the people mentioned in his publications, usually quoting (or professing to quote) them directly. Related was his seemingly unfavorable portrait of Scotland in the *Journal of the Tour to the Hebrides* (1785). Forbes writes to Bishop Thomas Barnard,

I am really not sure if the plan itself of the publication be altogether a proper one; had he only published what Dr. Johnson and he himself said, there could have been no harm in it, as the Doctor knew that it would be published but it is scarcely fair to record what other people said without their consent; for many a man spouts opinions in the carelessness of familiar conversation, which he would not chuse should be printed . . . I have strongly charged him carefully to attend not to insert any thing in his next publication which can be supposed to give offence. (79)

How blind Boswell was to such issues shows up when he was soliciting subscriptions for Johnson's monument in 1789 and wrote to Forbes, "I enclose an Advertisement for Dr. Johnson's Monument which you will please to get inserted in *all the newspapers in Scotland once*" (153). Boswell had sent the advertisement despite Forbes's previous attempt to dissuade him: "I would advise you, therefore, for fear of a disappointment, to make no advertisement in Scotland" (139). We learn later that, unsurprisingly, Forbes was correct: "What I prophecied in regard to the Subscription . . . has been exactly verified; not a single halfpenny having been paid in." Forbes continues, illustrating his (balanced) generosity: "You may put me down in your list: but as I would not wish to give either more or less than is proper, I will be much obliged to you to let me know in your next, about what the ordinary value of Subscriptions may be" (178). In the event, the amount was five pounds.

The funeral of Joshua Reynolds provides another opportunity for Forbes's personality to be revealed. As he writes in a letter to his wife, he had stopped by to pick up Bennet Langton, but found him "sitting in despair, for want of his Mourning-Suit; which he had written for to Oxford . . . and which was not arrived. . . . By one of those Chances which I believe seldom occurs to a Scotchman in London, I happened to be possessed of two black Suits; of course, immediately offered to accommodate him with the spare one" (243). Forbes seems to have been one of the first "belt-and-suspenders" kind of guy.

Spending time with Sher's edition is full of pleasures, only a few of which I have hinted at above. I conclude with one that, had Sher not collated all existing copies of a letter, he would not have discovered. Or, put another way, if he had examined only the letter Forbes wrote to Boswell (23 April 1792; available at Yale), and not further checked the Forbes archives for the corresponding rough draft, a case of Forbes's self-censorship would have remained unknown. Sher prints the Yale version, the one Boswell received, which states, "To one of our discussions on the road from Sloane-Street, I

hope you are paying a particular attention, as it well deserves” (254). Now Forbes, like Boswell, frequently included literary allusions in his correspondence; Shakespeare was a favorite. Here, Sher’s note *points* in a different direction: instead of “I hope . . . deserves” Forbes had written, then deleted, “I must beg to call your attention: I hope you are pressing home that point, as Mr Shandy says” (257n9). Sher provides the correct reference to *Tristram Shandy*, 6:18, but leaves Sterne’s bawdry to the reader’s memory. Forbes removed the reference before sending the letter to Boswell, perhaps in a nod to the decorum he assumed for almost four decades in his attempt to keep Boswell on the straight and narrow.

Robert G. Walker
Washington & Jefferson College

Alex Chase-Levenson. *The Yellow Flag: Quarantine and the British Mediterranean World, 1780-1860*. (Global Health Histories.) Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. xii + 307; bibliography; notes, 23 b/w figures; index. ISBN: 978-1-108-48554-8. Hardcover: \$105.

With the exception of Napoleon, who cavalierly stepped ashore at Fréjus upon his return in 1799 from his Egyptian campaign and the nameless shoemaker/smuggler scapegoated for the 1813-1814 outbreak plague on Malta, abiding by quarantine protocols was the rite de non-passage that marked the lives of all who crossed the Mediterranean between 1780 and 1860. Based on registers of incoming ships, declarations of captains and reports of quarantine doctors and boards of health, Alex Chase-Levenson estimates that tens of thousands performed quarantine during that temporal window. Crew members generally isolated onboard ship, but passengers were isolated in lazarettos for a specified period of time, usually two weeks. In 1830, about 9000 crew members performed quarantine onboard at Livorno, one of the most cosmopolitan quarantine ports in the Mediterranean; in 1835, the Malta lazaretto admitted 12,932 individuals. At the end of the time period, they would have either developed symptoms and been transferred to the local plague hospital where they either died or recovered, or been given a clean bill of health and allowed to proceed.

Quarantining was the time-honored way to control the spread of contagion. As a method, it was universally applied, but the character of quarantine and the responses to it varied. Freedom-loving Byron fumed as he stared out of the casement window of the lazaretto at Malta in 1811 and the experience of being shut up in the same lazaretto in 1831 made Sir Walter Scott feel guilty and polluted. Through the 1820s, *spoglio* was practiced at Malta and Odessa (not strictly on the Mediterranean, but connected to it through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles). During this practice, incoming inmates were stripped and placed in an unventilated room. At Malta, aromatic woods and herbs were burned. Individuals subjected to this disinfecting process often came close to asphyxiation. At Odessa, men and women were stripped, made to stand naked in a queue for hours, albeit in

separate queues, before being given stigmatizing clothing and admission to the lazaretto. All travelers, no matter their status, were subjected to this treatment. The English traveler Charles Terry wrote that in his processing line were a French count, a Russian officer, Polish Jews and a criminal. On the other hand, a lithograph of two Hungarian aristocrats ensconced in a large, sunlit, well-appointed apartment in the Malta lazaretto shows that for the moneyed, the experience of quarantine could be a comfortable hiccup in their itinerary, at least at Malta.

Pleasant or not, the bottom line is that these individuals and countless others had no choice but to accommodate themselves to the quarantine laws. Indeed, the vast majority accepted that the public health emergency represented by a plague outbreak on Western soil justified the abrogation of personal rights and freedoms. Patrick Russell, a medical doctor who, in 1799, was appointed the chair of the Quarantine Committee by Sir William Pitt the Younger encoded this position in one of the Committee's reports: "the general safety of the state is considered the supreme law."

Whether you beguiled the time at Marseille or Livorno, Malta or Odessa, the lazaretto you entered was, in the words of the Scottish poet and travel-writer Thomas Campbell, "a sort of hospital-prison." The artist Francis Hervé said, to all intents and purposes, his attendant was "a gaoler or turnkey." Chase-Levenson references Foucault in this context, noting that the existential threat of a plague outbreak enables the lazaretto to be construed as an early antecedent to the modern prison, but Machiavelli and the establishment of concentrating or internment camps make a better lens.

The hoisting of the yellow flag referenced in the title of Alex Chase-Levenson's study was universally understood to mean that a vessel was or might be harboring a dangerous disease and needed to be quarantined. The ship flew that flag until its foul bill of health was replaced with a clean one, and it was granted pratique, or clearance to engage with a port. For the jacket cover, Chase-Levenson chose a watercolor of a ship flying a yellow flag anchored at sea. The ship is far enough to be unthreatening yet close enough to the port for its features to be depicted. It's an excellent choice as it shows how being in quarantine was a state of suspended animation.

Chase-Levenson treats the phenomenon of quarantine from political and personal perspectives. Despite being a system that applied universally to all passengers, crew members and trade goods on a particular ship based on its point of origin, quarantine was a discriminating tool. Quarantine was the time-honored continental method for keeping the healthy European "us" healthy and separate from the unclean and diseased "them," with the "them" being associated with the Ottoman Empire whose most important port was Constantinople, and the North African country of Egypt, from whose port of Cairo bales of cotton reached Britain after going through an elaborate fumigation process. Even if plague was not raging in the Ottoman Empire and North Africa, these geographies were always assumed to be vectors of contagion, and those who ventured into these putative zones of contagion were considered to be flirting with death. Until the 1850s, the life insurance issued by the Church of England did not cover residence in any place not subject to quarantine laws yet affected by an epidemic disease.

This fixed, oversimplified and far-reaching racist idea survived the dismantling of the Mediterranean sanitary cordon based upon point of origin. In the second half of the nineteenth century, these rules and regulations were replaced by quarantine laws that forced immigrants and refugees, not to mention Bosnian Muslims returning from their pilgrimage to Mecca and Indian Muslims en route to the *Hajj*, into detention centers.

During an outbreak of bubonic plague in the 1890s in Hong Kong, a French scientist discovered that the disease was spread by the bites of rodent-borne fleas. New research suggests that human body lice may also spread *Yersinia pestis*, the bacterium causing bubonic plague. The WHO advises all who deal with infected individuals to avoid contact with their bodily fluids and tissues as they are another pathway. From the fourteenth century through the period covered by *The Yellow Flag*, the majority believed that plague was contagious. Referred to as "contagionists," they believed plague was carried in the ship's cargo and transmitted from person to person. The best way to control the spread of contagion was by fumigating the goods and isolating the passengers and crew. Expurgators decontaminated cotton, for example, by thrusting their arms into the bales as far as the middle of the bag for twenty consecutive days. Live feathered animals were repeatedly sprinkled with vinegar. Letters were either dipped in vinegar or smoked with such substances as sulfur, laudanum, cardamom, black pepper, chlorine, saltpeter, and absinthe. This method did more harm than good. Talleyrand complained to the Marseille Board of Health that letters addressed to him arrived stinking and illegible. It may also have caused letter paper to disintegrate. Among the miseries Byron associated with his stay at the lazaretto on Malta were the mail packets that arrived devoid of letters. One group that Chase-Levenson does not deal with are the lowly employees who removed the chamber pots of the sick and carried the dead away. Because the plague bacillus is carried in the tissues and bodily fluids of plague victims, these men were at high risk for contracting the disease unless they wore protective gear. But did they?

By the mid-seventeenth century, two Italian city-states had signed treaties to coordinate their quarantine procedures; among these were the fumigation practices adopted for enumerated goods, referred to above. By the eighteenth century, the quarantine policies of France, Spain and Austria were in alignment. European nations saw themselves engaging in a fight against a common enemy; lest it be considered a pariah nation, as barbaric as the plague-ridden countries of the East, as deserving of its ancient reputation as perfidious, Great Britain accommodated itself to the continental practices.

Chase-Levenson's thesis is that quarantine, which by definition, is a practice of isolation and exclusion, fostered national, even international cooperation and coordination among European nations. As quarantine was accepted as the one and only way to protect the public health of Europe, these rules and regulations came to be regarded as a contract binding its implicit signatory nations, members of a family, as it were, to this common goal. Chase-Levenson, who combed through British, French, Italian German and Maltese archives, marshals much evidence to prove that those engaged in quarantine administration across the Mediterranean were in constant contact, consistent in the application of quarantine laws. They were of

different nationalities, but the bureaucrats sat on each other's boards of health. Consuls were important cogs in the sanitary machinery. They collected epidemiological information and reported to their superiors back home about how quarantining was functioning in foreign ports. Their reports allowed boards of health to threaten retaliatory measures should they determine that a foreign country was not in compliance. As Chase-Levenson notes, the development of tit-for-tat diplomacy fostered greater intra-European coordination. A whole slew of British doctors, eager to understand the disease, served in hospitals across the Mediterranean.

An interesting case in point is Charles Maclean. This Scottish doctor did not believe that the plague was a contagious disease and stated that research on epidemic transmission was his particular area of interest. However, rather than offering an alternative explanation for the transmission of the disease, he claimed that a regimen of calomel, mercury and opium would cure those suffering from the plague. Quarantine being unnecessary, he excoriated quarantine laws as "the most gigantic, extraordinary, and mischievous superstructure that has ever been raised by man, upon a purely imaginary foundation." Nevertheless, he put his medical services at the disposal of a Greek-run plague hospital in Constantinople. His ranting and raving would not have saved him from going through quarantine on his way to and from Constantinople.

Chase-Levenson's starting point is 1799, the year that Pitt convened a Quarantine Committee with a membership composed of doctors, bureaucrats, merchants and politicians. Britain had quarantine protocols for ships entering via Gibraltar, but they were unnecessarily burdensome. The brief of the Committee was to streamline the existing protocols. Instead, the members concluded that the existing European precedents were superior and recommended that the British rules be aligned with them. Although England was at war with France, the Committee looked favorably at the procedures in place at the Marseille lazaretto. Because detainees had to pay for their room and board at the lazaretto, the Committee no doubt noted that it was a boon to the local economy. The Committee also recommended that the government send investigators to Livorno, to learn how quarantine was implemented there. Although the project was abandoned, the Committee recommended the establishment of a lazaretto on British soil on the model of the lazaretto at Marseille and Venice. What the Committee is most remembered for is how it exceeded its brief. The Committee convinced the Privy Council that the health of the realm depended on the destruction of three ships which had set sail from a Moroccan port carrying, among other items, goatskins, considered to be one of the goods most capable of harboring contagion. Accordingly, in 1800 the ships were carried out to sea and sunk in deep water, the action supervised by a naval warship. The acceptance of quarantine as the supreme law to which every knee had to bend led the merchant members of the Committee, who represented a community whose interests would not be served by the destruction of cargo, to go along with the decision.

What makes *The Yellow Flag* a chilling and resonating read are the portraits of the political appointees who took their mandate personally. The destruction of the three ships would not be the last time that quarantine

bureaucrats went overboard on a grand scale. In 1813, as plague fatalities mounted in Malta, the Civil Commissioner there proclaimed that any person who changed residence without permission from the Council of Health would be liable to the death penalty while individuals who had license to move had to wear a red armband. When neither fear or stigmata stopped the death toll from climbing, Sir Thomas Maitland, the first Governor of the island, exerted power and turned a medical measure into a species of despotism. Maitland ordered the entire population to withdraw to specially constructed military encampments in the center of the island, in effect converting the island into a giant lazaretto or internment camp. Maitland's term for this forced eviction was the euphemism "retirement." His authoritarian approach earned him the nickname "King Tom."

In 1816, Andrew White, the Superintendent of Quarantine on Corfu, improved on King Tom's plan. White had a military background, and unlike Maitland, didn't bother to conceal his iron fist within a velvet glove. He ordered the removal of the Corfu population to remote encampments where individuals were segregated into groups of "positively diseased," "highly suspicious," "simply suspected," and "under observation." Many of the locals refused to comply with this top-down order; White quashed the protest by quarantining the protesters with the positively diseased. Wanting to side with the angels of political correctness without falling into the pit of anachronistic thinking, Chase-Levenson reads the resistance of these imperial subjects as "an early form of anticolonial agitation" (228). I'm not sure if the disgruntled villagers thought of themselves as "imperial subjects," but Chase-Levenson doesn't belabor the association. However, it would have sounded less jarring to this reviewer's ears had he quoted the freedom-loving Lord Byron on the subject of the British presence on Malta. His rollicking "A Farewell to Malta" dismissed Malta as "thou little military hothouse," ridiculed the military men as "red coats [with] redder faces," and mocked "the supercilious air / Of all that strut 'en militaire." Byron, who left England for good in 1816 and died fighting for Greek independence in 1824, would have cheered the agitators on.

In the final analysis, did the means justify the end? Did quarantine measures, sometimes drastically applied, control or contain bubonic plague? Having devoted 200+ pages to the protocols of quarantine, Chase-Levenson devotes a few pages to this question at the end. Admitting that it was a "blunt instrument" (280) for separating the healthy from the diseased, he does not condone Maitland or White. He notes that bubonic plague, like epidemic diseases in general, peak and wane of their own accord. He acknowledges the role adumbrated by anticontagionist doctors in bringing plague under control. They believed that since plague was caused by something in the environment, the way to wipe out plague was not by detaining people but by reducing overcrowding and removing filth. That perspective is now the accepted one. Once the rodent-flea connection was established, governments implemented policies that reduced the population of the host and the vector; today, there are only three countries where bubonic plague is endemic. Nonetheless, Chase-Levenson believes that containment did help keep Europe safe from contagion, and he does point out that this vast international structure was dismantled when the situation no

longer justified its continued existence. Except for those made redundant by its demise, it was not mourned.

The Yellow Flag is part of Cambridge University Press's series in global health histories. It sets a high standard for the books to follow.

Frances B. Singh

Emerita, Hostos Community College, CUNY

Jennifer Milam and Nicola Parsons (editors). *Making Ideas Visible in the Eighteenth Century*. (Studies in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Art and Culture.) Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2021. Pp. xiv + 226; 60 color illustrations. ISBN 978-164453-232-4: Cloth, \$120. (Also available in paperback, \$34.95.)

This collection offers eight essays exploring depictions of ideas in visual art. In the introduction ("The Potential Visibility of Ideas in Enlightenment Art and Aesthetics"), the editors, Juliam Milam and Nicola Parsons, argue that eighteenth-century theorists and artists found "the traditional formulation of art as imitation of nature to be limited" (2). In place of simple mimesis, they posited the "visual independence of ideas" and sought to capture the relationship "between visual representation and an idea of a particular subject" (3, 4). By themselves, these statements may seem somewhat abstract, perhaps even intangible. Fortunately, the beautifully illustrated essays that follow substantiate the editors' claims through a series of richly interdisciplinary discussions that are both engaging and valuable.

In the collection's first essay, David Maskill examines the *logements* of the Louvre. These prestigious apartments not only "provide d free lodging for life," but also allowed savvy artists to perform their professional identities (11). Looking closely at the probate records of the portrait painter Louis Tocqué, who held a *logement* from 1759 until 1772, Maskill shows how the artist and his wife "used their material possessions to demonstrate their social pretensions and their perceived status" (12). Maskill acknowledges the limitations of his methodology, which can offer only a "detailed snapshot" of the Tocqués' living arrangements (26). Still, his analysis provides a compelling argument for how visual presentation communicates identity. In "Inventing Artifice: François Boucher's Collection at the Louvre," Jessica Priebe also focuses on a *logement*, this one occupied by Boucher between 1752 and 1770. Boucher extensively modified his space to accommodate his extensive collections. The objects he accumulated became "a visual index of classical motifs," which he used within his "painted and graphic oeuvre" (42). While Tocqué used his space for public self-fashioning, Boucher created his as an oasis "that soothed his soul and fired his imagination" (52).

Moving to England, Matthew Martin explores the tension "between nationalist and cosmopolitan tendencies" in the products of the Chelsea Porcelain Factory (59). Although branded as British and Protestant, the factory employed a number of Francophone artists, who "produced works

that were frequently French in character and content, but marketed *as* British” (61). Looking at several Counter-Reformational devotional sculptures, notably *Pietà* and *The Virgin and Child*, Martin suggests that the pieces would have allowed upper-class recusants to define themselves as members of both “a European aristocratic Catholic culture” and “the English elite” (61). The art, he argues, captures ideas of reconciliation and belonging. In one of the collection’s best essays, “Planting Cosmopolitan Ideals: Thomas Jefferson’s Poplar Forest,” Jennifer Milam discusses similar tensions and desires. Analyzing *Notes on the State of Virginia* and the architecture of Jefferson’s rural retreat, Poplar Forest, Milam discovers “the entangled strands of cosmopolitanism and patriotism in Jefferson’s thought, specifically in relation to time and history” (79). For many readers, Milam’s brief discussion of Monticello will prove particularly useful. Jefferson built Mulberry Row, a site of enslaved labor, immediately adjacent to his residence. The resulting view created, as Jefferson imagined it, a “perfectly ordered microcosm of American society,” one that unapologetically included the “lives and industry of enslaved workers” (96).

In “Growing Old in Public in Eighteenth-Century France,” Jessica L. Fripp examines the efforts of two French women, Marie-Thérèse Geoffrin and Marie Leszczyńska, to make themselves appear older. Each woman understood aging as “cultural construction of respectability” (112). A mature appearance allowed the *salonnière* Geoffrin “to increase her celebrity while maintaining her propriety” (128). For Leszczyńska, the wife of Louis XV and Queen of France, the semblance of age provided “a means to withdraw from her very public life” and define herself as pious and intellectual (128). In an equally fine essay, Wiebke Windorf explores how French funerary monuments of the *ancien régime* expressed “new ideas about and attitudes toward death and the hereafter” (135). Jean-Baptist Pigalle’s *Funerary Monument to the Maréchal de Saxe*, for example, reveals the artist’s rejection of “the Christian hope of an afterworld” and his celebration of a “this-worldly immortality” through the “memory of the people” (147).

Melanie Cooper’s “Meeting the Locals: Mythical Images of the Indigenous Other in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries” examines visual depictions of Native Americans and Australian Aboriginals. In their representations of these populations, European artists used mythological tropes “to define and position themselves as superior to those who appeared to fall short of Western cultural, political and physical norms” (160). Such efforts, Cooper demonstrates, “provided a means of situating humanity within the Chain of Beings” (162). Far more problematically, they also created a “justification for colonization and naturalized concepts of inferiority” (178). In this way, the visual art completed much the same work as Jefferson’s Mulberry Row. Each made visible an idea that excused the exploitation of others. In the collection’s final essay, “Infernal Machines: Designing the Bomb Vessel as Transnational Technology,” Jennifer Ferng discusses the development of terrifying naval ships with mortars mounted near the bow. In Ferng’s analysis, the ships, which “evolved through the hands of several shipwrights in the Netherlands, France and Britain,” become examples of transnational technology (188). Equally important, they

show the efforts of architects to “strike a balance between efficiency and aesthetic design” (189).

Making Ideas Visible is an important collection that will appeal to scholars from a variety of disciplines. Those teaching early-modern literature and history will find useful representations of ideas that are often less accessible in printed texts. Many of the book’s images will find a home in my instructional materials, and the authors’ insightful interpretations will inform our class discussions. Milam and Parsons should be congratulated for selecting such keen essays, each of which is handsomely produced and carefully documented. Similarly, the University of Delaware Press should be acknowledged for producing a volume with such an impressive abundance of high-quality color illustrations. At \$34.95, the paperback edition is a genuine bargain.

Christopher D. Johnson
Francis Marion University

Daniel Defoe. *The Farther Adventures of Robinson Crusoe. (The Stokes Newington Edition.)* Edited by Maximillian E. Novak, Irving N. Rothman, and Manuel Schonhorn. With contributions by Kit Kincade and John G. Peters. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press (distributed by Rutgers University Press), 2022 [24 November 2021]. Pp. xxxiv [2], 440; 9 illustrations (including first-edition map and title-page); Introduction; Explanatory notes; Textual Note [prior to] Bibliographical Descriptions and Collation of Variants; Selected Bibliography of Works Consulted [415-17]; Index. ISBN: 978-1-68448-325-9. Paperback: c. \$56.80 [on Amazon, where hardcover is \$130 and Kindle is 54.05; Bucknell UP has a scholars discount].

Bucknell University Press has published the final two volumes of Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* series submitted over a decade ago to the late AMS Press and salvaged by Bucknell. Vol. 1, *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe* had appeared in 2020. Irving N. Rothman, who with much help from students prepared the text, died in April 2019; Manuel Schonhorn, who especially contributed to the notes, died in April 2021. The introduction to *Farther Adventures* is mainly the product of Max Novak, long America's most distinguished Defoe scholar (he slips into the first person "I" in n. 38). The editors' first volume was very well reviewed, though John Richetti objected to the space devoted to variant readings (*Intelligencer*, 34.2 [October 2020], 47-49). Some have called the edition "definitive," but that is certainly not the case for *Farther Adventures*, which provides insufficient and sometimes inaccurate bibliographical and textual information and contains hundreds of incorrect readings in the text and in the historical collation.

The edition fails to establish a copy-text based on an examination of the sheets in many copies with the first-edition title-page; rather, the edition describes a single copy--with copy specific info on binding, etc.--and then relies on that copy as representative of all other individual copies. But the

variant "issues of the first edition" that the editors recognize as identified by Henry C. Hutchins in 1925 (*Robinson Crusoe and its Printing, 1719-1931*) call for the identification of diverse settings and the determination of their order and relation. The editors refer us only to Hutchins, who "reports three issues" (B1-B3), but readers may doubt that work done a hundred years ago can replace a survey of copies now known to exist. Hutchins offered much evidence on the main lines of transmission, but his account is handicapped by a failure to examine the transmission as occurring through sheets, not whole volumes. Thus, when he identifies readings shared by the later settings with earlier ones, he offers page numbers (116-18), failing to localize these shared readings on sheets. The editors needed to test Hutchins's conclusions by expanding his textual study and to demonstrate by going further than he had that he had performed all the necessary analysis of early printing. They could surpass Hutchins by noting that copies with the first-issued sheets (his B1) and those with different settings printed later (his B3 issues) share the same essential setting in sheet Aa but with revisions in the second impression (B3). Or they could note that both issues share the same setting of sheet Bb. Also, they needed to explain Hutchins's conclusions in more precise, updated language, indicating that Hutchins's "three issues" include two editions (thus the 1719 edition the publisher named "second" is really the third). This explanation would have required the editors to treat Hutchins's B3 issue, in fact the second edition, as they have four later editions, a copy of each of which was collated for variants.

What is said of Hutchins's conclusions is confused and inaccurate: "Hutchins reports three issues . . . B2 [second issue] has numerous changes and modernization of the typesetting, which, Hutchins, [sic] points out, proved to be the major textual source for the second edition. B3, he claims, "was hastily printed, and badly, too" (269). This wrongly indicates three settings linked to Hutchins's B1, B2, and B3 issues: calling them "variants," Hutchins distinguished as B1 first settings with A4v blank and as B2 first settings with an advertisement for a fourth-edition of *Robinson Crusoe* on A4v (pp. 111-12). Hutchins is more explicit in his 1927 article updating the book, when conceiving of an "issue" as a distinct publication venture, he defines only two issues of the first edition, distinguished by the absence or presence of an advertisement on A4v ("Two Hitherto Unrecorded Editions of *Robinson Crusoe*," *The Library*, 4th ser, 8 [1927], 65). Hutchins recognized that revisions occurred during repeated impressions of the prefatory half-sheet and that there were two different settings of most sheets of the book (109-10). His "third issue," "B3," has the revised setting of half-sheet A and of sheet B and new settings of later sheets. Ideally, the editors should have provided a division of 1719 copies into editions and issues that would guide and correct the ESTC practice (there is no reference to the ESTC).

Presently ESTC poorly classifies copies into four record numbers, with a further subdivision in each that notes variant states with or without, for instance, a wrong page number. Record T72272 is based on Hutchins's B1, the first issue, used by both Rothman et al. and by W. R. Owens in his 2008 edition for Pickering & Chatto as copy-text (Rothman used a Harvard copy, and Owens, the BL copy on ECCO). But other records are more troublesome. ESTC wrongly describes copies classed as N47837 as being

Hutchins's "second issue" of the first edition." My collation of the University of Kansas copy linked to N47837 on ECCO reveals that it fits Hutchins's B3, with second settings of sheets B-Aa. ESTC describes N47838 copies as first edition in a "variant issue not described by Hutchins"; this too misuses "issue." N47838 is linked to a Bodleian copy digitized on Google Books; it has the same title-page and, aside from having "A2" signed, the same signatures as other first-edition copies (none of the three first-edition issues described by Hutchins and by Rothman et al. has A2 signed). After sheet B, the Kansas copy has the same basic settings as the BL copy linked to T72272. A variant state differing due to accidents or stop-press corrections ought not to be said to create a new issue, and the ESTC tries to limit its separate records by noting variant states, but it defines records by features on five or six pages when all included copies may not have every fingerprint called for. ESTC notes that copies grouped as T72272 have a variant reading "Farthfr" (as does the BL copy G13276 on ECCO), but we don't know from that whether some copies of that same setting of sheet B have the spelling error corrected. (Hutchins is modestly candid about the limitations of his conclusions [111].) To properly edit this work one need think of it not as a book but as a collection of sheets, and all the sheets need be sorted, collated, and compared.

Although the textual variants peculiar to Hutchins's B2 and B3 classes are not recorded in the Stokes Newington edition, it includes a description of a specific copy of Hutchins' B2 and B3 classes in the "Bibliographical Descriptions" (a section sorely needing headings). We are not told how to distinguish these issues from each other. The second description (of the Boston Public's 13.1719.2) and third description (of the BL's C.30.f.7) have full title-page transcriptions for the same setting as the first (easily replaced with the statement that they are shared), and the contents and ornament sections fail to distinguish them from one another; nor are any distinguishing variants offered (271-74). The editors should note that the first issue has a tailpiece of a lion on A4 and a blank A4v; Hutchins B2 and B3 issues have on A4v an advertisement about vol. 1 of *Robinson Crusoe*. Also, it is the generalized ideal copies that should be described--they are relevant to understanding the textual evolution (the specific copies used for the collation are too specific--one should be able to reproduce the critical edition--as one would a scientific experiment--using other copies of the identified editions and issues).

The textual apparatus suggests that Rothman had a very unconventional and uninformed sense of what is expected in a critical edition. For one, he seems not to have understood the concept of authority and not to have grasped the conventional difference in the treatment of substantive and accidental variants. The editors have introduced into the copy-text "necessary changes authorized by later editions. It is editorial policy, for example, to reduce all verbs to lowercase letters where authority is found in subsequent editions" (270). The editors note "In the total text, 194 emendations have been made," but these emendations are not listed, and one wonders if the 194 includes putting verbs in lowercase. This notion that variants in the second-edition should be "incorporate[d] . . . in the copy-text where these changes are supported in subsequent editions" (283) is not sound

editorial practice unless it is shown that the author closely revised these later editions. Composers regularly made corrections repeated by later compositors without these changes having any authority. The editors never discuss Defoe's revising. They admit to the inconsistency of keeping the spelling "cabbin" used in the earliest setting but adapting modernizations of other words from later impressions (271, 283). Their short textual introduction to the variants list has the odd remark that the first edition's practice of skipping lines between paragraphs "is retained in the text" (283), but--fortunately--that white space is not reproduced.

The edition lists by numbers 1-5703 a mixture of substantive and accidental variants found in five copies standing for the first through fifth editions (1719-1726), called *O1*, *O2*, *D3*, *D4*, and *D5*. Note that the third edition should have the sigla "O3" since it is an octavo, not a duodecimo (as wrongly claimed on 269). Some of the lemma readings at the start of a variant listing are not the readings in this Bucknell edition as they should be; such as "*breaking*" in #20 (uppercase in the text) and "*wanting, on*" in #22 ("*wanting on,*" in the text) (p. 284). The reading "villainious" given as the lemma in #62 is a mistake for "villainous." The lemma in #77 is correctly "Hinderance," but it is repeated for the variant reading in stead of "Hindrance" as found in *O2* etc. Sometimes the variant reading does not exist or is not where claimed (as that claimed for *O2* in #35). Sometimes italics are neglected (e.g. #21). There are other types of problems in the "Variants" list. Some involve the numbering of variants. Two variants for the same reading are split between footnotes 195-196. Footnote 20 references two different disconnected variants in the same sentence but in different lines of the Stoke Newington text: "20. *Difference between*] *O1*, *O2*, *D3*, *D5*; ~ *Differace* ~ *D4*; *breaking*] *O1* *D3* *D4*; *Breaking* *O2*, *D5*" (284). The fourth-edition blunder "Differace" is the sort of variant not worth recording.

Moreover, this new text itself has many wrong readings: Hutchins's first issue that Rothman et al. claim to take for copy-text has on A4 the readings "*breaking*" and "*Punishment and: He*" and "*wanting, on.*" These readings were revised in some first-edition copies (as the Bodleian copy on Google linked to N47838), in copies with sheets B-Z reset (like the Kansas copy on ECCO linked to N47837), and in "second-edition" copies (like BL's 12613.d.6, on ECCO). The Stoke Newington text has the revised readings for first and third variants but uses the uncorrected version of the second: "*Punishment and: He*" p. 4). Apparently, Rothman did not recognize that the setting of type in half-sheet A reappeared with revisions in the second edition. Thus, the text offers "*Beautys*" at 4.4 (A3v.1 of original) even though standing type was corrected to "*Beauties*" for the second edition. (That the same setting of type in half-sheet A appears in the second edition is evident from the alignment of letters and also from shared broken type, as A3.7: "j" cut short in "*Subject*"; A3v.9 "s" cut short in "*supply'd*"; etc.) As another example of a wrong reading, at 11.11 the Stoke Newington edition has "Country," and indicates in a footnote that the same appears in 2nd through 4th editions. However, the reading in the copy-text is "County" (6.32), misread by the collator, and "Country" is the change made in the variant setting ignored by Rothman but repeated in the editions 2-4. (Hutchins recognized that *O2* reprints readings introduced by B3 [117]).

This change to "Country" is among many unrecorded in the neglected second settings that could contain revisions by Defoe. Another potentially authorial correction occurs at 24.27 where the first setting (T72272) nonsensically reads "all we had" and the second setting (N47837) followed by later editions corrected to "all they had" (variant #326 wrongly claims that "they" for "we" in O2 occurs earlier at "as we had saved their Lives"). Furthermore, the choice by the "second" edition's compositors of the readings in the settings ignored by Rothman and Owens suggests that modern editors may be overlooking some authorial emendations. However, they relied on Hutchins's bald remarks about the other settings, which inaccurately characterize all as full of inaccuracies (109-10). Some are, but some reset pages have few variants (B7/13 has none), and many of those are corrections. These variants needed to be examined for possible corrections by Defoe. And there are changes in the third edition that I would accept for emendations even if not by Defoe (as #834 on p. 48).

The transcription errors in the Stokes Newington edition seem to include over half a dozen errors with accidentals on each page, if the BL copy linked on ECCO to T72272 is compared to it, as for pp. 19 and 21 (I give copy-text and then Stoke Newington): 19.5: Burning] burning; / 19.6: Light,] ~; / 19.9: who] ~, / 19.23: Word] word / 19.24: four, . . . Children,] ~^ . . . ~; / 19.25: Merchant-Ship]-^ ~ / 19.28 body] Body. / 21.6: then] ~, / 21.7: Shalloop] Shallop / 21.11: only,] ~^ / 21.13: way] Way / 21.14 and .18: *New-found Land]* *Newfound-Land]* / 21.16: Twelve] twelve / 21.23: hopeless] ~, / 21.25: more,] ~; / 21.30: Sails, . . . Windward] ~; . . . ~, / 21.32: another,] ~;[.] In none of these instances does a textual footnote excuse the infidelity as an emendation. The note on 19.9, #238, claims "who" has no comma after it; the next note, #239, though appearing in line 19.10, contains variants on p. 21.14 and incorrectly claims "*Newfound-Land*" is in the copy-text. The list of variants often gives the reading in the copy-text as its first or lemma reading when that is not in fact the reading in the Stoke Newington text.

This list of variants in Stoke Newington takes up pp. 283-414 and effectively obscures important variants that could represent authorial substantive changes within a forest of compositorial changes to font, punctuation, spelling, etc. Yet the most important variants to be recorded are not: those involving substantives in settings before the second edition, when Defoe is most likely to have been reading copy while printing went forward. I read five pages of variants before finding an emended reading to the first-issue copy-text. The shaft collected include the use of small caps for the first word of paragraphs, a practice introduced in the fourth and fifth editions (e.g., "The] THE"). This use of small caps is a common adaptation in 12mo format, not something Defoe, who had sold copyright, had any control over. It could be mentioned in the note before the list of variants as something not recorded. That would have prevented the many instances of small caps in the fourth edition not being recorded where those in the fifth are (e.g., #134, 137, 143, 147). The less transcribed, the less wrongly transcribed, protecting against spelling blunders as in #142. In addition, the edition includes publisher William Taylor's 11-page booklist from the end of the first edition (Bb3v-Bb8v); it is not only reprinted but emended with textual notes indicating an omitted period is inserted (268). Note that the emendation on

268 is not referenced to this edition but to the Bb sheet of the original work. The 130 pages of variants must have considerably increased the price of the book. Why reproduce the accidental variants in five editions? Why not just deposit the information at a couple libraries? All that collating was done to no purpose really--no emendations are shown to derive from the work (though some are claimed), no transmission is traced, and no generalization is offered about how the 2nd-5th editions altered the work--how faithful was the copying? I find a noteworthy range of fidelity by the later compositors--from the faithful sheet B to later sheets lousy with accidental errors as if composed while someone dictated the work. If we could trust the variants compiled by students (credited on p. xi), the list might provide material for studying compositorial fidelity.

The mortal Rothman's fellow editors were too dependent on his textual expertise. In *Notes on Footnotes* Novak writes of his surprise at being called an "editor" on Amazon, for to his mind he is a "Writer of Scholarly Annotations" (26). Bucknell probably deferred more than usual to Novak, since he is the giant of Defoe studies. Bucknell let stand such blunders as the first issue's collation "[A]⁴ B-I⁸ K-U⁸ X-Aa⁸ Bb3 (-Bb4) [X]⁶" (all the collations offer unconventional formulations, and some are wrong, as that for the second edition). Rothman does not adhere to conventions established by Fredson Bowers, as incorporating a signing statement inside the collation. The black-letter on the title-page of the second edition is not so indicated. The contents entries are all incomplete. The catchwords recorded are a mess, from the very first referenced to "A8v," a location not in the book; they often provide copy-specific information on insufficient inking. The descriptions include the useless characterization of the paperstocks as "provincial."

There is no comparative reference to any edition of the work since Defoe's day. Readers should have some comparative remarks on how this text differs from that edited by W. R. Owens. Owens also relied on Hutchins and failed to examine and record variants in settings prior to the "second edition." (In any case, Owens's Vol. 2 in the Pickering Masters' Defoe edition is a very expensive alternative.) The possibility that Defoe revised text after the first impression is never discussed. Why isn't it possible that Defoe had corrections inserted into the 2nd edition? (Would a compositor have made the changes in the third at #158-59?) As revealed when Taylor's copyrights were sold at auction (discussed by David Foxon in *The Library* in 1970), Defoe's sale of the copyrights contained a provision for a bonus on the reprinting of every 1000 copies. Foxon's note like Hutchins' 1927 article and Keith Maslen's articles in 1952 and 1969 are the sort of studies that ought to be in "Works Consulted dated after 1731" (416-17). Also, noteworthy is the editors' preference for a 1938 edition of *The Review* in place of John McVeagh's recent edition.

My principal point is that there is a need for another edition of *Farther Adventures*. However, these observations on the text and apparatus should not suggest the edition has no value, for readers are aided by its explanatory footnotes. These notes take up from a quarter to a third of pages with Defoe's text. They include many glosses suited to helping students understand rare and archaic words (many--as glossing "e'er"--will seem unnecessary to scholars). The identifications of "Defoeisms" are interesting. The

introduction covers many necessary topics well, if not all (more should be said on compensation & copyright, republication, and reception). It examines the relation of *Farther Adventures* to *The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures*, how the former is a "kind of commentary" on the latter and how it alludes to and expands themes and inquiries in the first part. It offers interesting observations on Defoe's narrative method and on his greater reliance on adventure. The nine illustrations include the welcome addition of the six first printed in the third edition (1722). Also, the index is a valuable addition to the volume, particularly given all the homiletic material on religion, marriage, etc., and the cultural and geographical lore on trade, savages, piracy, communal life, east Asia, Siberia, etc. Classes can dispute how politically incorrect the novel is for depictions of "savages" as cannibals, for remarks about "tawny" women as beautiful but for their color (66), etc., though I thought the narrator, despite his vanity over personal accomplishments, a likeable and tolerant man (as in his respect for the Spaniards but also for the native islanders). But the novel's main claim is that it has been accepted since publication as a continuation of an exciting and influential adventure narrative preserving an early presentation of the globe.

James E. May

Claire A. McCormick Wins A. C. Elias Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship for 2023

ASECS has awarded the A.C. Elias Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship for 2023 to Claire A. McCormick, who received her Ph.D. in History this winter from the University of Limerick. The fellowship will directly assist McCormick in researching her project "The Invisible Past--Palatine Immigration to Ireland in Context, 1709-1730." She will be examining records related to the Palatine migrants in American libraries that should "provide further context for events leading up to the 1709 mass migration" from the continent to Britain and then Ireland and the further migration of many to North America. At the Library of Congress in Washington and the Pennsylvania Historical Society in Philadelphia, McCormick will search the papers of John Archdale and William Penn for evidence of efforts to bring migrants to Carolina and Pennsylvania.

Claire McCormick was born in Nenagh, Co. Tipperary, Ireland, and after a career in business, including time spent with the Bank of Ireland, undertook an M.A. (History of Family) in 2017. In 2022 she was invited to speak (online) to the Palatine special interest subgroup of the Ontario Genealogical Society, many of whom descend from Irish Palatines. The same year McCormick was invited student lecturer at the Church of Ireland Historical Society conference. She has published articles in the *Irish Palatine Association Journal* (2017, 2021, one in print) and *History Studies* (2021). In these and her dissertation, McCormick has through "exemplary research," thrown "important new light on the Palatine migrations to England, Ireland, and America during the early eighteenth century."

ASECS's A. C. Elias Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship annually provides up to \$2500 in funding 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 in ASECS to travel to Ireland and Irish-based scholars in the 18C Ireland Society to travel to North America for furthering their research.

Applications for the fellowship are due 15 November to its two trustees: Dr. Jason McElligott, The Keeper, Marsh's Library, St. Patrick's Close, Dublin 8, Ireland (jason.mcelligott @marshlibrary.ie) and Dr. James May (jem4@psu.edu; 1423 Hillcrest Road / Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603 / USA). Applications should be accompanied by a cover letter requesting the project's consideration and indicating personal contact addresses and naming in which Society the applicant belongs. Applications should contain a short C.V. (no more than 3 pp.), a project description (3 pp. or less, treating contribution to the field and work done and to be conducted during the proposed research), a one-page bibliography of related books & articles, a short budget, and two signed letters of recommendation. Please try to submit all the materials but the letters as one Word file or PDF. The two letters should be sent confidentially from their authors to May and/or McElligott. For more on the Fellowship, see websites of ASECS and Marsh's Library.

Ted Braun: A Tribute and a Farewell

The news of Ted Braun's passing grieved me much. It was not altogether a shock since it was clear when I saw him last time at our recent Winterthur conference that he had become very weak and infirm and was fading fast. He himself described his appearance there as his swansong. But the news of his death filled me with sadness nevertheless. Ted was a true friend for whom I had a great deal of affection and regard. He had his quirks such as his love for the color orange, but they were lovable quirks. A man of good and practical sense, he provided me with a lot of useful, helpful advice, and I valued his companionship and his conversation. It was he who got me to start researching 18th century Indian topics and presenting papers on them at our annual meetings. When I was chairing my department I once or twice discussed issues and problems that were weighing on my mind with him, and he always understood and had good suggestions. Indeed, I went to our annual meetings as much for the pleasure and profit of being in Ted's company and having a chance to talk to him as for everything else, and he most generously made it a point to come to my presentations though I did not always reciprocate since I know very little of 18th-century French literature and culture, which was his special area.

If I am not mistaken, he was one of the founders of our East-Central Society, hardly ever missed a meeting, and his friendliness, his openness, his good humor, his genuine interest in others' work, his encouragement of our younger members, and his extending a warm welcome to all new members made him the heart and soul of our meetings. I particularly remember a meeting in Philadelphia in the early 90s when he, unmistakable in his orange

tam o'shanter, led us on a walking tour through some of the historical landmarks of the city to the city hall, where we were ushered in by two bagpipers and were welcomed to a reception by the mayor. On a later occasion, when we met at the University of Delaware some years ago, Ted and his wife Anne very graciously hosted my wife Frances and me at their house. Every evening he would take us on a walk through the campus, for his cardiologist had recommended a daily walk after his heart attack, and it was pleasant to see how many students recognized and greeted him though he had retired from active teaching and used his office, full of books and papers, only for study and research. Indeed, he always related to students and junior colleagues not as a distinguished professor but as a friend and an equal, which also accounted in part for his great success as a teacher. It was obvious that he was a presence on his campus, just as he was a vital presence at our conferences, and it is only fitting that our Society should have honored him with the Leland Peterson Award.

I cannot help thinking of how Anne would be taking Ted's death. They met when they were students at Berkeley and had been married for well over fifty years. They were a very loving and devoted couple, and each took good care of the other. I remember that, when we once stayed with them and took them out to dinner to a fine restaurant staffed by students training to be chefs, both Ted and Anne were very particular about what the other was eating. Anne often accompanied Ted to our conferences. She is a fine scholar in her own right, but she was there also to ensure Ted's comfort and see that he ate and drank properly and got plenty of rest. With her I know that his legacy will be safe. She will know what to do with his books and papers, will be able to provide guidance should the university or Ted's department wish to hold a memorial, as I hope they will, and will know what to say about him. And she will be helped, I am sure, by their daughter Jeanne Velonis, who was looking after Ted at Winterthur last October. I was able to have a few words with her and was impressed by her thoughtfulness, her intelligence, her concern for her father, and her knowledge of the high value of his work. Together, mother and daughter will help ensure Ted's legacy.

In what follows, I have used a much material that Ted himself supplied in an autobiographical piece that he wrote for his university's website.

Theodore E.D. Braun was a self-made man. Born to a poor Catholic family in Brooklyn, he was the youngest of six siblings and, as he would often remark, just twenty minutes younger than his twin brother. While still at high school he decided that when he grew up he would become a teacher of French, an ambition which he was to fulfill with great success. He early stopped believing in or practicing many Catholic rituals though he probably never forswore his faith which remained a very private matter for him. Rather, he was a humanist to the core. As a young man he had to take up various jobs to earn enough to pay for his education, and he was also helped greatly by scholarships and stipends for talented students, without which he would probably not have been able to manage. After obtaining a B.A. in French Education from St John's University, he had spent a year teaching English at a school in France until he was drafted into the Army and served in Germany for nearly two unwilling years before being discharged.

Free to continue his education again, Ted went to the University of California, Berkeley, for his M.A. and Ph.D. in the Romance Languages and Literatures (1961, 1965); it was there that he met Anne, his future wife. He wrote his dissertation on Jean-Jacques Le Franc, Marquis de Pompignan, after researching his topic in France for a year. In 1964 he was appointed an Assistant Professor at the University of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, and was promoted to Associate Professor four years later. In 1970 he moved to the University of Delaware as Professor of French.

Ted's scholarship was focused around the life and works of two French figures who defined poles in the French Enlightenment, Le Franc de Pompignan and Voltaire, and he published twelve books and about eighty essays on them and on many other writers of the 18th century and other periods in not only French but also English, Italian and Spanish literatures. He was also interested in chaos theory, which is the subject of some of his publications, as well as in science fiction, and wrote a sci-fi novel: *Six Suns, Ten Planets, One Woman* (1999). In 1989 he edited Voltaire's *Alzire, ou les Américains* for the Voltaire Foundation's *Complete Edition of Voltaire*; the work was favorably reviewed by Catherine A. Beaudry in the *Intelligencer* (January 1992). He was particularly pleased to have co-edited with John Radner the essay collection *The Lisbon Earthquake of 1755: Representations and Reactions* in "Studies in Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century" (now "Oxford U. Studies in the Enlightenment"). Many of the papers were originally delivered at panels during one of our EC/ASECS meetings. Indeed, Ted was always glad to collaborate with others in matters of scholarship. He served as co-editor of EC/ASECS conference essays on *Man, God and Nature* with Donald C. Mell and Lucia M. Palmer (1988). According to his own calculation, Ted collaborated in the research and publications of more than twenty members of the French, Spanish and Classics departments of the University of Delaware and other institutions, as well as with members in the Instructional Technology department in the production of material for the teaching of French through computers. And for over twenty years he wrote a column for the *Intelligencer* entitled "Notes from Newark" in which he gave an account of the conferences he had attended, the people he had met and the papers he had heard. Written in an easy, civilized, colloquial style, these accounts were always a pleasure to read, and I read them as much to know what Ted had been up to as to remain *au courant* with the world of conferences in the US and elsewhere, and to get news of acquaintances.

Ted helped to establish many societies devoted to 18th-century studies. A founding member of EC/ASECS, he served as our president in 1989, co-chaired three conferences at Delaware, and created our first website. He was one of the founders of the American Society for 18C Studies, of the International Society for 18C Studies, of the Ibero-American Society for 18C Studies, and of the French Society for 18C Studies. He served as ASECS's Affiliate Societies Coordinator for two three-year terms. In addition, Ted was the recipient of many honors and awards. He was granted the honorary citizenship of the Ville de Montauban, Pompignan's city, elected a Corresponding Member of the Académie de Montauban, and made a Chevalier of the Ordre des Palmes Académiques (see *ECIntel*, 27.1 [2013],

60). In addition to receiving the Leland Peterson Award of EC/ASECS, he received awards from the South-Central Society for 18th-Century Studies and the Ibero-American Society. And the College of Arts and Sciences of his own institution, the University of Delaware, honored him with an award for outstanding achievement in teaching, scholarship and research.

Ted, my dear friend, it is with a heavy heart that I bid you a final good bye. You were one of a kind. There will never be another like you, and you will be greatly missed.

Brijraj Singh
bsingh1029@aol.com

An Appreciate of the late Donald Mell

I first met Don when I started graduate studies at the University of Delaware in 1986. At the time, I didn't know that I would eventually specialize in eighteenth-century British literature, nor that Don would become an important mentor. Don's classes were always wonderful. He packed the syllabus with dozens of primary readings and expected us to master the important critical statements, many of which he carried into the classroom by the armload. He kept the classes lively with his sharp wit and expansive frame of reference. But he excelled most as a writing teacher. Don pushed us to be better writers, showing us what we had done well, pointing out the shortcomings of our arguments, and encouraging us to transition from student to professional. If a paper showed promise, he worked tirelessly to help us make it ready for a conference presentation or publication, and he always seemed to know the exact sources needed to bring our ideas into focus.

After a few semesters, I had the opportunity to work more closely with Don. I was helping Jerry Beasley with the book reviews for *The Eighteenth-Century: A Current Bibliography* while Don was preparing article annotations. As deadlines approached, there were often technical challenges with the many WordPerfect files stored on 5 ¼ inch floppy disks. Don and I would work late into the afternoon in Jerry's office, trying to get the formatting right. The next day, I would often find a six-pack of good beer waiting on my desk, a thoughtful thank you for the little assistance I had provided.

Don served as the second reader for my dissertation. He was endlessly encouraging. Along with Jerry, Ann Ardis and A. C. Elias, he pushed me to sharpen the project, often noting that writing a dissertation was not enough. I should be thinking of a book, he insisted. Even before the defense, he was guiding me toward publication. He taught me how to write a proposal and pointed out the parts of the project that would need to be expanded before it was ready for a university press.

Don's generosity, of course, is legendary, and extended well beyond his efforts to train graduate students. His parties at MLA and ASECS were always fabulous, even if the small suites were overcrowded with his many friends. He made everyone feel at home and feel valued. He gave the same

attention to those of us who were just starting out as he did to established scholars whose works he assigned in his classes. His kindness was disarming and infectious, and those gatherings were often a welcome respite for those of us who were overwhelmed at the large, sometimes contentious, conferences. The press parties reminded me of those times when Don and Kay would invite graduate students to their home for end-of-the-semester gatherings. They were always so gracious and welcoming, even when my wife and I showed up with a fussy one year old. Late afternoon receptions at the Mell home often went late in the evening, and unlike some faculty/student events they were genuinely fun.

As I struggled to get my scholarly career started, Don always made himself available to look over drafts, and he would often take the time to attend my sessions, even when most others stayed away. He introduced me to editors, helped me shape arguments to meet the demands of particular journals, and always provided reassurance that I needed to keep working.

Some years later, I contacted Don about preparing a festschrift in honor of Jerry. He immediately embraced the project and sent a list of potential contributors. As the project progressed, he became the ideal press director. He provided guidance and direction, all the while allowing me to find a vision and focus for the volume. When Associated University Presses shut its doors in the middle of production, Don called straightaway, letting me know that Delaware would continue to operate under a new parent company. The festschrift was one of the first books to be published by Rowman & Littlefield, and Don made certain it was handsomely produced with a beautiful color cover portrait.

I last saw Don at an ASECS meeting in Pittsburgh. I had arrived early, and we ran into each other in the hotel lobby. We had dinner that evening, and he asked, as he always did, about my family and university. He also asked about a biography I was writing and seemed genuinely moved when I told him that it would be dedicated to him. And it was with the simple words, "For Donald C. Mell, Friend and Mentor." By the time the book came out, Don was quite ill, and I'm not sure he ever saw the copy I sent him. I hope he did, and I hope recognized that that book, along with most of my career, would never have been possible without his abiding generosity and care.

Christopher D. Johnson
Francis Marion University

Editor's note: This appreciation was read at the tribute session devoted to Don's memory at the fall conference. Ted Braun sent recollections to David Palumbo, in which Ted remarked of Don: "He was bright, witty, and never spoke an unkind word against anyone, even if that person deserved scorn."

2022 EC/ASECS Financial Report and Business Meeting Minutes

The good news, financially speaking, is that we are still afloat; the less good news is that we spent \$339 more than we took in. We began the year

with a balance of \$1,944.05 and ended the year with a balance of \$1,605.05. (As of March 2nd, it is \$1,493.33.) As per usual, our income is comprised of membership dues and conference registration. (Gifts go to the Future Fund, unless otherwise specified.) Our expenses, likewise, are the usual: printing the *ECI*, postage for the *ECI* and dues and conference letters, office supplies (paper, envelopes, and mailing labels), website license renewal, Molin Prize, Peterson Award, and conference expenses (plenary speaker [hotel, meals, and honorarium], catering, grad student support staff, miscellaneous expenses, etc.). Our conference was generously supported by the University of Delaware, thanks to the persuasive powers of Matthew Kinservik.

Our Future Fund account balance is \$18,746.72, as of March 2nd, 2023. We established this fund several years ago to ensure the financial health of our beloved society. One way this fund will do that is by helping us keep graduate student conference registration at a minimum to encourage their participation in the field at the professional level AND to offer them a welcoming environment in hopes of their continuing participation in the society. We have not as yet tapped the fund; however, it may be necessary in the future to supplement graduate registration fees directly to balance the conference budget. It is the society's hope that members will continue to donate to this fund to guarantee its and our financial viability going forward.

The business meeting was held during Saturday afternoon's luncheon in the Winterthur café/dining room. As usual, conviviality ruled the roost, and the X-Sec's august/commanding presence at the podium had absolutely no effect on the noise level—pleasant as it was. I have decided that my going-away present to the society will be a large wooden gavel which my successors can use to bring a sort of order to the proceedings . . . perhaps. The business was pretty standard: Greg Clingham, the Vice-President, accepted the mantle as President; Jane Wessel, the chair of the Molin Prize Committee in her final year on as an Executive Board member, accepted the nomination as Vice-President. Anna Foy gracefully stepped down as 2022 President, joining John Heins and Joanne Myers as "Past Presidents" on the executive committee (the Gang of Three). We also nominated David Palumbo to become a member of the Executive Board (and a judge of the Molin Prize). We usually nominate a member of the society to receive the Leland Peterson Award for long-time service to our society. This year we named Jim May, the editor of our newsletter/journal, *The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, to receive the award for a second time and gave him—what else?—a book about publishing: Richard Wendorf's *Printing History & Cultural Change* (OUP). As he always does, Jim discussed the latest edition of the newsletter and solicited copy for the next one, especially book reviews and members' news, as well as on-going research.

We also announced that Brett Wilson will organize our 2023 meeting for 12-14 October in Williamsburg, to be held at Colonial Williamsburg and on the campus of the College of William & Mary. Brett has selected as a theme "Colonial/Capital." (YAY!). Updates are forthcoming, so watch our website [www.ec-asecs.org] and the C18-L listserv.

PS. I need to add an addendum to the 2022 financial report above. In 2019 we set up the Future Fund to subsidize graduate students' registration at our

conferences. Well, this is the first real opportunity we have had to do that very thing, so as of now [14 March] we have transferred \$600 from the Future Fund to the checking account [thus reducing it from 18,746.72 and thus removing the loss attributed to the Winterthur meeting]. At our next conferences, I assume we may also draw on the Future Fund to pay graduate students to assist in running the conference, i.e. sitting at the registration desk, etc. That will be for the next executive board to decide/clarify.

Peter Staffel (plstaffel@gmail.com)

Barrientos and Holahan Receive Molin Prize Awards

The Molin Prize Committee awards this year's first prize to Javiera Barrientos, a PhD student in the English Department at Rutgers University. Javiera took her M.A. from the University of Chile. Besides being a book binder, she has taught courses in book history and Latin American literature at several universities. Her innovative paper, "Bark Paper, Bark Cloth: An 18th-Century Plant-Fiber Paper Book," demonstrates her sharp focus on material culture. Her research on a unique and important topic was provocative, as it connected one book, produced by Pierre L  orier-Delisle, to "colonial practices of trade, extraction, and exoticism between France and the Polynesia." Her presentation laid out a compelling exploration of natural history, book making, and the French Crown's "ongoing concern for arboreal politics and its capacity to manage the country's natural resources, wood and timber."

Barrientos's lively presentation was framed by a personal narrative that was both creative and compelling. The opening sentences reminded us of the magic of doing literary research:

The librarian approaches holding a small conservation box in her hand. She places it in front of me as she hands me a sheet of paper with the book's call number printed on it. She smiles at me and walks back to her desk. I take the small conservation box and slowly open it as if performing a sacred archival ritual. I am alone in the reading room of the Special Collections at the Firestone Library in Princeton. It is a cold Tuesday morning and I am here to handle a small yet unusual bibliographic specimen printed in 1786. Produced by Pierre L  orier-Delisle at the paper-mills in Langl  e, France, this leather covered duodecimo is said to be the first western book ever printed entirely out of plant-based fiber paper.

The paper concluded by returning to the physical space: "The librarian approaches holding a small conservation box in her hand and softly tells me it is time to go home. I close the book." She surely took a risk by inserting herself into the narrative, and it was very effective and exciting.

In addition, the Molin Prize Committee, very impressed by this year's submissions, has decided to award a second-place prize to Cassidy Holahan, a PhD candidate at the University of Pennsylvania, for her paper,

“Costuming Character, on and Off the Eighteenth-Century Stage.” Through analysis of engravings from John Bell’s *British Theatre* series, Holahan produces a new reading of “character” in the eighteenth century. The focus on costume in these prints, she argues, along with moments of disguise in works like Eliza Haywood’s *A Wife to be Let* and *Fantomina*, suggest that costume and disguise were fundamentally constructive of character rather than obstructive. Holahan’s paper inspired lively discussion, and she fielded the many questions she received well. Cassidy will start in the fall as an Assistant Professor at University of Nevada--Las Vegas.

Jane Wessel
Chair, Molin Prize Committee

News of Members, Announcements, New Resources, etc.

First some errata to the fall issue: Yvonne Noble adds an item to her bibliography on p. 25: Worsley, Lucy. "Architectural Patronage in the 18th Century and the Case of Henrietta Cavendish Harley." *Architectural History*, 48 (2005), 139-62. On p. 15 up 8, cut the apostrophe "s" after "Noble"; 54 up 4, cut "But" and "is"; 66.27 change "situation" to "situating"; and 84 up 8 change "first" to "third." Add a final "e" to Stephen Clarke's name on p. 69.

After handicapping our schools, covid became a much smaller threat for most of us during the second half of 2022. The case numbers decreased and most cases were less lethal. There was no contagion spread at our fall conference. Many of us began to travel. My wife and I went to Spain in October, where I caught my first covid virus, which came on like a bad head cold. Feeling entitled to a bigger carbon footprint, we went to Guatemala and visited Antigua, in some respects an 18C relic. As Elizabeth Bell explains in her often reprinted *Antigua Guatemala: The City and Its Heritage*, Antigua was wrecked once too severely in 1773, despite rebuilding after 1717 and 1751 quakes with "earthquake architecture," and thus the capital was moved to Guatemala City. What had been Santiago de Guatemala became known as "Antigua," i.e. the old capital. Rebuilding was prohibited--indeed, for a time living in the city was outlawed,--and the government dragged religious institutions, the university, etc. to the new capital. Thus, Antigua suffered the sort of neglect that Pompeii did, and, since large churches and convents and the like were left in ruins and development didn't occur until rather recently, Antigua offers unusual glimpses of an 18C city. But because so few buildings are over one story in height, its colonial architecture is not nearly so beautiful and impressive as that found in Oaxaca or, more especially, Puebla, Mexico. In Puebla dozens of 18C buildings tower up in the city center: some baroque churches have spectacular facades, often with talavera tiles, and some have naves and domes with exuberant decorative stucco painted by Indian artists. (Google up the images of Santa Maria Tonantzintla or the Rosary Chapel in Santo Domingo.) Many large 18C paintings are displayed in churches. In the Puebla area, 16C buildings are often painted in red, 17C-18C in yellow, and 19C structures in pastel. In all these towns convents, monasteries, or

wealthy homes have been converted into hotels. all are safe for tourists. Most visit Puebla by flying to Mexico City (the Mexican discount airline Volaris has nonstop flights from airports in Texas) and then taking a coachline (like ER) from either terminal to Puebla (two hours off) for about \$20 roundtrip. (I'm "publishing" this on the chance that research is a justifiable grounds for travel.)

Our conference 13-15 October at Winterthur Museum, Garden & Library was a splendid success thanks to the efforts of co-chairs **Sylvia Marks** and **Eleanor Shevlin**, who began this effort back in 2019 but were forced to provide us with Zoom-meetings in 2020 and 2021. The introduction to their program thanked a great many, such as **Matt Kinservik** for obtaining financial support from Delaware and a number of Winterthur's employees, such as Melissa Donnelly (who arranged our tours of the museum), Dennis Bisson (technical matters) and Bill White (Logistics Coordinator). The string quartet of the Serafin Ensemble who played Mozart, Beethoven, and Michael Hayden for us at the DuPont Country Club on Friday evening had been contacted three years earlier! There were some serendipitous events too, such as a coopering demonstration by Marshall Scheetz in the adjacent parking lot (he'd set up to demonstrate the craft to girl scouts). It was huge lift after the lockdown to see old friends like **Laura Kennelly** and **Rob Mayerovitch** (and to ask on which of their trips they caught covid). Most of us stayed at the Holiday Inn Express in Wilmington, near which we assembled Thursday at the Green Turtle for the Oral/Aural Experience led by **Peter Staff**. Besides beer, bar food, and poetry, the evening offered old-time music played by **Anna Foy** and **John Heins** and his wife, **Margaret Gonglewski**. We were also favored by a display of books published by Bucknell and Delaware presses. **Pamelia Daily**, the managing editor at Bucknell UP, never left her station. It was good to discover what the presses had recently published and be offered discounts on those books. I handled with pleasure the third Crusoe volume published in April: *Serious Reflections during the Life and Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe with his Vision of the Angelick World*, edited by **Maximillian E. Novak** and the late **Manuel Schonhorn** and Irving Rothman. **Geoffry Sill** remarks in Bucknell's catalogue listing, "Even the best readers of Defoe can benefit from having a guide through this philosophical labyrinth," which guidance is provided by "the introduction and notes to this superbly edited volume." The conference ended with a tribute to the late **Donald Mell**, filmed by his daughter Elizabeth, with ten or more speakers, including **Julia Oestreich**, who worked with Don at the University of Delaware Press. The tribute above by Don's student and co-worker Christopher Johnson has a detailed portrait.

Brian Grimes flew in from the NW coast to speak of his database on the quotations found in Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary*, which people raved about and so, after examining his very useful website, I asked him to provide us with the account he kindly has above. **Sylvia Marks** told me that Rebecca Parmer, Director of the Winterthur's Library, supported Brian's talk: "She responded quickly and enthusiastically to my very late request from Grimes for help with his presentation and personally accompanied the library's vol. 1 of the 1755 edition of the *Dictionary* and the 1785 sixth

edition." We were fortunate to have distinguished scholars **Stephen Clarke** and **Philip Smallwood** fly from England for the conference, speaking on a Samuel Johnson panel chaired by **Greg Clingham**: Stephen spoke on "Johnson's London Lodgings," very appropriately since he's one of the overseers for SJ's Gough Square house, and Philip on "Johnson and Friendship." I missed that one, but **Lisa Berglund** said it was "top-notch." Their session was concurrent with **Sean Silver's** "Material Encounters," on which Sean spoke on "Learning to Marble in London in 1760," **Helen Thompson** on "Extracting Micromatter: West African Craft and Boyle's Hydrostatic Instrument," and **Ruth Mack's** "How to Make a Poem." The other concurrent panel that Friday morning was **Eleanor Shevlin's** recurrent "Book History, Bibliography & Textual Studies," wherein **Nancy Mace** addressed a property dispute involving *The Maid of the Mist* (1765) prior to the legal extension in 1777 of copyright protections to music; and **Jim May** spoke on clues to help identify who printed London works before 1730 (on **Joe Rudman's** talk, see below). At Winterthur after lunch on Friday, while in the rotunda room at the museum, we received **Suvir Kaul's** plenary "Britannia and the Weight of Empires Past: The Instance of Falconer's *The Shipwreck*." The title refers to Falconer's attention to the ruined empires along the shore as the *Britannia* sailed from Egypt to Venice and floundered in a storm: with many quotations from the poem's first version, Suvir emphasized how allusions to dead civilizations accompany the narrative on the costs to the maritime proletariat as sailors risked their lives to bring wealth and commodities to the rich and the consumers of Britain. Suvir was introduced by **Brijraj Singh**, who had taught him in Indian, prior to Suvir's entering the PhD program at Cornell. Brij proudly surveyed Suvir's major monographs on 18C literature: *Thomas Gray & Literary Authority: A Study in Ideology and Poetics* (1992), *Poems of Nation, Anthems of Empire: English Verse in the long 18C* (2001), *18C British Literature and Postcolonial Studies* (2009), and also his work on India, as *The Partitions of Memory: The Afterlife of the Division of India* (2002) and *Of Gardens and Graves: Kashmir, Poetry, Politics*, a collection on Kashmir since its militarization in 1990 that includes translations of Kashmiri poems from the years of conflict (2015). The next day Suvir would introduce his student **Anna Foy**, who, as our President, offered an official address--she chose Phillis Wheatley's poetical elegies and petitions. **Stephen Karian** gave a superb talk at Winterthur on what was de-attributed and on what general grounds from the Swift canon by himself and **James Woolley** for their forthcoming CUP edition. With the edition project drawing to a close, Steve will start to edit Pope's poems in the Pope-Swift miscellanies for the OUP edition of Pope's works, aided by an NEH fellowship. James's remarks at that Swift panel touched on certain poems attributed to Swift, such as "The Grand Questions Debated," but focused on "'The Lady's Dressing Room' and Other Stolen Copies" (we will all at least remember that Swift advocated outdoor privies). That session chaired by **David Palumbo** included **Hermann J. Real's** essay--read by David--on "Exorcising His Demons: Swift and the Redhead," that being the Duchess of Somerset, the carrotty schemer close to the Queen who was threatening Harley's administration and thus Swift. Her red hair exposed to adverse stereotypes exploited in the satire

The Windsor Prophecy. David's own talk involved a careful examination of ironies in Swift's *A Vindication of His Excellency the Lord Carteret* (1730), a review in prose of Carteret's ten years as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, which acknowledges a personal circle of friendship yet concludes with tables of the "Value of the Favours" that Carteret did for Whigs and Tories (£27516 for Whigs and £111 for Tories)--the raillery collides with what seems an indictment for bias and neglect. David pondered how Swift intended and Carteret perceived the poem and its raillery.

A number of papers at Winterthur addressed the novel, including **Linda Troost's**, **Marissa Daly's** "Mr. Knightley's Equal Emma Woodhouse"; **Elizabeth Nollen's** "'Picturesque Touches of Genius': Radcliffean Images of Terror and Delight in Mary Wollstonecraft's *The Wrongs of Woman; or, Maria*"; and **Elizabeth Porter's** "Fashioning *Roxana* at the Expense of Women." Linda discussed the videogame versions of *Robinson Crusoe*, *Gulliver's Travels*, and *Pride and Prejudice*, finding "some developers clearly know something about the 18C novel (and one who had read *Evelina*) and others that see our century as a fantasy playground--we invented the 'survival narrative.'" Both literary and attending to Afro-Anglo engagements were **Alyssa Kowalick's** "Phillis Wheatley's 'Goliath of Gath' and the African-American Identity" and **Catherine Keohane's** "Stories, Yearsley, and the Slave Trade." Another panel on literature included **Sayre Greenfield's** "Ladies--Shall we Read or Burn? Dorothy Gell vs. William Hayley"; **Lisa Berglund's** "Hester Lynch Piozzi in the *OED*"; and **Jane Wessel's** "The Literary Smuggler of This Isle: Arthur Murphy, Imitation, and 18C Copyright Debates." There were many papers that inclined toward the conference theme of "Material Matters," such as those in a session chaired by **Sayre Greenfield**, in which **Xinyuan Qiu** spoke on "Extravagant 18C Women's Headdresses," **Cassidy Holahan**, on "Costuming Character: On and off the 18C Stage," and **Irene Fizer**, on "The Unstitched Creature: Skin, Seams and Second-Hand Goods in the 1818 *Frankenstein*." New member **Javiera Barrientos'** talk on "Bark Paper, Bark Cloth: An 18C Plant Fiber Paper Book" was another paper hitting the thematic center. Cassidy and Javiera won Molin Prize awards as noted above. Also treating material matters was **Ted Braun's** hands-on display of 18C French books. **Paul Kerry**, now an Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education at Brigham Young U., who researches German intellectual history and the Enlightenment, spoke at Winterthur on material objects within Mozart's *The Magic Flute* and their potential symbolism (some of us in the audience will rewatch Bergman's film). Paul also is working on the 19C American historian and politician George Bancroft and on the ethical ideas in Goethe. On that same German panel chaired by **John Heins**, **Elizabeth Powers** spoke on the Gretchen romance in Chapter 5 of Goethe's *Dichtung und Wahrheit* and subsequent events in the book and life, arguing that Chapter 5 offers a fictionalization of a failed romance later in Goethe's life, while in Leipzig 1765-68, one we know of from letters--years later when writing this autobiographical work, Goethe may not have remembered it enough to have treated the actual relationship and had other motives for the transmutation.

This fall's conference at Winterthur was the last attended by **Ted Braun**, who was ailing (he'd been hospitalized the previous summer) and

died on 14 December in his 89th year. All of us who then saw Ted for the last time are thankful to his and Anne's daughter **Jeanne Velonis** (Easton, PA), who brought Ted to Winterthur. Ted's presentation--a hands-on account of his collection of rare books by Pompignan enabled Professor **David Eick** to introduce him with a panegyric on his contributions to 18C studies, which included tributes to Ted sent from scholars in North America and Europe working on French letters, such as Nicholas Cronk. Jeanne afterwards wrote, "It was an event he [Ted] had been looking forward to and focusing on for a long time." She has attended to his legacy, attempting to find a home for his books and recording photographically the contents of bookshelves at www.dropbox.com/sh/h3xhfyhk50wwhi2/AABT9UMMH-0jQCKJOGJdECU5a?dl=0. Our choral tribute above to Ted is written by **Brijraj Singh**, which recalls his co-chairing three of our annual meetings at the Univ. of Delaware. Ted's contributions to our regional are matched by his presence in ASECS, where from 1985 to 1990 he served double terms as Affiliate Societies Coordinator, beginning then to write his column "Notes from Newark" that surveyed conference travel. Ted's "Notes" began appearing in the *Intelligencer* in April 1987 (that in September 1987 was called "Phantom Traveller," but he then returned to "Notes"). Other contributions to the *Intelligencer* included his 1989 Presidential Address and a piece in May 1991 on "Teaching Ethics in Content Courses." His engagement with affiliate societies allowed Ted to offer sage and sometimes innovative advice to EC/ASECS. ASECS has long had the Theodore E. D. Braun Research Travel Fellowship, providing \$1500 for research on French literature. Ted also regularly presented at the International SECS congresses, attending them faithfully through to 2016. In the Fall 2019 *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Ted, as an ASECS father, was interviewed by Nathan Brown about the society's history, which he remembered in remarkable detail. Ted brought an appreciative play with popular culture, bringing comic strips, columnists like Dave Barry, and science fiction films into the world of 18C scholarship: dressed in his signature orange, sometimes from hat to socks, he was never snobbish but always inclusive and good humored.

Louise K. Barnett, who had been a member of EC/ASECS until retiring over a decade ago from Rutgers, died last September. Louise took her PhD from Bryn Mawr in 1972 and joined Rutgers in 1976; she gravitated from English to the American Studies Dept., also directing study-abroad programs in Florence and Bristol. She had studied in Italy on a Fulbright and would publish two books involving Italian letters. In 1981 she published *Swift's Poetic Worlds*, and in 2006, *Jonathan Swift in the Company of Women*. The latter's first half offers a biographical study of Swift and the women in his life (Esther Johnson, Esther Vanhomrigh, and Jane Waring), and there follows a half devoted to Swift's writing on "women as a gender," addressing topics like maternity and misogyny and concluding with "his history as a subject of criticism by women." Louise explicitly addressed and tried to balance Swift's positive relations with real women in his life and his critique of women in general as a force for disorder. She contextualizes his misogyny within that tradition in the Christian west, drawing, for instance, on comparisons to Defoe for a measured perspective. Louise examined many Swift texts out of the mainstream. Her critical perspective seems

remarkably mature and fair to me, despite shaky reliance on the assumption through Irvin Ehrenpreis that Swift had a neglected and unhappy early childhood, assumptions questioned by Eugene Hammond's 2016 biography (cf. Barnett 105 vs. Hammond I.19-21). To American history, Louise contributed important studies of war and military culture, including *Touched by Fire: The Life, Death, and Mythic Afterlife of George Armstrong Custer* (1996), and *Atrocity and American Military Justice in Southeast Asia* (2010). Louise remained active in the Lancaster area, frequently writing letters to the editor of the local paper (*LNP*) and participating as faculty in non-credit classes for adults (Quest Program).

Martha Bowden was the program chair for the **SEASECS** held in Decatur, GA, 16-18 February, at which E. Joe Johnson took care of local arrangements (e.g., arranging for Clayton State U's choral presentation). Misty G. Anderson (Tennessee) delivered the plenary "Demanding Entertainment: A Producibile Interpretation of *Such Things Are*." The conference included Martha's NPEC-sponsored workshop on "Writing an Essay on Pedagogy," and she contributed "SEASECS through the Years: A Reflection on Friendships" to a panel subtitled "The Influence of Annibel Jenkins and SEASECS." **Mel New** presented "Last Words: The Conclusions of *Amelia* and *Sir Charles Grandison*" at a session on "Last Words: Final Works by 18C Authors"--**Bob Walker**, in the audience to make distracting faces, gave the session a thumbs up, noting it was well attended and the location for the conference quite pleasant. **David Eick** spoke on Diderot's *Encyclopedia*. **Catherine Ingrassia** presented "Judith Madan's Life Well-Written" on a panel on archival research, and **Marilyn Francus** offered "Trying to discern Identity: Frances Sheridan, the Archive, and the Life." The session on Professor Jenkins (d. 2013), who wrote a biography of Inchbald, was a timely follow up to the publication in July by Delaware of *The World of Elizabeth Inchbald: Essays on Literature, Culture, and Theatre in the Long 18C* (270 pp; 23 illus; \$46 in paperback). After the introduction by editors Daniel J. Ennis and E. Joe Johnson, and before the afterword by Paula Backscheider and tribute to Jenkins by Don Russ, are 13 essays, including Jenkins unpublished essay on the periodical *The World*, **Martha Bowden's** "The Structure of Fable in *Inchbald's Nature and Art*"; **W. B. Gerard's** "'Uncle to All the World': The Virtual Afterlives of Captain Tobias Shandy, 1831-1948"; and **Calhoun Winton's** "One of Thomas Bray's Apostles of Literacy: Thomas Bacon." Danielle Spratt, long a member of EC/ASECS (as during her graduate studies at Fordham), co-chaired the **WSECS** conference ("Material/Immaterial), 17-18 Feb. at CSU-Northridge.

Samara Cahill organized the South-Central SECS meeting held 24-25 February close by the Texas A & M Campus, with the theme "The Quixotic 18C." Blocked from holding the meeting last year by covid, Sam expected a small turnout this year, requiring but one day of sessions, but she ended up with two days of presentations. Eduardo Urbina, in Hispanic Studies at Texas A & M, gave an excellent illustrated account of his project to create a digital database with commentary of all illustrations of Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. His talk (see above) was accompanied by an exhibition of English translations and imitations of *DQ*. Also on the program was a music sessions with a talk by **Gloria Eive** on the Zarzuela opera form. **Barbara**

Benedict spoke on homosociability in an English novel and **Leah Orr** on posthumous publication; **Susan Spencer** spoke on "The 1721 Smallpox Pandemic: Lockdowns, Vaccine Hesitancy, Asia-Bashing, and Misinformation Campaigns." **David Eick** would have spoken on his pandemic French lit class, but snow blocked his flight from the Midwest. **John Scanlan** chaired a session on Samuel Johnson and presented a paper on the "Remembering Howard Weinbrot" session--that session had good tributes by C. Earl Ramsey (who had a three-year contract at Yale when Howard did), David Wade Nunnery (one of Howard's last dissertation students at Wisconsin), and **Kevin Cope**, who was to chair but couldn't fly in and so Susan Spencer ably read his paper. John has signed on to chair the 2024 SCSECS meeting in Portland, Oregon. And **Jim May** spoke on the revisions and reception of Edward Young's *A Poem on the Last Day*, and **Linda Reesman** read "A Visionary Journey of Revealed Religion: Coleridge beyond Priesley." **Leah Orr**, now Director of Graduate Studies in English at the U. of Louisiana at Lafayette, drove over to the SCSECS with two graduate students also participating in the conference. Oxford UP will by year's end publish Leah's book *Publishing the Women Writer in England, 1670-1750* (\$110). Also, the recent double-number of *Restoration* has Leah's "Contemporary European Fiction Available in Restoration England" (46.2/47.1: 65-82). This special issue has the title "Genre Liaisons in Restoration Prose Fiction: Influences, Texts and Reception" and is introduced by Sonia Villegas-López, who emphasizes the great variety of origins, forms, styles, and subjects in the "fictional experiments" of the period. Sam Cahill has invited participants speaking on Quixotic subjects to contribute their papers to a special topic volume of her online journal *Studies in Enlightenment and Religion*.

Jeremy Chow has edited for Bucknell U. Press *Eighteenth-Century Environmental Humanities* with 11 essays by mostly "early-career scholars" exploring "timely . . . topics such as climate change, new materialism, the blue humanities, indigeneity and decoloniality, and green utopianism," with particular concern for classroom applications (Nov. 2022, 230 pp; 20 color illus; in paper or kindle: \$39). BTW, at the same time Bucknell published Ann Campbell's *Families of the Heart: Surrogate Relations in the 18C British Novel* and, months earlier, Linda Van Netten Blimke's *Political Affairs of the Heart: Female Travel Writers, the Sentimental Travelogue, and Revolution, 1775-1800*. We can get review copies. **Marissa Daly**, who spoke on Austen's *Emma* at the fall conference, will this May receive her M.A. in English from Hofstra University (she's student teaching this semester). Welcome to new member **William Hancock** of Maryland, who joined our group last month. The University of Virginia Press has published **Catherine Ingrassia's** book *Domestic Captivity and the British Subject, 1660-1750* (2022; available in paperback [\$39.50]; x + 301); and we have a review copy in need of a reviewer. The book offers a comparative exploration of various forms of captivity, African slavery and the "captivity of white British subjects," which is the main reference of "Domestic Captivity." **Sandro Jung**, now teaching in Shanghai, published a basketload of articles in the past few years: "Dominant Visual Narrative, the Competitive Marketing and Metacritical Functions of Illustrations, and

Robert Morison's 1793 Edition of James Thomson's *The Seasons*," in *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 46.1 (2021), 43-71; "Gulliver's Travels in China: The Illustrations for Han Man You," *Book Collector*, 70.4 (2021), 546-61; "Amplifying Reading Experience: Illustrations to Longueville's *The English Hermit, 1727-1799*," *English Studies*, 103.1 (2022), 42-62; and "Text Technologies, Illustrated Editions as Multi-Technological Hybrids, and William Falconer's *The Shipwreck, 1762-1808*," *New Techno-Humanities*, 2.1 (2022), 13-22. **Deborah Kennedy** published "Frances Burney's Adventure at Ilfracombe" in *The Burney Journal*, 18 (2021), 34-56--that is the peer-reviewed annual from the Burney Society posted with open-access at McGill's Burney Centre. Vol. 18 (2021), edited by Hilary Havens, is the most recent issue on the web. Deborah's essay concerns Burney's treatment in her journal of a 1817 incident when she was trapped with her dog on rocks at high tide in Devon; Deborah examines the narrative for Gothic elements and in light of other treatments of women confronted by the elements. This same issue includes **Peter Sabor** and John Avery Jones's "Frances Burney's Original Will (1839), a related article in *ECL* on the will was discussed in September's news. **Catherine Keohane** is program chair for the Burney Society of North America's 2023 meeting at McGill U. in Montreal, on 13-14 June 2023. On 11 March, **A. W. Lee** presented a plenary via Zoom to the Johnson Society of London on "J. D. Fleeman: The Greatest Johnsonian?" Last October, Bloomsbury published **Devoney Looser's** biographical and critical study *Sister Novelists: The Trailblazing Porter sisters, Who Paved the Way for Austen and the Brontës* (576 pp), available on Amazon in hardcover for \$20 and on kindle for \$12.60. The book has been reviewed well and remarkably often. Devoney has a website posted by Arizona State dedicated to this book, which includes an account of Jane and Anna Maria Porter (authors of 26 books), of Devoney herself, extra illustrations, pages of tips for discussion, and the offer of a news-letter on the sisters. **Sylvia Marks**, who is writing an essay on Jane Porter's *Thaddeus of Warsaw*, will review the biography for us in the fall. We happily welcome **Roger Maioli** (U. of Florida) to the Society. Roger took his PhD from Johns Hopkins (2015) and works on 18C British and French lit, esp. the rise of the novel; and also in Enlightenment studies.

Honoring St Patrick's Day 2023, **Maureen E. Mulvihill** co-authored, with C.M. Brown, an illustrated webpage on literary Ireland: Book of Kells to Colm Tóibín (*Florida Bibliophile Newsletter*, March 2023). Maureen's protest letter on the recent 'takeover' of New College Florida by Governor DeSantis, ran on the Opinions page, *Herald-Tribune*, Sarasota, Feb. 28. As a guest writer for Rare Book Hub, she published commissioned, illustrated essays on Joyce Meskis (Tattered Cover Books, Denver), with a comment by ASECS colleague, Jessica Munns (Feb. 2023); and detailed centenary essays on Joyce's *Ulysses* (Feb. 2022) and Eliot's *The Waste Land* (Nov. 2022). Maureen added to her collection of rare & special books a modern edition of Milton's masque, *Comus* (1637), a deluxe edition by Nonesuch Press, Bloomsbury UK, 1938: an oversize folio with slipcase, eight pages of music by Henry Lawes, full-page color illustrations by M.R.H. Farrar, and a Foreword by the Earl of Ellesmere. Also acquired are two Cuala Press (Dublin) imprints, on Irish paper, by Elizabeth & Susan Yeats: *Memories of*

John B. Yeats (1923, with Emer t.p. logo); and *Drawings by Jack B. Yeats*, 11 hand-colored plates (1971). Forthcoming: an extended review of a bilingual Irish poetry anthology, *Bone & Marrow* (Wake Forest UP); for Palgrave's new *Encyclopedia of...Women Writers*, "Multimedia Research Methodology", with process graphic; and for MusicAir website (Royal Society of Musicians), "Eloquent Ear: Sonic Craft by Early Women Poets."

Penn State Univ. Press has published *Notes on Footnotes: Annotating Eighteenth-Century Literature*, edited by **Melvyn New** and **Anthony W. Lee** (2022; pp. xiii + 252 + [2, series bib.]; index; 978-0-271-09397-0). It treats present-day annotations of 18C texts--thus it complements **Michael Edson's** book on 18C annotation. We need a reviewer. Besides Tony's preface and Mel's introduction, there are 14 essays by contributors who are all experienced editors, most editors of 17-18C works. They often reflect on their experience as they ponder such questions as what to annotate and how annotation relates to interpretation. Tony Lee and Robert DeMaria discuss annotating Johnson; Mel New, Sterne; **Max Novak**, Dryden and Defoe; Thomas Lockwood, Fielding; **Stephen Karian**, Swift; Elizabeth Kraft, Charlotte Lennox; **Robert Hume**, Buckingham; and **Wm. McCarthy** on Barbauld--**Bob Walker** and Michael Edson also contributed essays.

Peter Perreten during February presented four lectures to various local history groups on the Perkiomen watershed in the late 19C and early 20C (that involves the stream flowing south from preserved land and reservoir north of Perkiomen and Collegetown). Peter recommends *Indigenous Continent: The Epic Contest for North America* (Liveright, 2022; 592 pp.; \$32.62 on Amazon), by Pekka Hämäläinen, Rhodes Prof. of American History at Oxford, who "takes a new (revisionist?) look at the relationship between the indigenous people of America and the European colonists. A large portion of the book focuses on the 18C." Peter notes that "Hämäläinen's view of the relationship between Native Americans and colonists differs quite sharply from the Euro-American story that most Americans are familiar with." The spring 2023 *American Archaeology* observes that the book "challenges the theorem that colonial expansion was inevitable"--"the heart of this book details examples of indigenous resistance from New England to California" (1600 armed clashes followed 1776). Hämäläinen contrasts the successful engagement of the French with the Indians based on trade with the colonizing assault of the English. Selections available on Amazon confirm that the book intends to challenge the "old, deeply rooted story, . . . that colonial expansion was inevitable"; rather, "this book reveals a world that remains overwhelmingly indigenous well into the nineteenth century" (ix). Chapter 15 begins with an account of how in 1721 the Nassaws, part of the Catawba Confederacy, welcomed the governor of South Carolina to their town, giving him a map prioritizing their town. The Nassaws had rules for how the English were to behave on their lands: "they had to be summoned and allowed in . . . and honor Catawba customs" (194). By 1721 "Indigenous resistance had forced the Europeans to radically reevaluate their methods. . . . [now] Like the French, the English sought to expand their reach *through* the Indians" (196). Thus when in 1737 the British stole land from the Lenape in Pennsylvania ("the walking purchase"), they had the "Six Nations quickly enforce the land deal" (260). The tribes often

tried to exploit the conflict between the French and English, siding with both against the other (272). Hämäläinen notes how Britain's General Braddock lost the initial campaign due to Indian support for the French (170-74), but "Native American diplomacy and military might had determined the outcome of the Seven Years War" (284)--many tribes lost their leverage with that victory. Reviews may not sufficiently value all the insight offered into the Indians' tribal structures and intertribal politics and relations.

Joe Rudman, who at EC/ASECS 2019 in Gettysburg reviewed studies of work attributed to Aphra Behn and relevant to the ongoing Behn edition, has published two related articles: "Editing Aphra Behn in the Digital Age (E-ABDA)." *Early Modern Review*, 4, no. 4 (2021 [2022], <https://doi.org/10.33137/RR.v44i4.38654>) and "Aphra Behn's Dramatic Canon: Stylistics, Stylochometry, and Non-Traditional Authorship Attribution," *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles, Notes, and Reviews*, 33, nos. 2-3 (2020), 217-227. At Winterthur, Joe returned to nontraditional attribution studies using computers, guiding us through the historical development of probability theory, reproducibility in experimentation, and other underpinnings of such stylistic analysis--he returns to these considerations while updating his important 2002 critique of some attribution studies then completed and thus in his talk discussed a number of important efforts throughout the world over the past three years. **Geof Sill** continues to write a biography of James Burney (Frances Burney's brother), who sailed with Captain Cook on his last two voyages, rose to Rear-Admiral, and wrote several books (Geof published an article on him in the *Burney Letter* in 2021). Also Geof is editing with a colleague the haiku of Nick Virgilio (1928-1989), a master of the haiku who lived in New Jersey and published hundreds of haiku (the Nick Virgilio Haiku Association has a considerable presence on the WWW). At Winterthur we enjoyed **Matthew Skie**'s illustrated talk on the life and especially the military career of Richard St. George, an aristocratic Anglo-Irish officer of light infantry fighting in Pennsylvania 1776-77. Matthew drew on his and colleagues work at The Museum of American Revolution for the special exhibit, in 2019-20, entitled *Cost of Revolution: The Life and Death of an Irish Soldier*, which is also the title of the accompanying exhibition catalogue that Matthew wrote as lead curator. (It was the museum's "first international loan exhibition," with over 100 artifacts on display). St. George was an artist, and Matthew showed battlefield sketches he had drawn and also paintings he had commissioned Xavier della Gata to paint of the Battle of Germantown and the Battle of Paoli (completed in 1782), no doubt based on St. George's designs. Matthew spoke on **Frances Singh**'s panel, entitled "Remains of the Day," which also offered Frances's account of Jane Colden and her father Caldwell, who developed a flora for the New York region and corresponded with other botanists. The Coldens moved from the north down to Flushing in 1757 due to the French and Indian War, and thus have fallen within Frances's local history studies. Also on the panel was **Rosemary Wake**, over from Scotland to attend her first EC/ASECS in nine years: she spoke on the Scottish poet Beatrice Campbell Grant (1761-1845), illuminating her life and career with six relics, a sampler stitched when a young girl and some of her poems and of others' poems about Grant and her family. **Brij Singh**, who contributed

the tribute above to Ted Braun, is now in India, where he was invited to speak at an anniversary celebration at his old college. **Rivka Swenson**, ASECS's Affiliated Societies Liaison, attended the Mozart Society's conference in Salzburg and the joint meeting of CSECS and NEASECS this past fall. She surveys forthcoming meetings in ASECS's *News Circular*.

Kathryn Temple has co-edited with three colleagues the *Research Handbook on Law and Emotion*, 2021 in Elgar's series of Research Handbooks in Legal Theory. Besides co-authoring the Intro, she contributed "Why the Law Needs the History of Emotions: William Blackstone, Agamben and Form-of-Life." **Robert Walker's** "Pursuing the Identities of Sterne's Subscribers down Genealogy's Garden Path" appeared in December's *Notes and Queries* (69:314-17). **Jane Wessel's** book *Owning Performance | Performing Ownership: Literary Property and the Eighteenth-Century British Stage* was published by the U. of Michigan Press in 2022. The book considers how playwrights, actors and managers tried to control the performance of their works in the years between the 1710 Copyright Act and the 1833 Dramatic Literary Property Act. She also recently had the essay "Extra-Illustration, Participatory Biography, and the Construction of Celebrity" appear in *Making Stars: Biography and Celebrity in 18C Britain*, ed. by **Nora Nachumi** and **Kristina Straub** (in Delaware's series "Performing Celebrity" ed. by **Laura Engel**). The essay "explores how theatre fans contributed to a communal construction of the biographies of their favorite performers through the practice of extra-illustrating their books." We are indebted to Jane for chairing the Molin Prize competition.

Melanie Holm, **Brian Michael Norton**, and fellow editors of *The Scriblerian* published in the fall a double-number (vol. 54, nos. 1-2 [Autumn 2021- Spring 2022]), as the review catches up after its transition to Penn State UP. The issue is particularly strong in book reviews, with three times the pages devoted to them as to article reviews (a high proportion of the articles involve women authors). Among EC/ASECS members reviewing books are **John Dussinger**, **Michael Genovese**, **Aparna Gollapudi**, **Nancy Mace**, **David Palumbo**, and **Robert Walker**. And **Jacob Sider Jost** and **Melvyn New** wrote several each. Mel's review of William Dalrymple's *The Anarchy* on the East India Company's corporate violence in India is interesting for a frank take on the text that defies a political correctness focused solely on Britain's atrocities. **Robert Hume's** review of the five-volume *Plays and Poems of Nicholas Rowe* also pulls no punches in a mixed review that offers lessons about what a good edition should do. And **Catherine Ingrassia's** review of **Peter Sabor's** 3-vol. CUP edition of Samuel Richardson's correspondence with Lady Bradshaigh and Lady Echlin showcases the value of the edition (to specialists and others more broadly) in an exemplary way--of course, you've got to have a good edition to sell it so enthusiastically. Catherine covers in detail the range of the correspondence and the touching humanity and affectionate regard of the correspondents (the review tells a good story well). Besides the 226 letters, most never published, the edition contains as appendices "Lady Echlin's alternative ending to *Clarissa*, Lady Bradshaigh's and Richardson's commentary on the last volume of *Sir Charles Grandison*, and her well-known annotations on *Clarissa*." *Scriblerian's* editors have sent the last double catch-up volume to

Penn State for publication, and it should appear within a month or two. "She be comin round the mountain"--she's crippled with a heavy load that includes **Bob Walker's** "An Update to Addenda and Corrigenda to Annotations of Boswell's *Hypochondriack*" and **Jim May's** survey of the rare-book & auction sales. Penn State uses Johns Hopkins UP for subscriptions (jrnlcirc@jh.edu).

Hermann Real, Kirsten Juhas, and their team at the Ehrenpreis Centre will publish next month the 38th volume of *Swift Studies*, with seven essays and several notes. The essays are Hermann's "Dr. Swift (Re)writing Doctors"; Kirsten's "Gulliver as a Vehicle of Satire in 21C Political Cartoons"; Dirk Passmann's "The Dean and the Jews"; Sabine Baltes's "'Go to Ombre, Sirrahs': Swift and Parlour Games"; Mary Stratton Ryan's "Jonathan Swift's Relics: A Preliminary Checklist"; Elias J. Taylor's "Humanity and Ecology in *Gulliver's Travels*"; and Mark Loveridge's "Listing to *The Beasts Confession*." **Cedric D. Reverand** (ed.), **Michael Edson** (asso. ed) and **Aparna Gollapudi** brought out the January issue of *Eighteenth-Century Life* (v. 47.1). It contains two lengthy articles: Bradford Mudge's "Face Value: Towards a Theory of 18C Portraiture," and Patricia L. Hamilton's "Patronage or Friendship? Charlotte Lennox and the Fifth Earl of Orrery," the latter I found a fine account of the two principals and of the patronage system. There follow eight review essays, beginning with a long and well illustrated review by **Susan Spencer**: Picturing Political Power: 18C Korean Portraits in San Francisco's Asian Art Museum. (*ECL* has long covered the visual arts well.) Among the books reviewed are **Michael Genovese's** *The Problem of Profit* (2019, previously reviewed here) and three collections of essays on Samuel Johnson or on Johnson and his circle edited by **Anthony W. Lee** (2018-2019), joined with Leo Damrosch's *The Club*.

A month or so ago David Gies posted with open access his Spring issue of *Dieciocho XVIII* (46.1), with six essays treating such topics as early 19C editing of influential early accounts of New Spain by Las Casas and Sahagún, the recommendation of criollos for communal leadership in *Tardes americanas* (1778) by José Granados y Gálvez (by Alexis Smith, the sole essay in English), 18C Spanish attitudes to pregnancy, and didactic almanacs in southern Europe (abstracts in Spanish and English are at the end of the volume). The volume also includes the bibliography of recent studies ("Cajón de sastrero bibliográfico," 143-48), plus reviews of eight books, three of which are in English: David Gies's of Elena Deanda-Camacho's *Ofensiva a los oídos piadosos: Obscenidad y censura en la poesía española y novohispana del siglo XVIII* (2022), noting that the author plumbs the depths of archives of obscene works gathered by the 18C censors; Valentina K. Tikoff's of *Society Women and Enlightened Charity in Spain: The Junta de Damas de Honor y Mérito, 1787-1823*, ed. by Catherine M. Jaffe and Elisa Martín-Valdepeñas Yagüe (2022); and Sandra Rebok's of Robert H. Jackson's *The Bourbon Reforms and Remaking the Spanish Frontier Mission* (2022). Noting its topicality for present disputes about European expansion in the Southwest, Rebok praises Jackson's well documented study of the shift from Jesuit to Franciscan missions and the development of the latter system (the focus of Jackson's lifework). This and earlier issues of *Dieciocho* are posted at [https:// dieciocho.uvcreate.virginia.edu/](https://dieciocho.uvcreate.virginia.edu/)

Robert Hume recently published in the 2022 *eBLJ*--with open access-- "**The London Stage, 1660-1800: A Short History, Retrospective Anatomy, and Projected Future**," 75 folio-sized pages of PDFs, with 285 fns occupying about a third of each page. Hume supplied a lengthy abstract, but it can only touch on major points. Beginning with celebration, he notes the eleven volumes (1960-[1970]) with 1058 pp. of introductions, 7182 pp. of calendar, and 672 pp. of index, were a monumental and influential achievement, making it possible to more accurately define movements and developments in the theatre--like Hume's own critique of assumptions about the success of sentimental comedy. Hume recounts the history of the project, first conceived as a revision of Revd. John Genest's 10-volume *Some Account* (1832). Hume details negotiations between the collaborators themselves and with presses etc., from the 1940s through the publication of the faulty cumulative index by Ben. Schneider (1969). Aided by correspondence supplied to Hume by Arthur Scouten (deposited at Penn State U.), Hume recounts conflicts between the participants (and some scandalous unprofessionalism by two of them), explaining, for instance, how William Van Lennep was falsely credited with editing Part I when he contributed nothing to the work of Emmett L. Avery and Scouten. Avery, Souten, Geo. Winchester Stone, and Ch. Beecher Hogan never agreed on what would be offered in the headings or the calendars of their separate chronological sections (yet Hume finds the performance record "for the most part . . . remarkably good"). They never envisioned that their products would be put to X, Y, or Z uses. Sometimes aided by reviewers' comments, Hume evaluates the *LS*'s five chronological sections with intros, calendars, and indices, mindful of the sorts of evidence available (as the lack of newspaper advts. in Part I). His comments are enriched by having with Judith Milhous produced an online revision of 1701-1711 (Part II: 1700-29 [1960], edited by Avery was the first published). The Hume-Milhous revision was conceived back in 1976 to be undertaken with Scouten. In this article Hume announces that he and Milhous will only bring this revision through to 1715 before moving on to other projects. In his mid section Hume explains what the *LS* does and does not do. Intended initially "to create a chronological list" of documented performances to perhaps 1737, increasing amounts of detail were added. One major limitation is the compilers' neglect of MS sources. The introductions and the calendars did not provide much information on the repertory, the staging (scene design, costumes, etc.), or the music and dance ("a serious weak point," 49), or the remuneration of playwrights and actors (58-59); and its indices had serious shortcomings (59-64).

Hume concludes by sketching the scope, method, and policies that should be employed when others redo "from scratch" the *LS* as an open-ended online tool, using primary materials and electronic links, inserting more verbatim texts from newspapers, playbills and the like (64-74). Some better practices are to be learned from John Greene's *Theatre in Dublin, 1745-1820*. Hume envisions a new *LS* dependent for longevity on institutional affiliation, with an advisory board of young and old members, with four temporal divisions: 1660-1705, 1705-1737, 1737-1776 (death of Garrick), and 1776-1800. He calls for more transcribed information from secondary sources like the *Biographical Dictionary of Actors* as well as from

contemporary MS and printed sources--often with links to the referenced material. Hume identifies many of these MS resources, such as the Larpent MSS at the Huntington, Vice Chamberlain Coke theatrical MSS at the Harvard Theatre Collection--which Van Lennep failed to tell Avery of--and countless others such as those described and often reproduced by Milhous and Hume since the 1970s. Even if a team does not revise *The London Stage* during our lives, Hume's densely documented review provides essential guidance to anyone working on English theatre--it is itself an embryonic "London Stage, 1660-1800"--offered freely on the WWW.

We in EC/ASECS meet with the theme "Colonial / Capital" at Colonial Williamsburg and on the campus of William & Mary on 12-14 October 2023, chaired by Brett Wilson (bdwils@wm.edu). Negotiations with hotels are ongoing. More info will be emailed to members and posted online soon.

The December 2022 issue (#134) of *Children's Books History Society Newsletter* contains an eight-page illustrated insert by Jonathan Cooper and Brian Alderson called *Ludford Redivivus*, describing three newly discovered, unrecorded 18C children's books with ownership autographs of John Ludford (dated 1759-1764)--"redivivus" as a box of the Ludfords' children books at UCLA was earlier known: *A Guide for the Child and Youth . . . Containing plain and pleasant Directions to read English. With Prayers . . . By T.H. M.A. Teacher of a private School* (L: by J. Roberts for the Company of Stationers, 1753); *The First of All Books for Children. Being a New Method . . . Second Edition* (L: for J. Collier, n.d., 3d.); and *A Pretty little Book of Pictures, or a New Method of Teaching little Children to Read . . . Second Edition* (J. Collier, 1757, 6d.). These small books under 4" tall and about 2" across, all very fully illustrated with tiny woodcuts (the last with 177). This newsletter, edited by Susan Bailes (bailes21@btinternet.com), contains abstracts from talks at the Society's 22 Oct. Study Day, which include Susan Bailes's on educator Jane Johnson (1706-59) and Lesley Delaney's on 18C nursery reading, particularly Ellenor Fenn's.

Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research is now published by Penn State UP. In January its editor, Anne Greenfield (Valdosta State U), invited articles of 5000-8000 words sent with 150-word abstracts and reviews of books & performances (750-1000 words).

The Art Museums of **Colonial Williamsburg** through January 2025 have the exhibition: "I Made This": . . . The Work of Black American Artists and Artisans," devoted to 18C-20C material culture."

The **Intelligencer** needs reviewers for: Catherine Ingrassia, *Domestic Captivity and the British Subject, 1660-1750* (Charlottesville: U. of Virginia Press, 2022; x + 301 pp.; bib.; index). Ann Campbell, *Families of the Heart: Surrogate Relations in the Eighteenth-Century British Novel* (Bucknell UP, 2022), 176 pp. (treating Defoe, Richardson, Haywood, and Burney); and Melvyn New and Anthony W. Lee, *Notes on Footnotes: Annotating Eighteenth-Century Literature* (Penn St. UP, 2022; pp. xiii + 252).

Cover illustration: William Hogarth, "Don Quixote releases the Galley Slaves" (for Book 3, Chapter 8 of *Don Quixote de la Mancha*), etching and engraving, third state of three (1756 or after); Metropolitan Museum of Art, donated to Wikimedia Commons.

The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer

The Newsletter of the EC/ASECS

N.S. Volume 37, Number 1: March 2023

James E. May, editor

1423 Hillcrest Road

Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17603

U.S.A.