THE DIGITIZED LARPENT COLLECTION—
And Some Surprising Facts, Problems, and Questions

by Robert D. Hume

The Larpent Collection of play manuscripts in the Huntington Library was originally generated by the passage of Walpole's Licensing Act of 1737, which required all new or altered plays performed in England, Scotland, or Wales "for gain" to be submitted to the Lord Chamberlain's office for censorship before performance. The collection has been much used by drama and theatre scholars since the appearance of Dougald MacMillan's excellent catalogue (1939), which lists 2502 items between 1737 and 1824. As of May 2016 the entire collection has been digitized and made available together with an extensive supporting apparatus by the British digital publishing firm of Adam Matthew.[1] I was asked to write a short essay on the kinds of things that scholars might do with Larpent manuscripts. Starting to work on such a piece, I thought to ask a question: just how complete is the Larpent collection?

MacMillan was aware of some missing items, admitting that "enormous as the collection still is, it is not now entirely complete. The extent and causes of the shrinkage are difficult to determine, but from time to time, apparently, individual pieces were abstracted."[2] MacMillan did not pose the question "What *ought* to be in the collection?" If we ask that question, the answer is disconcerting.[3] My best estimate—explained below—is that there "should" be about 3874 Larpent manuscripts of English plays, but what we have is roughly 1990 or only about 51% (the other 512 are prologues, epilogues, addresses and suchlike). So the "shrinkage" is shocking—roughly 50%. Clearly three questions need to be asked. First, what theatres and what plays did the 1737 Act apply to? Second, how can we best establish what plays *ought* to be in the Larpent collection? And third, when, how, and why did drastic attrition occur?

What theatres and what plays did the 1737 Act apply to? What the act unequivocally says is that every new "entertainment of the stage," prologue, epilogue, or alteration of a pre-1737 play must be submitted for licensing if it is performed for "gain."[4] No exception is made for works all-sung or in a foreign language. The collection comprises a large number of Italian operas, burlettas, ballets, and even pantomimes. Some scholars have believed that the Licensing Act did not extend beyond the London patent theatres, or that plays staged on the Surrey side of the Thames were exempt from the licensing process, but I am unaware of any evidence that would substantiate such claims. The Act specifically names England, Scotland, and Wales.

How can we attempt to determine what plays ought to be in the Larpent collection? This is a highly problematic matter that quickly brings us to irresolvable problems. From playbills in daily newspapers we have a complete record of professional performances in London from autumn 1705. For many provincial cities and towns, however, the records are far from complete, and sometimes nonexistent. So far as I am aware, the only attempt to create a "complete" list of plays and other entertainments of the stage was made by Allardyce Nicoll, who recorded his findings in the "Hand-List of Plays" appended to each volume in his *History of English Drama, 1660-1900*. Volumes 2, 3, and 4 (covering 1700 to 1850) were originally published in 1925, 1927, and

1930. He attempted to note the existence of Larpent MSS, but had to work from a crude predecessor to the MacMillan catalogue that did not assign shelfmarks to individual titles. When revised editions were issued in the 1950s, the publisher declined to reset the 732 pages devoted to playlists in these three volumes, and did not add shelfmarks available from MacMillan's 1939 catalogue in Nicoll's "Addenda."

The only way to determine what "ought" to have been in the Larpent collection is to do an item-by-item electronic search in the digitized version of MacMillan's catalogue for each "Nicoll title" performed between 1737 and 1824.[5] Many "Larpent" titles differ drastically from the title actually used for performance and publication, which can make definite identification difficult or impossible. I have done my best to count carefully and systematically, but any pretense at exactitude would be ridiculous. From Nicoll's list I have tried to identify all plays performed in public theatres "for gain" anywhere in England, Scotland, and Wales (but not in Ireland, which was not subject to the Licensing Act of 1737). I have counted each play in one of four categories. These are: (1) The play survives both as a printed book and as a Larpent manuscript. (2) The play was published, but there is no known Larpent manuscript. (3) A Larpent manuscript exists in the Huntington Collection, but the play was not published. (4) The play is apparently lost: it was not published and no Larpent manuscript survives (if there ever was one).

Plays Professionally Performed in England, Scotland, & Wales, 1737-1824

	Published + Larpent MS	Published but no Larpent MS survives	Larpent MS only (not published)	Lost (no copy known to survive)	Total
1737-1800					
Attributed	621	197	177	54	1049
Anonymous	19	49	176	212	456
1800-1824					
Attributed	384	204	226	272	1086
Anonymous	88	3	299	893	1283
Grand totals 1737-1824					
	1112 (28.7%)	453 (11.6%)	878 (22.7%)	1431 (37%)	3874

I offer four observations on these figures. First, the four categories have no overlap. Therefore adding the four "totals" (attributed + anonymous plays for the two time periods) yields the total of 3874 plays for which there "ought" to have been a manuscript submitted to the Examiner and retained in what eventually became the Larpent Collection at the Huntington. Adding 1112 published plays for which we also have Larpent manuscripts to the 878 that were not published but for which a Larpent manuscript exists yields a total of 1990 "Larpent" plays—which is only about 51% of the 3874 plays that we have reason to believe were professionally performed. Second, relatively few plays were both performed and published for which no Larpent manuscript survives—some 453 (11.6%); whereas, fully 878 plays (22.7%) that were performed but never published survive as Larpent manuscripts. Third, some 1431 plays (37%) survive in neither print nor manuscript form and are therefore "lost." Fourth, the likelihood of publication in particular and survival in general is far higher for attributed than for anonymous plays. Especially as we move forward in time, the number and proportion of anonymous plays that are unpublished and lost skyrockets. For 1737-1800 46.5% of anonymous plays are lost; for 1800-1824 almost 70% are lost.

No pretense to exactness can be made in counting titles. There are several glaring problems. One is that the title under which a play was submitted to the Examiner is surprisingly often not the title under which it was advertised and performed. Another problem arises from boundary issues. A huge number of plays were adaptations or revisions of earlier ones. At what point is something a "new" play? If a play in question is lost, we have no way to judge if it is merely a revival or a drastic revamping—or conceivably a completely different play under the same title. Nicoll does his best to associate anonymous titles with authors, but sometimes does not recognize the connection, especially if it is not blatant. Consequently double reporting of "unknown author" cases creates approximately sixty ghosts—the Larpent total implied by Nicoll's entries and electronic search for Larpent numbers in the Huntington database yields about 2050 plays, whereas we know that 1990 is what the Huntington actually has.

When and How Did Attrition Occur? How can we be so certain that attrition occurred? Consider the figures for some sample seasons. The first season under the Licensing Act was 1737-38. Covent Garden and Drury Lane premiered eight new plays while the King's Theatre Haymarket mounted six new operas—fourteen new works in all. For these cases we find nine Larpent manuscripts. In the season of 1738-39 we find three Larpent manuscripts and five cases with no manuscript. The first two seasons together give us twelve Larpent manuscripts and ten "no Larpent manuscript" cases. In 1776-77 twenty-six new plays were performed in London, for which we have only eighteen Larpent manuscripts. If we look at 1795-96, we find thirty-six new plays, with a total of twenty-four Larpent manuscripts surviving and twelve missing. Even for the London patent theatres, quite a lot of Larpent manuscripts seem to have gone missing.

Most scholars seem to have assumed either that licensing regulations did not apply to theatres outside of London (obviously false, as the presence of applications from a couple of dozen remote venues proves), or alternatively that such theatres could readily evade the licensing process. Leonard Conolly says that "provincial theaters … did not normally try to evade the regular licensing

procedure, but it is fairly certain that many plays were acted at the minors without official approval. Some minor theater managers, like Samuel James Arnold at the Lyceum, were conscientious about sending plays to be licensed, but the Surrey theater … seems to have completely ignored the licensing system."[6] This is demonstrably untrue: Larpent MSS 1649 (1810) and 2101 (1819) were duly licensed for performance at the Surrey Theatre. If, as some scholars have believed, the playhouses on the "Surrey side" of the Thames fell outside the control of the Lord Chamberlain and the Examiner, why should these manuscripts ever have been submitted to Larpent? Further investigation is clearly needed.

A look at T. J. Dibdin's numerous plays is instructive concerning licensing patterns. Dibdin was enormously prolific, churning out flaming melodramas. His work was produced at eleven different theatres between 1799 and 1824. An overwhelming majority of Dibdin's plays staged at the London "majors" early in the nineteenth century duly got licensed—and the Larpent copy survives. Contrariwise, *some* plays staged at the "minors" in the vicinity of London *did* get licensed and all were *supposed* to be licensed, but nonetheless relatively few of the presumptive Larpent copies survive.[7] The obvious question now is, "Why is that?"

I strongly suspect that a large part of the answer is that an early owner simply trashed a lot of manuscripts in which he had no interest. At some point after Larpent's death in 1824 the collection was bought (*circa* 1830?) from Larpent's widow by John Payne Collier and Thomas Amyot. In an entry dated 11 March 1832 in *An Old Man's Diary*, Collier says

> My friend Amyot and I, between us, have bought all Larpent's Dramatic Manuscripts … the collection is sadly deficient in sterling old comedies …. Of modern farces and melodramas, there are a superabundance; but, on the whole, they are hardly worth the money we have given for them (£400) …. The Larpent Manuscripts fill six or eight immense bundles, and I hardly know how to find them house-room, particularly as Amyot leaves his share to my keeping.[8]

Neither date nor price is reliable. A report in *The Athenaeum*,[7] January 1854, states that Larpent's widow sold the MSS in 1825 for £180. Collier's biographers cite documents suggesting that the date was 1830 and the price £180.[9] But two points seem germane. First, little in the collection seemed interesting or important to Collier. Second, he was appalled and upset by its sheer bulk—he could not readily accommodate it. I offer the hypothesis that Collier saw no reason to house what he considered dreck, whether attributed or anonymous, particularly if it emanated from the "minors" or the provinces.

Some Facts and Some Thoughts Towards Future Uses. Lack of a Larpent manuscript does not mean the play in question was not subject to censorship or that it had not been duly censored. Most likely it means merely that the licensing manuscript has disappeared. We must not confuse (a) the text-licensing system overseen by the Examiner with (b) the granting of at-pleasure licenses or patents for theatres in London or elsewhere. Licenses for the "minors" in London did initially restrict them to "musical" shows. Jane Moody has usefully traced the ways the "minors" gradually rolled back the "ban on

spoken dialogue" using flags and banners to communicate what could not conveniently be sung.[10] But the idea that the "minors" were illegitimate and unregulated is fallacious. Their operations were licensed and they were subject to the censorship provision in the 1737 Act.

We now lack a very large number of the manuscripts that must have passed through the Examiner's hands. This is simply a fact. I have offered a soberly calculated estimate, the bottom line on which is that *circa* 51% remains to us of what ought to have been in a complete collection. Given the radical uncertainties about what was performed outside London and how many of the lost plays are ghost titles, I offer the conjecture that what survives in the Larpent collection could be anywhere from 40% to 60% of what was actually submitted for licensing. I have counted what *can* be counted, but that is very far from everything. Granting the severity of the shrinkage, what remains is a fairly fabulous resource. I shall conclude by offering five suggestions concerning the present and future utility of the Larpent plays.

First, to state the obvious, they give us a detailed and explicit sense of how the Examiner exercised his powers. We can see what caused a play to be refused a license, and what had to be done to make it acceptable for performance.

My second point is that the Larpent manuscripts give us a wonderful opportunity to compare the "performance text" played in the theatre with the "reading text" available for plays that got published. Astonishingly little has been done with this rather obvious opportunity. It was extensively exploited in Richard Bevis's very innovative dissertation (Berkeley, 1965).[11] At numerous points in his still under-appreciated book, Bevis demonstrates that the performance and print versions can differ quite substantially. If we are trying to recreate a sense of what theatre audiences actually saw and responded to, we need to see how closely the print version replicates the performance version where we have both. Where the published version alone survives (some 453 cases, or 11.6% of the estimated total), we can only guess what was actually spoken (or not spoken) in the theatre.

A third point of importance is that the Larpent manuscripts for which we have no printed copy total 878 and so constitute more than one-third of all surviving performed plays for 1737-1824—about 36%. They are 22.7% of all known plays, but 1431 (37% of the 3874 estimated total) are lost. Surprisingly little has been done to mine and utilize the Larpent-only plays. Many have little "literary" value. Quite a few, however, are mainpieces or afterpieces by playwrights notable and successful in their time, and of genuine interest today—as for example, Hannah Cowley, Thomas Holcroft, Elizabeth Inchbald, and Joanna Baillie,.

My fourth point is that, although there is no vast amount of literary merit in the plays produced in the three kingdoms between 1737 and 1824, there is quite a lot of "content" that has gone almost totally unscrutinized. A broad range of commentary on all sorts of subjects resides in both the published plays and in the "Larpent only" cases. The Napoleonic wars, patriotism, class distinctions, marriage, the position of women in society, and a whole lot of other topics arise again and again, often from very different points of view. As a particular instance I offer slaves and slavery, subjects much debated for most of the decades represented in the Larpent manuscripts. If we are interested in

recreating contexts—of understanding public opinion about all sorts of topics of the time—then what can be gleaned from commercial drama is of value to the historian. Often, indeed, it will be more representative of the thinking of the day than more finely wrought and "literary" productions. Much cultural paydirt can be found in the often ephemeral works that survive only because the Examiner's copies give us scripts that did not get published.

Granting the large number of "Larpent only" plays that are benefit pieces and other ephemera, the fact remains that more than a third of the surviving plays from 1737 to 1824 exist *only* as Larpent manuscripts. They constitute an important contribution to what we know of drama in a period spanning more than three quarters of a century.

This brings me to my fifth and final point about the significance of the Larpent collection. The Larpent plays can be an enormous help in letting us reconstruct an accurate picture of drama as it was experienced by the theatregoers who attended plays in the mid and later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. If we are studying Major Plays of the Time, then we will concern ourselves with perhaps as many as fifteen or twenty new plays premiered in the extended era defined by John Larpent's many years as Examiner and the forty years of his predecessor, William Chetwynd. This is a minute and unrepresentative sampling of what must have been nearly 4,000 new plays (and may well have been more). If we are concerned instead with the ever evolving popular culture of the time, and the theatergoing experience of those who enjoyed or damned those plays, then we must cast our nets far wider. We need to pay attention to longstanding repertory vehicles and revivals—but also to the flock of new plays that got premiered each year. We must look not just at tragedies and comedies but also at farces and ballad operas and burlettas and pantomimes and ballets and melodramas and burlesques and pastorals—among others. Nicoll supplies a list of sixty-seven generic types in the headnote to his "Hand-List of Plays 1800-1850." To get a grip on the kaleidoscopic jumble of dramatic forms in common use, we need to exploit the Larpent Collection.

Penn State University

Notes

1. The collection is titled *Eighteenth Century Drama: Censorship, Society and the Stage*. URL: http://www.amdigital.co.uk/m-products/ product/ eighteenth-century-drama/. There is a "Request a Free Trial" button. Title notwithstanding, the whole of the Larpent Collection is included through to January 1824.

2. *Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library*, Compiled by Dougald MacMillan (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1939), p. vi.

3. The present note is basically a condensation of the 6000-word piece I ultimately wrote for the Adam Matthew website, "What the Larpent Collection Contains—and What It does *Not* Contain." I intend to extend my investigation and write a much longer analysis of the Larpent Collection and the licensing system that generated the Licencer's manuscripts.

4. For the text of the Act, see Vincent J. Liesenfeld, *The Licensing Act of 1737* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984), Appendix C-13.

5. Available at http://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/tf1h4n985c.

6. L. W. Conolly, *The Censorship of English Drama, 1737-1824* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1976), 24.

7. For example: 46 Dibdin plays at Covent Garden (43 with Larpent, 3 without); 17 plays at Drury Lane (all with Larpent); Surrey (54 plays, but only 4 with Larpent); Royal Circus (52 plays, but only 6 with Larpent).

8. John Payne Collier, *An Old Man's Diary, Forty Years Ago … for Strictly Private Circulation* (London: Printed by Thomas Richards, 1871), [pt 1] 49-50.

9. See Arthur Freeman and Janet Ing Freeman, *John Payne Collier: Scholarship and Forgery in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 1:219, 229, 642, and 708n.

10. Jane Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

11. Eventually published as *The Laughing Tradition: Stage Comedy in Garrick's Day* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1980).

The Problem of the Survey

by Joanne E. Myers

At Gettysburg, I'm lucky enough regularly to teach a survey of eighteenth-century British literature—in fact, I've taught some version of such a survey almost every semester since arriving in 2008. Once the students realize that nothing will actually be written in Old English, they tend to enjoy the course and write appreciative things on their course evaluations. Yet, while I like teaching the course, a few years ago I began to feel that it was too much like a series of "greatest hits" and wasn't conveying a coherent sense of the period to students. At the same time, I felt that my personal interest in fostering students' autonomy—which I prioritized when designing upper-level courses—wasn't having much influence on the shape of the survey.

Having heard a little about problem-based learning (PBL), I set out to learn more about this pedagogy, which is most commonly used in the sciences. Its core goal of fostering open-ended, authentic inquiry appealed to me, and I decided to see if I could incorporate this approach into my survey. A real, meaningful central problem, I learned, was crucial. What better than the essential problem confronting any instructor crafting a survey syllabus: What are the key characteristics of the literature of this age? What are its most representative works? These questions capture the key issues of periodization and canonicity that are embedded in our course design but often invisible to students.

A second key ingredient of a good PBL venture was a meaningful end product. Could my students perhaps, by pursuing the two-part question sketched above, generate their own syllabus for the survey? The idea was appealing, but I wanted to be sure that I wasn't simply "passing the buck" to students to craft a coherent survey; I also winced at the possible loss of coverage this might entail. With some more thought, I settled on a rough structure for the class. We would start with a "Boot Camp" unit in which students got oriented to reading eighteenth-century texts and learned the basics of the period's history; this

would be followed by a four-week stretch in which students worked in small groups to investigate the period's literary history, with me providing mini-lectures and individual conferences to keep groups on track. At the close of this second unit, each small group would nominate a slate of works to be read by the whole class, and we would winnow their recommendations via a whole-class vote. The third and longest unit of the class would be given over to reading the works that students had selected, and we would end with a novel, Burney's *Evelina*.

Planning

As I planned this new version of the survey, I had two key concerns: first, motivating students to care about canon-formation and reconciling them to the amount of small-group work that PBL requires. The literature on PBL provided some good resources to address the issue of motivation, since the method emphasizes highly transferable skills such as tackling poorly-structured problems, strengthening research skills, and communicating to varied audiences. In addition to emphasizing such skills, I decided to spend the first day of class having students analyze a handful of different survey syllabi, in the hope that seeing how different professors structured their courses would pique their interest in the larger topic of how issues of literary value are differently evaluated. An asset here was Gettysburg students' general embrace of the liberal arts ethos: I felt that I could count on my students at least to be open to entertaining questions about literary value, though in a different environment I can imagine placing more emphasis on the skills they would be learning through PBL.

In addition, my hunch was that the usual composition of my survey would be an asset in helping assuage student anxieties about small-group work: the class usually draws a mixed audience of majors and non-majors who also range from freshmen to seniors. Such variety, I hoped, would yield groups whose members could support one another well. Each group would have one broad genre (poetry, drama, fiction, or non-fiction prose) as its focus: to help ensure that students were committed to their group work, I had them rank their genre preferences at the end of the Boot Camp section and sorted them into small groups accordingly.

Lastly, I did order an anthology for the course—the Broadview Anthology of Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Literature—to give some structure to the students' investigation. Although I had some worries that the choice of anthology would foreclose the open-ended spirit of PBL, I felt it was a useful resource for the Boot Camp section and would give students an immediate research reference in the small-group PBL phase. To supplement the Broadview anthology, I assigned students to read several introductions from other anthologies and placed those anthologies on reserve for them to consult.

From the outset, students seemed open to and reasonably engaged by the PBL format, though they certainly acknowledged that it was intimidating to have to explore and conceptualize a whole literary period. When I finished introducing the format on the first day of class, I passed out index cards to allow students anonymously to ask questions. Some low-level concerns emerged, but no one voiced deep reservations. I addressed the concerns as best I could, and we were off.

Phase 1: Boot Camp

The Boot Camp phase largely felt like a "regular" English class: we read (mostly poetry) and discussed, but I kept a more explicit focus than usual on basic reading strategies, such as identifying a speaker and situation for a text and evaluating tone. Students also did background readings on eighteenth-century history and culture. The background they gleaned was fairly rudimentary, but I wanted them, for instance, to be able to follow an allusion to "1688" or "the Union." After three weeks, they were quizzed on that background and on the reading strategies we had been developing. Then, having had a taste of the period's literature, they ranked their genre preferences and were sorted into groups. I presented them afresh with the course problem, now theirs to solve.

Phase 2: Small-Group PBL

During the small-group phase, I spent one class session per week giving brief lectures on topics that students had requested, such as theatrical licensing, the public sphere, and contemporary attitudes towards fiction. The small groups could also confer about how the work was going. During the other class session, I met with each small group for fifteen minutes in the library, expecting them to spend the balance of that class period on research. These sessions let me offer targeted advice and help groups troubleshoot hitches in their research.

Assignments in this part of the class included a "division of labor" checklist that students had to draft and keep updated; this was intended to keep them accountable for their share of the group's work. Each student committed to reading a certain number of texts independently and then prepared two "reading reports" on texts that were considered for recommendation to the larger group. Those reports were given to me but also posted online so that group members could read them and ask each other questions about the texts they were reading. Each reading report had to include a plot summary, a close reading of a portion of the text, and an argument about why the work was representative and important. After three weeks, each group presented, both orally and in writing, the texts they were recommending for the whole class's consideration. Lastly, after the small-group phase concluded, each student also submitted an individual reflection on the process of "canon formation"—essentially, a meta-reflection on how the two-part course problem about representativeness and significance had been addressed through the small-group work.

Phase 3: Large-Group PBL

After students voted and selected a slate of works, I did some juggling of the recommendations to create a relatively coherent path forward. Then the "survey" began. Groups who had nominated a work were asked to introduce their texts and review their significance in the period. This felt like the most "normal" part of the course, for me and the students alike. We were back to the meat and potatoes of basic literary analysis, doing close readings and tracing the period's key literary developments. The writing assignments here felt more typical, too: students were asked to write a précis of a secondary source they read in conjunction with the literary texts and a more extended close reading paper. At the end of the semester, students were happy to finish with *Evelina*, whose blend of satire and social comedy I find highly teachable.

Reflections

Overall, I was happy with this course even in its first incarnation. The students had worked well together, and I felt that most of their recommendations were thoughtful. Even when I had doubts about a particular recommended text, the reading reports often showed that students were trying hard thoughtfully to conceptualize the dynamics of the period's literature. I was pleasantly surprised to find that genre proved a useful starting-point for students' research. Initially it had felt like one of the simplest ways to divvy up texts, but, since in my experience students rarely consider the historical specificity of genre, I found it useful to confront them with the topic from the outset. And because each genre they were assigned was so broad, they were immediately forced to make distinctions between the works they were researching, giving them an immediate but rich framework for making distinctions between kinds of works. Learning for themselves about the rise of periodical papers and the popular press, I hoped, would make a bigger impression than simply hearing me make the same point on the day we read from the *Spectator*.

In practical terms, we suffered from little group drama, perhaps because all students were able to work with one of their top two preferred genres. When I reviewed my evaluations, I was pleased that several praised the PBL unit's ability to foster engaged learning. "I liked how the PBL unit allowed me to think critically and forced me to create my own ideas," one student commented; in a first for me, another student wrote, that he or she enjoyed "learning about canon formation especially."

Of course, there were some challenges, and I tried to address these when re-teaching the PBL survey. As I anticipated, many students wished for more structure in the course. Though I ascribed some of that to discomfort with the format, I also recognized that I was asking a lot of students whose lack of background in the period sometimes made them feel like they were floundering with such an open-ended research process. Their anxiety sometimes made them fail to think as reflectively about their research process as I wanted. When I retooled the course, I addressed this by incorporating into the Boot Camp phase a new focus on information literacy. Students were introduced to relevant databases and asked to do more background reading. I drew attention to kinds of works (such as the Cambridge Companion series) that could give them rich overviews of the period that they could mine for further sources.

I also added some more structure in the small-group phase. Rather than simply invite requests for mini-lecture topics, I devised several of my own to address subjects I anticipated students might struggle with, such as the concept of literary decorum and largely unfamiliar but common eighteenth-century genres such as pastoral and georgic. The second time around, I also had a slightly firmer touch when steering students away from texts that I thought might be too ambitious for them to take on independently, trying to offer workable alternatives whenever possible.

Even with these tweaks, some challenges are inherent to the course format. Students are apt to feel overwhelmed in the early days and struggle to develop strategies to tackle the task of researching the development of a whole genre. The temptation as the "expert" here is to jump in, but there's value in pausing and helping students, instead, to think critically about their strategies for tackling the problem. For example, one group initially planned to pick the five

names that appeared most often in various tables of contents and research their works. Helping them revise this strategy became a kind of introduction to shifting trends in literary theory, as I steered them away from this initial focus on authors towards a more contextual approach that let them understand the trends in writing and publishing of which particular authors were representative.

Overall, I think the PBL format encourages students to feel a greater sense of ownership of the material they are covering and to think in more abstract ways about why they are encountering it in the first place. Although I have some regrets about the decreased coverage the PBL format necessitates, I think it's important not to underestimate the value of a student's independent encounter with a text. Many students read great material on their own that we didn't end up reading as a group. I think as teachers we tend to over-value our importance as a guide, discounting the sheer benefit of offering students the chance to read interesting things. And even when students were reading works that puzzled and even confounded them –it is no joke to read Otway's *The Orphan* or even Pope's *Dunciad* on one's own – the PBL structure forced them to read with a more critical eye, trying to align a given work with its place in the larger structure of the period.

Though it might seem unlikely, teaching the PBL version of the survey can be more work for me. I make a good faith effort to read along with students, picking up works I may not have read in a long time. I have to be flexible and teach works with less prep time than usual. But an unexpected pleasure of the course has been how it lets me see the period through new eyes and in new ways—new configurations—and thus stretch myself to learn to think about how particular texts interact with one another in ways I may not have anticipated. With ongoing tweaking and revision, I will continue to teach a version of the PBL survey.

Gettysburg College

Teaching "Cultures of Captivity in the Long Eighteenth Century"

by Catherine Ingrassia

Teaching advanced English majors and graduate students at Virginia Commonwealth University, a large, public institution in Richmond with a very diverse student population, I was interested in asking students to explore the concept of "captivity." Students attending university in Richmond, Virginia, former capital of the Confederacy, tend to be very familiar with the history and legacy of slavery in America; indeed they live, work, and study in a cultural space shaped by enslavement. Yet, they, like many, are largely unaware of the scope of British involvement in the Atlantic slave trade or its cultural legacies. That involvement, the cultures it created, and the representations of the same are the subject of this course, which was recognized with a 2016 ASECS Innovative Course Design Award.

The course title, "Cultures of Captivity," is drawn from historian Linda Colley's *Captives: Britain, Empire and the World, 1600-1850* (2002); Colley

uses that phrase to characterize a period in the eighteenth century when cultural anxiety about individuals' potential captivity in other countries existed simultaneously with pride in British commercial and colonial success built largely upon the enslavement and captivity of others. I expand Colley's term to suggest that the anxiety she identifies also bespeaks a cultural awareness of the many authorized (often institutionalized) forms of captivity that existed within eighteenth-century domestic culture (e.g. indentured servitude, prison, domestic service, even marriage). This course explores the fundamental contradictions and instabilities emerging from British imperial expansion and considers what Raymond Williams would term the "structures of feeling" within the texts we read. I really want students to think about how both heightened cultural anxiety about the possibility of captivity and naturalized the conditions of confinement in which much of the population were involved—either as captive subjects or as agents of control—shaped the texts we were reading.

Beginning with a discussion of the chartering of the Royal African Company in 1660, the course moves in a roughly chronological fashion to explore how the representations of and anxieties about captivity change over the century while paying attention to the economic and historical markers that shape the history of enslavement and the Atlantic trade. In the first four weeks of the course, students read narratives about enslaved individuals and the persistence of those representations. We begin with Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko: The Royal Slave* (1688) using Catherine Gallagher's Bedford Cultural Edition (2000). The texts in that edition's generous appendices help situate *Oroonoko* within the multiple discourses constructing the experience of British Atlantic. Students benefit from Gallagher's detailed introduction and headnotes, and read excerpts of relevant primary texts such as a as John Carter and Joseph Blyth's *Correspondence of Slave Traders in the Royal African Company* (1687), Thomas Phillips' *A Journal of a Voyage Made in the Hannibal* (1693-94), and George Warren's *An Impartial Description of Surinam* (1667), among others. These primary texts, further supplemented with items from *Early English Books Online* (*EEBO*), illuminate the collision of the material and symbolic economies Behn depicts and the disjunction between systems of enslavement existing within Oroonoko's honor-based culture and systems of enslavement within a European commercial culture. In addition to Behn's originating text, we read Thomas Southerne's theatrical adaptation, *Oroonoko: A Tragedy* (1695), parts of John Hawkesworth's 1759 revision ("with alternations"), and the preface to the further-revised 1791 edition. Students immediately recognize the differences among the texts and enjoy thinking about their implications and contexts. Students pay particular attention to the illustrations of each stage adaptation, which strategically construct visual images at odds with both Behn's text and with the theatrical adaptations themselves.

Following the iterations of *Oroonoko*, we trace the sequence of narratives presenting "Inkle and Yarico." Using Frank Felsenstein's *English Trader, Indian Maid: An Inkle and Yarico Reader* (JHUP, 1999), we begin with Richard Ligon's original tale in *A True an Exact History of the Island of Barbados* (1655, facsimile from *EEBO*), moving to Steele's representation in the *Spectator* #11 (1711), and then to the numerous poetic representations that appeared subsequently in the century. This constellation of texts offers diverse points of entry to the narrative, situating it within various generic and discursive contexts,

enabling us to explore how race, class, and gender fundamentally inform enslavement and captivity and their representations. This exploration positions students for George Colman's *Inkle and Yarico* later in the semester.

The Treaty of Utrecht and the Assiento of 1713 mark a turning point in the course as our focus shifts from texts directly representing individuals enslaved by the British to texts less representative of but no less shaped by British involvement in the Transatlantic slave trade. Juxtaposing Pope's *Windsor Forest* (1713) with the opening pages of the published *Assiento* (the subtitle itself--"Contract for allowing the Subjects of Great Britain the Liberty of Importing Negroes into the Spanish America"—gives students insight into the dynamics of race and geopolitics), we consider how these texts anticipate James Thomson's *Rule Britannia* (1740) which we also listen to and discuss. Students are surprised to realize that a familiar song they assume is purely one of celebration ("Rule Britannia") simultaneously and unquestionably expresses anxiety about captivity ("Britons never shall be slaves"). At this point, we move to Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (1726) and *A Modest Proposal* (1729), which students, now somewhat more knowledgeable about the cultural landscape of Britain's escalating involvement in the Transatlantic slave trade, recognize as narratives of captivity, anxiety, and colonialism. To ground these discussions and learn about the often-invisible financial connections individuals throughout England had with the slave economy, students use *Legacies of British Slave-ownership* database www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/ to more fully grasp the cultural influence of colonial slave-owners, watch the BBC series *Britain's Forgotten Slave Owners* (2015), and read host David Olusoga's piece in *The Guardian* "The History of British slave ownership has been buried" (7/11/2015). To ground the material reality of *Gulliver's Travels*—which students often read as a somewhat fanciful text—I use a research/writing assignment designed to have them think more carefully about what the codes within that text mean. I give them a copy of *The Daily Journal* from Wednesday March 1, 1727 that includes an advertisement for the third volume of *Gulliver's Travels*. I ask students to look up the ships listed in the shipping news section on the front page of that paper in the *Slave Voyages* database, http://www.slavevoyages.org/. Of course many of the ships are slaving ships, and it prompts fascinating in-class discussions as well as synthesis essays on how that information might cause them to rethink the imagery of captivity in *Gulliver's Travels*, his connections with Bristol, and the motivations for Gulliver's trips. This assignment compels students think about the actual culture practices surrounding these texts. During this part of the course, students also analyze other eighteenth-century London newspapers looking at classified ads that publish notices of escaped slaves (often on the same pages that display advertisements for a familiar literary text).

The course also addresses other forms of captivity. Aubin's novel *Noble Slaves* (1722) deals directly with Barbary captivity, something that the students don't even know existed; this under-discussed novel proves an engaging (if long) text. Supplemented with 1731 newspaper accounts and Mary Barber's poem about returned Barbary captives, this novel provides examples of both global and domestic anxiety. During this section of the course, we also consider how poets appropriate the language of enslavement to represent various domestic situations as forms of captivity; the patterns emerge particularly in poems by those most disenfranchised, and students consider the degrees to

which those metaphors also reflect, for some, a material reality. Metaphors of enslavement are deployed in poems representing domestic service (Stephen Duck, *The Thresher's Labour* or Mary Collier, *The Woman's Labour*), marriage (Elizabeth Thomas, *The Monkey Dance*, Mary Chudleigh, *To the Ladies*, Anne Finch, *The Unequal Fetters*), or the Barbary captives (Mary Barber, *On Seeing the Captives, Lately Redeem'd from Barbary by His Majesty* (1734)).

These readings also provide useful connections with the novel by Edward Kimber, *The History of the Life and Adventures of Mr. Anderson* (1754), a narrative about a young British boy kidnapped in London, transported to the colonies, and sold into slavery on a Maryland plantation. Using the Broadview edition (2008), we supplement the primary texts with additional narratives representing slavery and servitude among white British citizens such James Annesley's *Memoirs of an Unfortunate Young Nobleman, Return'd from a Thirteen Years Slavery in America* (1743), Malachy Postlethwayt, *The African Trade, the Great Support of the British Plantation Trade in America* (1745), and James Revel, *The Poor Unhappy Transported Felon's Sorrowful Account of His Fourteen Years Transportation at Virginia in America* (ca. 1660–80). These texts shift students' understanding of what captivity and slavery entailed, and expand their sense of why it was such a sustained source of anxiety for a wide range of the culture. To provide a context for thinking and writing about transportation, imprisonment, and other forms of domestic captivity, students do a focused writing assignment on eighteenth-century crime and punishment using the *Old Bailey Online*, www.oldbaileyonline.org. When they realize how stealing 1 shilling worth of linen could result in transportation to the Atlantic colonies, they newly recognize how the disparity between crimes and punishments contributed to a culture of captivity.

The final section of the course focuses on abolitionist texts or texts deployed for abolitionist purposes in various genres. Students read Equiano's *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano* (1789) and Mary Prince's *The History of Mary Prince* (1831), which detail the experience of enslavement quite differently than the narratives about Oroonoko and Yarico. We also spend some time on *Poems on Various Subjects* by Phillis Wheatley (1773), thinking about her strategic displacement of the metaphors of captivity. Students engage abolitionist poems, primarily by women, detailing the immorality of the slave trade (e.g. Anne Yearsley, *A Poem on the Inhumanity of the Slave Trade* (1788); Hannah More, *Slavery, A Poem* (1788), Mary Stockdale, *Fidelle* (1798), Anna Laetitia Barbauld, *Epistle to Wilberforce* (1791). Building on work done earlier in the semester, we also read George Colman's *Inkle and Yarico* (1787) and consider the implications of Colman's strategic departures from the narrative (including his happy ending) and ask why this text was the most popular English comic opera of the late eighteenth century.

The course concludes with four texts that focus on the production of sugar from distinct perspectives, representing both the abolitionist and "pro-slaver" interests of British colonial presence in the West Indies: *The Art of Making Sugar* (1752), an anonymous agricultural pamphlet; James Grainger's *The Sugar Cane* (1764), a poetic hybrid that is georgic cum natural history/how-to manual that erases the enslaved labor involved; William Fox's *An address to the people of Great Britain, on the utility of refraining from West India sugar and rum*

(1791); and Amelia Opie's *The Black Man's Lament* (1826) with the vivid illustrations, originally designed for a children's book, that graphically present labor of the enslaved on a sugar plantation. This cluster of texts, grounded by students' understanding of cultivation of sugar cane from their previous viewing of BBC's *Britain's Forgotten Slave Owners*, provides a example of the disparate points of entry to the cultures of captivity. This final focus on sugar attempts to connect the larger concepts of enslavement with a recognizable commodity, a move that mirrors for students the strategies of the late eighteenth-century abolitionists.

For their final assignment, students are asked to create a representation of the cultural of captivity in a series of material objects. They begin by going to the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, two miles from campus, to view the Wedgewood medallion ("Am I not a Man and a Brother?" [1787]). They then supplement that experience with an exploration of the digitally presented artifacts from the Yale Center for British Art's exhibition *Figures of Empire: Slavery and Portraiture in Eighteenth-Century Atlantic Britain*. Students surprised themselves with the items they identified and discussed.

The course seeks to prompt student reflection and reconsideration of a topic that remains highly relevant to current cultural discourse. One final project I received had particular resonance. This student had, before enrolling in the course, booked a trip to the Bahamas at the end of the semester that conflicted with the last day of classes. Willingly eliding the somewhat different history of the Bahamas, I encouraged the student to use the trip as an opportunity consider in situ the ideas we had been discussing all semester and make his final project a travelogue. The following excerpt from his account captures the different lens with which he viewed his Caribbean trip: "My experience at the Pompey Museum of Slavery & Emancipation brought back the vivid memory of visiting North Carolina with my grandmother and hearing her explain to me what it's like to pick cotton first hand …. I recalled my father pointing out a tree that his mother warned him that blacks were hung from in Georgia….the exhibits served as a refresher of everything we covered in our readings, discussions, and lectures throughout the semester…only this time the grounds echoed the story louder. …Each passing thought progressively became more unsettling …Studying a coin that at first glance appeared to be a common form of currency, I discovered it was actually a token for slave auctions which previously belonged to a merchant from South Carolina. This rusted coined symbolized more than slavery for me; it represented how the actions of the past remain today…. Upon leaving the museum there were no longer any parts of the Bahamas I was not able to see ties to captivity and oppression in…. although the weather was warm and the sun was shining, nothing about the Bahamas seemed inviting." His sense, as an African-American male, of the persistence of these structural power relationships was palpable and suggested the relevance of a course on the cultures of captivity.

Virginia Commonwealth University

Milhous, Judith, and Robert D. Hume. ***The Publication of Plays in London 1660-1800: Playwrights, Publishers, and the Market.*** (Panizzi Lectures, British Library, 2011.) London: British Library (distributed in North America by University of Chicago Press), 2015. Pp. xxxvi + 483; 5 appendices: 1) Copyright Payments for Plays; 2) Plays included in Major Multi-Author Collections Published in London [1710-1797]; 4) Author-Publisher Copyright Transfer Agreements in the Upcott Collection; 5) The Publication Order of Bell's British Theatre, 1791-97; bibliography [primary, secondary]; 115 illustrations; general and author-title indices; 36 tables. ISBN: 978-0-7123-5773-9. Cloth, £50; $85.

This truly excellent book, written by the two foremost living scholars of Restoration and eighteenth-century theatre and opera, is a much-expanded version of their prestigious 2011 Panizzi Lectures given at the British Museum. (Live podcasts of the three lectures are available at the BL website: https://soundcloud.com/the-british-library/money-and-readers.)

In 1927 Evelyn May Albright brought out a study of London plays published between 1580 and 1640, yet until now nothing of its kind has ever been attempted for the Restoration and eighteenth century. Milhous and Hume have undertaken this task for the later periods and the result is an exemplary model of clearly presented, rigorously meticulous scholarship, compiling and analyzing as it does massive amounts of previously inaccessible archival material and empirical data pertaining to London playbooks, made possible by deep mining of the ESTC, EEBO, and ECCO, among many other sources. With characteristic modesty, the authors do not mention the substantial amount of time and effort expended in researching and analyzing the data that went into this book, explaining in the Epilogue, that their book of some 500 pages "is dense, detailed, highly particular, and quantified." That is a considerable understatement, and, accordingly, this review can only touch upon the breadth and depth of its contents and can discuss a mere handful of its many important findings.

Another point that must be stressed is that while the authors imply that they have confined their analysis to the approximately 2,300 known titles of plays that were performed in the professional theatres in London during the period (some 1,530 of which–66%,–they estimate, were published), this book serves also as a broad study of dozens of congruent aspects of the London theatre world between 1660 and 1800, and, in its entirety, constitutes an essential resource for anyone attempting to understand the field of Restoration and eighteenth-century London theatre. Scholars will benefit, too, from the authors' pointing out along the way particular areas of research that need to done in this field.

To summarize from the book, the authors pose—and answer—eight crucial questions in the differing realms of playwrights, publishers, and readers: 1. Who published plays? 2. What was the cost of publication, the risk, and the potential profit? 3. What did single plays cost, and what did play collections cost? 4. What was the buying power of those prices, and who could afford to make such purchases? 5. How much market existed for used copies and at what prices? 6. What did playwrights earn from publication, and how important was it to their income? 7. What was the commercial logic of various sorts of collections, including both "collected work" of particular authors and omnium

gatherum series of titles by divers hands? 8. What was the function of illustrations in published plays, and what can we learn from such illustrations?

Following a brief Preface, the work is organized into a Prologue, three Parts, an Epilogue, and five Appendixes. The book is interspersed with over 130 illustrations (most full-page) and 36 statistical tables. The Prologue offers a synthesis of scholarship about play publication before 1660 that serves as a useful summary and critique of the major hypotheses about the publication process of Renaissance drama, including, of course, Shakespeare. Here, too, the authors pose a series of important questions about the approximately 829 new plays known to have been staged in London during that era. They are particularly interested in learning why relatively few of these plays were published (411 or 49.5%) and in whether or not the theatre companies tried to prevent publication in the early seventeenth-century. They conclude that prior to 1642 "theatre companies controlled publication rights" and jealously guarded their theatrical property, but that a major change took place after the interregnum.

Part I, which explores the publication of new plays after 1660, is divided into two chapters: the Age of the Quarto, 1660–1715, and the Era of Octavo and Duodecimo, 1715–1800. The authors discover that between 1670 and 1713 almost all professionally produced new plays published in London appeared in quarto. Post-1718, however, a "format revolution" occurred with a shift to octavo and, later, and to a lesser extent, duodecimo. In chapter one they, first, bring to bear their comprehensive examination of hundreds of surviving playbooks to describe what the purchaser might expect to find, including a frontispiece, title page, dedication, Preface, list of Dramatis Personae, advertisements, prologue and epilogue (many of these components were optional) as well as the play text, divided into acts and scenes and appendixes of songs. Illustrations were extremely rare at that time.

The second part of chapter one describes the "stunning" change that occurred between the 1630s and 1660s in regard to performance and publication rights of plays. Prior to the closing of the London theatres in 1642 "theatre companies normally controlled the performance and publication of plays," after 1660 the playwright was free to sell the script of his or her play to whomever they chose, "a truly radical reversal of established practice." This change was due, at least in part, to the increased concern for originality in plays giving the playwrights some "literary reputation." At the same time, theatre managements shifted the risk of publication success from themselves to the playwright. In the long run the result was a boon for playwrights.

In section 2 the authors attempt to untangle the vexed history of publication rights and "play right" and discover a "truly weird" occurrence previously unnoticed. When the King's Company collapsed in 1682, the United Company held a theatrical monopoly for ten years until an actors' rebellion lead to the opening in 1695 of the Lincoln's Inn Fields venue operating under a license from the Lord Chamberlain. Remarkably, the company began staging *any* pre-1695 play they cared to perform. The United Company undoubtedly complained, but their objections were ignored with the result that after 1695 performance rights had "no legal standing."

Section 3 discusses the importance of the involvement of playwrights with publication and provides a detailed examination of the contemporary publication

process itself. The authors conclude that "in a very high percentage of cases, the playwright did have some direct involvement in the publication of the first edition" but cared little thereafter. Of particular interest here is the correction by Milhous and Hume of the erroneous generalization made by the authors of *The London Stage* that plays were usually published a mere two months after performance. They find after closer study that the time lapse changed a lot: from one year in 1670 to as little as a few weeks by the end of the century.

Section 4 deals with the nitty-gritty of the business of play publication from the publishers' perspective and addresses the questions of who published plays and what plays got published? how much did playbooks cost and what were the potential profits? how were playbooks advertised? and, finally, how important were false imprints, piracy, and forgery to the business of play publishing? The authors are the first scholars to systematically review and analyze the outputs of publishers of plays in the long eighteenth century. Much of this information is conveniently assembled for the reader in Appendix I: Copyright Payments for Plays, which, in addition to a list of publishers, also provides the names of authors and plays, agreement dates and amounts of payment. They observe that in the 1660 there was "almost zero interest" in publishing new plays although interest picked up substantially toward the end of the century. There follows a section presenting the shop locations of the various bookseller/publishers. Most of the important publishers of plays had their business in Fleet Street and the authors conclude that location and contiguity were "extremely important," particularly when it came to collaborative publication of plays. This fact has previously escaped scholarly attention and the book quantifies this data in a very handy table.

Chapter 2: The Era of Octavo and Duodecimo, 1715–1800, examines the many changes, even "revolutions," that took place in playbook publication during that period. I have already alluded to the "format revolution" that began around 1715. The authors attempt to explain why the quarto was dethroned and why it happened so quickly. Their explanation or "guess," as they call it, is the increase in illegal competition from the Continent by publishers, such as T. Johnson of the Hague, who began producing cheap and popular octavo and duodecimo editions. London publishers quickly recognized "the elegance and efficiency of the format" and decided the octavo was the wave of the future.

Chapter 2 goes on to analyze the great importance of both the Copyright Act of 1710 and the Licensing Act of 1737 on play publication. The Copyright Act was an irrelevancy to playwrights since they had much earlier sold *de facto* perpetual copyright to publishers. From the publishers' perspective it was a boon since it slowed, but by no means stopped, the importation of books from the Continent. The Act did not apply to Ireland, and here Milhous and Hume ponder explanations for why it did not and wonder what "reason of logic or oversight" led to Ireland's not being included in the Act. The answer to their query is fairly simple: although the British parliament prior to the Act of Union in 1800 sometimes claimed to be able to legislate for Ireland, in practice, Ireland had its own laws made by its own Parliament that jealously defended its legislative "autonomy." The British Parliament in London could not impose the Copyright Act on Ireland, although it could, and did, prohibit the importation into Britain of Irish-printed books, with limited success.

Since, as the authors admit, the Licensing Act had "no direct impact on the publication of playscripts," the section discussing Walpole's Licensing Act of 1737 is a brief digression from their central subject. It is, nevertheless, a very useful, concise synthesis of the impacts that the law had on English-language theatre thereafter.

The third section of Chapter 2 presents a detailed analysis of the business of publishing 1715–1800. The "modus operandi of publishers of new plays remained relatively constant": booksellers bought perpetual copyright from the authors for a single cash payment (five times what had been paid at the beginning of the century). The texts were mostly careless and "almost invariably octavo," and beyond that, design was seldom an issue. Advertising of playbooks in newspapers became an increasingly important sales strategy, and reprinting of extensive series of older plays also became an important part of the business.

Who were the bookseller-publishers? The authors present a close study of the publication data to answer the question. Of the roughly 160 London firms that printed books during this era only fourteen printed significant numbers of new plays (detailed in Table 2.2). Even for these, publication of plays constituted only a small, niche market. A different group of publishers were important to the publication of reprints and series of older plays.

The chapter goes on to discuss the locations of these printing houses; prices and sizes of print runs; self-publication and cost implications of same; advertising, publicity, and dissemination of texts in the theatres; imports, piracies, and forgeries; and, finally, the changing theatre sizes and their impact on plays. The authors conclude that in the period 1590–1715 the "heavily anonymous and collaborative entertainment evolved rapidly into much more seriously 'literary' enterprises increasingly attributed to a single author who sought recognition of literary merit." On the other hand, from 1715–1800 "there is a major decline in the aesthetic and intellectual ambitions of playwrights." On the whole, "English drama declined seriously after 1737, as the playwrights aimed at popular appeal for commercial theatres increasingly dependent on an audience of 'the middling sort' to keep them solvent."

Part II of the book deals with the detailed examination of the "Financial Contexts" of play publication. To answer such questions as "who bought playbooks?" the authors assert in Chapter 3 that it is, first, necessary to answer the concomitant questions: "who could afford to buy playbooks?" and "what was the value of money anyway?" The answers to these notoriously difficult questions result in a very useful and convincing study of household economics during the era. The authors conclude that the average household income of all families in England and Wales was only about £47 and that even at £400 per annum "there would have been little to spare for books in most households." Refusing to go out too far on any "hypothetical limbs," they conclude that only about 3% of the population (10,000-15,000 families) could indulge in any "cultural expenditure" in 1760 and this would probably constitute the bookbuying public, at least at that time.

Chapter 4 debunks yet another long held notion of theatre scholarship: that a playwright willing to write to a formula could earn a living wage by his or her pen. Milhous and Hume state that this "is almost totally untrue." They wonder at earlier theatre historians' failure to investigate playwrights' earnings,

especially since so many full-season account books have survived for the London theatres. Basing their analysis on an assemblage of extant data about copyright payments for plays presented in Appendix I, they, first, are able to discuss the sale of copy and what it brought to playwrights in each of the eras in the study and discover a gradual increase in sale prices of mainpieces from £5 to £10 in the Carolean era to about £111 in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Afterpieces tended to fetch much less. Playwrights could also derive some money from writing dedications to important wealthy personages: 20 guineas on average. Benefit performances were also an important source of income, although self-publication was certainly less so.

By the 1760s theatres were beginning to stage an increasing number of new plays and a very few prolific playwrights probably did "make a passably steady living at the patent theatres," chief among these Isaac Bickerstaff (21 plays), John O'Keeffe, Elizabeth Inchbald, Frederick Reynolds, and Prince Hoare. Hume and Milhous conclude that successful playwrights earned about £150 from a successful mainpiece between 1714–37 and £400 by the 1790s. "With a bit of luck, an eighteenth-century writer might make quite a lot of money from a particular play, but basically what one could *not* earn from playwriting was a living."

Part III of *The Publication of Plays in London 1660–1800* discusses the importance of catalogues, reprints, collections and illustrations. These "undeservedly neglected subjects" are essential supplements to the first-edition data presented by the ESTC (described by the authors as "dodgy at best"). The section presents a useful chronological catalog of important playlists and ends with the observation that "No descriptive bibliography of post-1660 English drama has ever been compiled and published."

The section dealing with "singleton reprints" centers around an extremely useful analysis of editions of new plays and reprints, 1660–1800, which is presented in a table. Their conclusions are striking: nearly half of all new plays were never reprinted; of those reprinted, 60% did not see a third edition; of those reprinted more than three times only 20% went to five editions; and the chance of a play running to fifteen editions was only about 7%. Table 5.2 correlates the number of printings with current critical evaluation of the works and finds the results "decidedly erratic." To cite but one example, while Gay's *The Beggar's Opera* with 62 printings was the most popular play of the eighteenth century and continues to be the object of much scholarly attention, Lillo's *The London Merchant*, with 61 printings, is not studied much today.

The section on collections of plays by individual authors assembles the statistics for the frequency of printings of such collections, again, with some surprising results. Samuel Foote's farces were the most reprinted collections (18 printings), followed closely by Sir Richard Steele (17), and James Thomson (15). Another very welcome addition to dramatic scholarship that this book offers is the authors' lengthy study of the collected editions of Shakespeare's works with the aims of reporting facts, problems, and puzzles so as to explain how the publication of Shakespeare "fits in the larger context of publication of plays in our period."

One conclusion that Milhous and Hume reach in Chapter 5 is that adding illustrations to collected editions gave an extra incentive to buyers. This is fleshed out in scrupulous detail in Chapter 6, an 86-page, richly-illustrated

analysis of playbook prints in eighteenth-century London. The chapter begins with an historical overview of the relatively rare appearance of illustrations in late-seventeenth and early eighteenth-century playbooks. These were marked by weak artwork containing idealized characters, not living actors, and were featured in the collections of a few printers. With the advent of John Bell's collections of *Shakespeare* and *Bell's British Theatre, 1776–78*, play illustration went in new directions. Contrary to previous scholarly opinion, the authors observe that "actors were carefully matched to their assignments and were mostly drawn from the life." The authors go on to examine the origins of this phenomenon and the ways that other of Bell's rivals began to imitate him. Bell's portraits and those of his competitors "have much to tell theatre historians."

The book ends with five appendixes, primary and secondary bibliographies, a general index, and an author-title index to Appendixes III and IV. Specifically, Appendix I, mentioned several times earlier, catalogs all known payments to authors for publication rights to their plays, including the agreement dates, names of publishers, and amount of payments, among other things. Appendix II lists all of the plays included in the major multi-author collections published in London by T. Johnson and John Bell. Appendix III reprints publisher Bernard Lintott's copyright transfer agreements as reported by John Nicols in *Literary Anecdotes* in 1812–15, long out of print. Appendix IV presents, again, for ease of reference, the author-publisher copyright transfer agreements in the Upcott collection in the British Library. Finally, Appendix V undertakes the daunting bibliographical task of rationalizing the publication order of John Bell's *British Theatre, 1791–97.*

Finally, the book was free of typographical errors, misspellings, formatting errors, or other mechanical errors in the text, its appendixes, tables, footnotes, bibliographies, or indexes—a tribute to the care and attention given to the editing and printing of this handsome, sturdily bound book.

John C. Greene
University of Louisiana--Lafayette

Cedric D. Reverand, II (editor). *Queen Anne and the Arts*. (Transits: Literature, Thought, & Culture, 1650-1850.) Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press; Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015. Pp. xxiii + 320. ISBN: 978-1-61148-631-5; Hardcover, $100.

In the edited collection, *Queen Anne and the Arts*, the thirteen contributors approach the environment of artistic production both directly and indirectly under the larger umbrella of the reign of Anne (1702-1714). Designed by Cedric Reverand II, the volume provides analysis of plays, operas, architecture, painting, collectibles and decorative arts, and high and low literatures as evidence that the Queen was more than the sum of the unflattering parts with which she has been associated by historians and other cultural commentators. The essayists are well qualified to assess the arts in the reign of Queen Anne and include EC-ASECS members as well as international scholars.

That Anne valued creativity is evidenced in her own story- she played the guitar, took singing lessons, patronized church musicians, and had a sense of gravitas when it came to the tone she expected artists to set. While she seemed to have favored plays, her health kept her from attending the public stages. Given that the life of Anne is circumscribed and well known, Reverand gave his essayists good guidance, and he exercised good judgment in reducing the repetitiveness that could have been in a volume such as this. Authors here do not feel compelled to rewrite Anne into the artistic subject matter of their work. They also avoid the desire to problematize Anne or the nature of creative productive, focusing instead on explications of familiar and unfamiliar creative works produced in her time on the throne. This effectively integrates the essays on the visual arts and architecture better, for instance, as the point of the book seems to be that Anne had an influence on artistic and material culture that has been largely overlooked.

As a whole, this is a book about noticing where Anne or the events that surrounded her reign could have been felt within the fine arts, material culture, and in physical culture. Thus, the essayists tend to avoid the obvious in subject selection and in interpretation and call our attention to things we might otherwise miss. In fact, they make Anne and her artists into a sort of flash mob as readers can gather and gaze upon the forms of entertainment her reign proffered. For example, Kevin Cope asks why the interest in fruit in painting and writing? His analysis constructs a cornucopia of writing about apples, grapes and orangeries as he speculates on the draw of these to painters and writers. Barbara Benedict takes a close look at coin art and coin collecting as evidence of the ownership expedience for beautiful things across economic strata and suggests that such acts of collection formed a community of commonality between monarch and people. Just as plays and operas brought diverse groups of people together to be entertained, so to did readers of literary miscellanies, passersby of Hawkesmoor's architecture, and worshippers have the opportunity to experience a unified voice in artist production in the early years of the eighteenth century.

The collection of thirteen pieces opens strongly with the work of James Anderson Winn in which he examines Anne's engagements with poetry, painting, music and essentially all forms of creative expression be they material as in architecture or through the presentation of ideas in the form of great sermons. The keystones he establishes both generally and specifically introduce the subjects of the book as a whole and provide a solid synthesis as well as overview of the content to come. Winn is followed by Nicholas Seager on Defoe and his representation of the Queen in his pamphlets, noting that the author "perpetuates the maudlin and sentimental image of Anne" (54) in a manner that allowed him to judge her efforts from the lens of management of political controversies in which he was also engaged. Similarly, Juan Christian Pellicer examines patronage to poets as a sign that, like Defoe, "poets tended to appropriate her figure so as to indicate their own political allegiances" (60) while promoting their own careers as writers, of course. Expanding on this theme, Philip Smallwood considers first the implication of George Gordon, Lord Byron, having labeled Alexander Pope as the Queen's own "little man," and what light Pope sheds on his relationship to the Queen and her court in his poem, *January and May* both in contemporaneous times and afterwards.

Through a clever series of linkages, Smallwood is able to join Chaucer, Pope, and Byron in an extended dialog about the implications of patronage and its interrelated transparency among readers. A different synthesis is provided by Abigail Williams in her sweeping and useful examination of literary anthologies and the marketplace for such books. Her investigation found the extent to which Restoration poetry remained before the public in these anthologies, and she is also able to chart the development of the political arguments and debates, this time from the lens of history as the political poems found in the anthologies built out for Charles II's reign and even earlier, as Jacob Tonson, for instance, as a publisher and bookseller would use his extensive inventory of copies to make new works from both old and new poetry. Reading the anthologies produced in Anne's era as a literary critic and literary historian, Williams is able to find evidence of the "staging of debates about the nature of the modern verse" which would be useful to the Wartons' when they began the active pursuit of literary theory through the use of anthology later in the century.

Taking a cue from staging, Julia Fawcett offers a delightful reading of Nicholas Rowe's "The Fair Penitent" and makes a clear connection with Queen Anne "as an important focal point for considering personal space" (p. 136) which leads to a fresh reading of the relationship between private bodies, public places, and urban development. This is followed by Brian Corman's thoughtful examination of the work of George Farquhar as he questions what the space for comedy was in a reign that emphasized more sobriety in real life and satire in aesthetic life. Corman provides a useful table of plays by annual season of the Queen's reign and a lengthy appendix of new comedies produced between 1702 and 1714. While he touches on her role in comparison to Farquhar's, I would have liked to have seen more done with the work of Centlivre, who had the highest number of comedies in the period.

Jayne Lewis opens a new section in the study of Anne's influence on the arts with her study of how Isaac Watts used his writing to subtly address Anne's sick body through his many literary allusions in his hymns and sermons. The value of the works by Fawcett, Corman, and Lewis which leads into the study of George Granville's *The British Enchantress; or, No Magick (sic) like Love* (1706) by Amanda Eubanks Winkler is that Reverand encouraged writers to pursue lesser known works that are truly as representative of Anne's interests in all forms of monetized creativity and these essayists' contributions compare well to those on the better known Defoe and Pope. Like Winn's essay, Winkler's has links to an audio file, so readers can hear what Anne's audiences heard and really appreciate the sound of music in her era. Rounding out the volume are Estelle Murphy's excellent essay on Queen Anne in the court ode, " 'Sing Great Anne's Matchless Name'" which studies images of the queen as mother, and Murphy shows how the depiction of Anne in these sung odes gave her a powerful body which was essential to her image as Queen, even if she was not as healthy in real life. The final essay, by the editor Reverand, is an illustrated examination of the churches and church architecture built during Anne's time by Nicholas Hawkesmoor, whose main role within the context of this volume was to execute The Fifty Church Act of 1711, "the most important architectural program of Queen's Anne reign(249)." Reverand is to be commended for his eye for detail both as architectural historian and as the architect of the

illumination of Anne as patroness of the arts in all its various angles, reflections, and voices.

What constitutes the vision of Anne in the diverting arts? What might the various works studied in this volume tell us about her thoughts on creativity, and how through patronage and other forms of support, she monetized the kind of artistic works and entertainment that formed her aesthetic? And, how did the artists who pursued creative works perceive their monarch? These, the artists and the Queen, were equal, if perhaps silent or unknowing partners in the same enterprise- to celebrate the glories of Britannia through multiple infusions of shared values and belief systems. In other words, this collection of essays helps us see the constructs that Anne and her artistic community shared in the representation of the finest of British creativity to the world at large.

Beverly Schneller
Belmont University, Nashville, TN

Courtney Weiss Smith. ***Empiricist Devotions: Science, Religion, and Poetry in Early Eighteenth-Century England*****.** (Winner of the "Walker Cowen Memorial Prize for an Outstanding Work of Scholarship in Eighteenth-Century Studies.") Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2016. Pp. vii + 279; bibliography; notes; index. ISBN: 978-0-8139-3838-7. Hardcover, $45. Kindle edition available for $35.49 from Amazon.

As a graduate student, I fell in love with the eighteenth century because its orderly couplets seemed to provide an escape from my own twentieth (and now twenty first)-century messiness. Of course, I quickly discovered how unruly even the most elegant couplets can be—and how much ambiguity exists in the century's concepts of issues including but certainly not limited to literary genres, the sciences, linguistics/lexicography, gender and sexuality, and political discourse. One of the texts that transformed my critical approach to eighteenth-century studies was Ann B. Shteir's *Cultivating Women, Cultivating Science: Flora's Daughters and Botany in England, 1760-1860* (1996), and I was reminded of this book as I read Courtney Weiss Smith's thoroughly engaging study *Empiricist Devotions*, a book that is sure to engender new approaches to interpreting and teaching eighteenth-century poetry.

It is almost jarring in our political context to remember how intimately linked religion and science were during the eighteenth century, and Weiss Smith's introduction immediately draws attention to this with her description of Robert Boyle: "He was an air-pump experimenter, gentleman chemist, and early Royal Society member. He was also a believer. Boyle believed in God" (1). Throughout *Empiricist Devotions*, Weiss Smith underlines the ways in which "empiricism was pursued by natural philosophers, Christian mediators, and poets alike" in their writing, especially through figurative language (2-3). The writers in the tradition Weiss Smith examines seek instruction from nature: they believed that truth existed in it and could be rendered intelligible through observation and description. In her examination of what this meant for literature

of the period, Weiss Smith reviews scholarship that has helped dismantle the anachronistic privileging of science's influence on literature, such as Tita Chico's critique of R. F. Jones and Ian Watt, as well as much of the scholarship based on their theories. Weiss Smith builds on and complicates Chica's observations, using John Bender and Michael Marrinan's *Culture of Diagram* and others to emphasize a less linear understanding of the relationships between scientific, devotional, and poetic language.

Weiss Smith's book has lofty aims. She asks her readers to rethink "the stories we tell about early eighteenth-century England," and she provides compelling arguments that promote radical challenges to assumptions I have started to realize I never had examined before reading *Empiricist Devotions* about the "complex interactions across cultural realms" (13). She also breaks down the "usual story" of science's impact on language (14), "troubles some influential tenets of modernization narratives," and valuably reminds her readers that underneath "big graceful stories" about the emergence of modernity oversimplify history and rely on an "autonomous, rational subject" that is a fiction we've created (19). Weiss Smith instead "features pious empiricists who cultivated human passivity, affirmed nature's rich relevance, and trusted in figurative language's instrumentality" (20).

Empiricist Devotions is laid out in such a way that Weiss Smith first defines occasional meditation as an "empirical-devotional mode," then turns to large issues including Newtonianism, economics, social contract theory, and the georgic. At times, the phrase "meditative empiricism" seems slightly jargon, but for the most part, this is an accessible and elegantly-written analysis of texts and contexts. Weiss Smith approaches her subject with an expansive grasp of science, philosophy, politics, and poetry while never losing her eye for detail. Her juxtaposition of Alexander Pope and Daniel Defoe was, for me, perhaps the most immediately usable because of how she "upset usual ways of thinking about materiality and modernity" in her analysis of how meditative empiricism crossed party lines. Her analysis of metaphors related to money in Charles Gildon and Joseph Addison's writings also spotlighted interesting ways in which meditative empiricism played a role in making money matter—a process in which objects acquired meaning without the "problematic but necessary meditations of human agency" (139).

With *Empiricist Devotions*, Weiss Smith has recovered not a text or author but a mindset, which makes the book an invaluable addition to scholarship. Her systematic demonstration of how literary language shaped science and religion unworks established ideas about the primacy of science and religion in Enlightenment discourses, and her conclusion encourages scholars to take her model, in which "formal density corresponds with the nature of the world as understood by many of the period's writers" (208), and reexamining meditative empiricism's "cultural influence" on later texts.

Emily Bowles
Fox Valley Technical College

Dwight Codr. ***Raving at Usurers: Anti-Finance and the Ethics of Uncertainty in England, 1690-1750.*** Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2016. Pp xiv + 247; bibliography; index. ISBN 978-0-8139-3780-9. Hardcover: $39.50.

This book sets out to correct two widespread views about the word "usury": first, that "usury" refers exclusively to the taking of excessive interest, or even interest *tout court*, on a loan; and second, that "usury" is a term, like "witchcraft" or "divine right of kings," of strictly historical signification, naming something in which belief declines sharply after about 1700. In fact, Codr argues, "usury" has a wider second sense, that of a guaranteed, risk-free return on a loan or any other investment. And far from being a relic of scholasticism that disappears with the Reformation, this broader sense of usury remains a salient part of English moral thought deep into the eighteenth century, one that helps determine the course of economic history. Were a pious turn-of-the-eighteenth-century merchant such as Samuel Jeake (whose diary Codr discusses in his second chapter) transported to our time, he would decry as usury not only the interest on payday loans and rent-to-own appliances but also the profits of too-big-to-fail-banks and the management fees charged by hedge funds. Moreover, such a time-traveling Puritan would recognize in our stock markets and lotteries the successors of financial technologies that originally worked to assuage anxieties about usury. Even as the word has largely disappeared from our discourse, replaced in its two senses by "predatory lending" and "privatized profit, socialized risk," the ideas it represents continue to influence our economic institutions and thought.

Codr's fundamental claim is that the Protestant critique of usury was not that it caused supposedly barren metal to multiply—an Aristotelian-scholastic argument that was little better than a straw man by the seventeenth century—but rather that it impiously sought a guaranteed and determinate future rather than trusting in the providence of God. The key Biblical text is not the Old Testament prohibition of *neshek*, or interest, but Jesus's words in Luke 6:35: "You must love your enemies and do good, and lend without expecting any return; and you will have a rich reward." To expect a return, to secure the future against the unexpected will of God, was the "fundamental crime" of the usurer (71). Codr wittily plays on the etymological origins of "finance" in *finer*, to finish, to describe this Christian openness to the future as "anti-finance."

The four chapters of *Raving at Usurers* trace the implications of this rediscovered meaning of usury from the 1690s to the 1740s. The first chapter raises from the oubliette of history a London clergyman named David Jones (despite the name, the ODNB records that he was Welsh), who, expelled from a Lombard Street church in the center of London's financial district, shook the dust from his sandals with an incendiary sermon against usury. Jones illustrates that in the very decade that P.G.M. Dickson and other scholars have identified as the cradle of England's financial revolution, usury remained a contentious theological and moral topic. Codr's second chapter retells the wider story of that revolution, arguing that the Bank of England, the Lottery, and other innovations in public finance democratized risk, allowing even humble Britons to entrust their resources to God's providence through uncertain but potentially lucrative investments. The diary of the aforementioned Samuel Jeake shows how this

language of providence, far from being a superficial pious formula, deeply informed the economic behavior of merchants in Williamite England.

The second half of Codr's study applies his framework to two canonical English authors, Defoe and Fielding. Defoe's *Essay Upon Projects* (1694) reclaims the figure of the projector from its negative connotations by describing Noah's ark as a pious project, a collaboration between the world's first shipwright and his God. Ingeniously synthesizing two longstanding strands of *Robinson Crusoe* scholarship, Crusoe-as-*homo economicus* and Crusoe-as-pilgrim, Codr argues that Defoe's mythic novel is a case study in anti-financial Protestantism, showing a hero who is saved and enriched because he refuses the comfortable life of an English merchant. Yet this message must be esoteric; *Crusoe* is unable to articulate its soteriology lest it presumptuously delimit, and thus denude of risk, the nature of its hero's salvation.

The introduction and first three chapters of *Raving at Usurers* emphasize the religious foundations of anti-financial thinking, and caution against facile secular understandings of seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century economic and moral thought. Codr's final chapter turns to a reading of anti-finance as a secular presence in the mid-eighteenth century, examining the role of the gift in *The Modern Husband* and analyzing at length the role of prudence in *Tom Jones*. By describing Tom as learning "prudence" at the end of a narrative in which his imprudent but hearty goodness has won him his beloved Sophia and revealed his highborn lineage, Fielding critiques the Christian paradox of the unconscious giver who is rewarded because he does not expect a reward.

Raving at Usurers makes a sequence of bold, revisionist claims, enriching our scholarly sense of the period and inviting further research. Indeed, some of his boldest arguments will benefit from further investigation: though the example of Jeake is suggestive, Codr's intriguing theory of an "anti-financial" revolution of pious investors eager to embrace risk in order to show trust in God is itself speculative. And in a few places, the book's readings come across as strained: I rather doubt that John Ruskin was thinking of Robinson Crusoe's soldier brother when he wrote *Unto this Last*, for instance. Nevertheless, this book is a strong and timely contribution to several contemporary critical currents, in dialogue both with recent revisionist economic history and with postsecular literary scholarship. As such it deserves to be read alongside such recent books as Christine Desan's *Making Money* (2015) and Courtney Weiss Smith's *Empiricist Devotions* (2016) by all scholars of the early eighteenth century intent on reconsidering familiar stories about the rise of capitalism and the emergence of secular modernity.

Jacob Sider Jost
Dickinson College

Brijraj Singh. *Professing English on Two Continents*. Gurgaon, Haryana, India: Zorba Books, 2016. Pp. 210. ISBN: 978-93-85020-62-9. Available as an e-book for $5 from Zorba (also available as download on Amazon.)

This past summer Brijraj Singh published a memoir reflecting on his experiences "Professing English" for two decades in India and for longer still in

the United States. It was an enjoyable introduction for me to reading on a kindle, but the publisher has now released the book in paper copies. The memoir was drafted about nine years ago (how Horatian!) and, finding it satisfactory after a long separation, the author decided to share it with others. (I'm going to presumptuously call the author "Brij," for that is his name for many or perhaps most of those reading this account of the book.) When Brij wrote in mid July about its publication, he offered this summary: "It talks about my experiences of teaching at the college and university level both in India and here, the different types of students I had and their vastly different cultural and other contexts, and how I had constantly to devise different methods to profess the subject effectively. In the process I developed a set of values and a vision of life which then fed into my teaching. So, the book is about what I tried to do as a teacher of English, and what the teaching of English taught me about teaching and about living." Western readers will be introduced to much outside their range, as Brij shares his experiences teaching in India, first, when almost 20 years old, at his alma mater, St. John's College in Agra, then at St. Stephen's College in Delhi, at North-Eastern Hill University in Shillong, and at Delhi University. Between these experiences Brij's own formal education went forward, with a Rhodes scholarship to Lincoln College, Oxford, and then a Fulbright fellowship to Yale, where, under the direction of Richard Ellmann, Brij wrote his Ph.D. dissertation on "The Concepts of Art, Life, and Morality in the Criticism of Five Authors from Pater to Yeats"--and where he met his future wife, Frances, then finishing a Ph.D. in medieval literature. Those dissertations must have been rarely put to use when they taught students at a new college in Shillong without much on its shelves and with a service population of tribal people suffering from drought and subject to small pox. Most will also find foreign challenges encountered while teaching at City University of New York's Hostos Community College in The Bronx. But all faculty, certainly all humanities faculty, will find much that is also familiar and useful to them--the book might be styled more generally as "professing the humanities.

Brij has worked across boundaries until they disappeared--language, regional, national, religious, and disciplinary boundaries. From his youth, Brij perceived literature and its study as a way of engaging and transforming the world. He associated the study of English literature with becoming a modern, liberal, democratic progressive, the sort of person that India needed. He received an English education in India, England, and America (including degrees from Oxford and then Yale), and he taught diverse student populations in both metropolitan and provincial India, and then another equally diverse community at Hostos, where most students are Hispanic and many are African-Americans, some from the Caribbean. At Hostos he belonged to a faculty that resembled the United Nations. When Brij and his wife Frances left Delhi University, where they taught advanced academic classes to bright and relatively gifted students, to teach at Hostos in the Bronx, their shock must have been immense. Hostos had an exit writing test for its remediation classes, and many of its students were in the fullest sense speakers of English as a second language, taking the course repeatedly while living with non-English speaking family and struggling with great economic and often legal pressures--they sorely needed help, especially to achieve literacy. Brij took to reading composition journals and trying to integrate ideas there with literary theory and his

experiences teaching for two decades in India. He was intent on making two ears of corn grow where one had before. In the memoir, Brij never grumbles about a big division between his classroom teaching, much of it lower-level composition and much of that ESL, and his scholarship. Nor about service and administrative work that took up a lot of time that might have been spent on individual scholarly pursuits. His scholarship, pedagogy, and service simply expanded and evolved to integrate new cultures and challenges. His scholarship became more historical (and EC/ASECS played a role in that), and his research more directly concerned engagements between cultures--not only because he worked on early Europeans in India, like Thomas Stephens and Bartholomaeus Ziegenbalg, but because English studies has always had to relate to his life and to the lives of his students, thus being above all a humanities education. As he came to understand his interests and gain the freedom to follow them, his work "tended more and more to emphasize points of confluence and convergence rather than points of contention." And that intellectual outlook is inseparable from the seminar focus of his education from his college education in India right through the seminars he led in India and lastly in New York for tenure-track humanities faculty at CUNY. To my mind, that clubbable sociability must have inclined him to find a home in 18th-century studies.

One of many instructive and profitable sections of his memoir (in the chapter "Two Ears of Corn") describes his participation from 2006, upon his retirement, through 2012, in CUNY's Faculty Fellowships Publication Program, Originally "set up to help minority faculty in CUNY obtain Ph.D. degrees," by 2006 it was assisting them in achieving tenure and growing as professors. Each year Brij selected six applicants to the program for seminars meeting twice a month from January to May, with each participant submitting two draft essays or chapters for discussion by the group (Brij contributed his own papers to this review, too). The faculty from diverse disciplines critiqued the papers of their peer, who sat and listened without defending his or her work, and then in a second round submitted a revision of that work or another work for review. These seminars were right in line with the seminar education that Brij had received and practiced at St. Stephen's College in Delhi University, at other Indian colleges, and at Oxford, Yale, CUNY, and the Folger. The mentoring sessions were inherently interdisciplinary exchanges, forcing faculty to see beyond their specialties and building friendships between people in different disciplines and CUNY colleges--and they led to tenure, publications, and pedagogical practices enriching CUNY for decades.

In reflecting on his other educational experiences, Brij offers practical advice about curriculum and methods in composition and literature courses, testing, faculty governance, and much else that will be of universal interest to those professing English. The old mentor has shared a number of best practices with us--and shown enough complicity in unsuccessful efforts that readers will not be inclined to push back in envy. But besides homily there is also much epideictic rhetoric directed at the profession, building to a stirring climax in the penultimate chapter, encouraging his band of humanist sisters and brothers to fight the good fight in the classroom. Many a high school as well as college teachers working in the humanities can identify with Brij Singh and take some satisfaction in his choric voicing of our beliefs--even if we wish we could have been the one to voice our credo so well.

Professing English on Two Continents concludes with some hopeful observations about changes in English studies in India (in many respects due to the internet) and with some frank analysis of threats to English studies in the United States. The book has the clarity, grace, good humor, and humanity that we have come to expect from Brij after having enjoyed so many of his papers at our scholarly conferences (including his 2001 EC/ASECS presidential address) and his many books and articles--particularly his contributions to the *Intelligencer*.--Jim May

Some Comparative Remarks on Wing and ESTC Catalogues

Many antiquarian booksellers identify Restoration items with only a record number in the Wing *Short Title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700*, failing to cite the ESTC, which many academics might suppose has replaced the Wing catalogue in general practice. For some years now freely available on the WWW, the ESTC contains a fuller listing of copy locations, which might make some dealers shy from citing it. Although some Wing records are missing from the ESTC and the ESTC imported some transcription errors in Wing records (such as an individual's initial letter), the ESTC has long been correcting errors in Wing. Most importantly, ESTC provides essential pagination totals absent in Wing, and it usually expands the imprints, such as for R177086, Robert Fitzgerald's *Salt Water Sweetned . . .* (D[ublin]: "Joseph Ray, 1683"), where ESTC adds to Wing's F1088 entry the seller's name: "for William Norman (in Dames-street) bookbinder to his Grace the Duke of Ormond." Moreover, the ESTC has added hundreds of editions in 1660-1700 to the record in the CD-ROM 1996 edition of Wing (the ESTC's usual reference). If you search in ESTC 1660-1700 for the exact phrase "not in Wing," you'll get 1682 hits. Also, if you search the exact phrases "Wing wrongly," "Wing mistakenly," and "Wing omits," you'll get respectively 30, 10, and 5 hits. I recently pointed out to ESTC some conjectural dates in Wing taken over by the ESTC that could be improved after constructing a chronological sequence of the printer's or publisher's shop signs and addresses. The continued reliance on Wing by many antiquarian booksellers has led me to comparatively examine the two catalogues when rarities appear on the market. As we'll see, one regularly finds problems and gaps in one or both. I'd also demonstrate that to comparatively examine antiquarian books for sale against Wing and ESTC records reveals how and why it is very difficult to compile such bibliographical catalogues of rare, old books.

I must not overstate the superiority of ESTC: many bibliographical inquiries lead to the identification of the same editions and copies in Wing as in the ESTC. For instance, if one seeks out the single-leaf invitations to accompany corpses at funerals ("you are . . . corps"), one will get 11 hits in the ESTC for 1661-1700, the last being for John Dryden's funeral, and all are derived from Wing, where single copies are noted; the ESTC adds no new copies of any. However, the ESTC's greater chronological reach allows the discovery of the invitation to walk with "the corps of Sir Isaac Newton" at 9 p.m. in 1727. This invitational form and tradition cannot be well described given the scanty historical evidence: 12 single-copy editions from 1661, half of them from Dublin 1683-84, in diverse formats (from oblong octavo to folio),

covering the funerals of ordinary women and great authors, scheduled from 2 to 9:00 p.m. None are on EEBO, and the Dryden, based on a photocopy c. 1930, can no longer be found at the BL. As the stability in memorial notices suggest (and other examples occur below), a great deal of unrecorded Restoration and early eighteenth-century material has *not* been appearing on the market, so much so that a few dealers once specializing in this period have shifted their focus a one and two centuries later, allowing them also to list more rare editions of women authors. (And editions that are not in Wing or in the ESTC--an example of which is given below--often stay on the market at modest prices for many years!) On the inclusive website viaLibri, using its imprint function, one cannot locate on the market imprints mentioning the Dublin printers J. Brent, J. Brocas, C. Carter, F. or E. Dickson, W. Forrest, J. or S. Harding, E. Sadleir, R. Needham, D. Thompson, J. Whalley, or W. Wilmot, and only a single book printed by T. Hume, J. Ray, E. Sandys, P. Rider & T. Harbin, and J. Watts. The noteworthy discoveries for our period are usually new editions or issues, not new works. Also, scholars assisted by better bibliographies have improved the annotations and attributions of works recorded in Wing, but all the ESTC's changes to the bibliographical record are not necessarily corrections.

A good example of attribution shifts between Wing and ESTC is provided by a book for which Blackwell's listed an unrecorded edition: *The History of the Five Wise Philosophers: or, The Wonderful Relation of the Life of Jehosaphat the Hermit Son of Avenerian King of Barma in India. The Manner of his Conversion to the Christian Life* (London: Printed for [hereafter left implicit]: Eben. Tracy, 1704), small 12mo: [*x*], 128; in modern calf ($1600 back in 2013 and now $1200). Andrew Hunter of Blackwell's writes that the title-page notes "By N. H. Gent." and that the six-page preface "To the Christian Reader" is signed "Nich. Herick, Gent."; a 2-p. advertisement follows. The title-pages of the first and second editions, 1672 and 1700 (ESTC R181567 and R221082), attribute the work to "H.P. Gent." Like Blackwell's 1704 edition, the two 1711 editions (T87901, T225915--apparently sharing title-page settings), attribute it to "N. H. Gent."; but, in that for Tracy's son, "J[ohn]. Tracy," undated but conjectured [1725?] (T87900), and in the undated, final edition for Edw. Midwinter (T91527), the attribution reverts to "by H. P., Gent." In its entry for the first edition, ESTC attributes the work to Henry Peacham (1576?-1643?), as does Wing P946, but ESTC's records for all subsequent editions assign it to "H. Parsons." Even before the attribution change to "N.H." in 1704, from the first edition on, the preface had been signed by the purported editor, "Nich. Herick, Gent.," who claims to have found by "meer accident" the text and was moved by appreciation to publish it (this is Herick's only appearance in the ESTC). That signature led to the "N.H." attribution in 1704 and 1711. Details of the first edition I owe to librarians, for, like the second, the first is not on EEBO. EEBO claims to have the Huntington copy of the first edition ("Wing P946"), but it turns out to be a mixed copy beginning with the prelims of the Midwinter edition, then the prelims of the undated "J. Tracy" edition, and then the text-setting that both appear to share. ESTC calls the Midwinter issue "A reissue of the sheets of the [1725?] edition, printed for J. Tracy, with cancel titlepage and preliminaries" and a supplemental work. Both have 84 unpaginated pages of text, and the headpiece and tailpiece designs resemble the

ornamentation style of the Tracy prelims, not that of Midwinter's, but a safe copy of the "[1725?]" edition is not digitized to confirm this.

Why did an attribution to Parsons, not Herick, replace that to Peachum? Near the date of its first publication, Henry Peacham was appearing on the title-pages of other works, his most frequently reprinted being *The Worth of a Penny, or, a Caution to Keep Money*, first printed in 1641 and reprinted ten times by 1704, when printed for M. Gunne in Dublin. Nearer to Peachum's lifetime, the title-page of *The VVorth of a Peny* (by S. Griffin, for William Lee, 1664) describes him as "Mr. of Arts, sometime of Trinity College Cambridge" (R20793). When Samuel Keble reprinted *The Worth* in 1703 and 1704, he added the further information "Author of the Complete Gentleman." The third edition of *The Compleat Gentleman* (1661) identifies him again as "Mr. of Arts, sometime of Trinity Colledge in Cambridge" (R203169, Wing P943). *The History* has contents akin to these works acknowledged as Peacham's. The ESTC's proposed author "H. Parsons" is only listed in the second edition of Wing within brackets with the reference to see Peacham, and the ESTC has no works by H. Parsons but the later reprintings of *The History of the Five Wise Philosophers*. ESTC should not identify Parsons as author of *The History*--at least it should not without evidence.

The entries for two 1711 editions of *The History* for Ebenezer Tracy are correct but require a needed comparative reference. Both are on ECCO, one at the BL with pagination as that reported for Blackwell's 1704 copy: [*x*], 128 (but a distinct setting from it), + 6 pp. of books sold by Tracy (T87901, with p. 52 as "25"); and another, sole copy at the Bodleian, with [*x*], 137, + 5-p. booklist for Tracy (T225915, with 52 as "52"). To judge from the ECCO copies, ESTC should note that they share the same setting for the first five preliminary leaves.

The ESTC's pagination for Midwinter's edition seems copy-specific (a recurrent ESTC problem), describing the unique BL copy (on ECCO): pp. [*92*]; 12, [*4*]. The additional pages reflect the accidental state of that copy, bound before a booklet for children illustrated on every page, *A Guide from the Cradle to the Grave* ("Printed in the Year DMCCXXXII" [*sic*]), 12 pp., after which is a four-page catalogue of books "formerly belonging to Ann Gifford," a widowed bookseller in the Old Bedlam, and now sold by Midwinter "at the Three Crowns and Looking-Glass in St. Paul's-Churchyard." Some of these books are recorded in the ESTC as published by Gifford, 1720-1724, who published nothing thereafter. So, Midwinter could have been selling Gifford's stock as early as 1726, and certainly the misdated *Guide* could be misdated in more ways than is apparent. The Huntington, the only other verified location for Midwinter's reissue, notes it lacks *A Guide* and the four-page catalogue. The John Carter Brown copy is unverified, and Allison Rich at the Library "cannot find a shelf list card" for the edition; furthermore, JCB's copy of *A Guide* is bound after its copy of J. Tracy [1725?]. This copy appeared double-listed in the ESTC, for the ESTC has a record for a sole copy at JCB of an edition of *The History* printed "for F. Tracy [1711]" (accession no. 29749, no. 1), bound with *A Guide* (29749, no.2), also not found by Rich at JCB. This was, until the error was reported, the only "F. Tracy" imprint in ESTC, an error transcribing the "J. Tracy" imprint; presumably a cataloger once conjectured for the undated JCB copy the year two editions were published.

What of the conjectural dates for the John Tracy and Midwinter editions? ESTC's conjectural date of "[1725?]" for Tracy's must be close, though "[c. 1724-1726]" seems safer. After Ebenezer Tracy's death c. 1717, his wife Hannah, usually as "H. Tracy," is on imprints for the Three Bibles on London Bridge from 1718-1727. John Tracy was apprenticed to his father in 1714 and freed by Hannah Clarke on 19 January 1725 (D. F. McKenzie, *Stationers' Company Apprentices 1701-1800* [1978], 353). John first appears on two imprints in 1722, one with "H. Tracy," and then he is on none until 1724. Of five Tracy imprints for 1724, two are for H. Tracy, two for J. Tracy, and one for both. Thereafter J. Tracy is only on two extant imprints, in 1725 as "J. Tracey" and 1726 as "John Tracy" (without address).

The Midwinter reissue probably received the conjectural date "[1732]" because that seemed the likely date of *A Guide* and the catalogue following it has the same address as the imprint of *The History*. But the catalogue probably was not printed or published with *The Guide*--together they make a 16-p. 12mo unit! Furthermore, the fourth and final page of catalogue describes George Fisher's *The Instructor: or, Young Man's Best Companion*, "Just publish'd" for Midwinter at the St. Paul's address, whose first edition has the imprint "for E. Midwinter, 1727." (The catchword on the third page links this page to what precedes.) The Fisher advertisement implies that the catalogue and the *Guide* are unrelated productions, that Midwinter may not have published *A Guide*, and that the catalogue and Midwinter's issue of *The History* date from 1727-1728, years better suiting Midwinter's sale of Gifford's books and Tracy's sheets of *The History* than 1732. The safest dating may be "[ca. 1730]", for publications in the ESTC only place Edward Midwinter for certain at "the Three Crowns and the Looking Glass in St. Paul's Church-Yard" in 1730-1732 (e.g., ESTC N26550)--others for this address being conjectural. D[aniel]. Midwinter was at the Three Crowns in St. Paul's for over two decades before and for years thereafter. Edward Midwinter published at the Star in Pye Corner until 1725, employing Thomas Gent, who records that Midwinter was impoverished. In 1726-1729 Edward publishes "at the Looking Glass on London Bridge," the sign and location of Thomas Norris, whose daughter Elizabeth he married as his second wife "about 1720" (Plomer, p. 205). His 1730-1732 imprints unite the sign of the London Bridge shop with D. Midwinter's "Three Crowns." No "Edw. Midwinter" imprints occur after 1732, the last possible conjectural date.

Another recent listing reveals how dating problems are aggravated by our fragile and conjectural bibliographical record. Poor Man's Books of Vineland, NJ, has listed since at least 2014 an unrecorded printing of "Mr Dod's Sayings": *The First Part of Mr Dod's Sayings*, one-page broadside, 14 x 18 inches ($2500). None of the 27 listings in ESTC for these maxims on a Christian life by Reverend John Dod (1549?-1645) has a title "The First Part," and, while many are on whole sheets for posting, most have colophons. Of the 27 recorded editions, 8 are uncertain in place and/or date, 16 exist in one copy and 4 in only two--thus, many printings have surely been lost. The oldest extant first sheet dates to 1667 (Printed by A[nne]. Maxwell), ESTC R171799 and Wing D1783; then in 1670, if not sooner, *A Second Sheet of Old Mr. Dod's Sayings* appeared, "collected by R.T." (for William Miller, 1670), which differs in often being anecdotes about Dod. The 1671 first sheet of *Old Mr. Dod's Sayings* published by A. Maxwell is on EEBO (R13671; Wing D1784); there are 42 numbered

sayings in two columns, and this group of 42 first-part sayings (understood whenever no part is designated) coheres for over a century--the first part begins and ends the same in the1786 *Dod's Sayings* printed for H. Trapp of London (N1517). The maxims begin "Nothing can hurt us but Sin; and that shall not hurt us, if we . . . "; and they conclude with no. 42: "Brown-bread with the Gospel is good Fare." Almost half the editions of Dod's sayings are printed as sheets or half-sheets, usually in two columns, but at least half are small-format pamphlets of 12-24 pp.

Poor Man's Books remarks that its edition "Appears to be late 1660's but no later than 1700 . . . picturing Dod, [it] lists 42 of his religious sayings." A photograph from the dealer shows Dod's portrait in a triple-ruled oval frame at the top left corner. But there are no illustrations of Dod in the six pre-1700 editions on EEBO (four of them being broadsheets). The earliest edition on ECCO with an illustration of Dod is a whole sheet "Printed for Tho. Norris . . . And for Joseph Marshall . . . . 1721" (N10761), with Dod in an oval frame at top left, dressed in cap, with large white collar above a jacket and cloak, the same image in Poor Man's copy but a different woodcut. Norris and Marshall reprinted their illustrated whole sheet in 1726. Poor Man's copy also has a factotum with the same design as another employed by Samuel Richardson in 1736 (Maslen's R425). So, several features of this undated edition point to "ca. 1720-1730" as a conjectural date. Furthermore, the Poor Man's text has variant substantives from the texts in 1671 and 1678 that are not found in Norris and Marshall's 1721 text (for instance, no. 42 reads as quoted above in 1671, 1678, and in Norris & Marshall 1721, but in Poor Man's it reads, ungrammatically, "Brown Bread and the Gospel with *Content* is good Fare"). I would add that the Norris & Marshall's 1721 colophon ends, "Where may be had the Second Sheet of Old Mr Dod's Sayings," but no copies are apparently recorded of that edition.

ESTC adds second known copies to two pre-1700 Dod records, but adds only one edition to those in Wing: N492386, a pamphlet paginated "[*2*?], 12 p." without imprint ("ca. 1683") at the Congregational Library, with a row of ornaments over a caption title (it begins "Nothing can hurt us but sin"). The ESTC adds detail to all the entries it shares with the Wing 2nd ed. (1994). For the dozen shared records of Dod's sayings, there are but several problems in the ESTC's references to Wing. ESTC R43135 identifies an undated Welsh edition owned solely by Harvard; an "unedited record," it references "Wing (2nd ed.) D1789A," but that record is vacated ("no entry") in the 2nd ed. A comparable copy at the National Library of Wales is recorded as D1788A, with the note "[1972 ed.: D1789A]"; however, the conjectured date is not [1688?] as for D1789A and its Harvard copy (ESTC R43135), but is "[1693?]." The ESTC seems to have lost the record for the copy in Wales (NLW). Another problem involves ESTC record R32799 for a 1678 copy only at the Bodleian; ESTC's Wing reference is "D1784 variant." But D1784 is the Wing number for the second earliest edition of *Old Mr. Dod's Sayings* (Maxwell 1671), and ESTC's R32799 records the same title in an entirely different edition: "London: Printed by A.M. and R.R., in the year, M.DCC.LXXVIII." (The exact transcription from EEBO is "*LONDON*, Printed by *A. M.* and *R. R.* in the Year, M.DCC.LXXVIII."--ESTC has many punctuation errors like these.) This imprint also fits that of R175967 referenced to Wing D1785aA, copies at the Bodleian (fol. Theta 589 [14]) and the Clark libraries. The only bibliographical

difference between these two 1678 records is that the latter copies are said to be whole-sheet broadsides and the R32799 a half-sheet (Wing D1785aA doesn't specify size, only noting "brs"). Since only a Bodleian copy without shelfmark is indicated, the same Oxford copy may have duplicate ESTC records (EEBO has that copy linked to "D1784 variant," and damage to the sheet could be used to determine whether the two editions exist).

Wing's terse citations do not provide us with much basic information. For instance, D1785 indicates the title as only *Old Mr Dod's Sayings* for a 1678 edition, but ESTC R23859 transcribes it in 50 words, including: *Old Mr. Dod's Sayings composed in Verse. For the better help of Memory, and the delightfulness of childrens reading . . . Composed by T. S*., and the ESTC adds that the edition has a list of books at "small price" and a woodcut. Nor does Wing indicate that D1786C has a title providing biographical information on Dod: *Sayings of the Aged and Reverend Mr. John Dodd, who was born at Shotlidge in Cheshire, in the year 1550 . . .*, and also a note at the foot on the editor: "Collected out of Mr. Dod's Sayings by T.R." (T121265). But as resourceful as ESTC records are, some are not detailed enough to rule out the possibility of duplicate entries for the same edition, especially undated editions.

Investigating another recent listing reveals other gaps in Wing and ESTC, while again suggesting the ESTC's superiority. A. R. Heath lists an unrecorded edition of a popular anonymous devotional work: *The Devout Communicant Exemplified in his Behaviour before, at, and after The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (for Tho. Dring, 1688), 6th ed., 12mo: A-I^{12} K^{4}; pp. [*viii*], 211, [*5*, including a final advt. leaf], with a "fine woodcut frontispiece." Barter Books of Alnwick lists another complete copy of the unrecorded edition. Parenthetically, the prices of these copies reveal the devaluation of the pound: Heath's was $543 at the start of 2014 and is now $400; Barter's was $138, and is now $102. Dring first published the work with the date "1670" and half a dozen times thereafter to 1688, always in 12mo. One of these, but not that offered by Barter and Heath, is the previously recorded 1688 6th-edition 12mo, with pagination [*viii*, including frt], 204, [*4*, contents]; ESTC R13557; Wing D1244E. Heath calls the edition paginated to 211 "an unrecorded variant of Wing D1244E"; however, separate editions must be involved. Heath's copy has the frt. of five scenes captioned above "The devout Communicant" on $A1^{v}$, usually noted in ESTC entries for Dring's editions, but not for those dated 1678 and 1688, though copies of both on EEBO have the plate following the title-page. The work was originally published with this engraving preceding leaves A1-4, with title-page, dedication, and preface, which remain in later editions. In a 1675 edition, a plate presumably appeared on A1, as the title-page is A2, but the EEBO copy from the BL lacks the leaf, and, since that is the sole extant copy, the ESTC mentions no engraving. In EEBO copies dated 1678, 1682, and 1683, there are six preliminary leaves, beginning with an engraved title-page on $A1^{v}$, captioned at the top "The Devout Communicant" and depicting 20-30 people kneeling about tables during a communion ceremony, and at the foot Dring's imprint dated 1678[-1683] (more than the date is touched up on reimpressions--the floor is white in 1678 and checkered in 1683). After the dedicatory epistle, the preface is shortened from 3 pp. in 1675 to 2 pp. (A5-5^{v}), and the original frt. from 1670 is added as $A6^{v}$. That engraving has been altered so that the bottom caption in 1670, "The Wedding Supper," has become by 1678 "Luke.14-16: &c."

If one compares the Wing 2nd edition (1994) entries of *The Devout Communicant Exemplified* with those in the ESTC, resorting to the EEBO copies for guidance, one discovers an issue missing from Wing and a few problems in both catalogues. Wing D1244aC and ESTC R174541 both begin with the edition "Printed by J.M. for Tho. Dring," 1670, locating only the BL copy. Then Wing D1244A and ESTC R171761 (missed if you type "exemplified" in place of "exemplifi'd") record an edition "for Tho. Dring" 1671 at the Bodleian (on EEBO), Liverpool, and Yale. The signature positions in the 1671 Bodleian copy on EEBO are the same as those in the BL's "1670" copy on EEBO. Neither catalogue recognizes that the 1670 and 1671 items are two issues of the same edition, apparently differing only in their title-pages: the 1671 title-page, with some shared type, adds the printer's initials and alters the date (the Bodleian lacks the frt, presumably by accident). The next edition is Dring's 1675, Wing D1244AB and ESTC R174542, which has a distinct pagination error: 12mo: [*x*], 192, 131-180 [*2*]. Wing, however, lacks a reissue of this, recorded as ESTC R215201, with a cancellans title-page indicating "for William Cademan," 1675, and pagination slightly altered: [*xii*], 192, 131-180. Dring's 1678 edition comes next, ESTC R24993, a record calling itself "unedited" and linked to Wing D1244B; the ESTC has the inaccurate pagination "[*4*], 2, 275, [1]." In the Union Theological copy on EEBO, the edition starts with Dring's engraved title-page dated 1678, then comes the printed title-page, then on A3-A3^{v} the dedication, and on A4-A4^{v} the preface, and then the plate captioned "Luke. 14-16: &c." Thus, there should be [*x*] prelims at the very least, not "[*4*]." The "2" in the ESTC pagination refers to the duplication of B1/1-2 in the EEBO copy and others. The first B1 has the signature "B" under "h" of "*he*" and the catchword is "fatted"; the second has the "B" just after "hath" and the catchword "calf." A collation of the two pages involved reveals only accidental variants, no basis for a cancel: for instance, in the first B1^{v}, l. 2, reads "Saying, behold"; in the second, "Saying, Behold." In both settings, B1^{v} ends with the appropriate catchword "hath." Though multiple copies need be inspected to resolve this mystery, I would guess the first "B1" leaf is part of the half-sheet with the prelims, and the other is the proper B1 of that whole-sheet gathering.

Then both catalogues record Dring's editions dated 1682 and 1683 (Wing's D1244C-D), and the ESTC indicates that they share several pagination errors: R37730 notes the 1682 is paginated "[*xii*] 144, 143-156 [i.e. 256], [*6*]; ill."; and R216344 notes the 1683 is paginated the same but for [*x*] at the start. The different numbers for unpaginated prelims result from the presence in ideal copies of two plates in the first six leaves--if one is missing or the frt isn't counted, the total will be [*x*] (the EEBO copy of 1683 has [*xii*]). Totals for preliminaries are frequently wrong in the ESTC. In both the 204-p and 211-p editions dated 1688, the preliminaries are reduced to four leaves (employing only the original frt., on A1^{v}), and the text starts on A5. Despite the shared pagination errors in the 1682 and 1683 listings, these are at least in the main separate settings to judge from EEBO copies. A copy of the 1682 edition, with pagination errors, is listed by Book Hut ($94 in early 2014, now under $70). To sum up, it pays to consult both ESTC and Wing and then to verify them.

ESTC records frequently fall short in recording preliminary and supplemental leaves in different issues of the same edition. For instance, Meyer Boswell of San Francisco, Forrest Books of Lincolnshire, and Jarndyce of

London list copies of Michael Dalton's *The Countrey Justice: Containing the Practices of the Justices of the Peace out of their Sessions*, with various tables and an addenda (by H. Sawbridge, S. Roycroft, and W. Rawlins, and sold by H. Twyford et al., 1682), R27851, folio. This guide had been printed to assist Justices of the Peace since 1618, in about a dozen editions. The three copies differ before and after the main text. Meyer Boswell gives pp. [*32*] 535 [1, blank], [*64*]; Forrest, pp. [*16*] 535 [1], [*32*]; Jarndyce, pp. [*12*], 535 [1], [*30*]. Linked to Wing D148 (without pagination info in its 2nd ed.), ESTC R27851 gives pp. [*16*], 535 [31], differing from all three it alone covers. The EEBO copy fits the ESTC, beginning with prelims on A-B^4 and ending with [*14*] of addenda + [*16*] of index tables, but more records are needed. Also, ESTC and Wing records for editions dated 1690 (ESTC R29341 and Wing D149) and 1697 (R32398 and Wing D150), where the title has the spelling "Country," fail to record that the 1697 edition is a reissue with a new title-page, addenda and catalogue--at least EEBO copies of 1690 and 1697 share the same settings in the prelims (A-B), the main text (^{2}B, C-D, N, Zz alone checked), and the final 8 leaves of tables (Ccc-Fff^2). What's new in 1697 is the 28-p. addenda and the [*4*]-p. catalogue of statutes (on Hhh1-2v) in 1697.--James E. May

In Memoriam, Henry Snyder, Master Builder

On 29 February 2016, Henry L. Snyder died. Everyone in 18C should know that Henry was the principal architect of the ESTC, heading the American effort for 32 years. As Manuel Schonhorn has noted, we are all greatly in his debt. Back in March Manny wrote to ensure his passing drew a tribute from the *Intelligencer*: "Henry Snyder was one of my dear friends at the University of Kansas in the 1970s. Henry was a giant as an historian but a greater presence and innovator and organizer in the application of the internet and computer and electronic data management to 18th-century studies." Maureen Mulvihill posted a note lamenting Henry's death and recalling her encounters with him over ESTC postings and on an ASECS panel in 1996. Manny, surprised at the lack of enthusiastic tributes, posted his own on 18th Century Interdisciplinary Discussion list, where moderator Kevin Berland prefaced the note by remarking "We sometimes forget that we stand on the shoulders of giants," and he directed readers who didn't know that debt to the Wikipedia and *The San Francisco Chronicle* of 13 March 2016. Manny's paragraph-length note then followed:

> HENRY SNYDER--or as I lovingly called him, "Henery"--was a giant in our day like no other. I met him at the University of Kansas in 1963. I watched him build, almost single-handedly, one of the finest 18th-century collections at its Kenneth Spencer Rare Book and Research Library. I was overwhelmed then, and continued to be overwhelmed for the next thirty years, when we met at regional ASECS meetings, at seminars at The New York Public Library that he generated, commanded, and stimulated, at his energy, imagination, and domination of ideas and directions no matter the audience confronted. A better "historian" than I must talk about his monumental multi-volume edition of the correspondence of Marlborough

> and Godolphin. The finest compliment that I have ever received from any scholar came from Henry, when he asked, "Where, Manny, did you ever find that footnote?" To be with him, at the Chinese Opera or The Grolier Club--and how grand and worthy he made me feel with the invitations--was to be carried up to a heaven of taste, joy, and cultural conversation that has all but died out in our day. Others will, must tell, how the ESTC cannot be imagined or discussed without Henry's direction. Henry Snyder--WHAT A JOY!

The Wikipedia article "Henry Snyder" offers a good brief account of Snyder's life and career. It recounts Henry's taking his B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in history at Berkeley; his scholarship on early 18C political history, most memorably his three-volume Clarendon edition in 1975 of *The Marlborough-Godolphin Correspondence*; his teaching at the U. of Kansas from 1963 to 1979; his then working as Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences at LSU (1979-1986), while directing the ESTC; and his taking the ESTC to UC-Riverside, where as its Dean of Arts and Humanities he would set up the ESTC/NA within the Center for Bibliographic Studies and Research that he set up and directed until he retired in 2009. As noted, at Riverside he initiated two other projects unrelated to the ESTC: in 1990, the California Newspaper Project, which led to the online California Digital Newspaper Collection, and in 2000 the *Catálogo colectivo de impresos latinamericanos hasta 1851*, which also led to an online catalogue. Also noted are the honors that he received for his digital bibliographical projects, a National Humanities Medal in 2007 and his title of O.B.E. from Queen Elizabeth II in 2009, which attest to the value accorded to his efforts beyond the academy. Several footnotes are in order here. Snyder's expertise involved early 18th-century politics and print, in which I would include historians like Abel Boyer and David Jones and newsletters and newspapers. His articles include "Daniel Defoe, the Duchess of Marlborough, and the 'Advice to the Electors of Great Britain" in *Huntington Library Quarterly* (*HLQ*) in 1965; "Godolphin and Harley: A Study of Their Partnership in Politics" in *HLQ*, 1967; "The Circulation of Newspapers in the Reign of Queen Anne," *Library*, 5th ser., 23 (1968), 206-35; "Daniel Defoe, Arthur Maynwaring, Robert Walpole, and Abel Boyer: Some Considerations of Authorship" in *HLQ*, 1970; "The Prologues and Epilogues of Arthur Maynwaring," *Philological Quarterly*, 1971; and "Arthur Maynwaring, Richard Steele, and 'The Lives of Two Illustrious Generals'" in *Studies in Bibliography*, 1971. Other studies focused on Mrs. Manley, Boyer as a historian, and the historian David Jones. Besides his important edition of correspondence, his books include *The Scottish World: The History and Culture of Scotland*, 1981, co-edited with Harold Orel and Marilyn Stokstad. When Snyder was honored with the National Humanities Medal in 2007, the *Humanities* magazine of March/April 2008 carried an account of his accomplishments by Esther Ferrington, which focused on the ESTC, the California Digital Newspaper Collection, and the *Catálogo colectivo de impresos latinamericanos hasta 1851*. The newspaper project principally involved acquiring and then digitizing microfilm records of newspapers (100,000 reels were obtained), prior to posting them in a database accessible at the Riverside Center's website.

The other catalogue, the *Catálogo* of imprints that form the printed heritage of Latin America (from Mexico south including the Caribbean) and also the Philippines, lists in some detail books in Spanish and Portuguese that are held in- and outside of Latin America, indicating locations and identifying digital and microfilm surrogates. I tried the search engine at the site and found with "aventuras" and with "vida" as title-words 53 and 517 records (including some printed in Spain, perhaps there because of false imprints). The project enabled Snyder to expand his bibliographical empire beyond English and led to his visiting all the national libraries in central and South America in search of catalogue records. The webpage claims there was a phase one that involved "keying and importing select important printed bibliographies and library catalogues," which led to a file of 60,000 entries; phase two, apparently not completed as of October 2010 when last revised, will involve "matching" to the catalogue "records contributed from library online catalogues" and completing the keying of printed bibliographies. Henry had another partnership here with the Gale corporation and envisioned a spin-off product that could be sold (noted in CCILA's Spanish-language website). A bibliography at the website lists bibliographical sources for the index and places in bold those that have been keyed (the most recent dated 1997). The page's project description was last revised in 2010, but, when the Center's webpage was last updated in 2013, the Center's staff included project director Virginia Schilling and a cataloguer. In the last posted progress report, to ABINIA, dated 8 July 2005, Snyder noted his intention to apply again for major grant funding (he received $99,120 for CCILA from the National Science Foundation for 2002-04, one of two awards for it from NSF), but he has just "obtení una referencia del National Science Foundation para otro proyecto, la digitazación de la colección de periodicos de Burney en la British Library." (I've never seen his role in the BL/Gale Burney papers discussed.) My sense is that CCILA today needs another Henry Snyder. The Riverside Center itself, which has not updated the ESTC homepage since 2010, received funding in 2011 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for innovations in the catalogue, promised in 2012 to those contributing suggestions. We understand from Brian Geiger, Henry's successor, that a new search system is being tested.

A good deal that is left out of Wikipedia is supplied by "In Memoriam: Henry Snyder," posted 28 March 2016 by Linda Okazaki, who worked with Henry in his last years while he was the library director of the California Genealogical Society (blog.californiaancestors.org/2016/03/in-memoriam-henry-snyder_28.html). This posting and the memorial tacked on at the end are by Californians who came to know Henry after his retirement, when he wasn't juggling so many roles. Okazaki's tribute has 21 photographs and offers a portrait of Henry's private life. We learn how Henry worked for several years as a buyer for a department store's glass and china division before returning to Berkeley for graduate school; how he served in the National Guard and had a best friend also in the Guard and grad school at Berkeley, who died while his wife Janette was pregnant with their first child (Michael) and that Henry went from England, where he was doing dissertation research on the Third Earl of Sunderland, to Hawaii to console her, his old friend also, and proposed to and married her (1960). They subsequently had two sons (Christopher and David) and remained happily married, sharing interests as in opera, until her death in

January 2016. We learn from Henry's cousins' remarks on Henry's Legacy webpage that he was the family historian, happy to share information with other family members. In 2009 Henry toured the Library of the California Genealogical Society, to whom his California Newspaper Project had been a god-send. He soon became its library director (and later member of the Society's executive board). He "developed many close friendships" with volunteers and "initiated countless projects" at the library, such as acquiring early California directories, re-shelving the books, selling off duplicate holdings, and placing an updated online catalogue in OCLC. Even in his old age, he was perceived by the Society's activists as a "force of nature," with a "can-do" spirit that took joy in new projects and brought laughter to collaborators, though a past president of the Society thought "he wanted to get things done faster than the process we sometimes needed to adhere to" allowed. However, she appreciated his comment, "I think sometimes it is easier to just do it and apologize later." (We might read that mindful that Henry was a dean most of his career.)

Henry Snyder contributed three articles in the *Intelligencer*, putting me very directly in his debt. Simply to recount them is to note three of Henry's projects and the important on-going effort he made to link scholars to 18C materials via libraries and computer cataloguing:

--"Eighteenth-Century Short-title Catalogue, North America: College of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521" n.s. 1, no. 2 (April 1987), 10-12. Henry describes the move from LSU to Riverside in May 1986, the staff, funding sources, and various project developments, as the BL's ESTC office's direct link with RLIN in 1986 and new points of access for individuals. (An important association for Henry's projects was Research Library Information Network of the Research Library Group, founded by Columbia, Harvard, Yale, etc. in 1974, based at Stanford; it merged with OCLC in 2006 and its records went into OCLC's WorldCat.) At this point the Eighteenth-Century STC had 190,000 records, with 400,000 locations for copies in North America and 175,000 locations recorded by the BL for UK holdings. (Now the ESTC has over 335,000 18C records.) Henry notes the need still to cover Cambridge and Oxford college libraries and the PRO.

--"Towards a European Union Catalogue of the Hand Press Era: The European STC and the Early Printed Books File in RLIN" in n.s. 7, no. 2 (May 1993), 5-9. By now the ESTC had come to mean the English STC, pushed by Snyder to expand its scope despite the feelings of many, this editor included, that too much remained to be done on the eighteenth century--the expansion happened by obtaining STC records from the Bibliographical Society and Wing records from the MLA. In this status update, incorporating reports on conferences in 1990 and 1992, Henry describes the effort to create a European Short-Title Catalogue by pooling the EngSTC with 15 projects in 12 countries and 9 languages, for CD-ROM publication, providing in the process some specific details about national programs as that in The Netherlands. Henry thought that using these resources would enable a database of a million titles to be created within a year. What did follow from his and the other library directors' and technocrats' efforts was the Consortium of European Research Libraries (CERL), established in 1994 with the goal of creating a catalogue of European imprints c. 1450-1830, called "The Heritage of the Printed Book Database." (On the HPB, see the announcements at the end of the issue.)

--"Early English Serials: An International Union Catalogue of Periodicals and Newspapers" in n.s. 9, nos. 1-2 (February 1995), 20-27. Serials were the most important publications left out of the ESTC, and Henry next turned his attention to them. Having recently received approval for the EES from the International Committee for the ESTC, Snyder defines the projects goals and the manner in which it will be constructed (RLIN will develop a master record for each periodical meeting the standards of the Cooperative Online Serials Program coordinated by the Library of Congress and also will develop a capacity to attach to those master records the particular holdings within the run at particular libraries). The EES project did lead to improved records for many titles and to useful entries in the ESTC (much of the work being done by Juliet McLaren), but the project wasn't extended nearly long enough (one might say it was only begun) and the ESTC has many duplicate records and, as James Tierney revealed, lacks records for some titles and poorly records extant holdings.

Snyder has much to say about his career and about the ESTC in David J. Slive's "Exit Interview: Henry Snyder." *RBM*, 2, no. 1 (2001), 73-92--here Snyder recalls that he bought his first 18C book at fourteen: Jeremy Collier's *A Short View of the Immortality and Prophaneness of the English Stage*. Snyder's fullest discussion of the ESTC is probably within *The English Short-Title Catalogue: Past, Present, Future,* which he co-edited with Michael Smith (NY: AMS, 2003), which contained papers from a 1998 celebration of the ESTC in New York, with supplementary essays and reports. Snyder contributed "The Future of the ESTC: A Vision (21-30), treating new ways of adding records, particularly older records for pre-1700 books and adding resources that make ESTC one of a one-stop shop, as images; also "A History of the ESTC in North America" (105-54), recording the seminal roles in ESTC of ASECS President Paul Korshin, Robin Alston at the BL, Marcus McCorison at AAS, the NEH and Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and noting Snyder took over as director about the time he assume duties as Dean at LSU in January 1979; and "The Public Record Office Canvass for the ESTC," an introduction to reports (193-96).

Snyder's "History" does not cover well what happened before he became involved around 1977, for which one needs to read Robin Alston's "The History of the ESTC" in *The Age of Johnson*, 15 (2004), 269-329, which is intended to correct details in Snyder's history. Alston sketches the formative thinking, proposals, and tests in America in 1970s (270ff.) and the BL's pilot projects in which he participated, the second in 1977 "formally inaugurated the ESTC" (282). Alston is one of those who feel the project should have remained an "Eighteenth-Century Short-Title Catalogue"--in this essay he estimates that --"at least 100,000 records require attention" (320), which was surely no exaggeration in 2003. Although Alston recognizes how unprecedented and valuable the ESTC is, he reminds us that opportunities for excellence were missed and that the project was very costly. He estimates the costs by 1998 as over $30 million (319), including $10.6 million in American grants and $15 million from the BL. Snyder manage to direct a great deal of money into his projects that would have gone to others--some colleagues have felt too much. But he sold these bibliographical projects to libraries, whose staff contributed millions of collected hours of work (and free xeroxes), and the money spent by the NEH and others trained dozens of librarians like Steve Tabor, Laura Stalker, and Deborah Leslie, who remain important research librarians, and led many libraries to put their

shelves and catalogues in order. Once the ESTC became public property for all (recall that it once was sold by Thomson-Gale at a very hefty price, as c. $3000 for the 3rd ed. on CD-ROM in 2003), the grumbling subsided. The ESTC is "always developing" as David Vander Meulen remarked in the title of a 2011 essay, with libraries like the British Library, the Folger, and the Huntington adding records (and correcting records) directly into the catalogue. Henry Snyder not only studied politicians, he was something of a politician and a businessman (an "operator")--one could write a directory of grant sources by listing all the diverse private and public sources tapped for his projects, organizations many would not think to ask, like the Swedish-American Foundation. Moreover, Snyder's father was a civil engineer, but Henry Snyder Sr. built nothing compared to his son's virtual libraries.--Jim May

Editor's Note. For more on the ESTC, search the contents of the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer* at our newsletter archive and see David Vander Meulen's "The ESTC as Foundational and Always Developing," Stephen Karian's "The Limitations and Possibilities of the ESTC," and James E. Tierney's "The State of Electronic Resources for the Study of Eighteenth-Century British Periodicals: The Role of Scholars, Librarians, and Commercial Vendors," all in the "Forum on Electronic Resources," edited by Anna Battigelli and Eleanor F. Shevlin, in *Age of Johnson*, 21 (2011). On ESTC searches, see the end of this issue below.

In Memory of Our Colleague James E. Tierney (1935-2016)

Our colleague Jim Tierney saved his wife Pattie the trouble of writing his obituary. His spare and dignified account begins, "On June 25, 2016, Professor James E. Tierney left behind a world of beloved relatives, dear friends, and unfinished projects. But nothing was more precious to him than his beloved wife Pattie, who, early on, was his student at the University of Missouri-St. Louis, later served as his research assistant, married him in 1995, and tirelessly nursed him through various health problems in the later years of their twenty-one-year marriage." After noting those who predeceased and survive him, he filled out his first paragraph with the bare facts of his education and career. He graduated from St. Benedict's Prep in Newark, NJ (where he played football); and "from Seton Hall University, where he earned a B.A. in classical studies in 1956. While teaching at Seton Hall Prep in South Orange, NJ, he earned a M.A. degree at Fordham University, and a Ph.D. in English literature at New York University. Upon completion of his graduate studies in 1968, he came to St. Louis as an Assistant Professor at the newly founded University of Missouri-St. Louis. Here he taught Restoration and eighteenth-century British literature until his retirement as Professor Emeritus in 2000. Besides his teaching and research studies at UMSL, Tierney served on many department, university, and Faculty Council committees." Nobody much credits one for service, but it takes up a lot of one's life. Jim was such a good citizen in our 18C community that I'm sure he wasn't nodding at the committee table. For instance, as president of the Midwest ASECS in 2004, Jim hosted their annual meeting, on 7-10 October 2004 at the Drury Plaza Hotel in downtown St. Louis. He took great pains via correspondence, preliminary arrangements, and chatter with participants to make

it compete with any meeting he'd attended. The conference was right beside the stadium where the home-team Cardinals were playing in the World Series--one night many of us were gathered with him before the TV in the hotel bar.

Jim's second paragraph details his scholarly projects (and here too one can see evidence of service): "Professor Tierney's scholarly career focused on eighteenth-century British publishing history, particularly on the age's newspapers and periodicals for which he became recognized as an international authority. His major published work was a heavily annotated edition of the correspondence of the mid-eighteenth-century London bookseller/publisher Robert Dodsley, a work published in 1989 by Cambridge University Press. He published widely in journals in his field and delivered many papers and participated in round tables at annual meetings of professional societies, both in the U.S. and aboard. He was a reader of manuscripts for Cambridge . . . and Yale University Press, as well as a member of the editorial board of *Media History* and *The Eighteenth Century: A Current Bibliography* (1978-84). Collectively, his many trips to London to read . . . [at] the British Library amounted to several years. Tierney was also a member of the 'Salon' at Washington University, a group of eighteenth-century scholars of various disciplines . . . who met monthly to discuss one another's works in progress."

Let's flesh out this paragraph. Jim's edition of *The Correspondence of Robert Dodsley, 1733-1764* was a difficult edition but proved consequential for one of the same reasons: Dodsley was connected to so many important writers and participants in the Republic of Letters. The path to the edition probably began with his dissertation "A Study of *The Museum: or, Literary and Historical Register*" (1970), a periodical edited by Mark Akenside and published by Robert Dodsley in 1746-47. From the dissertation came "*The Museum*, the 'Super-Excellent Magazine'" in *SEL*, 13 (1973), 503-15. A number of his essays involved related letters, such as "*Museum* Attributions in John Cooper's Unpublished Letters," *Studies in Bibliography*, 27 (1974), 232-35. He published articles on unpublished letters by David Garrick in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* (*PBSA*) in 1974 and in *Yearbook of English Studies* in 1975 and on unpublished letters by William Shenstone in *Papers on Language and Literature* in 1975 and in 1978. (He stuck with Shenstone to write the *DLB* entry on him in 1990. Of more general importance from this time was his "The Study of Eighteenth-Century British Periodical: Problems and Progress" in *PBSA*, 69 (1975), 165-86. This survey of published studies and dissertations on newspapers and periodicals stood upon the annotated bibliography he worked on throughout his life, which was an endless task never published. For, as he noted, "The bibliography of secondary studies leaves much to be desired" (173). Other problems discussed include inadequate finding lists and extant texts, better discussed by him later, changing and multiply used titles; the progress surveyed, making up the bulk of the article, involves groups of studies involving authorship (such as of the "Junius" contributions to the *Public Advertiser*, 1769-71), specialized types of periodicals, book reviewing, relationship to the novel. Along the way gaps are noted: while he finds four studies of periodicals and three of newspapers, thirty dissertations on individual titles remained unpublished, and, among the periodicals relations to genres, the relation of periodicals to biography has scarcely been treated. In 1977 came his "Faulkner and Dodsley: A Publishing Link in *The Library*--followed up with a

note on Faulkner in *Factotum*, no. 19 (1984),--and in 1978 “Edmund Burke, John Hawkesworth, the *Annual Register*, and the *Gentleman’s Magazine* in *HLQ* in 1978. Later essays involving Dodsley and letters included “Robert Dodsley: The First Painter and Stationer to the Society” in *The Virtuoso Tribe of Arts and Sciences*, ed. by D. G. C. Allan and John L. Abbott (1992) and “Eighteenth-Century Authors and the Abuse of the Franking System” in *Studies in Bibliography*, 48 (1995)112-20. Two of his articles involved advertising: "Book Advertisements in Mid-Eighteenth-Century Newspapers: The Example of Robert Dodsley" in *A Genius for Letters: Booksellers and Bookselling from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, ed. by Robin Myers and Michael Harris (1995), and "Advertisements for Books in London Newspapers, 1760-1785" in *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 30 (2001), 153-64. Tierney found that rising costs forced booksellers to "drastically" cut back on newspaper advertisements during a period "when book production is known to have escalated." Most of his work from the 1990s involved two projects on periodicals left unfinished at his death. His preeminence in the field is reflected in his contributing “Periodicals and the Trade, 1695-1780” to Vol. 5 of *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*, ed. by Michael F. Suarez and Michael L. Turner (2009).

The third paragraph of the obit contains a list of fellowships, most for residence at libraries: “at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, the Harry Ransom Research Center, Folger Shakespeare Library, Newberry Library, from the British Academy, and multiple grants from the Andrew Mellon Foundation. For the edition of Dodsley’s correspondence, he was awarded grants from such agencies as the National Endowment for the Humanities, Gladys K. Delmas Foundation, the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the American Philosophical Society.” Tierney loved his one-month fellowships at libraries like the Folger and Lewis Walpole Library, with the full day spent hunting before the reward of dinner. He created comrades, as when he introduced me to Keith Maslen at the Houghton, and he discovered a great deal that was lost when catalogues were converted to digital records, as he reported to the Folger, the Newbery, and Illinois.

The final sentence in the obit notes Jim’s two major projects at the time of his death: “A Catalogue of Eighteenth-Century British Periodicals, 1660-1800,” and a subject index to 18C British periodicals that arose from inheriting an “80,000 index-card collection from James M. Osborn of Yale,” which contained notes on articles’ subjects and which Jim began augmenting, correcting, and converting to digital form back in the 1980s. The latter project, which became "British Periodicals 1660-1800: An Electronic Index,” he described in *SHARP News* in 2001 and repeatedly in our newsletter. His first account in the *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer* came after I heard his presentation at the Bristol Enlightenment Congress in 1991: “A CD-ROM Subject Index to Pre-1800 British Periodicals” (5.3 [Sept. 1991], 8-13). Then he offered us a progress report, which reflected his efforts to keep up also with technological changes: “Pre-1800 British Periodical Subject Index: An Update” (9.1-2 [Winter-Spring, 1995], 17-20). He reported that, with $30K from U of Missouri, the Osborn cards have been conserved electronically, the indexes for the contents of 65 of the 156 periodicals targeted were indexed and ready for searching; the program for data-entry had been changed to Dataease to allow more efficient entry; the

Concordance software for users to employ would be distributed free and was being updated to suit Windows, thus allowing the use of a mouse to pull-down menus. At this stage he envisioned a CD-ROM publication, either with Research Publications or self-published (for "machines that write data to CD-ROM disks" have dropped to "under $4000"). Jim built up considerable interest in the project by demonstrating his index at many conferences around 1999-2006, including ASECS and its regionals, the De Bartolo in Florida and the Bibliographical Society in London. In 2004 I twice had the pleasure of seeing his CD-ROM demonstration enthusiastically received by scholars, at a Johnson Society meeting held at Northwestern and at his MWASECS in St. Louis. Everyone was impressed with its easy handling and its resource-laden database. People would suggest topics, and the computer would quickly locate relevant articles. Many present were eager to purchase a copy of the tool as thus far completed.

The subject index database also included publication information on the periodicals, and this led to Jim's stepping back via the other big project, the Catalogue, or "Census," of 18th-century British periodicals (not including newspapers). The census was funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation in several grants over about five years, on which Pattie Tierney and Thomas McGeary also worked. They worked up a database with both a list of master records for periodicals and also a file of leads, or library-specific records. By the end of the last grant in 2011, Tierney could report with a checklist of periodicals that exposed the gaps in all other bibliographies, like the ESTC. Jim wrote of the inadequacy in the bibliographical record and the previous efforts made to compile a list of periodicals and their locations in such articles as "Resources for Locating Eighteenth-Century Periodicals: Strengths and Weaknesses," in *Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer*, n.s. 21, no. 2 (May 2007), 1-12, and "The State of Electronic Resources for the Study of Eighteenth-Century British Periodicals: The Role of Scholars, Librarians, and Commercial Vendors," in *Age of Johnson*, 21 (2011), 309-38, within Anna Battigelli and Eleanor F. Shevlin's "Forum on Electronic Resources." For Jim's remarks along these lines at the Bethlehem EC/ASECS in 2009, see Eleanor Shevlin's account of her roundtable (24.1-2 [Feb. 2010], 10-14). In 2012 the Mellon Foundation insisted that for further funding Jim needed to turn the project over to a younger scholar or scholars with institutional support, and he tried in vain up till last year to find a successor. As John Greene wrote of the project, "It would certainly be a great shame to let it die with him."

As this suggests, Tierney did a lot of work that never led to publications and thus obvious recognition. That reflects several core beliefs or values: he believed the community of scholars was a team pushing forward historical knowledge and in the necessity of scrupulously mastering one's own field, his garden being the British periodical. As a scholar he was ambitious and rigorous, with very high standards (which to his chagrin he found were in decline). By "rigorous" I mean he was the sort of guy to spend a month analyzing library sigla in use in the U.S. and U.K. and working out 86 new sigla for libraries holding periodicals in his database for Mellon. He had a hopeful optimism that there was much awaiting discovery--thus, at the Dublin Enlightenment Congress he told Paul Pollard he found it hard to believe that there weren't more documents to be found for Irish printers and publishers. He wanted to pioneer the bibliographical infrastructure for periodical studies filling in the large gaps

noted in *PBSA* and elsewhere. He wanted to have something of value to share--like the Osborn cards and the database built from them: he was delighted if someone like James Woolley came to the study above his garage to look through the index. And it was thus a disillusioning disappointment that no young scholar wished to take over the census of periodicals. The recognition that mattered to him came from people he greatly respected for being such masters, like Michael Harris, Robin Meyer, Caroline Nelson, E. W. Pitcher, and from hard-working colleagues like John Greene, Eleanor Shevlin, and James Woolley. He would have been proud to have seen the note I recently received from John Neal Hoover of the St. Louis Mercantile Library Association, a former President of the Bibliographical Society of America, who called Jim "A very good and kind colleague and scholar." Jim contributed to the community by reviewing for *The Age of Johnson, The Eighteenth-Century Intelligencer, The Library, Scriblerian*, *TLS*, etc; by compiling a section for many volumes of *ECCB*, by judging applications for the Bibliographical Society of America's William L. Mitchell Prize, and by countless little efforts like sending suggestions to the ESTC/NA when it called for such in 2012. Jim answered his mail and was dumbstruck by people who didn't. His inclusiveness is reflected in an observation in the Baue mortuary ledger by Maureen Mulvihill, whose correspondence Jim probably had long gathered in a folder: "You were always generous, always interested in the life & projects of others."

I close with some remembrances of Jim Tierney the man. He was from wherever in New Jersey the Bruce Willis character John McClane (*Die Hard*) came from, and his being out there in the heartland, on the edge of the west, made sense. He'd played and still loved baseball and football. Socially, he liked to fire up his pipe over good beer or a scotch and swap stories or argue about history or politics. He enjoyed even more doing the same while showing you the wonders of St. Louis, such as the best Italian restaurant on The Hill, Yogi Berra's old neighborhood, or the original store for Dad's oatmeal cookies. A straight shooter, Jim was candid and honest: he'd tell you that you were wrong but was also supportive--if you admitted you'd been too hard in a book review, he'd say you could have been harder. With a black belt in friendship, he was very loyal to his friends and family, and, loving his wife Patti very much, he was very eager to see her happy, and he was proud of her successes and always mentioned them in letters. One of the guestbook entries at the Baue mortuary page has a posting from Grace Kennedy, who was a departmental secretary in English and who on meeting Jim decades later at a retirement party said, "I enjoyed your [Pattie's] food blog" and then adds, "His eyes lit up; he was obviously proud of you." Actually, Jim himself was a great cook, the patron saint of salmon in particular (he should have written a book on cooking salmon, and he and Pattie tended to take turns cooking dinner). He was free of envy. His response to my memorial tribute to Skip Brack was a page of recollections dating back to the Huntington in the 1970s, all independent of scholarship, stressing Skip's capacity for friendship, how, after visiting Skip in Tempe, when Jim was setting out across the desert for the Huntington, Skip insisted on loading up the front compartment of Jim's Karmann Ghia with bags of ice. Jim loved to drive, and that was indicative of how he liked to see the world. It was fun to go anywhere with Jim Tierney, like the grocery store, because he was outgoing and talkative with strangers. Jim said he was a "city guy," and he loved St. Louis--

but he would have loved other towns, because he liked people. His sociability could be surprising sometimes since he could carry an irritation over pretension and foolishness or over his own bodily pain. He fought one painful condition after another in his last decade, repeatedly let down by his body, by his knees, hips, spine, and kidneys, and finally cancer got a foothold in his bladder, was checked by surgery and therapy, but eventually enveloped his heart. Loss of circulation began to affect his head, and, to some extent, death snuck up on him. All who knew Jim well loved him and will miss him and go on thinking about him until they die.--Jim May

Online.Swift Edition by Ehrenpreis Centre Now Voluminous

Back in the September 2008 issue of the *Intelligencer*, one will find an announcement for the inauguration of the Online.Swift Edition at the Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies in Münster, Germany ("Ehrenpreis Centre to Undertake Online Critical Edition of Swift" [23.3: 55-57]). The Centre, a longstanding member of EC/ASECS, was founded in 1986 and named for Professor Irvin Ehrenpreis (on its history, see *Intelligencer*, 12.1-2 [April 1998], 42-45). The Centre, with its library open to all scholars, is within the Englisches Seminar of the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, up some floors at Johannisstrasse 12-20, a stone tower in the city-centre campus. The project was spearheaded by Hermann J. Real, then Director and now Co-Director of the Centre with Dr. Gabriele Müller-Oberhäuser, and by Dr. Dirk Passmann. In 2008 Real and Passmann obtained funding for the first six years of an edition project from the German Research Council, which subsequently renewed its support. An update is certainly called for now that so many of Swift's works have been edited by the Ehrenpreis Centre, which is easily done by excerpting text from the menus at the Centre's informative website (www.uni-muenster.de/ Anglistik/ Swift).

As stated in the introduction to the Online.Swift: "Online.Swift is the Ehrenpreis Centre's most recent and most ambitious project, made possible through the financial support of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft . . . . Its objective is an old-spelling critical online edition of the Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, with introductions and variorum commentaries. The edition is based on the textual and historical researches of the late Dr. David Woolley (London, later Perth, West Australia) and Professor Angus Ross (University of Sussex, Brighton), who in the 1980s were commissioned to prepare a new two-volume edition of Jonathan Swift's prose. This edition was to present, for the first time in the history of Swift scholarship, a text established according to the bibliographical and textual principles of the New Anglo-American Bibliography but was never finished [though they had produced a fine one-volume paperback in Oxford's World Classics series]. . . . . Online.Swift presents Woolley's collations, supplemented by his and Ross's textual and historical introductions yet both revised whenever necessary in the light of new evidence. In addition, the Editors of Online.Swift provide commentaries of their own on all texts. On the one hand, these summarize the history of Swift criticism since 1745; on the other, they explicate and annotate Swift's texts, in many cases for the first time, on the basis of Swift's library and (demonstrable) reading experience." For both undertakings, "the Ehrenpreis Centre is ideally equipped: its collection of Swift

criticism is very nearly complete, and its almost complete replica of Swift's library and reading in identical imprints provides perfect working conditions."

"[One] unique feature of this new scholarly project is that all fully collated and annotated texts are made available online in searchable PDF documents. All *commentaries are integrated* into the texts and displayed through pop-ups when clicked (see also *Hints* on how to use the PDF files). [The italicized words are all links to submerged notes.] At the same time, the *running commentary's* explanatory potential is presented in a separate document. The in progressu mode of Online.Swift will make it possible to update its various components--texts, introductions, annotations--whenever relevant new research is published. The Editorial Board also invites Swift scholars to submit corrections and improvements as well as additional notes and glosses for consideration. A collection of images and facsimiles of the texts is added."

The introduction stresses two genuine strengths of the edition (and the Centre): the historical variorum of criticism and the close attention to Swift's reading. Passmann and Real together--and they often give papers as a duo--are the living authority on Swift's reading. But reducing the many strengths of the commentary and introductions to two understates the biographical, critical, and textual contexts offered. The edition's capacity for ongoing revision and expansion is exactly what has been hoped for from the new digital horizon. However, the old option is still open too: the introduction ends by promising a forthcoming printed edition: "All texts will be printed in a two-volume edition, whose page settings and pagination are identical with those of the online texts."

The Centre's menu along the top of the site offers pull-down files on history, library [including a link to a file of its rare book holdings], publications [related to the Centre's staff and edition], "about us," database, friends & members, and the Online.Swift. "Database" is the exhaustive bibliography of Swift criticism (but there is also for the edition an eight-page bibliography of abbreviations that is a sure-fire short list to important Swift studies). The "Friends" file provides information on joining the Centre and thus receiving the annual journal *Swift Studies* (€40, with a student rate of €20). When readers click on the Online-Swift, they are offered a welcome page with news postings (as on recently added or updated texts in the Swift.Online and acquired editions once in Swift's library) and a guide to hypertext links in its texts. The Swift.Online pull-down menu files are: home, works, user-guide, editors, citation/copyright, about, chronology. The "Works" file provides an alphabetized list of all the projected Swift works, with a blue font indicating those now available (such as *A Tale of a Tub, A Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit*, and *A Meditation on a Broomstick*, etc.). A click on one of the works will bring up the individual title and links there for the textual introduction, the historical introduction, and text itself, below which will be commentary windows. One can click symbols to obtain notes and citations or others to reduce the texts in note windows. The text and commentary are in separate screen windows, and one can click on the text's words/phrases in blue brackets for commentary or in red underlining for textual apparatus. The "Editors" file records those now and formerly working on the edition: Kristen Juhas, Dirk F. Passmann, Hermann J. Real, Eva Schaten, Sandra Simon, and contributing editor Sabine Baltes-Ellermann (the first four individuals are still at the Centre). The citation file helpfully indicates how to refer to the edition. The

"About" file has a paragraph with information overlapping the introduction excerpted above and then provides technical information as that the edition employs "XML according to the guidelines of the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI P5) . . . [and] XML files are transformed via XSLT into HTML and embedded in a Javascript framework." The "Chronology" file provides biographical information on Swift.

So, though incomplete, the Online.Swift is ready for use by scholars and teachers (www.online-swift.de is a valuable *free* resource).--Jim May

2017 EC/ASECS Washington, D.C.

The annual meeting of the East-Central/American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies will be held on 2-4 November 2017 at Howard University, in Washington, D.C. Inspired by the location, the meeting's theme, "Capital Culture and Cultural Capital," invites papers on any aspect of the many meanings of **capital** and **culture**. We welcome papers on:

--the **spatial** and **geographic** meanings of capital: as seats of government and metropolitan centers; spaces within capitals (neighborhoods, coffeehouses, theaters, pleasure gardens, and more); the relationship of capitals to those they govern in nations and empires;

--people who populate, represent or are at the margins of these spaces: tastemakers, rakes, fops, coquettes, milliners, merchants, designers, artists, improvers, cartographers;

-- **objects** and **material culture**: the everyday and the rare; the exotic and domestic; the needs and the wants; conspicuous consumption and invisible labor; the literary, visual, and performing arts;

--**capital** as **finance**, money, and trade: the literary and figurative role of the monetary, banks, stocks, bubbles and busts, fortune;

--**high** and **low** culture, and anything in-between: poetry, doggerel, opera, camp, satire, appropriation, adaptations, evolutions.

We welcome papers that explore these themes within the eighteenth century and those that consider the cultural capital of that era's afterlife; that represent a variety of approaches, methods, disciplinary mixes; that display our scholarship and our pedagogies. We welcome papers on **knowledge, literature, the fine arts, music, science, law, medicine, history, government, philosophy, economics, religion, entertainments, daily life**, and any other **capital idea** you conceive. As always, we will also do our best to find panels for papers addressed to different themes and questions.

Dr. Tara Ghoshal Wallace, our 2017 keynote speaker, is a Professor of English and Associate Dean for Graduate Studies at George Washington University. The author of *Imperial Characters: Home and Periphery in Eighteenth-Century Literature* (Bucknell University Press 2010) and *Jane Austen and Narrative Authority* (Macmillan 1995), as well as the editor of Frances Burney's *A Busy Day* (Rutgers University Press 1984), her work stretches from the Stuarts to Sir Walter Scott, and delves into issues of gender, imperialism, history, and monarchy.

Panel proposals are due March 1 and will be posted to the conference website: ECASECS2017.wordpress.com. Proposals for individual papers and

completed panels are due June 15. Please send panel proposals, paper abstracts, and questions to the conference organizer, Emily MN Kugler, and programming committee at ECASECS2017@gmail.com. Panels seeking submissions, hotel and transportation information, guidance on the Eric Sven Molin essay prize for best graduate student paper, and more will be posted to the conference website: ECASECS2017.wordpress.com. Also see the next *Intelligencer* for further developments and information on the conference and the Molin Prize.

Emily MN Kugler
Howard University

Additions and Corrections to the Directory

(The last directory published is in the October 2015 issue.)

Capmartin, Sophie. (French lit. & history, Tulane Univ.) scapmart@tulane.edu; 1727 Robert Street / New Orleans, LA 70115
Chalmers, John. jpchalmers@sbcglobal.net. New address: 7033 North Kedzie Avenue, No. 1602 / Chicago, IL 60645-2851
Chan, Christopher. (English, U. of Pennsylvania) chan13@sas.upenn.edu; 285 Main St. / South River, NJ 08882
Distel, Kristin M. (English, Ohio Univ.) kd484114@ohio.edu; 177 Longview Heights Rd. / Athens, OH 45701
Fourny, Diane. (French & Italian Dept., Univ. of Kansas) dfourny@ku.edu; 2916 Moccasin Drive / Lawrence, KS 66049
Gohmann, Joanna M. (Art history, Office of Historic Alexandria) 545 E. Braddock Rd., Apt. #502 / Alexandria, VA 22314
Gollapudi, Aparna Rao. Email: Aparna.Gollapudi@colostate.edu
Harwell, Jane. (English, Virginia Commonwealth U.) JBHarwell@vcu.edu 1803 Fenton Street / Richmond, VA 23231
Holm, Melanie. (English, Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania) holm.melanie@gmail.com; 211 East End Ave. / Pittsburgh, PA 15221
Holmes, Gerard. English Dept. / U. of Maryland) gholmes@umd.edu; 4A Hillside Road / Greenbelt, MD 20742.
Klein, Ula E. (English) ursula.Klein@tamiu.edu; Humanities Dept. / Texas A & M International Univ. / 5201 University Blvd. / Laredo, TX 78041
Lee, Anthony. lee.tony181.gmail.com. New affiliation: University of the District of Columbia
McGrath, Alice T. New address: English Dept. / U. of Pennsylvania / Fisher-Bennett Hall, #127 / 3340 Walnut Street / Philadelphia, PA 19104-6273
Murphy, Jillmarie. murphyj@union.edu; English Dept. / Karp Hall / Union College / Schenectady, NY 12308
Nawrot, Dawn. (English, Univ. of Wisconsin--Milwaukee) 457 Southview Drive / North Fond du Lac, WI 54937
Neuhauser, Julian. (English, Virginia Commonwealth U.) neuhauserjt@vcu.edu; 312 Goshen Street / Richmond, VA 23220
Roby, Joanne. jroby@umd.edu; has a new address: 8556 Wheatfield Way / Ellicott City, MD 21043
Root, Douglas. (English, Claflin U.) droot@claflin.edu; 3071 Market Dr. /

Orangeburg, SC 29115
Schonhorn, Manuel . New email address: drmanny30@gmail.com
Tallent, Alistaire. alistaire.tallent@coloadocollege.edu; Dept. of French & Italian / Colorado College / 14 E. Cache la Poudre St. / Colorado Springs, CO, 80903
Thompson, Will. (Univ. of Maryland) 315 Kentucky Ave., S.E., Apt. 4 Washington, DC 20003
Thorpe, Katherine. (English, Princeton U.) kthorpe@princeton.edu; 351 Lemonick Ct., Apt. 306 / Princeton, NJ 08540
Vickless, Matthew: new address: Dean of Professional Studies, Central Penn College / 600 Valley Rd. / PO Box 309 / Summerdale, PA 17093-0309
Wehler, Melissa: new address: Dean, Humanities and Sciences, Central Penn College / 600 Valley Rd. / PO Box 309 / Summerdale, PA 17093-0309
Wolloch, Nathaniel. nwolloch@yahoo.com; for this academic year: History Dept. / U. of Texas at Austin / 128 Inner Campus Dr., B7000 / GAR 1.104 / Austin, TX 78712-1739
Zimmerman, Rachel. (Art history, U. of Delaware) new address: 1609 Varsity Lane / Bear, DE, 19701

News of Members

Corey Andrews published "Radical Attribution: Robert Burns and 'The Liberty Tree,'" in *Studies in Scottish Literature*, 41 (Dec. 2015), 174-90. This is but one of many items of news below that we learned in May from **Richard Sher**'s 30th number of *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, a newsletter and review--always casting a broad net and produced with great care, all the more remarkable after 30 years. **Eve T. Bannet** continues to edit *SECC* for ASECS. **Anna Battigelli** and Nancy Johnson are organizing "Jane Austen & the Arts," a bicentenary conference at SUNY Plattsburgh, 23-25 March 2017. The keynote speaker is **Peter Sabor**. Anna writes that the conference "will have an English Country Dance with live period music. Proposals for faculty were due in early Sept., but graduate and undergrad students are invited to submit a one-page proposal for a 15-20 minute paper by 1 November. The website is at https:// janeaustenandthearts. com. Anna and **Eleanor Shevlin** continue to post interesting articles at Early Modern Online Bibliography, which I always check before sending the *Intelligencer* to press. **Barbara Benedict** published "The Sentimental Virtuoso: Collecting Feeling in Henry Mackenzie's *The Man of Feeling*" in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 28.3 (Spring 2016), 473-99. And Barbara contributed "'Death and the Object: The Abuse of Things in *The Rape of the Lock*" to *Anniversary Essays on Alexander Pope's* The Rape of the Lock, ed. by Donald W. Nichol (Toronto, 2015), which has an introduction by **J. Paul Hunter**. I hope our members have heard that **Lisa Berglund**, our long-standing member at Buffalo State, will be taking over as Executive Director of ASECS from Byron Wells of Wake Forest Univ. Lisa served as Executive Sec'y of the Dictionary Society of North America for six years and has for some time chaired the English Dept. at Buff State. In the same leadership change, **Jill Bradbury** of Gallaudet U., another EC/ASECS member, will take over as ASECS's new Treasurer from William Edmiston of the Univ. of South Carolina. (With the change, I believe that we will lose the hard-working **Vickie Cutting** as

ASECS's office manager, an extraordinarily dependable manager of this large Society.) And **Kevin Berland**, who in his retirement has been teaching occasionally for Rutgers-Newark and does free-lance indexing for scholars, wrote three essays the past year. These include "The Passenger Pigeon and the New World Myth of Plenitude" for a volume on birds in the 18C, ed. by **Sayre Greenfield** et al., and other essays on disabilities and secret histories (mentioned below). **Elisa Beshero-Bondar** directs the Center for Digital Text at the Univ. of Pittsburgh at Greensburg. She organized a three-day text coding school held this past June and plans another for 2017 "to concentrate on XSLT, XQuery, and the other transformations of XML into HTML, SVG, and more." Elisa's own work involves the early 19C English author Mary Russell Mitford. **Martha Bowden** has published an interesting, ambitious, and lucid book on the relation of the historical novel to romance and the legacy of the historical novel as practiced c. 1800 in contemporary fiction: *Descendents of Waverley: Romancing History in Contemporary Historical Fiction* (Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2016; pp. xxvi + 243). Martha's early chapters involving the romancing of history as explained by Sir Walter Scott and others of his period and the later chapters look at intertextual relations between literature and painting, the biographical romance and other forms of contemporary historical fiction by Julian Barnes, Jane Stevenson, Susan Swan, and also young adult fiction which continues the pedagogical legacy of the old historical novel. We received a review copy, and we have found a thoughtful reviewer to provide us with an account of the book next year. Martha, who directs the Writing Intensive Program at Kennesaw State U., is co-chairing a roundtable at ASECS on "Teaching the 18C in the Core and General Education Classroom"--I hope she steers some of the speakers to send the pedagogical presentations to the *Intelligencer* or reports on the session for us. There's another collection of essays in honor of **Skip Brack** being edited for the press by Jesse Swan, Skip's former student, who edited *Editing Lives* (Bucknell U. Press) as a tribute in 2014.

As a well deserved honor, the Ibero-American SECS has set up a special session to honor **Theodore E. D. Braun** at the Minneapolis ASECS. Ted was instrumental in its founding, and its constitution adopted in 1990 is still posted at the website Ted set up for it. Back in the mid 1990s Ted created our first website, learning HTML and finding digital images for posting (something difficult in those days). Then, before passing it on, he redesigned it, giving it a second incarnation. **Caroline Breashears** will soon see publication of "'A Parcel of Heart': The Business of Love in *Peregine Pickle*" in *International Journal of Pluralism and Economics Education*, within a special issue on "Economics and the Novel." **Peter M. Briggs** recently published "The Hesitant Modernity of John Dunton" in *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 40.2 (April 2016), 119-135. His article, which originated in two talks at EC/ASECS meetings, examines two different formulations of public literary authority pioneered by Dunton in the 1690s. In the *Athenian Mercury* (1691-97) Dunton relied upon institutional authority to validate his journalistic voice; in his *Voyage Round the World* (1691) he relied wholly on the authority of personal experience to speak his mind. Dunton's hesitation between these two models of discourse anticipates a quandary or a necessary choice faced by many literary successors. Welcome to **Sophie Capmartin,** a graduate student at Tulane, working on French literature, colonial history, and the collection imaginary about North Americans. **Rachel**

Carnell is co-editing with Rebecca Bullard a collection of essays for Cambridge UP (due 2017) entitled "*The Secret History in Literature, 1660-1820,"* which will have essays in by **Kevin Berland** and **Rivka Swenson**--Rivka's is on it-narratives. Rachel brings to the project a great knowledge of Delarivier Manley's secret histories, which she co-edited and of Manley, whose biography she wrote (2008). Rachel recently published "Slipping from Secret History to Novel" in *ECF*, 28.1 (Fall 2015), 1-24, and later this year *Literature Compass* will publish her "Beyond the Secret History: Recent Criticism of Delarivier Manley." Rachel has a forthcoming essay on editing and annotating Manley in *Editing Women's Writing*, being edited by Amy Culley and Anna Fitzer for the series Chawton Studies in Scholarly Editing (Routledge, this winter). **Andrew Carpenter** and Lucy Collins's anthology *The Irish Poet and the Natural World* is reviewed closely by Rebecca Anne Barr in *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 40.2 (April 2016), 162-67.

Vin Carretta, who continues to work on an edition of Phillis Wheatley, spent a month last fall at the Royal Archives in Windsor Castle as the Inaugural Senior Omohundro Institute Fellow on the George III Papers Project [see p. 69 below], "conducting research as part of the project to digitize more than 350,000 pages of the private papers of Kings George I, George II, George III and William IV." We welcome **Christopher Chan,** who works at Penn on poetry & poetics, nationalism, and the history of literary criticism. **Christine Clark-Evans** is chairing a roundtable at ASECS on "Mothers and Motherhood across the Caribbean and Central America." **Al Coppola** completed his tenure as chair of the Columbia Seminar on the 18C European Culture and passed on the organizational duties to Kathleen Lubey. **JoEllen DeLucia** is co-editing with Juliet Shields a volume of essays on "Migration and Modernity: The State of Being Stateless, 1650-1850." **Kristen Distel**, a Ph.D. student at Ohio University, returns to the meeting this year to speak on *Moll Flanders* at **Ellen Moody**'s "Gender and Transgression" panel. Kristen has written essays published or soon to be so on Toni Morrison, Faulkner and Shakespeare, Theodore Roethke, Edgar Allan Poe, and ekphrastic poetry--we hope she settles in 18C studies. In the spring issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* (*ECS*, 49.3), we find **Clorinda Donato**'s interesting review of Catriona Seth's anthology *La Fabrique de l'intime: Mémoires et journaux de femmes du XVIIIe siècle* (2013), a good opportunity for those working on kindred English materials to gather some comparative information and points of inquiry. **J. A. Downie** has an erudite and perceptive reexamination of Henry Fielding's dynamic attitude toward Swift, Pope, and Co., entitled "H. Scriblerus Secundus?" in *Swift Studies*, 31 (2016), 72-81. Partly in consequence of unpublished poetry discovered by Isobel Grundy in the papers of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, some scholars, such as Howard Weinbrot, **Peter Sabor**, and **Ashley Marshall**, have questioned the young Fielding's identification with or outreach to the so-called "Scriblerians," but Alan sides with the older notion that Fielding was signaling solidarity when he used the pseudonym Scriblerus Secundus in 1730-1731 publications. He notes that *The Grub-Street Journal* referred to "Scriblerus Secundus" as "our Friend," evidently for his parodies ridiculing poets and operas as had Pope and Gay recently *Peri Bathos*, *The Dunciad*, and *The Beggar's Opera* (79).

Though not an EC/ASECS member, with gratitude we'll sing his praises here: **Robert D. Fleck, Jr**., who founded Oak Knoll Books and contributed

much to antiquary book study as well as sales, died on 22 September 2017. Fleck, born in 1947, took degrees in chemical engineering from Delaware and then Virginia and worked as an engineer before giving it over in 1976 to work with books, founding Oak Knoll Books/Press in New Castle, DE, 40 years ago. Oak Knoll is the world's foremost seller and publisher of books about books, frequently being the American co-publisher of scholarly works also published in Europe. Bob served as both Treasurer and President of both Antiquarian Booksellers Association of America (ABAA) and the International League of Antiquariant Booksellers, helping create the first ILAB search engine. He's survived by his wife Mildred and four children, including his son Robert, who has headed the antiquarian division (its 311th catalogue appeared in August).

We're happy to welcome **Diane Fourny**, whose articles on the French Enlightenment many of our members have read (she contributed to **Linda Merians**' collection *The Secret Malady* and has published essays in *SECC* and *ECF*). Diane is co-director of the Humanities Multicultural Scholars Program at the Univ. of Kansas and active in its study abroad programs in Florence and Paris. Presently she's working on Orientalism and on Voltaire. The Summer 2016 issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* includes **Anna Foy**'s essay "The Convention of Georgic Circumlocution and the Proper Use of Human Dung in Samuel Martin's *Essay upon Plantership*." This 1750 essay talks around human dung by speaking of fructifying the soil by planting yams and potatoes. **Emily C. Friedman** has published *Reading Smell in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (Bucknell UP, 2016; pp. xii + 193). The PR notes, "Friedman examines how the recovery of forgotten or overlooked olfactory information might reshape our understanding of these texts," looking at such scents as tobacco and sulfur, and texts by Austen, Burney, Richardson, Lewis, Swift, and Smollett, We've a review copy in hand looking for a reviewer. **Henry L. Fulton** reviews **Corey Andrews**'s *The Genius of Scotland: The Cultural Productions of Robert Burns, 1785-1834* in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, no. 30 (Spring 2016), 31-32. **Brian Geiger**, head of ESTC/NA, is working on a report to the Mellon Foundation, which is supporting the development of new software for the ESTC. Brian notes that they've "just finished an Alpha version" and that he has promised the editor of *PBSA* an essay treating in part "what the new software hopes to address."

W. B. Gerard's "'When death himself knocked at my door': Richard Newton's Sentimental (and Satirical) Journey" appeared in *Shandean*, 26 (2015), 75-95. We're pleased to welcome **Joanna Gohmann**, working in the office of Historic Alexandria and speaking in Fredericksburg on aristocratic pets in French visual culture, one of the topics in her recent dissertation at Chapel Hill. **Aparna Gollapudi** published "Personhood, Property Rights, and the Child in John Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* and Daniel Defoe's Fiction" in *Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 28.1 (Fall 2015), 25-58. An Associate Professor of English and Women Studies at Colorado State, Aparna works on theatre culture and emerging discourses of gender and modernity. **Sayre Greenfield** is co-editing a collection on birds in 18C life. While a visiting fellow at the Chawton House Library, he wrote some observations with a birds-sighted list posted at www.chawtonhouse.org/?library_blog=the-fascinating-world-of-birds-at-chl. I may not have yet noted that Sayre and **Linda Troost** published "A History of the Fanny Wars" in *Persuasions: The Jane Austen Journal*, 36 (2014), 15-33. **Carolyn Guile** has joined **Clorinda Donato** as the co-editor of the book review

section of *ECS*. **Gene Hammond**, following the publication of his two-volume biography of Swift in the spring, explored Nepal this past summer, finding time to help lead an arts workshop while also hiking a national park, exploring temple centers, and drawing craftsmen and children into conversation, sometimes by sign language. Then Gene traveled on to South Korea, where he's teaching this fall--we'll miss his regular presentation on Swift at our meeting this month. Gene will be speaking on Swift at the Seventh Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift, organized by **Hermann J. Real** and his colleagues at the Ehrenpreis Centre (see below). **Mascha Hansen**, now a member of the senate at the U. of Greifswald, continues to work on a book regarding the vision of (and plans for) the future by eighteenth-century women. Mascha and colleagues like Annick Cossic (U. of Brest) are pushing forward a project called DIGITENS (Digital Encyclopedia of Enlightenment Sociability). **Sharon Harrow** is editing, with Kirsten Saxton, a collection entitled "Adapting the Eighteenth Century: Pedagogies and Practices," with essays that "combine current adaptations of 18C texts or concepts with texts from the 18C in ways that provocatively and thoughtfully open up and out our own reading and teaching"--their CFP was hoping for essays across the arts as well as history and science. We're happy to welcome **Jane Harwell** as a new member: she teaches English at Virginia Commonwealth and researches gender and sexuality in British Literature. And also **Melanie Holm**, who teaches graduate courses on the early novel and on the gothic at Indiana U. of Pennsylvania and is writing a book on "The Skeptical Imagination: Gender, Genre, and Sociability in Eighteenth-Century Fiction." She published "Laughter, Skepticism, and the Pleasures of Laurence Sterne's . . . *Tristram Shandy*" in *The Eighteenth Century* in 2014. **Jordan Howell**'s 2015 SHARP presentation "Digital Bibliography Quickstart" is available at **Anna Battagelli** and **Eleanor Shevlin**'s resource-laden website Early Modern Online Bibliography. Jordan invites us to "Learn how to develop a comprehensive and searchable bibliographical database using Wordpress in eleven somewhat easy steps." Jordan's sharing here much of value learned while compiling a bibliography on Defoe. **Robert Hume**'s essay "Garrick in Dublin 1745-46" appeared in *Philological Quarterly*, 93.4 (for 2014, published in September 2015), 507-40. Putting **John Greene**'s two multi-volume series *Theatre in Dublin, 1745-1820* to work (which receives a good deal of analysis on p. 509, with attention directed to the indices at the Lehigh UP website), Rob re-examines claims about Garrick's season at the Smock-Alley theatre, when he is supposed to have been brought in as Sheridan's co-manager and returned home with £600. This summer Rob began writing a book entitled "Historicist Methodologies for Literary Study, 1926-2016," "with chapters on people from Crane to Ezell." After that he expects to complete his 18th book, "Economics of Culture in London, 1660-1820," which will be full of tables.

Congratulations to **Andrea Immel** and her co-editor Brian Alderson for winning the Bibliographical Society of America's 2016 Justin G. Schiller Prize for the best bibliographical work 2012-15 on children's books for their study and edition of *Tommy Thumb's Pretty Song-Book* (2013 [2014]). That study was reviewed here by Máire Kennedy in *Intelligencer*, 29, 2 (Oct. 2015), 35-36. Andrea and Brian Alderson published "Tommy Thumb's Offspring," an account of their discovery of *Nancy Cock's Song-Book* (1744), in *TLS*, #5885 (15 January 2016), 15. Also, Andrea joined others including Dennis Butts and Pat

Garrett in contributing memorial tributes to Gillian Avery, children's book author and scholar of the history of children's books: *Gillian Avery, 1926-2016: Some Memorial Reflections*, a Supplement to *Children's Books History Society Newsletter*, number 114 (April 2016). **Catherine Ingrassia** (Virginia Commonwealth U.) will give our plenary address on Saturday morning at the Fredericksburg meeting, prior to the business lunch; her talk is entitled "Familiarity Breeds Contentment: (Re)locating the Strange in Eighteenth-Century Women Writers." We're grateful to her for the course description above (pp. 11-15). Catherine last year contributed "Writing in Wartime" to *The Cambridge Companion to Women's Writing in the Romantic Period*, edited by **Devoney Looser** (pp. 101-14). Catherine edited the *Cambridge Companion on Women's Writing in Britain, 1660-1780 (2015)*, which includes **Paula Backscheider**'s "Women and Popular Culture" (70-85) and **Rivka Swenson**'s "History" (135-46). **Erik L. Johnson**'s "'Life beyond Life': Reading Milton's *Aereopagitica* through Enlightenment Vitalism" appears in *ECS*, 49, no. 3 (Spring 2016), 353-70. Erik finds that Honoré de Mirabeau's free adaptation of Milton's tract (*Sur la liberté de la presse, imité de l'anglois de Milton*, 1788) and his responses to Johnson's *Life of Milton* (1779) demonstrate "a way of reading informed by Enlightenment vitalism." (Milton's metaphorically treating books as living things lent itself to that.) **Jacob Sider Jost**, to whom we owe a second book review (above), in November published "The *Gentleman's Magazine*, Samuel Johnson, and the Symbolic Economy of Eighteenth-Century Poetry" in *Review of English Studies*, 66 (2015), 915-35. **Sandro Jung**'s book *James Thomson's* The Seasons, *Print Culture, and Visual Interpretation, 1730-1842* (2015) is favorably reviewed by Denys W. Van Renen in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, no. 30 (Spring 2016), 30. **Laura Kennelly** continues to be the associate editor of *Bach: Journal of the Riemenschneider Bach Institute* (at Baldwin Wallace U.) and to publish as blogs *Cleveland Theater Reviews*--I was happy to hear from a fellow editor that our last cover illustration was a beauty.

Emily Kugler, who will host our 2017 meeting at Howard University, speaks on "Questions of Authorship and Ownership in *A History of Mary Prince, a West Indian Slave. Related by Herself*, to the **Washington Area Group for Print Culture Studies**, on 7 October. This group, meeting monthly from 3:30-5:00 in the Rosenwald Room of the Jefferson Bldg. of the Library of Congress, has been convened since 2000 by Sabrina Baron and **Eleanor Shevlin**. This year's speakers are largely filled in at the website (https://wagpcs. wordpress. com), and they include David Norbrook speaking on "Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration Public Sphere" on 7 April. In **Steve Karian**'s March newsletter for the Johnson Society of the Central Region we find abstracts for papers given by two of our members at the JSCR's 2016 conference at Northwestern: **Mike Genovese** presented "Golden Sentiment, or the Utopian Economics of *Rasselas*," which reassesses "the world in which Rasselas and his friends wander to argue that its utopian possibilities actually are not as strongly denied as its ending would suggest. Specifically, I look at how Johnson maps Rasselas's education in 'the use and nature of money' [precious metals] onto readers to encourage them to imagine how money . . . might ideally secure expansive fellow feeling." And **Anthony Lee** offered "'The Dreams of Avarice': Samuel Johnson and Edward Moore," exploring Johnson and Moore's acquaintance and shared and differing views, particularly "to a sentiment

deriving ultimately from antiquity"; Tony also considers whether Johnson had a hand in "the last two paragraphs of an anonymous defense of Moore's *Gil Blas* appearing in the February 1751 issue of *Gentleman's Magazine*."

April London is editing *The Cambridge Guide to the Eighteenth-Century Novel, 1660-1820*, which "will provide a comprehensive listing and critical summary of English fiction from 1660-1820, in multi-volume print and fully searchable digital forms. Designed to answer a range of research needs, the *Guide* offers a unique consolidated source of information on contemporary fiction for students and established scholars. Each novel published in the designated period will receive a separate entry and, when relevant, digital editions (EEBO, ECCO) will be noted. . . . individual articles combine analytical summary of the novel's plot with references to recurring ideas, motifs, genres, and references to political, social, or economic events or contemporary personalities." To this resource, **Sylvia Kasey Marks** is contributing the entries on four novels by Elizabeth Sibthorpe Pinchard, including *The Blind Child* (1791) and *The Two Cousins* (1794). **Devoney Looser** published "Mary Wollstonecraft, 'Ithurial,' the Rise of the Feminist Author-Ghost" in *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*, 35, no. 1 (Spring 2016), 59-91. Those teaching British lit should know that **Jack Lynch** has posted *A Guide to Samuel Johnson* on the WWW (http://andromeda.rutgers.edu/~jlynch/ Johnson/Guide)--nice to see that it is listed in the MLAIB. Jack introduces SJ, the editions, biographies, bibliographies, major works, etc., and the bibliography page has a link to Jack's much more ambitious *A Bibliography of Johnsonian Studies, 1986-*. Jack's essay "Generous Liberal-Minded Men: Booksellers and Poetic Careers in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*" appears in *Yearbook of English Studies*, 45 (2015), 93-108. **Ashley Marshall**'s big genre study *The Practice of Satire in England, 1658-1770*, has been released in paperback by Johns Hopkins U. Press (see the September 2013 *Intelligencer* for our review). **Jim May** retired from Penn State's DuBois Campus, where he taught lower-level English since 1982, after two years at Delaware and six as a Teaching Assistant at Maryland. **Linda Merians** contributed a witty and detailed memoir of **Shirley Strum Kenny** as teacher and scholar to a tribute volume assembled for the former president of SUNY-Stony Brook. Linda like many members who joined over 35 years ago can remember Shirley Kenny as chair and professor at Maryland, a member of EC/ASECS, and the editor of the plays of Steele and Farquhar. The volume, edited by Bill Arens and Mario Mignone, includes pieces by distinguished professors like Richard Leakey and Roger Rosenblatt that SSK brought to Stony Brook. Linda has served as EC/ASECS Executive Secretary far longer than any former captain of our Society, passing on the membership rolls, etc. to Peter Staffel, whom she thanks for taking over. There's a reception in Linda's honor arranged by conference chair **Marie McAllister** for the annual meeting this month in Fredericksburg. Linda cannot be thanked enough for all the headaches she's suffered and sacrifices she's made in our behalf--and we thank Marie too while we're feeling lucky--Marie, a former EC/ASECS President who's racked up enough service to have ducked this duty. After I saw the Whit Stillman adaptation of Austen's *Lady Susan* (*Love and Friendship*, 2016), I was curious what **Ellen Moody** thought--if we had a film reviewer, it would be Ellen,--and sure enough she had two blogs in her *Jane Austen's Reveries* series that offered perceptive and well contextualized critiques of the film. Ellen continues

teaching Osher Life Long Learning classes, at American U on 19C women writers and on *Tom Jones* at George Mason. Ellen is feasting on *War and Peace* as she leads an old-fashioned reading group of fifteen through Tolstoy's novel. **Tonya Moutray**'s book, *Refugee Nuns, the French Revolution, and British Literature and Culture*, was published in April 2016 by Routledge Press. The work examines the impact of the French Revolution on religious orders of women, including English convents on the Continent). It does so by examining writers' views of migrating refugee nuns alongside their own narratives of displacement, migration, reception, and settlement in England. Writers include Helen Maria Williams, Anne Radcliffe, and Augustin Barruel. Moutray argues that literary treatments, popular journalism, and actual contact with nuns reshaped British perceptions of nuns in the 1790s, a time critical to the survival of Catholic religious groups. We welcome **Jillmarie Murphy**, an Associate Professor of English at Union College who works in literary history, particularly the literature of the early American and the early American Republic period, with an interest in attachment theory (to place). **Joanne Myers**, who shared with us a good account of her problem-based approach to the survey course (pp. 7-11 above), will repeat this year as chair of our **Molin Prize** committee, serving with **John Heins** and **Marie Wellington**. Graduate students attending the fall conference who did not signal their intent to compete for the best paper prize should keep the award in mind for next fall's meeting (there'll be information in the next issue's announcement of the winner). We welcome **Dawn Nawrot**, who is writing a dissertation in British literature, touching on women's studies, at the U. of Wisconsin--Milwaukee. Several years ago Dawn published "'Nothing but Violent Methods Will Do': Heterosexual Rape and the Violation of Female Friendship" in *Interpreting Sexual Violence, 1660-1800*.

Julian Neuhauser, a doctoral student at Virginia Commonwealth U., is a new member working on book history, drama and letters, material history, and such women writers as Aphra Behn. In the last issue I spoke of **Mel New**'s remarks at the Sterne Tercentenary in 2013 on the current state of literary studies, and received a clarifying rejoinder to my saying that some might say history was winning an age-old contest with literature. Mel wrote back in March, quoting Simon Leys on how historians write literature (relying on imagination, "The historian does not merely record; he edits, he omits, he judges, he interprets, he reorganizes, he composes"). Mel sees the sciences ("the softer ones") as winning out, remarking, "just look at the latest issue of *ECS*, basically anthropology and sociology with a little ethnic and cultural studies on the margin--not a scent of literature." This to Mel is the more painful since the scientific discourse that's mimicked is degraded, often "unreadable," "because English professors stopped teaching them how to read with care and interpret with sophistication a single poetic line." Send more corrections! Mel reviews Anne Toner's *Ellipsis in English Literature: Signs of Omission* in *Studies in the Novel* (47.4 [2015/16]). **Maximillian Novak** published "Two Fictional References Misidentified in Daniel Defoe's *Commentator*" in the March 2016 issue of *Notes and Queries* (63.1: 71-72)--that issue has quite a bit for us working on the 18C, including another "attributions of authorship" article for the *Gentleman's Magazine* by E. Lorraine De Montluzin; notes on Defoe's *Tour* by Pat Rogers; on Swift and Kaempfer's *History of Japan* by Laurence Williams; on Jacob Tonson the Elder as publisher of classics by Stephan Barnard; on "A

New Portrait of Defoe in the Pillory" by Joseph Hone, on "Charles Johnson and the Attribution of *The Adventures of Anthony Varnish* (1786)" by Joe Lines; on "The Parker Family: Architectural and Scientific Printers?" by Hazel Wilkinson, a fairly recent Ph.D. doing exciting work with early 18C English printers; and on Boswell and Armstrong by **Robert Walker** noted below. **Hugh Ormsby-Lennon** and **Margaret Boener** have published *Fools of Fiction: Reading William Trevor's Stories* (Remodeled Books, Sept. 2016, 378 pp.), available for kindle at $9.99 on Amazon. This is an appreciative assessment of one of Ireland's greatest storytellers of the past century, integrating biographical and cultural into the study of Trevor's short fiction. (Read the short review by Maureen O'Connor on Amazon.) In *Swift Studies* 2016 Hugh has added a second part to his "Pinching Swift: Dean Swift as Paralytic Gnomon in James Joyce's 'The Sisters'" (29 [2014], 89-129, 31: 82-128). The broad-ranging essay showering details and insights has much to offer Joyce scholars as well as Swiftians. This fall Hugh's writing "The Tail of the Tub: Ben Franklin's Clandestine Redactions of Dean Swift" for the Swift symposium next summer. **Cathy Parisian** published an essay ("Alice in Shorthand . . .") in *Alice in a World of Wonderlands: The Translation of Lewis Carroll's Masterpiece* (2015). About every month this the past year **John Price** has been sending out from London PDFs, superbly illustrated, with short-lists of antiquarian books on a range of topics including music and philosophy. (This is the season for buying books in pounds sterling!) **Elizabeth Powers** reviewed the volumes *Lotte meine Lotte: Die Briefe von Goethe an Charlotte von Stein, 1776-1786* (2014), 2 vols. of the 1700 letters Goethe wrote Charlotte in those years, and Albrecht Schöne's *Der Briefschreiber Goethe* (2015) in *Goethe Yearbook*, 23 (2016), 273-76. And the next review is hers too! On 276-79 she reviews Rüdiger Safranski's *Goethe: Kunstwerk des Lebens, Biographie* (2013), a very readable life by the author of many biographies. Elizabeth compares Safranski's aims and selection to Nicholas Boyle's in his lengthier *Goethe: The Poet and the Age*. Elizabeth has two reviews in the previous issue of *Goethe Yearbook*, too--we hope she returns to our pages. **Jonathan Pritchard**'s "Swift's 'Bishoprick of Virginia'" is the lead essay in the 2016 *Swift Studies* (9-39). Jonathan makes a good case that, when Swift wrote his friend, Robert Hunter, appointed Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, that he needed "get me my Virginia Bishoprick," he was not jesting as Harold Williams supposed. Jonathan carefully contextualizes Swift's remarks within the history of Virginia and its colonial church, Hunter's admirable career and his relation with Swift (including Swift's allusion to Hunter in a Horatian paraphrase), and "those affairs of state, both domestic and colonial, which touched the Anglican establishment in this period." He concludes, "there can be little doubt that Swift was interested . . . in such an appointment" (37-38). Besides essays by Alan Downie and Hugh Ormsby-Lennon noted in elswhere in this survey, this issue of *Swift Studies* has an essay by Kelly Martin on *A Tale of a Tub*, Rebecca Ferguson's "Swift's Fleas and his 'Lost' Poetic Feet: Entomology, Microscopy, and Generation in the Poems," William Hines's "Some Recent Finds in Aberystwyth University Library," and a bibliography of recent acquisitions by the Centre. This volume is the 31st edited by **Hermann J. Real**, who begins the issue with an account of acquisitions by the Ehrenpreis Centre in its effort to duplicate Swift's library's holdings and goes on to offer tributes to Martin Battestin, John Irwin Fischer, and Ian Ross, and concludes

with news of Swift from throughout the world and an update on the Online.Swift edition. This month--following surgeries that left him unable to read for most of September!--Hermann is editing the 32nd volume and preparing for the 7th Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift, hosted by the Centre in June (see "forthcoming meetings" below). **Claude Rawson** reviewed for *TLS* (very favorably) **Judith Milhous** and **Robert Hume**'s *The Publication of Plays in London 1660-1800*. **Panthea Reid**, who's moved to Blacksburg, VA, from Princeton, has prepared for the press the typescript of Swift and Esther Johnson's word-book MS, edited with essays, appendices, and notes by **John Fischer** and **A. C. Elias, Jr**., which hopefully will be in print before the big Swift celebrations in June 2017. **Cedric Reverend** had mailed to readers the September issue of the 40th volume of *Eighteenth-Century Life* well before the middle of the month. It contains eight book-review essays (edited by **Adam Potkay**) and three essays: Valerie Rumbold's "Reading *The Tatler* in 1710: Polite Print and the Spalding Gentlemen's Society (1-35); Keith Johnson's "Music and Montesquieu's Climate Theory in the Criticism of Joseph Baretti and his English Contemporaries," which examines an odd belief about the impact of climate on musical sensitivity and ability that reminds us that they were different from us; and Nicholas Hudson's "Challenging the Historical Paradigm: Tories, Whigs, and Economic Writing, 1680-1714 (68-88). The review essays include Timothy Erwin's essay on **Ashley Marshall**'s festschrift collection *Representations, Heterodoxy, and Aesthetics: Essays in Honour of Ronald Paulson* (Delaware, 2015) and **Cedric D. Reverand**'s collection Queen Anne and the Arts (Bucknell, 2015). **Joanne Roby** is working on celebrity and print studies, particularly on Manley and Pope. **Shef Rogers** published "'To Accommodate the Purchasers of Former Editions': Publishers' Supplements to Printed Works in the Eighteenth Century" in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 110 (2016), 299-311. Aided by the ESTC, the Burney Newspapers Online and other sources, Shef worked up a list of 110 works with supplements later offered for sale, disproportionately knowledge books in fields like history, medicine, and the sciences, and he notes a rise in the publication of supplements around mid century (Thomas Cadell was the publisher "most frequently advertising paid supplements"). We welcome **Douglas Root** to the Society. Douglas is at Claflin U. in South Carolina and published on essay on Johnson, Franklin, and their social circles in *Social Networks in the Long Eighteenth Centur*y (2014). **Lisa Rosner** reviewed Robert Woods and Chris Galley's *Mrs Stone & Dr. Smellie: Eighteenth-Century Midwives and their Patients* (2014) in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, no. 30 (Spring 2016),

Peter Sabor last year edited *The Cambridge Companion t*o Emma, which includes, among its 12 essays, **Jan Fergus**'s "Composition and Publication" and **Rob Hume**'s "Money and Rank." Rob provides us in the 21st century with a sense of the sums of money offered for wealth and expenditures and then treats "the implications of occupations and incomes" and "The social spectrum," and concludes with the section "What did Jane Austen really think?" (which guardedly characterizes Austen's ironic manner, her perception of the world, and the ways to read and understand her stories, stressing the gap between "what the novels *say* and what they *show*"). **Beverly Schneller,** to whom we are indebted for a review above, is writing four entries for April London's *Cambridge Companion to the Eighteenth Century Nove*l, two on Elizabeth

Helme's novels and two on John Hill's. Beverly spoke on Sir John Hill and his printers during October 2014 at the conference "Sir John Hill and London Life" held at King's College London and organized by Clare Brant. Recently Beverly heard that good news that the collection, edited by Brant and George Rousseau, has gone to press. **Manuel Schonhorn** continues, with **Max Novak** and others, to provide an editorial reading to the volumes of the Stoke Newington Defoe edition published by AMS Press--this April he was rewarded with a copy of *The Family Instructor* (2 vols. 1715, 1718), ed. by Irving N. Rothman. Early this fall Manny was also working on a note involving Pope's *Windsor Forest* --he was reading Pat Rogers and hoping not to find his insight already in print.

It's a year of service for **Norbert Schürer**, who was elected Chair of the Academic Senate at California State U. at Long Beach. Norbert recently submitted an article on "British and International Print Trade Relations" to a forthcoming book, entitled *Richardson in Context* and edited by **Peter Sabor** and Betty Schellenberg (Cambridge 2017 likely). Norbert reports that his "last 'publication' was actually a study of a local Long Beach artisan builder and self-taught architect called Miner Smith (http://hslb.org/product/boom-and-bust-miner-smith-and-his-1920s-california-bungalow-mansions/) on whom I also curated an exhibition at the Historical Society of Long Beach." Though not involving 18C material, the work was a gratifying contribution to Long Beach, for "something like 2,000 visited the exhibition over its three months." **Rebecca Shapiro**, escaping a contract at slow-moving AMS (a serious problem when you're on tenure-track), will see her book *Fixing Babel: An Historical Anthology of Applied Lexicography* appear from Bucknell U. Press--now it will be illustrated, appear in paperback by the end of 2016, and cost under a $100. **Richard B. Sher** last year published *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment: The Moderate Literati of Edinburgh*. (Edinburgh U. Press, 2015), c. 430 pp. It's reviewed by David Allan in *Eighteenth-Century Scotland*, no. 30 (Spring 2016), 21-22. In December 2015 Richard and Zubin Meer posted their second version (edition) of *Adam Ferguson (1723-1816): An Annotated Bibliography*, available at: andromeda. rutgers.edu/ ~jlynch/C18/biblio/ Ferguson.pdf, with sections on bibliographies, dissertations, editions, and criticism on the 42-p. PDF. **Eleanor Shevlin** conducted an undergraduate seminar on newspapers, with a project on *The News-Paper Wedding*, which is the topic of a website she created in May; then she participated in the SHARP conference in Paris this summer. She has long been SHARP's membership secretary and also the liaison between SHARP and ASECS, and this year she is the EC/ASECS President and will offer us her presidential address in Fredericksburg, which we hope to offer everyone in the spring issue.

After 40 years, **Geoffrey Sill** retired from teaching at Rutgers University-Camden, but he's not changing his stripes and we'll still enjoy his papers at EC-ASECS, including one this October at Fredericksburg, on Robinson Crusoe's "sudden Joys." This fall at the Burney Society conference, he'll speak on "Frances Burney and the French Revolution," in a paper drawing on materials in the volume that he edited (Vol. 5: 1789) of *The Court Journals and Letters of Frances Burney*, which will be published by Oxford U. Press in November 2016. (I guess my emphasis is wrong there--publication of a volume in that valuable edition should be in a main clause.) Geoff also published the essay "Developments in Sentimental Fiction" in *The Oxford Handbook of The*

Eighteenth-Century Novel, ed. by **J. A. Downie** (Oxford, 2016), and another, "'Only a Boy': George Starr's 'Notes on Sentimental Novels' Revisited" in *Reflections on Sentiment: Essays in Honor of George Starr*, ed. Alessa Johns (U. of Delaware Press, 2016). Geoff's reflections on George Starr's career were motivated in part by his work (with co-editor Gabriel Cervantes) on an edition of Defoe's *Colonel Jack* published in 2016 by Broadview Press. As noted above in a review (pp. 27-30), **Brijrah Singh** has published *Professing English on Two Continents*, reflecting on his "experiences teaching at the college and university level both in India and here, the different types of students I had and their vastly different cultural and other contents, and how I had constantly to devise different methods to profess the subject effectively." In short the book is about what he learned from teaching about both teaching and living (it's available as a kindle and on paper at Amazon). **Jan Stahl**'s article "Violence, Female Friendship, and the Education of the Heroine in Mary Davys's *The Reform'd Coquet*," has been published in *Studies in the Literary Imagination*, Vol. 47.2 (Georgia State U.). In "Curating *Will & Jane*," the lead article in *Eighteenth-Century Life*'s April 2016 issue, **Kristina Straub** and Janine Barchas provide an account of working with "historic nonbook artifacts" while organizing over the past two years the Folger Shakespeare Library's current exhibition, *Will & Jane: Shakespeare, Austen, and the Cult of Celebrity* (running through 6 November). Aided by 20 illustrations, they "provide a record of the story told by this collection of objects as well as the lessons that we learned by telling that story through more concrete means than the literary scholar's usual stock in trade" (1). **Rivka Swenson** this year published *Essential Scots and the Idea of Unionism in Anglo-Scottish Literature, 1603-1832* (Bucknell U. Press's Transits series; pp. 348; $100). The PR notes, "Considering the emergence of British unionism alongside the literary rise of both description and 'the individual,'" Rivka "builds on extant scholarship with original close readings that illuminate the inheritances of 1603" (Union of the Crowns).

We're happy to welcome **Alistaire Tallent** to the Society. Alistaire works at Colorado College on French literature, non-canonical and pornographic novels, and women and sexuality. Her essay "Intimate Exchanges: The Courtesan Narrative and Male Homosocial Desire in *La Dame aux camélias* appeared in the Winter 2014 issue of *French Forum*, and she contributed an essay on prostitutes in French memoirs to Boyd and Kvande's *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-Century Women Transforming Public and Private* (2008). We welcome **Katherine Thorpe**, who after speaking on **Don Mell**'s ASECS panel on Swift comes to Fredericksburg to speak to us on Milton's Sin and Swift's Corinna. Kate is writing a dissertation at Princeton U. on personification in poetry from Milton to Wordsworth (she herself has received fellowships for creative writing, one leading to residence in Germany). **Robert G. Walker** published "John Armstrong's 'Finer Souls' in an Early Boswell Journal" in *Notes & Queries*, 63, no. 1 (2016), 86-87, and has forthcoming there in March "Two Cruces in [Ford Madox] Ford's *Some Do Not . . .*," which has "a bit of an 18th century tinge to it," for he discusses a "reference to Wicked *Will*. *Whiston* and Good Master *Ditton*." And Bob's review essay "Issues with Biographical Evidence in Recent Studies of Samuel Johnson: A Review Essay" appeared in *Biography*, 38.3 (Summer 2015), 391- 401. **Tara Ghoshal Wallace**'s "Historical *Redgauntlet:* Jacobite Delusions and Hanoverian

Fantasies" appeared in *Romanticism*, 21 (2015), 145-59. We welcome **Nathaniel Wolloch**, who normally teaches in Israel, is this year a Visiting Scholar at the Institute for Historical Studies at the U. of Texas at Austin. Natty will be speaking at our fall meeting. **Abigail Zitin** published "Fittest and Fairest: Aesthetics and Adaptation before Darwin" in *ELH*, 82.3 (2015), 845-68, which "compares eighteenth-century moral sense philosophy with the hypotheses that guide evolutionary psychology at the turn of the 21st century," and works William Hogarth into its discussion of the experience of beauty.

Forthcoming Meetings, Announcements, Resources, &c.

NEASECS meets 20-22 Oct. 2016 at the U. of Massachusetts, Amherst.

EC/ASECS meets 27-29 October 2016 at Mary Washington U. in Fredericksburg, VA, chaired by Marie McAllister (ecasecs2016@gmail.com). See the lead article in this issue.

The **Canadian SECS** meets 26-30 Oct. 2016 in Kingston, Ontario, co-hosted by Queen's University and the Royal Military College of Canada, with plenary speakers Christopher Cave and Lisa Freeman. The theme is "Secrets & Surveillance," and Chantal Lavoie calls for talks on topics like espionage, suspicion, & treason. .Proposals are due 1 April to CSECS2016@queensu.ca.

The **MWASECS** has no 2016 meeting this fall. Its Treasurer is Jeanne Hageman in Modern Languages at North Dakota State U, Fargo, ND 58108, and Jeanine Casler of Northwestern University edits the newsletter (j-casler@ northwestern.edu).

The **American Historical Association** meets in Denver, 5-8 January 2017.

The **Western Society for 18C Studies** will meet on 17-18 February 2017 at Univ. of California at Santa Barbara, with Rachael S. King serving as program chair. The theme is the 18C sciences; Jonathan Kramnick will give a plenary. The meetings first day overlaps with a conference on J.-J. Rousseau. Proposals for 15-20 minute papers were due by 1 October 2016 to rking@english.ucsb.edu. Details are posted at wsecs2017.wordpress.com. See www.wsecs.org.

SEASECS will meet 2-4 March 2017 at the Renaissance Montgomery Hotel & Spa in the historic district of Montgomery, AL, with the theme "Colonial Intersections in the 18C." Thursday's events include a plenary by Melissa Hyde on "The French Connection: Femmes-Artistes and the Founding Fathers" and, that evening, a dance with eighteenth-century steps. Friday offers Kathryn Braund's plenary "'The Manner of the Indian Nations': 18C Accounts of the Creek Indians." Paper proposals are due by 1 Nov. to Joe Johnson (joejohnson@clayton.edu). Local arrangements are chaired by W. B. Gerard (wgerard@aum.edu). SEASECS President Keith Pacholl (kpacholl@ westga.edu) announced a new website at www.seasecs.org.

On 17-18 February 2017 at Trinity College Dublin, there will be a conference on "**The Irish and the London Stage**: Identity, Culture, and Politics, 1680-1830," with Helen Burke and Felicity Nussbaum as plenary speakers (the CFP passed on 30 Sept.).

The **South-Central SECS** holds its 2017 meeting ("The Instructive Enlightenment") on 16-18 February at the Radisson Hotel in downtown Salt Lake City. Proposals are due by 31 October to chairs of the sessions posted at

the conference website (www.scsecs. net/ scsecs/2017/panels2017.html), or, if none apply, to the conference chair Brett McInelly (brett_mcinelly@byu.edu). Kathryn Duncan of St. Leo's U. (kathryn.duncan@saintleo.edu) chairs the 2018 meeting to be held in Florida.

The 10th biennial conference of the **Society of Early Americanists** occurs 2-4 March 2017 in Tulsa, OK, chaired by Laura Stevens (the submission deadline passed on 25 August). See https://sea2017.wordpress.com for details.

ASECS holds its 48th annual meeting in Minneapolis on 30 March-2 April 2017 (the CFP was run by ASECS with deadline 15 Sept.). Vickie Cutting posted a preliminary program for the meeting at the ASECS website on 11 Oct.

The Depts. of Theatre and Modern Languages at U. of Ottawa and the Centre for Publication History at Carleton U. are organizing a conference on "**Migrations / Representations / Stereotypes**" for 28-30 April 2017 at the U. of Ottawa, with proposals due 1 Nov. (migration.conference2017@gmail.com).

"Swift 350," an international conference marking the 350th anniversary of the birth of Jonathan Swift, is being organized for 7-9 June 2017 in Dublin, principally at Trinity College. It's receiving the patronage of the heads of Trinity College, the Royal Irish Academy, St. Patrick's Cathedral, and St. Patrick's Medical Health Services. A call for papers has been issued by organizers Aileen Douglas (Trinity College Dublin=TCD), Andrew Carpenter (University College Dublin), and Ian Campbell Ross (TCD). The plenary speakers will be Moya Haslett (Queen's U. Belfast), Ian McBride (King's College London), and James Woolley (Lafayette College). Details are being posted at the website http://www.tcd.ie/swift350. Send proposals to swift350@tcd.ie.

The **Seventh Münster Symposium on Jonathan Swift**--In Celebration of the 350th Anniversary of the Dean's Birthday--will be held 11-14 June 2017 in Münster, Germany. The conference is organized by Hermann J. Real and Kirstin Juhas and colleagues at the Ehrenpreis Centre for Swift Studies. The symposium enjoys the patronage of H. E. The Irish Ambassador to Germany, Michael Collins. The venue for papers will be Alexander von Humboldt-Haus, a fine conference building at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster. The Conference Hotel, for lodging and evening banquets, will be the Mövenpick Hotel, Kardinal-von-Galen Ring 65, 48149 Münster, Germany (hotel.muenster@moevenpick.com). Direct inquires about the meeting to realh@uni-muenster.de and juhas@uni-muenster.de. See also the Ehrenpreis Centre's website for details. (See above for more on the Ehrenpreis Centre.)

SHARP's 2017 annual meeting, entitled "Technologies of the Book," will be held in Victoria, British Columbia, and the 2018 meeting will be in Sydney, Australia, on 26-29 June. (See www.sharpweb.org.)

The 30th annual conference of the **Eighteenth-Century Scottish Studies Society** (ECSSS) "will be held as a joint meeting with the World Congress of Scottish Literature from 21 to 25 June 2017 at the Coast Plaza Hotel in Vancouver, principally hosted by the Centre for Scottish Studies and the English Dept. of Simon Fraser U. The "two key themes" are "indigenous/Scottish relations and transpacific/Scottish connections, but submissions reflecting a diverse range of interests are encouraged. The CFP had a deadline of 1 Oct.; see the conference's website at https:// dialoguesanddiasporas. wordpress.com. The meeting's organizer is ECSSS President Leith Davis (English, Simon Fraser U.).

The 15th annual **International Conference on Books, Publishing, & Literature** will be held 7 July 2017 at Imperial College London--the one-day conference is held in conjunction with the 15th International Conference on New Directions in the Humanities and registration covers both. The CFP ended back in July! But keep it in mind for another summer.

The next biennial conference of the **Charles Brockden Brown Society** will be held at University College Dublin, hosted by the Clinton Institute for American Studies, on 5-7 October 2017. The meeting is entitled "Migration, Diaspora, Circulation, and Translation" and the CFP is posted at the website www.brockdenbrownsociety.ucf.edu.. This Society, founded in 2000, focuses on Brown (1771-1810) and his era.

The **Canadian Society for 18C Studies** (CSECS) meets jointly with the **NEASECS** in Toronto on 18-22 Oct. 2017. The CSECS then meets on 10-13 Oct. 2018 at a major hotel in Niagara Falls.

Our **2017 EC/ASECS** meeting will occur at Howard University on 2-4 November, Thursday to Saturday, chaired by Emily Kugler (emily.kugler@ howard.edu). The plenary will be given by Tara Wallace of George Washington U. Dr. Kugler has set up a website at https://ecasecs2017.wordpress.com and a conference email account of ecasecs2017@gmail.com. Graduate students are encouraged to apply for the Eric Sven Molin Prize for best paper at the meeting.

The **International Society for 18C Studies** (ISECS) has updated its directory for 18C scholars, posted at its website: www.isecs.org under "ISECS-direct." Back in June, presumably as an ASECS member, I was sent a password to use for entering the ISECS web resources. On 27 May I received an account (in French and English) of ISECS from its President (Lise Andries) and senior officers, noting its official aims, activities, organizational structure, budget (31 national societies pay dues to ISECS), etc. It's great to see the ISECS reassert itself after a decade or more with a low profile--the Enlightenment Congresses also seem to have lost some of their stature. The **next Congress is 14-19 July 2019 in Edinburgh** with the theme "Enlightenment Identities," organized by the British SECS in conjunction with the U. of Edinburgh and ISECS. See the website at www.bsecs.org.uk/isecs2019/. The ISECS meets each year with another group, too, as it did this year in Florence and will in 2017 in Edinburgh.

Members of ASECS and its regional affiliates Societies are invited to submit revised conference papers (5000-6000 words) to ***Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture***, the 2016 volume of which is the 47th. The volume is edited now by Eve T. Bannett (U. of Oklahoma; etbannet@ou.edu). She recommends that those interested in submitting essays first send her a proposal or abstract and get coached on how to submit. *SECC* is now open to accepting a panel's papers.

The **Folger Shakespeare Library's** current exhibition, *Will & Jane: Shakespeare, Austen, and the Cult of Celebrity* (running through 6 November), looks at the two authors' literary afterlives, finding parallels in the impacts of adaptations and celebrations. Note that the Folger Shakespeare Theatre's upcoming season includes a production, through 30 Oct. of *Sense and Sensibility*, adapted by Kate Hamill.

On 29 July 2016 The **Library Company of Philadelphia** announced that during year three of its NEH Challenge Grant campaign it raised $478.600. They are close to securing $356,000 in a federal matching grant.

After being closed for a two-year restoration project, the **NYPL**'s Rose Reading Room and Blass Public Catalogue Room opened early in October 2016.

The Frick Collection (E 70th St., NYC) mounts from 16 Nov. to 19 Feb **"Pierre Gouthière, Virtuoso Gilder."** Gouthière (1732-1813) produced objets d'art for the French elite, gilding with bronze and other precious metals porcelain and other materials. This exhibition, with 21 masterpieces, is the first devoted to his work and moves from March-June to the Musée des Arts in Paris.

The Bibliographical Society of America every three years awards the **William L. Mitchell Prize for Bibliography or Documentary Work on Early British Periodicals or Newspapers**, with a cash prize of $1000. The Prize honors William L. Mitchell, a former rare-books librarian at the Kenneth Spencer Research Library at the U. of Kansas, where he curated the Richmond P. and Marjorie N. Bond Collection of 18th-Century British Newspapers and Periodicals and of the Edmund Curll Collection. The late Alexandra Mason, long the Spencer Librarian, spearheaded the establishment of the award's endowment, to which she was the principal donor. The prize recognizes excellent scholarship in--and thus encourages scholarship in--18th-century periodicals or newspapers published in English or in any language but within the British Isles and its colonies and former colonies. The work submitted in nomination could involve not only a book or article but also a web-posting or dissertation (but only a single effort can be submitted, not, let's say, a group of articles). The **next competition has the deadline of 30 September 2017** and will consider works (including theses, articles, books, and electronic resources) published after 31 December 2013. The competition is open to all without regard to membership, nationality, and academic degree or rank, requiring little more of applicants than the submission of a curriculum vitae and three copies of printed work (or one electronic copy) and access and instructions for internet publications. Direct questions to the prize's coordinator, James E. May (Jem4@psu.edu).

The Bibliographical Society of America's fifth triennial Mitchell Prize was awarded January 2015 to Simon Macdonald, then a postdoctoral fellow at McGill U., for his "**English-Language Newspapers in Revolutionary France**," published in *The Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 36, no. 1 (2013), 18-33. Dr. Macdonald examines a ambitious series of English-language newspapers printed in Paris 1789-1792 "for the purpose of export and sale in Britain, so bringing news fresh from revolutionary France while simultaneously--at least, according to the claims of their promoters--sidestepping the editorial constraints which corrupted the reporting available in the British press." The main such venture, Macdonald's principal focus, was the *Paris Mercury; and Continental Chronicle*, "a bi-weekly newspaper of four folio pages," whose first issue appeared in late May 1792 (a later issue is illustrated in the article). In the autumn the *Paris Mercury* was retitled the *Magazine of Paris, or Gazette of the Republic of France. Ci-devant the Paris Mercury* and issued for the same price in octavo. Macdonald's article "is divided into three parts: the first examines the contents of such copies of the *Paris Mercury* as survive, and reconstructs, as far as possible, its publication history and antecedents; the second reviews the commercial and political rationale behind the establishment of an English-language newspaper in revolutionary Paris, referring particularly to the reverse model offered by the *Courier de l'Europe*, a major old regime international

gazette produced in London; and the third discusses why the *Paris Mercury* failed." The last section examines "underlying structural factors within the British news market: above all, collusion between postal officials and newspaper publishers to exclude foreign-based competitors." Besides locating extant copies of the paper and also issues of other cross-channel serials in Britain, France, and the United States, Macdonald researched the publishers and editors involved, such as Thomas Gillet, a London publisher with a branch in Paris, and Robert Taylor, an Irish businessman living in Paris who wrote the interior minister in hope of obtaining a subsidy from the French government. For accounts of former Mitchell Prize winning books and essays, typically, as in MacDonald's submission, involving ground-breaking work on primary materials, see the Society's website (www.bibsocamer.org).

Sean Moore of the Univ. of New Hampshire will take over for a five-year term in July 2017 as **editor of *Eighteenth-Century Studies***. Moore is Associate Professor of English at the University of New Hampshire, where he served as Director of the UNH Honors Program from 2011-2014. He has been a member of ASECS for 17 years, served for many years as the Chair of the Irish Studies Caucus of ASECS and as the North American Correspondent for the Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society, and has given papers at ASECS panels sponsored by the SHARP caucus and Race and Empire caucus. His first monograph, *Swift, the Book, and the Irish Financial Revolution*, won the Murphy Prize for Distinguished First Book from the American Conference for Irish Studies, and he edited a special issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies* on the Irish Enlightenment in 2012. His new work, "Slavery and the Making of the Early American Library," is in a transatlantic and early American direction, focusing on how slave capitalism financed the transatlantic book trade in British texts.

Eighteenth-Century Studies has a CFP for a special issue on "**Empires**" (wide open: politics, trade, etc.); it invites essays of 7000-9000 words by 1 Feb. 2017, submitted to ecs57@yale.edu. Direct queries to the managing editor, Amy Dunagin (amy.dunagin@yale.edu).

ASECS's Race and Empire Caucus is pleased to announce the institution of an annual essay prize for graduate student members of ASECS. The Caucus welcomes essays that are revised versions of papers read at the regional and national conferences of ASECS and its affiliates (including the Society of Early Americanists, Early Caribbean Society, SHARP, NABMSA, etc.) between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2017. The prize-winning essay will be considered for publication in the 2017-2018 volume of *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, and the prize will be awarded at the 2018 ASECS meeting. *Submission guidelines*: The competition is open to papers on any topic that combines the multifarious legacy of post-colonial and/or critical race studies with the analysis of eighteenth-century literature and culture. In previous years, panels organized by the caucus have addressed the global frameworks of European exploration, commerce, conquest, colonialism, and slavery in Africa, Asia, the South Pacific, and the Americas. We welcome papers that explore similar topics or any new aspect of the constitutive links between race and empire. The deadline for submission is July 1, 2017. Essays should be double-spaced, maximum 5000 words in length, with the following information appearing only on the cover sheet: your name; institutional mailing address and e-mail address; name of conference, panel title; chair's name; and date of presentation. Please send

submissions in word document format to Betty Joseph (beejay@rice.edu) or Daniel J. O'Quinn (doquinn@uoguelph.ca).

Some of the books we've reviewed in recent years have won the Univ. of **Virginia Press's Walker Cowen Memorial Prize** in 18C Studies, which has a $5000 price plus publication by the press. The deadline for the next competition is 1 November. Download the application and gather info at www.upress.virginia.edu/cowen-prize. (This press is generous with review copies, unlike many, such as Routledge and its parent company, Taylor & Francis.)

The **Society of Early Americanists' annual essay contest** has a deadline extended to 31 Oct. this year. It's open to any paper on an Americanist topic, broadly conceived, during the academic year offered at one of its conferences or at the ASECS or any ASECS-affiliated society's conferences. The paper can be revised and need be no longer than 6000 words. The contest involves blind reviewing. See the contest page of www.americanocietyofearlyamericanists.org.

In 2012 SEASECS established the **Annibel Jenkins Prize in Performance & Theater Studies** in honor of its founding member, Annibel Jenkins. An award of $500 will be given annually for the best article in performance and theater studies published in a scholarly journal, annual, or collection between September 1, 2015 and August 31, 2016. Authors must be members of SEASECS at the time of submission. Articles may be submitted by the author or by another member. The deadline for submissions is November 29, 2016. Please send submissions as PDF files, and address any queries about the prize to the Chair: Diana Solomon, dks5@sfu.ca (English, Simon Fraser U.)

Most of the dozen or more research libraries with many fellowships open to 18C scholars have deadlines in December and January (such as Harvard, 15 January). But some could sneak up on you. Note that the **U. of Texas's Harry Ransom Center**'s fellowship applications for working in Austin from June 2017 to August 2018 are due 15 November (1-3 months in length, they pay $3000 per months, and there are dissertation fellowships).

ASECS's A. C. Elias Irish-American Research Travel Fellowship, with a $2500 award, supports "documentary scholarship on Ireland in the period between the Treaty of Limerick (1691) and the Act of Union (1800), by enabling North American-based scholars to travel to Ireland and Irish-based scholars to travel to North America for furthering their research." Original research on any aspect of 18C Ireland qualifies for consideration, but recipients must be members of ASECS or The Eighteenth-Century Ireland Society. Prize winners are chosen by an independent jury of three distinguished scholars from different disciplines. Each application goes through the hands of several readers, from within and outside the applicant's field. The Irish-American Research Fellowship was established in 1993-1994 by the late Dr. A. C. Elias, Jr. (independent scholar, Philadelphia), and now bears his name. Applications consist of the coversheet downloaded at the ASECS travel-fellowship website, a short curriculum vitae (no more than 3 pp.), a short narrative description of the project (treating its contribution to the field and work done and to be done during the proposed research period), a one-page bibliography of related books and articles, a short budget, and two signed letters of recommendation submitted directly by the two supporters. These materials are due by 15 November, with the candidate's application sent ideally as an single file attached in Word or PDF, to the fellowships two trustees: Dr. Máire Kennedy, Curator of the Dublin

& Irish Collections of the Dublin City Public Library (maire.kennedy @dublincity .ie; 138-144 Pearse Street / Dublin 2 / Ireland) and Dr. James May of Penn State University (jem4 @psu.edu; PSU--DuBois Campus / College Place / DuBois, PA 15801). Note: if the two letters of reference cannot be supplied as PDFs of signed letters, the original copies on paper should be mailed to one of the trustees. Last year the $2500 fellowship was awarded to Anne Wohlcke (History, California State Polytechnic University in Pomona) for her research in Belfast and Dublin on "Musical Work and Commemoration in the Eighteenth-Century British World."

The journal *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* has issued a call for a collection of essays on "**Transatlantic Drama**" (exchanges between the Old and New Worlds involving texts, reviews, actors, and "less tangible reimaginings of the politics, genres, customs, and performance practices across the Atlantic." The deadline is 1 Dec. 2016. Send submissions to editors@rectrjournal.org (the journal's website has guidelines, and another contact is Dr. Anne Greenfield in English at Valdosta State U.)

Vin Carretta passed on to me news of a program he's involved in: The **Georgian Papers Programme**. "On April 1, 2015, the Georgian Papers Programme was launched at Windsor Castle in the presence of her Majesty the Queen. A collaboration between King's College London . . . and the Royal Collection Trust, the Programme aims to digitize, disseminate, and interpret an extraordinarily rich collection of materials, including correspondence, maps, and royal household ledgers. Making this extensive collection of approximately 350,000 items available to scholars the world over, the project will transform our understanding of the Georgian period . . . . On October 6, 2015, the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, along with the College of William and Mary, was announced as the primary U.S. partner for the George Papers Programme. The digital availability of this . . . collection will have important bearing on the history of North America and the transatlantic worlds of politics, science, and religion in the long 18C. The Omohundro Institute's partnership includes fellowships (kinggeorge/index.cfm) supporting research in the original papers at Windsor Castle, early access to the digitized materials at Swem Library, and other opportunities for scholars . . . to engage with the project and the materials."

At the Early Modern Online Bibliography website, we saw the following announcement: "Expand your research with the **ACI Scholarly Blog Index**. As the world's only scholarly blog discovery service, the ACI Scholarly Blog Index was designed with your research in mind. Whether you're a . . . student or a scientist . . . use ACI's robust search engine, citation and sharing options, and other workflow tools to empower your scholarly blog research. The ACI Scholarly Blog Index provides access to blog articles written by researchers and academic organizations across a wide variety of disciplines. Our strict editorial process ensures that you can find higher quality articles and filter on more meaningful metrics than traditional search engine results" (http:// aci.info/scholarly-blogs/). Instructions are offered for librarians wishing to put the site to use and for authors wishing to submit their blogs.

For a huge inventory at modest prices, see ***Timothy Hughes Rare and Early Newspapers****: Authentic Original Newspapers for Sale:* www. rarenewspapers.com. This is a searchable website of a major dealer in 17C-19C

newspapers with digital images and descriptions of stock held by Hughes in Williamsport, PA. Queries can be sent to info@ www.rarenewspapers.com.

I recently stumbled on the ***Society for Emblem Studies Newsletter***, edited by Sabine Mödersheim, with Wim van Dongen design & distribution ed.). Issues from 45 (July 2009) through 54 (January 2014) were available on WWW in January, each about 40 pp., with illustrations, lengthy, informative calls for papers, conference & research reports, and society business. No. 50 (2012) was at: german.Iss.wisc.edu/ ~smoedersheim/ SES/SESNewsletter50.pdf.

Boydell and Brewer, in association with the British SECS, will begin publishing a monograph series, ***Studies in the Eighteenth Century***, on multidisciplinary research on the global 18C: "The major new series from Boydell & Brewer aims to bring into fruitful dialogue the different disciplines involved in all aspects of the study of the long 18C (c. 1660-1820). It will publish innovative volumes, singly or co-authored, on any topic in history, science, music, literature, and the visual arts in any area of the world during the long 18C. It will particularly encourage proposals that explore links among the disciplines, and which aim to develop new cross-disciplinary fields of enquiry. Projects on the transnational or 'global' 18C will be particularly welcome." Proposals are directed to any of the series editors: Ros Ballaster of Mansfield College, Oxford (ros.ballaster@mansfield.ox.ac.uk), Matthew Grenby of Newcastle U. (matthew.grenby@ncl.ac.uk), Robert D. Hume of Penn State U. (Rob-Hume@psu.edu), Mark Knights, History, U. of Warwick (M.J.Knights@ warwick.ac.uk), and Renaud Morieux, History, Cambridge (rm656@cam.ac.uk), or to the commissioning editor at B&B (Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF), Mari Shullaw (mshullaw@boydell.co.uk).

Boydell & Brewer announced in March a new publication series entitled **"Knowledge and Communication in the Enlightenment World,"** edited by James Raven and Mark Towsey. "The series considers the global history of knowledge transmission from 1650-1850." It aims to serve a broader audience than do must studies of book history: "This series addresses the interaction between material form and intellectual development in the global history of knowledge . . . by publishing groundbreaking transnational studies of script, print, material culture, and communications networks. . . . the fast-developing field of 'book history' has revolutionized national bibliographical study, but it remains largely bound by nationally or linguistically based networks . . . . The task of the proposed series will be both to engage with this wider range of material and to reflect the exciting range of trans-European and global research currently being done on the basis of newly accessible archives and libraries, thus providing a fresh and comparative perspective on the social history of knowledge." The series will mainly published monographs but will include multi-author collections on "the interaction between writers, readers and texts of all kinds from philosophical texts to everyday ephemera." It will begin with an edited collection with the working title "Exchanging Knowledge: Ideas and Materialities" and then will "develop themes set out in the opening volume."

Nothing regarding the 18C won a 2015 award in the ACRL competition entitled "Katherine Kyes Leab and Daniel J. Leab American Book Prices Current **Exhibition Catalogue Awards**." However, the previous year two 18C exhibitions were honored. For Division 1 (the most expensive class), the winner was Walter Davis's *All under Heaven: The Chinese World in Maps, Pictures,*

and Texts from the Collection of Floyd Sully (Bruce Peel Special Collections Library catalogue series) Alberta: U. of Alberta Press, 2014. Pp. 128; illus. of 16C-18C maps and hand-colored woodblock prints. And the award for the best electronic exhibition went to the John Carter Brown Library for "Sugar and Visual Imagination in the Atlantic World," on the period 1600-1850, posted to accompany an exhibit at JCBL mounted from Oct-Dec. 2013.

On 26 June the British Library and the Arts Comission of UIA sponsored a conference at the BL entitled "The Written Heritage of Mankind in Peril: Theft, Retrieval, Sale, and Restitution of Rare Books, Maps, and Manuscripts. The conference's PR claims that **theft of rare materials** has greatly increased globally. Speakers included the head of collections at BL and the BNF, Kristen Jensen and Denis Bruckmann, and also various legal and rare books experts, as Stephan Loewentheil of the 19C Rare Book shop of Brooklyn.

Manny Schonhorn sent me a flyer prepared by the Consortium of European Research Libraries on "**Contributing to the Heritage of the Printed Book Database (HPB)**," dated January 2016. It's a call for records from libraries regarding their holdings. It notes only one American library has contributed but libraries in Russia, the Baltic Republics, and Eastern Europe have begun adding their records. Presently the HPB has 6 million records for books printed to 1830, recording copies at 250 libraries. The CERL Thesaurus allows entry without having to type in all the fields and allows searches across fields and minimizes loss to variant spellings. "Our preferred file format is MARC21 (ISO-2709) encoded in UTF-8. However, we will work with you to facilitate other formats if we can." The records are converted at the SUB Göttingen (there's a delay of some months to get the submission into the database). The contact for the HPB is Marian Lefferts at marian.lefferts@cerl.org.

Patrick Scott in Special Collections at South Carolina has published as a separate pamphlet (and in *Studies in Scottish Literature* 2016) **Murray Pittock's W. Ormiston Roy Memorial Lecture** for 2015: *Who Wrote the* Scots Musical Museum*? Challenging Editorial Practice in the Presence of Authorial Absence*. (This is the fifth published in the lecture series.)

The Johnsonians of the UK have long produced a journal called The ***New Rambler***, and its editor, Michael Bundock, is overseeing the digitization of half a century's back issues. Robert DeMaria hopes to have the back issues available at the YaleJohnson.com website, making the rare journal available globally.

Scholars may find useful the ***Glossary of 18th Century Costume Terminology*** mounted on the WWW by Sue Felshin, an MIT language-processing scientist with the avocation of studying 18C New England life. Her long alphabetized list of proper definitions for words like tippet and zone, with good documentation, can be googled up by its title and is found at https:// people.csail.mit.edu/sfelshin/revwar/glossary.html last revised 13 Jan. 2016).

Bibliothèque Bleue Online is an online text-base created as a collaboration of Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, the ARTFL Project of the U. of Chicago, and the Initiative for French and North American Libraries (CIFNAL), posted at www.lib.uchicago.edu/efts/ARTFL/projects/BibBl/. The website offers the full text and page images of 252 titles from the 2570 volumes of "bleue" books, or chapbooks originally in blue covers, produced in Troyes and then Paris by the printshops of the Oudot and Garnier families, from the 1500s through the 1700s. The site has a user manual, perhaps the product of Catherine Mardikes, ETS

coordinator at Chicago, listed as a helpful contact. The introduction notes also that 623 imprints at the Médiathèque du Grand Troyes have been digitized.

The ***Intelligencer*** **needs reviewers for four books received:**

Emily C. Friedman, *Reading Smell in Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield; Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell U. Press, 2016; pp. xii + 193; bibliography; index. "Friedman examines how the recovery of forgotten or overlooked olfactory information might reshape our understanding of these texts," looking at such scents as tobacco and sulfur, and at texts by Austen, Burney, Richardson, Lewis, Swift, and Smollett,

Laurence Whyte [d. 1753], *The Collected Poems of Laurence Whyte*, ed. by Michael Griffin (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell U. Press, 2016), pp. xviii + 371 + [2]; bibliography; index; subscription list. ISBN: 978-1-61148-721-3. This is an annotated but straight-forward edition, based for all but one poem on Whyte's *Original Poems on Various Subjects, Serious, Moral, and Diverting*, 2nd ed. (Dublin 1742)--the reviewer will need to introduce us to Whyte's poetry.

Goethe Yearbook, Vol. 23, ed. by Adrian Daub, Elizabeth Krimmer, and (for book reviews) Birgit Tautz, published by the Goethe Society of North America (distributed by Camden House) 2016; pp. ix + 320; illus; 12 essays (all in English, with five on Visual Culture in the Goethezeit), and 24 reviews.

Eric Gidal, *Ossianic Unconformities: Bardic Poetry in the Industrial Age* (Univ. of Virginia Press, 2015; 240 pp.; 25 illus.), a study of Ossian's reception, particularly by "19C Scottish eccentrics who used statistics, cartography, and geomorphology to map and thereby vindicate Macpherson's . . .. renderings."

Four Sources for Terms for Books in Diverse Languages:

Gnirrep, W. K., J. P. Gumbert, and J. A. Szirmai. *Kneep en binding: Een terminologie voor de beschrijving van de constructies van oude boekbanden: Voor het Belgisch-Nederlands Bandengenootschap*. 3rd ed. The Hague: Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 1997. Pp. 126; illus.; indices. This dictionary of bookbinding terms first published in 1992 illustrates bindings and the like to allow better understanding of terms. The lexical guide concludes with indices of the terms in four languages: Dutch, English, French, and German). The Koninklijke posted the 1992 ed at www.kb.nl/sites/default/files/docs/kneep_en_binding_digitaal_20080410.pdf

International League of Antiquarian Booksellers (ILAB). *How to Describe Rare Books, Manuscripts, Autographs, Maps, Prints, Atlases, First Editions, Illustrated Books--Glossary in English*. Open-access database: http://www.ilab.org/eng/glossary.html. Terms, arranged alphabetically, and linked such that when one clicks on one the equivalent words appear for Danish, Dutch, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Swedish.

Morgan, Suzy, Peter Verheyen, and others (comps. and eds.). *Multilingual Bookbinding and Conservation Dictionary*. An open-access on-line international dictionary of terms used in Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Swedish, and Russian. Posed in 2014 and revised in 2015 at bookbindingdictionary.com/wiki/index.php?title-Main_Page. A bibliography of multilingual lexical resources, both printed and online, is also available at the page with the address ending "title=Bibliography" (as of 23 May 2015, last revised November 2014).

Smith, Shelagh, and Hélène Francoeur (comps.). *Translation of Books Arts Terms, from English to French*. An open-access on-line list of synonyms sponsored by and posted at the website of The Canadian Bookbinders and Book Artists Guild, n.d., at http://cbbag.wildapricot.org/resource-lists/translation-english-french. Before the list of synonyms, come lists of words without translations and words given questionable translations.

Tips for Searching the ESTC

Back in mid July I asked Greg Smith, who compiles and corrects the ESTC at the BL whether there was a guide to using the ESTC, he replied, "There is a fairly comprehensive help guide accessible in the ESTC catalogue. It's difficult to find, but once you know where to look, it is pretty useful. (We don't use the public interface that much, so we don't have our own documentation for this.) If you go to the search page on ESTC, hit the 'About' option. Towards the bottom of that information screen, hit the 'online Help' link, and this will take you to the help menus. Here you will be able to find library codes etc. I think that, if you do a 'Ctrl f' text search, it will be easier to find what you want."

Brian Geiger of ESTC/NA asked the same question for me of Iris O'Brien, the BL's Early Printed Collections Cataloguing and Processing Manager, and she replied as follows 25 July:

The 'Help' section for the BL ESTC can be found here: http://estc.bl.uk/F/374IV5XYI758HYIT9UTB2TQ8GKT1GX73MEN37SMD158V7EDY1E-14001?func=file&file_name=help-1-bll06#top. It lists the various ways of searching and what's included in the indexes. There is also a "Quick tips-for this page" button on individual search pages, for instance the "Previous searches" page, which explains how to cross searches."

She also offered the following advice for my wishing to identify editions at the Huntington Library that were not on ECCO:

'To find Huntington 18c. items not on ECCO follow these steps

- Go to Advanced Search
- Search Library code "ncsmh" and limit by date "1701->1800" 49997
- Clear search (blue button in middle)
- Search Notes "Eighteenth Century" 187262
- Click on Previous searches button (grey button at top)
- Tick both searches
- Click on Cross button (blue button at top)
- Cross your sets with "First set not second" and you should get 11177 Huntington items not on ECCO
- Tick your final search and click View button (blue above)

This search will include items that have a microfilm surrogate for other projects apart from ECCO, e.g. Public General Acts 1714-1800. In order to get rid of all records with a microfilm surrogate:

Go back to Advanced Search:

- Search Notes "microfilm" 301898
- Click on Previous searches button (grey button at top) and cross the results of your previous cross search "(W-Library code= ncsmh and W-year= 1701->1800) NOT W-notes= eighteenth century" with the "microfilm" search, this time crossing your sets with "Second set not first"; this should give 10490 results.'